

Assessment of school learners' prevention program in selected public secondary schools in Carsigma: Basis for enhancement intervention program

Joseph SY Butawan*

Ama Computer College, Cavite Campus Dasmarinas, Philippines

ABSTRACT

In the Philippines, the school dropout problem is increasing and is serious as ever. From early 1925 until present, the dropout problem has been considered as a priority concern highlighting the educational wastage. The study used descriptive survey method and utilizes purposive sampling with 250 actual samples. The top three causes of dropouts were financial problem followed by family and health problems. Comparing the assessments of the three groups of respondents on efficiency, relevance, adequacy and responsiveness on the school learners prevention programs of the DepEd with a total grand mean of 4.19 interpreted as very satisfactory (VS). The developed and enhancement intervention program entitled "Moving Forward Program" composed of six (6) programs for parents, teachers, and students at risks and out-of school youth was proposed. Objectives were set together with the key result areas. Then target areas are identified to measure if the objectives are realized. After which, strategies were planned wherein, the activities, resources, program duration were identified. After completing the program, a developed and enhanced intervention program was made.

Key words: School Leavers, assessment, prevention, program

1. INTRODUCTION

Education is commonly referred to as the process of learning and obtaining knowledge in school. Dropouts among school children are one of the most complicated problems that continually beset the Philippine educational system [1-2]. The internal efficiency of school

brought primarily by this problem has been with the system long enough to disturb and move both policy-makers and administrators [3]. Early dropout from school is growing, especially among the poor and depressed rural areas and this issue is unchecked. Children are forced out of school to help augment family income.

Thus, it is depriving them from their basic education right.

The students who chose to drop out of high school have their own story and reason for their decision [4]. This was caused by lack of interest in school, financial and family situations, health issue. It did not provide the support the students needed to fill the academic deficiencies and their success at school level [5-6]. With all the varying reasons that students give for dropping out of high school, we know that there is no one clear answer to this problem and no single strategy that will meet the needs of all these students. In this issue, we seek to provide information on what has been shown to work based on research and evidence and some innovative strategies being used in our states [7]. In the Philippines, the students dropping out school is a serious problem. As early as 1925 up to the present, the dropout problem has been considered as a priority concern highlighting the educational wastage [8].

In General Mariano Alvarez Technical High School (GMATHS), Division of Cavite, the researcher graduated the secondary school and also in Carmona National High School (CNHS). The school conduct teaching practice during the course work. But observed that students drop out due to some reasons. Oftentimes, parents are very reluctant to come to school if summoned, for their thoughts are pre occupied that surely they are called because of their child's shortcomings [9]. Since the schools are situated in a relocation area, most of the parents are from below-average income group and most

of them are living as ambulant vendors or spend their weekends in the market to sell vegetables to earn money for their needs [10]. Poverty is a driving force to both parents and their children to drop out from school. They want education but they lack the motivating force to support their children to pursue their studies [11].

Public school educators are mandated to educate all students with a curriculum that complies with government requirements [12]. Localities are faced with an abundance of students with poor academic achievement. Schools must educate students who lag behind their peers in academic achievement and who are at-risk of dropping out of school. If unchecked, the dropout rate problem will result to higher illiteracy rate because of the tendency of early school leavers to "revert to illiteracy" after several years of staying out-of-school without completing basic education. Minimizing or eliminating school leavers and having more graduates will be a big help in the country's economic recovery. This condition challenges all people concerned with education to undertake measures to remedy this problem [13]. Considerably, dropouts are a persistent problem in Philippines. Many researches have been conducted to reduce dropout rates and many intervention programs have been formulated to improve school and educational outcomes [14]. One of the factors that can lessen dropouts and thus improve chances of having youth stay in school are if parents are more cooperative, collaborative and involved in their child's

schooling and an enhanced intervention program is developed for students.

It is in this context that the researcher was motivated to pursue this study with high hopes of contributing to the solution of the dropout problem.

Research questions

This study aims to assess the dropout prevention programs in selected public secondary schools in CARSIGMA, a basis for developing an enhanced intervention program.

Specifically, it sought answers to the following questions:

1. What is the status of the following Dropout Prevention Program in CARSIGMA for the past three (3) years as to:

1.1 Balik-Eswela

- a) Number of recipient
- b) Year implemented
- c) Requirements/criteria for selection
- d) Budget

1.2 Open High School Program (OHSP)

- a) Persons involved
- b) Qualification

1.3 Alternative Learning System (ALS)

2. What is the cohort participation and survival of the three (3) participating schools in CARSIGMA from 2009-2012?

2.1 Survival

2.2 Participation

2.3 Dropouts

2.4 Common Causes of Dropout

3. How do the school administrators, teachers, and parents assess the dropout prevention program in public secondary schools in CARSIGMA as to:

3.1. Efficiency

3.2. Relevance

3.3. Adequacy

3.4. Responsiveness

4. Is there a significant difference among the assessment of the respondents as to the aforementioned variables?

5. Based on the findings, what intervention program may be developed?

6. How Suitable, Acceptable and Feasible (SAF) is the proposed intervention program as assessed by the school administrators and teachers?

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1. Research Design

This study used descriptive research design [15]. This kind of research design attempts to find generalizable attributes and deals with the dropout prevention programs in selected public schools in CARSIGMA which could serve as the basis for an enhanced intervention program in Carmona National High School, Muntingllog National High School, and General Mariano Alvarez Technical High School for the past three years 2010-2013, this research design is deemed appropriate to be used. Likewise, variable that was used deals on the relationship

of dropout prevention programs and the proposed intervention program hence, descriptive-correlational research design fits the purpose.

2.2. Population and Sampling

This study includes 216 respondents, consists of 135 dropout parents, 68 teachers and 13 school administrators in the three (3) participating schools in CARSIGMA. The researcher utilizes purposive sampling. According to Tongco MDC (2007) for purposive sampling technique, respondents for the study were chosen based on their knowledge of the information required.

As shown in table 1, the respondents of the study is composed of 135 dropout parent which is 90 per cent of the population of the dropout parent, 68 teachers that is 57.14 per cent of the population of the teachers and 13 school administrators that is 65 per cent of the

Respondents	Population	Sample	Percentage
Parent	150	135	90
Teacher	119	68	57.14
School Administrators	20	13	65

population of the administrators in the three participating schools in CARSIGMA in Cavite.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

From the analysis of data, the salient findings of the study are as follows:

3.1. Status of dropout preventions program as to:

3.1.1. Balik-Eswela/Aral:

Data show that Carmona National High School ranked No. 1 with 443 students enrolled in Balik-Eswela; followed by General Mariano Alvarez Technical High School which ranked No. 2 with 157 students enrolled. While, Munting Ilog National High School ranked No. 3 with 57 students enrolled.

3.1.2. Open High School Program

Based on the data presented, Munting Ilog National High School has the highest enrolled/passed students with 312 enrolled and 266 who passed during the past three (3) years from 2010-2013 with 85.26%; followed by Carmona National High School with 84 students who enrolled and 72 passed with 85.71%; and the last is General Mariano Alvarez Technical who passed with 76.56%. During 2010-2011, a total of 130 students who enrolled and 104 passed with 80%. In school year 2011-2012, 150 students who enrolled and 122 passed with

Schools	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	Total
Carmona national high school	126	150	167	443
Munting ilog national h.s.	15	19	23	57
Gen.mariano alvarez tech.h.s	41	55	61	157
Grand total	182	224	251	657

Joseph SY Butawan (2021). Assessment of school learners' prevention program in selected public secondary schools in Carsigma: Basis for enhancement intervention program. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Applied and Basic Subjects*, 1(2), 14-27.

81.33%; and school year 2012-2013, 180 students enrolled and 161 passed. A grand total

Table 3. Number of Students Enrolled and Passed in Open High School

Schools	2010-2011			2011-2012			2012-2013			Total		
	Enrolled	Passed	%	Enrolled	Passed	%	Enrolled	Passed	%	Enrolled	Passed	%
Carmona national high school	20	15	75	26	23	88.46	38	34	89.47	84	72	85.71
Munting ilog national h.s.	99	79	79.80	111	86	77.48	102	101	99.02	312	266	85.26
Gen.mariano alvarez tech.h.s	11	10	90.91	13	13	100	40	26	65	64	49	76.56
Grand total	130	104	80	150	122	81.33	180	161	89.44	460	387	84.1

Table 4. Number of Students Enrolled and Passed in ALS

Schools	2011			2012			2013			Total		
	Enrolled	Passed	%	Enrolled	Passed	%	Enrolled	Passed	%	Enrolled	Passed	%
Carmona national high school	25	11	44	33	14	42	38	16	42.11	96	41	42.71
Munting ilog national h.s.	20	11	55	22	13	59.09	38	22	57.89	80	46	57.50
Gen.mariano alvarez tech.h.s	160	60	25	372	41	3.76	390	52	13.33	922	153	16.59
Grand total	205	82	40	427	68	15.93	466	90	19.31	1098	240	21.86

Table 5: Cohort Participation, Survival and Dropout from S.Y. 2010-2013

Schools	2010-2011			2011-2012			2012-2013			Composite		
	PR (%)	SR (%)	DR (%)	PR (%)	SR (%)	DR (%)	PR (%)	SR (%)	DR (%)	PR (%)	SR (%)	DR (%)
Carmona national high school	100	93	7	100	93	7	100	92.91	7.09	100	92.97	7.03
Munting ilog national h.s.	100	96.12	3.88	100	94.53	5.47	100	95	5	100	95.22	4.78
Gen.mariano alvarez technical high school	100	85.20	14.80	100	90.36	9.64	100	92.91	6.09	100	89.50	10.5
Average in percent(%)	100	91.44	8.56	100	92.63	7.37	100	93.61	6.29	100	92.56	7.44

High School with 64 enrolled students and 49 of

460 enrolled and 387 passed with 84.13% for the past three (3) years.

3.1.3. Alternative Learning System

It can be seen from the data in table No.12, that a total of 922 students enrolled and 153 who passed the ALS Examination with 21.86% in

General Mariano Alvarez; followed by Carmona National High School with 96 enrolled and only 41 students passed with 42.71%; and Munting Ilog National High School has a total of 80 students enrolled and 46 passed the ALS Examination with 57.50% for the past three (3) years. During the calendar year 2011, a total of

Table 6. Common Causes of Dropouts

Common Causes of Dropout	Parent	Teacher	School Administrator	Composite		Rank
				f	%	
Health Problems	39	43	8	90	12.97	3
Delinquency	17	33	5	55	7.93	7
Emotional	26	16	2	44	6.34	8
Early Pregnancy	52	26	4	82	11.82	4
Poor Academic Performance	38	20	3	61	8.79	5
Family Problem	66	48	9	123	17.72	2
Financial Problem	91	46	11	148	21.32	1
Transfer in Residency	20	33	3	56	8.07	6
Teacher Factor	11	9	0	20	2.88	9
School Factor (Regarding Policies)	7	7	1	15	2.16	10
Total	367	281	46	694	100	

Table 7. Summary Table on the Assessment of Balik-Eskwela Program

BALIK-ESKWELA	Parent		Teacher		School Administrator		Composite	
	CM	VI	CM	VI	CM	VI	CM	VI
Efficiency	4.28	E	4.12	VS	4.18	VS	4.20	E
Relevance	4.34	E	4.19	VS	4.32	E	4.28	E
Adequacy	4.12	VS	4.02	VS	4.06	VS	4.07	VS
Responsiveness	4.31	E	4.06	VS	4.08	VS	4.15	VS
Grand Mean	4.26	E	4.10	VS	4.16	VS	4.18	VS

Table 8. Assessment of Open High School Program (OHSP)

OPEN HIGH SCHOOL PROGRAM	Parent		Teacher		School Administrator		Composite	
	CM	VI	CM	VI	CM	VI	CM	VI
Efficiency	4.28	E	4.24	E	4.23	E	4.25	E
Relevance	4.37	E	4.32	E	4.35	E	4.35	E
Adequacy	4.12	VS	4.13	VS	4.11	VS	4.12	VS
Responsiveness	4.34	E	4.19	VS	4.20	E	4.24	E
Grand Mean	4.28	E	4.22	E	4.22	E	4.24	E

Table 8. Assessment of Alternative Learning System (ALS)

ALTERNATIVE LEARNING SYSTEM	Parent		Teacher		School Administrator		Composite	
	CM	VI	CM	VI	CM	VI	CM	VI
Efficiency	4.27	E	4.14	VS	4.15	VS	4.19	VS
Relevance	4.36	E	4.20	E	4.23	E	4.26	E
Adequacy	4.19	VS	4.06	VS	4.14	VS	4.13	VS
Responsiveness	4.29	E	4.14	VS	4.12	VS	4.18	VS
Grand Mean	4.28	E	4.14	VS	4.16	VS	4.19	VS

205 students enrolled and 82 students passed with 40%; followed by calendar year 2012 has a total of 427 students enrolled and 68 passed with 15.93%. And the calendar year 2013 has 466 students enrolled and 90 students passed with 19.31. A grand total of 1098 students enrolled and 240 students passed the ALS examination with 21.86% for the past three (3) calendar years.

3.2. Cohort Participation and Survival of the three (3) participating school in CARSIGMA.

Data shows, during school year 2010-2011, 91.44% survived and 8.56% dropped with 100% participation rate; followed by 2011-2012 has 92.63% survived and 7.37% dropped with 100% participation rate. Lastly, school year 2012-2013, 93.61% survived and 6.29% dropped with 100% participation rate [16]. A composite rate of 95.22% survived and 4.78% dropped in Munting Ilog National High School with 100% participation rate; followed by Carmona National High School with 92.97% survival rate and 7.03% dropped with 100% participation rate. Lastly, General Mariano Alvarez Technical High School has 89.50% survival rate with 10.5% dropout rate and 100% participation rate. A total rate of 92.56% survival rate for the past three (3) years and 7.44% dropped in their class with 100% participation rate.

3.3. Common Causes of Dropout

Based on the data presented in table 14, there are 21.32% of the total responses of the three groups of respondents as the common reason of dropped out is financial problem, 17.72% is

family problem, 12.97% is health problems, 11.82% is early pregnancy, 8.79% is poor academic performance, 8.07% is transfer in residency, 7.93% is delinquency, 6.34% is emotional problems, 2.88% is teacher factor and 2.16 is school factor. Furthermore, the top three causes of dropouts is financial problem as Rank No.1, followed by Rank No.2 in family problems and health problems in Rank No.3. Comparing the assessment done by the parents, teachers and the administrators on school learners prevention programs by Deped such as Balik-Eswela, OHSP, and ALS on its efficiency, relevance, adequacy, and responsiveness. The parents of dropout students, teachers and administrators assessed Balik-Eswela with a composite mean value of 4.20 and 4.28 on its efficiency and relevance interpreted as excellent (E) while 4.07 and 4.15 on its adequacy and responsiveness interpreted as very satisfactory (VS) with a total grand mean of 4.18 interpreted as very satisfactory (VS). Followed by the Open High School Program, as a whole all the variables of the OHSP are excellent (E) on its efficiency, relevance, and responsiveness with a total composite mean value of 4.35, 4.25, and 4.24 except adequacy with 4.12 interpreted as very satisfactory (VS) with a grand mean value of 4.24 interpreted as excellent (E) respectively. Meanwhile, Alternative Learning System (ALS); assessed by the parents, teachers, and administrators on its total composite mean value of specifically in efficiency, adequacy, and responsiveness 4.19, 4.13, and 4.18 interpreted as very satisfactory (VS) while 4.26 interpreted as excellent (E) with a total grand mean of 4.19 interpreted as very satisfactory (VS) respectively [17].

Comparing the assessment of the three groups of respondents on the efficiency, relevance, adequacy and responsiveness with the F-computed value of 1.793, 1.448, 0.047 for efficiency, relevance and adequacy respectively

are less than the than the F-critical value of 2.999 at 5% level of significant accepting the null hypothesis there is no significant difference on the assessment of the tree groups of

Table 10. Significant Difference on the Assessment of Balik-Eskwela/Aral Program

BALIK-ESKWELA PROGRAM		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F computed	p - value	Decision	Verbal Interpretation
Efficiency	Between Groups	1.165	2	0.582	1.793	0.169	Accept the H_0	Not Significant
	Within Groups	69.510	214	0.325				
	Total	70.675	216					
Relevance	Between Groups	.973	2	0.487	1.448	0.237	Accept the H_0	Not Significant
	Within Groups	71.906	214	0.336				
	Total	72.880	216					
Adequacy	Between Groups	.033	2	0.016	0.047	0.954	Accept the H_0	Not Significant
	Within Groups	75.377	214	0.352				
	Total	75.410	216					
Responsiveness	Between Groups	2.989	2	1.495	4.812	0.009	Reject the H_0	Significant
	Within Groups	66.473	214	0.311				
	Total	69.462	216					

Table 11. Responsiveness on Balik-Eskwela program

Variable		Mean Difference	p - value	Decision	Verbal Interpretation	
Respondents	Parent	Teacher	0.244*	0.014	Reject the H_0	Significant
		School Administrator	0.234	0.351	Accept H_0	Not Significant
	Teacher	Parent	-0.244*	0.014	Reject the H_0	Significant
		School Administrator	-0.009	0.998	Accept H_0	Not Significant
	School Administrator	Parent	-0.234	0.351	Accept the H_0	Not Significant
		Teacher	0.009	0.998	Accept the H_0	Not Significant

adequacy. On the other hand, for

Table 12. Significant Difference on Assessment as to the Variables of Open High School Program

Open high school program		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F computed	p - value	Decision	Verbal Interpretation
Efficiency	Between Groups	0.079	2	0.039	0.132	0.876	Accept the H_0	Not Significant
	Within Groups	63.686	214	0.298				
	Total	63.764	216					
Relevance	Between Groups	0.107	2	0.053	0.169	0.844	Accept the H_0	Not Significant
	Within Groups	67.548	214	0.316				
	Total	67.655	216					
Adequacy	Between Groups	0.004	2	0.002	0.005	0.995	Accept the H_0	Not Significant
	Within Groups	85.104	214	0.398				
	Total	85.108	216					
Responsiveness	Between Groups	1.078	2	0.539	1.897	0.153	Accept the H_0	Not Significant
	Within Groups	60.796	214	0.284				
	Total	61.874	216					

Table 13. Significant Difference among the Assessment of the Respondents as to the Variables of Alternative Learning System

Alternative learning system		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F computed	p - value	Decision	Verbal Interpretation
Efficiency	Between Groups	0.849	2	0.425	1.531	0.219	Accept the H_0	Not Significant
	Within Groups	59.346	214	0.277				
	Total	60.195	216					
Relevance	Between Groups	1.161	2	0.580	2.094	0.126	Accept the H_0	Not Significant
	Within Groups	59.317	214	0.277				
	Total	60.478	216					
Adequacy	Between Groups	0.709	2	0.354	0.978	0.378	Accept the H_0	Not Significant
	Within Groups	77.588	214	0.363				
	Total	78.296	216					
Responsiveness	Between Groups	1.154	2	0.577	1.659	0.193	Accept the H_0	Not Significant
	Within Groups	74.420	214	0.348				
	Total	75.574	216					

responsiveness, since the F-value computed is less than the tabular value of 2.999 at 5% level of significant, rejecting the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference on the assessment of the three groups of respondents in terms of responsiveness. This implies that there is no significant difference in terms of efficiency, relevance and adequacy, while there is significant difference in the assessment of the three groups of respondents in responsiveness of the Balik-Eskwela/Aral Program. On the other hand, comparing the assessment of parents and administrators yielded mean difference value of 2.234 and p-value of .351 which is greater than 0.05 the decision is to accept the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference in the assessment of parents and teachers in terms of responsiveness. Furthermore, comparing the assessment of teachers and administrators yielded mean difference value of .009 and p-value of .998 which is greater than 0.05, accepting the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference in the assessment of administrators and teachers in terms of responsiveness of the Balik- Eskwela program. On the assessment of the three groups of respondents on efficiency, relevance, adequacy and responsiveness of the Open High School Program. Since the F- computed value of .132, .169, .005 and 1.897 for efficiency, relevance, adequacy and responsiveness respectively are less than the F- critical value of 2.99 at 5% level of significant, the decision is accept the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference on the assessment of the three groups of respondents on the aforementioned variables of the Open High School Program. On the assessments of the three groups of respondents

on efficiency, relevance, adequacy and responsiveness of the Alternative Learning System Program. Since the F-computed value of 2.094, 1.659, 1.531 and .978 for relevance, responsiveness, adequacy and efficiency respectively are less than the F- critical value of 2.99 at 5% level of significant, the decision is accept the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference on the assessment of the three groups of respondents on the aforementioned variables of the Alternative Learning System. On the summary, that there is no significant difference on the dropout prevention programs among the aforementioned variables [18].

An enhancement intervention program entitled "Moving Forward Program" composed of six (6) programs for parents, teachers, and students at risks and out-of school youth was proposed. Objectives were set together with the key result areas. Then target areas are identified to measure if the objectives are realized. After which, strategies were planned wherein, the activities, resources, program duration were identified. After completing the program, a enhancement intervention program was made.

The enhancement intervention program was assessed very highly suitable (VHS), very highly acceptable (VHA), and highly feasible (HF) by the two (2) groups of respondents as evidenced by the obtained grand mean values of 4.21, 4.20, and 4.19.

3.4. Recommendations

- a) In the light of the findings and conclusions of the study, the following recommendations are suggested:

- b) Enhancement intervention programs on potential school leavers learners should be strengthened to motivate students to stay in school.
- c) School governing council should be developed composed students, community leaders, parents and teachers to capitalize on school-parenting- community relationship.
- d) Activity must be meaningful to the students which is important when building a positive school environment. Classroom should be high in challenge and low in terms of threat.
- e) Parents and students should be well-oriented for the services offered by the school, especially the guidance centres and the functions guidance counsellors are rendering to the school populace.
- f) Parent orientation should be enjoyed at the beginning of the school year and attendance must be required to share to them the concept that education is a partnership and their roles as parents should be emphasized.
- g) Teachers should strengthen partnership with parents by coordinating with their free time if parents cannot attend parent-teacher conference to update them on their children's academic performance.
- h) Guidance counsellors should be vigilant in identifying students who are experiencing difficulties in their studies and having conflicts in relation to their teachers and parents.
- i) The teachers who play a great role to the development of students' lives should give extra attention not only in their academic performance but also should give extra attention of how the students behave inside the classroom because this may give a clue to problems the child may be experiencing at home. Students who are experiencing these problems should be referred to the guidance counsellor.
- j) Parental education should be provided by the school and other sectors for the parents should be aware of their roles and responsibilities not only to their children but also to the society where they belong.
- k) The administrators can include in their annual school program steps to increase the holding power of the teachers to minimize school leaver's learners.
- l) The continuous upgrading of skills among teachers through trainings, seminars, and workshops will be regularly conducted so that they will acquire the most up to date pedagogical skills in teaching.
- m) Invite and involves LGU officials, DSWD and PNP authority to participate in the planning and evaluating the impact of the School Leavers Learners Prevention Programs.
- n) Parallel studies can be conducted by future researchers that may correlate to the variables used to assess School Leavers Learners Prevention Programs.
- o) It is highly recommended in this study that the enhancement intervention program be implemented by the schools.

4. CONCLUSION

In the light of the findings as summarized above, the following conclusions are drawn. It was concluded that the status of School Leavers Intervention Programs by Deped such as Balik-Eswela/Aral, Open High School Program (OHSP), and Alternative Learning System (ALS) were fairly implemented and help to reduce dropout rate. This means that the Intervention

Program mentioned are effective to minimize but not totally can eradicate dropout rate in selected public secondary school in CARSIGMA. The most common reasons of students to drop out are financial problem, family problem, health problems, early pregnancy, and poor academic performance. The assessment by parents, teachers, and administrators to school leavers' intervention program on its efficiency, relevance, adequate, and responsiveness are Very Satisfactory (VS) which help to form an enhancement school leavers intervention programs. The school administrators, teachers, and parent who served as the respondents of the study had different assessments of School Leavers Intervention Program as basis on the enhancement intervention program. The enhancement intervention program entitled "Moving Forward" compose of six (6) programs for parents, teachers, and students at risks and out-of-school youth was proposed to minimize school leavers rate. First, objectives were set together with the expected output. After which strategies were planned wherein, the activities, human and other resources were identified. Table 38 presents Enhancement Intervention Program for Parents, Teachers, and Students.

The enhanced intervention programs were found very highly suitable (VHS), very highly acceptable (VHA), and highly feasible (HF).

5. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

NA

6. CONFLICT OF INTEREST

NA

7. SOURCE/S OF FUNDING

No source of funding

8. REFERENCES

1. Brown, T. M., & Rodríguez, L. F. (2009). School and the Co-Construction of Dropout. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 22(2), 221-242.
2. Department of Basic Education (2011). Report on Dropout and Learner Retention Strategy to Portfolio Committee on Education June 2011. Republic of South Africa.
3. Fleisch et al (2010). Report on Dropout and Learner Retention Strategy to Portfolio Committee on Education. Republic of South Africa.
4. LUZ, Juan Miguel (2006). Brigada Eskwela: The Power of Numbers. Commentary, *Philippine Daily Inquirer*, November 2006.
5. Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development (2007).
6. Samuels, C. (2007). Lack of research, data hurts dropout efforts, experts say. *Education Week*, 26, 8.
7. Suh, S., Suh, J., & Houston, I. (2007). Predictors of categorical at-risk high school dropouts. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 85, 196-203.
8. Steinberg, L. (2001). We know some things: Parent-Adolescent Relationships in Retrospect and Prospect. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 11, 1-19.
9. Strassburg et al. (2010). Report on Dropout and Learner Retention Strategy to Portfolio Committee on Education. Republic of South Africa

10. Tubeza, P. (2009). MNCs blamed for high school dropout rates. *Philippine daily Inquirer*. Retrieved January 10, 2009.
11. UNESCO Institute of Statistics (2009).
12. Valdez E.B. (2008). Productive School Promotion and Community Partnership Towards Quality Relevant Education. *Divine College of Vigan Research Journal*. 4-25.
13. Daco, E.P. (2014). The Implementation of Alternative Learning System (ALS) in Secondary Level from 2008 Onwards: Basis for a Five Year Development Plan. (Master's Thesis). Eulogio "Amang" Rodriguez Institute of Science and Technology, Manila.
14. Jerald, C. (2007). "Keeping kids in school: What research says about preventing dropouts." (Alexandria, VA: Center for Public Education).
15. Meyer, N.E. (2010). Preventing High School Dropouts: What Do Students Believe Caused Them to Leave the Comprehensive High School?. (Doctoral Dissertation). San Diego State University Doctor of Educational Leadership.
16. Petilo, R. (2006). Dropout reduction management strategies in public high schools. Unpublished Thesis and Dissertation, University of the Philippines.
17. Vergara, R.S. (2010). Parental attitudes towards the educational needs of drop-out students: as a basis for a proposed intervention program. (Master's Thesis). De la Salle University-Dasmariñas. Philippines
18. Zablocki, M.S. (2009). Predicting School Dropout Among Youth with Disabilities: The Role of Youth Characteristics, Experience Engagement. Factors. Department of Special Education, Thesis and Dissertation University of Maryland Baltimore, U.S.A.