STUDENT ATTRITION INTENT: BASIS FOR COMPREHENSIVE STUDENT RETENTION PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

Jeanylyn Embradura Marcojos[1]

Abstract: The purpose of this descriptive study was to determine the level of student attrition intent in the selected bilingual schools in Pathumthani Province, Thailand and become the basis for a possible school retention program. Topics addressed in this study include the different factors that may cause student attrition intent. These factors are classified into academic, motivational, psychosocial, and financial when analyzed by the respondents' gender, educational attainment, and economic status. Results of the study showed that in relation to economic status of the respondents, there is a significant difference in the motivational factors and psychosocial factors. On the other hand, there are no significant differences in the academic and financial factors. In relation to the educational attainment of the respondents, only the financial factor had a significant difference while the other factors had none. Lastly, in relation to the respondents' gender, none of the factors appeared to have a significant difference. Based on the foregoing findings, the following conclusions were drawn: Gender is not a factor in determining the level of student attrition intent. Motivational and psychosocial factors have significant differences when analyzed by economic status. Financial factors have a significant difference when analyzed by educational attainment. The following recommendations were offered: Implementation of the different comprehensive student retention programs that will improve the student academically and psychosocially. The schools should see to it that there would be equal treatments among students whether they come from a less fortunate family or from a rich family and replication of this study, using indicators not covered is highly recommended to the researchers to investigate further the factors influencing student attrition intent.

Keywords: Student Attrition Intent, Bilingual Schools, Retention Program

Background

The problems on student attrition and student retention are priority concerns in most educational institutions today. Though school administrators have always committed themselves to student success, student retention is now a matter of economic survival. The deteriorating legion of students has triggered a keen competition among schools for enrollments; there is no longer a stable flow of entering students to take the place of those who drop out and/or decide to leave their educational institutions. The demographic characteristics of the population have induced educators to consider how their institutions can more effectively serve their students and hopefully retain more of them until completion. As a result, studies of retention concerned with prevention of attrition have become commonplace. As schools try their very best to take in more students, then, it becomes increasingly important to characterize the potential retention rate to determine the reasons why he or she might withdraw and to see if procedures or programs could be established to help reduce those numbers that are going back out the open door (Tinto, 1978).

Therefore, the main thrust of the study is to assess and compare the level of student attrition in selected bilingual schools and to identify what programs should schools develop to retain their students. This further examines the extent of attrition problems in these selected schools and how these schools are trying their very best in every way to retain students.

In the course of the researcher's observation, she noticed that there is a need to answer the questions on why students leave their schools or why the parents pull their children out of their chosen schools. In addition, the researcher thought of what kinds of programs that schools might develop to retain the students.

Review of Related Literature

This chapter presents a review of relevant literature and studies from which the researcher gained valuable information and insights that guided her in the formulation of the research design and methodology. Moreover, the review gave more in depth and meaning to the investigation.

Scholars have long held an interest in student departure, partly because it is a complex human behavior; partly because it is related to other factors like status attainment, self-development, and the development of human capital; and partly because it is a place where theory can have an impact on practice. Retention studies are important to institutions because if institutions can maintain or increase their retention rates, they can survive, and possibly prosper.

Vincent Tinto's model of student departure has had the greatest influence on our understanding of student retention. His theory helped guide a large number of dissertations and empirical studies of student retention. The model posits that students enter school with family and individual attributes. Students enter an academic system that is characterized by grade performance and intellectual development, which together lead to academic integration, and they enter a social system where peer group interactions and faculty interactions lead to social integration. Academic and social integration work together to influence ongoing goal and institutional commitments, which, in turn, lead to the decision to remain in, or to leave, school.

---

[1] Lecturer, St. Theresa International College, Thailand

There is a substantial body of literature that has developed over the years that utilizes a variety of enrollment models to study the factors that affect college enrollment. Substantial reviews of this literature may be found in Hearn and Longanecker (1985), Leslie and Brinkman (1987), and Becker (1990). The consensus of these models is that enrollments are not very sensitive to changes in price. One emerging issue in the literature is the realization that enrollment has two major components--initial enrollment and continual enrollment or retention. Furthermore, there seems to be a growing recognition that retention models need to have a different focus with regard to the student-decision-making perspective. The initial enrollment decision is essentially a discrete process.

In 1987, Vincent Tinto proposed the dynamic Model of Institutional Departure stating that the student retention process is clearly dependent on the student's institutional experiences. In other words, students are satisfied with the formal and informal academic and social systems tend to stay in school. To the contrary, students who have negative interactions and experiences tend to become disillusioned with school and end up withdrawing from school.

In the past 20 years, numerous comprehensive studies have concluded that most institutional factors and innovative teaching methods can significantly motivate students to learn and stay in school.

Regardless of the particular approaches taken in a model, the general process of student retention remains the same: Both experiences before entering school and academic abilities are important; the way students interact in the social and academic environment once in school are important, as are factors from outside of the institution, particularly the cost of attending; and the attitudes a student forms about the institution and about his or her role of being a student at a particular institution (Do I fit in? Am I developing? Am I validated?) are also important aspects of a student's decision to remain enrolled.

Teaching is an art. It can be refined by training and practice. The availability of capable teachers is also vital in the restoration of the educational system. The quality of education is directly related to the quality of instruction in the classrooms. It is a fact that the academic qualifications, knowledge of the subject matter, competence, experience and skills of teaching and the commitment of the teacher have effective impact on the teaching learning process. Quality improvement in education depends upon proper training of teachers.

Academic Roots. Schools Matter. This statement is a truism to most. However, it must be followed by a statement of why schools matter, especially in light of the current debate surrounding schools nowadays concerning curriculum. Curriculum includes the different subjects a school has to offer. It also includes the quality of instruction a school has to offer to their students. Would that quality of instruction give difficulties for students or not? Curriculum may be defined in different ways but it would only mean the same that curriculum is one of the most important things in the academic area of an educational institution.

In relation to curriculum, school facilities also count. Those involved in school planning and design see this as an opportunity to enhance academic outcomes by creating better learning environments (Schneider 2002). He also added that the logic is compelling how can we expect students to perform at high levels in school buildings that are substandard? We all know that clean, quiet, safe, comfortable, and healthy environments are an important component of successful teaching and learning. Nevertheless, which facility attributes affect academic outcomes the most and in what manner and degree? A growing body of research addresses these questions.

Since every classroom consists of a wide array of students, each student brings with them different student learning styles, different interests, and different life experiences that make each classroom unique and special. There are several ways that teachers can tap into the individual learning styles and interests of students, thus making learning more fun and meaningful all at the same time. One excellent way to start is by having an environment conducive for learning and growing.

Kounin (2007) defined an environment conducive to learning and growing as "producing a high rate of work involvement and a low rate of deviancy in academic settings." It includes "the provisions and procedures necessary to establish and maintain an environment in which instruction and learning can occur and the preparation of the classroom as an effective learning environment" (Fraser, 2003). A well-managed school setting is then one in which pupils are consistently engaged in the learning tasks, giving incentives to students and acknowledging and honing students' talents and skills.

Motivational Roots. Based upon a literature review and an analysis of best practices, it seems almost self-evident that student engagement, including extracurricular activities, has a positive impact on student academic performance. NSSE reports, for example, have been widely used to study the relationship between student engagement and academic performance (National Survey of Student Engagement [NSSE] 2007 &2008). One recent study on second-year retention showed that "stayers" most likely participated in more extracurricular activities and spent more time on activities such as involvement in student clubs, athletic teams, or other social activities than did "leavers"(Williford & Wadley, 2008). However, another study seemed to suggest that participation in sports, fraternities, and sororities could either enhance or decrease student academic motivation (Van Etten, Pressley, McInerney & Darmanegara, 2008).

Rewards and privileges are great motivational tools for hard work (Hearn and Longanecker, 2005). Teachers can use a variety of them to encourage student motivation for participation. Many students may not ask for appreciation when they do exemplary work in schools, but they need to be appreciated, recognized and acknowledged. In this way, students would be encouraged

and motivated to do more because the appreciation they receive, added Hearn and Longanecker.

Several groundbreaking studies on this topic (Astin, 1985; Tinto, 1993; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005) suggest that there is a positive correlation between student engagement and student learning and persistence. Astin theorized that student learning is a function of a student's level of academic and social involvement with the institutional environment, whereas Tinto posited that extent to which students share the values and norms of other individuals in the institution influences their persistence in school.

Psychosocial Roots. In modern Western societies, schools are among the most influential institutions for socialization and the shaping of human personality (Ladd, 1990). Ladd also added that the adjustment of students to the requirements of school life is a complex task demanding adaptive abilities, coping skills and psychological resilience. Poor academic performance is associated with early dropout from the educational system and this, in turn, has long-term adverse effects on the life of adolescents and adults.

The students' home and school environments provide the foundation for learning. This includes both physical and mental readiness. Physically, parents need to send their children to school on time, well rested and well fed. Mentally, you need to send your child to school happy and calm, motivated to learn, and well behaved. In addition, you need to send your children to school prepared to learn. This includes helping them to discipline themselves to work hard and use good work habits. Adding to that, a health home environment provides good guidance and an increased self-esteem to students.

Financial Roots. Research confirms that money problems chip away at mental and physical health, and data shows that although schools may shelter students from some of life's rigors, it doesn't exempt them from the devastation of financial stress (Mendoza, 2006).

Mendoza added that, in comments and open-ended responses, students described worrying over parents losing their jobs, increases in tuition, fixed scholarship amounts, the need to work more (decreasing their time to study), and whether they should transfer to more affordable schools. Aside from the tuition fees, there are more fees to consider that add up to the worries of the parents and of the students. These fees may include other school fees like trips, projects, camps and school supplies that the parents might not be able to afford that affects students eagerness to stay in school.

There are a number of unresolved issues in the enrollment literature. One point of discussion within the enrollment literature relates to defining "price." A general overall perspective clearly recognizes that tuition is only part of the price faced by the student. For many parents, the price may be viewed as having two major components. The first component is the opportunity cost of their income while their kids are in school. This component may differ widely from student to student depending in part on their parents' jobs. (Wetzel 1999)

The second component according to Wetzel is that there is also a clear recognition that the explicit price to the student may be only marginally related to the cost of actually producing the education. The cost of producing that education may be divided among taxpayers and income from school endowments, as well as the tuition and fees collected directly from the students. As various states have altered their spending priorities, this division or sharing of the cost has been changing. This is especially true for urban public schools, where the cost-sharing picture may be further muddled as state support has decreased, which may have caused tuition increases, which may then be financed through increased use of federal dollars either in the form of grants or guaranteed loan programs. In this case, there has been a shifting of the costs from the state taxpayers to the federal taxpayers. This pattern may drive an additional wedge between the cost of producing the education and the explicit price faced by the parents.

After School Programs. Based from the UCLA National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards and Student testing, elementary school students attending afterschool program improved their regular school day attendance and reported higher aspirations regarding finishing school and going to college. Additionally, participants are 20 percent less likely to drop out of school compared to matched nonparticipants. (UCLA National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards and Student Testing, June 2000, December 2005 and September 2007)

A New Hampshire statewide study of students participating in academically focused after school programs, including those funded by the federal 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program (21st CCLC), found that more than half of regular attendees improved both behaviorally and academically. (RMC Research, 2005)

Annual performance report data from 21st CCLC grantees across the country demonstrate that students attending 21st CCLC programs improve their reading (43%) and math grades (42%). Students who attend 21st CCLC programs more regularly are more likely to improve their grades and their performance on state assessments. (Learning Point Associates, November 2007)

Participants in North Carolina's Young Scholars Program with at least 280 hours in the program averaged double-digit increases annually for proficiency in both math and reading. Promotion rates rose by 38 percent. Furthermore, the number of Young Scholars receiving A's and B's increased an average of 38 percent, while the number receiving F's decreased an average of 50 percent. (Z Smith Reynolds Foundation, 2006)

Active participants in programs offered by The After-School Corporation (TASC) were more likely to take and pass the Regents Math Sequential 1 exam by ninth grade than were non-participants. Thirty-two percent of active ninth grade participants took and passed the exam,

compared to one percent of ninth grade non-participants. Fifty-two percent of active participants took and passed the Math Sequential 2 and 3 exams, compared to 15 percent of non-participants in the same grades. (Policy Studies Associates, Inc., 2004)

The Promising Afterschool Programs Study, a study of about 3,000 low-income, ethnically diverse elementary students, found that students reported improved social and behavioral outcomes: elementary students reported reductions in aggressive behavior towards other students and skipping school.

A meta-analysis of 73 afterschool evaluations concluded that afterschool programs employing evidence-based approaches to improving students' personal and social skills were consistently successful in producing multiple benefits for youth including improvements in children's personal, social and academic skills, as well as their self-esteem. (University of Illinois at Chicago, Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning, 2007)

Scope and Limitation of the Study

This study was limited to students of the basic education level at selected Bilingual Schools in Pathumthani, Thailand. The survey was administered by the researcher herself and with the assistance of school staff.

1. The study was intended to determine the level of student attrition intent in selected bilingual and schools in Pathumthani Province in relation to academic, psychological, financial, and motivational factors. The finding should not be generalized for other schools.
2. The study was intended to determine if there is a significant difference in the level of student attrition intent when analyzed according to gender, educational attainment, and economic status of parents of Grades 4-6 students. The findings should not be generalized or other factors not covered by the study.

Methodology

The descriptive method is used in this study. This method is used to determine whether there are significant differences between selected variables of interest (Ariola, 2006).

The respondents of the study-included parents of Grades 4-6 students in selected bilingual schools (see Table 1). Snowball sampling was used in order to gather data. The data gathered through the questionnaires were tallied and treated using the following statistical tools.

Weighted Mean. It was used to compute with extra weight given to one or more elements of the sample.

T – Test. It was used to determine the significant difference between the two factors of educational attainment and economic status of the respondents.

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). It is used to analyze the significant differences among the factors of teaching experience of the respondents.

Findings

Academic factors. These included the level of the student attrition intent of respondents with lack of school activities, low student academic achievement in terms of numeracy and literacy, no student learning support programs, e.g., no remedial class, no tutorial class and no intervention programs for under achieving students and no academic programs for advanced students are above the expected level. However, this further implies that the level of student attrition intent of respondents with the difficulty of subjects and the low over-all student academic performance are within the expected level. It implies that the respondents transfer their children to another school if these factors mentioned above are existing in an educational institution where their children are currently studying. These findings support the idea of Kounin (1970) that an academically successful educational institution is one that provides programs that do not only hone students' numeracy and literacy skills but also cater to the students' special and individual needs. The students will then be consistently engaged in the learning tasks, will be aware of the value of incentives in class, and will then perform better each day (see Table 2).

Motivational Factors. Data show that the obtained overall mean is neutral. This means that the student attrition level intent for motivational factors in terms of no extracurricular activities implemented to motivate students to attend school, e.g., Science clubs, English club, Math club, Sports club, Arts and Culture Club is. This also means that in terms of no recognition and appreciation of student achievement, limited student exposure to educational activities like field trips, lack of giving attention to under achieving students and teachers' unfair treatment among students are within the expected level. This means that the respondents agree that extracurricular activities could motivate students to stay in school (see table 3)

Psychosocial Factors. Data reveal that the level of student attrition intent for psychosocial roots is neutral. This means that the level of student attrition in terms of student-student bullying and teachers' undesirable behavior is below the expected level. This further implies that the parents are in a critical situation. Anytime, the parents may pull their children out of the schools once the schools do not take good care of their students.

Data also reveal that the student attrition intent level in terms of lack of programs to develop a sense of belongingness among students, lack of safety measures in the learning environment, and lack of facilities, equipment to develop social and athletic skills among students are within the expected levels. This means that the level of student attrition intent for lack of activities to develop social skills is above the expected level. This also means that the respondents believe that the lack of activities to develop social skills affects greatly the intent of student attrition. This further explains that the respondents believe least that student-student bullying and teachers' undesirable behavior affects the student attrition intent.

Financial Factors. Data revealed that the level of student attrition intent in terms of tuition, instructional materials, support for the daily student needs, and demands of students to compete with the lifestyle of his or her classmates are within the expected level. This also means that the level of student attrition intent in terms of student projects and other contributions are below the expected level. This further explains that as whole, financial roots is within the expected level.

Summary

Data show that the student attrition intent among the respondents in the selected bilingual schools in Pathumthani, Thailand is moderate. This implies that the student attrition intent among the respondents is within the expected level. This also implies that the attrition intent due to academic roots is way above the expected level of student attrition intent.

Significance of the Difference in the Student Attrition Intent of Respondents When Analyzed by Gender

The data on the student attrition intent of the respondents were grouped by gender and their mean differences were tested using the t-test for uncorrected samples for means of the two groups were compared. Results of the computations are shown in Table 7.

Analysis of the data shows that computed t-value of indicators for the intent of the respondents is not significant. This means that the respondents did not differ significantly in terms of academic, motivational, psychosocial, and financial factors. This implies that the student attrition intent of male and female parents is the same and therefore the grouping of the respondents by gender does not contribute a significant mean difference. Data furthermore imply that gender of the respondents in this study is not a factor of difference and therefore, the null hypothesis of no significant difference in the student attrition intent of the respondents when analyzed by gender is accepted. It means both male and female parents have the same perspective in terms of student attrition intent.

Significance of the Difference in the Student Attrition Intent of the Respondents When Analyzed by Educational Attainment

The gathered data were grouped by educational attainment and their mean differences were compared to verify whether the educational attainment of the respondents is a factor of difference in areas of academic factors, motivational factors, psychosocial factors, and financial roots. The comparison of the mean differences required the use of One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and data are shown in Table 8.

Data imply that the mean scores of the respondents regardless of the educational attainment are not significant. This further implies that the intent of the respondents is the same for academic, motivational, and psychosocial but differs in financial. It implies that parents who graduated from high school transfer their children to another school due to financial reasons.

Significance of the Difference in the Student Attrition Intent of the Respondents When Analyzed by Economic Status

The gathered data were grouped by economic status and their mean differences were compared to verify whether the economic status of the respondents is a factor of difference in areas of academic factors, motivational roots, psychosocial roots, and financial factors. The comparison of the mean differences required the use of One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and data are shown in Table 9.

Data imply that the mean scores of the respondents regardless of economic status are not significant. This further implies that the intent of the respondents is the same in terms of academic and financial factors but differs in motivational and psychosocial. This also implies that the parents with monthly income more than 21,000 Bath will likely transfer their children to another school due to motivational factors. This further implies that parents with less than 10,000 monthly incomes will transfer their children to another school due to psychosocial factors. However, since the overall p value is higher than .05, therefore the null hypothesis is accepted.

Summary, Conclusion and Recommendations

Presented in this chapter are the summary, conclusions and recommendations based on the findings of the study.

Summary of Findings

The findings of the study are presented as follows:

1. The mean values of the indicators for student attrition were 3.60 or agree for academic roots; 3.13 or neutral for motivational and psychosocial roots; and 2.93 or neutral for financial roots. The over-all mean for the indicators of student attrition was 3.21 or neutral.

2. When analyzed by gender, the computed t-value for academic roots was 1.848 with .066 p-value or accepted, the t-value for motivational roots was 1.696 with .091 p-value or accepted, the t-value for psychosocial roots was .760 with .448 p-value or accepted, the t-value for financial roots was -.328 with .743 p-value or accepted and the over-all computed t-value was 1.897 with .059 as p-value or accepted. When grouped by educational attainment, the computed f-ratio for academic roots was .108 with .898 p-value or accepted, the f-ratio for motivational roots was 1.386 with .252 p-value or accepted, the f-ratio for psychosocial roots was .230 with .795 p-value or accepted, the f-ratio for financial roots was 9.542 with .000 p-value or rejected and the over-all computed r-ratio was 1.446 with .237 as p-value or accepted. When grouped by economic status, the computed f-ratio for academic roots was 1.807 with .166 p-value or accepted, the f-ratio for motivational roots was 5.096 with .007 p-value or rejected, the f-ratio for psychosocial roots was 4.598 with .011 p-value or rejected, the f-ratio for financial roots was .339 with .713 p-value or rejected and the over-

all computed f-ratio was 1.410 with .246 as p-value or accepted.

3. The computed percentages for the school programs were 97.33% for the After School English Reading Program; 92.66% for Swimming; 88.33% for After School Math Tutorial Program; 84.33% for After School Computer Literacy Program; 73.33% for After School Science Club Activities; 65.33% for football; 56.33% for playing piano; 54% for basketball and playing stringed instruments; 52% for table tennis; 49% for dancing; 46% for playing percussion instruments; 40% for acting; 37.66% for singing; 37% for sepak takraw; and 36% for track and field.

Conclusions

Based on the foregoing findings, the following conclusions are drawn:

1. The indicators of student attrition were overall within the expected level. The respondents from the selected bilingual school in Pathumthani, Thailand mostly agreed that students leave schools due to the lack of emphasis on the schools' academics. There were many factors in motivational, psychosocial and financial areas of schools that were also measured, thus needing more attention and exploration to retain the students in schools.

2. The gender of the respondents is not a factor of difference in the student attrition rates in schools. Either of the two, parents will not hesitate to pull their children out from the school once they notice that the student is not given an approach that would improve the student mainly in academics though some psychosocial, motivational and financial reasons are also factors. The educational attainment of the respondents particularly those who are high school graduates and those who are in the college level are affected. The respondents who belong in this bracket think that financially, they get affected and may be a reason for them to pull their child out from the schools. The economic status of the respondents specifically those earning less than 10,000 baht per month gets affected motivationally and psychosocially. The respondents who belong in this bracket think that their kids are not treated equally with those whose parents are earning more thus may become a reason why students do not want to come to school anymore.

3. The school programs for retention were responded well. The respondents from the selected bilingual schools in Pathumthani, Thailand mostly want to have an After School English Reading Program, followed by offering a Swimming Program. Other programs that more than half of the respondents responded positively were After School Math, Science and Computer Programs. Other sports/performing arts programs that were responded positively were football, playing piano, basketball, playing stringed instruments and playing table tennis. The respondents think that by the presence of these school programs, student will stay and not leave their schools.

Recommendations

Based on the foregoing findings and conclusions, the following recommendations are offered:

1. Implementation of the different comprehensive student retention programs that will improve the student academically and psychosocially. These programs will also motivate the students to stay in school. The programs that have been mentioned were Reading Recovery Program; EFL/ESL Programs; Math, Science and Computer Programs; and After School Physical Activities Programs.

2. The schools should see to it that there would be equal treatments among students whether they come from a less fortunate family or from a rich family. This will prevent students who come from less fortunate family feel that they do not belong to the school. This way, student will feel sense of acceptance wherever he/she came from.

3. The school should have programs like tapping an NGO for an Adopt a Child Program to help parents who are earning less to sustain the needs of the children and be able to stay in school.

4. Replication of this study using indicators not covered is highly recommended to the researchers to investigate further the factors influencing student attrition intent.

References

Allington, R. L. (2001). *What really matters for struggling readers: Designing research-based programs*. New York: Longman, pp. 23-27

Annon, D. V. (2003). College student retention - defining student retention, a profile of successful institutions and students, theories of student departure. *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 72, April 2003

Annon, D. V. (2004). *Improving your child is learning and grades*. Vol. 13 p. 47-46

Ariola, M. (2006). *Principles and methods of research*. Manila: Rex Printing Company Inc.

Askew, B. J., Kaye, E., Frasier, D. F., Mobasher, M., Anderson, N., & Rodriguez, Y. G. (2003). Making a case for prevention in education. In S. Forbes & C. Briggs (Eds.), *Research in Reading Recovery*, volume two (pp. 113-158). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Bean, P. (2000). Dropouts and Turnover: The Synthesis and Test of a Causal Model of Student Attrition. *Research in Higher Education* 12:155–187.

Bean, J. (2001). *Why students leave: insights from research in the strategic management of college enrollments.* ed. Don Hossler and John P. Bean. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bean, J & Eaton, S. (2000). *A Psychological Model of College Student Retention in Rethinking the Departure Puzzle: New Theory and Research on College Student Retention*, ed. John M. Braxton. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.

Bean, J. & Metzner, B. (2005). A Conceptual Model of Nontraditional Undergraduate Student Attrition. *Review of Educational Research* 55:485–540.

Chamot, A. U., and G. Stewner-Manzanares (2003). A summary of current literature on English as a second language. Part c: research AGENDA. Rosslyn, VA: Inter-America Research Associates, ED 261 539.

Clay, M. M., Gill, M., Glynn, T., McNaughton, T., & Salmon, K. (2003). *Record of oral language and biks and gutches*. Auckland, New Zealand: Heinemann.

Clay, M. (2002). *Reading: The patterning of complex behavior*. Auckland, New Zealand: Heinemann. (Other editions 1979, 1985)

Clay, M. (2005). *Literacy lessons designed for individuals part one: Why? When? And How?* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Clay, M. M. (2005). *Literacy lessons designed for individuals' part two: Teaching procedures.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Clay, M. M. (2002, 2006). *An observation survey of early literacy achievement.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Dorn, L. J. & Soffos, C. (2001). *Shaping literate minds: Developing self-regulated learners*. Portland, ME: Stenhouse Publishers.

Escamilla, K., Andrade, A. M., Basurto, A., & Ruiz, O. (2006). *Instrumento de observación de los logros de la lecto-escritura inicial*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Ferguson, B. (2001). *The Performance Evaluation.*

Fountas, I. C. & Pinnell, G. S. (2001). *Guiding readers and writers*, grades 3-6: Teaching comprehension, genre, and content literacy. Portsmouth. NH: Heinemann.

Hearn, D. and Longanecker, W. (1985), *Factors Affecting Student Probabilities: A Case Study*

Hearnsten, R. & Murray, C. (2004). *The Bell Curve Boston*. McGraw Hill

Ingersoll, R (1999). *Testing Teacher Candidates: The Role of Licensure Tests in Improving Teacher Quality.*

Jackson, M., Duvall, C., Ford, R., Frasier, D., Newman, C., & Salinas, K. (2004). Building ownership for Reading Recovery/Descubriendo la Lectura with school teams. *Journal of Reading Recovery*, 3(2) 44-51.

Ladd, J (2000). Handbook of Research on the Education of Young Children.

Learning Point Associates, November 2007

Leslie, W. & Brinkman, D. (2007). *Price Response and Enrollment Decisions: An Analysis.*

Mahoney, J., Lord, H., & Carryl, E., Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

McKeon, D. (2002). Different Types of ESL Programs. *ERIC Digest. ED289360*. ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics Washington *DC. 1987-12-00.*

Mendoza, P. (2007). Recession Impact Cripples Student Finances

Ohio State Dept. of Education (2007). *Strategies for Developing Language Programs for National Origin Minority Students* (rev. ed.). Columbus, OH: Ohio State Dept. of Education, 1987. ED 255 034.

Ovando, C. J., and V. P. Collier (2005). *Bilingual and ESL Classrooms.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1985.

Pinnell, G. S. (2000). *Reading Recovery: An analysis of a research-based reading intervention*. Columbus, OH: Reading Recovery Council of North America.

Ramirez, J. D. Comparing Structured English Immersion and Bilingual Education: First Year Results of a National Study. *American Journal of Education* 95 (2006): 122-49.

RMC Research, 2005

Seelye, H. N., and B. N. Navarro. *A Guide to the Selection of Bilingual Education Program Designs.* Arlington Heights, IL: Bilingual Education Service Center, 1977.

Scneider, M. (2002). Do School Facilities Affect Academic Outcomes?

Smith-Burke, M., Pinnell, G. S., Jackson, M., Wey, S., Askew, B. J., & Hambright-Brown, E. (2002). *A principal's guide to Reading Recovery*. Columbus, OH: Reading Recovery Council of North America.

Thanasoulas, D. *What do teachers bring to teaching-learning process?*

Tinto, V. (1985). Drop out from higher education: A theoretical synthesis of recent research. *Review of Education Research*, 45, 89:125.

Tinto, V. (1978). Limit of theory and practice in student attrition. *Journal of Higher Education*, 43, 687:700.

Tinto, V. (2008). *Leaving collage: rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

UCLA National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards and Student Testing, June 2000, December 2005 and September 2007

University of Minnesota, Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement, March 2004

Wetzel, J. N., O'Toole, D. and Peterson, S., (1999). Factors affecting student retention probabilities: a case study. *Journal of Education and Finance*. 23 (1), 45:554.

Table 1: Distribution of Respondents

Respondents	Number of Cases	Percentage
Male	150	50%
Female	150	50%
Total	300	100%

Table 2: Level of Student Attrition Intent in Terms of Academic Roots

Items for Academic Roots	Mean	Level
1. Difficulty of Subjects	3.26	Neutral
2. Lack of school facilities	3.56	Agree
3. Low student academic achievement in terms of numeracy and literacy	3.84	Agree
4. Low over all student academic performance	3.00	Neutral
5. No student learning support programs e.g. no remedial class, no tutorial class and no intervention programs for under achiever student	4.02	Agree
6. No academic program for advanced students	3.95	Agree
MEAN	3.60	Agree

Table 3: Level of Student Attrition Intent in Terms of Motivational Factors

Items for Motivational Roots	Mean	Level
1. No extracurricular activities implemented to motivate students to attend school e.g. Science clubs, English club, Math club, Sports club, Arts and Culture Club	3.72	Agree
2. No recognition and appreciation of student achievement	3.48	Neutral
3. Limited student exposure to educational activities like field trips	2.83	Neutral
4. Lack of giving attention to under achieving students	2.75	Neutral
5. Teachers unfair treatment among students	2.89	Neutral
MEAN	3.13	Neutral

Table 4: Level of Student Attrition Intent in Terms of Psychosocial Factors

Items for Psychosocial Roots	Mean	Level
1. Student-student bullying	2.03	Disagree
2. Teacher undesirable behavior e.g. threatening, scolding for students little mistakes	2.69	Disagree
3. Lack of activities to develop social skills	4.08	Agree
4. Lack of program to develop sense of belongingness among students	3.34	Neutral
5. Lack of safety measures in the learning environment	2.83	Neutral
6. Lack of facilities, equipment to develop social and athletic skills among students	3.83	Agree
MEAN	3.13	Neutral

Table 5: Level of Student Attrition Intent in Terms of Financial Factors

Items for Financial Roots	Mean	Level
1. Tuition fees are too high	3.09	Neutral
2. Instructional materials like books, modules are costly	2.83	Neutral
3. Student projects and other contributions are so high	2.65	Disagree
4. Can hardly support the daily student needs	2.73	Neutral
5. Can hardly meet the demands of students to compete with the lifestyle of his or her classmates	3.38	Neutral
Overall Mean	2.93	Neutral

Table 6: Student Attrition Intent in Selected Schools in Pathumthani Province

Indicators for Student Attrition Intent:	Mean	Descriptive Equivalent
Academic Root	3.60	Agree
Motivational Root	3.13	Neutral
Psychosocial Root	3.13	Neutral
Financial Root	2.93	Neutral
Overall Mean	3.21	Neutral

Table 7: Significance of the Difference in the Student Attrition Intent of Respondents When Analyzed by Gender

Indicators	Gender		Mean Difference	Computed t-value	P-value	Decision on Ho
	Male N=65	Female N=134				
Academic	3.64	3.56	.08037	1.848	.066	Accepted
Motivational	3.17	3.09	.08679	1.696	.091	Accepted
Psychosocial	3.14	3.11	.02731	.760	.448	Accepted
Financial	2.92	2.94	-.01796	-.328	.743	Accepted
Overall Mean	3.24	3.19	.04540	1.897	.059	Accepted

Note: Significant (Sig) if p <).05; NS – Not significant

Table 8: Significance of the Difference in the Student Attrition Intent of the Respondents When Analyzed by Educational Attainment

Indicators	Educational Attainment			Computed F-Ratio	P-Value	Decision Ho
	High School	College Level	College Graduate			
Academic Root	3.61	3.62	3.60	.108	.898	Accepted
Motivational Root	3.11	3.06	3.16	1.386	.252	Accepted
Psychosocial Root	3.09	3.13	3.13	.230	.795	Accepted
Financial Root	3.23	3.23	2.87	9.542	.000	Rejected
Overall	3.27	3.21	3.20	1.446	.237	Accepted

Note: Significant if p<0.05; NS – Not Significant

Table 9: Significance of the Difference in the Student Attrition Intent of the Respondents When Analyzed by Economic Status

Indicators	Economic Status			Computed F-Ratio	P-Value	Decision Ho
	Less than 10,000/ Month N=30	10,000-20,000/ Month N=98	21,000 and above/ Month N=170			
Academic Root	3.48	3.64	3.60	1.807	.166	Accepted
Motivational Root	2.87	3.13	3.17	5.096	.007	Rejected
Psychosocial Root	3.30	3.14	3.10	4.598	.011	Rejected
Financial Root	2.90	2.96	2.92	.339	.713	Accepted
Overall	3.16	3.23	3.2157	1.410	.246	Accepted

Note: Significant if p<0.05; NS – Not Significant

Table 10: School Programs for Student Retention

1. After-school English Reading Program	97.33%
2. After-school Math Tutorial Program	88.33%
3. After-school Science Club Activities	73.33%
4. After-school Sports Activities	
4.1 basketball	54.00%
4.2 football	65.33%
4.3 sepak takraw	37.00%
4.4 table tennis	52.00%
4.5 swimming	92.66%
4.6 track and field	36.00%
5. After-school Performing Arts Program	
5.1 Singing	37.66%
5.2 Dancing	49.00%
5.3 Acting	40.66%
5.4 Playing Piano	56.33%
5.5 Playing Stringed Instruments	54.00%
5.6 Playing Percussion Instruments	46.00%
6. After-school Computer Literacy Program	84.33%