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Abstract: High school dropout rate is substantially high in the waterlogged areas in Southwestern part of Bangladesh. The main focus of this study is to explore the causes of dropping out from secondary schools (age group 11 to 18 years) in waterlogged areas of Jessore district. Six villages of two unions under Keshabpurupazila in Jessore district were purposively selected. Survey research design has been employed where interview schedule is used for data collection. Data has been collected from 150 dropout children (male 82 and female 68) by using purposive and snowball sampling method. Result shows that male students’ dropout rate is remarkably high (54.7%) than the female (45.3%) in waterlogged areas. Due to waterlogging, 48.7% male are generally dropped out as compared to female constituting 42.7%. Owing to poverty, 48% male and 41.3% female students dropped out from secondary schools. However, this study has found a significant relationship between waterlogging and student dropping out from secondary level.
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I. Introduction

Bangladesh is a developing country situated in the South-Asian region. South-West Bangladesh is prone to waterlogging due to the vulnerable geographical setting and climate change. Severely waterlogged areas of southwestern Bangladesh are Keshabpurupazila of Jessore, tala upazila of Sathkhira, SathkhiraSadar, Kolaroaupazila and so on [1]. Secondary school dropout is a common phenomenon of the waterlogged areas. Irrespective of gender both male and female students are dropping out from secondary schools. The rate of dropping out is high in waterlogged areas. Waterlogging has multi-dimensional impacts on education. Waterlogging creates poverty in these areas [2]. It damages school buildings and houses, displaces children and detaches them from schools, loss of study materials and therefore increases the rate of children dropout from secondary schools [3]. Poor families employ their children to earn money through work in agriculture fields, shrimp culture farm or fishing in the river. The patterns and causes of school dropout are substantially different for boys and girls. Due to having available income generating opportunities for boys in these areas the rate of school dropout is higher for boys rather than girls. It is evident from the existing literature that, waterlogging situation has great impact on children’s dropout from secondary schools.

In Bangladesh, dropout rate in secondary level education was 80.02% in 2005. About 50% of primary and 80% of secondary level students dropped out from school in 2007 [4]. In 2008, the dropout rate at the secondary level was 61.38%. In 2010, the dropout rate was 55.26%. In 2011, about 53.28% students are dropped out where boys were 46.73% and girls were 56.43%. From 2014 to 2015, the secondary level dropout rate was 49.89%. The net enrolment rate in secondary level was 56.50% in 2013 [5]. Literacy rate among the 15+ adult population was 59.8% in 2010 [6]. However, these above statistical distribution shows that primary and secondary school level dropout is a common phenomenon for every academic year. Waterlogging creates a deplorable socio-economic condition of the waterlogged peoples. Illiteracy pulled them in backwardness. Recently, schools in Keshabpurupazilahave been severely affected by increased dropout rates and decrease the chances of children completing school cycle in the waterlogged areas [7].
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II. MATERIAL AND METHODS

This study is based on quantitative analysis. Survey research design and interview schedule were used for the purpose of collecting primary data. Selecting an area for a study is a crucial part for any research project. It is determined by the researchers’ interest, their convenient position toward the field as well as the possibility of getting funding for conducting study. In this regard, Gupta and Ferguson (1997) pointed out that “a good field site is made, however, not only by the consideration of funding and clearance but by its suitability for addressing issues and debates that matter to the discipline” [8]. This study is conducted in Keshabpurupazilaof Jessore district of Bangladesh. It consists of 143 villages under nine unions. Total population of Keshabpurwas 253291; among them male was 126656 and female was 126635 [9a]. The national census report also noted that, the literacy rate of this area was 55.2% where male constitutes 59.4% and female constitutes 51% within their own gender group [9b]. Based on the research objectives, we selected two unions namely Sagardari and Bidyandakathias the study area from these nine unions. Total population of Sagardariwas 28255 and Bidyandakatiwas 29977; among them waterlogged populations of these two unions were 10100 and 7100 respectively. At the same time, literacy rate of Sagardariwas 39.18% and Bidyandakatiwas 45.20%[9c]. In these two unions, there are six waterlogged villages namely Sagardari, Shakpura, Boga, Nehalpur, Komorpur and Chingra.

Based on the report of BBS (2011), we found that, students who belong to the age group of 11 to 18 years are mainly victim of dropout from secondary schools in waterlogged areas of Keshabpurupazila. So, students from age group of 11 to 18 are taken as the population of this study. The population census 2011 report explored the following distribution of male and female secondary school dropout students in these six waterlogged villages [9d]. From these distributions, we calculated our sample size for the study based on standard statistical sampling formula and after the calculation we determined total sample size as 150 where male and female constitute 82 and 68 respectively. These distribution of sample units have been selected through purposive and snowball sampling methods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Villages</th>
<th>Total Dropout</th>
<th>Sample Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sagardari</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shakpura</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boga</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nehalpur</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Komorpur</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chingra</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For collecting data from the selected sample, we employed interview schedule as data collection tools where questions are finalized through a pilot test from some selected sample. The final field work took more than six months to meet up the proposed samples. After collecting data, we thoroughly checked the questionnaire and categorized variables under some convenient headings. The IBM SPSS (Version 24) and MS Excel software have been used for processing data. We enriched our report with the help of some relevant secondary literature along with our primary data. Throughout our research journey we tried our level best for maintaining research ethics.

III. FINDINGS

Socio-economic Condition of the Respondents

The study was conducted among the student from age group of 11 to 18 and from different sex group where male students constitute 54.7% and female students constitute 45.3%. Their mean years is calculated as 15.75 where standard deviation is 1.385. This study revealed that the average schooling years of the respondents is 8.23. This study also tempted to explore parents’ status of schooling and found that fathers are schooled more than of their mothers where mother are mostly schooled at primary level and their secondary and higher secondary schooling rate is so low as compared to the fathers. In some cases, family income may interrupt on child education and for this we asked about their monthly family income. Calculating family income of 150 respondents, finally, we found that their monthly average income is 8063.33.
Table no 2: Socio-economic Condition of the Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Structure of the respondents</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 - 12</td>
<td>4 (2.7%)</td>
<td>2 (1.3%)</td>
<td>6 (4.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 14</td>
<td>3 (2.0%)</td>
<td>12 (8.0%)</td>
<td>15 (10.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 16</td>
<td>46 (30.7%)</td>
<td>43 (28.7%)</td>
<td>89 (59.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 - 18</td>
<td>29 (19.3%)</td>
<td>11 (7.3%)</td>
<td>40 (26.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>82 (54.7%)</td>
<td>68 (45.3%)</td>
<td>150 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean 15.75
Std. Deviation 1.385

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year(s) of Schooling</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>11 (7.3%)</td>
<td>7 (4.7%)</td>
<td>18 (12.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10 (6.7%)</td>
<td>7 (4.7%)</td>
<td>17 (11.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>23 (15.3%)</td>
<td>24 (16.0%)</td>
<td>47 (31.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>24 (16.0%)</td>
<td>24 (16.0%)</td>
<td>48 (32.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>14 (9.3%)</td>
<td>6 (4.0%)</td>
<td>20 (13.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>82 (54.7%)</td>
<td>68 (45.3%)</td>
<td>150 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean 8.23
Std. Deviation 1.184

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status of Fathers’ Schooling</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>11 (15.1%)</td>
<td>17 (23.3%)</td>
<td>28 (38.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>15 (20.5%)</td>
<td>14 (19.2%)</td>
<td>29 (39.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>7 (9.6%)</td>
<td>9 (12.3%)</td>
<td>16 (21.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33 (45.2%)</td>
<td>40 (54.8%)</td>
<td>73 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status of Mothers’ Schooling</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>22 (29.7%)</td>
<td>35 (47.3%)</td>
<td>57 (77.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>9 (12.2%)</td>
<td>7 (9.5%)</td>
<td>16 (21.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>1 (1.4%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1 (1.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32 (43.2%)</td>
<td>42 (56.8%)</td>
<td>74 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Income (monthly)</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3000 - 7000</td>
<td>55 (36.7%)</td>
<td>44 (29.3%)</td>
<td>99 (66.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7001 - 12000</td>
<td>17 (11.3%)</td>
<td>18 (12.0%)</td>
<td>35 (23.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12001 - 17000</td>
<td>6 (4.0%)</td>
<td>2 (1.3%)</td>
<td>8 (5.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17001 - 22000</td>
<td>3 (2.0%)</td>
<td>2 (1.3%)</td>
<td>5 (3.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 22000</td>
<td>1 (.7%)</td>
<td>2 (1.3%)</td>
<td>3 (2.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>82 (54.7%)</td>
<td>68 (45.3%)</td>
<td>150 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean 8063.33
Std. Deviation 4.992E3

In some cases, students are engaged with any kind of economic activities. This distribution is varied based on their gender role. Students attachment with any kind of economic activities may play some roles in causing dropout from schools and for this we tempted to reveal their economic attachments.

Table no 3: Economic Activities of the Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boys Occupation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goldsmith</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture (Farmer/ Fisherman)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day labor</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailors</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businessman</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puller (Van/ Rickshaw/ Motor bike/ Track)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Girls Occupation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housewife/ Housework</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housemaid</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handicrafts</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seamstress</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Living Standard of the Respondents

Living standard was measured on the basis of five interlinked and mutually reinforcing indices, i.e. (1) Modern appliance and furniture of family, (2) Family purchases, (3) Passing leisure style/ visiting relative’s house, (4) Amount of land property and (5) Food menu.

To measure modern appliance and furniture of family, respondents observation and experiences have been taken into account through asking four selective categorical options on the basis of following items and values i.e., (1) color TV, (1) refrigerator, (1) motor bike and any (1) costly furniture. Family purchases constructed through asking the question of family purchases types with four selective categorical index on the basis of following items i.e., clothes, shoes, jewelry and precious cosmetics where response options based on their values were (4) weekly, (3) monthly, (2) half-yearly and (1) yearly. Respondents were asked one selective question about how often their family member visits relatives’ house or any other place for passing leisure time on the basis of following items i.e., (4) weekly, (3), monthly, (2) half-yearly and (1) yearly. Amount of land property was the most important part to measure living standard and respondents have been asked four categorical items i.e., (0) No land (1) less than 1 bighas, (2) 1-5 bighas, (3) 6-10 bighas and (4) more than 10 bighas. Perception about food menu is measured through asking one selective categorical questions on the basis of following items i.e., cereal and cereal products; meat, fish, egg; fruits and vegetables; milk and milk products. The response options were: (4) daily, (3) weekly, (2) monthly and (1) yearly. Now, calculating five indices scores in that procedure; first index calculated value was within (0-4), second index calculated value was within (1-16), third index calculated value was (1-4), fourth index calculated value was (0-4) and finally fifth index calculated value was within (1-16), fourth index calculated value was (0-4) and finally fifth index calculated value was within (1-16). Now calculate all indices to measure the living standard. Calculation procedure was i.e., first, second, third, fourth and fifth number of index highest value was 44 and lowest value was 3. It is clear by the following index table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table no 4: Measurement Values for Living Standard Index.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indexes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the index table it is clear that to measure living standard lowest value was 3 and highest value was 44. Interval procedure was i.e., 44-3 = 41. Now, 41 were divided by 3 and by this procedure this combined index calculated class interval. Finally, calculating all the scores of different domains and the sum of the total responses was finally used to construct the living standard. It was clear following the living standard index that respondents were categories high, medium and low by these scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table no 5: Living Standard Index.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After calculating their responses, we found their status of standard as high 12%, medium 36% and low 52%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table no 6: Scenario of the Respondents’ Living Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex of the Respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Types of Dropout
This study found that seasonal dropout rate is high as compared to unseasonal dropout rate constituting 78% seasonal and 22% unseasonal dropping out.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of dropout</th>
<th>Sex of the Respondents</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seasonal</td>
<td>65 (43.3%)</td>
<td>52 (34.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unseasonal</td>
<td>17 (11.3%)</td>
<td>16 (10.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>82 (54.7%)</td>
<td>68 (45.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Causes of Dropout
We asked respondent several questions regarding the forces that act behind their secondary school dropout. Respondents opined that waterlogged is a curse that ultimately pushed them from the school. Among this distribution most of them (77.3%) affirmed that waterlogged is a curse where 22.7% of them rejected this statement. During flood time distance of school from the students’ residence play important role in dropout from school. This study found that distance of school on the range of 1-3 kilometer is 52.7% and 4-6 kilometer is 27.3% where school located in less than one kilometer is 7.3%. Poverty occupied as the most influential factor of student dropout. Students opined that poverty during flood time is an impediment that expelled them from school. In this distribution 89.3% is agreed and rest of them disagreed this statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Causes of Dropout</th>
<th>Sex of the Respondents</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waterlogged is a Curse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>61 (40.7%)</td>
<td>55 (36.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>21 (14.0%)</td>
<td>13 (8.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>82 (54.7%)</td>
<td>68 (45.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance of school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤1 Kilometer</td>
<td>1 (.7%)</td>
<td>10 (6.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 Kilometer</td>
<td>58 (38.7%)</td>
<td>36 (24.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 Kilometer</td>
<td>21 (14.0%)</td>
<td>20 (13.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥6 Kilometer</td>
<td>2 (1.3%)</td>
<td>2 (1.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>82 (54.7%)</td>
<td>68 (45.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty is impediment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>72 (48.0%)</td>
<td>62 (41.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10 (6.7%)</td>
<td>6 (4.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>82 (54.7%)</td>
<td>68 (45.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Waterlogged and Dropping Out
Students (74%) who fall under waterlogged areas identified waterlogging as a main cause of dropping out where a very few distributions (3.3%) disagreed on this statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waterlogged and Dropping out</th>
<th>Sex of the Respondents</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waterlogged</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>111 (74.0%)</td>
<td>5 (3.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>25 (16.7%)</td>
<td>9 (6.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>137 (91.3%)</td>
<td>13 (8.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We tried to explore other most influential factors that expelled students from schooling and found poverty, early marriage, unawareness, waterlogging and occupation as influential factors of school dropout. These categories are noted based on their opinions that we gained from open-ended questions.
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Table no 10: Influential Factors for Dropping out.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Influencing factors</th>
<th>Sex of the Respondents</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>26 (17.3%)</td>
<td>26 (17.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early marriage</td>
<td>6 (4.0%)</td>
<td>21 (14.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unawareness</td>
<td>5 (3.3%)</td>
<td>8 (5.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterlogging</td>
<td>18 (12.0%)</td>
<td>13 (8.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>27 (18.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>82 (54.7%)</td>
<td>68 (45.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In some cases, the above mentioned some factors may differently originated based on gender construction and for this we noted gender specific factor that through out students from secondary schools.

Table no 11: Gender Specific Factors for School Dropout.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Causes for Boys</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterlogging</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unawareness</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not interested to study</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For occupation</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall in love</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Causes for Girls</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterlogging</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unawareness</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early marriage</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall in love</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, the respondents were asked to know about their opinion regarding going back to the school where 45% respondents opined that they want to go back to their school and 55% had no such intention.

IV. DISCUSSION

Dropout children from secondary schools in waterlogged areas of Jessore district is a common phenomenon. Two unions of Keshabpurupazila under Jessore district were selected for the purpose of the study namely Sagardari and Bidyanandakati. Data were collected from secondary schools’ dropout children in waterlogged areas who belong to the age group of 11 to 18 years. It is found that 54.7% male students dropped out from schools while female dropout rate is 45.3%. Their average year of schooling is 8.23. The study explored that about 29% students dropped out from class eight and about 13% students dropped out from class ten where male and female constitute 9.3% and 4% respectively. This study has also sought educational status of their parents and found that only 1.4% mother had finished higher secondary education and 77% mothers finished primary level of education. On the contrary, 21.9% father had finished their higher secondary education. It is found in the study that, 16.7% male respondents are day laborer and 33.3% female are housewife. Most of the
households (60.7%) are male dominated. More than half of the respondents’ (66%) household income level ranged between BDT 3000 to 7000 and most of them (52%) belong to below the living standard.

Due to waterlogged situation, 48.7% male children are dropped out from schools as compared to 42.7% female. Among them, 40.7% male and 36.7% female thought that waterlogging was the curse for them where 22.7% did not think so. School distance is the most vital issue in waterlogged areas. Most of the female students (15.3%) had feeling exhausting due to school distance where male constitute 17.3%. It is found that both 48.7% male and 42.7% female respondents are agreed about the relationship between waterlogging and dropout from secondary schools. On the other hand, only 8.7% respondents did not think so (male 6% and female 2.7%). Majority of the respondents (78%) mentioned that seasonal dropout is higher than unseasonal dropout in waterlogged areas. Tuition facilities is lacked in this region which was revealed by the 51.3% respondents. But 28% male and 20.7% female had tutor facilities.

Owing to poverty male dropout rate was 48%, on the contrary, female rate was 41.3%. It is observed that a significant number of the respondents (54.7%) did not want to go back to school where male is 30.7% and female is 24%. In contrast, 45.3% respondents wanted to go back to school (male 24% and female 21.3%). A significant number of the respondents (72) faced psychological abuse (male 23.3% and female 24.7%). Some of the respondents (55.3%) faced some sort of sexual harassment; among them female 36.7% and male only 18.7%. In these distributions, 18% respondents faced sexual harassment by boyfriends and 16.7% by teachers. Among the total distribution, 44.7% respondents opined that they did not face any type of sexual harassment. Due to this reason 14% respondents stopped to go to their school where females are 13.3% and males are 0.7%.

Significant relationship was found between different variables which are generated through chi square test. The findings from chi square test clearly reveals that there is a significant relationship between poverty and types of dropout children (P < .004). Besides, there is a relationship between waterlogged and dropping out from secondary schools (P < .000). This study showed a strong relationship between school distance and dropout (P < .000). Even, this study found that poverty is another impediment to carry out study (P < .003). There is a relationship between sexual harassment and dropout from secondary schools (P < .003). Finally, we calculated the relationship between poverty and dropout and result is P < .000.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

A significant number of the respondents believed that government should take initiative to improve dropout situation in waterlogged areas. Government subsidy is essential in this region. Besides, creating opportunity for female students so that they can easily accept secondary education and to remove early marriage from waterlogged areas. Waterlogged areas most of the people were unaware about education. So, creating social awareness about education they can develop dropout situation from secondary schools. School infrastructure was vulnerable in this region. Government or local government should take initiatives to establish new school buildings. Finally, government should improve communication system and create drainage to reduce the waterlogged problem.

Education is regarded as one of the keys to success and development of individuals as well as nations. This implies that children need to be educated for them to live a better life in future. However, there are many current existing problems experienced in the world of education and dropout from secondary schools is one of them. The dropout is real and it affects waterlogged areas students every day. Waterlogged areas living standard was low. Their socioeconomic condition greatly impacts on education. Waterlogged areas secondary school going children off their school before finished their secondary level of education. Due to waterlogged situation secondary level education rate was very low both male and female children’s. Most of the people in waterlogged areas are poor. In this comparative study we found that male dropout rate is higher rather than the female children. Waterlogged situation greatly grasped their education. For this reason, both male and female children are dropping out from secondary schools.
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