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Abstract
The purpose of this study was to investigate the status and contributing factors for students’ dropout in primary schools of pastoralist areas of Sewena Woreda, Bale Zone, Oromia. Pragmatism as a philosophical assumption was employed. The mixed research method more specifically concurrent triangulation design was used. Both probability and none probability sampling techniques were employed. 13 primary schools were randomly selected specifically by using lottery method. 37 (30%) primary school teachers, and 36(30%) dropout returnee students were selected by proportionated simple random sampling technique and Kebele Education Training Board (KETB) members two from each primary schools were purposively selected for the study. 13 primary school principals, ten CRC supervisors and six educational experts were chosen using availability sampling technique. Questionnaires were distributed for 102(teachers, principals, Cluster resource Center (CRC) Supervisors, educational experts and dropouts’ returnee students). Interviews were also conduct with 26 purposively selected KETB members. Questionnaires, interview, and document analysis were used as data collection tools; thereby validity and reliability were used to test the quality of instruments. Both quantitative and qualitative data analysis techniques were employed. Descriptive statistics like frequency distribution, percentage, mean and standard deviation; inferential statistics ANOVA were used. The research findings concluded that there were six major factors contributing for students’ dropout in the target area. These are social factors, economic factors; school related factors; student related factors; climatic factors and political factors were identified as major and significant dropout factors. The study recommended with emphasis that the government as well as educational stakeholders should design the ways of improving the lives of pastoralists in contacting with different valuable NGOs. In addition, the Government should decide the exact and specific regional boundaries so as to solve the border conflict that brought community migration and displacement being the cause of students’ dropout in both Somalia Regional State and Oromia Regional State.
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Introduction
Background of the Study
Dropout is a series problem at every level in which the problem starts in primary schools and continue in secondary schools which make an early intervention necessary to try to prevent students from continuing on this path through their educational experiences (Marie-JoseTheunissen-Lamers, 2016). This expresses that dropout is an alarming issue, which affects the socio economic development. Dropout does not only affect the community they belong but also affect the nation at large. Globally, the education system characterized by the high number of children leaving school before completing primary education, which results about 31.2 million primary students dropped out of school in 2010 (UNESCO, 2012). Even though, little and uneven progress has been made in reducing the rate in which children dropout before reaching the last grade of primary school; on average the dropout rate across the developing world shows 1 in 4 children who enrol in primary school withdraw before completing it(SIDA,2016 ;UIS and UNICEF,2015).

Moreover, despite global pledges to achieve Education for All by 2015, nearly 58 million children of primary school age worldwide were not enrolled in school in 2012, but less than one quarter of these ‘out-of-school’ children were dropouts. (UIS and UNICEF, 2015: 23). In East Asia and the Pacific, 59% of primary school aged children who were not enrolled in school in 2012 had dropped out (MICS, 2014). On the other hand, Sub-Saharan African countries characterized by high dropout rate resulting 10 million children dropout of primary school yearly. In addition, more than 2 in 5 children who begin primary school do not complete their education. Dropout vary extremely by country, especially in Ethiopia, Malawi and Uganda with dropout rates
between 24% and 28% in the first grade, this shows dropout is huge problem in Sub-Saharan African countries; more than half of all children aged 10 to 19 had left primary school without completion (MICS, 2014; Bruneforth, 2006)

There are differences in school completion between children from urban and rural areas. Therefore, more than 80% of rural children as well as less than half of this amount of urban children had left primary school dropout in Sub-Saharan countries. There are also vast differences between poorest and richest; more than 90% of children from the poorest 40% of households who left primary school did not complete it as well as dropout is much less for the richest 40% of households. In addition, differences are also strong in relation to the mothers’ education in Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Mali and Mozambique; more than 70% of children with uneducated mothers who left primary school did not complete primary education (Hunt, 2008).

The MoE of Ethiopia, data of 2016 showed that primary school dropout rates are at 11.65% of school age students of primary. Particularly, Dropout is highest in grade 1, at 18%. This means that many children join in grade 1 and then leave the education system. Dropout in the rest of the grades is around 9% (MoE, 2016). On the other hand, in evaluating Ethiopia’s progress towards MDG, the gross enrolment rate in primary education increased from 96.4 percent in 2010/11 to 111.4 percent in 2016/17 (MoE, 2017). The target set by the Ethiopian Government for dropout rates of children from primary school was 9 percent for the year 2016/17 (MoE, 2017). The actual dropout rate in this same year is 11.65 percent, and the difference in rates between boys and girls was almost zero. To give more emphasis, in Ethiopia, household poverty is a major factor keeping many children out of school. Poor households often cannot afford to send their children to school or are forced to withdraw children out of school at early ages. Although primary school is free in Ethiopia, hidden costs such as exercise books, supplies, uniforms and food hinder poor households from sending their children to school (MoE, 2017).

Furthermore, MoE (2017) Ethiopian Education services in pastoralist areas are limited. Pastoralists derive most of their food source and income from raising livestock, a livelihood necessitating seasonal migration. Especially, in times of drought and famine, children may not be able to attend school or concentrate due to hunger, lack of water or illness induced by malnutrition. Children quit from their schooling to help collect water, fuel, or food, and the practice of early marriage (MoE, 2017). Moreover, as it was indicated in the ministry document Dropout is highest in grade 1, at 18% nationally. This means that many children join in grade 1 and then leave the education system, whereas the dropout rate escalates to 4.49% for both sexes in Oromia as well as in Bale Zone was 2.79 in the year 2016/17. However, according to Bale Zone report, in 2016/17 academic year the primary schools rate of grade 1-4 was 2.87 whereas rate of grade 5-8 was 2.71. In addition, Bale Zone Education Office quarterly report revealed that the total primary school dropout rate of it was 2.91% or 11,287 students dropped out in the year 2016/17. Particularly, in the same year the report jotted down the total primary school dropout rate of Sewena Woreda was 7.9% or 1253 students dropped out without completing their primary education. This study is therefore imperative to reduce the status of pastoralist students’ dropout in primary schools of Sewena Woreda, Bale Zone, Oromia.

Statement of the Problem
The objectives of primary education is to develop the physical, mental, potential and the problem solving capacity of individuals by expanding education in particular by providing basic education for all (MoE, 1994). These objectives have not been fully achieved due to the high level of pastoralist students dropping out. Dropping out is a serious problem because it denies fundamental human right of individual student to education by early departure of a student from school without completion of a given grade level (MoE, 2015). Dropout has serious negative implications for the individuals who drop out, their families, and society as a whole. It should be the concern of every member of society since it has negative consequences both at individual and societal level (Koskei, Tonui, and Simiyu, 2015).

In most of the studies cited in the background, the status of students’ dropout identified lack of parental involvement, peer pressure; parents do not want to send their children to schools stated as the main factors for students’ dropouts. There is an urgent need for more information regarding the status of students drop out of both sexes. An explanation of why both sexes of pastoral students drop out of primary school is needed in order to address this problem. The influences on students drop out for females have been explored by few Ethiopian studies. In the target area a Cross-sectional studies by (Teshome Sirak & Gamachu Gishe, 2016) have verified specific dropout factors namely; students walk the long distance to school, and children always move from place to place with their family while their families migrate from one place to the other due to the mobile nature of pastoralists.

However, dropout does not occur through a single factor; it is a composition of several factors. A number of studies have been conducted on girls’ dropout issue based on particular regions, societies and cultural perspectives in various parts of the world. Thus, this study tends to investigate the untouched parts by the previous study like the status of dropout which are organized in accumulated factors and can give further
opportunity to researchers to view the status of students’ dropout issue. Mainly, this study set out to investigate the status and contributing factors for students’ dropout in primary schools of pastoralist areas of Sewena Woreda, Bale Zone, Oromia. To fill the gaps of the study, the following basic research questions were raised and answered in the course of the study.

1. What is the status of students’ dropout in primary schools of pastoralist areas of Sewena Woreda, Bale Zone, Oromia?
2. What are the factors contributing for students dropout in primary schools of pastoralist areas of Sewena Woreda, Bale Zone, Oromia?
3. What are impacts observed as results of students’ dropout in primary schools of pastoralist areas of Sewena Woreda, Bale Zone, Oromia?

Theoretical Framework of the Study

A combination or hybrid of a social learning theory and facilitating learning theories were chosen as a theoretical framework for this study. First, the study employed predominantly social learning theory as a theoretical framework for this study. This theory was based on the idea that we learn from our interactions with others in a social context (Nabavi, 2014). Separately, by observing the behaviors of others, people develop similar behaviors. According to Bandura (1977), imitation involves the actual reproduction of observed motor activities. Moreover, in social learning theory there were different social units with whom children connects; family, school, peers and community. In conducting education children have interaction of different people having different habit and characters. Therefore, children can imitate or cope with the behavior of others.

Furthermore, social learning theory emphasize on changes in behavior and learning through the observation and imitation of the actions and behaviors in the environment. It models the child’s behavior to reflect the acceptable norms, attitudes and values in the society (Edinyang, et al, 2015). Therefore, this theory was important that they all verify that a social phenomenon like school dropout was a developmental concern influenced by various factors and context which happens over a period of time and not just as a single event. In considering all the above point, the social learning theory added additional substance to the theoretical basis within which I would interpret the findings of this study of the status of school dropout in Sewena Woreda Bale Zone, Oromia.

Secondly, the facilitation theory of learning was based on the belief that man was a unique creature with varying capacities, and a natural desire to learn. Educators recognize and achieve this natural desire of acquiring knowledge. Learning therefore should aim at achieving this desire thus bringing about self-actualization (Bouchard, T., 2013). In this context, learners should be helped to gain control over their own education and take responsibility of their own learning. Therefore, this allows the researcher to interpret learners’ roles, interpretation and understanding of the learner dropout phenomenon. It provided a clear perspective for this study because it explored the participants’ feelings, actions, intentions, experiences and their views with regard to the causes of dropout in primary schools of Sewena Woreda, Bale Zone, Oromia.

Conceptual Framework of the Study
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Figure 1. Conceptual framework on students’ dropout
The conceptual framework clearly indicates the status of students’ dropout in primary schools of Sewena Woreda, Bale Zone, Oromia by achieving the goals of schools were used by solving the school related factors; students related factors, economic factors; social factors, climatic factors and political factors. All the above factors considered as to be the dependent variables that contribute individually or collectively to the status of students’ dropout in primary schools and also considered as independent variables used in this study.

Research Method and Design of the Study

Paradigm
As mentioned in the outset of the study, the purpose of this research article was to investigate status and contributing factors students’ dropout in primary schools as an assumption and know about how and what was investigated during this research problem. This is because pragmatism paradigm mixes characteristics of quantitative and qualitative approaches and identifies solutions (Morgan, 2007). Moreover, the pragmatism paradigm provided the opportunities to the researchers to choose multiple research methods and techniques. Therefore, authors were used mixed research method more specifically concurrent triangulation mixed research design to investigate the status of students dropout in primary schools of pastoralist areas of Sewena Woreda, Bale Zone, Oromia based on testing the basic research questions.

Population of the Study
Population has defined as any group of people in which the researchers happens to be interested. Omari, (2011) says that Population is the totality of any group of units which have one or more characteristics in common that are of interest. Thus, target population for this study was 124 primary school teachers, 120 dropout returnee students, 13 primary school directors, 10 CRC supervisors, 18 educational experts and 104 KETB members. Therefore, the total population for this study was 389.

Types and Sources of Data
Both primary and secondary sources of data were used. Specifically, the major sources of primary data becomes primary school teachers, (CRC) supervisors, directors, dropout returnee students, educational experts and Kebeles education and training board (KETBs) of government primary schools of Sewena Woreda, Bale Zone, Oromia Region. The secondary sources of data were document analysis from Sewena Woreda Education Office.

Sample Size and Sampling Techniques
In this study, the sample schools were chosen from 42 primary schools, 13(30%) schools were chosen by using simple random sampling method specifically by using lottery method. Since Mugenda and Mugenda (1999) advises researchers to use 10-30% of samples from primary schools to gravitate the representative of the population. On the other hand, 13 (30%) of primary schools directors, 10(100%) of CRC supervisors and 6(30%) of educational experts were chosen using availability sampling technique. In addition, 37(30%) primary teachers, 36(30%) dropout returnee students were selected proportionated simple random sampling technique, and 26 KETB members two (chairman and secretary) from sample schools were selected by purposive sampling technique.

Data Collection Instrument
Questionnaire, interview, and document analysis were used as a main data gathering instruments.

Validity
Mugenda and Mugenda (1999) define validity as the accuracy and meaningfulness of inferences which are based on the research results. To this end, experts were consulted to check if instruments were well designed in relation to the research objectives. To ensure validity and reliability of data, the authors are used triangulation methods in data collection strategy for improving the validity and reliability of research findings as commented by Creswell (2012) which states that described that triangulation means the use of different data sources of information by examining evidence from these sources and using them to build a coherent justification for theme.

Reliability
Reliability is an essential ingredient in validity because a test cannot be valid if it is not reliable (Borg and Gall, 1993). Therefore, the instruments were pilot tested at a primary school. Questionnaires were piloted on twenty respondents who were not taking part in the sample. To check reliability using cronbach’s alpha and obtained 0.86 alpha coefficients which was considered as reliable for data collection. Therefore, the result of the test showed that the reliability of cronbach’s alpha & alpha should falls at acceptable range (i.e. α≥0.75).
Methods of Data Analysis
Both quantitative and qualitative data analysis techniques were used. Quantitative data were analyzed by means of descriptive and inferential statistics (frequency distribution, percentage, mean, standard deviation) and ANOVA. Whereas, direct quotation and paraphrasing were used to analyze qualitative data collected through interviews and document analysis.

1. Data Presentation, Analysis and Interpretation
This part focused on the outcome of data analysis. It was presented along each basic research questions. The findings were presented in relation to the following themes: the status of students’ dropout in primary schools; the factors contributing for students’ dropout of primary schools and indicating the impacts or consequences of students’ dropout in primary schools. It is, thus, presented the data gathered through questionnaire, interview and eighth years (2011-2018) document analysis of Sewena Education Office statistical report have checked on students’ enrollment and dropout status.

1.1. Status of students’ dropout rates by sex in percent and year 2011-2018

| Academic Years | Primary Students dropout rates in 2011-2018 | M % | F % | M+F % | Ranks |
|---------------|-------------------------------------------|-----|-----|-------|-------|
| 2011          | 81                                        | 6.8 | 54  | 6.27  | 3     |
| 2012          | 144                                       | 7.97| 79  | 6.41  | 2     |
| 2013          | 120                                       | 7.43| 74  | 5.94  | 4     |
| 2014          | 72                                        | 6.34| 35  | 5.21  | 5     |
| 2015          | 107                                       | 5.19| 67  | 4.76  | 7     |
| 2016          | 134                                       | 5.02| 85  | 4.85  | 6     |
| 2017          | 132                                       | 8.6 | 82  | 8.09  | 1     |
| 2018          | 110                                       | 3.11| 73  | 3.16  | 8     |

The table showed that dropout rate of primary students indicated from highest to lowest in the years of 2017, 2012, 2011, 2013, 2014, 2016, 2015 and 2018 respectively. that is, male 132(8.6%), female82(7.4%) total 214(8.09%); male144 (7.97%), female79 (4.72%) and total 223(6.41%); male 81(6.8%), female 54(5.6%) and total 135(6.27%); male 120(7.43%), female 74(4.48%) and total 194(5.94%); male 72(6.34%), female 35(3.80%) and total 107(5.21%); male 134(5.02%), female 85(4.59%) and total 219(4.85%); male 107(5.19%), female 67(4.21%) and total 174(4.76%) Whereas, in the year of 2018 the dropout rate was male 110(3.11%), female 73(3.26%) and total 183(3.16%) and it’s the lowest of all. To conclude that, more males were dropped out than females and was highest 2017 due to highest drought, boarder conflict and migration of pastoralists in the target area during this period.

1.2. Status of students’ dropout rates by grade levels in percent and year 2011-2018
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Figure 2 showed that dropout rates were presented in all grade level and in eight academic years (2011-2018). More specifically, the maximum male students dropout rates had seen in grade 5,6, and 8 with rate of 120(10.2%), 76(9.9%) and 32(9.8%) respectively; as well as, the maximum female students dropout rates had seen in grade 7,6 and 5 with rate of 28(7.9%), 47(7.2%) and 66(6.6%) respectively. The dropout rate also was high in grade 5, 6, 7 and 8 for boys and in grade 5, 6, and 7 for girls. Totally, within the eight years’ time grade 5 up to 8 grades level the dropout rates could be increased. However, to conclude that in all grade levels within eight academic years there was dropout of students in selected primary schools, that is, grade 1 the dropout rate was male 214(4.5%) and female148(4.3%) around 362 students dropped out from 13 primary schools. To support this idea, the qualitative data suggested that due to different dropout factors the above mentioned data of
students dropped out from their schooling. Findings suggest that students quit their schooling increase as the grade level also increase.

1.3. Status of Students’ Dropout by Age

The first objective was set to explore the status of students’ dropout in primary schools. To achieve this aspect, let’s see the following table.

### Table 2. The status of students’ dropout by age

| No | Items                                      | Teachers N=37 | Principals N=13 | Supervisor N=10 | Eduprerts N=6 | Dropout returnee N=36 | Total N=102 |
|----|--------------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------------|-------------|
| 1  | Students at which age level dropouts from their schooling? | 0.5 100 7.7 | 2 15.4 5 167 | 3 83.3 6 588 | 4 11.1 8 7.84 | 7 18 34 33.3 | 100 102 100 |
| 2  | Total | 7 100 13 100 | 10 100 6 100 | 36 100 102 100 | 100 102 100 |

Source: (Own Field data, 2019); N=102 df=101

Table 2 showed the frequencies of all respondents’ views about the status of students’ dropout in primary schools. According to the respondents which showed 11-14 age level of students dropped out from their schooling. Furthermore, from the total respondents that could replied based on the question ‘Students at which age level dropouts from their schooling’ were indicated as follows: 79 (77.45%); 13 (12.74%) and 10 (9.8%) between the age of 11-14, 7-10 and 15-18 students dropped out from their schooling respectively. This implies that majority of the respondents that replied the age range 11-14 of students were dropped out from their schooling.

2. Factors Contributing for Students’ Dropout

### Table 3. Social Factors Contributing for Students’ Dropout

| No | Items                                      | Teachers N=37 | Principals N=13 | Supervisor N=10 | Eduprerts N=6 | Dropout returnee students N=36 | Total N=102 | M   | SD  |
|----|--------------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------------------|-------------|------|-----|
| 1  | Domestic chores (Routine home tasks)       | 2 100 7.7 3 | 2 15.4 5 167 | 3 83.3 6 588   | 4 11.1 8 7.84 | 7 18 34 33.3                    | 100 102 100 | 4.63 | 0.716 |
| 2  | Home activities, herding, farming          | 2 100 7.7 3 | 2 15.4 5 167 | 3 83.3 6 588   | 4 11.1 8 7.84 | 7 18 34 33.3                    | 100 102 100 | 4.72 | 0.603 |
| 3  | Early marriage                             | 2 100 7.7 3 | 2 15.4 5 167 | 3 83.3 6 588   | 4 11.1 8 7.84 | 7 18 34 33.3                    | 100 102 100 | 4.86 | 0.346 |
| 4  | Attitudes to girls education               | 2 100 7.7 3 | 2 15.4 5 167 | 3 83.3 6 588   | 4 11.1 8 7.84 | 7 18 34 33.3                    | 100 102 100 | 4.87 | 0.335 |
| 5  | Lack of parental follow up                 | 2 100 7.7 3 | 2 15.4 5 167 | 3 83.3 6 588   | 4 11.1 8 7.84 | 7 18 34 33.3                    | 100 102 100 | 4.88 | 0.473 |
ANOVA result for this item was \((F, 2.019 \text{ at } p<0.001)\). Therefore, it shows early marriage was highly significant mean value, 3. This shows that early marriage mainly taken as causes of students’ dropout in the study area. The marriage scored 102(100%) for the statement that states early marriage are the social factor influencing students dropout. The arithmetic mean score of score of this item is 4.40 SD of .924 which is greater than the average mean value, 3. This show that early marriage influencing students dropout.

Home activities, herding, and farming mainly taken as causes of students’ dropout in the study area. The score of score of this item is 4.28 SD of .877 which is greater than the average mean value, 3. This show that home activities, herding, and farming were highly significant that influencing students dropout.

Parents sometimes obliged their children to do domestic chores staying at home. Children work instead of their family. Due to these reasons our children dropped out from their schooling (KETBs participant)

To support the above ideas, Hunt,(2008) many children from poor households have no choice but to juggle work and school or to help with domestic chores and childcare to free up their parents to work. In some cases, family commitments clash with school schedules and lead to high absenteeism, poor school performance and (usually) dropout

As can be shown in item 2 Table 3, 95(93.13%) of respondents replied strongly agree 84(62.74%) and agree 31(30.39%); 4(3.92%) of respondents replied disagree; whereas, 3(2.94%) of the respondents replied undecided for the statement that states Home activities, herding, farming are the social factor influencing students dropout in Sewena Woreda, Bale zone, Oromia. From the analysis , the total agreed scores for this item stating, home activities, herding, farming, scored 88(86.27%) against scores of 6(5.88%) for disagreed. The arithmetic mean score of score of this item is 4.2 SD of 1.072 which is greater than the average mean value, 3. This show that domestic chores (routine home tasks) mainly taken as causes of students’ dropout in the study area. The ANOVA result for this item was \((F, 7.513 \text{ at } p<0.001)\). Therefore, it shows domestic chores was highly significant that influencing students dropout.

As can be shown in item 3 Table 3, 102(100%) of respondents replied strongly agree 81(79.41%) and agree 31(30.39%); 4(3.92%) of respondents replied disagree; whereas, 8(7.84%) of the respondents replied undecided for the statement that states domestic chores (routine home tasks)are the social factor influencing students dropout in Sewena Woreda, Bale zone, Oromia. From the analysis, the total disagreed scores for this item stating, domestic chores (routine home tasks), scored 88(86.27%) against scores of 6(5.88%) for disagreed. The arithmetic mean score of score of this item is 4.2 SD of 1.072 which is greater than the average mean value, 3. This show that that domestic chores (routine home tasks) are the social factor influencing students dropout.

Some interviewees have spoken the following reasons for students dropout based on domestic chores (routine home tasks):

Parents sometimes obliged their children to do domestic chores staying at home. Children work instead of their family. Due to these reasons our children dropped out from their schooling (KETBs participant)

To support the above ideas, World Bank (2017) stated that children withdraw from school to help by herding, farming, collect water, fuel and other home activities. Therefore, Home activities, herding, and farming mainly taken as causes of students’ dropout in the study area.

As can be shown in item 3 Table 3, 102(100%) of respondents replied strongly agree 81(79.41%) and agree 21(20.58%) for the statement that states early marriage are the social factor influencing students dropout in Sewena Woreda, Bale zone, Oromia. From the analysis, the total agreed scores for this item stating, early marriage scored 102(100%) for the statement that states early marriage are the social factor influencing students dropout. The arithmetic mean score of score of this item is 4.40 SD of .924 which is greater than the average mean value, 3. This shows that early marriage mainly taken as causes of students’ dropout in the study area. The ANOVA result for this item was \((F, 2.019 \text{ at } p<0.001)\). Therefore, it shows early marriage was highly significant that influencing students dropout.

In our culture we obliged our girls to marry after they reached puberty stage. We do not think more about their education. We like our daughters getting marriage and have got their own children rather they complete their education (KETBs committee participants)

The effect of early marriage in the study area girls dropout rate become higher because parents consider girls schooling as of no benefits when they leave their own family after getting married. Girls with lower
socioeconomic backgrounds dropped out from school due to facing difficulties in getting marriage (Shahidul, 2012). Moreover, parents do not want their daughters to go to school, fearing that education will alienate them from traditional values and compromise their ability to be good wives and mothers (Shayan, 2015:281).

As can be shown in item 4 Table 3, 102(100%) of respondents replied strongly agree 84(82.35%) and agree 18(17.64%) for the statement that states attitudes to girls education are the social factor influencing students dropout in Sewena Woreda, Bale zone, Oromia. From the analysis, the total disagreed scores for this item stating, attitudes to girls education scored 102(100%) for the statement that states attitudes to girls education are the social factor influencing students dropout. The arithmetic mean score of score of this item is 4.53 SD of .681 which is greater than the average mean value, 3. This shows that attitudes to girls education mainly taken as causes of students’ dropout in the study area. The ANOVA result for this item was (F, 2.535 at p<0.001). Therefore, it shows attitudes to girls education was highly significant that influencing students dropout.

The above finding revealed that parents attitude to girls’ education made girls dropped out from their schooling. This is supported by E, Dood (2010), as parental attitude and support had great deal of influence on girls’ participation and the level of success attained in education.

In the interview KETBs committee expressed their idea according to the following theme:

Most of girls get influenced by families’ low attitude to girls education because they couldn’t believe on girls education. Even if girls will start their schooling families obliged them getting marriage. Then are forced to dropped out (KETBs committee participants)

As can be shown in item 5 Table 3, 98(96.07%) of respondents replied strongly agree 88(86.27%) and agree 10(9.8%); 4(3.92%) of respondents replied disagreed for the statement that states lack of parental follow up are the social factor influencing students dropout in Sewena Woreda, Bale zone, Oromia. From the analysis, the total agreed scores for this item stating, lack of parental follow up scored 98(96.07%) against scores of 4(3.92%) for the statement that states lack of parental follow up are the social factor influencing students dropout. The arithmetic mean score of score of this item is 4.40 SD of .756 which is greater than the average mean value, 3. This shows that lack of parental follow up mainly taken as causes of students’ dropout in the study area. The ANOVA result for this item was (F, 2.793 at p<0.001). Therefore, it shows lack of parental follow up was highly significant that influencing students dropout.

In the interview KETBs committee expressed their idea according to the following theme:

The mostly known reasons for students’ dropout were children low interest towards their education and need parental follow up. Unless they are followed by their parents they stayed elsewhere being absent from school, finally they dropped out (KETBs committee participants)

As can be shown in item 6 Table 3, 98(96.07%) of respondents replied strongly agree 81(79.41%) and agree 17(16.66%); 4(3.92%) of respondents replied disagreed for the statement that states preferring religious education are the social factor influencing students dropout in Sewena Woreda, Bale zone, Oromia. From the analysis, the total agreed scores for this item stating preferring religious education scored 98(96.07%) against scores of 4(3.92%) for disagree. The arithmetic mean score of score of this item is 4.21 SD of 1.03 which is greater than the average mean value, 3. This shows that preferring religious education mainly taken as causes of students’ dropout in the study area. The ANOVA result of all social dropout factors stated here under. Therefore, it shows preferring religious education was highly significant that influencing students dropout.

Some interviewees have spoken that pastoralist students dropped out due to preferring religious education. They said;

Our pastoralist society gives emphasis for religious education and wants their children to go to know their religion deeply. For this reason, our children also preferred religious education and go to other areas to learn Quran by quitting their schooling (KETBs committee participants)

| Source                     | Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F      |
|---------------------------|----------------|----|-------------|--------|
| Between Groups(Combined)  | 46.471         | 4  | 11.616      | 39.136 |
| Within Groups             | 171.09         | 97 | 1.764       |        |
| Total                     | 217.558        | 101|             |        |

With α =0.05, Fcrit=1.25.
3. Impacts behind the Status of Students’ Dropout

Table 5. Impacts behind the status of students’ dropout responded by Teachers, Principals, Supervisors, Educational experts and dropout returnee Students

| No | Items                                                                 | Teachers N=37 | Principals N=13 | Supervisors N=10 | Edu.expert N=6 | Dropout returnee students N=36 | Total N=102 |
|----|----------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------|----------------|------------------------------|-------------|
|    |                                                                      | f  | %  | f  | %  | f  | %  | f  | %  | f  | %  | f  | %  | f  | %  | M  | SD |
| 1  | Bring educational wastage in the country                            | SD | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | 1  | 16.7 | 11.11 | 8  | 7.84 | 4.69 | .965 |
|    |                                                                      | D  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | 1  | 11.11 | 8  | 7.84 |
|    |                                                                      | U  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  |
|    |                                                                      | A  | -  | 1  | 7.7 | 3  | 30 | -  | -  | -  | -  | 2  | 5.55 | 3  | 2.94 |
|    |                                                                      | SA | 37 | 100| 10 | 76.9| 5  | 50 | 5  | 83.3 | 26  | 72.22| 83 | 81.37|
|    |                                                                      | Total| 37 | 100| 10 | 76.9| 5  | 50 | 5  | 83.3 | 26  | 72.22| 83 | 81.37|
| 2  | Being burden or load on the country in general on the family in the particular | SD | -  | -  | 2  | 15.4| 3  | 30 | -  | 5  | 13.88| 10 | 9.8 | 4.71 | .918 |
|    |                                                                      | D  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  |
|    |                                                                      | U  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  |
|    |                                                                      | A  | 1  | 2.7| 2  | 15.4| -  | -  | 1  | 16.7 | 11.11| 8  | 7.84 |
|    |                                                                      | SA | 36 | 97.3| 8  | 61.5| 7  | 70 | 4  | 66.7 | 25  | 69.44| 80 | 78.43|
|    |                                                                      | Total| 37 | 100| 10 | 76.9| 5  | 50 | 5  | 83.3 | 26  | 72.22| 83 | 81.37|
| 3  | Being participated in different criminal activities                  | SD | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  |
|    |                                                                      | D  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  |
|    |                                                                      | U  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  |
|    |                                                                      | A  | 2  | 5.4| 2  | 15.4| 1  | 10 | -  | 5  | 13.88| 10 | 9.8 |
|    |                                                                      | SA | 35 | 94.6| 10 | 76.9| 8  | 80 | 6  | 100 | 29  | 80.55| 88 | 86.27|
|    |                                                                      | Total| 37 | 100| 10 | 76.9| 5  | 50 | 5  | 83.3 | 26  | 72.22| 83 | 81.37|
| 4  | The number of illiteracy will be increased                           | SD | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  |
|    |                                                                      | D  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  |
|    |                                                                      | U  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  |
|    |                                                                      | A  | 1  | 2.7| 3  | 23.1| 2  | 20 | -  | 1  | 16.7 | 22.22| 15 | 14.7|
|    |                                                                      | SA | 36 | 97.3| 8  | 61.5| 7  | 70 | 5  | 83.3 | 24  | 66.66| 80 | 78.43|
|    |                                                                      | Total| 37 | 100| 10 | 76.9| 5  | 50 | 5  | 83.3 | 26  | 72.22| 83 | 81.37|
| 5  | Reduce productivity income                                          | SD | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  |
|    |                                                                      | D  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  |
|    |                                                                      | U  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  |
|    |                                                                      | A  | 1  | 2.7| 3  | 23.1| 2  | 20 | -  | 8  | 22.22| 14  | 13.72|
|    |                                                                      | SA | 36 | 97.3| 10 | 76.9| 8  | 80 | 6  | 100 | 24  | 66.66| 84 | 82.35|
|    |                                                                      | Total| 37 | 100| 10 | 76.9| 5  | 50 | 5  | 83.3 | 26  | 72.22| 83 | 81.37|

**Source:** (Own Field data, 2019) ;( SD-Strongly Disagree, D-Disagree, A-Agree, SA-Strongly Agree):N=102df=101

As can be indicated in item 1 Table 5 showed, 83(81.37%) of the respondents replied strongly agreed and 3(2.94%) of the respondents replied agreed for the statement bring educational wastage in the country could be the impact behind the status of students’ dropout. Whereas, 8(7.84%) of the respondents replied disagreed and 8(7.84%) of the respondents replied strongly disagreed with the statement bring educational wastage in the country could be the impact behind the status of students’ dropout. The score for the total agreed for the item stood at 86(84.31%) for the statement bring educational wastage in the country could be the impact behind the status of students’ dropout. The arithmetic mean score of this item is 4.83 at the standard deviation of 0.424 which is greater than the average mean score 3, showing bring educational wastage in the country could be the impact behind the status of students’ dropout in Sewena Woreda, Bale Zone, Oromia. The ANOVA result for this item was (F, 9.627 at p<0.001). Therefore, bring educational wastage in the country could be highly significant impact behind the status of students’ dropout.

To help the above idea in interview some respondents described as;

*Dropout by itself is educational wastage. For instance, dropout students may forget the*
knowledge gained before, they may be misbehaved in the society. On the other hand, those students whom dropped out from their schooling become burden (load) on their families as well as on the government (KETBs committee participants)

Teachers and other professional educators have a solemn duty to ensure that money spent on education actually enables students to acquire the necessary knowledge and skill of the subjects and lessons of each grade before they move on to the next higher grade or level. A high rate in the number of dropouts and repeaters indicates the inefficiency (wastage) of the educational system itself (APHA, 2018). Therefore, dropout of students bring educational wastage in the country could be the impact behind the status of students’ dropout.

As can be indicated in item 2 Table 5 showed, 80(78.43%) of the respondents replied strongly agreed and 8(7.84%) of the respondents replied agreed for the statement Being burden or load on the country in general on the family in the particular could be the impact behind the status of students’ dropout. Whereas, 10(9.8%) of the respondents replied strongly disagreed with the statement being burden or load on the country in general on the family in the particular could be the impact behind the status of students’ dropout. About 4(3.92%) of the respondents replied undecided with the statement being burden or load on the country in general on the family in the particular could be the impact behind the status of students’ dropout. The score for the total agreed for the item stood at 88(86.27%) against the score of 2(1.96%) for the statement being burden or load on the country in general on the family in the particular could be the impact behind the status of students’ dropout. The arithmetic mean score of this item is 4.83 at the standard deviation of 0.424 which is greater than the average mean score 3, showing being burden or load on the country in general on the family in the particular could be the impact behind the status of students’ dropout.

To help the above idea in interview some respondents described as;

Since most of Pastoralists have chronic poverty. Beside this their children dropped out due to different cases as well as they become burden on their family and bothered them (KETBs committee participants)

As can be indicated in item 3 Table 5 showed, 88(86.27%) of the respondents replied strongly agreed and 10(9.8%) of the respondents replied agreed for the statement being participated in different criminal activities could be the impact behind the status of students’ dropout. About 4(3.92%) of the respondents replied undecided with the statement being participated in different criminal activities could be the impact behind the status of students’ dropout. The score for the total agreed for the item stood at 98(96.07%) for the statement being participated in different criminal activities could be the impact behind the status of students’ dropout. The arithmetic mean score of this item is 4.83 at the standard deviation of 0.424 which is greater than the average mean score 3, showing being participated in different criminal activities could be the impact behind the status of students’ dropout in Sewena Woreda, Bale Zone, Oromia. The ANOVA result for this item was (F, 6.632 at p<0.001). Therefore being burden or load on the country in general on the family in the particular could be highly significant impact behind the status of students’ dropout.

To help the above idea in interview some respondents described as;

Dropout students may participate in violence unemployment man power will be increased in the country. Totally the educational wastage may lead to economic, social and political crisis of the society in particular in the country as a whole (KETBs committee participants)

The above idea is supported with the following individual idea. The impacts behind students dropout makes students to participate in different criminal activities and People feel that because of the unfavorable environment in government or public schools, many students feel disengaged in school often interrelated to eventual dropouts (Attaullah, 2000).

As can be indicated in item 4 Table 5 showed, 80(78.43%) of the respondents replied strongly agreed and 15(14.7%) of the respondents replied agreed for the statement the number of illiteracy will be increased could be the impact behind the status of students’ dropout. Whereas, 2(1.96%) of the respondents replied strongly disagreed with the statement the number of illiteracy will be increased could be the impact behind the status of students’ dropout. About 5(4.90%) of the respondents replied undecided with the statement the number of illiteracy will be increased could be the impact behind the status of students’ dropout. The score for the total agreed for the item stood at 99(97.05%) for the statement the number of illiteracy will be increased could be the impact behind the status of students’ dropout. The arithmetic mean score of this item is 4.83 at the standard deviation of 0.424 which is greater than the average mean score 3, showing the number of illiteracy will be increased could be the impact behind the status of students’ dropout in Sewena Woreda, Bale Zone, Oromia. The ANOVA result for this item was (F, 3.224 at p<0.001). Therefore, the number of illiteracy will be increased could be highly significant impact behind the status of students’ dropout.

To help the above idea in interview some respondents described as;

On the other hand, those students whom dropped out from their schooling become burden (load) on their families as well as on the government (KETBs committee participants)
One of the major reasons for low literacy is the dropout of students at primary level in Pakistan. “A dropout is a pupil who leaves the school for any reason except death before completion of education programs of studies and without transferring to another school” (Kamal. A. 2002). According to Attaullah, (2000), a dropout is a student, who leaves the school for any reason before the completion of the educational program and without being transferred to any other school. Therefore, dropout of students bring educational wastage in the country could be the impact behind the status of students’ dropout could be the impact behind the status of students’ dropout.

As can be indicated in item 5 Table 5 showed,84(82.35%) of the respondents replied strongly agreed and 14(13.72%) of the respondents replied agreed for the statement Reduce productivity income could be the impact behind the status of students’ dropout. Whereas, 2(1.96%) of the respondents replied strongly disagreed with the statement Reduce productivity income could be the impact behind the status of students’ dropout. About 2(1.96%) of the respondents replied undecided with the statement Reduce productivity income could be the impact behind the status of students’ dropout. The score for the total agreed for the item stood at 98(96.07%) for the statement reduce productivity income could be the impact behind the status of students’ dropout. The arithmetic mean score of this item is 4.83 at the standard deviation of 0.424 which is greater than the average mean score 3, showing reduce productivity income could be the impact behind the status of students’ dropout in Sewena Woreda, Bale Zone, Oromia. The ANOVA result for this item was \( F = 1.737 \) at \( p<0.001 \). Therefore, reduce productivity income could be highly significant impact behind the status of students’ dropout.

### Table 6. Summary Table for ANOVA result for Impacts behind the status of dropout

| Source                     | Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F     |
|----------------------------|----------------|----|------------|-------|
| Between Groups (Combined)  | 51.416         | 4  | 12.854     | 24.256|
| Within Groups              | 200.537        | 97 | 2.068      |       |
| Total                      | 251.95         | 101|            |       |

*With \( \alpha = 0.05 \), \( F_{crit} = 1.25 \)

**Discussion of Results**

Looking into the findings of the study it seems that on an individual basis, the reasons for dropping out vary, but generally there are two main categories of factors that lead to dropping out students at primary level. These are out-of-school factors and in-school factors. Out-of-school factors are parent’s poverty, parent’s lack of motivation and understanding of value education, opportunity cost to the parents by sending the child to school, migration of parents and long distance of schools from homes. While in-school factors include lack of facilities in schools; defective textbooks and curriculum which is beyond the comprehension level of students; and harsh attitude of the teachers with students. Mitigating out-of-school factors that contribute to high dropout rates requires a wide range of policies and actions that focus on poverty reduction through income generation and other methods. However, dealing with in-school factors does not require as much effort (Moe, 1994). Generally, social factors (domestic chores or routine home tasks, home activities, herding, farming etc. early marriage, attitude to girls education, lack of awareness of the benefits of education, lack of parental follow up, and preferring religious education), economic factors (family income, household chronic poverty and lack of support), school related factors (school environments: shortage of school facilities like; toilets, desk, chair etc. school distance problem and peer influence), student related factors (students low interest towards education, regular absenteeism from school, inappropriate evaluation of students’ performance, lack of encouragement given by teachers to students and the number of children in a household), Climatic factors (lack of water, drought and famine) and political factors (migration, border conflict and inter-clan conflict) were identified as major and significant factors that contributing for students dropout.

The findings of the study showed that educational wastage in the country, being burden or load on the country in general on the family in the particular, being participated in different criminal activities, the number of illiteracy will be increased and bother the Educational indicators were some of the impacts of students dropout from schools in general study areas in particular. There are two important ways of dealing with or even eliminating in-school factors. The first one is improving the quality of the schools and curricula, and second, training of teachers to use methods that engage children in learning and help them gain high academic achievement. Provisions of facilities such as school places and enrolling pupils are only the aspects of primary education. Unless the children are able to stay through the primary education cycle and acquire with functional effectiveness the basic skills of literacy and numeracy and understanding and reasoning they would not have accomplished the first decisive step in education. This means that dropout and repetition with the associated human and financial wastage need to be minimized and the quality of primary education reflecting the learning gains of the learners enhanced (MoE, 1999). If the government of Ethiopia wants to increase literacy and numeracy rates, it must urgently address the problem of primary school dropouts.
Recommendations
From the findings and conclusions of the study, the following recommendations were forwarded.

✓ Parents should be aware of the importance and values of education so that they should permit relaxation to their children from domestic chores and home activities, herding, farming etc. during schooling. Early marriage is another social dropout factors that is limiting girls participation in education. to solve this factor in the long run expand and reinforce sex education as well as strict legal reinforcement by taking severe measures on forced early marriages.

✓ To eliminate attitudes of girls’ education problem; raise the awareness of pastoralists community on the benefits of girls education. All stakeholders should design ways and means to insure the distribution of educational materials to schools; should apply restrict follow up on the purchasing of educational materials with School Grant and Block grant budgets and Woreda and Zonal Education offices should select those parents who cannot able to purchase educational materials should design to help them sustainably. It is also recommended that the Government should provide educational materials, uniforms and monthly fees to poor students so that they may be able to continue their education.

✓ It is clear that the pastoralist community have less capacity to support the education system financially and materially because of their poverty. The government has to involve NGOs and create favorable condition under which schools facilities like; toilets, desks, chairs etc

✓ The government has to involve different NGOs and create favorable condition under which establishing ABE schools and Facilitators to solve the distance of school for those victims’ children. Teachers frequently contact the parents of students and discuss on regular absenteeism of their children with them.

✓ Educational stakeholders should strengthen and develop collaborative work between pastoralist community and school community. Moreover teachers should handle their students whenever they perform their regular work and evaluate their students appropriately as well as improve students’ encouraging through their activities. Supervisors and educational experts should restrict on monitoring and evaluation of teachers daily activities.

✓ The most direct impact of a shortage in rainfall on pastoralists’ livelihoods is the drying up of water sources and declining food for livestock. Water and grass are the most important resources for pastoralists. Therefore, Government should involve different NGOs on water sources and rations for pastoralists and other care services in areas of severe shortage to reduce the dropout of students.

✓ It was found in the study that migration is one of the major causes of student’s dropout. So it is recommended that education stakeholders and concerned governmental bodies should convenient education for the migrated students and the government should decide the exact and specific regional boundaries so as to solve the border conflict that brought community migration and displacement in both Somalia Regional State and Oromia Regional State.
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