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I. SDPP BACKGROUND

The School Dropout Prevention Pilot (SDPP) Program is a three-year multi-country program, funded by the US Agency for International Development, aimed at mitigating school dropout from primary and secondary school. Its objective is to provide evidence-based programming guidance to USAID missions and countries in Asia and the Middle East on student dropout prevention by piloting and testing the effectiveness of dropout prevention interventions in four target countries: Cambodia, India, Tajikistan, and Timor Leste. The SDPP Program will advance knowledge on dropout prevention through an applied research approach. In a three-stage process, it will:

1. Identify best practices in dropout prevention in the US and developing countries.
2. Analyze dropout trends in each country to identify those groups, grades, and/or geographic areas most severely affected by dropout and conduct a situational analysis of the target group to understand the risk factors and conditions affecting dropout.
3. Design, implement and rigorously assess interventions to keep at-risk students in schools in the most acutely affected areas.

II. THE SDPP COUNTRY ASSESSMENT(S)

To gain a better understanding of dropout issues in each of the pilot countries, individual in-depth country assessments will be conducted. The Country Assessment has dual objectives: first, to inform the design of the pilot project interventions and activities, and second, to provide information and analysis to inform future discussion about school dropouts by USAID Missions and host governments.

SDPP activities are organized to answer three key questions about each pilot country:

1. Which basic education grades(s) and population groups suffer most acutely from dropout?
2. What are the primary factors and conditions that affect dropout in these groups?
3. Which policies, practices and interventions show promise in reducing dropouts (increasing retention rates)?

From the investigations in each pilot country, SDPP will pinpoint the geographic location, educational cycle, grade, or group most severely affected by dropout and select the area for pilot interventions, identify the characteristics of at-risk students and dropouts, causes of dropout, and ascertain the policy and programmatic context in which dropout occurs. The country assessments will not only provide a focus for and inform interventions, but also serve as a diagnostic tool for in-country educational planners, school administrators and classroom teachers, allowing them to focus on areas with high dropout, students who fit an at-risk profile, and policies or programs that have proven effective in addressing dropout. Information about the methods and tools developed and used for the SDPP country assessments will be incorporated into the SDPP Student Dropout Prevention Guide to be developed later in the project.

III. IN-COUNTRY PRIMARY RESEARCH ON DROPOUT FACTORS

In-country primary research aims to identify the factors that influence dropout in the geographic area and in the group, grade and/or education cycle selected for pilot project interventions. Its purpose is to create a profile of at-risk students and provide a deeper understanding of the specific factors related to and issues affecting dropout in the selected population, so that pilot interventions can be crafted to respond to the priority needs. It does not seek to duplicate research already conducted at the national and regional levels, but instead to focus on a specific set of students.
Figure 1: Conceptual Framework for School Dropout (with illustrative factors)
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School dropout is a phenomenon driven by influences at multiple levels. (See Figure 1). The personal characteristics and circumstances of the child and his/her attitudes and motivations are formed by and interact with those of his/her parents and family situation, the school and his/her peers, and the community in which he/she lives.\(^1\) Underlying all these “spheres of influence” – or domains – are policies at the regional and national levels which contribute to and shape these other factors. Together, the policy environment and the child-, family-, school- and community-level factors produce the complex phenomenon of school dropout. (See Figure 1).

The assessment aims to investigate the factors associated with school dropout in each of the five key domains shown in the conceptual framework – child, family, school, community, and regional and national policy in the geographic area and in the group, grade and/or education cycle selected for pilot project interventions. Primary data collection efforts – both qualitative and quantitative – will be designed to answer specific research questions in each domain about the target group. These research questions include:

1. **What are the child-level factors associated with school dropout?**
   - What are the characteristics of students that are most at risk of dropout?
   - What are characteristics that distinguish dropouts?
   - What are students’ experiences with and opinions of the schooling they receive?
   - What are student attitudes towards schooling and their aspirations?
   - What are characteristics that distinguish dropouts?
   - What reasons do children say would cause or caused them to dropout?
   - What do children say would cause or would have caused them to remain in school?

2. **What are the family-level factors associated with school dropout?**
   - What are the characteristics of families of students that are most at risk of dropout?
   - What are the characteristics of families of students that dropped out?
   - What are parental experiences with and opinions of the schooling their children receive?
   - What are parental attitudes towards schooling and aspirations for their children?
   - What reasons do parents say would cause or caused them to allow their child to dropout of schools?
   - What do parents say would cause or caused them to allow their child to remain in school?

3. **What are the school-level factors associated with school dropout?**
   - What are the characteristics of schools with higher vs. lower dropout?
   - Does the school think that dropout is a problem?
   - What reasons do schools say cause students to dropout?
   - Does the school have a system of identifying and monitoring at-risk students?

\(^1\) See School Dropout Prevention Pilot Program Review of the Literature (January 2011)
• What, if anything, does the school do to mitigate dropout?
• What does the school think would mitigate dropout?
• To what extent does the school do anything to develop a sense of belonging/create a school community?
• What, if any, are the motivating and de-motivating factors for schools to retain students?

4. What factors at the community level influence school dropout?
• What are the community factors that influence dropout?
• Are there practices in the community that would contribute to student dropout?
• To what extent does the community view dropout as a problem?
• Does the community do anything to help children stay or return to school?
• What can the community or others do to reduce dropout?
• How does the community view education?
• What is the role of the community in the school?

5. What are the national/regional-level policies and programs that affect dropout?
• To what extent are national or regional level policies and programs supportive of or inimical to retention implemented at the school community level?
• What policies or programs could be put in place to increase retention?

IV. INVENTORY OF ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS FOR SITUATIONAL ANALYSIS

The SDPP research team has developed ten core instruments aimed at the key domains of inquiry—child, family, school, and community—that put students at risk of dropping out or contribute to dropout (Annex I). The inventory of existing tools identified earlier served as a source of information to ensure all relevant questions and response variables were included in these instruments. The instruments will be applied in a sample of schools in the targeted areas where dropout is comparatively high.

The key respondents include:
• students at risk of dropping out of school (in the targeted cycle, grade or group)
• former students who have dropped out of school (from the targeted cycle, grade or group)
• parents or guardians of at risk students
• parents or guardians of former students who have dropped out
• teachers (of students in the targeted cycle, grade or group)
• school administrators (school head, principal)
• representatives of community organizations involved in education (e.g., school management committee, parent teacher association, village education committee)
• education officer at the administrative level closest to the school (e.g., district, block)

2 Inventory of existing tools was submitted to USAID in March 2011.
Enumerators trained by the SDPP research team will use structured interviews to administer the instrument. All instruments are closed-ended questionnaires and can be easily coded and analyzed. Closed-ended questions are also more specific and likely to communicate similar meanings allowing for comparison of responses across the respondents.

The child-level questionnaires (2) will explore the characteristics of students at risk of dropping out and those that have already dropped out, their household context, academic history, experience with and opinions of schooling, attitude towards school, perception and causes of dropout, and future plans. The parent/guardian questionnaires (2) look at family characteristics, parents experience with the schooling their child received, aspiration for the child, competing activities that took the child’s attention from school, and their opinion of what should be done to keep children in school.

The teacher questionnaire (1) and school administrator questionnaire (1) examine teacher-parent interaction, teacher quality and attitudes, early warning systems for at-risk students, and school management and policies. The instruments delve into how schools recognize at risk students, the characteristic of schools with high dropout, reasons that schools believe cause student dropout, and what can be done to prevent dropout.

The education officer questionnaire (1) will look at the implementation of the national and district level policies at the school level, district-school relationships, and the official’s perception of dropout as a problem in the respective districts. Similarly, the community member questionnaire (1) will assess the community’s values on education, whether any community practices perpetuate dropout, goals for young people in the community and the community’s role in preventing dropout.

The school capture tool (1) will use a direct observation technique to capture basic characteristics of the school environment and facilities (latrines, playgrounds, canteen, library, etc.). On-the-spot teacher and student attendance will also be captured in the tool. The tool will also record data on student participation and internal efficiency such as enrollment, promotion, and dropout from secondary sources available either centrally or at the school.

Finally, the policy and program inventory tool (1) will organize the information collected by SDPP country offices about the policies and programs in effect in each country that may affect dropout providing a brief description and assessment of impact.

For each instrument or tool, the inventory specifies the factors that the instrument assesses, the type of instrument, the respondent, who administers the instrument, method of data collection, and number of items in the instruments (Annex I).

The instruments will be shared with partner countries for adaptation to the country context, specific target groups, and translation to the relevant local language(s).
### Annex I: Instruments for Situational Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Factors that the instrument assesses</th>
<th>Type of instrument</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Who administers the instrument</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>No. of items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1  | Child Questionnaire (At-risk)                   | (i) **Child background**: Ethnicity, language, grade enrolled, marital status, migration  
(ii) **Household background**: Parents education and occupation, siblings, birth order, pattern of dropout among siblings  
(iii) **Academic history**: Age at enrollment, scholastic performance, repetition, history of dropping out of school, absenteeism, behavioral problems  
(iv) **School experience**: Like/dislike about school, peers and friends, teacher absenteeism, teacher and school support, involvement in extracurricular activity, distance to school  
(v) **Competing activities and interests**: Activities that take time away from studies, time spent on chores, work opportunities  
(vi) **Attitudes and aspirations**: Importance of schooling, utility of education, congruence of aspiration with education, plan next academic year, future plans  
(vii) **Family support**: Parent-teacher interaction, parental aspiration, decision points to continue or drop out, financial support by parents  
(viii) **Perception of dropout**: Friends/peers who have dropped out, reasons child may drop out from school, acceptable age to drop out  
(ix) **Dropout mitigation**: Potential interventions to make school interesting/fun/useful, increase attendance and perform better in school  
(x) **Girls**: Perception of girls education, bullying, teacher support for girls, attendance during menstruation, school safety, pregnancy, marriage, domestic violence | Close-ended questionnaire | At risk student | Enumerator | Structured interview | 89             |
| 2  | Child Questionnaire (Dropout)                   | (i) **Child background**: Ethnicity, language spoken at home, last grade attended and completed, marital status, occupation, migration  
(ii) **Household background**: Parents education and occupation, siblings, birth order, pattern of dropout among siblings  
(iii) **Academic history**: Age at enrollment, scholastic performance, repetition, history of dropping out of school, absenteeism, behavioral problems  
(iv) **School experience**: Like/disliked about school, peers and friends, teacher absenteeism, teacher and school support, involvement in extracurricular activity, distance to school  
(v) **Competing activities and interests**: Activities that took time away from studies, time spent on chores, work opportunities | Close-ended questionnaire | Former students (dropouts) | Enumerator | Structured interview | 100            |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Factors that the instrument assesses</th>
<th>Type of instrument</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Who administers the instrument</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>No. of items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Parent Questionnaire (At-risk students)</td>
<td>(vi) <strong>Attitudes and aspirations</strong>: Importance of schooling, utility of education, congruence of aspiration with education &lt;br&gt; (vii) <strong>Family support</strong>: Parent-teacher interaction, parental aspiration, financial support by parents &lt;br&gt; (viii) <strong>Decision to dropout</strong>: Age when dropped out, process and decision points when dropping out, friends/peers who have dropped out &lt;br&gt; (ix) <strong>Causes of dropout</strong>: Reasons why dropped out, acceptable age to drop out, situation after dropping out &lt;br&gt; (x) <strong>Dropout mitigation</strong>: Interventions that would have helped to continue school, interventions to make school interesting/fun/useful, increase attendance, and perform better in school &lt;br&gt; (xii) <strong>Future plans</strong>: Return to school, factors that would help to re-enroll in school &lt;br&gt; (xiii) <strong>Girls</strong>: Perception of girls education, bullying, teacher support for girls, attendance during menstruation, school safety, pregnancy, marriage, domestic violence</td>
<td>Close-ended questionnaire</td>
<td>Parents of at-risk students</td>
<td>Enumerator</td>
<td>Structured interview</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Instrument¹</td>
<td>Factors that the instrument assesses²</td>
<td>Type of instrument³</td>
<td>Respondent⁴</td>
<td>Who administers the instrument⁵</td>
<td>Method⁶</td>
<td>No. of items⁷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4 | Parent Questionnaire (Dropouts) | (i) **Parent/guardian background**: Relationship to child, occupation, ethnicity, language, migration  
(ii) **Household educational background**: Enrollment of all children, pattern of dropout in household  
(iii) **Focus child background**: Age of enrollment, academic background, disability, distance to school  
(iv) **Decision to drop out and causes**: Process and decision points when child dropped out, family situation after child dropped out, causes of child dropping out  
(v) **School experience**: Academic performance of child, learning difficulties, absenteeism, support from school/teacher, behavioral problems, school support  
(vi) **Competing activities**: Activities that took child’s time away from school, investment decisions  
(vii) **Parental-school interaction**: Involvement with child’s school work, interaction with school, monitoring child’s progress in school  
(viii) **School characteristics**: School facilities, classroom instruction, extracurricular activities  
(ix) **Attitude toward schooling and aspiration for child**: Value of education, utility of education, allocation of resources among children  
(x) **Dropout Mitigation**: Locus of responsibility, interventions to prevent drop out | Close-ended questionnaire | Parents of former students (dropouts) | Enumerator | Structured interview | 66 |
| 5 | Teacher Questionnaire | (i) **Teacher background**: Languages, education attainment, work experience, absenteeism  
(ii) **Scope of dropout**: Reasons that cause students to drop out, how drop out is prevented, accountability to prevent drop out  
(iii) **At-risk students**: Behavior of at-risk students, responsibility/accountability to help at-risk students, perceptions of at-risk students, resources that students need  
(iv) **Student absenteeism**: Monitoring of student attendance, excessive student absenteeism, responsibility/accountability to address student absenteeism  
(v) **Interactions with students**: Handling of discipline issues, homework assignment and completion, teacher perception of students, extra time spent with students | Close-ended questionnaire | Teachers | Enumerator | Structured interview | 70 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Instrument¹</th>
<th>Factors that the instrument assesses²</th>
<th>Type of instrument³</th>
<th>Respondent⁴</th>
<th>Who administers the instrument⁵</th>
<th>Method⁶</th>
<th>No. of items⁷</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 6  | School Administrator Questionnaire | (vi) **Interactions with parents**: Communication with parents, responsiveness of parents, topics of discussion with parents  
(vii) **Teacher professional development**: Experience with professional development, topics helpful to addressing student dropout  
(viii) **Mitigating student dropout**: Making class interesting to students, discussing dropout within the school, addressing dropout | Close-ended questionnaire | School administrator | Enumerator | Structured interview | 81 |
<p>| 7  | District Official Questionnaire | (i) <strong>Education officer background</strong>: Title, work experience, education level, experience with student dropout | Close-ended questionnaire | District Official | Enumerator | Structured interview | 50 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Factors that the instrument assesses</th>
<th>Type of instrument</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Who administers the instrument</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>No. of items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Community Questionnaire</td>
<td>(i) <strong>SMC/PTA background</strong>: Profession/title, group membership&lt;br&gt; (ii) <strong>Role of SMC/PTA</strong>: Frequency of meetings, interaction with school administrator, functions, disseminating school information to community, role in preventing dropout and improving student behavior&lt;br&gt; (iii) <strong>Basic community characteristics</strong>: Actions to reduce dropout, community groups that support education&lt;br&gt; (iv) <strong>Local economy</strong>: Child labor, seasonal work, employment opportunities for educated youth, migration&lt;br&gt; (v) <strong>Community values towards education</strong>: Reasons that children are sent to school, parental value in education, reasons for dropout, dropout decision-making process, parental expectations for child&lt;br&gt; (vi) <strong>Perceptions of school</strong>: School-organized community events, community participation in school, perceptions of school quality, school actions to reduce dropout, role of school, perception of gender, school attendance, education and marriage&lt;br&gt; (vii) <strong>Physical and safety environment</strong>: School safety, safety issues in traveling to school, harassment by teachers/administrators, distance between schools, handling health-related issues</td>
<td>Close-ended questionnaire</td>
<td>SMC/PTA members</td>
<td>Enumerator</td>
<td>Structured interview</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>School Capture Tool</td>
<td>(i) <strong>Data on school participation and internal efficiency</strong>: Enrollment, dropout&lt;br&gt; (ii) <strong>Attendance</strong>: Existing records and on-the-spot check&lt;br&gt; (iii) <strong>School facilities and infrastructure</strong>: Electricity, latrines, classroom, water, cafeteria, library, computer, dormitory etc.</td>
<td>Checklist</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Enumerator</td>
<td>Direct Observation</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Policies and Programs</td>
<td>(i) <strong>Policies and programs in each pilot country</strong>: Affirmative action in teacher recruitment, automatic promotion, compulsory education, teacher code of conduct, uniform requirements, provision of meals, legal age of marriage, child friendly schools etc.</td>
<td>Information matrix</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Local partners</td>
<td>Document review</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Title of instrument
2 Such as dropout interventions, teacher performance, community attitude, student behaviors etc.
3 Includes focus group interview guide, one on one closed interview, self-administered questionnaire, etc.
4 Parent, teacher, principal, student, district officials etc.
5 Enumerator, teacher, district officials, self etc.
6 Structured interview, focus group, direct observation
7 No. of questions in each instrument