
Factors Responsible for Students' Dropout at Tertiary Level in District Swabi

Saba Gul¹



Abstract: *The study was sought to explore the cause of students' dropout at university level. Objectives of the study were to identify the factors responsible for students' dropout related to parental socio-economic status, to find out factors responsible for students' dropout related to cultural constraint, to determine the factors responsible for students' dropout related to academic activities, to investigate the factors responsible for students' dropout related to discipline. All the 60 teachers serving in 10 affiliated colleges of education constituted population of the study. A sample of 40 teachers was randomly selected from the population to fulfill the requirement of representation. A closed-end questionnaire was developed with the consultation of supervisor containing 47 items based on Likert scale. The collected data was analyzed by using percentage as statistical tool. More than half of the respondents agreed that tense environment at home cause dropout. More than half of the teachers agreed that illiteracy of the parents causes dropout. Less than half of the respondents agreed that family enmity of the parents causes dropout. More than half of the respondents agreed that considering education unfruitful causes dropout. More than half of the individuals agreed that parent's engagement in earning causes dropout. Majority of the respondents agreed that financial problem of the children causes' dropout. Based on findings it was recommended that Parents may provide conducive environment in home to prevent dropped out. Administration should provide safety to the students, and department should provide separate campus for females, so that they ensure their society and parents that they are safe, their social rights are reserved. Administration should provide safety to the students, and department should provide separate campus for females, so that they ensure their society and parents that they are safe, their social rights are reserved.*

Key Words: Drop Out, Tertiary Level, Socio Economic, Cultural Constraints, Academic

Introduction

Background of the Study

Students who drop out of college without completing a degree face serious consequences for themselves, institutions, and society (Voelkle and Sander, 2008; O'Neill et al, 2011; Hällsten, 2017; Sarra et al., 2018). Dropouts suffer a marking effect in the form of greater marginalisation and negative labour market outcomes. Hällsten (2017) found that dropouts spent about 3 percentage points more of their first eight years in a state of low earnings than those who never entered university in a study of mid-life marginalisation of Swedish men. Dropout rates can have a negative impact on an institution's future recruitment efforts. This is due to the fact that high dropout rates can be interpreted by prospective students as a sign that the institution lacks adequate teaching and support

¹ B.Ed, University of Peshawar, KP, Pakistan.

resources ([Voelkle and Sander, 2008](#)). Dropouts are argued to be a waste of tax dollars because they prevent another student from obtaining a university place that could have otherwise gone to them ([Voelkle and Sander, 2008](#); [Ortiz and Dehon, 2013](#)). Even though students who drop out can re-enroll in another institution or field of study, ensuring retention has become a major policy concern for governments and institutions around the world because of the aforementioned negative consequences of dropout.

There have been a number of studies looking into the causes and predictors of university dropout among students in order to better understand the problem. According to the findings of these studies, the factors that contribute to students dropping out of school are numerous and complex, and there is little agreement on the most important ones ([Tinto, 1975](#); [Stratton et al., 2008](#); [Melguizo et al., 2011](#); [Ortiz and Dehon, 2013](#); [Heublein, 2014](#); [Bernardo et al., 2016](#); [Contini et al., 2018](#); [Mabel and Britton, 2018](#)). Students' pre-entry attributes, goals, and commitments, as well as their academic and social experiences at university, were all considered in [Tinto's \(1975\)](#) groundbreaking student integration model.

However, our knowledge of the determinants of dropout is limited in several ways. First, despite the prevalence of dropout in universities around the world, majority of the literature has emanated from the US and Europe ([Voelkle and Sander, 2008](#); [Ortiz and Dehon, 2013](#); [Stewart et al., 2015](#)), with comparatively very few studies undertaken outside high income countries. Second, due to the absence of longitudinal data, very few studies have examined risk antecedent of university dropout across time. Most studies have tended to focus on whether students dropped out or not without taking the trajectory of dropout into account (e.g., [Melguizo et al., 2011](#)). Third, the majority of studies examining the determinants of dropout tend to focus on dropout intentions rather than actual dropout (e.g., [Alkan, 2014](#); [Ronaldo and Pereira, 2016](#)). Fourth, existing studies argue that student dropout consists of interplay among several factors (e.g., [Paterson, 2017](#); [Contini et al., 2018](#); [Sarra et al., 2018](#)). However, a review of research on dropout indicates that most studies mainly tell us about the predictive power of each risk antecedent rather than their cumulative effect on dropout over time. The importance of examining cumulative risk has been well-documented in research on child development (e.g., [Atzabi-Poria et al., 2004](#); [Mackenzie et al., 2011](#); [Solomon et al., 2016](#)). According to this cumulative risk model, the synergistic effect of a variety of risk factors is more important in determining adverse outcome than the aggregated effect of a single risk factor (e.g., [Evans et al., 2013](#)). Thus, a student who experiences multiple risk factors should be at a greater risk of dropout than a student who experiences only one of these factors. Drawing on the cumulative risk hypothesis, this study addresses the current gap in the literature by examining how the cumulative effect of two key determinants found in the literature that is, academic vulnerability and family support, influences the trajectory of dropout in Thailand. We argue that, understanding how cumulative risk influences dropout can help identify which groups are most at risk and to develop interventions targeted at retaining members of the at-risk group

Statement of the Problem

Students are the prospect of any society, and the progress of countries is dependent on highly educated, well-mannered and skillful individuals. All the desire qualities of an individual can be enriched through the provision of quality education, but unfortunately several students left the college or university before the completion of his/her degree due to certain reasons. The present study was sought to explore the factors responsible for student's dropout at Tertiary Level in district Swabi.

Objectives of the Study

Objectives of the study were

1. To identify the factors responsible for students' dropout related to parental socio-economic status
2. To find out factors responsible for students' dropout related to cultural constraint.
3. To determine the factors responsible for students' dropout related to academic activities
4. To investigate the factors responsible for students' dropout related to discipline

Research Questions

1. Which factors are responsible for students' dropout related to parental socio-economic status?
2. Which factors are responsible for students' dropout related to cultural constraint?
3. Which factors are responsible for students' dropout related to academic activities?
4. Which factors are responsible for students' dropout related to discipline?

Significance of Study

The study will be beneficial for students, teachers, parents, psychologist, policy maker and researcher.

Literature Review

According to research, many interrelated factors influence whether or not children drop out of school. In the following sections, we'll examine these in greater detail. First, the study examines how poverty affects families' ability to keep their children in school.

Household Income and Financial Circumstances

It has been found that household income is one of the most important factors in determining whether or not a child has the opportunity to attend school. School fees are one of the more obvious costs, but there are also the less obvious ones like uniforms, transportation, supplies, and the lost productivity that comes with not having a child in school. For example, how often children attend school, whether they have to take time off, and whether they drop out all have an impact on a family's disposable income (Croft, 2002: 87-88). Dropping out of school has been linked to a family's income, according to a few studies.

Many studies have found a correlation between poverty and school dropouts (Birdsall et al, 2005; Boyle et al, 2002; Brown & Park, 2002; Bruneforth, 2006; Cardoso & Verner, 2007; Gakuru cited in Ackers et al, 2001: 369; Dachi & Garrett, 2003; Hunter & May, 2003; Porteus et al, 2000; Ranasinghe & Hartog, 2002; UIS & UNICEF, 2005; Vavrus, 2002). It has been suggested that poverty is the "most common primary and contributory reason" for students to drop out of school by Porteus et al (2000: 10), as has been suggested by Hunter and May (2003: 5), both of whom describe exclusions rather than dropouts. According to Dachi and Garrett (2003), who polled Tanzanian parents and guardians on the subject of the cost of enrolling their children in school, the primary obstacle to sending their children to school is a lack of funds. There were only a few people who reported that the children had a negative attitude toward school or that the school itself was unappealing to them.

Research shows that children from more affluent families are more likely to finish school, while those from less affluent families are more likely to have never attended school or to have quit after starting. A study in rural China by Brown and Park (2002) found that "poor and credit constrained children" were three times more likely than other children to drop out of elementary school. School drop-outs had a higher mean wealth index than those who had never attended school, and children who were enrolled in school came from better-off households than those who had dropped out, who in turn came from wealthier backgrounds than those school-age children who had never attended school, as described by Colclough et al (2000). (Colclough et al, 2000: 16).

Because the costs of education are more difficult to bear for the poor, they are less likely to demand it as much as those in more affluent households (Colclough et al, 2000: 25).

As they get older, children from lower socioeconomic backgrounds are under increasing pressure to drop out of school, especially as the opportunity cost of their time rises.

A household's income and spending options are influenced by the work patterns of its members. Seetharamu (1984 cited in Chugh, 2004: 86) found that the father's income was linked to the continuity or discontinuity of the child's schooling, with the fathers of most dropouts not employed. If the family's income is low, children may be asked to supplement the family's income, either by working themselves or taking on additional tasks to free up other members of the household for work (see section 2.1.3). Children's time becomes more valuable as they get older and the value of their time becomes more apparent.

How people regard schooling and the importance placed on it at times might shape interactions between schooling, household income and dropping out. For example, Pryor and Ampiah's (2003) research on schooling in a Ghanaian village, talks about education being regarded as a 'relative luxury', with many villagers considering education not worthwhile. Chi and Rao's (2003) research on rural China sees things slightly differently, with children's education one of the main household priorities. Yet, even in this context if rural parents are short of money, expenses on ancestral halls and gift giving are prioritised over educational spending. Another body of work indicates that withdrawal from school is a last resort for many families (e.g. Sogaula et al, 2002 cited in Hunter & May, 2003: 10). And there is research that shows households often do not want to remove children from school as they see it as an investment for the future (e.g. Bouis, 1998 cited in Hunter & May, 2003: 10).

Research has found a correlation between household income, gender, and the likelihood of dropping out of high school. With regard to South Africa, Fuller and Laing (1999) discovered an association between the level of household expenditure and access to credit, as well as the likelihood a daughter will remain in school, in Grant & Hallman (2006): 6. Girls from Malawi's poorest families are less likely to attend school when school costs are too high, as shown by Kadzamira and Rose (2003). Glick and Sahn's (2000) research in Guinea, on the other hand, shows that as household income rises, more money is allocated to the education of girls, with no discernible effect on the education of boys. According to Colclough et al (2000), 'the gendered outcomes of such under-enrollment are the product of cultural practise, rather than poverty as a whole' (2000: 1).

Household Contexts and Motivations

A student's ability to attend school may be influenced by a variety of factors, including his or her living arrangements at home. Other factors, such as income, education, the size and scope of the household, and the ages of household members, may also play a role. Although dropping out is closely linked to poverty, many social factors also play a strong role, with students sometimes taking actions that result in them leaving university against the wishes of their families, Al Samarrai and Peasgood (1998: 22), drawing on Peasgood et al (1997), suggest that the impact of household context is greater on initial access than on drop out.

Health

Studies on student health, educational attainment, and cognitive development abound (e.g. Alderman et al., 2001; Pridmore, 2007), but few focus on the link between poor health and school dropout. As Pridmore (2007) notes, the long-term health and nutritional status of young students and their impact on university enrollment dropout and achievement is "less well understood." Other factors, such as poverty, are frequently implicated in health problems.

Methodology

Population

All the 60 teachers serving in 10 affiliated colleges of education constituted population of the study.

Sample

Out of the total population 40 teachers were randomly selected through simple random sampling technique.

Research Instrument

A closed-end questionnaire was developed with the consultation of supervisor containing forty items based on Likert scale.

Data Collection

Researcher personally visited the sampled institutions and distributed the questionnaire to collect accurate and reliable data.

Analysis of Data

The collected data was analyzed by using percentage as statistical tool.

Analysis of Data

Factors Responsible for Students' Dropout Related to Parental Socio-economic Status

Table 1. Tense Environment at Home

	SA	A	N	DA	SDA
Frequency	7	14	8	11	0
Percentage	17.5	35	20	27.5	0

Table 1 indicates 52.5% of the respondents agreed that tense environment at home causes dropout.

Table 2. Illiteracy of the Parents

	SA	A	N	DA	SDA
Frequency	9	12	9	8	12
Percentage	22.5	30	22.5	20	5

Table 2 explore 52.5% of the teachers agreed that illiteracy of the parents causes dropout.

Table 3. Family Enmity of the Parents

	SA	A	N	DA	SDA
Frequency	4	14	12	8	2
Percentage	10	35	30	20	5

Table 3 pursue 45% of the repliant agreed that family enmity of the parents causes dropout.

Table 4. Considering Education Unfruitful

	SA	A	N	DA	SDA
Frequency	4	16	6	13	1
Percentage	10	40	15	32.5	2.5

Table 4 indicates 60% of the respondents agreed that considering education unfruitful causes dropout.

Table 5. Parent's Engagement in Earning

	SA	A	N	DA	SDA
Frequency	7	18	6	7	2
Percentage	17.5	45	15	17.5	5

Table 5 show 62.5% of the individuals agreed that parent's engagement in earning causes dropout.

Table 6. Financial Problem of the Children

	SA	A	N	DA	SDA
Frequency	12	18	2	6	2
Percentage	30	45	5	15	5

Table 6 elaborate 75% of the respondents agreed that financial problem of the children causes' dropout.

Table 7. Education as Economic Burden

	SA	A	N	DA	SDA
Frequency	10	11	10	8	1
Percentage	25	27.5	25	20	2.5

Table 7 explore 52.5% of the teachers agreed that education as economic burden causes dropout.

Table 8. Engaging Children in Earning

	SA	A	N	DA	SDA
Frequency	10	19	9	2	0
Percentage	25	47.5	22.5	5	0

Table 8 show 72.5% of the respondents agreed that engaging children in earning causes dropout.

Table 9. Parent's poor economic condition

	SA	A	N	DA	SDA
Frequency	7	23	6	3	1
Percentage	17.5	57.5	15	7.5	2.5

Table 9 examine 75% of the individuals agreed that parent's poor economic condition causes dropout.

Factors Responsible for Students' Dropout Related to Cultural Constraint

Table 10. Illiteracy

	SA	A	N	DA	SDA
Frequency	8	20	5	5	2
Percentage	20	50	12.5	12.5	5

Table 10 indicates 70% of the respondents agreed that illiteracy causes dropout.

Table 11. Early marriage system

	SA	A	N	DA	SDA
Frequency	8	12	8	8	4
Percentage	20	30	20	20	10

Table 11 indicates 50% of the subjects agreed that early marriage system causes dropout.

Table 12. Feudalistic structure of society

	SA	A	N	DA	SDA
Frequency	7	15	11	6	1
Percentage	17.5	37.5	27.5	15	1.5

Table 12 indicates 55% of the teachers agreed that feudalistic structure of society causes dropout.

Table 13. Religious Obstacles

	SA	A	N	DA	SDA
Frequency	5	11	9	9	6
Percentage	12.5	27.5	22.5	22.5	15

Table 13 elaborate 40% of the subjects agreed that religious obstacles cause dropout.

Table 14. Negative Social Attitude of Society for Female Education

	SA	A	N	DA	SDA
Frequency	13	12	5	8	2
Percentage	32.5	30	12.5	20	5

Table 14 show 62.5% of the respondents agreed that negative social attitude of society for female education causes dropout.

Table 15. Tribal Constraint

	SA	A	N	DA	SDA
Frequency	12	13	5	9	1
Percentage	30	32.5	12.5	22.5	5

Table 15 elaborate 62.5% of the respondents agreed that tribal constraint causes dropout.

Table 16. Diverse Language

	SA	A	N	DA	SDA
Frequency	5	11	12	11	1
Percentage	12.5	27.5	30	27.5	2.5

Tables 16 examine 40% of the participants agreed that diverse language causes dropout.

Table 17. Rapid Population Growth

	SA	A	N	DA	SDA
Frequency	3	10	14	9	4
Percentage	7.5	25	35	22.5	10

Table 17 show 32.5% of the individuals agreed that rapid population growth causes dropout.

Table 18. Lack of Awareness about Education

	SA	A	N	DA	SDA
Frequency	10	19	3	8	0
Percentage	25	47.5	7.5	20	0

Table 18 indicates 72.5% of the respondents agreed that lack of awareness about education causes dropout.

Factor Responsible for Students' Dropout Related to Academic Activities

Table 19. Outdated Curriculum

	SA	A	N	DA	SDA
Frequency	4	8	10	14	4
Percentage	10	20	25	35	10

Table 19. Explore 45% of the Subjects Disagreed that Outdated Curriculum Cause's Dropout.

Table 20. Lack of Co-curricular Activities

	SA	A	N	DA	SDA
Frequency	5	10	9	14	2
Percentage	12.5	25	22.5	35	5

Table 20 show 40% of the respondents disagreed that lack of co-curricular activities causes dropout.

Table 21. Burden of Assignments

	SA	A	N	DA	SDA
Frequency	3	8	11	16	2
Percentage	7.5	20	27.5	40	5

Table 21 indicates 45% of the respondents disagreed that burden of assignments causes' dropout.

Table 22. Students can't Perform their Presentations on Stage

	SA	A	N	DA	SDA
Frequency	6	10	10	9	5
Percentage	15	25	25	22.5	12.5

Table 22 indicates 40% of the respondents agreed that students can't perform their presentations on stage causes dropout.

Table 23. Attendance Issue

	SA	A	N	DA	SDA
Frequency	9	22	4	3	2
Percentage	22.5	55	10	7.5	5

Table 23 elaborate 77.5% of the subjects agreed that attendance issue causes dropout.

Table 24. Lack of Effective Strategies

	SA	A	N	DA	SDA
Frequency	6	12	11	9	2
Percentage	15	30	27.5	22.5	5

Table 24 examine 45% of the participant agreed that lack of effective strategies causes dropout.

Table 25. Course Difficulty

	SA	A	N	DA	SDA
Frequency	4	12	13	9	2
Percentage	10	30	32.5	22.5	5

Table 25 show 40% of the respondents agreed that course difficulty causes dropout.

Table 26. Language Problem between Students and Teachers

	SA	A	N	DA	SDA
Frequency	6	11	10	10	3
Percentage	15	27.5	25	25	7.5

Table 26 indicates 42.5 % of the respondents agreed that language problem between students and teachers causes dropout.

Table 27. Failure of Core Academic Courses

	SA	A	N	DA	SDA
Frequency	3	12	14	9	2
Percentage	7.5	30	35	22.5	5

Table 27 explore 37.5% of the subjects agreed that failure of core academic courses causes dropout.

Table 28. Teacher should not Support Equal to Students/Favoritism

	SA	A	N	DA	SDA
Frequency	5	7	10	13	5
Percentage	12.5	17.5	25	32.5	12.5

Table 28 show 45% of the subjects disagreed that teacher should not support equal to students are causes dropout.

Table 29. Lack of Conflict Resolution Facility

	SA	A	N	DA	SDA
Frequency	3	11	14	11	1
Percentage	7.5	27.5	35	27.5	2.5

Table 30 examine 35% of the individuals agreed that lack of conflict resolution facility causes dropout.

Table 30. Classroom Environment

	SA	A	N	DA	SDA
Frequency	5	7	7	19	2
Percentage	12.5	17.5	17.5	47.5	5

Table 30 indicates 47.5% of the subjects agreed that untrained teacher causes dropout.

Table 31. Low self Esteem

	SA	A	N	DA	SDA
Frequency	2	14	10	11	3
Percentage	5	35	25	27.5	7.5

Table 31 show 40% of the participants agreed that low self-esteem causes dropout.

Table 32. Having Limited English Ability

	SA	A	N	DA	SDA
Frequency	10	19	4	6	2
Percentage	25	45.5	10	15	2.5

Table 32 elaborate 70.5% of the respondents agreed that having limited English ability causes dropout.

Table 33. Low-income Family that Students can't Afford Academic Fee

	SA	A	N	DA	SDA
Frequency	5	23	4	7	1
Percentage	12.5	57.5	10	17.5	2.5

Table 33. indicates 70% of the subjects agreed that low-income family that students can't afford academic fee causes dropout.

Table 34. Past College Performance

	SA	A	N	DA	SDA
Frequency	12	17	3	7	1
Percentage	30	42.5	7.5	17.5	1.5

Table 34 explore 72.5% of the teachers agreed that past college performance causes dropout.

Table 35. Excessive Absenteeism

	SA	A	N	DA	SDA
Frequency	3	19	13	4	1
Percentage	7.5	47.5	32.5	10	2.5

Tables 35 examine 55% of the subjects agreed that excessive absenteeism causes dropout.

Table 36. High Mobility

	SA	A	N	DA	SDA
Frequency	2	16	15	6	1
Percentage	5	40	37.5	15	2.5

Table 36 show 45% of the respondents agreed that high mobility causes dropout.

Findings

1. Table 1 indicates 52.5% of the respondents agreed that tense environment at home cause dropout.
2. Table 2 explore 52.5% of the teachers agreed that illiteracy of the parents causes dropout.
3. Table 3 pursue 45% of the repliant agreed that family enmity of the parents causes dropout.
4. Table 4 indicates 60% of the respondents agreed that considering education unfruitful causes dropout.
5. Table 5 show 62.5% of the individuals agreed that parent's engagement in earning causes dropout.
6. Table 6 elaborate 75% of the respondents agreed that financial problem of the children causes' dropout.
7. Table 7 explore 52.5% of the teachers agreed that education as economic burden causes dropout.
8. Table 8 show 72.5% of the respondents agreed that engaging children in earning causes dropout.
9. Table 9 examine 75% of the individuals agreed that parent's poor economic condition causes dropout.
10. Table 10 indicates 70% of the respondents agreed that illiteracy causes dropout.
11. Table 11 indicates 50% of the subjects agreed that early marriage system causes dropout.
12. Table 12 indicates 55% of the teachers agreed that feudalistic structure of society causes dropout.
13. Table 13 elaborate 40% of the subjects agreed that religious obstacles causes dropout.
14. Table 14 show 62.5% of the respondents agreed that negative social attitude of society for female education causes dropout.
15. Table 15 elaborate 62.5% of the respondents agreed that tribal constraint causes dropout.

16. Tables 16 examine 40% of the participants agreed that diverse language causes dropout.
17. Table 17 show 32.5% of the individuals agreed that rapid population growth causes dropout.
18. Table 18 indicates 72.5% of the respondents agreed that lack of awareness about education causes dropout.
19. Table 19 explore 45% of the subjects disagreed that outdated curriculum cause's dropout.
20. Table 20 show 40% of the respondents disagreed that lack of co-curricular activities causes dropout.
21. Table 21 indicates 45% of the respondents disagreed that burden of assignments causes' dropout.
22. Table 22 indicates 40% of the respondents agreed that students can't perform their presentations on stage causes dropout.
23. Table 23 elaborate 77.5% of the subjects agreed that attendance issue causes dropout.
24. Table 24 examine 45% of the participant agreed that lack of effective strategies causes dropout.
25. Table 25 show 40% of the respondents agreed that course difficulty causes dropout.
26. Table 26 indicates 42.5 % of the respondents agreed that language problem between students and teachers causes dropout.
27. Table 27 explore 37.5% of the subjects agreed that failure of core academic courses causes dropout.
28. Table 28 show 45% of the subjects disagreed that teacher should not support equal to students are causes dropout.
29. Table 29 examine 35% of the individuals agreed that conflict resolution causes dropout.
30. Table 30 elaborate 50.5% of the teachers agreed that classroom environment causes dropout.
31. Table 31 indicates 47.5% of the subjects agreed that untrained teacher causes dropout.
32. Table 32 show 40% of the participants agreed that low self-esteem causes dropout.
33. Table 33 elaborate 70.5% of the respondents agreed that having limited English ability causes dropout.
34. Table 34 indicates 70% of the subjects agreed that low income family that students can't afford academic fee causes dropout.
35. Table 35 explore 72.5% of the teachers agreed that past college performance causes dropout.
36. Table 4.3.17 examines 55% of the subjects agreed that excessive absenteeism causes dropout.

Conclusion

More than half of the respondents agreed that tense environment at home cause dropout. More than half of the teachers agreed that illiteracy of the parents causes dropout. Less than half of the repliant agreed that family enmity of the parents causes dropout. More than half of the respondents agreed that considering education unfruitful causes dropout. More than half of the individuals agreed that parent's engagement in earning causes dropout. Majority of the respondents agreed that financial problem of the children causes dropout. More than half of the teachers agreed that education as economic burden causes dropout. Majority the respondents agreed that engaging children in earning causes dropout. Majority of the individuals agreed that parent's poor economic condition causes dropout. Majority of the respondents agreed that illiteracy causes dropout. Half than of the subjects agreed that early marriage system causes dropout. More than half of the teachers agreed that feudalistic structure of society causes dropout. Less than half of the subjects agreed that religious obstacles cause dropout. Maximum number of the respondents agreed that negative social attitude of society for female education causes dropout. More than half of the respondents agreed that tribal constraint causes dropout. Less than half of the participants agreed that diverse language causes dropout. Majority of the individuals agreed that rapid population growth causes dropout. More than

half of the respondents agreed that lack of awareness about education causes dropout. Less than half of the subjects disagreed that outdated curriculum cause's dropout. Less than half of the respondents disagreed that lack of co-curricular activities causes dropout. Less than half of the respondents disagreed that burden of assignments causes' dropout. Less than half of the respondents agreed that students can't perform their presentations on stage causes dropout. More than half of the subjects agreed that attendance issue causes dropout. Less than half of the participant agreed that lack of effective strategies causes dropout. Less than half of the respondents agreed that course difficulty causes dropout. Less than half of the respondents agreed that language problem between students and teachers causes dropout. Less than half of the subjects agreed that failure of core academic courses causes dropout. Less than half of the subjects disagreed that teacher should not support equal to students are causes dropout. Less than half of the individuals agreed that conflict resolution causes dropout. More than half of the teachers agreed that classroom environment causes dropout. Less than half of the subjects agreed that untrained teacher causes dropout. Less than half of the participants agreed that low self-esteem causes dropout. Majority of the respondents agreed that having limited English ability causes dropout. Majority of the subjects agreed that low-income family that students can't afford academic fee causes dropout. Majority of the teachers agreed that past college performance causes dropout. More than half of the subjects agreed that excessive absenteeism causes dropout. Less than half of the respondents agreed that high mobility causes dropout. Less than half of the teachers agreed that lack of social resources causes dropout. Less than of the participants agreed that uniform causes dropout. Less than half of the respondents agreed that autocratic attitude of head/teacher causes dropout. Half of the respondents disagreed that university timing causes dropout. Less than half of the participants agreed that rigid rules and regulations cause's dropout. Less than half of the respondents agreed laziness causes dropout. Less than half of the respondents agreed that any kind of drug addiction causes dropout. Less than half of the individuals agreed that gender segregation causes dropout. Less than half of the subjects agreed that political interference causes dropout. Less than half of the respondents disagreed that unexpected omission cause's dropout.

Recomandations

1. Parents may provide conducive environment in home to prevent dropped out.
2. Parents may focus on their children education instead of earning.
3. Administration should provide safety to the students, and department should provide separate campus for females, so that they ensure their society and parents that they are safe, their social rights are reserved.
4. People may focus on their children education not to early marriage system to prevent dropped out.
5. Administration should provide limited and accessible assignment to the student, so that they easily approach to the assignments qualitative level rather than quantity.
6. The department should provide early coaching and training centers to the new corners, so that they easily educate their students in good way.

References

- Alkan, N. (2014). Humor, loneliness, and acceptance: predictors of university drop-out intentions. *Proc. Soc. Behav. Sci.* 152, 1079–1086. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.09.278
- Atzaba-Poria, M., Pike, A., & Deater-Deckard, K. (2004). Do risk factors for problem behaviour act in a cumulative manner? An examination of ethnic minority and majority children through an ecological perspective. *J. Child Psychol. Psychiatry* 45, 707–718. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-7610.2004.00265.x
- Bernardo, A., Esteban, M., Fernández, E., Cervero, A., Tuero, E., & Solano, P. (2016). Comparison of personal, social, and academic variables related to university drop-out and persistence. *Front. Psychol.* 7:1610. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01610
- Bonaldo, L., & Pereira, L. N. (2016). Dropout: demographic profile of Brazilian university students. *Proc. Soc. Behav. Sci.* 228, 138–143. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.07.020
- Contini, D., Cugnata, F., & Scagni, A. (2018). Social selection in higher education. Enrolment, dropout and timely degree attainment in Italy. *High. Educ.* 75, 785–808. doi: 10.1007/s10734-017-0170-9
- Evans, G. W., Li, D., & Whipple, S. S. (2013). Cumulative risk and child development. *Psychol. Bull.* 139, 1342–1396. doi: 10.1037/a0031808
- Faas, C., Benson, M. J., Kaestle, E. C., & Savla, J. (2018). Socioeconomic success and mental health profiles of young adults who drop out of college. *J. Youth Stud.* 21, 669–686. doi: 10.1080/13676261.2017.1406598
- Hällsten, M. (2017). Is education a risky investment? The scarring effect of university dropout in Sweden. *Eur. Sociol. Rev.* 33, 169–181. doi: 10.1093/esr/jcw053
- Heublein, U. (2014). Student drop-out from German higher education institutions. *Eur. J. Educ.* 49, 497–513. doi: 10.1111/ejed.12097
- Hovdhaugen, E. (2009). Studies in higher education transfer and dropout : different forms of student departure in Norway. *Stud. High. Educ.* 34, 1–17. doi: 10.1080/03075070802457009
- Mabel, Z., & Britton, T. A. (2018). Leaving late: understanding the extent and predictors of college late departure. *Soc. Sci. Res.* 69, 34–51. doi: 10.1016/j.ssresearch.2017.10.001
- Mackenzie, M. J., Kotch, J. B., Lee, L.-C., Augsberger, A., & Hutto, N. (2011). A cumulative ecological–transactional risk model of child maltreatment and behavioral outcomes: reconceptualizing early maltreatment report as risk factor. *Child. Youth Serv. Rev.* 33, 2392–2398. doi: 10.1016/j.chilgyouth.2011.08.030
- Melguizo, T., Torres, F. S., & Jaime, H. (2011). The association between financial aid availability and the college dropout rates in Colombia. *High. Educ.* 62, 231–247. doi: 10.1007/s10734-010-9385-8
- O'Neill, L. D., Wallstedt, B., Eika, B., & Hartvigsen, J. (2011). Factors associated with dropout in medical education: a literature review. *Med. Educ.* 45, 440–454. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2923.2010.03898.x
- Ortiz, E. A., & Dehon, C. (2013). Roads to success in the Belgian French community's higher education system: predictors of dropout Bruxelles. *Res. High. Educ.* 54, 693–723. doi: 10.1007/s11162-013-9290-y
- Paterson, N. D. (2017). Predictors of first year retention rates at the university of the west Indies, Jamaica. *Int. J. Educ. Dev.* 55, 63–68. doi: 10.1016/j.ijedudev.2017.06.001
- Sarra, A., Fontanella, L., & Di Zio, S. (2018). Identifying students at risk of academic failure within the educational data mining framework. *Soc. Ind. Res.* 1–20. doi: 10.1007/s11205-018-1901-8
- Sittichai, R. (2012). Why are there dropouts among university students? Experiences in a Thai university. *Int. J. Educ. Dev.* 32, 283–289. doi: 10.1016/j.ijedudev.2011.04.010

- Solomon, D., Åsberg, K., Peer, S., & Prince, G. (2016). Cumulative risk hypothesis: predicting and preventing child maltreatment recidivism. *Child Abuse Neglect*, 58, 80–90. doi: 10.1016/j.chiabu.2016.06.012
- Stewart, S., Lim, D. H., & Kim, J. H. (2015). Factors influencing college persistence for first-time students. *J. Dev. Educ.* 38, 12–20.
- Stratton, L. S., O'Toole, D. M., & Wetzel, J. N. (2008). A multinomial logit model of college stopout and dropout behavior. *Econ. Educ. Rev.* 27, 319–331. doi: 10.1016/j.econedurev.2007.04.003
- Tinto, V. (1975). Dropout from higher education: a theoretical synthesis of recent research. *Rev. Educ. Res.* 45, 89–125. doi: 10.3102/00346543045001089
- Voelkle, M. C., & Sander, N. (2008). A structural equation approach to discrete-time survival analysis. *J. Individ.* 29, 134–147. doi: 10.1027/1614-0001.29.3.1