Parental Funding and Learner Retention in Free Day Secondary Education in Busia County, Kenya

Phaustine Barasa[1], Stanley Mutsotso[2], Simon Kipkenei[1]

[1]Department of Education Planning and Management, Kibabii University, Bungoma, Kenya
[2]Department of Curriculum & Pedagogy, Kibabii University, Bungoma, Kenya

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to establish the effect of parental funding on learner retention in Secondary schools. The study adopted a descriptive survey research design with its population drawn from principals, class teachers and students' representatives giving a target population of 1340. Yamane formula was used to select a suitable sample of 308 to represent the study population in data collection. Data collection instruments that were be used in the study included; the questionnaire, interview schedules and document analysis. Reliability of the instruments was determined through test-retest method and a Cronbach Alpha coefficient of 0.734 was computed, which was considered sufficient for use of the questionnaires in the actual study. To attain validity of the research instruments the researcher sought for opinions from the colleagues and experts. Data was analyzed using; frequencies, percentages, means, standard deviation Spearman's correlation and linear regression statistics. The study concluded that parental funding has statistically significant effects on learner retention in schools. Thus, learners whose parents provide money for levies required in schools stand better chances of successfully completing the secondary level of education.

KEYWORDS: Free Day secondary Education, Learner, Parental Funding, Retention

1. INTRODUCTION

According to a 2012 World Bank research, secondary education subsidies provided by the federal government in the United States for higher education have been crucial in boosting secondary enrollment, retention, and transition. Johnston (2006) adds that the federal government provides financial aid for secondary education in the form of scholarships and tuition assistance. This has improved many students' access to education, improving participation rates across all educational levels (World Bank, 2012). Although there is evidence that the United States of America's government subsidies for higher education students are positively correlated, there is a lack of knowledge regarding the moderating impact of parental financial support for the government-subsidized non-tuition costs, which is the knowledge gap that this study aims to fill.

Secondary school principals stated in a Munda and Odebero (2014) study that a school's stable financial base acts as a motivator for initiatives that increase academic achievement in classrooms. Though not all schools used financial need as a criteria for admission, school levies were crucial to funding educational initiatives. School Boards of Management (BOM) made decisions regarding fees after consulting with PTAs and receiving approval from the District Education Board (DEB). The Ministry of Education had a standard requirement in place. The majority of schools only received less than 70% of their overall anticipated income, which was nearly completely made up of fees, aside from the government subsidies, which was paid in guaranteed installments. Examining income trends revealed a general increase in levies to keep pace with the rising expense of living. This study proved that student fees were a major factor in their erratic attendance and eventual dropout, which hurt their academic performance. However, principals felt that without sufficient income collections, educational programs could not be maintained (Munda & Odebero, 2014).

According Gogo (2012) survey of rural public secondary schools in Nyando District, principals believed that raising prices was the better option, even though it would be ideal to lower school fees in light of the poor response in payments. They said that despite ongoing increases in the cost of products and services, which ultimately put pressure on school budgets, current budgets in public schools were the lowest. Despite the Government implementing grants worth $10,265 per student per year in 2008, principals and parents have continued to voice their displeasure about the unaffordably high expenditures associated with escalating prices for school uniforms, stationery, and food (Muindi, 2009). Additionally, the funding' inconsistent disbursement appears insufficient to cover the intended vote heads, such as tuition, exercise books, laboratory supplies, teaching aids, internal exams, power, water, conservancies, and student activities (Shikanda et al., 2013)

In Kenya, the Constituency Development Fund provides funding to schools for the upkeep and administration of educational projects like buses, sports fields, and other items linked to educational programs (Ngolovoi, 2010). The Kenyan government allots Ksh 600 to each school for extracurricular activities (Daily Nation, 2008). Romer (2003) discovered that since the allotted monies are frequently insufficient, school administrators should seek for additional funding from parents in the form of levies to make up the shortfall. However, school programs stall when school levies are not paid. This has an impact on extracurricular activity management because it costs money to purchase game supplies and equipment, pay coaches, and train game teachers. Students today are pricey and demanding.

Parents want to buy expensive meals for their kids, like ugali made with shifted flour, rice, bread, fruits, and meat. Such meals come with an additional cost that is placed on parents by nature (Bowen, 2015). As a result, the researcher will attempt to determine how non-payment of school levies affects the delivery of services and educational programs. Research studies have demonstrated that PTA contributions and other levies have an impact on schooling. According to Mason and Rozelle (1998), the cost of education has a significant impact on how appealing it is to engage in and participate in education. Levies for remedial classes, incentive, a building fund, PTA teachers, and lunch costs for day secondary schools are included in this education cost. Therefore, Colcough, Rose, and Tembon (2000) found that non-payment of school levels has a significant impact on school programs.

According to Muteti and Kirimi (2016), parental funding, which is based on economic levels, is a significant element that determines whether students have high or low access to and involvement in their education. High levels of poverty at the family level have caused families to either not enroll their children in school or to be unable to support those who are enrolled in school because they are unable to meet various requirements, which has led to poor quality education, inadequate provision of learning facilities to the enrolled, and high dropout rates among the poor whose parents are unable to meet indirect costs for schooling such as school learning and teaching m

In order to give their children the best care and education possible, parents face difficulties in every household. Rich families on both an economic and social level aid pupils' development by creating conducive environments that offer a variety of learning experiences. They enroll them in reputable schools as well. Due to their poor income and unmotivated attitude toward education, parents from low-income households find it difficult to provide their children with the necessities of education (Mauka, 2015).

At a study about the influences of parental socioeconomic status on academic performance of kids in particular schools conducted in Nigeria, it was discovered that there was a substantial correlation between socioeconomic status and educational background and students' success in the area. Furthermore, according to other experts in Nigeria, parental status not only influences students' performance but also makes it harder for children from low-income families to compete fairly with their counterparts in the same academic setting (Anisia, 2015).

Parents must encourage their kids to participate in academic-related activities because parental class and tenure differ based on gender (Coulter, 2018). (Dojillo, Balandra, Lebuna, & Lopez, 2017). Children's admission into college is consistently and long-term correlated with income and assets (Huang, Guo, Kim, & Sherraden, 2009). Parents weren't always consistent in creating circumstances at home that encouraged their kids to develop an internalized sense of academic motivation (Garn, Matthews, &Jolly, 2011).

Affection and action between parents and teenagers must be in alignment for the influence of parents' education on the selectivity of the colleges attended to be effective (Kim &Schneider, 2017).

Families vary greatly in the amount of overall support they give to their adult children as well as in how equally that support is spread across all of their children (Kim, Fingerman, Birditt, & Zarit, 2015). In

order to improve their children's academic performance in school, parents' participation in their children's extracurricular activities is more important than their financial situation (Machebe, Ezegbe, &Onuoha, 2017). Regardless of their financial situation, parents should regularly participate in the classroom (Masabo, Muchopa, &Kuoth, 2017). Parental involvement is crucial in inspiring kids to raise their academic performance (Mahuro & Hungi, 2016).

Parental verbal guidance and financial understanding seem to have complicated associations with credit card debt (Norvilitis &Maclean, 2010). Students who had parents who participated in academic activities and were more supportive of them had better academic results than students whose parents were less supportive (Shahzad, n.d.) Parents' school attainment is an essential predictor, particularly at the high end of the socio-economic allocation, as the majority of the parents required their children to remain at home after they graduated as they are unable to support themselves financially (West, Lewis, Roberts, & Noden, 2016). (Wightman, Patrick, Schoeni, &Schulenberg, 2013).

The availability of instructional resources and personal items supports learning in the classroom. According to Ouma (2016), a parent's responsibility extends beyond simply ensuring that their child attends school. It also entails helping the youngster succeed by providing the necessary supplies. In addition to the government's promise of free basic education, parents are expected to give their children uniforms, school supplies, and meals. According to Kweyu (2019), providing their children with good parental support entails paying their tuition on time, showing up to meetings held by the school, and monitoring their academic progress. Odaga, & Heneveld (2010) emphasize that extreme poverty may make it more difficult for parents to provide their children with educational resources. This could result in students skipping school to work as children to support their families' economies.

Despite the fact that access has generally increased at all educational levels, investigations have shown that this expansion is not evenly distributed (Avenstrup et al. 2004; Lucas & Mbiti 2012; Muyanga et al. 2010). Hattori (2014) found that home wealth and the education level of the household head had a substantial impact on the number of children not attending school globally across 63 nations. Less than 6% of children from the richest quintile were not in school, compared to 22% of children from the poorest quintile. Similar correlations were found in Kenya between household food consumption, household head education, and enrollment in a public primary school (Bold et al. 2010). Relatedly, established similar effects of a voucher system in encouraging access to vocational education for the poor were described (Hicks et al. (2013); Njihia and Nderitu, 2014), showing that even though the school grant is able to address the issue of access, parents still contribute some money for paying teachers, specific projects, exams, as well as extra tuition.

A significant obstacle to ensuring that girls receive an education is the cost of school. A lot is expected of parents in Kenya in the form of indirect costs of schooling, such as school construction and maintenance, uniforms, personal effects, learning materials, and lunch fee, which have grown to be a major burden to the majority of parents due to poverty. This is in addition to the government's subsidized fees, which cover tuition. Household income is a crucial predictor of school enrollment and retention in Africa, with more than 50% of Kenyans living in poverty (Kattan and Burnnet, 2004).

2. METHODOLOGY
2.1. Research Design
The study adopted a descriptive survey research design, which has enough provision for protection from bias and maximizes reliability (Kothari, 2016). In addition, the design was appropriate for this study because it is flexible and allows the researcher to get clarity of information given the diversity of quantitative and qualitative methods of data collection (Orodho, 2013).

2.2. Sample Size and Sampling Technique

Table 1: Sampling frame

Population Category	Target Population	Sample Proportion (%)	Sampling Technique	Sample Size
Schools	161	30	Simple Random	48
Principals	161	30	Purposive	48
Students Representatives	959	15.6	Simple Random	150
Class Teachers	220	50	Simple Random	110
Total	**1340**			**308**

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Effect of Parental funding on learner retention in Secondary schools

The objective of the study was to establish the effect of parental funding on learner retention in Secondary schools in Busia County. Data was collected through questionnaires administered to the class teachers and students' representatives and interview schedule for principals.

3.2. Response from Students Representatives on Parental Funding

The students' representatives were asked to indicate the degree to which they agreed or disagreed with various statements on relationship of parental funding and learner retention in secondary schools in Busia County. In this study the score of 1 was assigned to strongly disagree, 2 to disagree, 3 to not sure, 4 to agree and 5 to strongly agree. The findings are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2: Student Representatives' Responses on Parental Funding and Learner Retention

Attributes of Parental Funding	SD		D		UD		A		SA		Mean	Std.
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		
My friends / classmates are retained in school because of good fee payment	9	6%	17	13%	6	4%	63	47%	40	30%	3.8	0.235
My friends / classmates are retained in school because of payment development levies	9	7%	25	19%	20	15%	60	44%	21	16%	3.44	0.856
My friends / classmates are retained in school because of payment toward remedial programs	17	13%	98	72%	3	2%	11	9%	6	4%	2.19	0.265
My friends / classmates are retained in school because of payment of school lunch fees and welfare levies	40	30%	69	51%	9	6%	14	11%	3	2%	2.04	0.965
Parents who meet other school levies in good time enable learners to be retained in school	3	2%	11	9%	3	2%	72	53%	46	34%	4.09	1.022
Valid N (list wise)	135											

KEY: 5- Strongly Agree, 4 -Agree, 3-Undecided, 2- Disagree, 1-. Strongly disagree

Source: Field Data 2022

The study sought to determine the various aspects of parental funding on learner retention as given by student representatives in Secondary schools in Busia County. The student representatives generally agreed that classmates are retained in school because of good fee payment (Mean = 3.80, SD = 0.325). Those who strongly agreed were 40(30%) while those who agreed were 63(47%) the ones who were undecided were 6(4%) while only 17(13%) disagreed and 9(6%) respondents strongly disagreed.

The students' representatives generally agreed that classmates are retained in school because of payment of development levies (Mean = 3.44, SD = 0.856). The student representatives that strongly agreed were 21(16%), those who agreed were 60(44%) while those who were undecided were 20 (15%). A total of 25(19%) of the students' representatives disagreed and 9 (7%) strongly disagreed.

When asked as whether their classmates are retained in school because of payment toward remedial programs a total of 6 (4%) strongly agreed while 11 (9%) of the students' representatives agreed. The student representatives that were undecided were 3 (2%). However, majority of them represented by 98(72%) disagreed and 17 (13%) students' representatives strongly disagreed. Hence the statement had a mean of 2.19 and standard deviation of 0.265 implying that generally the students' representatives disagreed that classmates are retained in school because of payment towards remedial programs.

Further, the students' representatives generally disagreed that classmates are retained in school because of payment of school lunch fees and welfare levies (Mean = 2.04, SD = 0965). The respondents that strongly agreed were 3(2%) while 14(11%) agreed. Those who were undecided were 9 (6%) while a larger proportion of 69(51%) disagreed and 40(30%) strongly disagreed.

Lastly on other school levies, the students' representatives generally agreed that Parents who meet other school levies in good time leads to high retention of learners (Mean = 4.09, SD = 1.022). The students' representatives who strongly agreed were 46(34%) while a large proportion of 72(53%) agreed with the statement. Only 3(2%) students' representatives were undecided. The student representatives who disagreed were 11(9%) while 3(2%) students' representatives strongly disagreed.

3.3. Class Teachers' Responses on Parental Funding and Learner Retention

The class teachers were asked to indicate the levels to which they agreed or disagreed with various statements on relationship between parental funding and learner retention in secondary schools in Busia County. In this study the score of 1 was assigned to strongly disagree, 2 to disagree, 3 to not sure, 4 to agree and 5 to strongly agree. The findings are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3: Class Teachers' Responses on Parental Funding and Learner Retention

Attributes of Parental Funding	SD		D		UD		A		SA		Mean	Std.
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		
Students whose parents pay fees in time are likely to be retained in school up to form four.	3	3%	4	4%	18	18%	34	33%	43	42%	4.08	.569
Students whose parents meet their financial obligations like remedial programs in good time leads to high retention of learners to form four	20	19.6%	69	67.6%	3	2.9%	6	6%	4	3.9%	2.07	.235
Students whose parents pay school lunch fees and welfare levies are likely to be retained to form four	12	11.8%	30	29%	7	7%	35	33%	18	18%	3.17	.458
Students whose parents pay other levies in time are likely to be retained in school up to form four	26	25.5%	19	18.6%	3	2.9%	26	25.4%	28	27.5%	3.10	.754
Valid N (list wise)	102											

KEY: 5- Strongly Agree, 4 -Agree, 3-Undecided, 2- Disagree, 1- Strongly disagree
Source: Field Data 2022

Table 3 sought to determine the various aspects of parental funding on learner retention in secondary schools in Busia County. The respondents who were class teachers strongly agreed that students whose parents pay fees in time are likely to be retained in school up to form four (Mean = 4.08, SD = 0.569). Majority of the respondents represented by 43(42%) strongly agreed while 34(33 %) of the respondents agreed. A total of 18(18%) of the respondent were undecided while 4(4%) disagreed and only 3 (3%) respondents strongly disagreed.

The class teachers disagreed that students whose parents meet their financial obligations like remedial programs in good time leads to high retention of learners to form four (Mean = 2.07, SD = 0.235). The respondents who strongly agreed were 4 (3.9%), while 6(6%) agreed, 3(2.9%) class teachers were undecided, 69(67.6%) class teachers disagreed and 20(19.6%) class teachers strongly disagreed.

When asked as whether Students whose parents pay school lunch fees and welfare levies are likely to be retained to form four, the class teachers generally agreed with the statement. The class teachers disagreed with a mean of 3.17 and standard deviation of 0.458. 16 (12%) class teachers strongly agreed, 39 (29%) class teachers agree, 9 (7%) class teachers were undecided, 47 (35%) class teachers disagreed and 24 (18%) class teachers strongly disagreed.

The respondents generally agreed that students whose parents pay other levies in time are likely to be retained in school up to form four (Mean = 3.10, SD = 0.754). The respondents who Strongly Agreed were 28(27.5%) those that agreed were 26(25.4%) while those that were undecided were 3 (2.9%). The respondents that disagreed were 19(18.6%) but those who strongly disagreed were more at 26(25.5%).

3.4. Hypothesis testing

The study set to test the null hypothesis which stated that:

H_0: There is no significant effect of parental funding on learner retention in secondary schools in Busia County.

In order to establish the effect of parental funding on learner retention the study the study used the multiple regression analysis inferential technique. The analysis consisted of a correlation matrix, the Model summary and coefficients of multiple regression.

The general form of the regression model was of the form:
$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \beta_4 X_4 + \beta_5 X_5 + \varepsilon$.

Where;
Y = Learner retention
X_1 = Payment of fees in time
X_2 = Payment of remedial fees in time
X_3 = Payment of School lunch and welfare levies
X_4 = Payment of development Levies
X_5 = Payment of other school levies
β = Coefficient of variation
ε_1 = the error term.

3.5. Correlation Matrix

The study computed the Pearson's correlation analysis in order to find out the nature and strength of relationships among the variables in the model. The findings are as shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Pearson correlation between parental funding and learner retention

Parental funding and learner retention (Pearson's Correlation)		Y	X_1	X_2	X_3	X_4	X_5
Y	Sig.	1					
X_1	Sig	.865** .000	1				
X_2	Sig	-.102 .623	.125 .235	1			
X_3	Sig	.521** .012	.012 .685	-.215 .965	1		
X_4	Sig	.452** .034	.284 .854	.425** .058	.625** .079	1	
X_5	Sig	.589** .000	.314 0.052	.235 .096	.174 .235	.237 .754	1

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)
Source: Field Data 2021

Based on this correlation matrix in table 4, there exists a correlation between the variables defining parental funding and learner retention. Most of the factors of parental funding correlated with learner retention. The correlations were between -0.102 to 0.865. Therefore, parental funding was expected to predict learner retention.

A positive significant correlation was found between variable X_1 and Y (r= +0.865, $\rho<0.05$); between X_3 and Y (r=+0.521, p<0.05); X_4 and Y (r = +0.452, p<0.05); and between X_5 and Y (r = +0.589, p<0.05). However, there was no significant relationship between X_2 and Y (r= -0.102, p>0.05)

Hence, the study considered the independent variables X_1, X_3, X_4 and X_5 for analysis in the regression model. The correlation matrix further reveals no significant relationships among the independent variables hence there was limited multicollinearity.

3.6. Model Summary and ANOVA

The second part of the regression analysis consisted of the model summary. In this study, regression model was used where the model summary, variance (ANOVA) and standardized coefficients were applied. The findings were summarized in Table 5.

Table 5: Model Summary for Parental Funding on Learner Retention

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.472a	.327	.298	.2354

Table 5, presents the model summary of regression statistics of parental funding on learner retention. The findings in Table 5 shows that correlation coefficient (r =.472) for the regression analysis. This represents a moderate and positive relationship between the independent variables of parental funding and learner retention. This is in line with Saunders (2000) who asserts that when r= 1, this depicts a perfect linear correlation whereas when the value of r is below 0.5, a weak correlation exists between variables and finally, a negative r shows negative relationship while zero depicts that there is no relationship between the variables. This is the rule of thumb when using Pearson coefficient to establish relationship between quantitative variables (Creswell, 2014).

Table 5 also presents the coefficient of determination given by R- square of 0.327 that showed how much the variation in learner retention in Secondary schools in Busia County was explained by parental funding. R Square of 0.327 implies 32.7% of variation in learner retention in Secondary schools in Busia County is explained by parental funding.

The study sought to test the significance of the regression model. To achieve that, the F test for ANOVA was performed and results were presented in Table 6.

Table 6: ANOVA for Parental Funding on Learner Retention

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	6.510	2	2.145	201.326	.000[b]
Residual	45.256	235	.388		
Total	51.766	237			

a. Dependent Variable: learner retention
b. Predictors: (Constant), X_1, X_3, X_4, X_5

From the data presented in Table 6, it can be ascertained that a significant regression equation existed for the dependent variable Learner retention and the independent variables defining parental funding, $F_{(3,235)} = 201.326$, $p<0.05$).

3.7. Regression Coefficients

In order to assess the significance of the coefficients for variables of Parental funding, the t-test for regression coefficients and standardized beta values was conducted. The unstandardized coefficients, the standardized beta coefficients and the t-test values were presented in table 7.

Table 7: Coefficients for effect of parental funding on learner retention

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	2.856	.056		14.235	.000
X_1	.116	.005	.104	2.716	. 007
X_3	.064	.025	.054	2.415	.017
X_4	.124	.165	.114	4.235	.004
X_5	-.126	-.352	-.112	-2.356	.003

a. Dependent Variable: Learner retention
b. **Source:** Field Data 2022

From Table 7, the coefficients for the constant, X_1, X_3, X_4 and X_5 were found to be significant at the 0.05 level of significance with t $_{(235)}$ =2.716, p<0.05, t $_{(235)}$ =2.415, p<0.05, t $_{(235)}$ = 4.235, p<0.05 and t $_{(235)}$ =-2.356, p<0.05) respectively.

Based on the unstandardized coefficients in Table 7, the regression model predicting learner retention based on parental funding was outlined as below:

$Y= 2.856 + 0.116X_1 + 0.064X_3 + 0.124X_4 -0.126X_5 + e$

The study therefore rejected the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant effect of parental funding on learner retention. A multiple regression model computed to predict learner retention basing on parental funding found a significant effect ($F_{(3,235)}$ = 201.326, p<0.05).

Hence the study established that parental funding plays a significant role learner retention in secondary schools in Busia County. Changes in Learner retention can be attributed to 11.6% change in timely payment of fees (X_1), 6.4% change in payment of school lunch fees and welfare levies (X_3), 12.4% change in payment of development levies and 12.6% change in payment of other school levies respectively.

The findings further agreed with those of the interview data obtained from interview schedules administered to principals in the sampled schools. Majority of the principals noted that parental funding is highly related to learner retention in schools.

One principal noted
"Retention is high among learners whose parents keenly support fee payment"

Another principal noted

"The schools have been lenient in order to maintain learners in schools, however at some point they have to be sent home because their parents are hands off"

Over 90 % of the principals noted that when parents meet their other financial obligations like remedial, lunch fees and welfare levies their learners are likely to finish school

A principal noted
"Parents who we unable to pay lunch fees, unable to purchase uniform and other school needs have the highest number of dropout children"

Another principal noted
"there is a very high correlation between student retention and fee payment. quiet a number of learners that drop out have not been supported by the parents yet the fee is just Kshs.10,000 per year. Fee arrears are overwhelming schools"

The findings of this study from the interviews and the multiple regression analysis (Table 6) are supported by Muteti and Kirimi (2016), who observed that high levels of poverty at family level have made families to either not register their children in schools or unable to cater for continuous involvement of those in school due to inability to meet various requirements which has resulting in poor quality education inadequate provision of learning facilities to the enrolled, and high dropout rates among the poor.

Similarly, Mauka (2015) noted that economically and socially well-off families support students' learning by providing favorable environments that provide learning variety. But Parents from low-income households, face a challenge in providing their children with basic educational materials due to their low income and low attitude towards education.

The findings of this study strengthen the postulation of the Epstein (1992) in the theoretical model of parental involvement in education. That the educational outcomes of the learners hinge on parental responsibility which includes funding of the learners' activities at school.

From the current study, there is need to consider that provision of fee subsidies alone cannot sufficiently guarantee 100% learner retention in secondary school. Although the Kenya Government anticipated that provision of the fee subsidy was sufficient to cover the costs of education at the secondary school level, there are many other unforeseen costs that have not been catered for in the subsidy, which must be borne by Parents in order to enable learners access education in secondary school institutions. Hence Parents must play a role by paying lunch fees, welfare levies and development levies timely in order to sustain the learners in school. The failure of parents to make such contributions may therefore cause learners to fail to attend school adequately and may drop out.

In order to guarantee 100% retention of learners in Day Secondary Schools in Kenya, the government must consider assessing the other costs beyond those covered in the capitation, and quantify them so as include them in the capitation grants advanced to secondary schools.

4. CONCLUSIONS
The findings of this study have demonstrated that learners whose parents provide money for levies required in schools stand better chances of successfully completing the secondary level of education. Therefore, the study concludes that parental funding has statistically significant effects on learner retention in free day secondary education.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS
In view of the study findings and the conclusion arrived at, the study recommended that the government should give more support to needy students to cater for other school levies in order to minimize school drop outs.

References
[1] Epstein, J. L. (1992). School and community partnerships in M. Alken (Ed.) Encyclopedia of educational research, 139-1151.

[2] Gogo, J. G. O. (2012). Cost Effective Measures to Reduce Operational Costs of Secondary Education. Working Paper Series Number DU/2012/003. Daystar University Centre for Research, Publications and Consultancy.

[3] Johnstone, D. B. (2006). Financing Higher Education, Cost-Sharing in International Perspective. Centre for International Higher Education, Lynch School of Education, Massachusetts.

[4] Muindi, B. (2009, January 5). Minister warns against fee increase. Daily Nation. Nairobi: Nation Media Group.

[5] Munda, S. W., & Odebero, S. (2014). The influence of education costs on students' academic performance in Kenya: an empirical study of Bungoma County secondary schools. Asian Journal of Educational Research, 2(1), 1-11.

[6] Ngolovoi, S. M. (2010). Cost Sharing in Higher Education in Kenya: Examining the Undesired Policy Outcomes. Higher Education Policy, 23, 515-529.

[7] Shikanda, F. C., Odebero, O. S., & Byaruhanga, J. (2013). Role of ministry of education fees guidelines in management of annual school budgets in public secondary schools in Kenya. Kenya Journal of Education Planning, Economics and management, 5 (January 2013).