

FACTORS AFFECTING INTERNAL EFFICIENCY OF PRIMARY SCHOOLS IN NUER ZONE OF GAMBELLA REGIONAL STATE

BY: KOANG YANG



**INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
STUDIES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND
MANAGEMENT**

MARCH, 2014

JIMMA, UNIVERSITY

**FACTORS AFFECTING INTERNAL EFFICIENCY OF PRIMARY SCHOOLS IN
NUER ZONE GAMBELLA REGIONAL STATE**

BY: KOANG YANG



ADVISOR: GETACHEW ABESHU (PHD)

CO-ADVISOR: MR ABEBE HUNDE

**A THESIS PRESENTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION PLANNING AND
MANAGEMENT IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS IN EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP**

MARCH, 2014

JIMMA, UNIVERSITY

Letter of approval

JIMMA UNIVERSITY

INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT STUDIES

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

The thesis on the Factors Affecting Internal Efficiency of Primary Schools of Nuer Zone, Gambella Regional State was approved by the board of Examiner as the original work of Koang Yang.

BOARD OF EXAMINER

Ababo Hirudo _____ [Signature] _____ 21/08/06
Chair Person Signature Date

Gelachew Abeshu, PhD _____ [Signature] _____ 21/08/06
Main Advisor Signature Date

Co-advisor Signature Date

Dr. Mikku Betele _____ [Signature] _____ 21/08/06
Internal Examiner Signature Date

Dr. Jem Wirtu _____ [Signature] _____ 21/08/06
External Examiner Signature Date

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my appreciation to my adviser Dr Getachew Abeshu for his constructive comments and suggestions he gave me in the preparation of my thesis. And I also thank my Co-advisor Mr.Abebe Hunde who invested his precious time and energy in assisting me in analyzing the data.

I sincerely thank my friend Mr Gebeyehu Abebe for his unconditional support during the thesis proposal and analysis.

As usual, my family has been very helpful in providing unreserved support and I also thank the Nuer Zone Education Offices, Woreda Education Offices, school principals, teachers, unit leaders, department heads, students and parents for their participation in giving necessary information.

TABLES OF CONTENT

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	I
LIST OF TABLES	IV
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS	V
ABSTRACT.....	VI
CHAPTER ONE	1
1. BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY	1
1.2 Statements of the Problem	6
1.3. Objectives of the Study	8
1.3.1 General Objective	8
1.3 .2 Specific Objectives	8
1.4. Significance of the Study	8
1.5. Delimitation of the Study	9
1.6 Limitations of the Study.....	9
1.7 Definitions of the Key Terms.....	10
1.8 Organization of the Study	11
CHAPTER TWO	12
2. REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE	12
2.1. The Goal of Universal Primary Education.....	12
2.2. Concepts of Educational Efficiency.....	13
2.3. Internal and External Efficiency	14
2.3.1 Internal Efficiency.....	16
2.3.2. External Efficiency	17
2.3.3 Internal Efficiency and the Extent of Wastage in Primary Education	18
2.4 Efficiency	26
2.5 Factors behind Low and High Completion Rate in Education	26
2.5.1. Education Polices and Institutional Process.....	26
2.5.2. School Related Factors.....	27
2.5.3. Student Related Factors	31
2.5.4. Parent and Community Related Factors.....	32

CHAPTER THREE	33
3.1 Research design and methodology	33
3.2 Data Sources	33
3.3 Sample Size and Sampling Techniques	33
3.4 Data Collection Instruments.....	34
3.5 Method of Data Analysis	36
CHAPTER FOUR.....	37
4. Data Presentation, Analysis and Interpretation.....	37
4.1. Characteristics and Background of Respondents.....	37
4.2 Parents and Students Knowledge toward School Dropout as well as Grade Repetition.....	39
4.3. Internal Efficiency	43
4.3.1. Dropout Rate.....	44
4.3.2 Repetition Rate.....	48
4.3.3. Perception of Principals, Teachers, Unit leaders and Department Heads	53
Perception towards Repetition	53
4.3.4. Survival Rate.....	54
4.3.5. Principals, Teachers, Unit Leaders and Department Heads Attitude towards Internal Efficiency	55
4.3.6. Mechanism that have been used to Enhanced Schools Internal Efficiency	56
CHAPTER FIVE	58
5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	58
5.1. Summary of Findings.....	58
5.2. Conclusion	62
5.3. Recommendations.....	65
REFERENCES	68

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Distribution of sample schools by, woredas and school-----	36
Table 2: Background of respondents -----	38
Table 3: Parents Respondents on Students Dropout and Repetition-----	40
Table 4: Students Respondent on School Dropout and Repetition-----	42
Table 5: Schools Observation Checklist-----	44
Table 6: Zonal level Trends in Primary Education Dropout Rate-----	45
Table 7: Woreda level trends in Upper Primary Education (5-8) Dropout Rate-----	46
Table 8: School level Trends Dropout Rate in Upper Primary Education (5-8) -----	47
Table 9: Factors to Students' Dropout-----	48
Table 10: Zonal level Trends of Upper Primary Education Repetition Rate-----	49
Table 11: Woreda level trends of Upper Primary Education Repetition Rate-----	50
Table 12: School level Trends Repetition Rate in Upper Primary School (5-8) -----	51
Table 13: Factors for Student's Repetition-----	53
Table 14: Upper Primary Education Survival Rates to Grad 8-----	54
Table 15: Upper Primary Education Survival rates to grade 8-----	55
Table 16: Attitude towards Internal Efficiency-----	56
Table 17: Mechanisms of Enhancing Internal Efficiency-----	57

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

CE	-----	Coefficient of Efficiency
EFA	-----	Education for All
EMIS	-----	Educational Management Information System
GER	-----	Gross Enrollment Rate
MDG	-----	Millennium Development Goal
MOE	-----	Ministry of Education
REB	-----	Regional Education Bureau
GRSEB	-----	Gambella Regional State Educational Bureau
UNESCO	-----	United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNICEF	-----	United Nations Children Fund
UPE	-----	Universal Primary Education
WEO	-----	Woreda Education office
ZEO	-----	Zone Education Office

ABSTRACT

The general objective of this study was to assess the internal efficiency of primary schools of Nuer Zone of Gambella Regional State. The study endeavors to identify the major trends that may affect positively or negatively, primary education efficiency of the zone. To achieve these objective descriptive research studies was conducted. The quantitative data was collected from principals, unit leaders, department heads by using available sampling and teachers using simple random sampling, annual abstracts and report through questionnaires were presented, analyzed and interpreted by using standard deviation frequency count, mean, grand mean and percentage. Qualitative data was collected from students and parents by using focused group discussion and interview. Parents were selected using purposive sampling and that of student using simple random sampling. Ten primary schools were selected randomly which comprised (13%) of the total primary schools. The zonal trend of dropout rate and repetition rate of upper primary schools was showing oscillating with varying increase and decrease over the years but it ended up with an increasing trend, whereas the trend of dropout rate increased in 2012/13 by 0.98% and that of repetition rate trend increase by 1.85% in 2012/13 respectively. The average grand mean of 10 sampled primary schools showed increased trend of dropout rate by 0.56% and that of repetition increased by 1.60%. Based on the research finding, some of the major factors causing for students dropout rate and repetition were; students over age group; principals, teachers, unit leaders and department heads have low education academics background; most parents are illiterate and with low standard of living; the long distance from home to school, students family standard of living, shortage of school facilities and involvement in family work were mentioned as the major challenging factors for dropout. High students section ratio, students- teachers' ratios and lack of adequate student text books were the major challenging factors for repetition. To solve these problems, the researcher recommends actions in order to enhance parent literacy and awareness raising program; enhanced schools facilities and resources and limiting the student's involvement in family work were the major ones. Finally, zonal education office, woreda education offices and schools administrators have to work hard and provide serious follow up to make schools show continuous trend in decreasing student dropout and repetition.

CHAPTER ONE

1. BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

The world Book Encyclopedia (1992) defined education as the process by which people acquire, knowledge, skill, habit, value, attitudes and stresses that education should help people to become useful members of society; to develop an appreciation of their cultural heritage and to live more satisfying lives.

Education reform efforts in less industrialized countries have aimed at making education an effective vehicle for national development. Governments, policy makers, and civil society have emphasized that developing countries need to invest more in education and ensure that systems of education are efficiently managed, that limited funds allocated to sector have maximum impact, and that cost-recovery measures are adopted (GoK, 1996; 1997; Inter-Agency Commission, 1990; UNESCO, 1996; World Bank, 1988; 1996).

Thus, in nutshell, education is a fundamental right, means of realizing other rights and part of development. In order to translate the principles enshrined in the UN Declaration of Human Rights and thereby realizing the dual gains of education as an intrinsic basic right and as a mean for development, governments of developing countries declared their commitments to providing primary education to all their citizens in a reasonable period of time Taddele (2008).

Educational planners need to know how the educational system is behaving. Good and correct statistics are essential to monitor, diagnose the problems and plan effective actions to improve the educational system. Wrong statistics lead to wrong diagnostics and wrong policies. For instance, it is important to know the enrollment by grade and age, the transition rates between grades, that is, the promotion, repetition and drop-out rates, the percentage of an age cohort (all children born in a given year) which has access to school and at which age, the percentage of a school cohort (all students that enter in a school system for the first time in a given year) which concludes each grade and graduates, what the students know and are able to do at each or some grades, the available resources to finance the system and how it is being spent.

Internal efficiency is a milestone of each organization, basically, educational institution. It gives us the mirror of operation system of organization. If educational institutions are more efficient internally, they have their good results and the students who pass from such organizations get good jobs for their bright future. Internal efficiency is affected by various factors especially drop-out, retention, promotion, and cycle completion etc. The writer wants to highlight such factors which are the causes of internal efficiency. Basically these factors are categorized in three as input, process and output related factors (Subedi, 2009).

Internal efficiency is the extent to which resources made available to the educational system are being used to achieve the objectives for which the educational system has been set up. In this regard, the input into the system and the output from it needs to be measured.

The inputs include classroom, teachers, furniture, textbooks, etc. and all these can be quantified as the cost per student per year. Thus, the input has to be in terms of student years. The outputs of the educational system are the graduates from that system. In order to measure internal efficiency in education, a researcher needs to do a cohort analysis. The cohort analysis simply tells the history of a particular level of education to the time the group of students left the level. As such, it can show to what extent the educational system is able to use its raw materials (students) in the production of output (graduates). In this regard, the cohort analysis would show the flow rate in the system such as the promotion rate, repetition rate and the dropout rate of students. If the system is able to see the students through the system in the shortest possible period, then the system is efficiency. In another form, system is efficiency if the wastage rate of the system is low. The smaller the wastage rate the more efficient the system (Babalola, 2003).

Abagi and Odipo (1997) and Lerotholi (2001) point out that the internal efficiency of an education system is revealed by grade promotion, repetition and dropout rates. Lerotholi (2001) further asserts that the higher the promotion and completion rates, the better the system's efficiency. Galabawa (2003) also describes internal efficiency as follows:

The internal efficiency of the system concerns maximizing the relationship between inputs and outputs. There must be a constant quest on the part of managers of the education system to see whether the same out-puts in terms of enrolments, successful completers, or measured learning achievement - can be achieved with fewer financial or 'real resource' inputs; and whether greater

outputs can be achieved by redeployment of the existing level of inputs. (p4). Lerotholi (2001) concurs with the above citation and remarks that since internal efficiency is calculated on the basis of dropout, repetition and promotion rates, when dropout and repetition rates are high before the end of each education cycle, then that portion of the education system is said to have serious internal inefficiency.

According to Human Development in South Asia (Haq and Haq, 1998), internal efficiency refers to the links between educational inputs (such as teachers, text books) and learning achievements. Likewise Sharma and Mridula (1982, cited in Pradhan and Shrestha, 1995), assert that internal efficiency of an educational institution would particular level of education with minimum wastage and stagnation and allocation of resources in such a way that the objective of producing qualitative manpower is effectively met.

Internal efficiency is the relationship between the outputs and inputs of an education system. The internally efficient educational system is one, which turns out graduates without wasting any student-year or without dropouts and repeaters (Akinwumiju, 1995). The inputs of education can be summarized as teachers, materials, and buildings and these are all used to transform one set of outputs (say primary school leavers) into another set of output (i.e. secondary school graduates) (Olubor, 2004).

(Ignatius, 2001) Nigerian universities explain internal efficiency as internal operation of an organization relating to avoidance of wastages through judicious use of resources that are available to the organization at a given time. Succinctly, internal efficiency is a measurement of the use of resources to achieve the desired results. Effective strategic planning in the universities could help to reduce wastage in the use of the available resources which, in turn, could help the universities achieve their goals. But inadequate or lack of effective planning and implementation of plans, inadequate academic staff as well as poor infrastructural facilities have been identified as factors militating against internal efficiency, and invariably effective management of Nigerian universities. Therefore there is need to examine the relationship between strategic plan implementation and internal efficiency.

The Ethiopian government education policy documents succinctly express that primary education is the right of every citizen. The second millennium development goal is to achieve universal primary education, the target for this goal is to ensure that by 2015, and children

everywhere boys and girls alike will be able to complete a full course of primary schooling. In Ethiopia, the government set out to improve the education sectors when it came to power in 1991. Recognizing rural poverty was not only a key driver in conflict and inequality, but was also holding the country back and perpetuating the cycle of poverty...and ensure children had access to school was the key to this broad development goal.

The government development education reform plans and gradually upped its education spend from 8% of the total budget in 1985 to 23% in 2009, with the donor education aid also rising. The increased funds went toward abolishing school fee. The Ethiopian government applied intervention strategies required to reach the target of MDG by 2015. As a result the government is working hard by providing training and recruiting a lot of teachers, infrastructure (including furniture, teaching and stationary materials), building schools and building and maintaining roads in rural areas.

The key to meeting Millennium Development Goals (achieving Universal Primary Education) was to move in 1991 to devolve power to regions and districts to run their own schools; and shifting the language of instruction to local language in 1994. 3 million pupils, in Ethiopia attended primary school; by 2008. Local authority involved parent-teacher association in rehabilitating and reviving schools, the investment made created access to households to send their children to school for the first time there, was genuine appreciation of that and the people state to realize it relevant.

Education Sector Development Program (ESDP) was aimed at achieving universal primary education (UPE) by improving access, quality, equity, relevance and efficiency of the education system. This action in turn was believed to contribute and pave paths for reducing poverty. This is to mean that, by accelerating of education young citizens through improving access, equity, efficiency, relevance and quality of education. In this effect, yet significant changes have been achieved in terms of improvements and accomplishments of the above stated aims of the education system as a result of implementation of three consecutive Educational Sector Development Programs (ESDPI, II, & III). The inefficiency of the internal efficiency is the most important problem in the Nuer Zone primary schools. The Zone is founded at the west part of Gambella Regional state which

is south-west Ethiopia, and with border to south Sudan. Within the zone the progress of internal efficiency were not researched at primary school level.

1.2 Statements of the Problem

The regional enrollment rate of primary schools recorded increase from year 2008/2009 to 2010/2011. For instance Gross Enrollment Rate of primary schools is 129.7% for Boys, 107.2% for Girls and 119.1% for both increased to 126.6% for boys, 113% for girls and 120.1% for both in 2008/2009 and 2010/2011. Similarly the Net Enrollment Rate is 79.6% for Boys, 70% for Girls and 75.1% for both in 2008/2009 increased to 92.5% for boys, 82.3% for girls and 87.7% for both in 2011/12 (GREB Annual statistics Abstract 2008/2009. For instances the Regional Enrollment Rate of primary schools has increased from 108.8% in 2008/2009 to 120.1% in 2010/2011. Similarly there has been substantial increase in Regional Enrollment Rate of primary schools, has risen from 75.1% in 2008/2009 to 87.7% in 2010/2011 document in GREB Annual statistic abstract 2010/2011).

The dropout and repetition rate of Gambella primary schools was very high indicated that, performances of Gambella Education has been posing challenge when compared to standard needed for education wastage to be (GREB Annual statistics abstract 2010/2011). In addition to this, the Regional Education system was not able to meet the yearly expected target of lowering both the dropout and repetition in this period of time, for instance in 2010/2011 the dropout rate of primary schools was 12.2% and repetition rate was 4.4% in the region. From (MOE) the repetition rate was 12.4% and dropout was 16.4% in 2011/2012. These data indicate the challenge of implementing MDGS which say that all enrolled children must complete full course of primary education. This shows that regional education is internally inefficient. The expected standard considered the repetition rate and dropout rate to be zero, as we are implementing Education Millennium Development Goal. As a result the internal efficiency of the region is very low.

The Gambella regional Education Bureau (GREB) Education Statistics Annual Abstract 2010/11) also indicated that the primary school co-efficiency that measures the combined impact of dropout and repetition rates in relation to graduates has been showing inconsistent trend between the years 2008- 2011. In between these years the highest co-efficiency was seen in 2010 which was 67.5% & the least value was seen in 2008 that is 54.5%. When pupils repeat a class for one or more than one year's tends to constitute wastage in the school system. This is in view of the fact that the space which could have been occupied by anew enrolled or promoted pupils

would have to be retained for a repeater, and the dropout or pupil who leave the school before completing the given cycle or academic year are also wasting the education resource, some time they may not bring back the school material to the school, there by siphoning more funds from government in intern of continued teaching of the repeaters in the same class for more than one year.

Nuer Zone is one of the Zones located in the Western region of Gambella. Within this zone there are 77 primary schools and 336401 students studying in primary school level (zone education report, 2012/2013). It has been found from different sources that the achievement of primary schools is very low due to internal efficiency level. The researcher has been unable to find out any such kind of research report to explore the exact situation of internal efficiency of primary schools level in the zone. It is written that internal efficiency is related to all round process of school activities and school management system. In this study the researcher is interested to find out the cause for low internal efficiency and it trend in education system. The above situation demand for systematic investigation to accomplish such gap .bass on the purpose of this, the researcher intends to undertake research guide by statement of problems that focus on how to study on factor affecting internal efficiency in primary schools in Nuer Zone in term of dropout, repetition and promotion, so the problem is stated as, the factor affecting internal efficiency of primary schools. Many reasons perhaps could be responsible for this problem. The problem of this study therefore is to identify the internal efficiency of primary schools in the Nuer Zone, Gambella Regional State.

The purpose of this study is to assess the internal efficiency of the primary schools. In addressing the problem of this study, the following research questions were raised.

1. What does the trend of internal efficiency look like in Nuer Zone of Gambella Regional State between 2009/10-2012/13?
2. What are the major factors affecting the internal efficiency of primary schools in the Zone?
3. To what extent are the stakeholders' aware of impact of the internal efficiency?
4. What measures have been taken to enhance schools internal efficiency in the Zone?

1.3. Objectives of the Study

1.3.1 General Objective

The main objective of this study is to assess the internal efficiency of primary schools of Nuer Zone Gambella Regional state.

1.3.2 Specific Objectives

The specific objectives of this study were:

- a. To identify the trend of internal efficiency of Nuer primary schools.
- b. To assess the major factors those affect the internal efficiency of primary schools.
- c. To explore the awareness level and attitude of stakeholders on the impact of internal efficiency
- d. To explore whether or not effective measures have been taken to solve problems related to internal efficiency

1.4. Significance of the Study

The results of the study may have the following relevancies.

The study may be helpful to Zonal education offices, woreda education office and schools by providing them information on how to identify the factors affecting school internal efficiency and its trends.

The study might enhance the understanding of stakeholders on factors affecting the schools internal efficiency and it may increase the awareness and participation of parents in the school management system.

It may help schools, woreda education office, zonal education office; principals and parents to take appropriate measures on factors affecting school internal efficiency.

It may help other researchers who will study on the factors affecting internal efficiency in school system and it may encourage parent of students to have knowledge on the factors affecting school internal efficiency.

1.5. Delimitation of the Study

Delimitations refer to the scope of the study. The scope of this study covered the following aspects:

The study is delimited to ten primary schools of Nuer Zone, Gambella Regional State. Nuer Zone had 77 primary schools with 36401 pupils, 701 class teachers and 77 principals, with in these schools number of them are located in rural areas. This study was confined to the analysis of the key factors affecting internal efficiency of primary schools of Nuer Zone, Gambella Regional State.

The internal efficiency variables which the researcher concentrated on were the flow of pupils in terms of dropout and repetition. The study delimited to take place at upper primary school levels (grades 5-8) of some selected primary school in all woredas in the zone and also delimited to ten primary schools of Nuer Zone, Gambella Regional State. The study was delimited technically in the assessment of internal efficiency with particular focus on the trend of internal efficiency and the factors affecting them.

1.6 Limitations of the Study

It is obvious that research works can't be totally free from limitation. For this matter, limitations might be observed in this study. Accordingly, some of the school principals unite leaders and department head are over burden by routine office and personal activities to provide the necessary data. These problems elongates the time for data collection more than the expected plan. In addition the limitation of this study could be the fact that the findings cannot be generalized for all schools in Gambella Regional State because it focused on only in Nuer Zone Primary schools. Furthermore, there was acute shortage of books or lack of updated related literature and similar research works on the topic, especially Gambella context impede the researchers from consulting more findings in the literature as well as in the discussion part.

The problem scanty data on pupil drop-outs and repetitions of Nuer zone primary schools. Though study covered the period 2009/10-2012/13. The researcher found it very difficult to collect data because it was the time of planting most, of the parents were not available and the study also was limited by time constrains, shortage of budget and road condition.

1.7 Definitions of the Key Terms

Co efficiency of efficiency: is a measure of the internal efficiency of an education system obtained by dividing the ideal number of pupil-years required for a pupil cohort to complete a level or cycle of education (e.g. the primary level) by the estimated total number of pupil years actually spent by the same pupil cohort (UNESCO, 1998:47).

Cohort: Refers to group of pupils join the beginning grade of courses in a given years (UNESCO, 1972:25).

Completion rate: Is defined as the total number of students who successfully completed the final years grade of primary Schools, expressed as percentage of the total population of the school leaving age (UNESCO, 2000:25).

Dropout Rate: Leaving a school before completing of a given stage of education or some intermediate or non-terminal point in level of education (UNESCO, 1998:46).

Internal efficiency: Refers to the measure of performances of education system which show students successfully completing a given level without wastage (UNESCO, 1972).

Promotion Rate: Is percentage of pupils promoted to next grade in the following school year, some countries practices automatic promotion, meaning that all pupil are Promoted regardless of their scholastics achievement (UNNESCO, 1998:47).

Pupil--Years: Are non-monetary measures. One pupil-year denoted the resources spent to maintain a pupil in school for one year (UNESCO, 1998:47).

Repetition Rate: Refers to the proportion of students who have remained in the same grade over one year and used additional resources for the grade. Resources are in the form of teacher salary, school materials (UNESCO, 1998:47).

Survival Rate: percentage of cohort of pupils who enrolled together in the first grade (e.g. grades 5) or the final grade of an education cycle either with or without repeating grade (UNESCO, 1998:47).

Educational inputs: comprise the buildings, teachers, books and other learning materials, which may be aggregated and expressed in terms of expenditure per pupil per year

(UNESCO, 1998:13)

Educational output: Refers to the numbers of pupils who complete a given cycle of education.

in this case it is the primary school cycle which ideally takes eight years are promoted to the next class at the beginning of the School years.

Net Enrollment rate (NER): is the number of pupils in the official school-age group expressed as a percentage of the total population in that age-group (UNESCO, 1998:48).

Gross Enrollment rate (GER): is the total enrolment in a level or cycle of education, regardless of age, expressed as a percentage (sometimes exceeding 100 per cent) of population in the officially defined school-age group for the level or cycle Concerned group (UNESCO, 1998:46).

1.8 Organization of the Study

The study was organized in to five chapters. The first chapter deals with the background of the study, statement of the problem, objectives of the study, significances of the study, delimitation of the problem and operational definitions. The second chapter presents the related literature review. The third chapter deals with research design and methodology. The fourth chapter deals with the presentation and analysis of data collection. The last chapter provides the summary, conclusion and recommendation.

CHAPTER TWO

2. REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

2.1. The Goal of Universal Primary Education

The goal of Universal primary education emphasizes both universal access and completion of quality primary education. This calls for a perfectly efficient system whereby technically all students admitted in to the first grade would be able to complete the full course of eight-year primary education (Taddele 2008:166). The concept of UPE has no universally accepted norm for the number of years of Schooling that shall constitute the requirement. The EFA global monitoring report for 2002 (UNESCO 2002:33) notes that “the universal Declaration of human rights and each of its successors deliberately left the definition of the primary span of education Unspecified”. As a result different years of primary education ranging from four to eight years are being considered by different countries, with the results that the Attainment of UPE represents the provision of schooling twice as much in some Countries than in others.

According to UNESCO 2002 the second United Nations Millennium Development Goal is to achieve Universal Primary Education, more specifically, to “ensure that by 2015, children everywhere, boys and girls alike will be Able to complete a full course of primary schooling.” Currently, there are more than 100 million children around the world of primary school age who are not in school. The majority of these children are in regions of sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia And within these countries, girls are at the greatest disadvantage in receiving access to Education at the primary school age. Since the Millennium Development Goals were launched, there have been many successes. For example, China, Chile, Cuba, Singapore and Sri Lanka are all examples of developing countries that have successfully completed a campaign towards universal primary education.

Human being should have the opportunity to make a better life for themselves. Sustainable end to world poverty as well as the path to peace and security requires that citizens in every country of the world are empowered to make positive choices and provide education for themselves and their families (UNICEF, 2011). Education has been recognized as a means to such empowerment as well as national development. And now over six decades have passed since education,

particularly primary education, been recognized as fundamental human rights. In the 1960's different regional conferences, for example African countries met in Addis Ababa (1961), where organized and 1980 were set as target year to Universalizing primary education. This did not materialize and the target year was pushed first to 1990, then 2000 and now to 2015 (Taddele 2008:10).

Access to primary education has expanded over the past 2-3 decades, Significant progress has been recorded both in terms of number of primary schools and enrollment 51% (1965/66) ,71% (1970/71) and 100 % (1980/81) for example document that enrollment in developing countries more than doubled. Despite these achievements, however, achievement of the goal of UPE still remains rhetoric and major challenge in the move towards UPE is low internal efficiency expressed in terms of high dropout and repetition rate.

2.2. Concepts of Educational Efficiency

According to, Abagl (1997). The conceptualization of school efficiency seems to access to education by increasing education opportunities to school-age population. Due to this many countries in Africa, including Ethiopia have focused attention on increasing resources to education sector to achieve UPE goals. Thus, these countries now faced with the problem of trade-off between enhancing the efficiency of the education sector and increasing access of primary, secondary and tertiary education (Abagl, 1997). This is to mean that educational expansion affects the efficiency of the education system. As substantial amount of resource is assigned for increasing educational access, the educational efficiency is facing a challenge, because the system is not getting adequate resources solve problem in inputs, process and output of the education system.

Secondly, the knowledge about what education efficiency entails is limited. That is, very little is known about the efficiency with which various schools raise pupils learning and/or achievement. But as the official budgetary allocation to education shrinks inefficiency is a problem that needs to be understood and solved. Thirdly, as poverty increases and the level of investment in education declines, policymakers are looking for innovative and feasible strategies for improving the operation of the education system and making education promote national development a

question facing policy makers is how can available resources be used more efficiently in a proposal to make education achieve its objectives at house hold and national level.

2.3. Internal and External Efficiency

Efficiency can be seen from two perspectives: internal and external efficiency. Internal efficiency of education is concerned with the provision of more education to produce a given output by using less input of resources. Internal efficiency of an education system is concerned with the relationship between the inputs and outputs of an education system (Coombs and Hallak, 1987:9) elaborate the definition of internal efficiency as follows;

It refers to the relationship between systems' (and sub systems) outputs (learning achievements) and the corresponding inputs that went in to creating them Internal efficiency may be judged in terms of its cost-effectiveness, with effectiveness measured in this context by the systems immediate out puts as distinct from its ultimate benefits.

Inputs are the various elements that enable the education system to properly function. Inputs include the human resources which include teachers, educational managers, students and non-human resources like; educational materials, buildings, different machineries and equipment that are required for the normal function of a teaching –learning process that takes place in a school. Education output, on the other hand, refers to the expected results of the objectives of the system mainly student achievement. The knowledge, skills, attitudes and exposures the students acquire from the schools are indicators of the output of an education system. Coombs & Hallak, (1987: 7-8); Psacharopoulos and Loxley (1985; 68).

On the other hand, external efficiency refers to the attainment of social goals or objectives. It measures, as mentioned above, not the 'immediate output but the ultimate benefits ' that is gained by passing through the system. External efficiency of an educational system is realized through the relevance of education to socio –economic conditions of a country. The ability of graduates to enter the labor market following the completion of education can be seen as an indicator of educational efficiency (Tsang, 1988). Different between internal and external efficiency, external efficiency measures not the output but outcome of an education system. Here outcome of an education system refers to the "external effects of outputs, the ability of people to be socially and

economically productive’’ (Psacharopoulos and Wood hall, 1985). Since the objective of this research is to study the internal efficiency of schools, the major emphasis will be given to the problems of the internal efficiency of the education system.

According to Psacharopoulos, et.al, (1985), though there is a link between internal and external efficiency to make a better understanding of the two concepts it is necessary to distinguish educational “output” and “outcome”. Educational output in the sense of pupils or students achievement which refers to knowledge, skills, behavior and attitudes as measured by tests, examination results and the like, but outcome is in the sense of the external effects of output that is the ability of people to be socially and economically productive (World Bank,1980).

However, roughly speaking, external efficiency is judged by the relationship between input and outcome whereas internal efficiency is only concerned with the relationship between inputs and outputs within the education system or within individual institutions (Psacharopoulos and Woodhall, 1985:215). Therefore, to measure educational system efficiency, educational statisticians and planners assume the output of a given cycle of education is the number of pupils who complete the cycle, i.e. the graduates. Similarly educational inputs comprise the buildings, teachers, books and other learning materials which may be aggregated and expressed in terms of expenditure per pupil per year. Usually they equate the educational inputs with outputs to measure or estimate efficiency of schools. If we agree with human capital school and view education as a productive investment in human capital, efficiency will become our first consideration. As Psacharopoulos has pointed out, ‘the choice of investments must, therefore, be based on an analysis of the external efficiency of all competing uses of resources, from the point of view of society’s objectives, as well as the internal efficiency of resources.’(Psacharopoulos, George and Woodhall, Maureen 1985, p.23)

External efficiency and internal efficiency are linked but different considerations in public subsidization in education. To make a better understanding of these two concepts, it is necessary to distinguish “output” and “outcome” clearly. To follow the World Bank who distinguishes between output in the sense of achievement of pupils or students--which refers to knowledge, skills, behavior, and attitudes—as measured by tests, examination results, and the like, and outcome in the sense of the external effects of output—that is, the ability of people to be socially and economically productive (World Bank 1980, p.32). Roughly speaking, external efficiency,

with the objective of social welfare maximization, is judged by the relation between input and outcome. By external efficiency analysis, we can justify the investment in education based on certain manpower demands or the higher social rate of return to investment in education than other alternatives. Some evidence showed that in developing countries the average rate of return to human capital investment is higher than the rate of return to physical investment, even though we do not take into account the positive effect of education on the productivity of physical capital. (Psacharopoulos, George and Woodhall, Maureen 1985, p.22) Therefore, government, as a rational investor, should invest in education, since it is more profitable (or beneficial if we consider social externalities) for society. Not only external efficiency consideration affects the amount of public subsidization, external efficiency is also important for government to decide which levels or which kinds of education should enjoy the priorities in public subsidization. For example, it is widely argued that the *social* rate of return to primary education is higher than that of secondary and higher education, so it should be paid more attention than the latter two.

2.3.1 Internal Efficiency

(Abagl, 1997: 14) defines internal efficiency as “the amount of learning achieved during the school age attendance, compared to the resources provided.” And take ‘the percentage of entering students who completed the course’ as its measure. Thus, internal efficiency refers to the measurement of performance of the education system by showing the proportion of students successfully completing a given level of the Education system without wastage.

Internal efficiency addresses the question of how funds within the Educational sector should be best allocated. It is concerned with obtaining the greatest Educational outputs for any given level of spending. Economists have a simple Conceptual rule to determine how resources should be allocated among alternative Educational activities: The improvement in educational performance that results from the last amount of funds spent on an educational activity should be equal across each possible activity. For example, consider a school that is deciding between buying new Workbooks for students and hiring a part-time teacher to tutor individual students. Clearly, the school should spend the funds on the one that increases performance the most--say workbooks in this example. In fact it should continue spending money on Work books until the educational

value of the two choices are the same (After the Initial purchase of workbooks, the value of added workbooks is probably lessened so that at some level of spending the appropriate decision is to purchase a tutor instead of more workbooks). The same logic holds for all of the inputs that a school Purchases, leading to the previously stated rule. Internal efficiency is also sometimes referred to as "allocate efficiency" or "price efficiency" (Lockheed and Hanushek, 1987).

In a nutshell, internal efficiency of any educational system is believed to have high co-relation with educational inputs, processes & outputs of the system. On the other hand according to Sanothimi and Bhaktapur, (2001), the question of educational quality is also a question of internal efficiency in education system. Therefore, internal efficiency and quality of the education system can be indicated by calculating the promotion, repetition & dropout rates, at various grade levels. Furthermore efficiency also includes cycle completion and survival rates at certain grade level and cycle to cycle transfer rates. To put it differently, improving internal efficiency of the school system is by default improving quality of education because both of them focus on relationship of educational inputs, processes & outputs of the system.

2.3.2. External Efficiency

According to Lockheed and Hanushek, (1987:8) "external efficiency, we refer to what is often the topic of cost-benefit analyses: that is, the ratio of monetary outcomes to monetary inputs. Extensive consideration has been given to the issue of "external efficiency", or how the overall use of money for schooling compares to other potential public and private uses. If a country received \$1 million, should it channel this to education or to some other expenditure? The answer depends crucially upon a comparison of the benefits of the alternatives. In perhaps the simplest consideration, one can calculate the rate of return to an investment in education and then compare this with an alternative investment. (Lockheed and Hanushek, 1987; 8) This is complicated--in large part because the calculation of benefits is frequently difficult--but it has proven to be a very useful approach for policy considerations. The analysis of external efficiency provides information that is useful in deciding upon the right level of educational spending for a country, or in deciding upon the allocation of funds across different subsectors such as primary education or vocational training. It does not, however, provide guidance about the specific policies that should be pursued within the educational sector. This guidance is provided through analysis of internal efficiency.

2.3.3 Internal Efficiency and the Extent of Wastage in Primary Education

The term wastage in respect to education refers to human and material resources spent or 'wasted' on pupils who have to repeat a grade or who drop out of school before completing a cycle. It denotes the inefficiency of a school system and refers also to the wasted opportunities for these children to develop the knowledge, skills attitudes and values they need to live productive lives and to continue learning (UNESCO, 1998:48).

The dropout and repetition are considered as two components of educational wastage. Still some writers argue that in educational term it is not correct to consider dropouts and repeaters as wastage, because in their school career they have received a Considerable amount of education. So, from the point of view economic evaluation, Matured school leavers and repeaters may contribute to the economy. On the other hand, there are some that disagree that it is undeniable from the education point of View; both dropout and repetition contribute heavy costs in education. When a school fails or is inefficient to achieve educational objectives, it is inevitable that there is wastage of human learning, school buildings, equipment and other instructional materials and the labor of teachers. This means when the degree of wastage is high, the internal efficiency of the system becomes low and vice versa.

It is clear that the national aim of all nations is to retain all children recruited in to the education system until the objective of the system has been satisfied. However, due to external and internal factors, schools cannot retain children, as they would wish. The School system has much responsibility to reduce wastage by controlling the internal factors (school related factors) that cause repetition and dropout. At primary level of education; both dropout and repetition represent wastage of education. Dropout and repetition are the most convenient events through which to observe the failure of a system to hold children with in it and the inefficiency in the achievement of objectives (Brimer and Pauli, 1971:17). So, to study the problem of educational wastage, the basic symptoms of wastage i.e. Dropouts and repetition need to be understood in relation to the types of system which reveal them.

There are also some measures that indicate the internal efficiency of an education system. According to this author, in practical terms, the educational efficiency has two internal dimensions: the how of students through the system (with minimum waste) and the quality of

learning achieved in the system. Therefore, internal efficiency of an education system can be measured by promotion, repetition, dropout, completion and survival rates.

Dropout

(UNESCO) 1998 defines the term dropout as leaving a school before completion of a given stage of education or some intermediate or non-terminal point in level of education. The basic symptoms of wastage, in particular dropping out, depend on the type of education systems. It is defined in relation to the characteristics of the various educational systems. The duration of compulsory schooling and the periods between the ages into grades varies between countries of different educational systems. The duration of compulsory schooling and the periods between the ages in to grades varies between countries of different educational systems.

In the less developed regions, however, early drop-out is a major problem, of the approximately 96 million pupils who entered school for the first time in 1995, one quarter (24 million) are likely to abandon their schooling before they reach Grade 5. UNESCO (1998: p14). There are three categories of theories that explain why dropouts abandon school. Categories are “Drop-out”, “Pull-out” or “Push-out” theories (Glennie & Stern, 2002:10).

“Dropout” refers to attributes of the individual that precipitate early school departure. Factors like readiness and attitude of the student, health problems, and malnutrition are examples of dropout theory. This theory considers student personal characteristics as factors for dropping out of school. Lessanu (2004:30). Employment opportunities are also examples of pullout factors that attract student to drop out of school. School factors that dispirit students from continuing with their education, Unattractive school condition policy irregularities are some of the examples that can act as push factor to students. The tendency for students to dropout is also associated with their school experiences such as dislike of school; Low academic achievement; retention at grade level; the sense that teachers and administrators do not care about students; and inability to feel comfortable in a large, depersonalized school setting (U.S. Department of Education, 1999:31). In school factor that deter the attendance of students can be categorized as ‘push out’ factors. The first and most important reason for dropping out, especially in the developing countries is the ‘pull out’ factor. The need for having a time that would be used to sell the labor and in return get a means of subsistence in which the family or the individual would depend on has contributed to a greater proportion of school dropouts. Lessanu, (2004: 31)

There are many factors associated with drop out, some of which are associated with the individual, such as poor health or under-nutrition and children's school motivation. Other emerges from children's household situations such as child labor and poverty. School level factors also play a role in increasing pressures to drop out such as teacher's absenteeism, school location and poor quality educational provision. The nature of educational provision at the community level e.g. type of school, level of community support) generates conditions that can ultimately have an impact on the likelihood of children dropping out from school. Both demand and supply driven factors play a role in the process of school dropout. Based on this the causes of school dropout focusing on the child household and school contexts. This review is informed by the work commissioned by CREATE by Hunt.F, (2008) and Pridmore (2007). We discuss evidence on the child's health, gender and disability; the child within the household; the cost of schooling; household characteristics; precursors to drop out; and recent studies from Bangladesh.

Personal characteristics of a child, influenced by social norms can determine whether the child drop out from education. Some studies explore associations between child health and educational outcomes, in particular how nutritional status impacts on school enrolment and cognitive development (Ghuman et al, 2006; Alderman *et al*, 2001) but only a few studies look at how health problems are directly related to dropping out from school (Pridmore, 2007). In general, studies suggest that poor health is often a result of poverty and through under-nutrition; children's educational access and attainment are severely jeopardized. Thus there is evidence that hemoglobin levels in the blood, and height and weight (body mass for age), are both indicators of nutritional status, and have significant and positive associations with school enrolment (Alderman et al, 2001; Ghuman et al, 2006). In addition, early child under-nutrition is associated with delayed school enrolment (Glewwe and Jacoby, 1995). In Bangladesh nutrition deficiencies are associated with slow school progress due to its impact on children's cognitive development (Grira, 2001).

The family context, in particular the relationship of the child with other members of the household and the child's responsibilities may be important determinants of school drop out Rose and Al- (2001); Khanam (2008). In many poor countries children combine school with work (at home or away Samarrai from home) in order to satisfy household needs (Admassie, 2003).

However, not all forms of child labor are compatible with school participation (Hadley, 2010). Some labor activities, especially in agriculture, are seasonal and the timing of seasons do not correspond to the school calendar (Hadley, 2010). Other activities, such as child care for younger members in the household, are labor intensive and time consuming and may detract from children's ability to undertake school work (Dar et al, 2002).

Another important aspect of the life of children within the household is the relationship with their parents, in particular the support given by parents with the child's schooling and the perceptions of parents about the potential benefits of education for their children (Ananga, 2011 forthcoming). It is likely that parental support for the child's education is linked to lower chances that the child will drop out from schooling. Not all parents are engaged with their children's education. A study by Liu (2004) in China found that the majority of parents were indifferent about their children dropping out from school and left the schooling decision to the child, particularly for older children. Liu (2004) suggested that parents do not want to be blamed by the child for not continuing in education, particularly at junior secondary level.

The direct and indirect costs of schooling can exclude some children from school. One of the most important direct costs underlying the process of drop out is school fees where these are levied. Thus school fees were found to be a potent reason for drop out of 27 percent of boys and 30 percent of girls before matriculation in South Africa (Hunter and May, 2002). Many countries have now adopted fee free for the basic education cycle because of the effects on participation. Some have also introduced capitation systems to offset the loss in school income. But other charges and indirect costs continue to be an obstacle to enrolment of the poorest households (Lewin, 2008).

Thus the costs of pens/pencils, copybooks, private coaching, transportation, and school uniform remain a relative economic burden for poor households (Ananga, 2011 forthcoming). Lack of money to buy essential school materials for children's schooling is likely to cause lack of enrolment in the first place and potentially high dropout at a later stage (Kadzamira and Rose, 2003). This is the case in Kenya, where dropout rates among the children of economically vulnerable families have gone up due to lack of resources to pay for the costs of education for

their children that are not covered by the fee free educational policy (Mukudi, 2004). The ‘cost-sharing’ policy of Kenya compelled parents to pay about 65 percent of school costs, which caused many poor children to drop out (Ackers et al, 2001).

The opportunity cost of schooling is the income forgone of the next best activity available for children who are in education. These activities relate to child labor or caring responsibilities both within and outside of the household. The opportunity cost for children who are in schooling often increases as they get older, which increases the pressure on them to withdraw from school Colclough et al (2000). In Bangalore, India, for example, if the wage earnings of parents are low children may be called to supplement household income either by working or by taking on other household responsibilities to free up other out from education.

Several studies have focused on income and dropout. Most of these studies are undertaken at a macro-level. A UN taskforce report on education and gender equality on low and middle-income countries shows that completion rates are lowest for children from poor households and less than half of the poorest children complete even the first year of school (Birdsall et al, 2005). At a micro-level, family income is directly linked to the affordability of education and as such has a direct impact on whether children attend education (Hadley, 2010). If children do attend education, changes in the financial situation of parents, as reflected by the volatility of family income, may push some children out of education. Although this may be a temporary effect and income may recover and return to schooling (Kane, 2004; Hadley, 2010).

Another important factor that is often related to drop out is parental education level Chowdhury et al (2002); Nath *et al* (2008). Parents with low levels of education are more likely to have children who do not attend school. If they do, they tend to drop out in greater numbers (Blick and Sahn, 2000; Brown and Park, 2002) and engage in more income generating activities than children of parents with high levels of education Duryea (2003); Ersado (2005). A recent case study of a rural village in Ghana showed parental illiteracy was associated with low household income as two important factors likely to cause girls to dropout Pryor and Ampiah (2003). Furthermore, there may be some gendered dimensions to the links between parental education and children’s drop out with differential effects for boys and girls (Connelly and

Zheng, 2003). For girls, the risk of becoming pregnant, and hence potentially dropping out of school, declines significantly as the educational attainment of the household head increases (Grant and Hallman, 2006).

Repetition

Most research on grade repetition's relationships to educational outcomes has been done in developed countries. Its findings may not generalize well to developing countries, where repetition occurs more frequently and is more likely to be initiated or at least accepted by the family rather than imposed by the school. There are other differences as well. In developed Countries, students ordinarily are not absent from school more than a few days each year (mostly due to minor illnesses). However, in developing countries (especially rural areas), many children miss many days of school because of more serious health or nutrition problems or because their families require them to assume child care or work responsibilities. Here, many students repeat a grade because they did not attend school frequently (if at all) the previous year. Although the situations that create them are undesirable from a societal perspective, these repetition choices are understandable, even productive, from the family's perspective (Gomes-Neto and Hanushek, 1994). There also are exceptions to the usual association between grade repetition and low achievement. In Burundi and Kenya, where most repetition occurs in the final years of the primary cycle, students allowed to repeat are selected for their high academic potential, as a way to prepare them to compete for limited secondary openings (Eisenmon and Schville, 1991).

Despite these differences, findings from developing countries mirror those from developed countries: Grade repetition is associated with low achievement and early dropout. Yet, needless repetition persists because many school administrators, teachers, and parents believe that repeating the grade is preferable to promotion when students have achieved poorly (Eisenmon, 1997).

Teachers in developing countries ordinarily are not trained to make promotion/repetition decisions and do not have access to detailed achievement standards and aligned assessment instruments, so concerns have been expressed that many decisions may be based on arbitrary

observations or beliefs rather than justified criteria. However, studies done in rural Brazil (Gomes-Neto and Hanushek, 1994) and in rural Pakistan (King, Orazem, and Paterno, 1999) found that promotion decisions were closely related to measured achievement. Even so, when these decisions are made locally by individual teachers, they are subject to the “frog pond” effect: Students’ achievement progress is judged relative to that of their immediate classmates rather than to national norms. As a result, many students in generally high achieving schools are retained when they would be promoted if they attended generally low-achieving schools (Ikeda, 2005).

In developed countries grade repeaters are more likely to come from families that rank lower on measures of socioeconomic status and related variables (income, parental years of education completed, etc.). They also are more likely to be male than female. Their parents are less likely to be involved with the school and to advocate effectively for their children. Repetition occurs most often at kindergarten or first grade. Subsequently, it occurs more often at grades preceding transitions to middle school, junior high school, or high school than at other grades. Repetition decisions are almost always initiated by the school rather than the parents, although they may be communicated as recommendations rather than requirements (in which case, the final decision is left up to the parents). Recommendations that preschool or kindergarten children repeat a grade are usually based on teachers’ assessments of intellectual and social maturity (attention span, direction following, social adjustment), whereas retention recommendations in first grade and beyond are usually based mostly on indicators of achievement progress. Grade repeaters tend to be younger than their classmates and more often absent from school. Otherwise, however, comparisons of repeaters with other low-achievers who either were promoted or recommended for placement in special education usually do not show significant group differences in intelligence, achievement, or even social competence (Beebe-Frankenberger, Bocian, MacMillan, and Gresham, 2004; Corman, 2003; Martin, Foels, Clanton, and Moon, 2004; Jimerson, Carlson, Rotert, Egeland, and Sroufe, 1997).

In recent years, educational policies in the United States have featured increased emphasis on mandated standards, sometimes including requirements that students at certain grade levels pass tests to qualify for promotion. In states that implemented these requirements, grade repetition rates increased noticeably, especially in grades preceding those in which the tests were

administered. States and large school districts that established “promotional gates” in certain grades often found that 20 to 40 percent of the students in these grades did not qualify for promotion. In terms of cost, repetition increases education cost, because repeaters reduce the intake capacity of the school and prevent other children from entering school or causes overcrowding of classrooms. Repetition is one of the constraints of developing countries not to achieve universal primary education (Psacharopoulos and Woodhall 1985: 209).

Another form of school wastage occurs when pupils have to repeat grades. According to UNESCO (1998:17) in developing countries especially, this is often a prelude to drop-out. School systems around the world differ widely in their policies toward pupils who fail to master the work appropriate to a particular grade level. In a majority of countries, both developed and developing, educators require such pupils to repeat the grade in order to give them additional time and material that they failed to master the first time around. Repetition is thus seen as a remedy for slow learners. The practice is typically applied in Grade 1 out of a conviction that it is important for pupils to get off to good start in their education. However, repeating the final primary grade is also widespread in countries where admission to secondary school is based on passing an end-of-primary school examination. A minority of countries appear to believe that repetition creates more problems than it solves and therefore follow a policy of automatic promotion. Accordingly, pupils proceed to the next grade even when they have not mastered the material of the previous grade. Some educators argue that pupils who did not learn something the first time are not likely to benefit from repeating the same academic year. A wiser policy, they argue, is to provide such pupils additional assistance and allow them to proceed to the next grade with their peers (UNESCO, 1998).

Survival Rate

Survival rate is Percentage of a cohort of pupils, who enroll together in the first grade of primary education, which reaches a given grade (e.g. Grade 5) or the final grade of an education cycle either with or without repeating a grade (UNNESCO, 1998:47).

2.4 Efficiency

The concept of “efficiency” as used by economists, refer to the relationship between the inputs in a system and the outputs or outcomes from the system. However according (UNESCO, 1998:17), measuring the efficiency of education systems is problematic due to difficulties in defining and measuring educational outputs and outcome as well as quantifying the relationship between inputs and outputs and/or out comes. Any way an education system is considered to be efficient if it produces the desired outputs or outcomes at a minimum cost. The desired quality of output is measured in terms of a maximum number of pupils who have acquired the necessary knowledge and skill as prescribed by the society. Therefore, as stated above an education system is considered to be efficient if for a given input of resources (human, financial and material) is maximized the desired output both in quantity and quality.

2.5 Factors behind Low and High Completion Rate in Education

As indicated above, many primary school children who enter the school system at primary level do not complete the cycle in the given time frame. This is becoming one of the challenges of achieving UPE goals at 2015. And many factors could be behind low completion rate at primary schools. According to (Abagi, et.al, 1997), the major factors that affect low completion rate at primary school could be divided into three or four categories. These are education polices and institutional processes, school-based factors, house hold and community based factors and student related factors. Even though their impact varies from school to school, the above categories of factors of low completion rate have caused inefficiency in primary education. Thus, since low completion rates a serious wastage in the system it must be solved as immediate as possible.

2.5.1. Education Polices and Institutional Process

Under these categories of factors one can evaluate insures such as polices or budget allocation, cost of primary education, political will, loop sided priorities, poor management, monitoring and feedback (Abagi, et.al, 1997). The budget allocated to primary education per child the cost education which might be incurred by Government or parent; poor management monitoring, and

evaluate major impact on internal efficiency of schools. For instance, if burden of cost of education is shifted to parents, due to poverty level of parents they might be unable to finance their children's educational cost. For example, in Kenya as cost sharing policy is introduced in primary schools since 1988. This policy has made parents and community unable to support their children education. And this became a major source of school inefficiency (Bishop, 1989). Any way this policy factor does not seem an influential factor in our countries because cost sharing is not introduced at primary schools. Government allocates a block grant to each student. In addition to this, the policy related factors are like promotion policy, teacher textbook ratio, student classroom ratio, teacher student ratio policies affect the policy on teachers 'salary, and policies on school feeding program etc. also affect schools internal efficiency.

2.5.2. School Related Factors

Several school-based factors have been cited as being responsible for high or low completion rates among primary school. Pupils in most African countries among these the main ones are school environment and location, access of educational facilities and materials, classroom dynamics (use of more efficient methods), teachers qualification and attitudes towards their work and pupils and over loaded curriculum, are the main areas (Abagi,1997). Therefore, one of the most important factors that enable us to determine high or low internal efficiency is the organization and structure of the school. According to Simmons (1986: 45), School based factors include school facilities, teacher characteristics. School management regulation and guidance and the class room dynamic or the interaction of the student, teacher and the curriculum are the dominate factors.

2.5.2.1. School Physical Resource and Facilities

School physical resources and facilities include school buildings, furniture, equipment's of laboratory pedagogical center, library, textbooks etc. Many writers have tried to study the effect of school physical resources and facilities on academic achievements of students in particular and internal efficiency in general. For instance, Shiundu John (1999:17) indicates that shortage to physical resources and facilities at school level cause wastage of education, by raising the

repetition and dropout rates. Similarly as stated in Harrison and Hanusheck recent review studies on the relationship between facilities and student achievement in developing countries 22 out of 34 studies showed positive relationship. However, three studies showed inverse relationship and nine studies were found that it was insignificant (Nebiyu, 1999:285). This review of studies indicates that the school facilities and academic achievement of students are associated directly. In other words, other things being equal, as school facilities increase the number of good achievers or promoted children increases, and vice versa.

It is true that many educationalist give emphasis for the availability of school facilities, which affect the quality of teaching. Poor school facilities may affect students' performance. In some cases it has more impact on girls than boys. The effect is clearly seen when girls reach puberty, they need seats permanently and also separate latrine. The non-existence of these facilities is likely to be contributing factors for girls' dropout (Rose, 1997:6). In addition to this sexual harassment and school location and distance affect girls' dropout.

2.5.2.2. School Location

School location has been described as one of the factors of rising school dropouts and repetition rates. Distance to school and danger to travel are major problems categorized under this factor. This problem is mostly felt in rural schools than urban schools.

It also affects girls than boys. For instance, as one study conducted in Egypt reports, "among enrolled girls who lived 2km from their school was achieved 8% lower than that of girls who lived 1 km from their school. Whereas for boys who lived farther away was 4 percent lower" (World Bank, 1990:3435). In Ethiopia as greater proportion of the population is living in scattered settlements of rural area this factor seems critical factor for internal efficiency of primary schools.

2.5.2.3. Teacher's Characteristics

Generally the qualities of teaching staff in schools affect the internal efficiency of schools. The characteristics that are related with quality of teachers include teachers attitude, qualification,

experience, motivation, classroom management and their interaction with students' academic achievement in particular and school repetition rate in general (Bishop, 1989:74). For instance the effect of teachers input on cognitive achievement was studied by many researchers and the summary of the results of the study are reported as follow. As Harmison and Hanucheck in Nebiyu, (1999) summarized 96 studies conducted in developing countries they reported that among 63 studies conducted on the relationship between teacher education and 23students' academic achievements 35 of them showed positive relationship. However he studies were found insignificant relationship. On the other studies conducted regarding teachers experience, salary and teacher-pupil ratio on academic achievement, over half of the studies were found to have insignificant effect. In contrast the above mentioned fact (Simmons and Alexander, 1986:90-91). Reviewed many research findings and stated the following conclusion:

- Teachers experience and salary tends to have positive influence on academic achievement.
- Smaller teacher-pupil ratios have little effect on students' achievement.

Similarly studies carried out in Asian countries confirmed that schools which have increase class size had yet shown reduced wastage in terms of dropout and repetition (Bishop, 1989). On the other hand, few class observations in Kenya indicate that there are cases where teachers negative attitudes "Push" pupils, especially girls, out of schools. These pupils are those who are neglected, abused, and miss-handled and sent out of class during teaching learning periods. The results of all the above cases are absenteeism, hate of schooling poor academic performance, and non-completion of the education cycle (Bishop, 1989). In addition to this sexual harassments and pregnancies is found to affect girls' participation and repetition rate in education.

Finally, in the sphere of teacher's characteristics, low teacher motivation is one of the most important causes for wastage in education. Low teacher motivation leads to teacher absenteeism and attrition, which are the prominent problems of developing countries. Teacher absenteeism reduces students learning time, while teacher attrition increases costs of teacher training. One recent World Bank study reports that the causes of low teacher motivation are low salaries, poor working conditions, insufficient career advancement opportunities and/or weak supervisory and support services. Low teacher moral, directly or indirectly, affects the quality of teaching and the

relationship between teachers and students, which results low pupil achievement and high school dropouts.

2.5.2.4. School Policies

Schools have their own operational policies and regulation in relation to teaching learning process and assessment of students learning. That affect repetition and dropout rates, these policies includes multi-grade teaching Self-contained teaching, shift system, language policies, Promotion policy etc. Are some of the school based policies of these policy factors have their own positive or negative impact on schools internal efficiency performance. For instance according to Eiscomon (1977:27) multi grade teaching and shift system teaching that are designed to expand the opportunity of basic education through effective use of available resources are associated with high, repetition rate for that it reduces instructional time.

The other school policies that affect educational wastage are the promotion policy or examination regulation. Even though examinations are not fully efficient to measure student academic achievement, yet many use it to determine the chance of students to move the next higher grade or level of education .As a result examinations and promotion usually cause high or low rate of educational wastage (Psacharopoulos,1991:235). Many countries incorporate automatic promotion policy especially at lower grade to reduce high repetition rate. In Ethiopia automatic Promotion was incorporated in grade 1-3 so as to reduce repetition rate, however, in these grade still repetition rate are reported (MOE, 2000:13).The other school related factor which is most critical for school readiness, academic performance and repetition rate is the language policy, as it is evident in our educational policy and practice; we have given primary school education in Mather tongue instruction. The ultimate purpose of this policy was mainly to increase educational quality and reduce educational wastage.

2.5.2.5. School Management System and Practices

School management is one of the important factors that affect internal efficiency of schools. For instance the school management have on important role in improving the learning capacity of learners, because they coordinate teachers in setting standards teaching the curriculum in

relevant way, and providing additional support (Susy, 2008). However, there are several factors that influence school management practice namely the top management, qualification of head teachers qualification & training of school teacher, and most importantly the commitment and initiative taken by the head teaches and teachers (Kathmandu,2001).In order to improve status of school management many countries has adopted and emphasized on decentralized management system. School level decentralized management system is believed to improve schooling efficiency.

2.5.3. Student Related Factors

Students' characteristics are among most important factor that affects internal efficiency of schools. In a class room due to individual difference and background students come to school with different characteristics that affect the students' level of participation and achieving in education.(Nebiyo,1999:247), For instance due to this difference students come up with different physiological and psychological makeup and as a result of this students attending the same class are considered to have difference in personality such as physical, mental, intellectual, moral & motivational factors that in turn have a contribution to educational wastage at different levels (UNESCO, 1970).

In light of the above stated fact and according to Kathmandu, (2001) among many student characteristics that affect internal efficiency includes:

- Variation in sex and age group
- Difference in socio-cultural background such as backwardness community, Difference in economic condition
- Parental attitude towards education in general & girls in particular
- Parents educational awareness and literacy level
- Opportunity cost of child labor and house hold work
- Difference in children's living location (in remote and rural areas)

- Vulnerability such as orphans and those affected by HIV/AIDS.

In addition to these refugees, internally displaced children that affect by conflict and natural disaster are victims of repetition and dropout which in turn affect internal efficiency of schools.

Eggen and Kauchack (1992:178) Explained that the students with the following characteristics are found to be either under achievers, slow learners or children at risk and students characteristics that lead to inadequacy and grade repetition are:-Low motivation, Low self-esteem, Dissatisfaction with their school environment, Poor school attendance, Lack focus on their task and not respecting school regulation.

2.5.4. Parent and Community Related Factors

In developing countries, like Ethiopia, there are many reasons why parents or the community discouraged to send their children to school. Even though many parents managed to send their children and made them enrolled in schools but in the meantime those enrolled students become drop outers or repeaters. According to Abagi (1997). House hold or community based factors that affects completion rate in education includes:-Household attitudes to education, Opportunity cost of education, Socio-cultural factors and traditions (example, early marriage), Gender issues, socialization and Religious factors.

According to the above cited author all the above house hold or community based factors are responsible for pupils failure to complete primary education. Generally, parents' economical, socio-cultural, religious and educational background affects the internal efficiency of schools. According to Susy, (2008:13-15) Factors contributing to repetition in particular and internal efficiency of primary schools in sub-Saharan Africa include the following. The cost of schooling, remoteness of the school, illness and malnutrition, lack of sanitation blocks at schools, the need to work, limited access to secondary schooling, quality and relevant of schooling instructional time in schools and language of instruction.

CHAPTER THREE

3.1 Research design and methodology

The main purpose of this study is to assess the internal efficiency of upper primary schools in the Nuer Zone Gambella Regional state. To achieve this purpose, the descriptive research design was employed. The study involved the cross sectional study type of key factors that affect the internal efficiency in each sampled primary schools

3.2 Data Sources

To achieve the purpose of the study the researcher employed both primary and secondary data sources. **Primary Data Source:** to assess the major factors that affect the internal efficiency, to examine the awareness of stakeholders on the factors that affect internal efficiency of schools and to explore whether or not effective measures have been taken to enhance problems related to internal efficiency. Primary data were collected from the sample respondent (principals, teachers, unit leaders, department heads, students and parents).

Secondary Data Source: secondary data sources were collected from Nuer Zone Annual Abstracts; Woreda Education reports and school statistics in order to identify the challenging trend of internal efficiency of primary school based on the dropout and repetition rate.

3.3 Sample Size and Sampling Techniques

Since the zone is divided in to five woredas, to make the study manageable, the study was conducted at upper primary schools by using simple random sampling.

To determine the sample size and sample procedures, the sample frame of population should be defined. Accordingly the target respondents of the study were the population of primary school students, teachers, principals, unit leaders, department heads and parent in each word in the Zone. Therefore the populations are target people in five woreda and 77 primary schools.

According to the zone annual statistic of (2012/2013), in these schools there are 77 principals, 701 teachers and 36401 students.

To obtain the necessary sample units, availability, purposive and simple random sampling techniques were employed. From the total of 77 primary schools 10 (13%) were taken as sample by using simple random sampling techniques. 20 principals, 10 unit leaders and 40 department head were selected using availability sampling assuming that they could give adequate information about current status on the factors affecting internal efficiency in their respective schools. 20 parents were selected purposively for interview since they are parents whose children have history of grade repetition and dropout. 100 students were selected using simple random sampling techniques for focus group discussion 50 students from repeater and 50 from dropout.

Table 1: Distribution of Sampled Schools by Woreda and School Level

Woredas	No of schools	Sample					No of students	Sampled of students			Sample parents
		Schools	principals	teachers	Unit leaders	Department heads		M	F	T	
Akoba	11	2	4	5	2	8	5227	10	6	16	4
Jikow	18	2	4	7	2	8	5847	11	7	18	4
Lare	19	2	4	8	2	8	8906	14	10	24	4
Makuey	15	2	4	6	2	8	8550	13	9	22	4
Wanthoa	14	2	4	5	2	8	7871	12	8	20	4
Total	77	10	20	30	10	40	36401	60	40	100	20

3.4 Data Collection Instruments

Four types of data collection tools were used.

Document Analysis: document at Zonal education office, Woreda education offices and sampled primary schools were reviewed to identify the challenging trend of internal efficiency.

Questionnaires: In addition to document sources, questionnaires were prepared and filled in by principals, unit leaders, teachers and department heads. The content of this questionnaires included respondents' personal and professional background, about their view of internal efficiency in their respective school contexts.

Interview: Interview was conducted with some parents. Interview guide question was presented to parent of students who are victims of repetition as well as dropout from primary school life

time. The purpose of this tool is to find out the reason for dropout and repetition using data collection tool.

Observation Checklist: observation check was carrying out to observe school infrastructure, environment, management and other.

Focuses Group Discussion: was conducted with students who have a history of grade repetition as well as dropout. The purpose of this tool is found out the reason for their dropout and repetition.

Pilot Test

To check the relevance and quality of the instrument, the researcher's carried out the pilot test for questionnaires. The pilot test was held in two primary schools from Lare woreda which were not included in the sample. Namely Teluoth and Koatngoal primary school. Based on the data collected, the validity and reliability of the tools were analyzed and necessary modifications were made for the questions which were not understand by the respondents and contents of questionnaire which have the same idea.

Validity of instruments

Research instruments can be validated using experts judgments and or statistical procedures (Best &Khan 2003, KUOL, 2006). Therefore this research tools were validated by experts' evaluation and ideas for contents of questionnaires. Two experts, who evaluated the questionnaires before and after pre testing, were experts who have MA degree in EDPM and another have MSC Monitoring and Evaluation. Based on the comment of the experts, the researcher made some minor modifications for items that lacked clarity.

Reliability of questionnaires

Reliability of the items must be checked before they were administered to the target population of the study. Therefore, the reliability of questionnaire was analyzed using Crombach Alpha method. The questionnaire items were calculated using Crombach alpha Test and the result was 0.99. Therefore pilot test show relevant measure, because reliability considered that, the value above 0.70 indicated reliable instrument.

3.5 Method of Data Analysis

Both quantitative and qualitative data collected from different sources were organized and presented in the way that it gives answer to the research question. Quantitative data that indicate the number of students repeat the class and dropout of the school system were organized in term of table, calculated using percentage and illustrate in term of average at Zone, woreda and sampled schools, these document are more of quantitative data which indicated the number of students repeated the grade and dropout of the schools system from the years 2009-2013. Moreover, primary data collected through questionnaire where tabulated and standard deviation percentage mean, frequency count, and grand mean were calculated. The most reliable way of finding the efficiency of education institution is to follow a true cohort method i.e. starting with cohorts of pupils at the beginning of their study in primary for consecutive four years. In this study, an attempt was made to find the major factors caused for low internal efficiency of primary schools in Nuer Zone .Interview guide questions and focused group discussion illustrate intern of percentage whereas observation checklist were used to meet the objectives of the study.

CHAPTER FOUR

4. Data Presentation, Analysis and Interpretation

This chapter deals with the findings of the study and their interpretations. It has three parts where the first part deals with characteristics and background of respondent. The second part deals with analysis of data collected from documents to show the trends of internal efficiency. Third part presents analysis of responses from principals, teachers, unit leaders and department heads followed by interview with students and parents.

4.1. Characteristics and Background of Respondents

A total number of 100 questionnaires were distributed to 20 Principal, 30 teachers, 10 unit leaders and 40 department heads. Focus group discussion were held with students who have the history of dropout and grade repetitions particularly those who were attending grades 5 to 8 and 20 parents whose their children repeat grade or dropout of the school were interviewed.

Table 2: Characteristics of Respondents

Characteristics		Respondents															
		Principals		Teachers		Unit leaders		Department heads		parents		Total					
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%				
Sex	Male	13	65	19	63.4	5	50	22	55	14	70	73	60.83				
	Female	7	35	11	36.6	5	50	18	45	6	30	47	39.17				
	Total	20	100	30	100	10	100	40	100	20	100	120	100%				
Work experiences	0-5	12	60	15	50	5	50	9	7.5	-	-----	-----	-----				
	6-12	8	40	14	46.7	5	50	16	40	-	-----	-----	-----				
	>13	---	-----	1	3.3	--	---	5	12.5	-	-----	-----	-----				
	Total	20	100	30	100	10	100	40	100	-	-----	--	---				
Educational Levels	Illiterate	---	-----	---	-----	---	-----	---	-----	13	65	13	65				
	Read & write	---	-----	---	-----	---	-----	---	-----	3	15	3	15				
	Grade 1-8	---	-----	---	-----	---	-----	---	-----	2	10	2	10				
	Grade 9-12	---	-----	---	-----	---	-----	---	-----	2	10	2	100%				
	Certificate	---	-----	---	-----	---	-----	---	-----	---	-----	---	-----				
	10+3, 12+2	17	85	22	73.4	10	100	27	67.5	---	-----	76	76%				
	BA/Bed/BSc	3	15	8	26.6	---	---	13	32.5	---	-----	24	24%				
Total	20	100	30	100	10	100	40	100	20	100	20	100%					
Field of the study	EDPM	9	45	---	-----	---	-----	---	-----	---	-----	9	45				
	NON EDPM	11	55	---	-----	---	-----	---	-----	---	-----	11	55				
	Total	20	100	---	-----	---	-----	---	-----	---	-----	20	100%				
Students grade levels and group age	Grade Levels	Age															
		11	%	>11	%	12	%	>12	%	13	%	>13	%	14	%	>14	%
	Grade 5	19	61.3	12	38.7	--	---	---	-----	---	-----	---	-----	---	---	-----	--
	Grade 6	---	-----	---	---	18	58.06	13	41.94	---	-----	---	-----	---	---	-----	---
	Grade 7	---	---	---	---	---	-----	---	---	12	52.2	11	47.8	---	---	---	---
Grade 8	---	---	---	---	--	-----	---	-----	---	-----	---	-----	9	60	6	40	

As indicated on Table 2, the majority 13(65%) of principals, 19(63.4%) of teachers, 5(50%) of unit leaders, 22(55%) of department heads and 14(70%) of parents are male and the rest are female 7(35%) Principals, 11(36.6%) teachers, 5(50%) unit leaders, 18(45%) department heads and 6(30%) Parents' respondents were female. This shows that the encouragement of female teachers in teaching profession is increasing their participation as they hold the post of principal, unit leaders and department heads and enjoy the equality with Male at work places. On the other hand, 12(60%) principals, 15(50%) of teachers, 5(50%) of unit leaders and 19(47.5%) of department head respondents are with work experience of five years and below. The remaining 8(40%) of principals, 14(46.6%) of teachers, 5(50%) unit leaders and 16(40%) of department heads respondents were with work experience of 6-12years while only 1(3.3%) of the teacher respondents were with work experience of thirteen years and above. Since the majority of principals have experiences less than five years, this show that in handling school internal efficiency problem will be at lower advantage.

The current Education policy on human resource recruitment and development (MoE, 2002) indicate that minimum educational requirement for primary schools teacher is diploma (10+3 /12+2), while primary school principals need to have at least a first degree. However, table 3 shows that the majority, 17(85%) of principals, 22(73.4%) of teachers,10(100) of unit leaders and 27(67.5%) of department heads were diploma holders, showing that the system meet minimum level requirement of primary school teachers instead of being principal, while the3(15%) of principal,8(26.6%) of teachers and 13(32.5%) of department heads full fill the maximum requirement of being a primary school Principal as well as teachers. The majority of parent respondents 13(65%) were also illiterate. Based on this, almost all of the principal respondents' educational background was so far below the required educational level of being school principal.

Therefore, principals lack the necessary knowledge to show effectively manages schools and handling internal efficiency of School. Above half 13 (65%) of the parents were illiterate, show the less possibility to support their pupil in learning. Based on principal field of the study, 9(45%) were EDPM and 11(55%) were Non EDPM.As indicated on Table 2, the status based on the sex of students, indicated that both the female and male students ideas about the reason for their repetition and dropout50(50%) were males and 50(50%) were also females. Besides, focus group

discussion made with students from grades five, six, seven, and eight which constitute 12(38.7%), 13(41.94%), 11(47.8%) and 6(40%) respectively are over age group students.

4.2 Parents and Students Knowledge toward School Dropout as well as Grade Repetition

The Parents responses on their children grade repetitions as well as dropouts of schools system.

The result presents and analyzed in Table 3

Table 3: Parents Respondent on Students Dropout and Repetition

S.N	Items	Dropout	Repetition
1	Factors that force your child to drop out or repeat grade the grade	70%	60%
2	The reason have you hear or told you by school administrators about your child to repeat grade	-----	80%
3	The effort made by the local education offices or school administrators to bring your child back to school	100%	-----
4	The mechanism undertaken in your locality in order to enhance school internal efficiency	100%	
5	The school location	90%	-----
6	The awareness created or rising about students dropout and repetition	70%	60%
7	The participation in school daily meeting	70%	

Table 3: Respondents views concerning Parent's Knowledge on their children dropout and grade repetition

Data which collected from parent by interview conducted with 10 parents whose children were dropout from schools. The statements which say that, the factors that force your child to drop out of the school, 7 parents said that, the factors contributed to their children dropout were the distance between school to home and lack of educational awareness of parents, negative attitude to education and low economic background. This indicate that negative attitude to education and low economic background, has serious effect in parent mind as they see a lot of student who scoreless result at Grade ten matriculation they are just at home and help their parent, these two factors contribution to student repetition, as the family has poor economic background, they need their child to help them at home and work place. They limited their child to go to school regularly and also fail to provide consumption for students who are far away from school.

This mean that majority of respondents indicated that, parents have knowledge about their children dropout of the school system. Information from interview held with minority 3 parents

of the interviewees indicated that their children dropout of the school because of the health problem/illness and subjected to corporal punishment in the school.

Among the minority respondent one of the parents stated that “... *my child dropout of the school system because of the corporal punishment used by school teachers*”.

Data collected through interview with 10 parents whose children repeat grade. The statement which say that, factors that force your child to repeat grade revealed that 6, majority of parents said that their children repeat classes specifying that students have no adequate text book, home environment are not supportive since they are illiterate, most of the teachers were fresh with no or little experience to effectively support students learning, no adequate instructional materials available from woreda or Zone. 4 parents said that we do not know that our children repeat the same grade. This indicated that such parents did not know the progress of their children in school system.

The statement, the reasons have you hear or told you by school administrators’ about your child to repeat grade. The majority of respondents 8 parents revealed the school administrators did not make known to them the reason why their children repeat in the class. This indicated that such parents did not know the reason why their children repeat the class. The minority of the respondents 2 parents revealed that, the school principals make known to them the reason why their children repeat class.

Statement which said that there, was effort made by the local education’s office or school administrators to bring your child back to school. Based on the question 10 parents said that, they do not have knowledge if there have been effort made by local education administration to bring the children back to school.

Question on mechanism undertaken in your locality in order to enhance school internal efficiency. All of these respondents 20 said that, they don’t know if are there mechanism undertaken to enhanced school internal efficiency.

The school location of parents, on this question majority of respondents 9 (90%) revealed that their children dropout from school due the distance from home to school and road condition and one dropout of school because of health problem.

Question which ask parents if they participation in school meeting. The majority of respondents 14 parents said that they don't participated in school daily, the reason were the distance from home to school and 6 parents said that they use to participate in school management.

Students Response on the Focus Group Discussion

Students' respondent on their grade repetition and dropout in school system. The result presents and analyzed in Table 4.

Table 4: Focus Group with Students

S.N	Items	students dropout N= 50	Students repetition N=50
1	School physical resources and facilities	10(20%)	-----
2	School Location	9(18%)	-----
3	Teacher's characteristics	2(4%)	1(2%)
4	Parents attitude toward education	3(6%)	8(16%)
5	Economic condition	4(8%)	-----
6	Parents educational awareness and literacy	8(16%)	15(30%)
7	Opportunity cost of child labor and household work	12(24%)	25(50%)
8	Variations in sex and student's over age group	2(4%)	1(2%)

Student's respondent on their dropout and grade repetition

The result of focus group discussion made with 50 students who drop out of the school,12(24%) of the respondents mentioned that, they drop out of the schools due to students related factors specifically opportunity cost of child labor and household work and illness. The same is true for discussion made with 50 students who have history of grade repetition, 25(50%) of respondents repeat the grade for such factor.

2(4%) of dropout students and 1(2%) of repeater students response that, it was the variation of sex and over age group of student that lead them to dropout or repeat grade. This indicate that in each of the classes from grade five to grade eight there were yet students over age groups which indicates the prevailing possible repetition or/and dropout rates.

10(20%) of respondent dropout out from schools, since there was shortage of school physical resources and facilities such as school building, library, textbooks, school furniture, laboratory equipment and pedagogical centre. 9(18%)of students dropout because of school location which are the distance between home to school and road condition.

2(4%) of dropout students and 1(2%) of repeater students response that, they dropout or repeat grade because of school related factors specifically teacher’s related factors such as poor teacher’s interaction with pupils, poor classroom management, shortage of experiences teachers and shortage of qualify in the school. 3 (6%) of dropout respondents and 8 (16%) of repeater respondents said that, it was parent and community related factors accountable for their dropout as well as repetition. This factor is parent attitude toward education, among parents of these students some of their children’s scoreless result in grade ten matriculations as result they always use failed students as example of education disadvantage. 4(8%) of the dropout students response that, they drop out of the school system due poor economic background of family.

8(16%) of dropout students and 15(30%) of repeater that. Their parents are illiterate and have no awareness of education. Since parents are illiterate they lacks of counseling, they force their child to work at home, they do not provide school materials needed for school students and they do not give time for pupil to do school activities. Because of this involvement in family work, as result such students were dropout from school and some repeat the same grade.

Result of Schools Observation Checklist

Observation on the school infrastructures, facilities, schools management practices and teacher’s and student’s in class activities.

Table 5: Observation checklist

<i>S.N</i>	<i>Items</i>
------------	--------------

1	Teaching approaches of teachers
2	Students- section ratios
3	Schools facilities
4	School infrastructures
5	Teachers punctuality
6	Students punctuality from class
7	Students participation in classroom activities
8	Continues assessment practices in schools
9	Schools environment

Schools Observation checklist

Based on schools observation major factors contributing to poor internal efficiency stated were high students'- section ratio, low teachers and students' punctuality in classroom, inadequate or no infrastructures such as text books, student's desks, references, clean water and latrine. Teaching approaches of most teachers was dominated by teachers centered methods; most of the teachers do not use teaching aids and continues assessment was not practiced.

4.3. Internal Efficiency

It combines the trend and factor of dropout and repetition rate at different levels of Zonal, woredas and schools.

4.3.1. Dropout Rate

Table 6: Zonal level Trends of Upper Primary Education (5-8) Dropout Rate

Academic years	Dropout Rate														
	Grade 5			Grade 6			Grade 7			Grade 8			Grade (5-8)		
	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T
2009/10	13.48	19.59	16.53	12.36	15.04	13.7	12.22	18.83	15.52	11.47	10.47	10.97	12.38	15.88	14.13
2010/11	14.90	15.28	15.05	11.77	12.57	12.17	15.41	14.85	15.13	17.82	11.47	14.65	14.97	13.54	14.26
2011/12	11.12	19.40	15.26	10.96	15.70	13.33	11.04	18.66	14.85	13.87	12.21	13.04	11.75	16.50	14.13
2012/13	16.43	19.42	17.92	13.30	16.00	14.65	12.58	16.07	14.33	12.46	13.65	13.05	13.94	16.28	15.11

Table 6, shows the trends of dropout in upper primary education. The record shows that the trend of dropout rate has been evident in all grade levels. But Grade five dropout rates higher than all others in years under consideration, except 2010/2011. The dropout rate for grade five steadily enhanced from 16.53 in 2009/2010 to 15.26 in 2011/2012 but start to increase to 17.92 in (2012/13, because many schools in the Zone have been organized in one villages while parents of students failed to join the place. In the term of age these children could not able work 3-5KM away to schools. Dropout rate for grade sevens enhanced from 15.52 in (2009/10) to 14.33 in (2012/13). Number of boys' dropout at grade eight in 2010/11 and grade seven in 2012/13 because of ethnic conflict. Both grade six and eight record inconsistent trend of dropout rate. As of the zonal record, trend of dropout show inconsistent trend increased in four academic years. The dropout fluctuating over the years but it ended up with the trend increase in 2012/13 by 0.98%.

Gender wise, the table shows that there were slightly significant differences in dropout rates for boys to girls, though girls have higher dropout rate than boys in all grade levels. Zonal averages. Dropout rates show variations among different woredas and schools in zone. The following two tables present recent trends for woredas and schools. Therefore the average grand total for the ten sample schools indicated a complete increasing trend of dropout rate by 0.56%.

Table 7: Woreda Level Trend of Upper Primary Education (5-8) Dropout Rate

Woredas	2009/2010			2010/2011			2011/2012			2012/2013		
	Dropout Rate			Dropout Rate			Dropout Rate			Dropout Rate		
	M	F	AV	M	F	AV	M	F	AV	M	F	AV
Akoba	16.89	17.33	17.11	23.09	14.04	18.52	13.84	21.80	17.82	18.23	18.42	18.32
Jikow	24.58	23.93	24.28	21.62	26.31	23.96	19.80	31.76	25.78	20.65	25.79	23.17
Lare	12.04	14.15	13.09	10.76	11.49	11.12	10.19	11.53	10.85	11.33	10.79	11.06
Makuey	9.97	10.52	10.24	8.30	10.69	9.49	8.96	10.28	9.62	13.23	12.42	12.82
Wanthoa	8.44	15.39	11.91	11.90	8.18	10.04	7.78	17.31	12.54	8.89	16.98	12.95
Zonal	12.38	15.88	14.13	14.97	14.14	14.26	11.75	16.50	14.13	13.94	16.98	15.11

Table 7, shows that woreda level trends of primary education dropout rates, average for woredas were the same to the Zonal trends averages, since all woredas with in the Zone were included in the sample. As shown from the table girls have higher dropout rate than boys, among the five sample woredas, dropout rate. Lare showed a decreasing trend from 13.09 in 2009/10 to 10.84 in 2012/13. To the contrary, the rates for the remaining four woreda worsened in the years under. These data suggest that dropout rate indicate that, woreda education offices challenged by low internal efficiency. Dropout rate at Jikow and Akoba Woreda was because of ethnic conflict. In Akoba there was external conflict with boarder local people because of the many students drop out from the schools and Jiokow woreda has ethnic conflict within it, therefore lot of students' dropout from schools.

Table 8: School Level Trends of Dropout Rate of upper primary Education (5-8)

	Woredas	Schools	Enrollment Rate				Dropout Rate			
			2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13
Zonal	Akoba	Tergol	376	328	413	447	16.76	17.30	17.43	18.05
		Gurebiey	381	373	405	431	18.63	20.10	20.24	19.50
	Total		757	755	818	878	17.70	18.7	18.86	18.82
	Jikow	Nip-Nip	461	481	515	568	19.08	18.91	17.95	17.26
		Makuar	482	563	578	588	17.63	19.71	19.49	19.78
	Total		943	1044	1093	1157	18.36	19.31	18.72	18.47
	Lare	Kuergeng	861	984	1026	1273	19.04	18.39	26.67	15.78
		Mangok	643	686	735	895	14.15	15.88	16.02	16.77
	Total		1504	1670	1761	2078	16.60	17.14	21.35	16.30
	Makuey	Puokueth	695	738	817	886	18.99	19.51	22.76	23.84
		nyinenyang	391	413	473	501	17.13	20.82	19.45	19.00
	Total		1086	1151	1290	1387	18.06	20.17	21.11	21.42
	Wanthoa	Matar	873	931	986	1015	15.80	17.18	17.64	19.48
		Muon	506	571	603	732	15.21	15.18	12.43	11.97
	Total		1379	2502	1589	1747	14.50	16.18	15.04	16.83
	Total Grand		5669	6122	6551	7247	17.34	18.3	19.01	18.15

Based on the conducted document review, Table 8, indicates that trends of primary education dropout rate in Nuer zone schools (except schools from Jikow and Wanthoa woreda) is inconsistent. That is, the above data collected from Tergol and Gurubiey School in Akoba woreda shows an increasing-decreasing trend in each school. The calculated average of these schools showed irregular trends with high decreasing-increasing trend by 9% (between 2009/10, 2010/11) and by 10.16 % (between, 2010/11, 2012/13).

In Lare woreda Kurengeng School shows inconsistent trend where as Mangok School increased the trend. The calculated average for these schools, increased by 4.75 % (between 2009/10 and 2011/12) and decrease by 5.05 % (between 2011/12 and 2012/13). In the same manner, in Makuey woreda, Nyinenyang School shows both trend increase and decreases where as Puokueth primary school shows trends increased. The calculated average also shows an increasing trend by 2.11 % (between 2009/10 and 2010/11) and decreased by 0.06% (between 2010/11 and 2011/12) but increased in 2012/13 by 0.31% respectively.

The exception here is that two woreda Jikow and Wanthao decreased the trend. The calculated average for these schools in Jikow, for instance, shows slightly increasing trend by 0.95% (between, 2009/10 and 2012/13).The same is true for Wanthao woreda, increase the trend by 2.33% between 2009/10 and 2012/13 respectively.

The calculated average for ten schools trend showed an increase for three years and decrease for the fourth years. Challenges such as inconsistency trend of dropout rate happened were major challenges to schools, woredas and zone. The trends of dropout rate of sampled schools were higher than woredas as well as zonal trend of dropout rate.

Table 9: Factors to Students' Dropout

S.N	Items	Principals N=20		Teachers N=30		Unit Leaders N=10		Department heads N=40		GM
		M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	
1	Long distance from home to school	4.10	.788	3.87	.937	4.00	.667	3.95	.947	3.98
2	Family standard of living	4.15	.875	3.73	1.257	3.40	1.074	3.92	1.227	3.80
3	Shortage of school facilities	3.80	1.105	3.90	1.493	3.50	1.715	3.88	1.399	3.77
4	Involvement in family work	4.00	1.123	3.13	1.655	4.00	1.247	3.56	1.395	3.67
5	Lack of parental encouragement	3.65	1.387	2.93	1.460	3.10	1.519	3.42	1.357	3.28
6	Home - school Unsafe road condition	3.40	1.142	3.40	1.302	2.70	.823	3.28	1.260	3.20
7	Cultural impact/ harassment	3.35	.933	2.80	1.349	3.50	1.178	2.65	.892	3.08
8	Poor academic performance	3.20	1.281	3.00	1.083	3.00	1.054	3.02	1.251	3.06
9	Frustration during examination	3.05	1.145	2.80	1.063	3.50	1.178	2.80	1.159	3.04
10	Peer group Influence	3.15	.988	2.93	1.142	2.90	.994	3.13	.938	3.03
11	Frequent absenteeism	3.15	1.138	2.90	1.267	3.10	1.100	2.55	.783	2.93
12	Lack of interest in learning	2.80	1.105	2.70	1.264	2.80	1.133	3.00	1.240	2.82
13	Parental illness/death	2.45	.759	2.63	1.351	3.30	1.159	2.80	.911	2.80
14	Subjected for Corporal punishment	2.90	1.293	3.03	1.273	2.20	.788	3.02	1.143	2.79
15	Frequent repetition	2.65	1.182	2.80	.996	2.80	.632	2.63	.867	2.72
16	Health problem/ sickness	2.25	1.069	3.03	1.449	2.70	.948	2.65	1.075	2.66
17	Family divorce	2.75	1.164	2.56	1.00	2.50	1.178	2.80	1.159	2.65
18	Lack of counseling service	2.85	1.136	2.17	1.261	2.40	1.173	2.52	1.219	2.49

Level of agreement: '>3.50=Very High; 2.50-3.49= Moderate; <2.50=Very Low'

The list of factors that let students to dropout from school was organized from the literature review. Moreover principal, teachers, unit leaders and department heads were invited to rate them and level each factors seriously, based on their knowledge on each factors. From Table, 9 long distances from home to schools, family low standard of living, shortage of school facilities and involvement in family work rated very high with minimum mean value ranging from 3.13 to maximum mean value of 4.15 and with the minimum grand mean ranging from 3.67 to maximum grand mean of 3.98.

Lack of interest in learning, poor academic performance, unsafe road home school condition, health problem or sickness, peer group influence, frequent repetition, frequent absenteeism,

subjected for corporal punishment, parental healthiness and death ,family divorces, frustration during examination, lack of parental encouragement and cultural impacts/harassment were rated moderate that indicated moderate agreement with minimum mean values of ranging 2.25 (indicate low) up to maximum mean values of 3.65 (indicates high). Obtained from these mean value, the minimum grand mean value ranging from 2.65 up to maximum grand mean value of 3.28 which show that, these factors indicated to be moderate on their contribution on student drop out as were collected from principal, teachers, unit leaders and department heads respondents. On the other hand, lack of counseling services only rate as very low, with minimum value ranging from 2.17 (indicated low) and the maximum value 2.85(indicated high) and with the grand mean 2.49. This factor has less contribution to students' dropout as confirmed by the same respondents.

4.3.2 Repetition Rate

Table: 10 Zonal Level Trend of Upper Primary Education (5-8) Repetition Rate

Academic years	Repetition Rate														
	Grade 5			Grade 6			Grade 7			Grade 8			Grade (5-8)		
	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T
2009/10	10.11	12.72	11.2	11.20	12.71	11.96	10.64	14.32	12.48	10.01	14.21	12.11	10.49	13.49	11.99
2010/11	13.17	12.83	12.99	12.58	11.70	12.14	12.08	13.63	12.86	13.44	17.22	15.33	12.81	13.85	13.33
2011/12	9.47	10.09	9.78	8.96	10.65	9.80	9.80	10.49	10.15	9.34	10.92	10.13	9.40	10.54	9.97
2012/13	12.41	15.66	13.9	11.13	11.66	11.49	11.85	11.43	11.64	10.26	11.76	11.01	11.39	12.63	11.82

On grounds of the conducted document review of which table 10, shows the Zonal trends in primary education repetition rate. The record shows that with an inconsistent trend, repetition rate has been severing in all grade levels especially from (2010/11). Based on document the review trends of repetition shows the increased and decreased trends in all Grade level. As indicated from the table above grade five, six, seven and eight trend of repetition rate increased by 1.34% (between 2009/10 and 2010/11 and decreases by 2010/11 to 2011/12 and again increases in 2012/13. The repetition rate fluctuating over the years but it end up with the trend increase in 2012/13 by 1.85%.

The total trend of repetition rate in upper Primary Education (5-8) shows both the increased and decreased trend in four consecutive years. The repetition rates increased from 11.99% in

2009/10 to 13.33% in 2010/11 with 1.34% and shift to decrement from 13.33% in 2010/11 to 9.97% in 2011/12 and again shift to increase in the trends from 9.97% in 2011/12 to 11.82 in 2012/13 with 1.85%.

Therefore the average grand total for the fifteen sample schools indicated a complete increasing trend of dropout rate by 1.60%. This indirectly indicates that; add the following in Zone education system since repetition rate showed significant number of students. Furthermore, the statuses of girls' repetition rate in all of the given grades were partially equivalent to boys. Repetition rates show variations among different woredas and schools of the Zone. The following two tables present recent trends for sample woredas and schools. The Zone education failed to encourage parents and students who are low achiever in 2010/11. The repetition rate at grade five was very due to lack of adequate text books, poor infrastructure of the Zone.

Table 11: Woreda Level Trend of Upper Primary Education (5-8) Repetition Rate

Woredas	2009/2010			2010/2011			2011/2012			2012/2013		
	Repetition Rate			Repetition Rate			Repetition Rate			Repetition Rate		
	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T
Akobo	15.82	17.62	16.72	20.28	15.68	17.98	10.93	11.05	10.92	11.75	14.82	13.28
Jikow	18.38	13.88	16.35	18.83	19.48	19.15	12.74	16.44	14.52	14.90	16.06	15.48
Lare	7.43	12.15	9.79	10.36	10.61	10.50	8.79	8.94	8.78	11.73	11.13	11.43
Makuey	8.52	7.96	8.25	10.03	11.52	10.77	7.96	7.49	7.65	10.88	9.84	10.36
Wanthoa	6.38	16.91	11.64	9.22	11.56	10.39	8.76	11.10	9.86	7.68	9.84	8.76
Zonal Average	10.49	13.49	11.99	12.81	13.85	13.33	9.40	10.54	9.97	11.39	12.63	11.82

Table 11, indicated that woreda levels trends of primary education repetition rates for each woredas are inconsistent. Among the five woredas repetition rate at Wanthoa woreda showed a regular pattern of decreasing trend with 11.64% in 2009/10, 10.39% in 2010/11, 9.86% in 2011/12 and 8.76% in 2012/13, which show that, the trend decrease with 2.88% from 2009/10 to 2012/13. In general, the trend of other four woredas records trend increases for first two years and recorded up and down repetition trend for the next two years, primary education repetition rate at woreda level were characterized by inconsistency. The zonal average for four consecutive years, as the data suggest, repetition rate is relatively decreasing with 0.17% that indicate, woreda education offices failed to reduce wastage in education and increase their effort to achieve UPE at 2015 at their woreda level in particular and zonal level in general.

On the other hand, females' repetition rate was higher compared with males at different year in each woredas as the Zonal average indicated from the table. There was inconsistent trend increases from 2009/10 to 2010/11 and decreases from 2010/11 to 2011/12 and also increased from 2011/12 to 2012/13.

Table12: School Level Trends Repetition Rate of upper primary education (5-8)

Zonal	Woredas	Schools	Enrollment Rate				Repetition Rate			
			2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13
	Akoba	Tergol	376	328	413	447	11.43	14.65	17.19	18.34
		Gurebiey	381	373	405	431	9.44	13.13	13.32	15.31
	Total		757	755	818	878	10.44	13.89	15.26	16.83
	Jikow	Nip-Nip	461	481	515	569	13.44	15.59	14.95	14.23
		Makuar	482	563	578	588	16.59	16.51	16.78	17.17
	Total		943	1044	1093	1157	15.02	16.05	15.69	15.7
	Lare	Kuregeng	861	984	1026	1273	13.00	12.60	10.52	10.36
		Mangok	643	686	735	805	12.59	13.99	12.65	16.02
	Total		1504	1670	1761	2078	12.80	13.30	11.59	13.19
	Makuey	Nyinenyang	695	738	817	886	13.95	13.68	10.89	12.07
		puokueth	391	413	473	501	12.02	12.34	14.16	14.57
	Total		1086	1151	1290	1387	12.98	13.02	12.53	13.32
	Wanthoa	Matar	873	931	986	1015	10.47	10.85	11.77	15.43
		Muon	506	571	603	732	14.42	15.06	16.08	15.43
	Total		1379	1502	1589	1747	12.45	12.96	13.93	15.43
	Grand total		5669	6122	6551	7247	12.74	13.84	13.40	14.90

As mentioned in document review, Table 12, shows that two out of ten sample schools Nib-Nib from Jikow woreda and Kuregeng from Lare woreda recorded decreasing trend of repetition rate during the four academic years (2009/10-2012/13). Five schools namely Makuar, Mangok, Nyinenyang and Muon were also record an increasing trend between 2009/10 and 2010/13 and a decreasing trend between 2011/12 and 2012/13. In contrast, three schools namely, Tergol and Gurubiey from Akobo and Matar from Wanthao woreda record an increasing trend of repetition rate in reference to the given four academic years.

Both Akobo and Wanthao woreda shows increase trend during for academic years from 2009/10-2012/13. The Jikow Woreda average trend showed repetition rate decreases from the two sampled Primary schools (Nib-Nib and Makuar). Nib-Nib primary school decreased trend with

2.15% between (2009/10 and 2010/13). Makuar primary school decreased trend with 0.08% between (2009/10 and 2010/11) and also increased trend with 0.39% between (2011/12 and 2012/13). Lare Woreda sampled Primary schools trend also indicated the increased and decreased trends. In Lare woreda kuregeng primary schools record only trend decrease where as Magok recorded both increase and decrease. Lare Woreda trends increased with 1.03% between (2009/10 and 2010/11) and decreased with 0.35% between (2010/11 and 2012/13). The trend of Makuey woreda sampled Primary Schools namely Nyinenyang and Puokueth primary, the Nyinenyang school records trend increased and decreased trend whereas puokueth primary schools shows only the decreased trend. In Wanthoa Woreda, Matar School increased the trend from 2009/10 to 2012/13 where as Muon school shows the trend increase from 2009/10 to 2011/12 and increases in 2012/13. The total average trends of this woreda also increased with 2.98 % between (2009/10 and 2012/13). The grand mean of these woreda indicates trend increase from 2009/10 to 2010/11 and decreases in 2011/12 and again increases in 2012/13.

To add up, primary schools repetition rate reveals fluctuated trend from the four consecutive academic years, in similar trend like woreda and zonal reports which indirectly implies poor performance of professionals at school, woreda and zonal level and local administrators at each levels of authority. In addition to this, the increasing trends almost remain inconsistent and combine to be a major challenge of the already mentioned authorities.

Table 13: Factors to Student's Repetition

S.N	Items	Principals N=20		Teachers N=30		Unit Leaders N=10		Department heads N=40		GM
		M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	
1	High student section ratio	4.50	.688	3.87	1.196	3.5	1.354	4.10	1.150	3.99
2	Poor school infrastructure	3.75	1.251	3.4	1.428	2.70	1.494	4.02	1.250	3.47
3	Lack of students adequate text books	4.25	.716	3.73	1.257	3.80	1.399	3.92	1.345	3.93
4	Unsuitable instructional environment	2.95	.759	2.80	1.063	3.25	1.269	2.60	.982	2.90
5	Lack of experience teachers	3.65	1.182	3.50	1.167	3.10	1.523	3.38	.982	3.41
6	Content loaded by heavy curriculum	2.45	1.321	2.10	1.152	2.10	1.102	2.40	1.354	2.26
7	Difficulty of language of instruction	2.30	1.128	2.17	1.288	2.10	1.286	2.35	1.291	2.23
8	Teachers absenteeism	2.80	1.151	2.53	1.152	2.80	1.229	2.70	1.042	2.71
9	Teacher centered teaching approach	2.75	.966	2.66	1.093	2.80	1.398	3.02	.973	2.81
10	Teachers do not use teaching aids	3.15	1.136	2.53	1.175	2.40	1.429	3.05	1.197	2.78
11	Not using local specific examples	3.05	1.099	2.53	.937	2.70	.948	3.00	.933	2.82
12	poor continuous assessment practice	3.15	1.182	3.23	1.304	2.70	1.337	3.42	1.152	3.13
13	Poor questioning skill of teachers	3.20	1.281	2.67	1.028	2.10	.567	3.18	1.129	2.79
14	Poor teachers' extra support	2.85	1.089	3.26	1.172	2.60	.967	2.80	1.114	2.88
15	Poor teachers' classroom management	3.40	1.231	3.17	1.176	2.60	1.349	3.50	1.219	3.17
16	Inappropriate teacher-pupil relationship	3.15	1.089	3.10	1.155	2.30	.948	3.02	1.229	2.89
17	Absence of Instructional supervisory support	2.80	.951	2.67	1.184	2.30	1.337	3.00	1.012	2.69
18	poor student support management	3.1	.911	2.77	1.072	2.50	1.080	3.13	1.304	2.88
19	Poor staff's conflict management	2.75	1.333	2.90	1.423	2.40	.966	3.28	1.061	2.83
20	Lack of parents and community involvement	3.30	1.316	2.50	1.525	3.30	1.702	2.50	1.632	2.90

Level of agreement: '>3.50=Very High; 2.50-3.49= Moderate; <2.50=Very Low'

The same to that of dropout rate, factors that leads students to repeat in a class were rate based on the degree of contribution by principals, teachers, unit leaders and department heads. As Table 13, indicated, high student section ratio, high students-teacher ratio and lack of student text books were rated very high that show high agreement with minimum mean value ranging from 3.50 (indicated low agreement) to maximum mean value of 4.50 (indicated high agreement) .Both of the mean value has minimum grand mean value ranging from 3.92 to maximum grand mean value of 3.97, which show that, these factors show highest contribution based on the level of their agreement in causing student repetition.

Poor school infrastructure, unsuitable instructional environment, lack of experienced teachers, teachers absenteeism, teacher centered teaching approach, poor teaching aids employment, inability using local specific examples, poor continuous assessment practice, Poor questioning skill of teachers, students teachers ratio, Poor teachers' class room management, Inappropriate teacher-pupil relationship, Absence of Instructional supervisory support, low student support management, Poor staff's conflict management and Lack of parents and community involvement

all show moderate agreement with minimum mean values ranging 2.10. (Indicate low agreement) to maximum mean values of 4.02 (indicates high agreement) and both of these mean has minimum grand mean value of 2.69 to maximum grand mean value of 3.47. In addition, such items as Content loaded by heavy curriculum and Difficulty of language of instruction were also rated very low with minimum mean value of ranging from 1.90 to maximum mean value of 2.63 and with grand means of ranging from 2.23 to maximum mean value of 2.26 this implies that, these factors has the very less contribution up on student repetition as indicated by the respondents.

In summary, almost all of the factors stated above are minor factors for student repetition, except high student section ratios, high students-teachers ratio and lack of students' textbooks from the data obtained. However, data collected more from questionnaire and also supported by the conducted interview and focuses group reveal that, three and sixteen out of twenty factors are said to be very high and moderately prevailing factors in the sample schools that caused student repetition. The remaining three were nothing to do with student dropout. This indicated that sampled schools are not in better position in controlling such factors.

4.3.3. Perception of Principals, Teachers, Unit leaders and Department Heads

Perception towards Repetition

Table 14: Students Related factor for Repetition

S.N	Students related factors	Principals N=20		Teachers N=30		Unit Leaders N=10		Department heads N=40		GM
		M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	
1	Work load at home	3.60	1.187	3.83	1.341	4.20	1.135	3.43	1.430	3.77
2	Lack of educational awareness of Parents	3.55	1.394	3.90	1.470	3.80	1.475	3.75	1.427	3.75
3	Low economic background	3.70	1.080	4.03	.961	3.30	1.567	3.67	1.403	3.68
4	Illiterate family background	3.50	1.192	3.87	1.000	3.10	1.197	3.42	1.448	3.47
5	Negative attitude to the value of education	3.45	1.234	3.63	1.129	2.80	1.229	3.28	1.300	3.29
6	Travel long distance to school	3.30	1.218	3.10	1.124	3.30	1.059	3.42	1.129	3.28
7	Student frequent absenteeism	3.15	1.089	2.70	.876	3.00	1.154	3.30	1.043	3.06
8	Lack of interest in learning	3.05	1.099	2.73	1.080	3.20	1.135	3.00	1.086	2.99
9	Students who are orphans	2.90	1.119	3.03	1.245	3.20	1.229	2.75	1.080	2.97
10	Lack of self-confidence	3.15	1.182	2.60	1.132	2.80	1.135	3.32	1.071	2.97
11	Health problem	3.35	1.225	3.17	1.116	2.20	1.229	3.12	1.136	2.96
12	Disciplinary problems	2.65	.933	2.76	1.304	2.60	1.264	2.95	1.153	2.74

Level of agreement: '>3.50=Very High; 2.50-3.49= Moderate; <2.50=Very Low'.

As mentioned in table 14, work load at home, lack of education awareness of parents and low economic background of parents were rated at very high level of agreement with minimum mean value ranging from 3.30to maximum mean value of 4.20 and also with a minim grand mean of 3.68 to maximum grand mean of 3.77, this indicates that, these items have a very high contribution causing many students repeat in the same grade for more than one years.

Besides, such items like lack of self-confidence, frequent student absenteeism, disciplinary problems, negative attitude to the value of education, students who are orphans, Health problem, Illiterate family background, Long distance travel to school and Lack of interest in learning were rated with moderate mean of minimum value ranging from 2.20 to maximum value mean of 3.87 and with minimum grand mean value of 2.74 to maximum grand mean value of 3.47 these were presumed as major factors that cause repetition with the moderate agreement level from the sampled school principals, teachers, unit leaders and department heads respond.

4.3.4. Survival Rate

Table 15: Upper Primary Education Survival rates to grade 8

Academic years	Survival rate to grade 8		
	M	F	AV
2009/10	78.52	75.32	76.92
2010/11	68.74	71.31	70.02
2011/12	76.79	76.87	76.83
2012/13	77.34	74.59	75.97

The extent to which an education system manages dropout and repetition rates affects student progression through the system in one way or another with combined effect of high dropout and repetition rate that result in low survival rates. Table15, above shows that the zonal trends of primary education with regard to survival rate to grade 8 for four consecutive years (from 2009/10 to 2012/13) shows the pattern of inconsistency record. That is, the trend were decreasing by 6.9%from (76.92 to70.02) between (2009/10 and 2010/11) and increased by 6.81%

from(70.02 to 76.83) between (2010/11 1nd 2011/12) and again decreased by 0.86% from (76.83to 75.97) between (2011/12 an 2012/13) respectively.

In general when summing up the years with the increasing and decreasing trend of survival rate for four consecutive years, the years (2009/10 and 2012/12) were recorded increasing and (2011/12 and 2012/13) were decreased. The average trend increased by 7.76%.The survival rate was enhanced these two years and decreases in 2010/11 and 2012/13.This inconsistent enhancement recorded of the trend implies that, the rate of dropout and repetition rate needs serious follow-up by the zonal and woreda education administrators.

4.3.5. Principals, Teachers, Unit Leaders and Department Heads Attitude towards Internal Efficiency

Table 16: Attitude towards Internal Efficiency

S.N	Items	Principals N=20		Teachers N=30		Unit Leaders N=10		Departments heads N=40		GM
		M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	
1	High dropout indicates high wastage in education	3.25	1.208	3.37	1.401	3.90	1.100	3.40	1.115	3.48
2	High repetition rate indicate inefficient	3.30	1.031	3.57	1.222	3.20	.632	3.70	.939	3.44
3	High dropout rate indicates inefficient schools	2.95	.897	3.37	1.245	3.00	1.490	3.60	1.150	3.23
4	Enhancing dropout is the task of a teacher	3.20	1.056	3.73	2.033	3.60	1.505	3.40	1.335	3.23
5	High promotion rate is the result of inefficient school	3.00	1.450	3.03	1.299	3.40	1.173	3.43	1.337	3.22
6	Repeat grades a result of inefficient teacher	3.20	1.105	3.00	1.389	2.80	1.316	3.60	1.150	3.15
7	Poor management leads to high repetition	3.30	.978	3.13	1.455	3.50	1.581	3.28	1.240	2.80
8	enhancing dropout is not the task of a teacher	2.65	1.136	2.57	1.406	2.70	1.567	3.18	1.298	2.78

Level of agreement: ‘>3.50=Very High; 2.50-3.49= Moderate; <2.50=Very Low’.

The principal, teachers, unit leaders and department heads responses show that their perception on different factors related to internal efficiency varies. Table 16, show that majority of the principals, teachers, unit leaders and department heads have apperception that, the factors like high repetition rate indicate inefficiency, high dropout indicates high wastage in education, high dropout rate indicates inefficient schools, repeat grades a result of inefficient teacher, poor management leads to high repetition, high promotion rate is the result of inefficient school and

enhancing dropout is the task of a teacher that were rated as moderate with minimum mean value of 2.57(indicated low) and maximum mean value of 3.90(indicated high) and with the minimum grand mean of 2.78 and maximum grand mean of 3.48. Therefore, this indicates that the majority of items (eight out of ten) were found to be moderate factors that caused repetition and dropout in the sampled schools.

4.3.6. Mechanism that have been used to Enhanced Schools Internal Efficiency

Table 17: Mechanisms for Enhancing Internal Efficiency

S.N	Mechanism	Principals N=20		Teachers N=30		Unit Leaders N=10		Department heads N=40		GM
		M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	
1	Increase the number of teachers	2.40	1.095	2.13	.973	1.70	.823	2.35	.892	2.14
2	Enhancing access to schooling	2.05	.845	2.26	.944	1.70	.483	2.00	.716	2.00
3	Enhancing adult literacy of parents	2.45	.826	2.20	1.031	1.60	.843	2.23	.800	2.12
4	Make a better school facilities and make school more flexible	2.00	.858	2.37	.765	1.50	.707	2.02	.733	1.95
5	Enhancing teaching methods	2.20	.833	2.27	.907	1.50	.527	1.88	.686	1.95
6	Enhancing inclusive education	1.75	.786	2.67	.785	1.80	.788	1.87	.757	2.02
7	Make educational more available Such as text books	1.80	.768	2.17	.874	1.30	.483	2.05	.714	1.80
8	Raising awareness level of parents	2.30	.864	1.97	.718	1.70	.823	1.93	.787	1.96
9	Closing the gender gap	2.10	.852	2.17	.791	1.80	.788	2.05	.749	1.77
10	Strengthen education management and management information system	2.20	.768	2.26	.784	1.50	.707	1.90	.744	1.96
11	Strengthen community involvement in schooling	1.65	.745	2.13	.819	1.70	.675	2.25	.776	1.93

Level of agreement: '>3.50=Very High; 2.50-3.49= Moderate; <2.50=Very Low

As indicated on Table 17, increasing the number of teachers, enhancing access to schooling, enhancing adult literate of parent, make better school facilities and make school more flexible, enhancing teaching methods, enhanced inclusive education, making educational materials more available, rising the awareness levels of parents, closing the gender gap, strengthen community involvement in the schooling and strengthen educational management and management information system were rated with very low agreement with minimum mean value of 1.30 and maximum mean value of 2.67 and with minimum grand mean value of 1.77 and maximum mean value of 2.14 all of these items were very low exercised in sampled schools as response by the principal, teachers, unit leaders and department heads.

The data obtained from questionnaire four items out of eleven items were slightly exercised in the sample schools, revealed that sampled schools were working to reduce student dropout and repetition in their respective schools.

CHAPTER FIVE

5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In this section a summary of the major findings of the study are presented, conclusions drawn and recommendations for the study advanced based on the findings.

5.1. Summary of Findings

Characteristics and Background of Respondents

There were students over primary school age group from upper primary school grade five, six, seven and eight who constituted 12(38.7%),13(41.94%),11(47.81%) and6(40%)respectively indicated that, there were students over age group.

12(60%) of principals, 15(50%) of teachers, 5(50%) of unit leaders and 19(47.5%) of department heads has work experiences of five years and below.

The majority 17(85%) of principal, 22(73.4%) of teachers, 10(100% unit leaders and 27(67.5%) respondents were diploma.13 (65%) parent were illiterate. 11(55%) of principals were Non EDPM background.

1. Most of the school teachers were fresh or beginning teachers with experiences of five years and below and also diploma holders.
2. Zonal trends of primary education in relation to dropout rate of upper primary school have indicated increasing or decreasing from years to years. The trend of dropout rate at grade five was higher than other class.
3. The woredas primary education dropout rate in the four consecutive years from 2009/10-2012/13 were the same to that of zonal trend averages, since all five woreda in zone were included in the sample .Dropout rate trend of females in the sampled woredas were higher than male counterpart as of the zonal trend.
4. Three sampled schools Tergol, Mangok, and Puokueth show continuous increasing trend of dropout rate in the four consecutive years in 2009/10-2012 /13 whereas Makuar and Matars

schools decreased the trend from 2009/10 to 2012/13 respectively. The average trends of dropout of sampled school were higher than that of woreda and zonal trends.

5. Long distances from home to schools, family low standard of living, shortage of school facilities and involvement in family work were found as the major factors to student dropout that affecting schools internal efficiency.

6. Lack of interest in learning, poor academic performance, unsafe road condition from home to school, frequent repetition, frequent absenteeism, family divorces, frustration during examination, subjected to corporal punishment, lack of parental encouragement, health problem or sickness, peer group influence, parental healthiness/death and cultural impact or harassment were found to be the moderate factors causing student dropout and lack of counseling service were one of factors with very less effect to dropout.

7. Result of interview made with ten parents whose children dropout of the school, majority of them said that, their children dropout from school because of distances lack of education awareness of parents, negative attitude toward education and economic background of parents considered as major factors to student dropout. Minority of parents' response that health's problem and subjected to corporal punishment were factors for their children dropout.

8. The result of focus group discussion made with fifty students drop out of the school, the major factors to their dropout were opportunity cost of child labor and household work, shortage of school physical resources and facilities, school location and illiterate of parents and their lack of education awareness were the major factors to students drop out of the school system.

9. Result of interview made with ten parents whose children repeat the same grade, majority of them said that, their children repeat grade because the school have no adequate textbooks, the home environment are not supportive, poor qualification of teachers and lack of adequate material in the school.

10. The result of focus group discussion made with fifty students who repeat the same grade, majority of them response that, opportunity cost of child labor and household work, illiterate of

parent and their lack education awareness, negative attitude of parents toward education are accountable to their grade repetition.

12. The total trends of repetition rate in upper Primary Education (5-8) show both the increased and decreased trend in four consecutive years.

13. Among the five woredas repetition rate at Wanthoa woreda showed a regular pattern of decreasing trend which show that, the trend decrease with 2.88% from 2009/10 to 2012/13. In general, the trend of other four woredas records trend increase for the first two years and record up and down repetition trend for the subsequent, primary education repetition rate at woredas level reveals is almost characterized by inconsistency. The four consecutive zonal average indicate that repetition rate is relatively decreasing with 1.60% this indicate that, woreda education offices failed to reduce wastage in education and increase their effort to achieve UPE at 2015 at their woreda level in particular and zonal level in general.

14. Four out of ten sampled schools namely Gurubiey, Tergol, Puokueth, and Matar show continuous increase trend of repetition rate for four consecutive academic years. Only Kuregeng and Nib-Nib School recorded continuous decrease of trend for four consecutive academics years. Five schools namely Muon, Nyinenyang, Makuar and Mangok recorded inconsistent trend of repetition rate.

15. High student section ratio, high student-teachers ratio and lack of student text books were the major factors to student repetition that affect the internal efficiency.

poor school infrastructure, unsuitable instructional environment, lack of experienced teachers, teachers absenteeism, teacher centered teaching approach, teachers failure to use teaching aids, resistances locally specific examples, poor continuous assessment practice, poor questioning skill of teachers, poor teachers' class room management, inappropriate teacher-pupil relationship, absence of instructional supervisory support, poor student support management, poor staff's conflict management and lack of parents and community involvement were moderate factors to repetition.

16. Content loaded by heavy curriculum and difficulty of language of instruction were the minor factor to student repetition

17. The survival rate to grade 8 for four consecutive years were assessed and the pattern were inconsistency record. That is, the trends were decreasing by 6.9% and increased by 6.81% and again decreased by 0.86% respectively. The average survival rate for four consecutive years was increasing by 7.76%.

18. Work load at home, low economic background and lack of education awareness of parents were found to be major factors that cause students repetition in sampled primary schools.

19. Lack of self-confidence, frequent student absenteeism, disciplinary problems, negative attitude to the value of education, students who are orphans, health problem, illiterate family background, long distance travel to school and lack of interest in learning were proved as the additional cause for students' dropout in sampled schools.

20. Negative attitude to value of education and low economic background has been mentioned by parents as the most important factors for their children's dropout. These two factors have major effects in parent mind as they see a lot of student who scoreless result in matriculation because of this, they force their children to work at home and they limited them to go to school regularly.

21. Principals, teachers, unit leaders and department heads, perception such as making more student to repeat grades enhancing the quality of the school and School with high repetition rate is that has quality management were found to be the major issues for quality management.

22. increasing the number of teachers, enhancing access to schooling, enhancing adult literate of parent, make better school facilities and make school more flexible, enhancing teaching methods, enhanced inclusive education, making educational materials more available, rising the awareness levels of parents, closing the gender gap, strengthen community involvement in the schooling and strengthen educational management and management information system, were found to be the major problem since the sampled schools in the Zone failed to implement them effectively.

5.2. Conclusion

Internal efficiency plays a very crucial role in the schooling system. The internal efficiency is connected with the educational wastage, because a high rate of internal efficiency decreases the educational wastage. Then students can upgrade their level. Internal efficiency has a direct relationship to the school managing system. So, a well-managed school is more efficient than a mismanaged school.

The composition of the students suggests that, the higher the age of students, the lower the grade level. There will be more chances of repetition due to the age factors, classmates' discrimination, and the interest of students.

Most of the teachers have experiences less than five years and less qualification. These teachers could not be able to teach at upper primary school levels, as a result some students decided to repeat grade to have a good understanding of the subject matter. Primary education dropout rate has been showing an oscillating trend in the past four years.

The trend of dropout rate at zone, woreda and sampled primary schools was highly characterized by ups and downs that could be a major problem for Zonal and Woreda Education Offices, which indicated that there is more need for government effort to achieve UPE in 2015 in Ethiopia.

The trend of repetition and dropout rate showed an oscillating trend at Zone, woreda and school level which indicated that there is a need for responsible experts who are highly experienced to design other intervention strategies to manage these problems.

The trend at Zone and woreda dropout rates revealed a similar trend characterized as the study included all five woredas in the zone in the sample, therefore Zonal and woredas have similar trends, compared to school levels trend of dropout rate which recorded little difference to sampled school dropout rate. This implied that there were poor performances of professionals at all levels of education administrators and experts. The same is true for repetition rate because it showed a similar trend at Zonal and woreda level.

Factors that cause students' dropout are long distances from home to schools, the parents of students are not yet coming near to schools. The development services are located at one place.

As the new policy for rural said that, development service should be located at one place. Since there is resistance from parents, students are always suffering from working 3-5 KM away to school.

One of the reasons for low internal efficiency in Nuer Zone primary schools is economics background of parents. The poor economic status of parents compels their child to stay at home and support the family activities. Children are bound to do house hold work for increasing the income of intra family. Poor parents are not prepared to bear the cost of sending their child to school where as they can immediately benefit if their child work for them at home or do income generating activities. Therefore economics background of parents contributes negatively to internal efficiency. The opportunity cost is higher when a child of poor family attendance the school .So, the child leaves the schools to reduce the cost. Hence; the opportunity cost of attendances at school has a close relationship with internal efficiency.

The study reveals that Educational status of parents and lacks of educational awareness of parent have impact on internal efficiency. The children, whose parents have low or less Education status, are normally leave the school without complete the cycle. These families were found helping to dropout their children from school. Therefore academic level of parents contributes negatively to internal efficiency of primary, since majority of parents are farmer.

Shortage of school facilities ,lack of students text books and lack of education materials were found to be major factors that are significantly cause for students drop out and repetition. Because of these factors some students decided either to dropout or repeat the class. Since there is shortage of laboratory equipment, laboratory services, lack of student desk, cleans water, toilet and school building. The school buildings was not service all students, as result some student leave schools during the summer season before final examine because of rain. Therefore students decided either to dropout or repeat the class.

Most of the teachers are busy because of high student section ratio and students- teachers' ratio. The teachers are loaded for number of class. Because of these teachers are absences to class, due

to this reason students are disappointed to continuous their education. These factors have direct relation with internal efficiency.

Beliefs of teachers and school principals toward student repetition and dropout were contrasting each other and there by indicate the need for scientific justification to bring about a common consensus.

Although many mechanisms have been carried out to enhance internal efficiency the practices in sample schools revealed, that they were working to reduce student dropout and repetition try to associate the upper phrase with the next from the expectation and other stakeholder.

5.3. Recommendations

Based on the major findings and conclusions drawn with respect to the factors affecting the internal efficiency of primary schools in Nuer Zone Gambella Regional State the following recommendations are suggested:

1. ZEO and WEO should assign school principals who fit for the requirement set for primary school principal. To increase the productivity of their proficiency and as a result to reduce the rate of repetition and dropout it is very importance to prepare updating programs, designing practical strategies such as training and retraining of principals to the minimum educational requirement for minimum level of qualified primary school. ZEO is also expected to provide supervisory support for WEO to respect the requirement set for school principal.
2. “Numerous studies have established that skilled teaching has strong positive impacts on pupil achievement.”(UNESCO, 1998:33).But the study have shown that lack of students text books ,students-teacher ratio, high students section ratios were major reasons for students repetition. Therefore to enhances these problem, government should provide the available text books, reference material that single student can have his/her own, which may give opportunity to every child to have education materials in each school..
3. To alleviate the long distances from home to school, ZEO, WEO and school principals should advised parents to join the new village where the development services are placed, such as schools, health centers and water instead of being there in former places, as new policy for rural people.
4. The study clearly indicated that there are circumstantial family conditions arising due to lack of education awareness that have contributed to low internal efficiency. For this there is a need to mobilize and activate people to be self-aware of their children’s need. Adult literacy programs and programs for social interaction and reflection on children’s education are needed. The Zone, worda and schools administrators should strongly introduce the benefit of sending their children to school.

5. Professionals at different levels of Education should raise the awareness level of principals , parents, teachers and give especial attention to understand the necessity of honest and reliable data that could back up a rational decision making during policy formulation, planning and strategy development.

6. The study result revealed that the problems of school dropout were rooted both to school factors and economic problem and social condition external to the school addressing them that requires working with local community politician and parents. Therefore, it recommended that:

- Parents and the community should be aware of the cost and benefit of schools when children are prevented to go to school or fail in school system.
- The schools administrators should strengthen community involvement in school management and parental concerns about school activities.
- Promote continuous awareness programs on the importance of education so that parents encouraged and convinced to send their children to school and to provide the necessary school materials to their children.

Zone or woreda Education should employ a number of teachers and increasing the number of classroom, Strengthen education management and information management system and close the gender gap.

The Zonal Education Office should have general guidelines on school counseling that can be practiced at primary school levels. Counseling, guidance service and tutorial support for student who have low performances in schools is necessary. Each school should have at least one teacher councilor.

In poor communities where parents detain their children from school because of school cost, it is recommended to cooperate with non-governmental organization or international donor organization to seek funding for dropout prevention programs such as provision of some

stationary materials, counseling and guidance services etc. These programs may help children to stay in the system and pursue their academics.

REB, ZEO, WEOs and schools should have close attention and fill gaps on mechanisms that are established to effectively manage internal efficiency, such as;

- Parents participate in educational activities; provide more text books, better school facilities, greater community involvement, community mobilization, active parent-teacher association, Public awareness program collaboration with NGOs in conducting local program.
- The study revealed that it was difficult to give a set of common solutions to the problems of school wastage for each woreda. Therefore; it is recommended that teachers and school administrators should need to identify the predominant causes of repetition and dropouts in their particular situation and then devise appropriate solutions.

Experiences gained by school administrators and teachers in reducing repetition and dropping should be disseminated and widely applied in other schools.

REFERENCES

- Abagi, O. and Odipo, G. (1997). Efficiency of Primary Education in Kenya: Situational Analysis and Implications for Educational reform. Discussion paper, No,
- Ackers, J., Migoli, J. and Nzomo, J. (2001) Identifying and addressing the causes of declining participation rates in Kenyan primary schools. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 21 (4): 361-374.
- Admassie, A. (2003) Child Labor and Schooling in the Context of Subsistence Rural Economy: Can they be Compatible? *International Journal of Educational Development*, 23 (2): 167-185.
- Akinwumiju A. (1995) **Educational** planning Statistics and models. Ibadan. Center for External Studies. 108-116.
- Alderman, H. (2001) Child Health and School Enrollment: A Longitudinal Analysis. *The Journal of Human Resources- XXXVI*, 36(1):185-205.
- Ananga, E., (2011 forthcoming) Typologies of School Dropout: the Dimensions and Dynamics of Exclusion from Universal Basic Education in Ghana, paper accepted for a CREATE special issue of the *International Journal of Educational Development*
- Athmandu, Tripureshwor (2001) Research Center study on improvement of internal efficiency of Primary school in Nepal (17-34)
- Babalola, O. T (2003) an Investigation into the Internal Efficiency of Ekiti State Secondary Schools. Unpublished M.Ed Thesis University of Ado Ekiti, Nigeria. 52-56
- Beebe-Frankenberger, M., Bocian, K., MacMillan, D., &Gresham, F. (2004). Sorting second grade students: Differentiating those retained from those promoted. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 96, 204-215.
- Blick, P. and Sahn, D.E. (2000) Schooling of girls and boys in a West African country: the effects of parental education, income, and household structure, *Economics of Education Review*, 19, 63-87.

- Birdsall, N., Levine, D. and Ibrahim, A. (2005) Towards Universal Primary Education: Investments, Incentives and Institutions. *European Journal of Education*, 40 (3): 337- 349
- Bishop, G. (1989). Alternative Strategies for Education. Hong Kong: British Library
- Brimer, M .A.And L. Pauli (1971).Wastage in Education a World Problem. Paris: UNESCO:
- Colclough, C., Rose, P. and Tembon, M. (2000) Gender Inequalities in Primary Schooling: The Roles of Poverty and Adverse Cultural practices. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 20: 5-27.
- Connelly, R. and Zheng, Z. (2003) Determinants of school enrolment and completion of 10 To 18 year olds in China. *Economics of Education Review*, 22 (4): 379-388.
- Coombs, P.H. and Hallak, Jacques (1987).Cost Analysis in Education; A Tool for Policy and Planning. EDI series in Economic development, The World Bank London.
- Corman, H. (2003). The effects of state policies,individual characteristics, family characteristics, And neighborhood characteristics on grade repetition in the United States. *Economics of Education Review*, 22, 409-420.
- Chowdhury, A.M.R., Nath, S.R., Choudhury, R.K. and Ahmed, M. (2002) Renewed Hope Daunting Challenges: State of Primary Education in Bangladesh, Education Watch 2001, the University Press Limited.
- Dar, A., Blunch, N.H., Kim, B. and Sasaki, M. (2002) Participation of Children in Schooling And Labor Activities: A Review of Empirical Studies, Social Protection Unit, and Human Development Network. Washington DC: The World Bank.
- Dennison S.R. (1984). Choice in Education Institute of Economic Affairs, London.
- Duryea, S. (2003) School Attendance, Child Labor and Local Labor Market Fluctuations in Urban Brazil. *World Development*, 31 (7): 1165-1178.

- Eggen, P. and Kauchack D (1992). *Education Psychology: Classroom connections*, New York: Macmillan
- Eisemon .T.O (1997). *Reducing Repetition Issues and Strategies*. Paris UNESCO, International institute for Educational planning
- Eisenmon, T. & Schwille, J. (1991). Primary education in Burundi and Kenya: Preparation for secondary education or for self-employment? *Elementary School Journal*, 92, 23-40.
- Ersado, L. (2005) Child labor and schooling decisions in urban and rural areas: comparative evidence from Nepal, Peru, and Zimbabwe. *World Development*, 33 (3): 455-480.
- Galabawa, J. C. J. (2003). *Enhancing Efficiency, Improving Quality and Relevance*. Paper Prepared for the Kenya National Conference on Education, at Kenyatta International Conference Centre 27th - 29th November, 2003, Nairobi.
- Ghuman, S. (2006) *Children's Nutrition, School Quality and Primary School Enrollment in Philippines*, Working Paper Series, Volume, 2006-24.
- Glewwe, P. and Jacoby, H.G. (1995) *An Economic Analysis of Delayed Primary-school Enrolment in a Low-income Country: The Role of Early Childhood Nutrition*. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 77: 156-169.
- GoK. (1996). *Kenya - Economic Reforms for 1996-1997: The Policy Framework Paper*. Nairobi.
- Gomes-Neto, J., & Hanushek, E. (1994). Causes and consequences of grade repetition: Evidence From Brazil. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 43, 117-148.
- Grant, M. and Hallman, K. (2006) *Pregnancy Related School Dropout and Prior School Performance in South Africa*. Policy Research Division Working Paper No 212. New York: Population Council.
- GREB (2010/2011): *Education Statistics Annual Abstract: The Education Bureau of Gambella Regional State Education Management Information systems*
- GREB (2010/2011). *Education Statistics Annual Abstract: The Education Bureau of*

- Gambella Regional State Education Management Information systems.
- Girra, H. (2001) *Delayed School Enrolment in Bangladesh: Who Is Responsible*, Pantheon Sorbonne University and CNRS, Maison des Sciences Economiques.
- Hadley, S. (2010) *Seasonality and Access to Education: the case of primary education in Sub-Saharan Africa*, CREATE Pathways to Access, Research Monograph No. 31, Brighton: University of Sussex.
- Haq, M. and Haq, K. (1998). Efficiency of educational spending. In *Human Development in South Asia*. Dhaka: The University Limited.
- Hunt, F. (2008) *Dropping Out from School: A Cross Country Review of Literature*, CREATE Pathways to Access, Research Monograph, No, 16. Brighton: University of Sussex.
- Hunter, N. and May, J. (2002) Poverty, Shocks and School Disruption Episodes among Adolescents in South Africa, CSDS Working Paper No 35.
- Ignatius, I. V. (2001). The imperatives of strategic planning. Paper presented at the National Workshop for Pro-chancellors, Vice-Chancellors and other principal Officers of Nigeria universities. NUC Auditorium, Abuja.
- Ikeda, M. (September, 2005). *Grade repetition and its effect on performance in SACMEQ countries*. Paper presented at 2005 SACMEQ Research Conference, Paris, France.
- Inter-Agency Commission (1990). *Final Report World Conference on Education for All: Meeting Basic Learning Needs*. Jomtien, Thailand.
- Jimerson, S., Carlson, E., Rotert, M., Egeland, B., & Sroufe, L. (1997). A prospective, longitudinal study of the correlates and consequences of early grade retention. *Journal of School Psychology, 35*, 3-25.
- Kadzamira, E. and Rose, P. (2003) Can free primary education meet the needs of the poor? Evidence from Malawi, *International Journal of Educational Development, 23*.501-516.

- Kane, E. (2004) *Girls' Education in Africa: What Do We Know About Strategies That Work?* Washington DC: World Bank.
- Khanam, R. (2008) *Child Labor and School Attendance: Evidence from Bangladesh*, International Journal of Social Economics. Vol. 35, Iss:1/2, pp 77-89.
- Kathmandu, Tripureshwor (2001), Research Center, A study on improvement of Internal efficiency of primary school in Nepal (17-34).
- King, E., Orazem, P, & Paterno, E. (1999). *Promotion with and without learning: Effect On student dropout* (Paper No. 18 in the working paper series on impact evaluation of education reforms). Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Lerotholi, L.M. (2001). *Tuition fees in primary and secondary education in Lesotho: The levels and Implications for access, equity and efficiency*. Paris: IIEP.
- Lewin, K.M. (2008) *Strategies for Sustainable Financing of Secondary Education in Africa*. World Bank Working Paper No 136 Africa Human Development Series World Bank Washington.
- Lisanu Asheber (2004). *Factors affecting Internal Efficiency of Rural Primary school in Tigray Region*. Addis Ababa University. Master Thesis.
- Liu, F. (2004) *Basic education in China's rural areas: a legal obligation or an individual choice?* *International Journal of Educational Development*, 24: 5-21.
- Lockheed, Marlaine E and Hanusheek Eric (1988). "Improving Educational Efficiency in Developing Countries. What do we know?" *Compare*. Vol. 18 No.1.
- MOE (2000). *Education Statistics, Annual Abstract 2007 /2008*-Addis Ababa EMIS. Berhanena Selam Printing Enterprise.
- Mukudi, E. (2004) *the Effects of User-Fee Policy on Attendance Rates among Kenyan Elementary School Children*. *International Review of Education*, 50(5/6): 447-461.
- Nath, S.R. Haq, M.N. Begum, U.S., Ullah, A. Sattar, M.A. and Chowdhury, A.M.R. (2008)

- The State of Secondary Education: Quality and Equity Challenges, Education Watch report, 2007, CAMPE, Bangladesh.
- Nebiyu Taddese, (1999). Educational Materials and Finance Management USAID/BESO Project (unpublished)
- Olubor, R.O (2004): “A Comparative Analysis of the Internal Efficiency of Public Junior Secondary Education of Two Selected States in Nigeria.” *Journal of Educational Foundations and Managements (JEFAM)*, University of Ado Ekiti, Nigeria4 (1)194- 196.
- Omari, I.M. (1983). *Universal Primary Education in Tanzania*. Dares Salem: university of Dares Salem.
- Pradhan, K. M. and Shrestha M. M. (1995). A study on internal efficiency in Tribhuvan University. Kathmandu: Faculty of Education, T. U.
- Pridmore, P. (2007). *Impact of health on education access and achievement: A crosses national review of the research evidence*. CREATE Pathways to Access No 26. Brighton: University of Sussex.
- Pryor, J. and Ampiah, J.G. (2003) *Understandings of Education in an African Village: The Impact of Information and Communication Technologies*. London: DFID.
- Psacharopoulos, G .and M. Woodhall, (1985). *Education for Development. An analysis of Investmentchoices*. WashingtonD.C, A World Bank Publication Oxford university press.
- Psacharopoulos, George, “Returns to Education: A Further International Update and Implication”, in *the Journal of Human Resources*, Vol 20, No.4, 1985.
- Psacharopoulos G.J. (1989). “Why Educational Reform Fail: A Comparative analysis.” *International Review of Education* vol.35 (No.2), pp.199-1940.
- Rose, Pauline et al. (1997). *Gender and Primary Schooling in Ethiopia*. England Institute of

Development Studies

- Rose, P., and Al-Samarrai, S. (2001) Household Constraints on Schooling by Gender: Empirical Evidence from Ethiopia. *Comparative Education Review*, 45(1): 36-63.
- Sanothimi, & Bhaktapur, (2001). Study of Internal Efficiency of Primary Education. Nepal. <http://www.esat.org.np/>.
- Shiundu, John.O. (1999). Wastage in Education. A synthesis of causal Factors and Strategic interventions. A paper Presented to MOA. Published.
- Martin, R., Foels, P., Clanton, G., & Moon, K. (2004). Season of birth is related to child Retention rates, achievement, and rate of diagnosis of specific LD. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 37, 307-317.
- Simmons, John and Alexander Leigh (1986). "Factors which Promote school Achievement in Developing Countries: A Review of the Research "The Education Dilemma, Policy Issue for Developing countries in the 1980's, Frankfurt: Pregame on press.
- Subedi, R.P. (2009). *Internal Efficiency of Primary School in Nepal: A Unpublished*
- Susy N darhutse (2008). Grade Repetition in Primary Schools in sub- Saharan Africa: An evidence base for change. Retrieved 10 Nov 2010, [http:// www.cfbt.com](http://www.cfbt.com).
- Taddele Hagos, (2008). The Feasibility of UPE by 2015 in the State of Tigray (Ethiopia): Opportunities and Challenges. A thesis presented to the Department of Education, National University of Ireland, Cork, In Fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of Doctor of philosophy
- Tsang, M.C. (1988). "Cost Analysis for Educational Policy Making. A Review of cost studies in Education in Developing Countries" *Review of Educational Research*. Vol.58 No .2.
- UNESCO (1972). A Statistical Study of Wastage at School. Geneva: UNESCO.

UNESCO (1998). *Wasted Opportunities, when schools fail, repetition and Dropouts in primary schools*. France: UNESCO.

UNESCO (2002). *EFA Global Monitoring Report 2002: Education for All, Is the World on Track?* Paris: UNESCO.

UNICEF --goal (2011). *Achieve Universal Primary Education*; Retrieved February 8, 2011; Page 1-5 <http://www.Unicef.org/mdg/education.html/>.

UNESCO. (1996). *Learning the Treasure Within*. Paris: UNESCO

World Bank, *World Development Report 1980*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1980.

World Bank (1980), *Education Sector Policy Paper*. Washington D.C: The World Bank.

World Bank. (1988). *Education in Sub-Saharan Africa: Policies of Adjustment, Revitalization and Expansion*. Washington, D.C: The World Bank.

World Bank (1990). "A World Bank Policy Paper-Primary Education" Washington; World Bank.

World Bank Group. *United Nations 2009 Millennium development goals*. Retrieved.

World Bank (1980), *Education Sector Policy Paper*. Washington D.C: The World Bank.

World Book Encyclopedia No.6. (1992). World Book, Inc: USA.

World Bank Group. *United Nations 2009 Millennium development goals*. Retrieved

World Book Encyclopedia No.6. (1992). World Book, Inc: USA

Appendix –A

Jimma University

Institute of education and professional development studies School

Questionnaire to be filled by Teachers and Principals

Dear Principal, Teachers, Unit Leaders and Department Heads

The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect information that will help investigating factors related to dropout and repetition of students in selected primary schools. The information you are supplying will be useful to identify major factors affecting school repetition and dropout rates that help to provide possible solutions for educational wastage and increase internal efficiency.

Your participation in completing the questionnaire is extremely useful. Therefore, you are kindly requested to complete the questionnaire honestly and responsibly. And, the study is purely academic so that all the information will be kept confidential.

General Direction

- You do not need to write your name.
- Put a tick (X) mark in boxes that represent your responses.
- Provide additional opinions, if any, on the space provided.
- Please follow instructions provided for each part.

Thank you in advance

Part I. Background Information

1.1. Name of the school _____

1.2. Zone _____

1.3. Woreda _____

1.4. Sex Male Female

1.5. Your Current Position in the School:

Principal Teacher Unit Leaders Department Heads

1.6. Principal's Educational Field of Study

EDPM Non – EDPM

1.7. Your Current Highest Educational Level:

10+3 / 12+2 BA/BSc/Bed Certificate

Other if any, _____

1.8. Principal's, Teacher's, Department heads and Unit leaders Work Experience:

0 – 5 years 6 -12 years >13 years

Part II Questions to be answered

The definitions of some technical terms those are essential to respond to the questions are given below.

Internal efficiency: Refers to the measurement of performance of the education system which shows students are either successfully completing or detained at certain grade level.

Repetition: Refers to the proportion of students who have remained in the same grade over one year and used additional resource for the grade. The resource is in the form of teacher salary, school materials etc.

Dropouts: Leaving a school before completion of agave stage of education or some intermediate or non-terminal point in Level of education.

III. Rate the following factors that favor students to dropout in your school. Based on your judgment put the degree of contribution of each factor by putting an “X” mark in a column you select.

S.N		Very high (5)	High (4)	moderate (3)	Low (2)	Very low (1)
3.1	Long distance from home to school in KM					
3.2	Students’ lack of interest in learning					
3.3	Poor academic performance (fear of failure)					
3.4	Frequent repetition					
3.5	Lack of counseling service when facing a problem (at school level)					
3.6	Frequent absenteeism					
3.7	Unsafe road condition from home to school					
3.8	Shortage of school facilities					
3.9	Use of corporal punishment by school personal					
3.10	Lack of parental encouragement					
3.11	Health problem/ sickness					
3.12	Family disunity/ family breakdown					
3.13	Parental illness or death (family					

	problem					
3.14	Frustration during examination					
3.15	Involvement in family work					
3.16	influence of peer group					
3.17	Cultural impact/ harassment					
3.18	Families low standard of living					

IV. Rate the following school based factors that favor students to repeat grades in your school. Based on your judgment put the degree of contribution of each factor by putting an “X” mark in a column you select.

S.N	Items	Very high (5)	High (4)	Moderate (3)	Low (2)	Very Low (1)
4.1	High student section ratio					
4.2	Poor infrastructure of the school such as desk, lab, library, latrine, water etc					
4.3	Lack of text books					
4.4	Suitability of school environment for instructional programs					
4.5	Lack of experienced teachers					
4.6	Content loaded curriculum heavy curriculum					
4.7	Difficulty of language of instruction					
4.8	Teachers’ frequent absenteeism in classroom instruction					
4.9	Teaching approaches of teachers is dominantly teacher centered					

4.10	Teachers' do not use teaching aid materials, to make students understand their lesson					
4.11	Teachers' do not use local specific examples, to make students understand their lesson					
4.12	poor continuous assessment practice by giving class work, homework, test and project work					
4.13	Poor questioning skill of teachers or unsuitable examination					
4.14	High student - teachers ratio					
4.15	Poor class room management of teachers					
4.16	inappropriate relationship of teachers with their pupils					
4.17	Absence of instructional supervision support for class room instruction by principals of the school.					
4.18	Poor management of school based student academic support programs such as tutorial and girls special support.					
4.19	Excess staff conflict that create bad working environment due to poor conflict management					
4.20	Involvement of parents & community in management of the school					

V .Rate the following student related factors that make students repeat grade in your School. Based on your judgment put the degree of contribution of each factor by putting an “x” mark in a column you select

S.N	Items	Very high (5)	high (4)	moderate (3)	low (2)	Very low (1)
5.1	Lack of self-confidence					
5.2	Frequent absenteeism during class room instruction					
5.3	Lack of interest in learning					
5.4	Disciplinary problems					
5.5	Travel long distance to school					
5.6	Negative attitude to the value of education					
5.7	Health problem					
5.8	Work load at home(in hours)					
5.9	Students who have illiteracy family					
5.10	Students who have low economical background					
5.11	Students who are orphans					
5.12	Lack of educational awareness of parents					

VI. The following items are meant to address issues related to your belief towards the problem of internal efficiency in your school. Based on your opinion put the degree of contribution of each factor by putting an “x” mark in a column you select.

S.N	Items	Very high (5)	High (4)	moderate (3)	Low (2)	Very low (1)
6.1	I think schools with high repetition rate are inefficient schools					
6.2	I feel that high dropout in schools is high wastage of school many					
6.3	I think schools with high dropout rate are inefficient schools					
6.4	I believe that a teacher that make students to repeat grades is inefficient Teacher					
6.5	I think a schools with high repetition rate is a school that has poor Management					
6.6	I feel that enhancing dropout in schools is not the task of a teacher					
6.7	I believe a school that allow high promotion rate is inefficient schools					
6.8	I feel that enhancing dropout in schools is the task of a teacher					

VII. The following items are about your attitude on the how the repetition or dropout rate can be enhanced in your school context. Based on your school situation judge the degree of contribution of each mechanism by putting an “X” mark in the column you select

S.N	Items	Very high (5)	High (4)	moderate (3)	Low (2)	Very low (1)
7.1	Lowering the cost of schooling (making primary education free)					
7.2	Increase access to schooling					
7.3	Enhancing adult literacy of parents					
7.4	Make better school facilities and makeup school more flexible					
7.5	Enhancing teaching methods					
7.6	Enhancing inclusive education or special need education					
7.7	Making educational materials more available such text books					
7.8	Rising awareness level of parents					
7.9	Closing the gender gap					
7.10	Strengthen educational management and management information system					
7.11	Strengthen community involvement in schooling					

APPENDIX – B

Jimma University

Institute of education and professional development studies School

Interview guide for Parents whose Children dropout/repeated school

The researcher will briefly explain the purpose of the interview to the interviewee that is

The purpose of the interview is to collect data that will help to identify factors related to dropout and repetition of students in selected primary schools. And, inform the parents that their honest response is important for the success of the study.

Background Information

Zone _____ Woreda _____

Sex _____

Level of Education _____

1. What factors force your child to dropout from school?
2. What reasons have you hear or told about your child to repeat grade?
3. Was there any effort made by the local Education office or local administrators to bring your child back to school?
4. Was there mechanism undertaken in your locality in order to enhance school internal efficiency?
5. How about the distance from your to schools?
6. Have you got any awareness created or rising about students dropout and repetition?
7. Have you always attended school daily meeting?

APPENDIX – C

Jimma University

Institute of education and professional development studies

Document Review Guide

The researcher will conduct document review on the following documents: Zonal

Education bureau annual abstract, woreda education reports, and school reports

Regarding student dropout, repetition, and promotion:

1. Zonal Trends of Primary Education Dropout Rate
2. Zonal Trends of Primary Education Repetition Rate
3. Zonal Trends of Primary Education Survival Rates to Grade 8
4. Woreda Trends of Primary Education Dropout Rate
5. Woreda Trends of Primary Education Repetition Rate
6. Trends of Primary Education Dropout Rate in Schools
7. Trends of Primary Education Repetition Rate in Schools

Observation check list

S.N	Items
1	Teaching approaches of teachers
2	Students- section ratios
3	Schools facilities
4	School infrastructures
5	Teachers punctuality
6	Students punctuality from class
7	Students participation in classroom activities
8	Continues assessment practices in schools
9	Schools environment

Focus Group with Students

S.N	Items
1	School physical resources and facilities
2	School Location
3	Teacher's characteristics
4	Parents attitude toward education
5	Economic condition
6	Parents educational awareness and literacy
7	Opportunity cost of child labor and household work
8	Variations in sex and student's over age group

Parents Respondent on Students Dropout and Repetition

S.N	Items
1	Factors that force your child to drop out or repeat grade the grade
2	The reason have you hear or told you by school administrators about your child to repeat grade
3	The effort made by the local education offices or school administrators to bring your child back to school
4	The mechanism undertaken in your locality in order to enhance school internal efficiency
5	The school location
6	The awareness created or rising about students dropout and repetition
7	The participation in school daily meeting

