CHAPTER - V
To recapitulate, the present study set out with the main objectives of -

i) Ascertaining the percentage of dropouts to their initial enrolment.

ii) Ascertaining the causative factors of dropping out of colleges.

iii) Determining the correlates of dropouts.

iv) Investigating the differences between dropouts and non dropouts in terms of socio-demographic and personality variable; and

v) Ascertaining if the dropouts and non dropouts differ in their attitude towards higher education, achievement motivation, and future plans, etc.

The study was conducted in two phases: the first phase focussed on arriving at the exact number of dropouts and the second phase attempted to study the dropouts in detail. To state briefly, the findings of this research have been able to clearly demonstrate the reasons for dropping out of the course stream in the colleges midway, the reasons for wastage, attrition, and stagnation etc, and it has been
able to ascertain the typical socio-demographic features of the dropouts. The findings also demonstrated that the opinion of students, both dropouts and non-dropouts towards higher education was neutral, and their opinion regarding the present examination system was negative to the extent that they desired an examination reform. Almost all students expressed a desire to have the higher education linked to job. Most important of all, the present study has been able to indicate the correlates of dropouts, viz. what factors contribute to the dropout phenomenon.

Before taking up the discussion of the above findings in the light of other studies in this field, it is imperative to emphasize the conceptual definitions of the term "Dropout" used in this study. It may be reiterated that most studies on dropouts have really focussed on 'Wastage' rather than "dropouts"; for instance, Kamat and Deshmukh (1963), Miller (1970), Sanders (1957), and Kelsall (1963) have all mainly considered the number of students who did not appear in the final examination. These studies had not taken into account all those who had withdrawn from the course, or had taken admission in other colleges to pursue other course in higher education, nor had they considered those who had migrated to either other states or other countries. On the other hand the studies by Chitnis (1980),
Phadke (1980) and Mathews (1957) had considered withdrawn cases and failures, and did not find out how many of the withdrawn cases had actually completed their studies. Thus one might point out that the above studies had not really investigated the 'dropout' phenomenon, but investigated only the wastage, stagnation and other related factors. Further, the students whom they considered to be 'dropouts' might not have been the real dropouts, because many of them might have possibly completed their graduation from some other institutions. In reality, they were all a wastage for the college in which they had initially enrolled but they were not dropouts from the higher education system itself. Many of them, for example, Kamat & Deshmukh (1963) and Miller (1970), had even considered wastage, attrition and dropout as synonymous terms.

The present study, however, has attempted to avoid the above pitfalls and has tried to study the real dropouts, by not merely subtracting from the total enrolled, the number of students who appeared in the final year examination, but also (1) those who had completed their graduation courses from amongst the withdrawal cases and (2) those who had migrated to other cities or to other colleges or to other courses and other countries for pursuing higher education. Thus, the real dropouts were worked out on the basis of following formula:
DO = (TE) - (W) - (M)

Wherein TE was the total enrolment in a college, 'W' the withdrawal cases who had completed graduation and 'M' was the number of students who had migrated to other colleges, cities or countries or in any way completed the graduation even after leaving the institution where they were initially enrolled.

In this context, it is worthwhile to mention McNeely's (1938) definition of wastage: gross wastage as failure or withdrawal of students from courses without account being taken of whether they enrolled in another University or re-enrolled at a later date in the same University; and net wastage according to him was when account was taken of later enrolment of students in another University or enrolment in the same. On this basis gross wastage in the 25 Universities that McNeely (1938) studied was 62.1 percent, and net wastage, was estimated at 45 percent. According to his definition the net wastage can be termed as dropout as defined in this study.

Kamat and Deshmukh (1963) defined wastage as consisting of all those students who joined college in the first year class but for some reason or the other could not or did not pursue college education to obtain the first
degree in 'Arts'; 'Science' or 'professional' courses. Further, they explained the wastage by giving some examples. For instance, according to them, the factors that will constitute wastage would be: (i) a person x, who leaves a college without taking a degree to join 'defence' services and for whom the years spent in the particular college were not necessary for getting this opportunity; (ii) a woman y, who joins a college at the desire of her parents to pursue higher education before they find a suitable match for her, contributes to wastage if she leaves the college before completing the degree course on account of marriage; (iii) a person z, who could not get admission to a diploma course in engineering after Senior Secondary Certificate Examination but could do so after studying one or two years in college. In this case, as it was not necessary for him to join the college to get admission to the diploma course, he will be considered as a wastage.

According to the above examples X, Y, and Z students are wastage in three different ways. Out of these, the student 'Y' who leaves the studies incomplete due to marriage will be a real dropout according to the definition of the present study, and the students X and Z are not dropouts because, even after leaving the institution in which they
were initially enrolled, they are still pursuing their graduation in some other courses.

The problem of academic failure, or as it is variously called - 'dropout', 'attrition', 'wastage' or 'stagnation', is one which has been widely investigated for many years in the United States but markedly less in other countries (Miller 1970). The United Kingdom in the past has been less concerned with this problem probably because of traditionally low overall failure rate.

Studying the problem of 'wastage' or 'dropout' in itself is rather complicated partly because the colleges and universities do not have information about the students who withdraw from the course or fail to report after taking admission to other colleges. Thus it is clear that wastage is due to a combination of various factors, some of which apply directly to students and some to institutions, in various combinations.

Wastage in higher education means all those students who took admission to a college, but for some reason or the other, could not or did not pursue the course for which they got initially enrolled in that college. Wastage, thus, often includes stagnation, attrition, and dropouts. In order to deduce the exact figure of dropouts, one must subtract from the initial enrolment in the field of higher
education, factors such as stagnation, attrition and wastage. This would yield the figure of probable dropouts.

In the present study, the findings showed that in the 20 colleges considered, on an average 623.05 students were enrolled in each college of which 372.35 students appeared in the final year examination.

Of the remaining, on an average 135.60 were found to be cases of attrition. Using the formula presented earlier to arrive at exact dropouts one finds that,

\[ \text{Probable Dropout} = (623.05) - (372.35) - (135.60) \]

\[ = 115.10 \]

On an average there were 115.10 probable dropouts in one college, viz. 18.4% of the total enrolment were probable dropouts and about 22% were withdrawal or attrition cases and about 60% of the total enrolled appeared in the final year examination.

Robbins Committee (1961-63) reported that in the United States, of the total students enrolled for the degree courses, about 40 to 50% left without obtaining a degree, while another 10% took longer than the normal four years. Montgomery (1964), Summerskill (1962) and Staudt (1965) estimated wastage at higher education to be around 50%.
Iffert (1957) in his study pointed out the wastage to be nearly one third of the enrolled number.

In India, studies have shown almost as high a rate of wastage from higher education, as in other countries. Rawat (1970), for instance, found around 41% of dropout at higher education level. Earlier, Bombay University's (1965) study indicated 50% to 60% dropout, whereas the University of Baroda found 33% dropout. Singh (1981) observed that wastage in higher education was as high as 50%.

The findings of the present study have shown about 40% wastage at the graduation level in colleges, and this percentage varied from college to college. In some colleges, this percentage was as less as 18% and as high as 74%. Another interesting finding of the study was that the wastage was significantly higher in the co-educational colleges (49%) as compared to women's colleges (34%).

When the ratio of wastage was calculated, it was found that on an average, there was 1:0.43 of wastage in the field of higher education.
CAUSES OF DROPPING OUT OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Based on the response received from the probable dropouts the following reasons were deduced and were classified into 16 categories, which are presented below:

1. Failed in 1st or 2nd year.
2. Completed graduation by correspondence/external cell.
3. Joined medicine/engineering etc.
5. Got a job.
6. Migrated to other college.
7. Transferred to another subject.
8. Family responsibility.
9. Lack of interest in studies/low percentage.
10. Going to complete graduation.
11. Father was transferred.
12. Went abroad for some course.
14. Due to strike.

As per the definition of dropout (already cited in the review chapter), all those who did not appear in the final examination were not dropouts. In fact majority of
them i.e. 70 percent were found to have completed their graduation or were non dropouts and only about 30 percent of the total probable dropouts were actual dropouts. Though the 70 percent of the probable dropouts appeared as non dropouts, they were, however, wastage for the initial course of enrolment.

In other words, one may say that if a student encounters any of the 16 situations (given as causes), he or she may probably more often cause wastage in higher education, than those who do not encounter any of the above situations. In the context of wastage in higher education, MacIntosh (1962) and Shuman (1956) had all reported 50 percent of wastage and within this only 20.2 percent graduated at a later period. Discussing the dropout phenomenon in terms of sex factor, Ecland (1964) showed that 60 per cent of the male students dropout before graduation, and again of this only 1/3rd were permanent dropouts. Of the remaining, half of them graduated in ten years time; however, the reasons advanced by these students were not clear.

In the present study, as mentioned elsewhere, it has been observed that nearly 40% was found to be wastage in higher education, and apart from withdrawal and
attrition cases, the highest wastage was due to failure in the 1st or IIInd years of degree course. Figure - 1 depicts the reasons for wastage and it is seen that the highest number of wastage obtained in colleges were mainly due to failure. That is 18.28% of probable dropouts left the college midway because they failed either in the 1st or 2nd year of the degree course. In this context, Wurzburg's (1966) study on college failures demonstrated that, of the students who stayed for more than two years beyond the norm of four year degree course, 53.6 percent failed in the examination and thus went out of the higher education system.

Two decades ago in this context Murray's Committee (1957) found it necessary to make an observation that the most disturbing aspect of University education was its high rate of failure. According to the Committee, in 1951, only 61 percent passed the first year examination while 35 percent graduated in the minimum time; and 58 percent graduated six years after enrolment. Gray and Short (1961) reported that in an Australian University about 25 percent of selected scholarship holders failed in the first year.

Apart from failure, there appear to be various other reasons which contribute to wastage in higher education. It was observed in the present study that
14.07% of students left the college due to personal or educational problems and completed their graduation by correspondance as an external candidate. The third highest (15.17%) dropout from the colleges were those who shifted to medicine/engineering or other equivalent professional courses. The fourth reason for dropping out of the college was found to be marriage, which caused 13.43% of students to drop out of higher education. Taking up any available job which did not require a graduate degree, also appeared to be one of the reasons for dropout. The opportunity to migrate to other colleges or transfer to other colleges or subjects were also important reasons for a student to dropout of the initial enrolment.

Lack of interest due to unemployment problem was another reason for the student to dropout from the college. Nearly 6.5% of students dropped out due to lack of interest in studies. The above findings appear to find support in the researches done by Ireland (1952), Robbins Committee Report (1963), and Summerskill (1962).

Another interesting finding of the present study was that 2.11% of students dropped out due to their father's transfer, whereas 1.5% went abroad to pursue some other course. Another 1 to 2% of students dropped out due to
reasons such as serious disease, accident, death and adjustment problem, due to prolonged strike in the University/college etc.

All the above reasons advanced by the students for leaving the colleges were classified into six categories viz. - (1) failure in the Ist or IIInd year, (2) joined other course, (3) marriage, (4) personal and emotional problems, (5) adjustment problems, and (6) economic problems.

It was found that marriage and economic reasons were the major causes for the students to dropout and within this while the former cause appeared to apply more to girls, the latter applied more to boys. In other words, significantly more female students dropped out due to marriage than the male students. On the other hand, significantly more male than female students dropped out due to economic reasons such as taking up employment, or business etc.

The above findings supported the finding of Kamat and Deshmukh (1963) regarding wastage, which had explained that many of the men students were subjected to the pressure that they must start earning as soon as possible, and especially those students who did not show promise in
college were urged by their families to go in for some vocation or job. And the women students, who were not subjected to such pressure to the same extent can persist even after repeated failures. While in the case of men, the pressure of seeking employment appeared to begin operating from the early stages of education, the pressure to learn household duties so as to be 'prepared' for marriage appeared to begin operating from early stages of education amongst women. These two different pressures appear to act differently on men and women students leading to their dropout from higher education system.

As mentioned elsewhere in this study, of the 804 potential dropouts who were contacted to ascertain the exact reasons for their leaving the course, it was found that only 250 students were real dropouts while 554 students turned to be non dropouts or graduates. Although these 554 (68.9% of probable dropout) students were not dropouts, they initially caused wastage to the institution concerned. The reasons for wastage appeared to vary for different students. It was found that though these students finally completed their graduation, they had left the college in which they were initially enrolled. They left the institution mainly because they failed in 1st or 2nd year of the course and did not want to continue
with the same. Quite a number opted for a job because they had failed or preferred to take up their graduation examination while working on a job. It was interesting to note that many students while doing their job or involved in their family business etc., were able to complete the graduation either by appearing as a private candidate or by joining evening colleges.

THE DROPOUTS :-

As pointed out elsewhere, the term 'dropout' as defined in this study is different from the conceptualization of dropout by many scholars. In most cases the word dropout has been used to mean wastage, and also to refer to a student who is leaving the course without obtaining a degree from that particular college in which he had initially enrolled. In none of the cases (except a few, such as Astin, 1964 and Bean 1979), any attempt has been made to ascertain if the person had later completed his graduation. Thus all those leaving a course or an institution cannot be considered dropouts. They may at the most be considered as probable dropouts in terms of the definition of the present study. In this research, all the probable dropouts had been further investigated to ascertain if they finally completed their graduation;
those who did not complete graduation and also remained so at the time of investigation were taken as real dropouts. In other words, students who did not complete graduation and left the studies completely were taken as dropouts. Thus dropouts had been narrowed down to refer to only those who not only left the college without completing the graduation, but also remained so even at the time of collecting data for this research. Perhaps, such a restricted definition of dropout may be one of the reasons why there was a very low rate of dropouts (2.02%) obtained in this research as compared to the ones reported by the other researchers in this field.

Causes of Dropout

While failure in the 1st or IIrd year of the course was one of the most important reasons for dropout (see in the earlier section), marriage appeared to be the other important reason for dropping out; for instance 25.6 percent of the total dropouts discontinued their studies due to marriage.

The third important reason for dropout appeared to be that of taking up a regular job or business. This was also the second reason given by the 'wastage' group. While the latter continued with their higher education
and wrote their examination, the dropouts completely discontinued their education, concentrating mainly on their jobs or business.

The fourth factor which led to the dropout phenomenon was the taking over of family responsibility due to certain family circumstances. In this 16 percent of the total dropouts complained that their family was responsible for their giving up the college education completely, as they were denied financial support to pursue education. A few others left the course because of lack of interest in studies on the part of their family members who discouraged them from pursuing higher education. Some others reported negative attitude and circumstances like death in the family, parent's illness etc., which compelled them to drop out of the course. These personal/financial reasons were, however, not advanced by the 'wastage' group who somehow managed to complete their higher education. On the other hand, the typical reasons such as taking up Engineering, Medicine and other professional courses were given by the dropout group.

Poor academic performance was advanced as an important reason for dropping out of the course. Nearly 12.8% of students reported that they wanted to complete
their graduation, but they could not do so despite making 2 or 3 attempts during the following years. This is a rather contrasting picture to that of the 'wastage' group who, though failed, got through their final examination in their second attempt.

About 22 percent dropout students found higher education irrelevant and so did not try to complete it. They reported that they had no interest in the subjects offered by these colleges because the courses concerned were not related to the realities of life, or of any practical value. They were of the view that in the particular course concerned there was no future in terms of job opportunities. Hence they preferred to take up some job-oriented course like Nursery Teacher Training, Nursing, Electronics etc., from Technical Training Institutes. They had, thus, no intention to complete their graduation.

The least important reason for dropouts were personal reasons like disease, accident or adjustment problem. This comprised only 2% of the total dropouts. A similar trend was observed even in the wastage group.

Having discussed the phenomenon of dropout, its conceptualisation and the causes of dropouts, it would be
worthwhile to consider the typical socio demographic characteristics of those who dropout of higher education system. This is being discussed in the following section:

**DROPOUTS : SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS :**

The Socio-demographic factors considered for this study were age, sex, marital status, type of family, parents' level of education and their occupation, the type of school the dropouts had attended before joining the course and their previous educational records.

Analysis of the data in Chapter 1 showed that the socio-demographic factors of a student played a significant role in his dropping out of a college or completing the course to which the student was initially enrolled. For instance, it was observed in this study that the socio-demographic factors contributed relatively more to the dropout phenomenon than the other factors. It showed that the personality variables such as adjustment to home, health, emotions as well as student's attitude towards higher education played a secondary role in influencing the students to dropout, compared to the socio-demographic factors. This was substantiated by the multiple regression analysis.
Dropouts and age

The results showed that the dropouts were significantly older than the non dropouts.

This finding supports that of a number of studies which have reported differences in terms of age factor in academic performance. For instance, Sanders (1948, 1961, and 1963), Philip (1955), Fleming (1959), Schonell (1962), and Baureti (1972) observed that younger candidates tended to obtain better degree results. Flecker (1959), in Australia, Howell (1962) in Great Britain, and Harris (1940) in the United States had also obtained similar findings. Though these studies relate to academic performance, yet the effect of age on academic achievement had been strikingly brought out. Since dropout in one way or the other reflects also the academic non-achievement, its relationship to age factor can be compared with studies relating age to academic performance. Typically relating age with dropout was the study by Kamat and Deshmukh (1963) who in their extensive work on wastage at college level found that the dropouts from science group were younger than the students from arts group and also the wastage was found to be more amongst women than men and the former were found to be again younger in age than their fellow male students. Explanation cited for women students to
dropout and also being younger was that: (a) there was a
tendency amongst the parents to marry off the girls who
did not show good academic progress in schools and (b)
most of the women students coming from urban families and
from culturally advanced communities were found to be
younger than those from rural families and culturally
backward communities.

Ambarao (1982) found that Scheduled Caste students
were significantly older than the non Scheduled Caste
students at college level. A similar analysis of age by
occupation of the guardian, made by Kamat and Deshmukh
(1963) showed that - (i) students whose guardians were
businessmen were older than those whose parents were in
service; (ii) lower the income of the guardians, higher
the age of their wards; (iii) sons and daughters of
professional men and teachers formed the youngest age
group of students.

It is clear from the above studies that age
appears to play an important role in influencing academic
achievement as well as dropouts. Thus the findings of
the present study appear to find support in the early
researches who had shown differences in age group affecting
differentially the educational performance and dropouts
in the higher education system.
Having discussed the age factor as influential in causing dropout, the following section discusses the influence of sex factor on the dropout phenomenon.

**Dropouts and Sex factor**

The findings of the present research showed a significant difference between dropouts and non dropouts with regard to sex factor. More specifically, there were significantly more dropouts amongst men students than amongst women students and the reasons advanced for dropping out of the higher education courses, were also different.

There were proportionately larger number of males who dropped out of the course than female students, and this difference was found to be statistically significant. The Table below shows that while the percentage of dropout to the total enrolment was 2.02%, it was found that there was 2.79% of dropout amongst male students while it was only 1.55% amongst female students. The Table below presents the total enrolment in men and women's colleges vis-a-vis the dropout figures.
Table - VI

ENROLMENT FIGURES FOR 1982-83
AND THE PERCENT OF DROPOUT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Women' colleges</th>
<th>Men colleges</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>503</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7471 489 4501 4990

For 20 colleges Total enrolment = 12461
Male Dropouts = 126 out of 4501
Female dropouts = 124 out of 7960
Total dropouts = 250 out of 12461
As pointed out earlier, these findings validated hypothesis no. 5, and found support in the studies of Kamat and Deshmukh (1963) who found that wastage amongst men students was remarkably higher than amongst women students.

While studies relating to the difference in dropouts between male and female students are few, many studies in the educational field have dealt with the sex dichotomy in terms of academic performance amongst students, adjustmental aspects and certain personality characteristics such as achievement motivation etc. For instance, Pathak (1970, 1972) found significant difference between boys and girls on health, social and emotional adjustments. More than two decades ago, Pasricha (1964) investigating the sex differences with regard to adjustment problem, found boys to be more prone to such problems than girls. Grewal (1971) who investigated the vocational choice between boys and girls found it to vary significantly. In personality characteristics, Sharma (1972) found that boys were more achievement oriented than girls, whereas Kohli (1972) found that boys and girls did not at all differ in their learning capability. In a totally different context, though concerned with education, more recently, Springett (1986) observed that the perception
of course satisfaction of male students was more linked to their occupational ego identity whereas it was not so in the case of girls. Going in line with the study of Kohli (1972) was Matteo's (1972) study which showed no significant difference between boys and girls with regard to their adjustment in different areas of life.

Thus sex factor appears to have had considerable influence on various aspects of educational including academic achievement, adjustment to educational institutions etc. One could indirectly find support in these studies for differences in dropouts. Further more, the dropout amongst women being far lesser than that of men needs explanation. It has been observed in the present study that failure and stagnation amongst women students is far lesser than that in the case of men students. Since one of the major causes of dropout was found to be failure and more men students have failed (59) than women students (24), perhaps dropout is also found more amongst men.

Further, amongst the causes advanced for dropouts, marriage has been a major factor including dropout. This aspect is being discussed in the following section:
Dropout and Marital Status

In 20 percent of the cases marriage has been found to be an important cause for dropout. Also, the results had shown a significant difference between dropouts and non dropouts in regard to their marital status. In other words, significantly more married persons were found amongst the dropout group than amongst the non dropout group, indicating thereby that marriage could be an influential factor inducing dropout amongst students.

The above finding not only validated hypothesis No. 7 but also supported the study of Harris (1972) who found that 24 percent of total dropouts were due to marriage or pregnancy. In this group again, one noted that those who gave 'marriage' as a reason for dropping out were mostly girls and very few were boys.

Thus, as pointed out elsewhere in this study, one may mention that 'marriage' generally forces a girl to dropout of higher education system and this aspect needs to be kept in mind while one considers dropout in this system.

Marriage, family etc. are a few of the important social institutions which determine the life and future of individuals. Since the present study indicated that
dropouts are also due to "marriage" factor, an attempt has been made to analyse the type of family to which a student belonged and its influence on the dropout behaviour of a student.

Dropouts and type of family:

The joint family system which had been considered as a unique feature of Indian society by sociologists has been compared with nuclear family system to ascertain their role in the dropout phenomenon.

The results of the present study showed that there was a significant association between the type of family to which a student belonged and his/her dropping out of the college. In other words, there were significantly more students from joint family in the dropout group of the students as compared to those from non dropout group. This finding validated hypothesis no. 8, which stated that there will be a difference between dropouts and non dropouts in regard to the type of family to which they belong; this also supported the findings of Jackson (1978) who concluded in a different context that dropouts tended to have a greater number of persons dependent upon the family income than the graduates. Similarly, Astin (1964) also demonstrated that dropouts belonged to relatively
larger sized family as compared to non dropouts. However, discussing academic achievement at higher education level Hopkins, Malleson and Sarnoff, (1958); and Himmelweit and Summerfield, (1951) demonstrated that the size of the family had little correlation with these factors. Though these findings are as expected in the Western countries, as education there has nothing to do with the size of the family due to greater affluence in the families, the same cannot be true in the Indian context as most families are not as economically well off as in the West. Hence a person in a large family, may have to enter a job before completing his graduation so as to earn for his family or supplement his family income. Thus one would find many persons dropping out of the higher education belonging to joint family system.

The joint family system by itself may not as such contribute to the dropout phenomenon, but the traditional and cultural orientations that exist within the system which give relatively less importance to higher education, appear responsible for the dropout phenomenon. In the recent years the joint family system is said to be giving way more to nuclear families, particularly in the urban areas. This changing trend appears to have slightly
reduced the rate of dropouts in the urban colleges as compared to the rural ones. Further, the changing trend appears to have brought about a change in the educational and occupational careers of individuals. As is seen over the years, there has been an increase in the level of education of the parents and their level of occupation. This might have also led to the lowering of the dropout rate in urban areas. This later aspect is discussed in the following section:

**Dropouts and Parents' level of education**:

The analysis of present study showed that slightly more than 3 times fathers of non dropouts were above the level of graduation as compared to the fathers of dropout students. Further nearly 5 times, the fathers of dropout students were below matric level of education as compared to their non dropout counter parts. Similarly, nearly 10 times more the mothers of non dropouts had studied above graduation level as compared to those of dropout students; and slightly more than three times the mothers of dropouts were below matric level as compared to the non dropout group.

The above result supports the findings of Bayer (1968), and Astin (1964) who also found a significant difference between dropouts and non dropouts in regard
to the parents' level of education. Swart (1976) and Nayal (1986) found that at school most of the dropouts belonged to lower socio-economic strata. Vernon (1963), and Rowlands (1961) showed that the cultural level of homes were more closely related to a students' education than the economic level. Similarly Lovell and White (1958) had earlier showed that children were often influenced by their parents even to the extent of choosing a particular subject or occupation or even a school or college in which to study. In quite a few cases parents decide the career and course for their children based on their own present occupation. This at times takes two forms; either the son takes the same type of occupation as the father, such as becoming a doctor or layer etc., or the son takes an occupation totally different from that of the father, as the latter had suffered in that occupation. Thus father's occupation may play a certain role in the choice of higher education course of the son/daughter, which is one step before taking up an occupation for earning one's livelihood. Hence the present research, which investigated this aspect, by comparing dropouts and non dropouts showed a significant difference between the two groups in terms of their father's occupation. In other words, significantly more percentage (nearly
three times) of parents of non dropouts than the dropouts were found to belong to higher professions such as medicine, engineering, law, teaching profession etc. On the other hand, parents holding petty shop business and other related category of jobs were found significantly more amongst dropouts than amongst non dropouts.

The above finding supports the finding of Swart (1976), who found that parents of continuers were more likely to have occupations like - professional, technical, managerial, sales etc. while the fathers of dropouts were more likely to have farming, fishery, forestry, and related work. Shitra (1970) found that the opportunity for women to pursue higher education was mostly from amongst the students whose father was in a high level occupation which fetched higher income. In comparing socio-economic strata of the dropouts and non dropouts Cliff (1962), and Iffert (1957) found that the dropouts came from lower socio-economic strata as compared to the stay-ins. Astin (1964), based on his research, also concluded that one of the factors contributing to the dropout problem was the low level of socio-economic background which included father's occupation. The comprehensive study by Kamat and Deshmukh (1963), based
on the entrance form filled in by the candidates, pointed out that the wastage was lower amongst the students whose parents were in medicine, engineering etc. In contrast to the above findings Marril (1964) found in his sample thatpersisters and non persisters did not differ significantly in terms of their yearly income or their father's occupation. Hughes (1960) had also indicated similar trends, viz. that there was no significant correlation between income and academic success. Discussing the failure rate and performance, Malleson (1959) demonstrated that social class grouping had very little influence on the students' failure rate and academic performance. Marris (1964) found that working class students were sometimes academically superior to higher class children.

In a different context, Reddy (1971) showed that children whose fathers were engaged in manual work or blue-collar jobs were less adjusted than children whose fathers were in good business or professions like teaching, medicine or engineering; Karandikar (1975) studied the problems of Poona University students and found that deficient economic conditions were responsible for the varied types of problems faced by the students. Similarly, Sharma (1971) found that students whose parents were
holding occupations of high prestige had less of anxiety and were better adjusted as compared to those whose parents were in relatively less prestigious occupations.

In this context, it was pointed out that such academic superiority may be attributable to the parents in this socio-economic class, being highly selective as to which of his children would enter higher education. In these cases, children who had not been academically bright were less likely to go into university for higher education unless they were of exceptional calibre. This leads to the next question whether students performing at a higher level tend to persist in higher education as compared to those who had not performed as well. For this purpose, students' academic performance at high school leaving certificate were taken and scrutinised for both dropouts and non dropouts and the results are discussed in the section below.

Dropouts and Previous educational records:

As mentioned elsewhere, the academic performance of students of both the groups viz. dropout and non-dropout, at the 12th class level before entering the college was considered in order to ascertain if their previous academic performance was in any way related to the dropout phenomenon.
The results of the present study had shown clearly that the previous educational records of the dropouts were significantly poorer than those of the non dropout students. While there were 52.17% of non dropout students having first class at school leaving level, there were only 11.30% of such students amongst the dropout group. Similarly, while there were only 7.82 percent of the non dropouts having 3rd division, there were 14% in the dropout group who had secured third division. Similarly, while only 40 percent of non dropouts were second divisioners at school leaving level, 75 percent of dropouts were second divisioners at that level.

The above results supported the findings of studies by Bayer (1968), Bragg (1956), Iffert (1957), Yoshino (1958), and Jackson (1978) who all concluded that dropouts as compared with the students who remain in college, had a lower academic record at school leaving level.

In a study on college dropouts Astin (1964), concluded that low rank at high school level was one of the important variables for a student to drop out of the college. Similarly, Blanchfield (1971), Sharma (1976), Diederichs (1979), Titone (1979), and Mecloy (1986) showed on the basis of their findings that the dropouts had relatively poorer previous academic record as compared to the non dropouts.
In one of the most comprehensive study on college level wastage in India, Kamat and Deshmukh (1963), observed that marks obtained by the students of S.S.C. examination, was crucial in determining the dropout phenomenon. They pointed out that in the case of students who had obtained less than 45% marks at S.S.C. examination, the chances of completing the college course would be as low as one in five. These findings are supported by the findings of the present thesis which had also shown that the dropouts had 48.51% on an average, whereas non dropouts 58.01% on an average. It has been observed in studies (for eg. Veeraraghavan 1985, Sen Gupta and Veeraraghavan 1984) that the academic performance of students varied in terms of the type of school in which a pupil studied. Perhaps one may expect even dropouts to vary in terms of the types of school in which a student studied. More specifically if one considers this aspect and looks at the dropout phenomenon, one may perhaps find more dropouts belonging to a particular type of school as compared to the non dropouts. This aspect has been investigated and discussed in the section below:

Dropouts and type of School

It may be recalled that the schools in which the students had been before joining the college were grouped into four types of schools, viz. Public School, Private
school, the central government and state government run schools. Then the schools in which dropouts studied were taken up and classified in terms of schools as above. The analysis of the type of schools which the two groups attended, showed significant differences between the dropouts and non dropouts ($X^2 = 56.76$, df = 3, $p < .01$). Nearly 89% of dropouts had attended state government run schools, whereas only 2.6% amongst these students were from Public schools. On the other hand 31.3% of non dropouts were from Public schools and only 42% of this group were from Government schools. There were, however, almost equal percentage of students from the two groups who had studied in central schools and private schools.

The above results support the findings in the studies by Rao (1978), Opal and Sen (1979), and Veeraraghavan (1985). For instance, Rao (1978) had compared the privately managed schools with public and Government schools and found that students from privately managed schools had performed better than those from the other schools. Veeraraghavan (1985) compared students from Public schools, government schools, and corporation run schools and found that public schools students not only performed better but also had higher ambition and more ambitious future plans as compared to students from other schools.
Thus it may be concluded that the type of schools may act as an important variable not only in the learning process or academic success (as investigated by above-mentioned scholars) but may also play a crucial role in students dropping out from a college without obtaining a degree.

While the type of school may appear to influence the dropout phenomenon and various other academically related aspects, it is equally important to recognize that, irrespective of adverse socio-economic status, parent's occupation and the type of school in which a pupil studies, a student may still continue to pursue his higher education without dropping out if he is motivated to achieve the goal of completing his higher education course. In other words a person who is achievement oriented would persist in higher education as against the one who is not. To state the same differently, one may come across larger number of high achievement oriented students in the non-dropout group rather than the dropout group. This aspect had been investigated in the present study and the findings of the same are discussed in the following section.

**Dropout and Achievement Motivation**

The findings of the present study observed a significant difference between dropouts and non-dropouts in regard to their level of achievement motivation. That
is, the dropout students had significantly lower achievement motivation as compared to non-dropout students who had average achievement motivation. This finding supported the findings of Summerskill (1962), Mehta (1968) and Moos (1976) who found that the level of achievement motivation was related to the academic success of the students. In a similar study Heist and Williams (1950), and Himmelweit et al. (1951) found that under-achievers were significantly poorer in their performance as compared to over-achievers.

However, when the level of achievement motivation was studied in terms of sex factor, no significant difference was observed between male and female students; whereas, between dropouts and non-dropouts, both male and female dropouts differed significantly from the female non dropouts but not from male non dropouts in their level of achievement motivation. In other words female non dropouts had significantly higher achievement motivation than dropout males and females. These findings appear to support those of Jindal (1976), Sinha (1966), and Sharma (1964), who all found successful students to be significantly higher in achievement orientation and lower on anxiety than students who failed. Bhatnagar (1969), Kumar (1972), Deo et al., (1970) found that high and low achievement was related to the self concept of a student. Poorer self concept was associated with low achievement whereas favourable self concept was associated with
higher achievement. Phutela (1976) found a relationship between need achievement and academic success.

In a different context, Rao (1965) studied the relationship between achievement motivation and academic achievement, and found that the problems of motivation hindered scholastic achievement. Contrary to the above finding, De and Khan (1969), and Muthayya and Rajeshwari (1969) found no relationship between personality and achievement motivation.

There have been a large number of researches in the field of achievement motivation. However, those relating to dropout or wastage are almost absent. Yet, the available researches on this aspect in the educational areas have shown categorically that higher level of achievement motivation is associated with higher level of academic performance and activity. The present research which had demonstrated that non dropouts had significantly higher achievement motivation and also had higher academic performance in their last school, appear to support the above findings. In other words, one could state that lack of achievement motivation could very often be one of the causes for dropping out of the higher education courses.

Apart from achievement motivation there may be various other personality factors, particularly adjustment to various areas of one's life, which may in one way or the
other influence dropout. These aspects are being discussed in the next section.

**Dropout and Personality Adjustment**

The present study attempted to ascertain if personality adjustment in any way varied between dropouts and non dropouts. Personality adjustment in this study has been considered in terms of Home adjustment, Health adjustment, Social adjustment, Emotional adjustment, and Educational adjustment. Using Sinha and Singh's (1972) scale of personality adjustment, it was found in this study that dropouts and non dropouts varied significantly in their adjustment to social and educational areas but not in the home, health and emotional areas of adjustment. As was observed, the non dropouts had significantly better adjustment in all the areas as compared to dropout cases, though significantly better only in two areas, indicating thereby that the non dropouts had a relatively more rational and well balanced personality which contributed to better adjustment. Perhaps, because of this more favourable adjustment, they were persisters in the course whereas dropout students having a less favourable adjustment had dropped out from the course.

The above findings appear to find support in the findings of Edelbrock (1975), Bayer (1968), Maxwell (1960), and Grace (1957) who reported that the persisters scored
significantly higher on personality adjustment as compared to the non persisters or dropouts. In this context it is worthwhile mentioning that Jha (1985), and Tripathi (1965) found academic success to be related to personality problems. Sharma (1986) concluded that 'Arts' students had greater adjustment problems as compared to professional course students. Commenting on the correlation between emotional and social areas Bhat, et al., (1961) found significant correlation between these two areas of adjustment. Pathak (1970 and 1972), found that the boys and girls differed significantly on adjustment to health, social and emotional areas. Contrary to these findings, Mattoo (1972) found that the two sexes did not differ in the areas of adjustment.

While many factors have been studied as being associated with or influencing the dropout phenomenon, an interesting finding of the present research is the emergence of certain correlates of dropouts. The multiple regression analysis carried out, clearly brought to the fore age, sex material status, type of family and socio-economic status as important factors contributing to the dropout phenomenon. No study has been able to ascertain the correlates of dropout as has been attempted in this research. However, studies by many, for example, that of Kamat and Deshmukh (1963) and Sanders (1963), related age to dropout and wastage and showed that there were more
dropouts at older age group level than at younger age. Similarly, studies by Harris (1972) demonstrated that marriage was one of the most important factors causing wastage in the field of higher education. It was in Kamat and Deshmukh's (1963) study that one found that there were greater number of wastage amongst the male than amongst the female students. Though no typical studies had related type of family to dropout, Astin (1964), Swart (1976), and Mopkings et al. (1958) showed that larger families had greater number of dropouts as compared to smaller families, thus indirectly showing the importance of nuclear / smaller families having lesser number of dropouts. All the above researches had considered these variables individually to dropout, some focusing on one variable and a few on second variable and the third on another variable, etc. Attempts to arrive at a certain number of factors jointly contributing to dropout had been almost absent. Thus, to this extent, the present research could be considered as having made a special contribution to the field of higher education.

Dropouts and Attitude towards Higher Education

The earlier section dealt with a number of academic, social, psychological and personal variables as influencing the dropout phenomenon. An important socio-psychological variable, viz., attitude towards higher education. The
findings categorically showed no significant difference in the attitude towards higher education between dropouts and non-dropout students. Furthermore, it clearly indicated neither positive nor negative but a neutral attitude towards higher education held by the students.

The above findings rejected hypothesis no. 13 which stated that there will be a difference between the two groups in regard to the attitude towards higher education. There appears to be a paucity of research on the attitude of students towards higher education. Hence no parallel study could be discussed to substantiate this aspect.

Other Factors Related to Dropouts

Having discussed the correlates of dropouts and socio-demographic factors affecting the dropout phenomenon, the present section discusses other factors which have emerged as strikingly influential to the dropout phenomenon. For instance, factors such as future plans regarding career, students' opinion about education and its link with job and their satisfaction or dissatisfaction over the present examination system were some of the factors dealt with in this section. These are being discussed in the following section.

Dropouts and their future plans regarding their career

The results of this study had shown that dropouts had relatively more specific and ambitious future plans as compared to dropouts. These findings validated hypothesis.
no. 15, which stated that there will be a difference in the future plans of dropouts and non dropouts. It also supports the findings of Venables (1961) who pointed out that the vocational aims and career prospects were important factors for a student completing a particular course. Similarly, Himmelweit (1950) cited studies showing positive correlation between interest in chosen course and examination results. Astin (1964) found a significant difference between dropouts and persisters in connection with whether they intended to proceed to higher degrees in their subjects or only to Bachelor's degrees. He found that persisters were keen to proceed to higher degrees whereas dropouts were contented with obtaining Bachelor's degree.

Thus, one may conclude that student's future plans regarding his career is one of the influential variables, which not only influences one's educational performance but also the dropout phenomenon. Although the student's future plans were observed to be an important variable, certain other aspects such as student's opinion about higher education as well as its link with jobs and their opinion about existing examination system could not be associated with the dropout phenomenon.

The investigations showed that not only dropout group emphasised the need to link the education with jobs but the same opinion was also expressed by non dropout group.
One may infer from this that the need to link education with job had been felt strongly by both the groups.

Similarly, the investigation about the student's opinion about existing examination system showed that more non dropouts than dropouts expressed dissatisfaction. Strikingly, the dropouts showed satisfaction or indifference, while the non dropouts showed more concern and dissatisfaction and expressed the need for an examination reform. One may infer from this finding that although there is a growing dissatisfaction amongst the students regarding present examination system, no association could be established between this and the dropout phenomenon.

Concluding Remarks

To conclude this chapter, it may be stated that findings of the present research were seen in the light of available studies covering the phenomenon of dropout. Though very few studies were available directly related to this area, the trend obtained in those researches were supported by the findings of the present study. While the variables considered in this research also figured in other studies, it is seen that only one or two variables at a time had been considered by a researcher; on the other hand, the present research has considered all the variables to ascertain their effects and influence on dropout. Perhaps, in the
present research one may consider the emergence of correlates of dropouts in higher education as an exclusive contribution, which does not appear to have been attempted by other researchers. The typical comparison of dropouts and non dropouts appears to be also a unique feature in this study which had figured rather scarcely in other researches. The discussions have also shown that most studies have not delineated the correlates of dropouts as attempted in this study which again appears to be a special feature of this research.

The next chapter presents the conclusions, limitations and recommendations based on the findings of this research.