

Original Research Article

Why do Junior High School Students from Poor Families in Southwest China Maintain a High Dropout Rate under Multiple Policies Support?

ABSTRACT

Little is known about the reasons for the high dropout rate of students from poor Southwest China families under various policies support. The dropout rate of 27312 junior high school students was 6.90%, and the dropout rate of grade 7-9 increased with the grade. Principal Component Analysis was conducted on 21 attributes of 299 dropout students. We found that parents with higher educated degree and late marriage, parents working close to home, large family size, family with sick or disabled members, higher grade and non-boarding and unhealthy students increased the dropout rate. The dropout prevention requires reducing the inducers from family, school management and students themselves.

Keywords: Aid policy; Dropout factors; Junior high school students; Poor families

JEL codes: I20, I25, R10

1. INTRODUCTION

The high dropout rate of junior high school students exists in many countries and regions. In recent years, India [1-2], Bangladesh [3], Singapore [4], Israel [5] and China [6-10] have reported high dropout rate of junior high school students. In some regions, the cumulative dropout rate of junior high school students in three years was more than 50% [6-7]. The problem of dropping out of school has always been a common concern in the education field. Dropping out of school causes the waste of educational resources, hinders the development of education, and is unfavorable to the talent cultivation and economic development of a nation [8].

The factors that cause junior high school students to drop out of school are multidimensional, including achievement, emotion, economy, cognition, social culture, **behavior and psychology** [3, 11]. Dropout factors are complex and heterogeneous, involving society, school, family and students themselves [12]. Dropout is strongly influenced by pushing out of school due to students' adverse experiences within school and by pulling out of school due to factors external to the school [10]. Poor rural junior high schools generally have a higher dropout rate than developed urban junior high schools [10, 13]. Singapore [4] and the United States [14] have implemented educational diversion and alternative school programs to reduce dropout rates. Some Chinese scholars advocated promoting secondary vocational education [13, 15] or setting up social-emotional learning programs to relieve students' learning

anxiety and reduce dropout [16].

Since 2016, China has implemented a nationwide poverty alleviation policy in order to eradicate poverty, improve people's livelihood and gradually realize common prosperity. Taking families as the unit, poverty-stricken families were identified and the degree of poverty was judged according to the family's housing, annual grain harvest, annual income, medical security, number of students and other conditions. Poverty-stricken families were accurately identified abided by strict procedures and criteria, whose information were input in the Poverty Alleviation and Development Information system (PADI system). Archives containing detailed information were established for these families, including the total member number of each family, poverty level, per capita income, gender, age, educated degree, health status, marital status, labor force, employment and other attributes. Such families were called Archive Established and Identified Poor families (AEIP families). Children from AEIP families could enjoy all free policies in school, including nutrition meal, sundry fees, book fees, school accommodation, local government scholarships, temporary subsidies and free small loans. In addition, according to the family poverty level, students could receive poverty grant of different levels from the government and various kinds of donation from all walks of life, such as sporting goods, books and stationery, clothes and money. They also received long-term aid and attention from local government designated supporters. If they drop out of school, the designated supporter had the obligation to persuade students to return to school, and had the responsibility to understand the reasons for dropping out and track the students' whereabouts within the first three months after leaving school. The whole process needed to be well recorded and submitted to the school where the dropout was attending. For deep poverty-stricken families, they could apply for free new housing in immigrant zone, where houses were constructed specially for the deep poor families. The government also assisted some poor family members to get temporary job or permanent employment. Students from AEIP families were subsidized by a variety of preferential policies. Surprisingly, the dropout rate remained high and the success rate of persuading them to return to school was very low if they had left school. Why was the dropout rate of students still high under so many preferential policies and subsidies? The purpose of this paper is to (i) understand the dropout situation of different attribute student groups; (ii) analyze the reasons why students drop out of school and why they are unwilling to return to school after leaving the campus; (iii) explore the countermeasures to prevent dropout by trace the dynamics of dropouts. This study has practical significance for preventing students from dropping out of school in poverty-stricken areas.

2. DATA SOURCES

2.1 Regional Introduction

The data were collected from G Province, China. In recent decades, G Province has been one of the provinces with the lowest per capita income in China, and it has been

officially identified one of the provinces with the highest density of poverty population. The landform of G Province is mainly plateau and mountainous area with high ratio exposed karsts, leading to the scarcity of agricultural land. In remote rural areas, transportation is inconvenient, and the proportion of junior high school students going to school on foot and boarding in school is high. Because economy in the study area lags behind, many villagers emigrate for work. **These factors, such as backward economy, inconvenient transportation, remote geographical location, lack of parental control, may cause the dropout rate increase.**

2.2 Data Collection

From Sep. 2017 to Aug. 2019, the first author of this article was sent to CJ County of G Province to hold a temporary post and manage education. During this period, **the first author** collected all relevant data **and frequently** participated in home visits to persuade the dropout students to return to school. Due to confidentiality issues, the names of the province, prefectures and counties in this paper are not suitable for disclosure. The data collected include: (1) Dropout rate. The data collected from the summary table of inspection at the beginning of semester released by local bureau of education of CJ County and CH County of G Province, including the enrollment situation of 27312 students (grade 7-9) **from** 18 junior high schools in CJ County and one junior high school in CH County in the two spring semesters (March to July) in 2018 and 2019. The summary table was usually published in the second week after the beginning of the school, reporting the enrollment situation of students of different genders and grades in each school. In fact, the enrolled students displayed by summary table referred to registered students. Some students became concealed dropouts after registration; they took the final exam, and were notified to attend classes temporarily during the superior inspection, but seldom entered campus during regular class time. (2) Student name list. Our study focused on the reasons why students from poor families dropped out of school. Therefore, we chose middle schools which were remote from the county town. A name list of all the students from five rural junior high schools in CJ County and one rural junior high school in CH County was collected, containing the details of age, gender, boarding, whether the students were in school and when the dropouts left school. **The information of 508 students in total, including 299 dropout students and 209 randomly selected students in school as reference were obtained.**

(3) Family information. Number of family members, parents' educated degree, health status of family members, number of migrant workers, poverty level, per capita net income, birth date of parents, number of siblings, number of parents alive and number of family labor force were obtained from the local population information registration spreadsheet and the PADI system. Since the PADI system only provided information on the AEIP families and did not provide data on families that were not poor. Therefore, in addition to the drop out rate calculation involved all 27312 students, the rest of the content involved students from the AEIP family. In our study, family information of 299 dropout students (including concealed dropouts) and 209 students

in school were obtained from the PADI system and the local population information registration spreadsheet. (4) Whereabouts of dropouts. After the children of the AEIP families dropped out of school, the designated supporter conducted at least three home visits for each dropout student, persuaded them to return to school and traced their whereabouts. **There were 293 dropouts were traced by the designated supporters. Rigorous data collection methods and authoritative data sources provide the credibility of data analysis for this research.**

2.3 Factor Definition And Data Processing

If there were both dropout students and students in school in a family, family information was only used as statistics data for dropout. If a family had more than one child and all of them were in school, only one child was randomly selected as represent of the family and the family member information was collected. If the student was a foster child, then collect foster family information. A total of 21 factors were obtained (Table 1), including four student attribute factors, one school management factor and 16 family characteristic factors. Both the dropout students and the students in school were the children from AEIP family.

Table 1. Factor of students from poverty-stricken families in Southwest China and factor processing

Factor category	Serial number	Factor	Definition and assignment in calculation
Student attributes	f1	Gender	Male=1, female =0
	f2	Grade	Seventh grade=7, eighth grade=8, ninth grade=9
	f3	Age gap (month)	The standard age of a student was calculated based on the legal age of admission of the first-grade students in the local primary school, which was 6-year-old (72 months). The age gap (months) was equal to the actual age minus the standard age
	f4	Heath condition	Unhealthy included mental retardation, disability or chronic diseases. Healthy = 1, unhealthy = 0
School management	f5	Boarding or not	Boarding = 1, no boarding = 0
Family characteristics	f6	Family size	Total number of family members including students themselves
	f7	Poverty level	Poverty levels were obtained from the PADI system. Very light poverty = 1, light poverty = 2, low-income = 3, poverty-stricken family with government living guarantee = 4, and poverty-stricken family with extremely poor support = 5
	f8	Per capita income (yuan)	Net income per capita
	f9	Father's marriage age	The age of the father at the time of his marriage. If the father has no record of marriage age due to death, the average value was used instead
	f10	Mother's marriage age	Refer to f9
	f11	Number of siblings	Number of siblings including students themselves

f12	Number of parents alive	The number of parents alive, all dead = 0, one alive = 1, both alive = 2
f13	Marital status of parents	Divorce = 1, no divorce = 0
f14	Father's educated degree	Father dead or unexplained loss of contact = 0, illiterate or semi-illiterate = 1, primary school = 2, junior high school = 3, senior high school = 4, college and above = 5. In case of divorce, since the education role still works, it was calculated according to the father's actual educated degree. If it was a stepfather, it was calculated according to the stepfather. The foster children counted according to the foster family
f15	Mother's educated degree	Refer to f14
f16	Total score of educated degree	Total score of parents' educated degree, $f16 = f14 + f15$
f17	Number of patients	Number of chronic patients or disabled family members excluding students
f18	Number of labor force	Healthy manual workers in the family identified by the local government
f19	Father migrant work status	The farther away from home, the less care and contact with children. Father dead or unexplained loss of contact = 0, migrant work outside the province = 1, migrant work in the province outside the county = 2, migrant work in the county outside the town = 3, migrant work in the town = 4, work at home = 5
f20	Mother migrant work status	Refer to f19
f21	Parents score of migrant work	The total score of both parents' migrant work, $f21 = f19 + f20$

3. DATA ANALYSIS

All data were analyzed with Statistical Package for Social Science software (version SPSS 17.0). The Chi-square Test was used to test the difference of dropout rate between different genders and among different grades, and the data were weighted before the test. The function of Chi-square Test in this paper was to calculate the deviation degree between the actual observation value and the theoretical inference value. When comparing the mean values of the characteristic parameters between the dropout students and students in school, the two groups of data of each factor did not meet the requirement of homogeneity of variance (Kolmogorov-Smirnov test; $p < 0.05$), and all of them were tested by Mann Whitney U Test. When the Principal Component Analysis was used to extract the principal components of dropout factors (Rotation method: Varimax), a total of 21 variables were selected (Table 1). Significant level $\alpha=0.05$.

4. RESULTS

4.1 Dropout Rate

A total of 1885 students dropped out of 27312, with a dropout rate of 6.90% (Table 2). There was no significant difference in the dropout rate between different genders ($p = 0.593$; Chi-square test), but there was a significant difference among different grades ($p = 0.049$). The dropout rate increased with the grade.

Table 2. Dropout rates between different genders and among different grades of junior high school students from poor families in Southwest China

		Total number	Number of dropout	Dropout rate (%)	Difference
Gender	Male	16277	1230	7.56	$\chi^2=0.29, df=1,$ $p=0.593$
	Female	11035	655	5.94	
Grade	Seventh- grade	9436	230	2.44	$\chi^2=6.00, df=2,$ $p=0.049^*$
	Eighth- grade	9211	703	7.63	
	Ninth- grade	8665	952	10.99	

Note: P value with * indicates significant difference (the same below). The data was from local bureau of education.

4.2 Differences In Characteristics Between Dropouts And Students In School

A characteristics comparison on dropout students from poor families with those in school showed that (Table 3): the dropout students had older age, lower boarding rate, lower family poverty level, parents had a relatively older marriage age and a higher divorce rate, mothers had a higher educated degree, parents had a higher total educated score, families had more labor force and parents work closer to home. There were no significant differences in health status, number of family members, per capita family income, number of siblings, number of parents alive, father's educated degree and number of family patients between dropout students and students in school.

Table 3. Differences in characteristics between dropout students and students in school from poor families

Variables	Dropout students			Students in school			Mean difference
	Min	Max	Mean \pm SD	Min	Max	Mean \pm SD	
Age gap (month)	-16	74	9.38 \pm 12.53	-25	38	4.30 \pm 10.43	$Z=-4.63, P<0.01^*$
Heath condition	0	1	0.99 \pm 0.12	0	1	1.00 \pm 0.07	$Z=-0.96, P=0.34$
Boarding or not	0	1	0.15 \pm 0.35	0	1	0.86 \pm 0.35	$Z=-15.94, P<0.01^*$
Family size	1	8	4.45 \pm 1.50	2	11	4.54 \pm 1.52	$Z=-0.12, P=0.90$
Poverty level	1	4	2.25 \pm 1.21	1	5	2.52 \pm 1.19	$Z=-2.29, P=0.02^*$
Per capita income (yuan)	432	14652	5563.64 \pm 2809.79	1197.50	21250	5495.09 \pm 2994.72	$Z=-0.59, P=0.55$
Father's marriage age	14	47	26.43 \pm 5.97	16	46	25.02 \pm 5.03	$Z=-2.61, P=0.01^*$
Mother's marriage age	13	40	24.24 \pm 5.49	15	45	22.54 \pm 4.01	$Z=-3.52, P<0.01^*$
Number of siblings	1	5	2.19 \pm 0.92	1	6	2.12 \pm 0.85	$Z=-0.97, P=0.33$
Number of parents alive	0	2	1.82 \pm 0.51	0	2	1.87 \pm 0.36	$Z=-0.14, P=0.89$

Marital status of parents	0	1	0.08±0.27	0	1	0.02±0.14	Z=-2.97, P<0.01*
Father's educated degree	0	3	1.96±0.77	0	4	1.79±0.84	Z=-1.87, P=0.06
Mother's educated degree	0	4	1.68±0.80	0	4	1.53±0.67	Z=-2.31, P=0.02*
Total score of educated degree	0	6	3.64±1.37	0	6	3.33±1.10	Z=-3.29, P<0.01*
Number of patients	0	2	0.16±0.40	0	2	0.18±0.40	Z=-0.66, P=0.51
Number of labor force	0	5	2.27±0.97	0	6	2.04±0.80	Z=-3.40, P<0.01*
Father migrant work status	0	5	3.16±1.92	1	5	2.95±1.76	Z=-2.06, P=0.04*
Mother migrant work status	0	5	3.89±1.71	0	5	3.46±1.79	Z=-3.53, P<0.01*
Parents score of migrant work	2	10	7.05±2.77	1	10	6.41±2.98	Z=-2.49, P=0.01*

Note: The data obtained from the local population information registration spreadsheet and the PADI system

4.3. Analysis Of Dropout Factor

The Principal Component Analysis of 21 characteristics (Table 1) of 299 dropout students showed that (Table 4; Fig. 1): there were eight principal components with eigenvalues greater than 1, and the cumulative contribution rate was 70.92%, indicating that these eight principal components reflected the information of 21 variables. The factor component matrix after rotation (rotation method: Varimax) showed that the parents' educated degree had a greater load on the first principal component, reflecting the higher educated degree of parents, the higher dropout rate of their children. Parental migrant work had a greater load on the second principal component, reflecting that the closer the parents worked to home, the more likely their children inclined to drop out of school. The number of family members and the number of siblings had a greater load on the third principal component, indicating that the number of family members and the number of siblings greatly increased the dropout rate. The parents' marriage age exerted a greater load on the fourth principal component, which reflected the rising trend of children's dropout rate if parents got married late. The number of sick members of a family had a greater load on the 5th principal component, which indicated that the illness of family members increased the dropout rate. Boarding or not had a greater load on the sixth principal component, indicating that boarding could reduce the dropout rate. The grade had a greater load on the seventh principal component, which indicated that the dropout rate increased with the grade. The health condition of students had a greater load on the eighth principal component, which indicated that unhealthy status led to an increased possibility of dropping out.

Table 4. Rotated Component Matrix And Rotation Sums Of Squared Loadings From Dropout Factors Of Poor Students

	Variables	Component							
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Rotated component matrix	Gender	-0.05	0.02	0.00	0.18	-0.61	-0.04	-0.27	-0.16
	Grade	0.01	0.02	0.06	-0.06	0.05	0.11	0.86	0.05
	Age gap (month)	0.07	0.28	-0.05	-0.12	-0.05	0.36	-0.35	0.43
	Health condition	0.02	-0.08	0.06	0.09	0.01	-0.13	0.10	0.86

Boarding or not	-0.12	0.08	0.07	-0.17	0.04	0.61	0.17	-0.26
Family size	0.21	-0.10	0.90	-0.02	0.09	0.04	-0.02	0.03
Poverty level	-0.15	0.30	-0.05	0.14	0.55	-0.29	-0.14	0.03
Per capita income (yuan)	0.17	-0.40	-0.18	0.10	-0.13	0.56	0.04	0.11
Father's marriage age	-0.13	0.10	-0.10	0.86	0.11	-0.12	-0.01	0.01
Mother's marriage age	-0.04	0.10	-0.10	0.90	0.03	-0.01	-0.05	0.06
Number of siblings	0.03	0.02	0.87	-0.15	-0.05	-0.05	0.14	0.00
Number of parents alive	0.80	-0.17	0.16	0.14	-0.01	0.23	0.06	0.08
Marital status of parents	-0.05	0.01	-0.34	0.25	-0.16	-0.34	0.24	0.05
Father's educated degree	0.85	-0.14	0.04	-0.14	0.04	-0.01	-0.16	-0.04
Mother's educated degree	0.85	-0.01	0.09	-0.08	-0.06	-0.02	0.11	0.04
Total score of educated degree	0.97	-0.09	0.07	-0.12	-0.02	-0.02	-0.02	0.00
Number of patients	0.01	0.01	0.09	0.22	0.71	0.02	-0.06	-0.16
Number of labor force	0.36	0.01	0.49	0.02	-0.13	0.50	-0.04	0.14
Father migrant work status	-0.18	0.68	-0.17	-0.11	0.41	0.06	-0.02	0.04
Mother migrant work status	-0.04	0.76	0.09	0.31	-0.26	-0.08	0.02	-0.05
Parents score of migrant work	-0.15	0.94	-0.07	0.11	0.12	-0.01	0.00	0.00
Rotation sums Total	3.36	2.36	2.08	1.99	1.51	1.37	1.13	1.10
of squared	15.99	11.24	9.93	9.46	7.19	6.53	5.37	5.22
loadings	15.99	27.23	37.16	46.62	53.80	60.33	65.70	70.92
% of Variance								
Cumulative %								

Note: The values in bold indicated the factors with larger load in the principal component. The data were from the student name list, the local population information registration spreadsheet and the PADI system




Fig. 1 Principal component plot in rotated space of dropout factors for poor students (f1-f21 in the plot refer to Table 1)

4.4 Students Returning Rate And The Dropout Whereabouts

Of the 299 students who were persuaded to return by designated supporter, only three (1.00%) returned to school, 235 (78.60%) were unreturned, and 61 (20.40%) were concealed, according to the records submitted by designated supporters (Fig. 2). The trace record on 296 students who were unreturned and concealed dropouts showed that 73.99% stayed at home, 25.00% worked outside and 1.01% lost contact, and 10.47% of them got married soon after they left school (Table 5).




Fig. 2 Return rates of dropout students

Note: The data was from trace records of dropout students submitted by designated supporters

Table 5. Whereabouts of dropouts within 3 months after leaving campus

Whereabouts	Number of dropouts (%)	Details
Stay at home	219 (73.99%)	214 dropouts were idle or farming, five were sick or mentally disabled; 27 got married
Work outside	74 (25.00%)	74 dropouts worked outside; four got married
Lost contact	3 (1.01%)	The whole family went out or refused to contact

Note: The data was from trace records of dropout students submitted by designated supporters

5. DISCUSSION

5.1 Dropout Factors From Family

Family financial difficulties are no longer an important factor that causes junior high school students to drop out of school in rural areas of China [10, 17]. In rural junior high school in Northwest China, even if tuition and fees are zero, the dropout rates still maintain high level [10]. Our research on the poverty-stricken families in Southwest China showed that there was no difference between the per capita income of dropout students' families and that of school students' families, which indicated that economic factors had little influence on dropouts. The impact of parents' educated degree on children's dropout rate shows different results. Some studies have shown

that students with different parental educated degree have little difference in dropout tendency [15], and some studies have shown that children from families with less educated parents are more likely to drop out [6, 10, 18]. Our research showed that the dropout rate of children with more educated parents was higher (Table 3, Table 4, Fig. 1). More educated parents have an advantage in the labor market, which increases the proportion of educated parents employed in the labor market. The parents who work in economically developed areas are more informed than those who stay in isolated and economically backward mountainous areas, a better understanding of the current situation of college students' difficulty in obtaining employment [19]. As a result, more educated parents may be more likely to meet the dropout requirements of their children. The closer parents work to home, the more frequent they communicate with their children. Letting children know about new things outside of school will incentive their desire of dropping out of school, just like school students who have frequent contact with their dropout peers will increase the dropout rate [10]. Our conclusion was similar to previous studies that the average age of the heads of households of dropout students was higher than the average age of the heads of non-dropouts [3]. Older parents who spoil their children more may increase the dropout rate of their children (Table 4, Fig. 1). Children in families with large size and many siblings [3, 8] divorced parents [15] and sick members are more likely to drop out of school (Table 3, Table 4, Fig. 1), in which families they receive less attention and bear greater psychological stress.

5.2 Dropout Factors From Student

At present, Chinese junior high school students go out to work not because of economic pressure, but a willing choice under the temptation of money [10]. Boys have more temporary low-skill job opportunities than girls, resulting in a higher dropout rate for boys than girls in junior high schools [8, 10, 15]. Our research showed that the dropout rate of boys was 1.27 times higher than that of girls (Table 2). China's labor-intensive economy has a large market and low requirements on the cultural quality of the labor force. By hiring these cheap labor forces, the boss can obtain the maximum economic benefits [10]. On the other hand, the dropouts escape from the constraints of school, and the new lifestyle can temporarily satisfy their psychological needs of curiosity, independence and freedom [20]. As high as 55% dropout students in Bangladesh slums became migrant workers shortly after they dropped out of school [3]; the dropout students showed a similar trend in our study area (Table 5). The older students are more likely to drop out of school [10]. The age gap of the dropout students was significantly higher than that of the non-dropout students (Table 3). The older students are likely to cause inferiority complex, leading to drop out of school. Our research showed that the dropout rate increased with grade (Table 2), which is consistent with the findings of many rural junior high schools in China [9-10]. Students with psychological pressure due to entrance examination are likely to drop out of school. Dropping out of school is a natural reaction of students and their parents to avoid the failure of educational investment. The dropout rate of

students with health problems is three times higher than that of students without health problems [18]. Unhealthy has a significant impact on students' dropout (Table 4; Fig. 1). Early marriage has always been an important factor leading to the dropout of remote rural junior high school students [3, 21]. We found that although some of the dropout students did not reach the age of marriage and did not get a marriage license, they had already held a marriage ceremony. Some of them even had a child shortly after they left school.

5.3 Dropout Factors From School Management

Boarding conditions can provide students with a sense of school life outside the classroom. Boarding students are affected by campus hygiene, diet, dormitory conditions, sports facilities, campus environment and library facilities. Since China implemented the poverty alleviation policy in 2016, the campus environment in poverty-stricken areas has been greatly improved. These schools generally provided two-meat-and-one-vegetable meals, added new books and sports goods, and many students received new quilts, new stationery, new clothes and cash donated by warm-hearted people. Improved school environment comfort might reduce the dropout rate (Table 4; Fig. 1), which is contrary to the conclusion of previous studies that poor boarding conditions and poor diets lead to drop out [8, 10, 22]. It's not just our research that has found a large number of concealed dropouts (Fig. 2), a phenomenon already reported in Fujian Province of China [15]. Schools with high dropout rate will be subject to pressure from the government and society, which will bring negative impacts to the schools. Therefore, the school will take various measures to conceal the truth.

5.4 Experience Of Persuading Dropouts To Return To School

During our home visits to dropouts, we found the main reasons for students' unwillingness to go back to school were as follows: (1) The hopelessness of further studies lead to the weariness of studies, and finally choose to drop out. (2) The consequences that some college students are unable to find employment or some college students have low incomes after employment bring about negative impacts, resulting in some people form the concept that studying is useless. (3) Some parents and their children have developed the psychological dependence that poor families will always get social assistance. Therefore, some students who have not poor achievement success also drop out of school.

6. CONCLUSION

Our research found that family, school management and students themselves have a lot of potential factors leading to dropout. The dropout factors are complex and are the result of a combination of multiple factors. Whether to drop out of school is ultimately decided by the parents and students weighing the advantages and disadvantages. Low achievers do not necessarily drop out of school, and high achievers do not necessarily remain in school. In order to reduce the dropout rate, the government, society, schools, parents and students must cooperate with each other. Students who are absent from

school need to be discovered in time and sent back to school during the first one or two days of absence, which helps to reduce dropout rates. The longer a student is absent from school, the less likely the dropout is to be persuaded to return.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are grateful for financial support of National Nature Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 31960231), the Colleges Teaching Content and Curriculum System Reform Project of G Province (Grant No. 2019174) and Teaching Content and Curriculum System Reform Project of Kaili University (Grant No. JG202007 & JG202015).

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Yadav V, Mehta D. Issues and challenges of dropout students of Mirzapur District. *International Journal of Advanced and Innovative Research*. 2018; 7 (6): 2278-7844.
2. Mardolkar M, Kumaran N. Forecasting and avoiding student dropout using the k-nearest neighbor approach. *SN Computer Science*. 2020; 96 (1): 1-8.
3. Hossen S, Hira AA, Mohsin KF. Factors responsible for students dropout at secondary education among slum children: a study on Khulna City of Bangladesh. *International Journal of Advanced Research*. 2018; 6 (5): 542-552.
4. Ma QR. The education division in Singapore and the solution of the rural school student drop-out in China. *Journal of Hebei Normal University*. 2008; 10 (12): 15-19.
5. Qiu X. Study on the drop out of high school students in Israel. *Studies in Foreign Education*. 2005; 32 (9): 73-75+81.
6. Yi H, Zhang L, Luo R, Shi Y, Mo D, Chen X, Brinton C, Rozelle S. Dropping out: why are students leaving junior high in China's poor rural areas? *International Journal of Educational Development*. 2012; 32 (4): 555-563.
7. Shi Y, Zhang L, Ma Y, Yi H, Liu C, Johnson N, Chu J. Dropping out of rural China's secondary schools: a mixed-methods analysis. *The China Quarterly*. 2015; 224, 1048-1069.
8. Chang F, Min W, Shi Y, Kenny K, Loyalka P. Educational expectations and dropout behavior among junior high students in rural China. *China World Economy*. 2016; 24 (3): 67-85.
9. Min WB, Chang F, Wang H. The non-economic factors contributing to junior high school student dropout in rural areas. *Education & Economy*. 2016; 5: 73-77.
10. Gao S, Yang M, Wang XH, Min WB, Rozelle S. Peer relations and dropout behavior: evidence from junior high school students in northwest rural China. *International Journal of Educational Development*. 2019; 65: 134-143.
11. Vaughn MG, Roberts G, Fall AM, Kremer K, Martinez L. Preliminary validation of the dropout risk inventory for middle and high school students. *Children and Youth Services Review*. 2020; 111: 104855.
12. Kearney CA. School absenteeism and school refusal behavior in youth: A contemporary review. *Clinical Psychology Review*. 2008; 28 (3): 451-471.

13. Li ZH, Wang WH. Study on the dropout phenomenon of rural senior high school students in Western China - Based on the survey of 14 schools in 8 districts (counties) of Chongqing. *Theory and Practice of Education*. 2017; 37 (11): 21-23.
14. Yuan YC. On factor analysis and precautionary measures to high school drop out in America. *Studies in Foreign Education*. 2008; 5: 3-6.
15. Liang F. Hidden worries, trends and governance of rural junior high school students' dropout in the balanced development stage of compulsory education - Based on the investigation of three counties and four schools in Fujian Province. *Journal of Ningde Normal University*. 2013; 104 (1): 82-89.
16. Wang H, Chu J, Loyalka P, Xin T, Shi YJ, Qu QH, Yang C. Can social– emotional learning reduce school dropout in developing countries? *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*. 2016; 35 (4): 1-39.
17. Shi YB, Zhao XX. Which is more influential to rural dropout: parents' migration for work or school boarding? - Based on the empirical analysis of 1881 junior high school students from three western provinces. *Education & Economy*. 2016; 5: 78-83.
18. Wang H, Yang C, He F, Shi Y, Qu Q, Rozelle S, Chu J. Mental health and dropout behavior: a cross-sectional study of junior high students in northwest rural China. *International Journal of Educational Development*. 2015; 41 (41): 1-12.
19. Sun Z. Study on the dropout of rural middle school students under the background of employed-out economy. *Journal of Shijiazhuang University of Economics*. 2014; 37 (1): 66-69.
20. Ou XC, Wang K. Voluntary dropout: A new problem in rural junior high school education in the new era. *China Youth Research*. 2007; 5: 62-65.
21. Li J. Investigation and research on the reasons for rural students' dropping out of school in Western China. *Teaching and Management*. 2012; 6: 83-84.
22. Luo R, Shi Y, Zhang L, Zhang H, Grant M, Alexis M, Scott R. The limits of health and nutrition education: evidence from three randomized-controlled trials in rural China. *Cesifo Economic Studies*. 2012; 58 (2): 385-404.