

FACTORS AFFECTING STUDENTS' DECISION TO DROP OUT OF SCHOOL

HERMOGENES C. ORION, JR

orionjrh@cjc.edu.ph

Chairperson, Sunday College Program

Cor Jesu College

ERIKKA JUNE D. FOROSUELO

erikkajune@yahoo.com

Program Head, Sunday College-BSBA

JEAN M. CAVALIDA

jean_cavalida@yahoo.com

Program Head, Psychology

Cor Jesu College

Abstract - Dropping out is a serious problem because it denies individual students their fundamental human right to education. The study aims to find out the reasons why students drop out of school and the factors that contribute to 'the high dropout rate in order to provide a programme design to identify mode of interventions to address the problem. It is a descriptive-correlational and comparative type of research. Descriptively, results revealed that financial resources were the major reason why students drop out of school. Inferentially, result showed significant differences in terms of policies and practices, student-teacher relationship, financial resources and academic performance except the nature of the curriculum which shows no significant difference by the number of times the students dropped from school year 2010-2011 to school year 2012-2013, while age, civil status and sources of tuition payment are contributory factors that lead students to drop out of school.

Keywords: dropout, policies and practices, student-teacher relationship, nature of the school curriculum, financial resources

INTRODUCTION

Most students go to college with the hope of giving themselves the foundation that they need to be successful in life or the skill that they need to find a good job. Every year, a number of students attend college, but many of them often fail or drop out within less than three years. Dropping out is a serious problem because it denies individual students their fundamental human right to education.

According to Apollo Research Institute, (2012), more than 8 million adults are currently enrolled in U.S. higher education institutions; total enrollment is projected to increase up to 20% by 2016. However, National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) data indicate that less than half of all students enrolled in a 4-year bachelor's program will earn a degree. In one study conducted by the NCES, only 28.1% of full-time and 5% of part-time nontraditional learners—who comprise the majority of degree-seeking students—had earned an associate's or bachelor's degree after 6 years of study. These high dropout rates demand a deeper examination of the reasons why many college students fail to complete degree programs (Apollo Research Institute, 2012).

In the Philippines, the dropout rates revealed an alarming 83.7 percent, meaning the country is producing 2.13 million college dropouts annually. In this case, the Philippine government must, in the next education generation or the next 14 years be able to reverse the current situation from 80 percent of college students enrolled in private schools and 20 percent in state universities and colleges (SUCs) to 20 percent, private colleges, and 80 percent SUCs (Manila Bulletin, 2012).

In Digos City, Sunday College Division of Cor Jesu College has been existing for eight (8) years. Since then, it has been tremendously increasing its first year population from 2005-2006. Most of the students are self-supporting and working in order to pursue and earn a bachelor's degree.

Despite the socialized tuition fee offered by the school, it has been observed that many students have dropped out in the next curriculum year. Records from the registrar's office show that 28.74% of the students have already dropped out in the second semester of SY 2010-2011 and SY 2012-2013. Considering that the college has lower tuition fee and entrance fee as compared to other neighboring colleges in the province of Davao del Sur, students are expected to finish their bachelor's degree, and thus, they should not drop out of school. But still, a big number of students dropped out.

The study intends to find out the reasons why students drop out of school and the factors that relatively contribute to the high dropout rate. Results of the study will provide programme design to identify mode of interventions which the school undertakes to address the problem.

The study attempts to identify the factors affecting the CJC Sunday college students' decision to drop out of school and the differences and relationships to the students' dropout from SY 2010-2011 to SY 2012-2013. The researchers aim to (1) determine the Sunday college students' socio-demographic profile of age in terms of civil status and sources of tuition payment (2) determine the

level of the factors affecting the Sunday college students' decision to drop out of school with regard to policies and practices, student-teacher relationship, nature of school curriculum, financial resources and academic performance (3) find if there is a significant relationship in the factors affecting students' decision to drop out of school by the number of times they dropped from SY 2010-2011 to SY 2012-2013 in terms of policies and practices, student-teacher relationship, nature of school curriculum, financial resources and academic performance (4) determine if there is a significant difference in the students' socio demographic profile by the number of times they dropped from SY 2010-2011 to SY 2012-2013 when classified according to age, civil status and sources of tuition payment (5) find if significant relationship exists between the factors affecting students' decision to drop out of school and the students' drop out of school from SY 2010-2011 to SY 2012-2013 (6) determine if significant relationship exists between students' socio-demographic profile and the students' drop out of school from SY 2010-2011 to SY 2012-2013 (7) identify possible intervention programs that can be proposed using the findings of the study.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The study made use of the descriptive-correlational and comparative design. It would determine the extent to which different variables are related to each other in the population of interest. These critical distinguishing characteristics are the effort to estimate the difference or relationship (Sevilla, et.al, 1992 as cited by Villa, 2011). From the design, the study aimed to find the significant relationship between the factors affecting students' decision to drop out of school and the students' actual act of dropping out of school from SY 2010-2011 to SY 2012-2013.

Respondents

The respondents of the study were the (48) Sunday College students. It made use of the non-probability sampling specifically the purposive sampling. The researchers chose students with complete records from the Registrar and Guidance offices and who momentarily dropped out of school from SY 2010-2011 to SY 2012-2013.

Measures

In measuring the variables, the secondary data on the Sunday College students' profile, and students' GPA were gathered from the offices of school registrar and guidance and testing center.

A researcher-made questionnaire was utilized. The instrument consisted of the following: part 1, demographic profile and part II, questions related to the factors affecting students' decision to drop out of school using the 5-point likert scale. The questionnaire was validated and pilot-tested, and test results were item-analyzed which resulted to 0.8210 reliability coefficient of the test instrument. Using the Cronbach's Alpha, it showed that the research instrument was very reliable.

Respondents were asked to encircle the items that most corresponded to how they thought the statement described them using the 5-point scale with the following interpretations:

Descriptive Rating and Interpretation

Weight	Interval Range/Scale	Descriptive Rating	Interpretation
5	4.51-5.0	(SA) Strongly Agree	means that the respondent strongly favors the statement in all cases
4	3.51-4.50	(A) Agree	means that the respondent favors the statement in majority of the cases
3		(NDA) Neither Disagree or Agree	means that the respondent is undecided or unsure
2		(D) Disagree	means that the respondent does not favor the statement in few cases
1		(SD) Strongly Disagree	means that the respondent is not totally in favor of the statement

Academic performance based on students' grade point average (GPA) was obtained with the following interpretations:

GPA Scale	Descriptive Rating	Interpretation
1.00-1.49	Very Highly Satisfactory	Excellent
1.50-1.99	Highly Satisfactory	Very Good
2.00-2.49	Satisfactory	Good
2.50-2.99	Moderate	Fair
3.00	Low (Passing)	Poor
5.00	Very Low (Failing)	Very Poor

Procedure

In conducting the study, the following steps were undertaken by the researchers:

First, the researchers asked permission from the College Dean and the Registrar together with the Guidance and Counseling Coordinator to use records of the Sunday College students. Second, as the letters of request were approved; the researchers made the survey questionnaires. Third, the survey questionnaire was validated by three (3) professors. The notes or comments made by the questionnaire evaluators served as the bases which items would be retained or removed. Fourth, the research instrument was pilot-tested to 32 students who were currently enrolled in the Sunday College. Fifth, results were item analyzed and few items were discarded. Using the Cronbach Alpha, the coefficient relationship of survey questionnaire was 0.8210 which is rated very reliable.. Sixth, the process of communicating information to the respondents and seeking their consent was to establish mutual understanding between researchers and participants. Each participant was individually called for and was given opportunity to ask question pertaining the survey questionnaire and to discuss the information and their decision if they wish to participate in the survey or not. Thus, information on the following matters were communicated to the respondents: how the research will be monitored; contact details of the researchers; how privacy and confidentiality will be protected; how the participants can withdraw from further participation at any stage, along with any implications on the withdrawal, and whether it will be possible to withdraw data. After the individual and group briefing, all of the identified respondents agreed to the terms and conditions discussed by the researchers and gave their voluntary consent. Seventh, validated questionnaire was administered to the 48 respondents of the study. Finally, the data gathered were tabulated, computed, analyzed and interpreted with the aid of the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) Software.

Data Analysis

The statistical data were computed and analyzed with the use of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) 14 Software. The statistical tools are the following: (1) Frequency and percentage distribution were used to describe the students' socio-demographic profile of age in terms of civil status and sources of tuition payment; (2) Mean score was employed to determine the level of each factor affecting students' decision to drop out of school by the number of times they dropped from SY 2010-2011 to SY 2012-2013 in terms of policies and practices, student-teacher relationship, nature of the school curriculum,

financial resources and academic performance; (3) One-way Analysis of Variance (One-Way ANOVA) was utilized, whether significant difference exists in the factors affecting students' decision to drop out of school by the number of times they dropped from SY 2010-2011 to SY 2012-2013 and in the students' socio-demographic profile by the number of times they dropped from SY 2010-2011 to SY 2012-2013 in terms of age, civil status, and sources of tuition payment; (4) Post hoc analysis was used to detect an effect of some specific size and scores which further utilize to identify the differences actually observed in the study. Hence, it will be employed only when significant difference will be observed in the ANOVA Test and; (5) Pearson Product-Moment Correlation was used to test whether significant relationship exists between the factors affecting the students' decision to drop out of school and the students' Drop Out of School from SY 2010-2011 to SY 2012-2013; and the significant relationship between students' socio-demographic profile and the students' dropout of school from SY 2010-2011 to SY 2012-2013. All interpretations were based on 0.05 alpha level of significance.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The following are the results of the analyses and interpretations of the findings based on the statistical tests employed in the study.

Descriptive Statistical Results

1. It reveals that students aging from 18 to 22 years old with the greatest frequency counts of 25 or 52.02% and 16 or 33.33% were mostly single and working students. As cited by Hoobler, Wayne, and Lemmon (2009), the traditional conceptions of marriage has entailing greater social responsibilities outside the workplace for women while studying at the same time as compared to single working-students. This holds true to the laboratory experiment conducted by Correll, Benard, & Paik, (2007). Participants rated working students who are married as less competent and committed to their jobs than working students who are single.
2. Among the five (5) factors that affect students' decision to drop out of school, financial resources were the major reason why students drop out of school. It revealed a descriptive equivalent of neither agree nor disagree which means that availability of financial resources seemed unpredictable as perceived by the respondents. Some were dependent on cash advances from their employers, some were coming from parents' financial support and some were from unstable salary proceeds. The findings from this study were consistent with previous findings by Sweeten (2004), who identified economic reason as one of the causes for students to drop out of school.

Data from the Philippine National Statistics and Coordination Board (NSCB) show that the ratio of graduates to enrollment for tertiary education stands at 16 percent to less than 18 percent from 1994 to 2001. And, the NSCB reported, in the past 10 years, the total number of college graduates increased by an average of only 2.9 percent. The number of graduates also increased to only 481,862 in Academic Year 2009-2010 from 363,640 in AY 2000-2001. Based on the Commission on Higher Education's (CHED) 2008 data, out of 100 Grade 1 pupils, only 66 finish Grade 6 and only 58 of them enroll in first year high school. Of the 58, only 43 finish high school. Of the 43 only 23 finished high school enrolled in college, and of the 23, only 14 eventually graduate from college. The dropout rate among college students, according to the CHED, has reached an alarming 83.7 percent. This means that the country is producing 2.13 million college dropouts annually while graduates stand at close to 500,000 only. CHED records also showed that enrollment in tertiary education slowed down from 1999 to 2002, and then dropped gradually starting 2002 to 2003, with negative 0.8 percent growth in 2004-2005 for both public and private schools. Except for the big jump in 1998-1999, enrollment continues to decline. Moreover, tertiary education enrollment even in state universities and colleges shows a decelerating trend, weakening to negative 1.2 percent growth in 2004-2005, despite the lower cost of public education. In the case of private schools, the decline started as early as 2002 Manila Bulletin, (2012).

Inferential Statistical Results

1. There is a significant difference in the factors affecting students' decision to drop out of school in terms of policies and practices, student-teacher relationship, financial resources and academic performance. However, significant difference does not exist in the nature of school curriculum by the number of times they dropped from SY 2010-2011 to SY 2012-2013. Below are the specific results of each of the indicators:

Policies and Practices - The computed mean score of SY 2010-2011 is 4.48, SY 2011-2012 is 4.49 and SY 2012-2013 is 4.55, having the f-value of 5.937 with p-value of 0.003 that is less than 0.05 level of significance. The null hypothesis that there is no significant difference in the factors affecting students' decision to drop out of school by the number of times they dropped out of school from SY 2010-2011 to SY 2012-2013 in terms of policies and practices is rejected. It implies that policies and practices of the school lead to the students' decision to drop out of school from SY 2010-2011 to SY 2012-2013. The policies and practices include maximizing class schedule to ensure standard as mandated by CHED and the school services provided to the students through quality educational facilities; the no I.D,

no uniform policy; teacher performance and students' learning; select and develop teachers' competency to ensure high quality instruction; and the implementation of the classroom attendance policy. Educational settings and school policies are important influences on the patterns of completion and early leaving. It is well established that, after controlling for various intake and other relevant factors, there remain substantial differences between individual schools in the proportion of students who remain to complete college (Rumberger and Thomas, 2005). This is a particularly important finding for schools' policymakers because schools are one of the principal mechanisms for targeting policies to improve rates of completion.

Student-teacher relationship - Results reveal that the mean scores of 4.06, SY 2010-2011; 4.28, SY 2011-2012; 4.19, SY 2012-2013 having the f-value of 5.529 with p-value of 0.005 that is less than 0.05 level of significance. The null hypothesis that there is no significant difference in the factors affecting the students' decision to drop out of school by the number of times they dropped out of school from SY 2010-2011 to SY 2012-2013 in terms of student-teacher relationship is rejected. The findings are consistent with findings by Govindaraju and Venkatesan, (2010) who found out that neglect by teachers, poor teaching, discrimination, cruelty or punishment meted out by teachers, absence as being among the teacher-centric reasons for dropping out of school in rural settings in India. In this study most students indicated that teachers' uncaring behavior acts as a push out factor to many of them. Caring teachers have been shown by Croninger and Lee (2001) in a study in America to be an important source of social capital for students, positive relationships between students and teachers both in and out of class which reduces the probability of dropping out by nearly half. Such a relationship is important particularly to students from disadvantaged backgrounds and those experiencing academic difficulties who are at risk of dropping out. Contributing to this debate Stearns and Glennie (2006) note that factors internal to the school, such as disciplinary policies or conflicts with students or teachers, might serve to push students out of school. In this study, it emerged that students are less likely to drop out of schools if the relationships between teachers and students (as perceived by the students) are more positive, a finding consistent with findings made by Wotherspoon (2004) in a study of high school dropouts in Japan.

Financial Resources - The mean scores of SY 2010-2011 is 3.45, SY 2011-2012 is 3.37, and SY 2012-2013 is 3.49 having the f-value of 6.889 with the p-value of 0.001 that is less than 0.05 alpha level of significance. The null hypothesis that there is no significant difference in the factors affecting the students' decision by the number of times they dropped out from SY

2010-2011 to SY 2012-2013 in terms of financial resources is rejected. This indicates that the students' decision to drop out of school was affected by the number of times they dropped in terms of financial resources. According to Hunter and May (2011), it seems for students from poorer backgrounds in particular the pressure on them to withdraw from school increases as they get older, particularly as the opportunity cost of their time increases. With the parents of most drop outs not employed, and income levels are low, most children are called on to supplement the household's income, either through wage-earning employment themselves or taking on additional tasks to free up other household members for work resulting in them dropping out of school.

Academic Performance - The computed mean score of SY 2010-2011 is 3.54, SY 2011-2012 is 3.32 and SY 2012-2013 is 3.93 having the f-value of 4.690 with p-value of .011 that is less than 0.05 level of significance. The null hypothesis that there is no significant difference in the factors affecting the students' decision to drop out of school by the number of times they dropped out of school from SY 2010-2011 to SY 2012-2013 in terms of academic performance is rejected. It indicates that the students' decision to drop out of school is affected by their academic performance from SY 2010-2013 to SY 2012-2013. According to Loury and Gorman (2007), college employment may also have a detrimental effect as time spent in market work reduces time available for the accumulation of schooling-related human capital. In addition, fatigue from extensive employment hours may reduce the productivity of schooling-related activity that does occur (Oettinger, 2010).

Nature of School Curriculum - The mean score of 4.35 for SY 2010-2011, 4.25 for SY 2011-2012, and 4.44 for SY 2012-2013 having the f-value of 2.146 with p-value of 0.121 level of significance. The null hypothesis that there is no significant difference in the factors affecting the students' decision to drop out of school from SY 2010-2011 to SY 2012-2013 in terms of the nature of school curriculum is accepted. This indicates the Sunday College students' decision to drop out of school was not affected in terms of the nature of school curriculum by the number of times they dropped out of school. The finding connotes that majority of the Sunday College students are in favor of how the school curriculum is being implemented in terms of motivating the learner using activity-based instruction; identifying prerequisite subjects or courses for each program; encourages inquiry and creativity by being democratic with regard to procedure and accepting individual differences; observing 54-hour CHED minimum requirements for a 3-unit subject; and providing avenue for translating curriculum into

concrete learning experiences. From the above findings, it indicates that Sunday College students perceived the school curriculum to be common and is able to set high expectations for all, and is linked to clear learning goals, that is connected to pathways that lead to employment. (OECD, 2008)

2. Results reveal that students' socio-demographic profile affects the number of times they dropped from school year 2010-2011 to SY 2012-2013 in terms of age. As cited by Lewin (2007), repetition and late enrolment cause a student to be over the age-in-college-level appropriate. Over age entry and progression, delays college completion to ages where male and female may be subject to growing pressure to contribute to household income, and to enter into marriage. Roderick (2004) shows that in the U.S. students who repeat in college are significantly more prone to drop out even after controlling for difference in background characteristics. In general, older students have higher opportunity cost of schooling which is linked to the probability of drop out. Similarly, older female students face issues of school safety. Pregnancy and marriage which are associated with dropping out from school, and this is particularly important in low enrolment countries in terms of age, SY 2010-2011 has significantly higher mean difference value than SY 2011-2012 and SY 2012-2013 by 0.43750 and 0.64583 respectively. However, SY 2011-2012 and SY 2012-2013 have significantly lower mean difference value than SY 2010-2011 and SY 2012-2013 by -0.43750 and -0.64583. It means that when classified by school year, significant difference exists on the age in the students' socio-demographic profile. SY 2010-2011 has significantly high positive description on how they are affected by the age of the students. The findings agree with Cameron, (2005), that age-specific dropout rates for older student increase drastically after the age of 16-18. Furthermore, students fully agree that civil status is necessary and important indicator of socio-demographic profile that would affect the number of times they dropped from school year 2010-2011 to SY 2012-2013.

In addition, women who marry in their teens tend to have more children and to have those children earlier. Teenage marriage is also associated with much lower education levels; women who marry before the age of 19 are 50% more likely to drop out of high school or college and four times less likely to graduate from college (Klepinger, Lundberg, and Plotnick 2002). The negative outcomes associated with early marriage and dropping out of school have the potential to affect not only the individual making the decision but also her children and the rest of society.

In terms of civil status, SY 2010-2011 has significantly higher mean difference value than SY 2012-2013 by 0.35417. Nevertheless, the SY 2012-2013 is significantly lower in mean difference value than the SY 2010-2011 by -0.35417. This means that when classified by school year, significant difference exists in civil status in the students' socio-demographic profile, SY 2010-2011. School Year 2010-2011 has significantly high positive perception on how students' socio-demographic profile in terms of civil status affect the number of students dropped out of school. The findings agree with Lochner and Moretti, (2004), that the negative outcomes associated with marriage and dropping out of school have the potential to affect not only the individual making the decision but also her children and her future.

In terms of sources of tuition payment, it was found out that the mean scores of 4.47 for SY 2010-2011, 4.45 for SY 2011-2012 and 4.67 for SY 2012-2013 having the f-value of 5.603 with p-value of 0.005 that is less than 0.05 alpha level of significance. The null hypothesis that there is no significant difference in the students' socio-demographic profile by school year in terms of source of tuition payment is rejected. It implies that in the students' socio-demographic profile for all school years, Sunday College students valued much the sources of tuition payments. These findings agree with Pullin (2008), that working students are working hard to compensate for the effort, financial resources and time they invested in order achieve their goals, wherein financial aspect becomes an ultimate necessity for them to be able to finish school.

3. The results revealed that the students' decision to drop out of school in terms of policies and practices, students-teacher relationship, nature of the school curriculum, financial resources and academic performance do not significantly relate to students' dropout of school from SY 2010-2011 to SY 2012-2013. The result implies that students' decisions to drop out of school were not perceived by them as significant to their dropping out of school. As cited by Azam (2007), the major social cause of dropping out of school does not have significant effect on the school related factors but more from societal aspect, family background and students' emotional readiness to engage into studying and learning.
4. In the findings of Bushnik (2001) in his research entitled "Education, Skills and Learning Research Paper-Learning, Earning and Leaving: The Relationship Between Working and Dropping Out, his analysis confirms that there is a significant relationship between socio-demographic profile of students and their decision to dropout out of school. Having controlled for

a number of characteristics including demographics, socio-demographics, parental and peer influences, school-related and engagement in school, substance use and other extracurricular activities, students who did not work at all or those who worked more than 30 hours per week were at a higher risk of dropping out than those students who worked moderate hours. Students who worked 30 hours (in order to pay for their educational expenses) or more were at the highest risk of dropping out. There are many possible explanations for this. Some students may have been far enough along in the dropping out process to prefer working to schooling or some may think they are old enough to continue schooling or some are married and their family already becomes their topmost priority so they prefer to drop out of school. Some students may have needed money and decided that the opportunity cost of staying in school was too high. These ideas are supported by the fact that 44% of heavy workers reported that they had dropped out because of “wanting to work” or “having to work/money problems.” Although there is no simple cause-and-effect relationship, knowing that working many hours is related to dropping out could help to identify those students who are at a higher risk of leaving school without graduating. (Lavoie, 2002)

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The research results revealed that 18-22 year old students were mostly single and working. It was found out that the major reason why students drop out of school was the lack of financial resources. Thus, the indicators namely policies and practices, student-teacher relationship, financial resources and academic performance affected students' decision to drop out of school while the nature of school curriculum showed no significant difference by the number of times the students dropped from SY 2010-2011 to SY 2012-2013. Age, civil status and sources of tuition payment were contributory factors that led them to drop out of school.

However, no significant relationship was observed between students' decision to drop out of school in terms of policies and practices, student-teacher relationship, nature of the school curriculum, financial resources, and academic performance and students' dropout of school from SY 2010-2011 to SY 2012-2013. Similarly, no significant relationship exists between students' socio-demographic profile in terms of age, civil status and sources of tuition payment and students' decision to dropout of school from SY 2010-2011 to SY 2012-2013.

A program design is presented to help lessen students' decision to drop out of school. Below are the details:

PROGRAM TITLE:**PREVENTING DROP OUTS: AN ADVOCACY AND ACTION
GUIDE OF THE SUNDAY COLLEGE DIVISION****Rationale**

In a study made on the “Factors Affecting Students Decision to Dropout of School, it was found out that several indicators need improvement. These areas include policies and practices, student-teacher relationship, financial resources, and academic performance. Using the salient findings as basis for the proposed interventions, four (4) specific programmes are designed.

This proposal aims to address the needs of the respondents and the Sunday College Division as a whole.

PROGRAM CONCEPT DESCRIPTION

The program intervention scheme is more on prevention strategy for students’ who plan to drop out of school before or after a semester ends. Before and after the midterm examination, Sunday College instructors are required to conduct academic counseling. As a result of the counseling, instructors will have to identify students with inclination to drop out to be given preventive measures.

The following are the specific programs:

1. **THE ADOPT-A-STUDENT PROGRAM** – a number of instructors expressed their need of house helpers who are willing to enroll in the Sunday College Program. A coordinator will be assigned to list down interested students who want to avail of the program. Qualified applicants will undergo interview for further background checking and information. This program will help address students who drop out of school due to financial problems. This is an initiative that falls under one of the CJC’s pillars which is apostleship to support the financial needs of the students by providing alternatives through other forms of scholarship.
2. **SC ACADEMY** - This program will be administered by the SC Programme Heads who will be responsible to look for instructors or competent students who can spare time out of their busy schedules. Students with academic problems are placed at random into “family groups” of 5-10 identified

members that meet 3x a week for a specific academic session. Instructors/ students provide the modules and referrals in the “extended day” program. Parents are encouraged to participate, and the instructors/students visit each student’s home at (least once) to introduce and explain the program objectives. This will help address problem on academic performance that lead students to drop out from school. For the instructors who will volunteer to render their time, their effort will be given due credit as part of the community engagement in the SC Program. Moreover, to further encourage these instructors, they can also earn additional points that will be credited to the rank and promotion for the faculty. Volunteer students will also obtain points that will be reflected in their co-curricular activity and whoever gets the highest points will receive a co-curricular reward during student recognition day.

3. **TFP (Teacher Formation Program)** - The main goal of the program is to revisit the role of the teacher not just to transfer learning but also to lead by example by displaying positive values and caring behavior so that students will be motivated to continue their studies inside the classroom. This will help address problem on student-teacher relationship and facilitates mutual understanding between teacher and their students. Student representatives from each division will also be invited. Teachers will be given the opportunity to share their classroom teaching experiences (both good and bad) and so with the students. There will be group sharing sessions between the teachers and the student representatives together with the assistance of the school guidance counselors who will be responsible for the counseling.
4. **SCPPO PROGRAMREMINDERS (Sunday College Policies and Practices Orientation)** - This program will be implemented once in every semester to re-orient students with the major Sunday College policies under CHED mandate. This orientation program will be facilitated by the Sunday College Division Chairperson, Programme Head and participated by the School Registrar.

LITERATURE CITED

- Apollo Research Institute. (2012, May) Why students drop out from school. Retrieved, March 6, 2013, from paulyniceroldens.hubpages.com/hub/What-Causes-College-Students-to-Fail-or-Dropout#comment8223407.
- Azzam, A.M. (2007). Why students drop out. *educational leadership*, 64(7): 91-93. Retrieved July 9, 2012 from <http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership/apr07/vol64/num07/Why-Students-Drop-Out.aspx>
- Bushnik, L. (2005). Education, skills and learning-research papers, learning, earning and leaving: The relationship between working and dropping out. Ottawa, Culture, Tourism and the Centre for Educational Statistics Division.
- Cameron, L. (2005). 'Primary completion rates.' EPDC Technical Paper WP-09-0. Washington DC: Education Policy and Data Center
- Correll, S. J., Benard, S., & Paik, I. (2007). Getting a Job: Is there a motherhood penalty? *American Journal of Sociology*, 112, 1297–1338.
- Croninger, R.G. , & Lee, V.E. (2001). Social Capital and Dropping Out of High School: Benefits to at Risk Students of Teachers' Support and Guidance. *Teachers College Record*, 103(4): 548-582.
- Govindaraju, R., & Venkatesan, S. (2010). A study on school drop-outs in rural settings. *Journal of Psychology*, 1(1), 47-53.
- Hoobler, J. M., Wayne, S. J., & Lemmon, G. (2009). Bosses' perceptions of family-work conflict and women's promotability: glass ceiling effects. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52, 939-957.
- Klepinger, D., Lundberg, S. and Plotnick, R. (2002). "How does adolescent fertility affect the human capital and wages of young women?" *Journal of Human Resources* 34:421–48
- Lavoie, C. (2002). Youth employment situation in Canada: Explanations and future outlook. Ottawa: Human Resources Development Canada, Strategic Policy, Applied Research Branch.

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.

Lochner, L. and Moretti, E.(2004). "The effect of education on crime: evidence from prison inmates, arrests, and self-reports." *American Economic Review* 94,155–89.

Loury, L.D. & Garman, D.(2007). College selectivity and earnings. *Journal of Labor Economics*,13(2), 289-308.

Manila Bulletin. (2012, December 4).*College Education for Poor Students*. Retrieved April 25, 2014 from <https://ph.news.yahoo.com>

OECD. (2008).*Creating effective teaching and learning environments: First results from teaching and learning international survey*, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Paris, France

Oettinger, G.S.(2010). *Parents' financial support, students' employment, and academic performance in college*. Unpublished manuscript.

Pullin, D.(2008). Assessment, equity and opportunity to learn. New York. Cambridge University Press.

Roderick, M.(2004).Grade retention and school dropout: Investigating the association. *American Educational Research Journal*, 31(4), 729-759

Rumberger, R.W., & Thomas, S.L. (2000). The Distribution of dropout and turnover rates among urban and suburban high shools. *Sociology of Education*, 73(1), 39-67.

Stearns, E. & Glennie, E.J.(2006). When and why dropouts leave high school. *Youth & Society*, 38 (1), 29-57. Retrieved March, 2013 from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0044118X05282764>

Sweeten, G.A.(2004). School dropout and subsequent offending distinguishing selection fromCausation. Retrieved February 15, 2009 from, <http://www.lib.umd.edu/drum/bitsreani/l903/191/1/dissertation.pdf>

Wotherspoon, T (2004). The sociology of education in canada: critical perspectives. Toronto: Oxford University Press.