THE EFFECT OF DROPOUT PREVENTION PROGRAM OF 9th GRADE RETENTIONS STUDENTS ON DROPOUT RISK, SELF-EFFICACY BELIEF AND LEARNING MOTIVATION STRATEGIES

Gülşah Ertekin[1i],
Ayşe Esra İşmen Gazioğlu[2]
[1]Psychological Counselor,
Ministry of National Education,
Türkiye
[2]Associate Professor,
Department of Guidance and
Psychological Counseling,
İstanbul University-Cerrahpaşa,
Türkiye

Abstract:
High school dropout is a common problem in many countries and governments are trying to solve this problem for years. School counsellors can play an important role in dropout prevention by implementing school-based interventions. The aim of this study is to examine the effect of the Social-Cognitive Learning theory-based dropout prevention program which is applied to 9th grade retention students of the Anatolian and vocational high school students who were at risk for dropout. The dropout prevention program was aimed at reducing dropout risk, enhancing self-efficacy belief, and learning motivation strategies of students. The program was implemented in 11 sessions for the experimental students. For the data analysis, 'ANOVA' for the repeated measures and 'Bonferroni test were used to evaluate the effect of the program on students. The result of the study showed that the dropout prevention program is effective in reducing participants' dropout risk, enhancing learning motivation strategies, and moderating self-efficacy beliefs. In conclusion, it can be said that Social-Cognitive Learning theory-based psychoeducation program is effective to reduce the dropout risk at high schools.

Keywords: high school dropout prevention program, self-efficacy, learning motivation

[1i] Correspondence: email gulsahhertekin@gmail.com

1. Introduction

The problem of dropouts in secondary education is a serious problem that regresses the development level of the country in terms of individual and social aspects. Therefore, efforts to prevent dropout are a problem that is on the agenda of educators, researchers and governments in many countries.

Although the risk of dropout is a phenomenon that is a result of the combination of many factors, studies indicate that repeating a grade and also being in the 9th grade increases school in many countries (APA, 2000; USAID, 2011). dropout twice as much (Jimerson, Anderson and Whipple 2002; Neild, 2009; NCES, 2013). In this critical period, it is extremely important that school counseling services provide educational, personal and vocational support to students at risk of dropout (Blount, 2000).

According to the Center of the American National Education Statistics, 1.3 million students in the country dropout of high school in 2013. More than half of these students were immigrants and they had a low-income level (NCES, 2013). According to the OECD report, the rate of schooling between the ages of 15-19 is 69% in Turkey (OECD, 2021). And to the national survey data, the rate of high school dropout rate among young people aged 16-18 is %38 in Turkey (ERG, 2018).

The risk factors for dropout can be grouped under four headings these are; individual reasons, family reasons, school-related reasons and social-related reasons (Battin-Pearson, Newcomb, Abbott & Hawkins, 2000). Individual reasons are; being male (Suh & Suh, 2000), having learning difficulties or having a chronic disease (Hammond, Smink & Drew, 2007), working a job (Taylı, 2008) and early marriage (Bridgeland, Dilulio & Morison, 2006). Family reasons are; low income (Hammond et al., 2007), low education level (Battin-Pearson et al., 2000), family divorce or single-parent family (Balfanz & Legters, 2008), unemployed family (Rumberger & Lim, 2008), low education expectation from the child (Christenson, Sinclair, Lehr, 2001) and having a sibling who dropped out of school (Dockery, 2012). School-related reasons are; academic failure (Dockery, 2012; Yorğun, 2014), ninth-grade retention (Fulk, 2003), disciplinary punishment (Battin-Pearson et al., 2000) and size of the school (Blount, 2012). And lastly, social-related reasons are; not educating girls (UNESCO, 2012), inadequate access to school in rural areas (Uysal, 2008), poverty (Taylı, 2008), belonging to an ethnicity or minority group (Hammond et al., 2007), instability in education policies (Suh & Suh, 2007), adolescent pregnancy and early marriage (UNESCO, 2012).

Despite the risk factors in school dropout, there are protective factors that are effective in students' attendance at school. According to the studies, protective factors for students at risk for dropout are; academic support (Fulk, 2003; Karacabey, 2016), increasing self-efficacy belief (Blount, 2012; Hupfeld, 2007), self-regulation training (Brier, 2006), mentoring programs (USAID, 2011), increasing self-esteem (Bademci, Karadayı, Pur Karabulut, Bağdatlı Vural, 2018), psychological counseling (Berger, 2013) and parent involvement (White & Kelly, 2010).

2. Purpose of the Study

The aim of the study was to examine the effectiveness of the 'Dropout Prevention Program' which was developed for reducing the dropout risk of 9th grade retention students. In line with this purpose, it was aimed to increase students' self-efficacy belief and develop motivational strategies for learning. For this purpose, the following hypothesis has been tested.

2.1 Objectives of the Study

It was hypothesized that participants who received the 11-week intervention would report: (1) significant improvements on measures of school experiences scores relative to the control group,(2) significant improvements on measures of self-efficacy scores relative to the control group (3) significant improvements on measures of motivational stratgies for learning scores relative to the control group.

In this study, the aim was to examine Social-Cognitive Learning Theory based dropout prevention psychoeducation programs that reduce the dropout risk of 9th grade retention students. In accordance with this purpose reducing dropout risk, enhancing students' self-efficacy and developing motivation strategies for learning were aimed. The revised model is 2x3 experimental model (experimental, control; pretest, posttest, follow-up test). The independent variable of the study is the Dropout Prevention Psychoeducation Program, and the dependent variables are the dropout risk, self-efficacy beliefs and motivational learning strategies.

Inclusion criteria:
- Having a 9th grade average of 49 points or less,
- Having a high score of School Experiences Scale,
- Willingness to attend school.

Exclusion criteria:
- Being diagnosed with ADHD or learning difficulty,
- Reason for the grade retention due to absenteeism,
- Getting psychiatric help.

3. Literature Review

3.1 Self-Efficacy Theory and Sources of Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy is one of the motivational components of the Social-Cognitive Theory developed by Bandura (1986). The definition of ''*self-efficacy is a belief an individual's capacity to organize and perform the steps of the action that are necessary to achieve a certain level of performance*'' (Bandura, 1986, p.391). Studies show that self-efficacy belief is high effective in academic performance, academic motivation and self-regulation (Zimmerman, Bandura and Pons, 1992). Individuals with high self-efficacy can exhibit effort, persistence and resistance when they deal with difficulties. Bandura (1989) states that individuals' beliefs about their abilities are shaped by information from four sources.

There are four sources of self-efficacy belief, these sources are; mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, verbal experiences and psychological/physiological states. Mastery experiences; Bandura (1989) emphasizes that individuals' success and failure stories on a particular subject are one of the strongest sources of self-efficacy beliefs. It is also called direct experiences or personal achievements. Successful experiences increase self-efficacy belief, while unsuccessful experiences decrease self-efficacy belief. If success is attributed to internal and controllable processes such as ability and effort, self-efficacy belief will be strengthened, but if success is attributed to external factors such as luck or help from others, self-efficacy belief will weaken (Pajares, 1996). Vicarious experiences are self-efficacy beliefs that individuals develop by observing or modeling the successful completion of a job or task (Bandura, 1986). Successful performance of the observed person improves self-efficacy belief, while low performance decreases self-efficacy belief. An important point in learning from the model is that it is more effective to follow someone who does not give up and succeeds despite having difficulties on the first try than watching someone who succeeds perfectly on their first try (Bandura, 1989). Verbal experiences; self-efficacy belief is developed through messages coming from the environment about whether an individual can succeed in any job or task. In order for verbal persuasion to be effective, the source of the message must be someone who is reliable, respected, and considered an expert in their work. In particular, students who have difficulties in school life need encouraging messages from teachers. Another point to be considered in verbal persuasion is that the feedback given should be realistic if not as the students get unsuccessful results their self-efficacy will be damaged (Pajares and Schunk, 2002). Psychological/physiological states; self-efficacy belief is directly related to the physical condition of the individual. According to Bandura (2001), students may give up on the task by weakening their beliefs so they can't perform the task successfully because their hands are sweaty and their heart beats fast before making a presentation in the classroom.

3.2 Motivational Strategies

Motivational strategies consist of self-regulation (goal orientation, effort management, time management) and motivational beliefs (internal motivation, self-efficacy). According to the result of the research conducted by Pintrich and De Groot (1990), students who set learning goals, make an appropriate study plan and control their learning process can motivate themselves for academic success. As a result of learning these strategies, students may develop the habit of working systematically thus students will learn that they can control their learning activities (Zimmerman and Clearly, 2004).

3.3 Dropout Prevention Programs

In the USA there have been developed many prevention programs to prevent high school dropout. These programs are usually funded by the government or civil society and they have been planned by obtaining a certain budget for teacher support, tutoring, awards, and financial support for families. The content of dropout prevention programs was

increasing academic success (Rumberger and Larson, 1995), ninth-grade academies (Blackwell, 2008), social skills training (Waterman and Walker, 2001), career academies (Kemple and Herhily, 2004) and mentoring programs (USAID, 2011).

4. Method

4.1 Participants

The study group consisted of 37 students who were 9th retention students at an average age of 15. Students were attending a public high school in İstanbul. The socio-economic level of them was mostly medium. Families of the participants commonly migrated to İstanbul from the Southeastern Anatolian region. The education level of the families was commonly primary and secondary school graduates. The fathers of the participants were mostly tradesman. The majority of the participants had a part-time job with their families' workplace.

The demographic characteristics of the group participants are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Demographic Information on Experimental and Control Group

Participants Characteristic		Treatment		Control	
		%	N	N	%
Gender	Female	8	36.0	8	43.3
	Male	14	64.0	7	36.7
Education level of the mother	Primary	9	41,0	8	53.3
	Secondary	8	36.3	2	13.3
	High School	5	22.7	5	33.4
	University	9	0.0	0	0
Education level of the father	Primary	7	31.8	6	40.0
	Secondary	7	31.8	4	26.6
	High School	6	27.2	3	20.0
	University	3	9.2	2	13.4
Family income level	Low	4	18.2	2	13.0
	Medium	18	81.8	13	87.0
	High	0	0	0	0
Family marital status	Married	20	90	12	80.0
	Widowed	2	0	3	20.0
Mother working status	Working	11	50.0	7	46.7
	Not working	11	50.0	8	53.3
Father working status	Working	21	95.0	13	87.0
	Not working	1	5.0	2	13.0
Sibling who dropout	Yes	5	22.8	3	20.0
	None	17	5.0	12	80.0
Friend who dropout	Yes	8	36.4	5	33.0
	No	14	63.6	10	37.3
Part-time work status	Working	18	82.0	13	86.7
	Not working	4	18.0	2	13.3

As seen in Table 2, the demographic data of the participants showed that in the experimental group; 36% of the participants were female and 64 % of them were male. 41% of the mothers of the participants were primary school graduates, 36.3% of them were secondary school, 22.7% of them were high school graduates and none of them were university graduates. 31% of the fathers were primary school graduates, 31.8% of them were secondary school, 27.2% of them were high school graduates and 9.2% of them were university graduates. 18.2% of the families of the participants had low income, 81.8% of them had medium income and none of them were high income. 90% of the participants were married and 10% of them were widowed. 50% of the participants' mothers were working a job and 50% of them weren't working. 95% of the participants' fathers were working a job and 5% of them weren't working. 22.8% of the participants' siblings were dropouts of the school and 5% of them weren't dropouts. 36.4% of the participants' friends were dropouts of the school and 63.4% of them weren't dropouts. 82% of the participants were working at a job and 18% of them weren't working a job.

4.2. Measures

4.2.1 Personal Information Form

This form was designed by the researchers and it contained demographic information, psychiatric history, and grade retention information about the participants.

4.2.2 School Experiences Scale (SES)

The School Experience Scale was developed by Yorğun (2014) to determine the dropout risk of high school students it was based on Brofenner's ecological theory. The areas of the scale are divided into personal, social, family and educational categories that rely on ecological theory (Brofenner, 1989 in Yorğun, 2014). The scale consists of seven subscales that may lead to dropout. The subscales are: Low social support, Negative peer relationships, Negative attitudes towards school, Self-withdrawal, Attitudes of peer group towards school, Attitudes towards education and Low self-esteem. As an example of the items in the scale 'Being successful in school is not important for me', 'I don't feel valued when I'm at school'' can be given. The construct validity of the scale was examined by exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis and the MSA3 was found .77. As a result of the explanatory factor analysis, the variance explained by the seven subscales dimensions was .63.43. As a result of confirmatory factor analysis RMSEA=.07, NFI=.97, CFI=.86, SRMR=.08 compliance values were significant. As a result of the general reliability analysis of the scale was .87. And for the subscales; Low social support .75, Negative peer relations .70, Negative attitudes towards school .67, Self-withdrawal .63, Attitudes of peer group towards school .69, Attitudes towards education .59 and Low self-esteem .55. The scale consists of 25 items and it is triple rated self-report scale. The lowest score that can be obtained from the scale is 25 and the highest score is 75. A high score on the scale indicates a high dropout score and low score indicates low dropout score.

4.2.3 Child-Adolescent Self-Efficacy Scale (CASES)

The Child-Adolescent Self-Efficacy Scale was developed by Murris (2001) to measure the self-efficacy of adolescents aged 12-19. The scale consists of three subscales which are named Academic self-efficacy, Social self-efficacy and Emotional self-efficacy. The scale is a self-reported measurement tool in a 5- point Likert scale. As an example of the items of the scale "How good are you good at completing your homework each day?, How well do you control your emotions?'' can be given. The scale was adapted into Turkish by Telef and Karaca (2012). The correlation coefficient between the Turkish and English versions of the scale was found .95 for the overall scale and also for the academic subscale .93, for the social subscale .94 and for the emotional subscale .91. As a result of the exploratory factor analysis it was determined that totally explained variance was .43.74%. In confirmatory factor analysis RMSEA=.049, NFI:.95, CFI=.96, GFI=.94 and SRMR: .66 compliance values were reached it was stated that these values were significant. Turkish form of CASES' general internal consistency coefficient KR-20 for total items was calculated as .86 and for academic self-efficacy .84, for social self-efficacy .64 and also for emotional self-efficacy .78. The scale's test-retest reliability coefficients range from .75 to .89. The lowest score that can be obtained from the scale is 21 and the highest score is 105. High scores obtained from the scale indicate high self-efficacy levels of adolescents and low scores obtained from the scale indicate low self-efficacy levels of adolescents.

4.2.4 Motivational Strategies Scale for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ)

The scale was developed by Pintrich de Groot (1990) to measure students' motivational strategies for learning and it was adapted to Turkish by Üredi (2005). The scale consists of 44 items and it is divided into 2 dimensions these are; Self-regulation and Motivational Beliefs. Self-Regulation dimension consists of two sub-scales which are named Cognitive/Meta-Cognitive strategies and Self-regulation. Motivational Beliefs dimension also consists of two sub-scales these are Instrinsic value with Self-efficacy and Text anxiety. The scale is a self-reported measurement tool in a 7-point Likert scale. As an example of the items of the scale 'If I can, I want to get better grades in this class than most of the other students', 'When studying for this class, I read my class notes and the course readings over and over again' can be given. The validity and reliability study of the scale for high school students was conducted by Arslan, Erturan, İlker and Demirhan (2014). The result of the factor analysis showed that Turkish version of the MSLQ; RMSEA: .042, SRMR=.047, CFI=.95, GFI=.90, AGFI=.94. Reliability Cronbach alpha coefficient for total scale .88, for Self-regulation dimension .81 and for Motivational beliefs dimension .81 so it indicated an adequate level of reliability. The lowest score that can be obtained from the scale is 44 and the highest score is 308. A high score from the self-regulation strategies dimension indicates that students can use self-regulation strategies effectively, while a low score indicates that they cannot use the strategies effectively and gets a high score on the motivational beliefs dimension; A low score indicates that students are able to motivate themselves to learn a subject, and that they cannot motivate themselves to learn.

3.2.5 General Session Evaluation Form

The form was designed by the researcher to evaluate the Psychoeducation group training. Th form consists of 17 items. 15 items of the form are evaluated as Likert type 5-point rating and other two items are open-ended questions. The first 5 items of the form evaluate the management skills of the group leader and the other 10 items about the training process.

3.3 Development of the Psychoeducation Program for the Dropout Prevention

In this study, a dropout prevention program based on self-efficacy theory was developed to reduce the dropout risk of grade 9th retention students. The variables of the psychoeducation program developed by the literature review of the effective dropout prevention programs which designed for high school students. After determining the theoretical basis of the program, students' development period, socio-economic level of students, and cultural characteristic was also taken into account. During the preparation of the baseline; effective dropout programs were examined by the researcher and as a result of this examination components of the effective programs were involved; academic support (Bozanoğlu, 2004), enhancing self-esteem/self-efficacy (Bademci et al., 2018), career guidance (Kemple & Herlihy, 2004), study skills (Fulk, 2003) and parent involvement (White & Kelly, 2010).

It also benefited that the findings of the study by Öğülmüş, Aypay, Taşpınar, Çabuk Kaya, Varçın, Pişkin, Çınkır, Sever, Önen, Eşkisu and Çam (2013). With the support of Ministry of National Education & UNICEF (2013), there was extensive research on grade retention and dropout student at high schools. The researchers conduct the study nationwide with 2599 students between the ages of 14-18 who repeat the grade and dropout the high school. The findings of the study showed that dropout interventions should include peer support, they should aim to enhance self-efficacy beliefs and set positive goals for the future.

Social-Cognitive Learning Theory based on the development of the Dropout Prevention Program. According to the Social-Cognitive Learning Theory there is a strong relationship between academic achievement and self-efficacy belief (Bandura, 2001). Students with high self-efficacy fulfill their school-related responsibilities and they can overcome stressful situations when faced with them. In the content of the psychoeducation program developed in this study, it was aimed to increase students' self-efficacy beliefs by developing their self-efficacy resources. These resources are; successful experiences are indirect experiences (modelling), verbal persuasion, and physiological/psychological state control (Bandura, 2001).

As a result of the analysis of variables for developing the school-based intervention, they could be grouped under two headings; academic support and psychological support. For the academic support group activities about self-regulation techniques, and study skills training and for the psychological support group activities about self-efficacy beliefs, and motivational beliefs for learning exercises used during the developing the program. The content of the program is presented in Table 1.

Table 2: Dropout Prevention Program

No	Content of the Session
Session 1	İntroduction, setting group rules, a brief explanation about the process, setting a personal or academic goal.
Session 2	Providing information about self-efficacy beliefs by focusing vicarous experiences.
Session 3	Setting academic goals, examine the difference between short-term and long-term goals.
Session 4	Teaching study skills, test anxiety and time management skills.
Session 5	Developing motivation for learning strategies, information about internal and external motivation.
Session 6	Developing motivation strategies, learning psychological and physiological state control.
Session 7	Modifying the negative experiences to positive experiences by mastery experiences.
Session 8	Recognizing the relationship between effort and success, vicarous experiences about a peer model.
Session 9	Focusing on future life, raising awareness about academic life.
Session 10	Evaluating individual learnings, motivating the participants not to give up.
Session 11	Summarizing the group process, and motivating the participants through verbal experiences.

4.3 Procedure

The participants of the study were the 9th grade retention students of Public high school in İstanbul. The School Experience Scale (Yorğun, 2014) which measures the dropout risk of the students applied to 9th grade retention students. Beginning of the procedure, there has been two experiments and a control group because the effect of parent involvement would be investigated. The score of the students on the School Experience Scale was ranked from high to low. From 57 students who met the inclusion criteria of the research were held information meeting. After the meeting, 40 students voluntarily were accepted the join the psychoeducation group. The experimental and control group were divided into three groups for their course schedule. Experimental 1:12 students, Experimental 2: 12; Control: 16 (due to the dropout risk), at the end of the psychoeducation group training 3 students were dropout the school. Due to insufficient participation in parent involvement; this situation has been assessed and two experimental groups combined into one group. During the process, the revised study group consisted of Experimental: 22 students (8 girls, 14 boys) and Control: 15 students (8 girls, 7 boys).

4.4 Data Analyses

Firstly, obtained data was investigated by Shapiro-Wilks test and the sphericity test whether it shows the normal distribution. And also, Levene test was used for variance homogeneity. Because of the data showed normal distribution for the hypothesis test mixed ANOVA for the repeated measure, Bonferroni test which is a post-hoc analysis was used to determine whether there was a significant difference between and within groups. Descriptive statistics were used for the qualitative data which obtained from the session evaluation forms.

5. Results and Discussion

In this section, a quantitative analysis of the findings obtained by the hypothesis of the research and a qualitative analysis of the findings obtained from the general session evaluation form is presented.

According to the results of the Two-way ANOVA for mixed measures analysis, there was a significant difference between pretest, posttest and follow-up scores of SES obtained from experimental and control groups are given in Table 3.

Table 3: ANOVA results for the Pretest, Posttest and
Follow-up Measurements of School Experiences Scale

Source of the variance	Sum of squares	Sd	Mean squares	F	p	η_p^2
Group (Exp/Cont)	5.90	1	5.90	.13	.716	.004
Error	1597.77	35	43.94			
Measure (pre-post-follow-up)	95.60	1.33	72.54	4.76	.025	.12
Group*Measure	196.70	1.33	147.72	9.69	.001*	.22
Error	710.65	46.61	15.25			

*p<.05

The analysis of the mixed ANOVA of School Experiences Scale scores indicated that there was a significant difference between pretest, posttest and follow-up test scores obtained from experimental and control groups ($F_{(1.35)}$=9.69, p=.001, η_p^2=22). These findings indicated that the psychoeducation group was effective to reduce the dropout risk of students. According to another finding, there was no significant difference between posttest scores obtained by experimental and control groups ($F_{(1,35)}$=.13, p=.716, η_p^2= .004). This finding could be due to the fact that because of the absence of a random assignment of the groups at the beginning of the group process.

According to the results of the Two-way ANOVA for mixed measures analysis, there was a significant difference between pretest, posttest and follow-up scores of Academic self-efficacy subscale of CASES obtained from experimental and control groups are given in Table 4.

Table 4: ANOVA results for the Pretest, Posttest and Follow-up Measurements
of Academic Self-Efficacy Subscale of Child-Adolescents Self-Efficacy Scale

Source of the variance	Sum of squares	Sd	Mean squares	F	p	η_p^2
Group (Exp/Cont)	980.84	1	980.84	22.51	.000*	.96
Error	1525.16	35	43.58			
Measure (pre-post-follow-up)	27.95	1	27.95	4.71	.037*	.12
Group*Measure	5.57	1	5.57	.94	.339	.02
Error	207.83	35	5.94			

*p<.05

The analysis of the mixed ANOVA of Academic Self-Efficay Subscale of Child-Adolescents Self-Efficacy Scale pretest, posttest and follow-up test scores scores indicated that there was a significant difference between posttest scores obtained from by

experimental and control groups ($F_{(1.35, 70)}$=22.51, p=.000, η_p^2=.96). And also, there was a significant difference between posttest scores obtained by experimental and control groups ($F_{(1,35)}$=4.71, p=.037, η_{p^2}=.12). These findings indicated that the psychoeducation group was effective to increase the academic self-efficacy of students.

According to the results of the Two-way ANOVA for mixed measures analysis, there was a significant difference between pretest, posttest and follow-up scores of Motivational Strategies of Learning questionnaire obtained from experimental and control groups are given Table 5.

Table 5: ANOVA results in for the Pretest, Posttest and Follow-up
Measurements of Motivational Strategies of Learning Questionnaire

Source of the variance	Sum of squares	Sd	Mean squares	F	p	η_p^2
Group (Exp/Cont)	1234.23	1	1234.23	1.42	.24	.04
Error	3047.69	35	870.65			
Measure (pre-post-follow-up)	3518.46	1.04	3370.79	11.13	.002	.24
Group*Measure	3093.05	1.04	2963.24	9.78	.003*	.22
Error	11066.64	36.53	302.92			

*p<.05

The analysis of the mixed ANOVA of Motivational Strategies of Learning Questionnaire scores indicated that there was a significant difference between pretest, posttest and follow-up test scores obtained from by experimental and control groups ($F_{(1.35,)}$=9,78, p=.003, η_{p^2}=.22). These findings indicated that the psychoeducation group was effective to increase the motivational learning of participants. According to another finding, there was no significant difference between posttest scores obtained by experimental and control groups ($F_{(1,35)}$=1.42, p=.24, η_P^2=.04). This finding could be due to the fact that because of the absence of a random assignment of the groups at the beginning of the group process.

At the end of the psychoeducation program the participants were asked to evaluate the psychoeducation process by the General Evaluation Form. The data of the Dropout Prevention Program Evaluation Program are presented in Table 6.

Table 6: The Result of the General Session Evaluation Form (N=22)

Items	$\bar{x}$	Ss	Min	Max
1. Group leader presented the information clearly.	4.81	0.39	4	5
2. The group leader manages the time well.	4.68	0.47	4	5
3. Group leader encouraged to participate in activities.	4.68	0.56	3	5
4. The group leader communicates well with the students.	4.54	0.50	4	5
5. The activities chosen by the group leader were interesting.	4.68	0.56	3	5
6. I liked the content of the training.	4.63	0.49	4	5
7. The activities were beneficial for both my school life and personal life.	4.63	0.49	3	5
8. I realized the effect of my self-efficacy on my academic success.	4.50	0.51	4	5
9. I learned useful information about study skills.	4.45	0.73	3	5
10. I realized the importance of time management.	4.63	0.65	4	5
11. I realized the importance of setting goals.	4.54	0.59	4	5

12. I can make a self-evaluation of my success or failure.	4.22	0.75	3	5
13. I realized that failure is also a learning and I have to strive without giving up.	4.59	0.66	4	5
14. I will continue to apply what I have learned in the program in my school life.	4.50	0.67	3	5
15. I will recommend my friends to join dropout prevention programs.	4.36	0.65	3	5

When the participants' responses were examined, it was determined that the highest score was item 1 'Group leader presented the information clearly' (x=4.81, Ss=0.39) and the lowest score was item 12 'I can make a self-evaluation of my success or failure' (x=4.22, Ss=0.75). The maximum score of the participants was 5 (Totally agree) and the minimum score of the participants was 3 (Partially agree).

And also, some of the participants responded to the open-ended question 'Which session impressed you the most during the psychoeducation process?'. By examining the responses four themes were determined these were goal setting, intrinsic motivation, the importance of effort and future orientation. The themes are presented in Table 7.

Table 7: Classification of themes of the responses

Themes	f	%
Goal Setting	7	31.9
Intrinsic Motivation	5	22.7
Importance of Effort	5	22.7
Future Orientation	5	22.7
Total	22	100

As seen in Table 7, when the responses of the participants are examined it was determined that Goal setting theme was 31.9%, Intrinsic motivation was 22.7%, Importance of effort was 22.7% and Future orientation was 22.7%.

According to the results of the participants' responses on the theme of Goal setting examples: *"I understood the importance of goal setting"* (Participant, 9), *"I realized that I needed to raise my academic goals"* (Participant, 18), *"I set a goal about university training"* (Participant, 13) and *"I learned that I have to work to achieve my goals"* (Participant, 1). İn terms of the responses on the theme of Intrinsic motivation examples; *"I learned that I can motivate myself"* (Participant, 5), *"I realized that I still have extrinsic motivation"* (Participant, 17), *"I have seen that successful people have intrinsic motivation"* (Participant, 20) and *"I learned to motivate myself to finish high school"* (Participant, 21). For the responses on the theme of Importance of Effort; *"As a quitter, I understand that I don't give up"* (Participant, 8), *"I realized that in order to pass the class I had to study"* (Participant, 6), *"Even if we got off to bad start, we can make up our mistakes"* (Participant, 15) and *"I learned from my mistakes and I learned to take action"* (Participant, 22). In terms of the responses on the of Future orientation examples; *"I realized that I need to plan my future now"* (Participant, 17), *"I will have a bright future if I worked hard"* (Participant, 2), *"I understood to the importance of plan my academic life"* (Participant, 16) and *"The imagine of being a successful adult made me feel good"* (Participant, 19).

The first hypothesis of the research was "The participants who received 11-week intervension would report significant improvements on measures of school experiences scores relative to the control group". According to the findings obtained from the research, this hypothesis was partially confirmed. As a result of the research, there is a significant difference between the school life pre-test scores and post-test scores of the participants in the experimental group, and this difference continues in the follow-up test two months later. This result shows that the program is effective in reducing the risk of dropout. The findings of this study are consistent with the results obtained in previous early leaving programs (Bademci et al., 2021; Güngör, 2018; Kemple and Herlily; 2004; Rumberger and Larson, 1995; Sinclair, Christenson, & Turlow, 2005; Somers, Owens & Piliawsky 2009; USAID, 2011). However, no significant difference was found between the post-test scores of the experimental and control groups. The reason for this is thought to be due to the inability to assign randomly to groups before the application due to factors that the researcher could not control, and the inability to match the scores.

The second hypothesis of the research is as follows: "The participants who received 11-week intervention would report significant improvements on measures of the child-adolescent self-efficacy scores relative to the control group ". According to the findings obtained from the research, this hypothesis was confirmed. As a result of the research, there is a significant difference between the academic self-efficacy pre-test scores and post-test scores of the participants in the experimental group, and this difference continues in the follow-up test two months later. The findings of this research are consistent with the results of previous research, which aimed to increase academic self-efficacy (Bağcı, 2020; Önemli & Yöndem, 2012; Zimmerman & Clearly, 2004). However, no statistically significant difference was found between the self-efficacy mean scores of the experimental and control groups. the program implemented within the scope of this study was aimed to increase the academic success of the students by developing their self-efficacy resources and developing the students' desire to continue school. According to studies, the most powerful sources of self-efficacy are successful experiences and indirect experiences. (Bandura, 2001). However, when the qualitative findings obtained from the group sessions' general evaluation forms in this study are examined, it is seen that the sessions in which the students were most impressed and benefited were the sessions in which the 'indirect experiences' strategy was studied. It can be thought that the reason for this is that the students in the study group are in adolescence and students in this period are more prone to learning from the model and experience. According to Bandura (1989), the behaviors exhibited by individuals are acquired through observing and modeling other individuals. When students observe the behaviours' of individuals who are successful despite adverse conditions, their self-efficacy beliefs become stronger (Pajares, 1996). In this context, it can be said that the use of successful role models in the content of the program contributes to the increase of self-efficacy beliefs.

The third hypothesis of the research is in the form of: "The participants who received 11-week intervension would report significant improvements on measures of the motivational strategies for learning scores relative to the control group''. According

to the findings obtained from the research, this hypothesis was confirmed. As a result of the research, there is a significant difference between the motivational strategies for learning pre-test scores and the post-test scores of the participants in the experimental group, and this difference continues in the follow-up test two months later. This result shows that the developed program was effective in increasing the motivational beliefs of the experimental group participants toward learning. The findings of this research are consistent with the results of previous research, which aimed to increase learning motivation (Bandura, 2001; Önemli & Yöndem, 2012; Zimmerman & Clearly, 2004). However, there is no statistically significant difference between the post-test scores of the experimental and control groups. The reason for this is thought to be due to the inability to assign randomly to groups before the application due to factors that the researcher could not control, and the inability to match the scores. When the relevant literature is examined, some of the methods used in practices and research to develop motivational strategies for learning; goal setting (Bozanoğlu, 2004), time management (Berger, 2013), discovering inner values (Zimmerman & Clearly, 2004), struggling with obstacles (Duckworth, 2018), sharing inspiring life stories (Işık, 2016), coping with anxiety methods (Mirto, 2017) and using positive expressions (Brier, 2006).

5. Recommendations

Although the research was conducted with an experimental design, which is strong in terms of cause-effect relationships, it has some limitations in terms of the evaluation of the study group and the participants. In this study random assignments could not be made in the formation of the study group, since the students had different course schedules. It is recommended to increase the internal validity of the study by paying attention to random assignment in future studies. In addition, in the context of multilevel approaches, it is thought that there is a need for practices that make parents and teachers a part of the intervention.

6. Conclusion

In this research, the school dropout prevention program for 9th grade retention students was developed and its effectiveness was examined. As a result, it was observed that the students in the experimental group who participated in the developed 'School Dropout Prevention Programme' had a decrease in the risk of dropping out and an increase in their self-efficacy and motivational beliefs. In this context, it can be said that the program developed is effective for students at risk of school dropout who experience academic failure.

Conflict of Interest Statement

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

About the Author(s)

Gülşah Ertekin is psychological counsellor in Ministry of National Education, Türkiye. Also, she works as an assistant professor at the university.

e-mail: gulsahhertekin@gmail.com

Orcid: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6829-336X

Ayşe Esra İşmen Gazioğlu is an associate professor at İstanbul University-Cerrahpaşa, Türkiye, Department of Guidance and Psychological Counseling Department.

e-mail: ismen@iuc.edu.tr

Orcid: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1293-5183

References

American Psychological Association (APA) (2000). *Resolution on school dropout prevention.* Washington, DC. Author. https://www.apa.org/pi/families/resources/school-dropout-prevention. Accessed 09.12.2021

Bademci H. Ö., Karadayı, E. F., Pur Karabulut İ. G., Bağdatlı ve Vural, N. (2018). Özsaygının artırılması yoluyla okul terkinin önlenmesi. *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları*, 21(41). 60-73.

Bademci, H. Ö., Karadayı, E. F. ve de Zulueta, F. (2015). Attachment intervention through peer-based interaction: Working with İstanbul's street boys in a university setting. *Children & Youth Services Review*, 49, 20-31, doi: 10.1016/j.childyouth.2014.12.019

Bağcı, S. Ç. (2020). Akademik öz-yeterlik artırma: erken ergenler arasında uygulanmış bir müdahale programının etkinliği. *Hacettepe ÜniversitesiFakültesi Dergisi.* 1-19, doi: 10.16986/HUJE.2018040665

Balfanz, R. & Legters, N. (2006). Closing dropout factories: The graduate-rate crisis. Education Week. (25) 42-43. https://www.edweek.org/leadership/opinion-closing-dropout-factories/2006/07. Accessed 10.11.2021

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social Foundations of Thought and Action: A Social Cognitive Theory.* Englewood Cliffs. NJ. Prentice Hall.

Bandura, A. (1989). Regulation of cognitive process through self-efficacy. *Developmental Psychology*, 25 (5), 729-735.

Bandura, A. (2001). Perceived self-efficacy in cognitive development and functioning. *Educational Psychologist*. 28(2).117-148.

Battin-Pearson, S., Newcomb, M., Abbott, R. & Hawkins, J. (2000). Predictors of early school dropout. *Journal of Educational Psychology*. V.92(3), 568-582.

Berger, C. (2013). Bring out the brilliance: A counseling intervention for underachieving students. ASCA: *Professional School Counseling*. 86-96. doi: 0.1177/2156759X0001700102

Bozanoğlu, İ. (2004). Bilişsel-Davranışçı yaklaşıma dayalı grup rehberliğinin, güdülenme, benlik saygısı, başarı ve sınav kaygısına etkisi. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi*, 38, 17-42.

Blount, T. (2012*).* Dropout Prevention: Recommendations for school counselors. *Journal of School Counseling*, 10(16), 1-16.

Bridgeland, J. M., Dililio, J. ve Morison, K. (2006). The Silent Epidemic: Perspectives of High School Dropouts. www.civicenterprises.net Accessed 07.01.2022

Brier, N. (2006). Enhancing Academic Motivation. *An Intervention Program for Young Adolescent*s. Research Press.

Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2016). Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemleri. Pegem Yayıncılık. Ankara. 22.baskı.

Christenson, S. L., & Sinclair, M. F., Lehr, C. A. (2001). Promoting Success for School Completion: Critical Conceptual and Methodical Guidelines. *School Psychology Quarterly*. 16(4), 468-484 doi:10.1521/scpq.16.4.468.19898

Dockery, D. J. (2012). School Dropout Indicators, Trends and Interventions for School Counselors. *Journal of School Counseling*, 10(12), 1-33.

Duckworth, A. (2018). Grit: The Power of Passion and Perseverance. Scribneri, NY, USA.

Eğitim Reformu Girişimi-ERG (2018). 2016-2017 Eğitim İzleme Raporu. İstanbul. https://www.egitimreformugirisimi.org/egitim-izleme-raporu-2017-18-2/ Accessed: 01.02.2019.

Fulk, E. (2003). Concerns about ninth-grade student's poor academic performance: One school action plan. *American Secondary Education*, 31, 8-26.

Güngör, G. (2019). *Mesleki ve teknik ortaöğretimde okul terkinin nedenleri ve çözüm önerileri: Bütüncül bir program önerisi*. (Doktora tezi). Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü. Kocaeli Üniversitesi.

Hammond, C., Linton, D., Smink, J. & Drew, S. (2007). Dropout risk factors and exemplary programs: A technical report https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED497057.pdf Accessed. 14.01.2021.

Işık, Ş. (2016). Lisede Grup Rehberliği Etkinlikleri. Pegem Yayınevi. Ankara.

Jimerson, S. R., Anderson, G. E. & Whipple, A. D. (2002). Winning the battle and losing the war: Examining the relation between grade retention and dropping out high school. *Psychology in the Schools*, 39(4), 441-457. https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.10046

Karacabey, M. F. & Boyacı, A (2019). Ortaöğretimde Okul Terkinin Bireysel ve Kuramsal Nedenleri. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*. 27(3):1047-1057. DOI:10.24106/kefdergi.2540

Kemple, J. J. & Herlihy, C. M. (2004). Career Academies: High School Model. http://www.ncacinc.org, Accessed: 05.09.2018

Önemli, M. & Yöndem, Z. D. (2012). The Effect of Psychoeducation Group Training Depending on Self-Regulation of Students' Motivational Strategies and Academic Achievement. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice.* v12 n1 p67-73 win 2012. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ978433 Accessed: 25.12.2021

MEB ve UNICEF (2013). Ortaöğretimde sınıf tekrarı, okul terk sebepleri ile örgün eğitim dışında kalan çocukların eğitim ve çalışma durumları ile ihtiyaçlarının belirlenmesi https://www.meb.gov.tr/earged Accessed: 18.06.2021

Mirto, D. (2017). The effect of the self-efficacy-based program on at-risk secondary education students' level of general self-efficacy and achievement motivation. PhD thesis. Western Connecticut State University

NCES (2013). Ninth Grade Dropout Prevention Program. https://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/index. Assessed: 25.12.2021

Neild, R. C. (2009). Falling off track during the transition to high school: What we know and what can be done. *The Future of Children,* 19, 53-76.

OECD (2021). Education Welfare Report. http://www.oecd.org/education/education-at-a-glance-2015. Accessed: 12.05.2019.

Öğülmüş, S., Aypay, A., Taşpınar, M., Çabuk Kaya, N., Varçın, R., Pişkin, M., Çınkır, Ş., Sever, M., Önen, E., Eşkisu, M. ve Çam, Z. (2013). Ortaöğretimde sınıf tekrarı, okul terk sebebleri ve örgün eğitim dışında kalan çocuklar politika raporu. MEB/UNICEF. Eduser Yayıncılık. Ankara https://www.meb.gov.tr/earged/unicef/pdf Accessed: 01.07.2019.

Pajares, F. (1996). Self-efficacy beliefs in academic settings. Review of Educational Settings. Review of Educational Research, 66, 543 https://doi.org/10.2307/1170653

Pintrich, P. R. & De Groot, E. V. (1990). Motivational and self-regulated learning components of classroom academic performance. *Journal of Educational Psychology*. 82(1), 33-40. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.82.1.33

Rumberger, R. W. & Lim, S. A. (2008). Why students drop out of school: A review of 25 years of research. California Dropout Research Project 1-5.

Somers, L. C., Owens, D. & Piliawsky, M. (2009). A study of high school dropout prevention program at risk ninth graders' role models and motivations for school completion. *Preventing School Failure*. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ871669 Accessed: 04.03.2021

Suh, S. & Suh, J. (2007). Risk factors and levels of risk for at-risk high school dropouts. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 85, 196-203. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6678.2007.tb00463.x

Taylı, A. (2008). Eğitim sisteminde önemli bir sorun: Okulu bırakma. *Türk Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi*. Cilt: III Sayı:30 ,89-101.

Telef, B. ve Karaca, R. (2012). Çocuk ve ergenler için öz-Yeterlik ölçeği: Geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması. *Buca Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*. (32). s. 169-187.

UNESCO (2012). Global partnership for girls and women education. Better Life, Better Future. http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0021/002166/216606c.pdf. Accessed: 01.03.2021

Üredi, I. & Üredi, L. (2005). İlköğretim 8. sınıf öğrencilerinin öz-düzenleme stratejileri ve motivasyonel inançlarının matematik başarısını yordama gücü, Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 1(2), 250-260

https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/mersinefd/issue/17391/181765   Accessed:
07.06.2019

Yorğun, A. (2014). Investigation of School Dropout Among High School Students. PhD
        Thesis. University of Hacettepe.

Zimmerman, B. J. & Clearly, T. J. (2004). Self-regulation Empowerment Program: A
        school-based program to enhance self-regulated and self-motivated cycles of
        student learning. *Psychology in the Schools*. V(4). 845-862. DOI: 10.1002/pits.10177