

March 2016

# **Educational Expectations and Dropout Behavior Among Junior High Students in Rural China**

**Chang Fang, Wenbin Min, Shi Yaojiang, Kaleigh Kenny and Prashant Loyalka**

## **Abstract**

Dropping out of junior high school one of the most serious challenges facing the human capital development of the next generation of workers in China's rural areas. The goal of this paper is to assess to what extent the educational expectations of students are correlated with dropout behavior at the junior high school level in China. Using panel data, this research finds that the cumulative dropout rate is high among grade 7 and grade 8 students within our sample (as high as 19.5%, which implies a three year drop out rate of around 25%). Importantly, we find this high rate of dropout is significantly correlated with students' educational expectations. Specifically, students who reported their expected level of education is "Less than High School" or "Less than College" are 5 times and 4 times more likely to dropout during junior high school than their peers, respectively.

---

**Working Paper 288**

**March 2016**

**[reap.fsi.stanford.edu](http://reap.fsi.stanford.edu)**



## **Educational Expectations and Dropout Behavior among Junior High Students in Rural China**

**Abstract:** Dropping out of junior high school is one of the most serious challenges facing the human capital development of the next generation of workers in China's rural areas. The goal of this paper is to assess to what extent the educational expectations of students are correlated with dropout behavior at the junior high school level in China. Using panel data, this research finds that the cumulative dropout rate is high among grade 7 and grade 8 students within our sample (as high as 19.5%, which implies a three year drop out rate of around 25%). Importantly, we find this high rate of dropout is significantly correlated with students' educational expectations. Specifically, students who reported their expected level of education is "Less than High School" or "Less than College" are 5 times and 4 times more likely to dropout during junior high school than their peers, respectively.

**Key Words:** Dropout, Educational Expectations, Junior High School, Rural China

**JEL Codes:** I20, I25, R10

# **Educational Expectations and Dropout Behavior among Junior High Students in Rural China**

## **I Introduction**

After thirty years of rapid growth, a critical question China now faces is how to avoid falling into the Middle Income Trap (Eichengreen et al., 2011; Cai, 2014; Yao, 2015). The Middle Income Trap refers to the economic stagnation that occurs when the average income level in a country reaches a point where it can no longer sustain transformative economic development, resulting in slow economic growth or stagnation (World Bank, 2007). Scholars agree that one of the most basic measures that can be taken to avoid this situation is to encourage the development of a country's human capital, especially within poor areas (Zhang et al., 2013; Yilmaz, 2014). Indeed, it has been found that an emphasis on education has been the main reason for the rapid economic growth in many of countries in East Asia in recent years (World Bank, 1993; Fleisher et al., 2009).

Unfortunately, human capital accumulation in China's rural areas is likely hindered by the fact that many students choose to drop out of school at relatively young ages. In particular, evidence suggests that large numbers of students dropout of school at the junior high school level at rates much higher than those reported by the government (2.6% —MOE, 2006). For example, Mo et al. (2013) has found that the grade 7 dropout rate in rural China is 13%. Similarly, Yi et al. (2015) found that more than 51% of junior high school students in poor, rural areas do not go on to high school. A recent study based on 24,931 middle school students showed that the cumulative dropout rate across all stages of secondary education may be as high as 63% (Shi et al., 2015). These dropout rates are not only high, but also will have negative consequences for China's human capital accumulation and future growth.

The literature in developing countries has identified several factors associated with dropout behavior. For example, economic factors, such as poverty and opportunity costs faced by remaining in school, have been found to be associated with high dropout rates in rural China (Brown et al., 2002; Connelly et al., 2003; Yi et al., 2012; Barrera-Osorio et al., 2008). In addition, certain family factors have been found to be related to the likelihood of a student dropping out of school, such as the number of children in the family and parental education levels (Lopez, 2000; Shapiro, 2001; Knight and Li, 1996; Zhao and Glewwe, 2010; Glick and Sahn, 2000). Gender also plays a role in dropout, as research has found that boys drop out of junior high school at rates higher than those of girls (Wang et al., 2014). Psychological factors may also affect dropout behavior (Chen and Li, 2000; Nolen-Hoeksema et al., 1986; Kokko et al., 2006; Wang et al., 2014). Specifically within the context of China, left-behind children, children that have been left in the countryside with relatives while their parents migrate to cities for work, have also been found to be especially vulnerable to dropping out of school (Yi et al., 2012; Su et al., 2015).

In addition to the factors that other research teams have identified as determinants of dropout, a student's own educational expectations may also play a role in determining his/her dropout decision. Educational expectations have been found to play an important role in the process of educational attainment (Sewell and Shah, 1967; Sewell, et al., 1970). The empirical literature also suggests that an individual's expected level of education is an effective predictor of future educational attainment and life-long achievement (Jacob and Wilder, 2010; Goodman et al., 2011; Khoo and Ainley, 2005; Rampino and Taylor, 2013; Ou and Arthur, 2008).

While of great interest to those trying to assess the determinants of dropping out in China, it should be noted that almost all work to date has been done in developed countries. This line of research may be especially important in China, due to the country's extremely competitive, exam-oriented educational system. Under this system, students are tracked from an early age and must pass entrance exams to continue onto further levels of schooling. If expectations are important for educational attainment and tracking systems create forces that can positively or negatively affect a student's expectations, then having positive expectations might be thought to be an important factor to reducing dropout.

It is also the case that a competitive, exam-oriented system puts pressure on students to drop out. These effects are likely to be particularly acute within China's poor, rural areas. The competition is every bit as intense within these areas as in urban centers because China's education system is unified across rural and urban boundaries. However, there are many factors that may be reducing the competitiveness of rural students, such as lower incomes (MOE and NBS, 2004; Tsang and Ding, 2005), weaker family structures (Huang and Du, 2007), and poorer schooling facilities (World Bank, 2001; Wang et al., 2011).

It is within this setting that we are interested in understanding the expectations of rural students regarding their own education. Even further, we are interested in determining whether these expectations are associated with different rates of dropout. In short, the overall goal of this paper is to examine the relationship between dropout behavior and educational expectations among junior high school students in rural China. To meet this goal, we pursue four specific objectives. First, we document the prevalence of dropout among junior high school students in rural China. Second, we report on the educational expectations and

aspirations of junior high school students in rural China. Third, we measure determinants of dropout and educational expectations through multivariate regression. Fourth, we measure the nature of the association between dropping out and educational expectations. The correlations are calculated for both an unconditional specification and after controlling for student, family, and school characteristics.

To meet these objectives, the rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section II introduces the study's sample, data collection, and methodological approach. Section III reports the prevalence rates and correlates of dropout and educational expectations. Section IV analyzes the relationship between dropout and educational expectations. Section V concludes.

## II Data and methods

### *Sampling*

The sample was chosen in a four step process. First, sample counties were selected from a prefecture in northern Shaanxi Province. The prefecture has relatively poor agricultural resources and poor transportation infrastructure. Indeed, the per capita rural income in this prefecture is \$38 (or 3%) lower than the average per capita income in rural China (NBS, 2012). In 2012, the per capita rural income in our sample area was 7,681 RMB (or \$1,238). When compared to other rural areas in Shaanxi, our sample area is not the poorest prefecture. In fact, the per capita rural income is \$309 higher than the average per capita rural income of Shaanxi province. However, given that some of the counties in the prefectures are nationally-designated poor counties (which are common across China's

northwest region), we believe that this prefecture remains broadly representative of rural areas in Western China.

To select the counties in the sample prefecture, we first obtained a list of all the twelve counties in this prefecture. We then randomly chose eight counties to enroll in our sample. The population of these eight counties constitutes 84% of all of the sample prefecture.

After the counties were chosen, the second step of the sampling protocol involved selecting the schools. To do this, we solicited a list of all schools in each county from each county's Bureau of Education. Schools located in the county seat were excluded in order to target rural students. We also eliminated the schools that had fewer than 100 students (50 students in seventh and eighth grade, respectively), since many counties were in the middle of merging such schools. We did not want small schools in the sample since we wanted to follow these students for up to two years (and there was a likelihood that the schools would not be around at a later date during a follow up survey). From this modified complete list of junior high schools, we randomly selected a sample of 38 schools.

The third step was to select the students within each sample school. In each sample school, we enrolled all students in seventh and eighth grade into our sample. We did not select ninth grade students because they would not be attending the school during the follow-up surveys, making collecting follow-up survey information from students of this age prohibitively difficult. At the time of the baseline survey in 2012, the total sample consisted of 4840 students. Of the total, 2317 were grade 7 students and 2523 were grade 8 students (Table 1).

TABLE 1. Number of Sample Counties and Sample Students

	Number of schools	Number of students
Total sample	38	4840
<i>By county</i>		
County 1	9	1073
County 2	4	606
County 3	4	631
County 4	6	982
County 5	5	371
County 6	3	470
County 7	4	509
County 8	3	198
<i>By gender</i>		
Female		2250
Male		2590
<i>By grade</i>		
Seventh grade		2317
Eighth grade		2523

Source: Author's own survey

## *Data*

During the baseline survey our enumeration team gathered detailed information on a variety of variables covering students and their families from a survey administered to sample students in 3 blocks. A description of these variables can be found in Table 2.

TABLE 2. Descriptive Statistics for Key Variables

Variables	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min	Max
Expected Levels of Education for High School (1=high school or above; 0=less than high school)	0.94	0.23	0	1
Expected Levels of Education for College (1=college or above; 0=less than college)	0.80	0.40	0	1
Boarding (1=Yes; 0=No)	0.71	0.45	0	1
Left behind student (1=Yes; 0=No)	0.34	0.47	0	1
Math test scores	7.81	2.43	0	15
Father completed Junior HS (1=Yes; 0=No)	0.45	0.50	0	1
Mother completed Junior HS (1=Yes; 0=No)	0.25	0.44	0	1
Qualified for poverty grants (1=Yes; 0=No)	0.32	0.47	0	1
Number of Siblings	1.39	0.97	0	7
Teacher-student relationship score	7.05	2.51	1	10

In the first block, all students were asked to provide information on their educational expectations. Specifically, students were asked to provide the highest level of education that they expected to receive. The choices for their expected level of education were: grade 7; grade 8; grade 9; high school; college degree; master's degree; or doctorate degree. From these responses, we were able to determine which students expected to attend high school/college and which did not.

The second block of the survey was a 25 minute standardized math test. The questions that made up the exam were based on a subset of a test originally created for the Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS). We contracted with a team of teachers that worked in rural schools to ensure that the questions were relevant to the curriculum of their students. To ensure strict time limits and avoid cheating, enumerators remained in the classroom, timed the exam, and monitored the exam.

In the third block of the survey, enumerators collected data on the characteristics of students. Students were asked to fill in a questionnaire on their personal and family backgrounds. They were asked questions about their gender, age, number of siblings, the level of education of their parents, whether their family received welfare benefits, and whether the parents migrated for work. The questionnaire also included information related to the schooling of students, such as their grades, whether they boarded at school, and a score relating the quality of their relationships with their teachers.

Data on student dropout was derived from follow-up surveys conducted in September 2013 and April 2014. To collect this information, enumerators first collected the name and contact information of each student included in the baseline survey. Then,

enumerators recorded whether the students were present or absent during the follow-up survey. If a student was absent, the enumerators asked the homeroom teacher to provide a reason for the student's absence (coded as transferred to other schools, dropped out, or on temporary leave due to being ill). To further confirm whether a student had dropped out or was temporarily absent, enumerators then called the student's household to confirm that the homeroom teachers were providing accurate information.

### *Analytical methods*

In order to understand the relationship between student educational expectations and drop out, we first run descriptive analyses. In the initial analyses we look at the prevalence rates of dropouts with regards to the educational expectations of students. To understand what kinds of students are more likely to drop out, we then examine the student and family characteristics and educational expectations of students that do and do not drop out during junior high school. Specifically, we use t-tests to measure if there is a significant difference in characteristics between these groups in order to analyze which characteristics are correlated with educational expectations and dropout. Furthermore, to analyze the determinants of dropout and educational expectations, we run a multivariate regression that includes all the student and family characteristics.

In estimating the correlation between dropout and the individual educational expectations of students, we use an ordinary least squares (OLS) model:

$$Y_{ij} = \alpha + \beta H_i + \lambda X_i + \mu_j + \varepsilon_i \quad (1)$$

$$Y_{ij} = \alpha + \beta C_i + \lambda X_i + \mu_j + \varepsilon_i \quad (2)$$

The dependent variable  $Y_{ij}$  indicates the dropout status of student  $i$  in school  $j$ , which equals 1 if the student dropped out in 2013 or 2014 and equals 0 if the student remained in school.  $H_i$  is the educational expectation of student  $i$  for high school, which equals 1 if the student said he/she expects to go to high school and equals 0 if the student said he/she does not expect to go to high school.  $C_i$  is the educational expectation of student  $i$  for college, which equals 1 if the student said he/she expects to go to college and equals 0 if the student said he/she doesn't expect to go to college. The vector  $X_i$  includes student individual-level and family-level characteristics. The individual-level characteristics include student *gender*, *grade*, *boarding status*, whether the student is a *left behind child*, the student's *teacher-student relationship score*, and the student's *academic performance (math test score)*. The family-level characteristics include the *education level of parents*, *qualification for poverty grants*, and *number of siblings*. To further improve efficiency, we add school-level fixed effects, represented by  $\mu_j$ .

### III The Prevalence and Correlates of Dropout and Educational Expectations

#### *Dropout rates and correlates*

According to our data, the average dropout rate over our study period of one and a half academic years is 9.8%. Additionally, we find that the dropout rate varies by grade; the dropout rate for grade 7 students is 7.0% and the dropout rate increases to 12.5% for grade 8 students. This means that the cumulative dropout rate for grade 7 and grade 8 students among sample schools during the study period is 19.5% (Figure 1). If we extrapolate to all three years of junior high school, this means that approximately 25% of students are dropping out

of junior high school before they graduate. This rate is nearly 10 times higher than the officially recognized level for all three grades of junior high school (2.6%—MOE, 2006). The high level of dropout in our sample is consistent with those found by Mo et al. (2013—13%), Yi et al. (2015—51%), and Shi et al. (2015—63%).




FIGURE 1. Dropout rate (%)

Our data also demonstrate that dropout rates vary along the individual characteristics of students (Table 3). We find that boarding students, eighth grade students, students with siblings, students with lower levels of academic achievement, and students with poorer teacher-student relationship scores are more likely to dropout from junior high school than their peers. Additionally, we find that the dropout rate of male students in our sample (12.6%) is nearly two times higher than that of female students (6.7%—Figure 1). Such findings are also consistent with the results of other researchers. According to Mo et al. (2012) and Yi et al. (2013), junior high boys in China face a higher opportunity cost to staying in school as compared to girls because there are more opportunities available to them in the job market at this age.

TABLE 3. Comparisons between attrited students and students present for the endline survey

	Students in Endline Survey	Attrited Students	Differ- ences	t-values / levels of significance <sup>a</sup>
[1] Male share (%)	68.48	51.94	16.54	6.79***
[2] Eighth-grade student share (%)	65.87	50.53	15.34	6.28***
[3] Boarding students share (%)	81.30	70.05	11.25	5.07***
[4] Left behind students share (%)	37.39	33.25	4.14	1.79*
[5] Math test scores <sup>b</sup> (mean)	7.32	7.87	-0.55	4.58***
[6] Share of fathers with educational attainment of junior high school or above (%)	38.04	45.78	-7.74	-3.17***
[7] Share of mothers with educational attainment of junior high school or above (%)	25.65	25.36	0.29	0.14
[8] Share of families that qualify for poverty grants (%)	32.83	31.68	1.15	0.50
[9] Number of siblings (mean)	1.51	1.38	0.13	2.78***
[10] Teacher-student relationship score <sup>c</sup> (mean)	6.45	7.11	-0.66	-5.41***

<sup>a</sup> \* Significant at 10%; \*\*Significant at 5%; \*\*\*Significant at 1%.

<sup>b</sup> Math test scores measure math abilities using a standardized math instrument that is based on student curriculum. The scores are between 0 and 15. The mean of the distribution is 7.81; the standard deviation is 2.43.

<sup>c</sup> The teacher-student relationship score measures the relationship between teachers and students. The scores are between 0 and 10. The mean of the distribution is 7.05; the standard deviation is 2.51.

### *Educational expectations and correlates*

Figure 2 depicts the prevalence of educational expectations among junior high school students. On average, the share of junior high school students whose expected level of education is “Less than High School” is 5.6% ( Figure 2a), and the share of students whose expected level of education is “Less than College” is 19.9% ( Figure 2b). Interestingly, these results mean that most of the junior high school students expect to attend high school or college. However, these findings are inconsistent with the high rates of dropout that have been found at the junior high school level. For this reason, we believe that it is likely that the educational expectations reported by students are due to “wishful thinking” rather than a realistic assessment of future educational attainment. Yi et al. (2015) found that, within China's competitive educational system, rural students with lower levels of academic achievement rarely went on to attend academic high school even after reporting that they planned to attend that level of schooling. In this case, the educational expectations of these students were credited to “wishful thinking” rather than a realistic evaluation of outcomes. It may be “wishful thinking” that can explain these discrepancies between the reported expected levels of education of students and their dropout behavior.




FIGURE 2a. The share of students whose expected level of education is “Less than High School” (%)




FIGURE 2b. The share of students whose expected level of education is “Less than College” (%)

To further understand what types of students tend to have lower educational expectations, we used t-tests to compare characteristics between students whose education expectations are “Less than High School” or “High School or Above” (Table 4) and between students whose educational expectations are “Less than College” or “College and Above” (Table 5). Similar to the relationship identified between student gender and dropout, we find there is a large difference in educational expectations between the genders. The share of male students whose expected level of education is “Less than High School” (7.6%) is more than two times higher than that of female students (3.2%—Figure 2a). Additionally, the share of male students whose expected level of education is “Less than College” (24.9%) is nearly 11 percentage points higher than that of female students (14.2%—Figure 2b). We also find students from more disadvantaged family backgrounds (indicated by boarding at school, having siblings, and lower levels of parental education) are more likely to have lower academic expectations than their peers. Finally, the data show that students with lower math test scores at baseline are also more likely to have lower educational expectations than other students (Tables 4 and 5).

TABLE 4. Comparisons between Students whose Expected Levels of Education is “High school or above” and Students whose Expected Levels of Education is “Less than High School.”

	Expected Level of Education is “High School or above”	Expected Level of Education is “Less Than High School”	Differences	t-values / levels of significance <sup>a</sup>
[1] Male share (%)	52.40	73.18	-20.78	-6.57***
[2] Eighth-grade student share (%)	52.13	50.57	1.56	0.49
[3] Boarding students share (%)	70.79	77.39	-6.60	-2.29**
[4] Left behind students share (%)	33.35	38.70	-5.35	-1.77*
[5] Math test scores <sup>b</sup>	7.88	6.73	1.15	7.46***
[6] Share of fathers with educational attainment of junior high school or above (%)	45.58	35.63	9.95	3.14***
[7] Share of mothers with educational attainment of junior high school or above (%)	25.51	23.37	2.14	0.77
[8] Share of families that qualify for poverty grants (%)	31.54	36.02	-4.48	-1.51
[9] Number of siblings (mean)	1.37	1.57	-0.20	-3.18***
[10] Teacher-student relationship score <sup>c</sup> (mean)	7.12	5.81	1.31	8.28***

<sup>a</sup> \* Significant at 10%; \*\*Significant at 5%; \*\*\*Significant at 1%.

<sup>b</sup> Math test scores measure math abilities using a standardized math instrument that is based on student curriculum. The scores are between 0 and 15. The mean of the distribution is 7.81; the standard deviation is 2.43.

<sup>c</sup> The teacher-student relationship score measures the relationship between teachers and students. The scores are between 0 and 10. The mean of the distribution is 7.05; the standard deviation is 2.51.

TABLE 5. Comparisons between students whose expected level of education is “College or Above” and students whose expected level of education is “Less than College.”

	Expected Level of Education is “College or Above”	Expected Level of Education is “Less Than College”	Differences	t-values / levels of significance <sup>a</sup>
[1] Male share (%)	50.24	66.92	-16.68	-9.21***
[2] Eighth-grade student share (%)	51.07	55.96	-4.89	-2.67***
[3] Boarding students share (%)	69.68	77.12	-7.44	-4.49***
[4] Left behind students share (%)	32.97	36.41	-3.44	-1.99**
[5] Math test scores <sup>b</sup> (mean)	7.98	7.14	0.84	9.57***
[6] Share of fathers with educational attainment of junior high school or above (%)	47.11	36.63	10.48	5.77***
[7] Share of mothers with educational attainment of junior high school or above (%)	26.04	22.77	3.27	2.05**
[8] Share of families that qualify for poverty grants (%)	31.39	33.40	-2.01	-1.18
[9] Number of siblings (mean)	1.37	1.47	-0.10	-2.69***
[10] Teacher-student relationship score <sup>c</sup> (mean)	7.28	6.14	1.14	12.54***

<sup>a</sup> \* Significant at 10%; \*\*Significant at 5%; \*\*\*Significant at 1%.

<sup>b</sup> Math test scores measure math abilities using a standardized math instrument that is based on student curriculum. The scores are between 0 and 15. The mean of the distribution is 7.81; the standard deviation is 2.43.

<sup>c</sup> The teacher-student relationship score measures the relationship between teachers and students. The scores are between 0 and 10. The mean of the distribution is 7.05; the standard deviation is 2.51.

*Multivariate regression: Determinants of dropout and educational expectations*

When we run a multivariate regression, we find that several student and family characteristics are significantly correlated with dropout behavior. Most of these correlations are consistent with the descriptive results. According to our data, we find that boys, eighth grade students, boarding students, students with siblings, and students with lower teacher-student relationship scores are more likely to drop out at the junior high school level than their peers (Table 6, Column 1). We also find that students with lower levels of academic performance are more likely to drop out. Specifically, the rate of dropout increases 0.9 percentage points for each 1 point decrease in a student's math score (Column 1, Row 9).

Also similar to the findings of our descriptive results, our multivariate analysis reveals that student and family characteristics are also related to a student's educational expectations. Our descriptive results show that boys and students with siblings are significantly less likely to report to expect to attend high school than their peers (Table 6, Column 2). Additionally, boys, eighth grade students, boarding students, students with siblings, and students with low teacher-student relationship scores are significantly less likely to report to expect to attend college than their peers (Table 6, Column 3).

TABLE 6. Multivariate analysis of determinants of dropout and educational expectations

VARIBLES	(1) Drop out (1=yes)	(2) Expects to Attend High School or Above (1=yes)	(3) Expects to Attend College or Above (1=yes)
[1] Male (1=yes)	0.062 <sup>***</sup> (0.01)	-0.044 <sup>***</sup> (0.01)	-0.103 <sup>***</sup> (0.01)
[2] Grade 8 (1=yes)	0.059 <sup>***</sup> (0.01)	0.002 (0.01)	-0.035 <sup>***</sup> (0.01)
[3] Boarding (1=yes)	0.046 <sup>***</sup> (0.01)	-0.013 (0.01)	-0.048 <sup>***</sup> (0.01)
[4] Left behind child (1=yes)	0.010 (0.01)	-0.002 (0.01)	-0.007 (0.01)
[5] Father completed junior high school (1=yes)	-0.014 (0.01)	0.010 (0.01)	0.044 <sup>***</sup> (0.01)
[6] Mother completed junior high school (1=yes)	0.014 (0.01)	0.004 (0.01)	0.013 (0.01)
[7] Household qualifies for poverty grants (1=yes)	-0.009 (0.01)	-0.008 (0.01)	-0.003 (0.01)
[8] Number of siblings	0.010 <sup>**</sup> (0.00)	-0.010 <sup>***</sup> (0.00)	-0.016 <sup>***</sup> (0.01)
[9] Math test score	-0.009 <sup>***</sup> (0.00)	0.009 <sup>***</sup> (0.00)	0.022 <sup>***</sup> (0.00)
[10] Teacher-student relationship score	-0.006 <sup>***</sup> (0.00)	0.009 <sup>***</sup> (0.00)	0.023 <sup>***</sup> (0.00)
County dummy	YES	YES	YES
Constant	0.062 <sup>**</sup> (0.02)	0.879 <sup>***</sup> (0.02)	0.620 <sup>***</sup> (0.03)
Observations	4668	4668	4668
R <sup>2</sup>	0.054	0.061	0.099

Robust standard errors in parentheses; \* p < 0.10, \*\* p < 0.05, \*\*\* p < 0.01

In addition to student and family characteristics (and while holding these characteristics constant), the academic performance of students at baseline is also related to their educational expectations. For each one point decrease on the standardized math test at baseline, students are 0.9 percentage points less likely to expect to attend high school and 2.2 percentage points less likely to expect to attend college (Table 6, Column 2 and Column 3, Row 9). In particular, when we focus on the poorest performing students, who we expect are the most likely to fail the entrance exams in China's schooling system, these effects are even larger. For those students whose standardized math test score rank is in the lowest quintile, the probability of expecting to attend high school is 9.4 percentage points lower and the probability of expecting to attend college is 17.0 percentage points lower than other students (Table 7, column 3, row 3; column 6, row 3).

TABLE 7. OLS Estimates of the relationship between educational expectations and academic achievement

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	Expects to Attend High School or Above			Expects to Attend College or Above		
[1] Math Test Score	0.010 <sup>***</sup> (0.00)	0.020 <sup>**</sup> (0.01)		0.022 <sup>***</sup> (0.00)	0.030 <sup>**</sup> (0.01)	
[2] Math Test Score <sup>2</sup>		-0.001 (0.00)			-0.001 (0.00)	
[3] Lowest Quintile Math Test Score			-0.094 <sup>***</sup> (0.03)			-0.170 <sup>***</sup> (0.05)
[4] Second Quintile Math Test Score			-0.066 <sup>***</sup> (0.02)			-0.133 <sup>***</sup> (0.04)
[5] Third Quintile Math Test Score			-0.033 <sup>**</sup> (0.01)			-0.062 (0.04)
[6] Fourth Quintile Math Test Score			-0.014 (0.01)			-0.004 (0.04)
[7] Student controls <sup>a</sup>	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
[8] County dummy	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
[9] School dummy	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Constant	0.87 <sup>***</sup> (0.03)	0.84 <sup>***</sup> (0.04)	0.99 <sup>***</sup> (0.03)	0.54 <sup>***</sup> (0.07)	0.51 <sup>***</sup> (0.09)	0.78 <sup>***</sup> (0.08)
Observations	4668	4668	4668	4668	4668	4668
R <sup>2</sup>	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.12	0.12	0.12

Robust standard errors in parentheses \* p < 0.10, \*\* p < 0.05, \*\*\* p < 0.01

<sup>a</sup> Student controls including gender, grade, boarding, left behind status, academic achievement, parent's education status, quality for poverty grants, number of siblings, and teacher-student relationship score.

Taking into account all the evidence offered above, similar student and family characteristics predict the dropout decisions and educational expectations of students. In sum, the multivariate analysis in Table 6 confirms that findings of the descriptive analysis: boys, eighth grade students, boarding students, students with siblings, and students with poor teacher-student relationship scores are more likely to drop out and less likely to report to expect to attend high school or college. Additionally, we find students who perform worse academically are also more likely to dropout and to report to have lower educational expectations.

#### IV The Correlates of Dropout and Educational Expectations

In this section, we examine the correlations between educational expectations and dropout. Figure 4 shows that students whose expected level of education is “Less than High School” drop out of junior high school at an extremely high rate (38.7%). This rate of dropout is more than five times higher than students whose expected level of education is “High School or Above” (8.1%—Figure 3). Similarly, students whose expected level of education is “Less than College” drop out at a rate of 23.4%, nearly four times higher than students whose expected level of education is “College or Above” (6.5%—Figure 3).




FIGURE 3. The relationship between dropout rate (%) and educational expectations

When we run the unadjusted OLS analysis to examine the correlation between educational expectations and dropout, we find that educational expectations are strongly correlated with dropout behavior. The dropout rate among students whose expected level of education is “Less than High School” is more than 30.6 percentage points greater than that of students whose expected level of education is “High School or Above” (Table 8, column 1, row 1). In addition, the dropout rate among students whose expected level of education is “Less than College” is more than 16.9 percentage points greater than that of students whose expected level of education is “College or Above” (Table 8, column 4, row 2).

In the adjusted OLS regression, we still find that lower educational expectations predict dropout behavior after controlling for student-level and family-level characteristics. Specifically, we find that the dropout rate among students whose expected level of education is “Less than High School” is more than 27.7 percentage points greater than that of students whose expected level of education is “High School or Above” (Table 8, Column 2, Row 1). Also, the dropout rate among students whose expected level of education is “Less than College” is more than 14.5 percentage points greater than that of students whose expected levels of education is “College or Above” (Table 8, Column 5, Row 2).

Importantly, the same story continues to hold when we look at associations between dropout and educational expectations within schools. In our adjusted regression with school fixed effects, we find that educational expectations are still significantly correlated with dropout (Table 8, Column 3, Row 1 and Column 6, Row 2). These results mean that educational expectations are highly correlated with student dropout even when controlling for all student, family, and school characteristics.

TABLE 8. OLS Estimates of the relationship between educational expectation and dropout

VARIBLES	(1) Dropout	(2) Dropout	(3) Dropout	(4) Dropout	(5) Dropout	(6) Dropout
[1] Expected Levels of education for High School (1=High School or above; 0=Less Than High School)	-0.306*** (0.02)	-0.277*** (0.02)	-0.254*** (0.04)			
[2] Expected Levels of education for College (1=College or above; 0=Less Than College)				-0.169*** (0.01)	-0.145*** (0.01)	-0.133*** (0.02)
[3] Student controls <sup>a</sup>	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES
[4] School fixed effects <sup>b</sup>	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	YES
Constant	0.387*** (0.02)	0.339*** (0.03)	0.301*** (0.04)	0.234*** (0.01)	0.187*** (0.02)	0.150*** (0.02)
Observations	4671	4671	4671	4671	4671	4671
R <sup>2</sup>	0.055	0.078	0.123	0.052	0.073	0.116

Robust standard errors in parentheses \* p < 0.10, \*\* p < 0.05, \*\*\* p < 0.01

<sup>a</sup> Student controls including gender, grade, boarding, left behind status, academic achievement, parent's education status, quality for poverty grants, number of siblings, and teacher-student relationship score.

<sup>b</sup> Significance tests adjusted for clustering within schools.

## V Conclusion

In this paper, we attempted to determine the relationship between the educational expectations of students and dropout at the junior high school level. We found that the cumulative dropout rate among grade 7 and 8 students in our sample is high (19.5%). In addition, we have shown that the level of expected education among this sample is also low – 5.6% of rural junior high school students do not expect to go to high school and 19.9% do not expect to attend college. Though these levels of educational expectations are low, they are optimistic when compared to actual proportion of students in rural China that continue onto high school and college. This may be due in part to “wishful thinking” among our sample. Further, we found that that students with lower levels of academic achievement were more likely to have lower expected levels of education than other students.

Even after controlling for student, family, and school characteristics, our results show that the educational expectations of students are significantly correlated with dropout rates at the junior high school level. A student with an expected level of education of “Less Than High School” was found to be 25.4 percentage points more likely to drop out of junior high school than their peers who expected to attend high school. Similarly, students with expected levels of education of “Less Than College” were found to be 13.3 percentage points more likely to drop out than students who expected to attend college.

Taken together, these results may imply that China’s exam-oriented academic system has been a contributing factor to the high levels of dropout at the junior high school level. Under China’s exam-oriented academic system, where one’s ability to continue schooling relies on his/her performance on the high school and college entrance exams, students who

have performed poorly in school will be likely to lose confidence and lower their expectations of continuing in this academic system. As a result, they may choose to dropout of school as a form of escape or to select other paths to success.

The results of this study contribute to a broader policy debate about how to effectively deal with dropout. Recently, the Chinese government has put forward a plan to universalize high school education (MOE, 2015), which would no doubt benefit from a lower dropout rate among junior high school students. Our results suggest that China's top educational leaders should consider reforming the exam-oriented academic system in poor rural areas. Doing so may serve as a way to raise the educational expectations of students, encourage them to continue their schooling past the junior high school level, and ultimately improve human capital in poor, rural areas.

## References

- Barrera-Osorio, Felipe., Bertrand, Marianne, Linden, Leigh L., and Perez-Calle, Francisco, 2008, "Conditional cash transfers in education: Design Features, Peer and Sibling Effects. Evidence from a Randomized Experiment in Colombia," NBER Working Paper No. 13890, National Bureau of Economic Research, Cambridge, MA.
- Brown, Philip H., Park, Albert, 2002, "Education and Poverty in Rural China," *Economics of Education Review*, Vol. 21, No.6, pp.523–541.
- Cai, Fang and Wang Meiyan, 2014, "China's Income Gap and Its Risk of Falling into Middle-Income Trap," *Journal of the Renmin University of China*, Vol. 3, No. 3, pp. 2-7. [in Chinese]
- Chen, Xinyin and Bo-shu Li, 2000, "Depressed mood in Chinese children: Development significance for social and school adjustment," *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, Vol. 24, No. 4, pp. 472-479.
- Connelly, Rachel, and Zhenzhen Zheng, 2003, "Determinants of school enrollment and completion of 10 to 18 year olds in China," *Economics of Education Review*, Vol. 22, No. 4, pp. 379-388.
- Eichengreen, Barry, Donghyun Park, and Kwanho Shin, 2011, "When Fast Growing Economies Slow Down: International Evidence and Implications for China," *NBER Working Paper*, No.16919.
- Fleisher, Belton, Haizheng Li, and Minqiang Zhao, 2009, "Human Capital, Economic Growth, and Regional Inequality in China," IZA Discussion Papers, No. 3576, Institute for the Study of Labor, Leibniz Information Centre for Economics.
- Glick, P. and David E. Sahn, 2000, "Schooling of Girls and Boys in a West African Country: The Effects of Parental Education, Income and Household Structure," *Economics of Education Review*, Vol. 19, No. 1, pp. 63-87.
- Goodman, Alissa, Paul Gregg and Elizabeth Washbrook, 2011, "Children's Educational Attainment and the Aspirations, Attitudes and Behaviours of Parents and Children through Childhood," *Longitudinal and Life Course Studies*, Vol. 2, No. 1, pp.1-8.
- Huang, Aili, and Xueyuan Du, 2007, "Comparative Analysis of Urban and Rural Difference in Family Education in China," *Journal of Yibing University*, Vol. 7, No. 1, pp.107–110. [in Chinese]
- Jacob, Brian A. and Tamara Wilder, 2010, "Educational Expectations and Attainment," NBER Working Paper No. 15683, National Bureau of Economic Research, Cambridge, MA.
- Khoo, Siek Toon and John Ainley, 2005, "Attitudes, Intentions and Participation," LSAY Research Report, Australian Council for Education Research, Melbourne.
- Knight, John and Shi Li, 1996, "Educational Attainment and the Rural-Urban Divide in China," *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, Vol. 58, No. 1, pp. 83-117.
- Kokko, Katja, Richard E. Tremblay, Eric Lacourse, Daniel S. Nagin, and Frank Vitaro, 2006, "Trajectories of Prosocial Behavior and Physical Aggression in Middle Childhood: Links to Adolescent School Dropout and Physical Violence," *Journal of Research on Adolescents*, Vol. 16, No. 3, pp. 403-428.

- Lopez-Acevedo, Gladys and Angel Salinas, 2000, "Marginal Willingness to Pay for Education and the Determinants of Enrollment in Mexico," Working Paper No.2405, World Bank, Washington, D.C.
- Ministry of Education and National Bureau of Statistics, 2004, *China Educational Finance Statistical Yearbook*, Beijing: China Statistics Press.
- Ministry of Education, 2006, "Statistical communiqué on national educational development in 2005," [http://www.moe.edu.cn/moe\\_2792/moe\\_2863/moe\\_2832/201002/t20100209\\_49957.htm](http://www.moe.edu.cn/moe_2792/moe_2863/moe_2832/201002/t20100209_49957.htm) (accessed 24 September 2015).
- Ministry of Education, 2015, "The Fifth Plenary Session Bulletin of the 18<sup>th</sup> Central Committee of the Communist Party of China," Available at: [http://www.moe.gov.cn/s78/A21/A21\\_ztzt/ztl\\_sbjwz/201511/t20151102\\_217013.html](http://www.moe.gov.cn/s78/A21/A21_ztzt/ztl_sbjwz/201511/t20151102_217013.html) (Accessed Feb 28, 2016).
- Mo, Di, Linxiu Zhang, Hongmei Yi, Renfu Luo, Scott Rozelle and Carl Brinton, 2013, "School drop-outs and conditional cash transfers: evidence from a randomised controlled trial in rural China's junior high schools," *The Journal of Development Studies*, Vol. 49, No. 2, pp. 190–207.
- National Bureau of Statistics, 2012, *China Education Statistical Yearbook*, Beijing: China National Bureau of Statistics.
- Nolen-Hoeksema, Susan, Joan S. Girgus, and Martin E. Seligman, 1986, "Learned helplessness in children: a longitudinal study of depression, achievement, and explanatory style," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 51, No. 2, pp. 435-442.
- Ou, Suh-Ruu and Arthur J. Reynolds, 2008, "Predictors of Educational Attainment in the Chicago Longitudinal Study," *School Psychology Quarterly*, Vol. 23, No. 2, pp.199–229.
- Rampino, Tina and Mark P. Taylor, 2013, "Gender differences in educational aspirations and attitudes," ISER Working Paper Series No. 2013-15.
- Sewell, William H. and Vimal P. Shah, 1967, "Socioeconomic Status, Intelligence, and the Attainment of Higher Education," *Sociology of Education*, Vol. 40, No. 1, pp.1-23.
- Sewell, William H., Archibald O. Haller, and George W. Ohlendorf, 1970, "The Educational and Early Occupational Status Attainment Process: Replication and Revision," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 35, No. 6, pp. 1014-1027.
- Shapiro, David and B. Oleko Tambashe, 2001, "Gender, Poverty, Family Structure and Investments in Children's Education in Kinshasa, Congo," *Economics of Education Review*, Vol. 20, No. 4, pp. 359-375.
- Shi, Yaojiang, Linxiu Zhang, Yue Ma, Hongmei Yi, Chengfang Liu, Natalie Johnson, James Chu, Prashant Loyalka and Scott Rozelle, 2015, "Dropping Out of Rural China's Secondary Schools: A Mixed-methods Analysis," *The China Quarterly*, Vol. 224, pp. 1048-1069.
- Su, Qun, Xu Yue'e, and Chen Jie, 2015, "Parental Migration and Left-behind Children's Dropout: An Empirical Analysis based on CHNS Survey Data," *Education and Economy*, No. 2, pp. 67-71. [in Chinese]

- Tsang, Mun C., and Yanqing Ding, 2005, "Resource Utilization and Disparities in Compulsory Education in China," *Education and Economy*, No. 2, pp. 34–40. [in Chinese]
- Wang, Huan, Chu Yang, Fei He, Yaojiang Shi, Qinghe Qu, Scott Rozelle, and James Chu, 2014, "Mental health and dropout behavior: a cross-sectional study of junior high students in northwest rural China," *International Journal of Educational Development*, Vol. 41, pp.1–12.
- Wang, Xiaobing, Chengfang Liu, Linxiu Zhang, Renfu Luo, Thomas Glauben, Yaojiang Shi, Scott Rozelle, and Brian Sharbono, 2011, "What Is Keeping the Poor Out of College?" World Bank, 1993, "The East Asian Miracle: Economic Growth and Public Policy," *World Bank Policy Research Reports*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- World Bank, 2001, "China: Challenges of Secondary Education," Second Education Series No. 22856. World Bank, Washington, DC.
- World Bank, 2007, "An East Asian Renaissance: Ideas for Economic Growth," The World Bank, Washington, D.C.
- Yao, Zhizhong, 2015, "How Can China Avoid the Middle Income Trap?," *China & World Economy*, Vol. 23, No. 5, pp. 26-42.
- Yi, Hongmei, Linxiu Zhang, Renfu Luo, Yaojiang Shi, Di Mo, Xinxin Chen, Carl Brinton, and Scott Rozelle, 2012, "Dropping out: Why are students leaving junior high in China's poor rural areas?" *International Journal of Educational Development*, Vol. 32, No. 4, pp. 555-563.
- Yi, Hongmei, Yingquan Song, Chengfang Liu, Xiaoting Huang, Linxiu Zhang, Yunli Bai, Yaojiang Shi, 2015, "Giving kids a head start: the impact of early commitment of financial aid on poor seventh grade students in rural China," *Journal of Development Economics*, Vol. 113, pp. 1-15.
- Yilmaz, Gökhan, 2014, "Turkish Middle Income Trap and Less Skilled Human Capital," Central Bank of the Republic of Turkey Working Paper, pp.14-30.
- Zhang, Linxiu, Hongmei Yi, Renfu Luo, Changfang Liu, and Scott Rozelle, 2013, "The human capital roots of the middle income trap: the case of China," *Agricultural Economics*, Vol. 44, No. 1, pp. 151–162.
- Zhao, Meng and Paul Glewwe, 2010, "What determines basic school attainment in developing countries? Evidence from rural China," *Economics of Education Review*, Vol. 29, No. 3, pp. 451–460.