

Student Dropout in Higher Education: A Descriptive Sociological Study of the Factors Associated with Student Discontinuation

Dr. K. M. Desai

Head, Department of Sociology, Shri Shahaji Chhatrapati Mahavidyalya, Kolhapur (M.S)

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51583/IJLTEMAS.2026.150900073>

Received: 17 September 2026; Accepted: 22 September 2026; Published: 13 October 2026

ABSTRACT

Student dropout in higher education is a significant sociological and educational issue because discontinuation of higher education can affect students' employment opportunities, economic mobility, social participation, and future life chances. Student dropout is not generally the result of a single factor; rather, it emerges through the interaction of economic, academic, institutional, family, social, psychological, and personal circumstances. The present study proposes a descriptive sociological investigation of the factors associated with student discontinuation from higher education. The study focuses on students who have discontinued their higher education as well as, where appropriate, currently enrolled students for comparative understanding. The research examines the relationship between socioeconomic background, family circumstances, academic experiences, financial difficulties, institutional conditions, social support, and students' decisions to discontinue their studies. A mixed-method descriptive research design may be employed, combining a structured questionnaire with semi-structured interviews. Quantitative data may be analysed using frequencies, percentages, cross-tabulations, and appropriate measures of association, while qualitative responses may be analysed thematically. The study is expected to contribute to a sociological understanding of dropout by locating individual decisions within wider social and institutional structures. The findings can assist educational institutions, policymakers, teachers, families, and student-support services in developing strategies to reduce preventable discontinuation from higher education.

Keywords: Higher Education, Student Dropout, Student Discontinuation, Sociology of Education, Socioeconomic Factors, Academic Factors, Institutional Factors, Student Retention.

INTRODUCTION

Higher education plays an important role in individual development and social transformation. Universities and colleges provide students with knowledge, professional skills, social networks, cultural capital, and opportunities for upward social mobility. For many young people, completion of higher education is associated with improved employment prospects and greater participation in economic and social life.

However, admission to higher education does not necessarily guarantee completion. Some students discontinue their studies before completing the programme in which they are enrolled. Student discontinuation may occur voluntarily or involuntarily and may result from financial difficulties, academic problems, family responsibilities, migration, health or personal circumstances, dissatisfaction with the institution, lack of social support, employment opportunities, or other factors. From a sociological perspective, student dropout should not be understood merely as an individual failure. Therefore, the study of student dropout requires examining the relationship between the individual student and the wider social environment.

The present research proposes a descriptive sociological study of the factors associated with student discontinuation in higher education. It seeks to identify the major factors associated with discontinuation and to understand how different dimensions of students' social and educational experiences interact.

Background of the Study

The expansion of higher education has increased access to colleges and universities among diverse social groups. Students entering higher education may differ considerably in their socioeconomic circumstances, educational preparation, family responsibilities, financial resources, and access to institutional support. Students from economically disadvantaged backgrounds may face difficulties in paying tuition and examination fees, purchasing books, meeting transportation costs, or maintaining accommodation. Some students may also need to undertake paid employment while studying. Academic preparedness is another important dimension. Students who experience difficulties in adapting to university-level learning, language requirements, examinations, workload, or teaching methods may become academically disengaged.

Family circumstances can also affect educational continuity. Marriage, caregiving responsibilities, parental illness, family conflict, pressure to work, or other household responsibilities may interfere with students' education. Institutional factors are equally important. Students' experiences with teachers, administrative procedures, curriculum, assessment systems, counselling services, accommodation, libraries, transportation, and campus climate can influence their educational experience. Thus, dropout is best examined as a multidimensional social phenomenon.

Statement of the Problem

The problem addressed by this study is the discontinuation of higher education among students and the social, economic, academic, family, and institutional factors associated with such discontinuation. The following central question guides the study:

What factors are associated with students' discontinuation from higher education, and how do students' socioeconomic, family, academic, social, and institutional circumstances shape their decision to continue or discontinue their studies?

Significance of the Study

The study is significant for several reasons.

Sociological Significance

The study contributes to the sociology of education by examining dropout as a social phenomenon rather than simply an individual educational problem.

Educational Significance

The findings can help colleges and universities identify conditions that may place students at greater risk of discontinuation.

Policy Significance

The study may provide evidence useful for designing student-support programmes, financial assistance, counselling, academic mentoring, and retention policies.

Institutional Significance

Educational institutions may use the findings to strengthen academic advising, student welfare services, communication systems, and institutional support.

Social Significance

Reducing preventable dropout can contribute to educational equality, social mobility, and more effective utilisation of educational resources.

Objectives of The Study

General Objective

To descriptively examine the sociological factors associated with student discontinuation from higher education.

Specific Objectives

1. To examine the socioeconomic background of students who discontinue higher education.
2. To identify the major economic factors associated with student discontinuation.
3. To study the influence of family responsibilities and family circumstances on educational continuity.
4. To examine the role of institutional factors in student discontinuation.
5. To understand the influence of peer relationships and social support on students' educational continuity.

Research Questions

The study will address the following research questions:

1. What are the major factors associated with student discontinuation from higher education?
2. To what extent are economic difficulties associated with discontinuation?
3. How do academic difficulties influence students' decisions to discontinue?
4. What family circumstances are associated with discontinuation?
5. What support could have helped students continue their education?

Hypotheses

- Because this is primarily a descriptive study, hypotheses are optional. However, if the study includes inferential statistical analysis, the following hypotheses may be tested.
- **H1:** There is a significant association between students' socioeconomic status and discontinuation from higher education.
- **H2:** Students experiencing greater financial difficulties are more likely to discontinue higher education.
- **H3:** Academic difficulties are significantly associated with student discontinuation.
- **H4:** Family responsibilities are significantly associated with student discontinuation.
- **H6:** Students with lower levels of family and peer support are more likely to report discontinuation.

Null Hypotheses

- **H01:** There is no significant association between socioeconomic status and student discontinuation.
- **H02:** There is no significant association between financial difficulties and student discontinuation.
- **H03:** There is no significant association between academic difficulties and student discontinuation.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The study conceptualises student discontinuation as the outcome of interactions among multiple dimensions.

Independent Variables:

In the present research study, independent variables are such as Socio-economic factors, Demographic factors, Academic factors, Family factors, Institutional factors and social factors

Dependent Variable:

Student Discontinuation from Higher Education

Operationally, discontinuation may be defined as leaving a higher education programme before completing the qualification and not being enrolled in that programme at the time specified by the study.

Conceptual Relationship

Socioeconomic + Demographic + Academic + Family + Institutional + Social Factors → Student Educational Experience → Decision/Capacity to Continue → Continuation or Discontinuation

Operational Definitions

- **Student:** For this study, a student refers to an individual enrolled or previously enrolled in a recognised higher education institution.
- **Higher Education:** Higher education refers to education provided by colleges, universities, and other recognised post-secondary educational institutions.
- **Student Dropout:** Student dropout refers to discontinuation of an educational programme before completion, where the student does not subsequently return within the period defined by the study.
- **Student Discontinuation:** Student discontinuation refers to the cessation of participation in a higher education programme before obtaining the intended qualification.
- **Socioeconomic Status:** Socioeconomic status refers to the combined social and economic position of a student's family, measured through indicators such as household income, parental occupation, parental education, housing conditions, and access to material resources.
- **Institutional Support:** Institutional support refers to academic, financial, administrative, counselling, welfare, and other forms of assistance provided by the educational institution.

Scope of The Study

The study focuses on student discontinuation in higher education.

The scope may include:

- Undergraduate students
- Postgraduate students, if included in the sampling design
- Students who discontinued their programme
- Currently enrolled students, where a comparison group is required
- Public and/or private institutions, depending on the research setting

The study may be geographically limited to a particular city, district, university, or group of institutions. For a manageable master's-level study, the researcher may limit the research to selected colleges or universities

in a particular geographical area.

Delimitations

The study may be delimited as follows:

1. The research will be restricted to selected higher education institutions.
2. The study will cover students within a specified age or educational range.
3. The study will focus on discontinuation rather than all forms of academic failure.
4. The research will examine factors reported by respondents and will not claim that every identified factor causes dropout.
5. The findings will be generalised only to populations reasonably represented by the sample.

Research Design

A **descriptive research design** is appropriate for the present study because the primary purpose is to describe the characteristics and factors associated with student discontinuation.

A **mixed-method approach** can strengthen the research.

Quantitative component

A structured questionnaire can be used to collect information regarding:

- Demographic characteristics;
- Socioeconomic background;
- Academic experiences;
- Financial difficulties;
- Family circumstances;
- Institutional experiences;
- Social support;
- Reasons for discontinuation.

Qualitative component

Semi-structured interviews can provide a deeper understanding of students' experiences, perceptions, decision-making processes, and circumstances surrounding discontinuation. Thus, the study may adopt a:

Descriptive cross-sectional mixed-method research design.

If the researcher wants to compare students who discontinued with students who remained enrolled, a **comparative cross-sectional component** may also be incorporated.

Research Approach

The study will employ both quantitative and qualitative approaches.

Quantitative approach

The quantitative component will measure the prevalence and distribution of different factors associated with discontinuation.

Qualitative approach

The qualitative component will explore students lived experiences and perceptions regarding why they discontinued or considered discontinuing their education. The mixed-method approach allows statistical patterns to be complemented by respondents' explanations.

Study Area

The researcher should clearly specify the study area. The study will be conducted in selected higher education institutions located in Kolhapur district. The selected institutions will represent relevant variations in institutional type, course structure, and student socioeconomic background.

The researcher should provide a brief profile of the study area, including:

- Number and type of higher education institutions;
- Major courses/programmes;
- Student population;
- Socioeconomic characteristics;
- Urban/rural characteristics;
- Relevant educational infrastructure.

Study Population

The target population will consist of students who have discontinued higher education within the period defined by the study. Where a comparative group is included, the population may also include currently enrolled students from the same or comparable institutions.

Example

The target population will consist of students who discontinued their undergraduate or postgraduate programme during the previous three academic years in selected higher education institutions in the study area. The exact population should be established using institutional records where available.

Sampling Frame

The sampling frame should be developed from available institutional records.

Possible sources include:

- Admission records;
- Withdrawal records;
- Examination records;
- Student databases;

- Alumni records;
- Institutional retention records;
- Department records.

Where formal dropout lists are unavailable, the researcher may use institutional records, student associations, alumni networks, or carefully designed respondent-recruitment methods, while clearly reporting the limitations.

Sample Size

The sample size should be determined according to the size of the population, expected variability, desired confidence level, precision, study design, and available resources. If the population is finite, a finite population correction can be applied. The final sample size should also account for expected non-response.

Suggested example

For a master's-level descriptive study, the researcher may select approximately 200 respondents, subject to the actual accessible population and statistical requirements. The number should not simply be adopted without justification; it should be calculated and reported according to the actual study population.

Sampling Technique

A **multistage sampling technique** may be appropriate.

Stage 1: Selection of institutions: Institutions may be selected using purposive or stratified sampling depending on the research objectives.

Stage 2: Selection of departments/programmes: Selected departments or programmes may be identified from the participating institutions.

Stage 3: Selection of respondents: Students may be selected using:

- simple random sampling;
- systematic random sampling;
- stratified random sampling; or
- purposive sampling for qualitative interviews.

Recommended approach

For the quantitative component:

Stratified random sampling can be used to ensure representation across relevant categories such as institution, gender, programme, or level of study.

For the qualitative component:

Purposive sampling can be used to select students with diverse discontinuation experiences.

Inclusion Criteria

Respondents may be included if they:

1. Were enrolled in a recognised higher education institution.
2. Meet the educational level specified by the researcher.
3. Discontinued their programme within the defined study period.
4. Are willing to participate.
5. Provide informed consent.
6. Can understand the language used for data collection.

If a comparison group is included, currently enrolled students meeting the specified criteria should be recruited separately.

Exclusion Criteria

Participants may be excluded if they:

1. Did not actually discontinue the programme as defined by the study.
2. Completed the programme.
3. Have already re-enrolled, if re-enrolment is excluded by the operational definition.
4. Are unable to provide informed consent.
5. Submit substantially incomplete questionnaires, according to predetermined criteria.

Variables of The Study

Dependent Variable

Student discontinuation/dropout.

Independent Variables:

Demographic variables, Socioeconomic variables, Academic variables, Family variables, Institutional variables and social variables

Sources of Data

Primary Data:

Primary data will be collected directly from respondents through:

1. Structured questionnaires.
2. Semi-structured interviews.
3. Where appropriate, focus group discussions.

Secondary Data

Secondary information may be obtained from: institutional reports, student records, government education reports, university reports, official statistical publications, published academic studies, books and scholarly articles. Secondary data should be appropriately cited and evaluated for reliability.

Data Collection Instrument

A structured questionnaire will be developed based on the research objectives, conceptual framework, relevant literature, and previously established measures where suitable.

The questionnaire may contain the following sections:

- Section A: Socio-demographic information
- Section B: Family background
- Section C: Economic conditions
- Section D: Academic factors
- Section E: Institutional factors
- Section F: Social and family factors
- Section G: Discontinuation

Example of A Factor-Rating Scale

Respondents may be asked to rate the extent to which different factors affected their decision.

5-point scale:

Score	Response
1	Not at all
2	Slightly
3	Moderately
4	Highly
5	Very highly

Factors:

Factors may include financial problems, Academic difficulties, Family responsibilities, Employment, Health/personal circumstances, Lack of institutional support, Dissatisfaction with the course, Lack of social support, Transportation problems, Accommodation problems, Peer influence and administrative difficulties

Pilot Study

Before the main data collection, a pilot study should be conducted with a small group of respondents who are similar to, but preferably not part of, the final study sample. The pilot study will help determine issues such as clarity of questions, time required to complete the questionnaire, response options and ambiguous questions; Necessary modifications should be made before final data collection.

Data Collection Procedure

The following procedure may be followed:

1. Obtain approval from the relevant academic/research authority.
2. Obtain permission from participating institutions.
3. Develop and validate the questionnaire.

4. Conduct the pilot study.
5. Revise the instrument.
6. Identify eligible respondents.
7. Explain the purpose of the study.
8. Obtain informed consent.
9. Administer the questionnaire.
10. Conduct qualitative interviews with selected participants.
11. Maintain confidentiality and secure data storage.
12. Check questionnaires for completeness.
13. Code and prepare the data for analysis.

Ethical Considerations

Ethics are particularly important because dropout may involve sensitive economic, family, academic, or personal circumstances.

The study should follow the following principles:

- **Informed consent:** Participants should be informed about the purpose of the study, what participation involves, the voluntary nature of participation, potential risks and benefits, confidentiality and their right to withdraw.
- **Voluntary participation:** No respondent should be forced or pressured to participate.
- **Confidentiality:** Personal information should not be disclosed in the research report.
- **Anonymity:** Where possible, identifying information should not be collected.
- **Data protection:** Research data should be securely stored and accessible only to authorised persons.
- **Minimisation of harm:** Questions should be designed to avoid unnecessary emotional or social harm.
- **Institutional approval:** The researcher should obtain approval from the relevant institutional ethics committee/research ethics authority before collecting data, where required.

Data Management

Completed questionnaires should be coded using identification numbers rather than respondents' names. The researcher should create a codebook, enter data into appropriate statistical software, check for missing values, identify inconsistent responses, remove duplicate records, maintain secure backups, and restrict access to research data. Qualitative interview recordings and transcripts should also be anonymised.

Data Analysis

Quantitative Analysis

Quantitative data may be analysed using software such as SPSS, R, Stata, or equivalent statistical software.

Descriptive statistics

The study may use frequencies, percentages, mean, median, standard deviation and minimum and maximum values.

Cross-tabulation

Cross-tabulations may be used to examine relationships between variables.

For example: Gender $\times$ Discontinuation, Income category $\times$ Discontinuation, Academic difficulty $\times$ Discontinuation and Family responsibility $\times$ Discontinuation

Qualitative Data Analysis

Interview data may be analysed through **thematic analysis**.

The process may involve:

1. Familiarisation with the data.
2. Transcription.
3. Initial coding.
4. Identification of categories.
5. Development of themes.
6. Review of themes.
7. Definition and naming of themes.
8. Interpretation and reporting.

Possible themes may include:

- Economic pressure
- Academic struggle
- Family responsibility
- Institutional alienation
- Lack of support
- Employment pressure
- Social expectations
- Mental/emotional strain
- Loss of belonging
- Future aspirations

These are potential analytical themes, not predetermined findings. Actual themes should emerge from the collected data.

Mixed-Method Integration

The quantitative and qualitative findings should be integrated during interpretation.

For example:

Quantitative analysis may show that financial difficulties are frequently reported among discontinued students. Qualitative interviews can then be used to explain how educational expenses, household responsibilities, and employment pressures interacted in students' individual experiences. This approach prevents the research from reducing dropout to a single numerical explanation.

Review of Literature: Thematic Structure

The literature review should not simply list previous studies. It should critically synthesise existing knowledge.

1. Concept of Student Dropout

Review definitions and distinctions between dropout, withdrawal, stop-out, transfer, suspension, temporary interruption and permanent discontinuation.

2. Economic Factors

Review literature concerning household income, tuition fees, living costs, employment, financial aid and economic inequality.

3. Academic Factors

Review: academic preparedness, grades, attendance, workload, academic integration and student-teacher relationships.

4. Family Factors

Review: parental education, family support, family responsibilities, caregiving, marriage and family economic pressure.

5. Institutional Factors

Review: institutional support, counselling, academic advising, administrative practices, campus environment and sense of belonging.

6. Social Factors

Review: peer networks, social capital, discrimination, social integration and community expectations.

7 Research Gap

The researcher should identify what previous studies have not adequately explained.

For example:

Although existing research has examined individual predictors of higher education dropout, there remains a need for context-specific sociological research examining the interaction of economic, family, academic, institutional, and social factors rather than treating dropout as the result of a single variable.

The actual research gap should be established through a systematic review of the literature relevant to the selected geographical and institutional context.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Several sociological and educational theories may be used.

Tinto's Student Integration Perspective

Tinto's model emphasises the role of academic and social integration in students' persistence and departure from higher education. Students' interaction with the academic and social environment can influence their commitment to continuing.

Bourdieu's Theory of Cultural Capital

Pierre Bourdieu's concept of cultural capital can help explain how students from different social backgrounds possess unequal familiarity with the language, norms, expectations, and practices valued by educational institutions.

Social Capital Perspective

Social capital can be used to examine how family, peer, institutional, and community networks provide resources that help students remain connected to education.

Rational Choice Perspective

A rational-choice approach can help analyse how students may evaluate the perceived costs and benefits of continuing education under particular social and economic circumstances.

Recommended theoretical position

The study can primarily use **Tinto's integration perspective**, complemented by **Bourdieu's cultural capital** and **social capital** perspectives to provide a stronger sociological explanation.

Proposed Analytical Model

The study can conceptualise dropout through five interconnected levels:

- **Micro level:** motivation, academic confidence, personal circumstances and aspirations.
- **Family level:** family income, parental support, responsibilities and expectations.
- **Institutional level:** teaching, administrative systems, academic support, counselling and institutional climate.
- **Social level:** peers, social networks, discrimination and community expectations.
- **Structural level:** labour market, inequality, education costs, regional conditions and broader social policies. These levels interact rather than operate independently.

Expected Findings

Because no original field data have been supplied, the following should be treated as **anticipated areas of investigation rather than actual findings**.

The study may identify multiple interacting factors associated with discontinuation, including:

1. Financial constraints.
2. Need to undertake paid employment.
3. Academic difficulties.

4. Family responsibilities.
5. Lack of institutional support.
6. Problems with transportation or accommodation.
7. Weak academic and social integration.
8. Family pressure.
9. Health or personal circumstances.
10. Dissatisfaction with programme or institution.

The actual ranking and statistical significance of these factors must be established through field data.

DISCUSSION FRAMEWORK

The discussion should compare the empirical findings with previous research.

For each major finding, the researcher should address:

1. What was found?
2. How strong was the association?
3. Does the finding agree with previous studies?
4. Why might the finding have occurred?
5. What sociological explanation is possible?
6. What are the implications for institutions and policy?

For example:

If financial difficulty is found to be strongly associated with discontinuation, the finding can be interpreted not simply as an individual inability to pay but within the broader context of household resources, educational costs, labour-market opportunities, and social inequality.

Limitations of The Study

Potential limitations include:

1. The study may rely partly on self-reported information.
2. Students who have discontinued may be difficult to locate.
3. Some respondents may not accurately remember events that occurred several years earlier.
4. Sensitive questions may produce socially desirable responses.
5. Institutional records may be incomplete.
6. A cross-sectional design limits the ability to establish temporal causality.
7. Findings from selected institutions may not be generalizable to all higher education institutions.

8. Non-response may introduce selection bias.
9. Students who return to education after a period of interruption may be classified differently depending on the operational definition.

These limitations should be reported honestly rather than hidden.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The final recommendations should be based on actual findings. Potential areas include:

- **Financial support:** Institutions and policymakers may strengthen scholarships, fee assistance, emergency financial aid and flexible payment systems.
- **Academic support:** Institutions may provide early academic-warning systems, tutoring, mentoring, remedial classes and academic advising.
- **Counselling services:** Accessible academic, career, and psychosocial counselling can help students address difficulties before discontinuation occurs.
- **Family-sensitive support:** Institutions may consider flexible arrangements for students facing significant family responsibilities.
- **Institutional integration:** Colleges and universities can strengthen student orientation, mentoring, peer-support programmes, student clubs and faculty-student interaction.
- **Early identification:** Institutions may develop ethically appropriate systems for identifying students experiencing prolonged absence, academic decline, financial difficulty, repeated examination problems and disengagement.

Such systems should provide support rather than stigmatise students.

CONCLUSION

Student discontinuation from higher education is a multidimensional sociological phenomenon. It cannot be adequately explained by academic performance alone. Students' educational trajectories are shaped by the interaction of economic resources, family circumstances, academic experiences, institutional environments, peer relationships, and broader social structures. A descriptive mixed-method study can provide both an overview of the prevalence and distribution of relevant factors and a deeper understanding of students' lived experiences. Such an approach is particularly valuable because students who discontinue their education may experience several overlapping difficulties rather than one isolated problem.

The proposed study therefore approaches student dropout as a relationship between individual educational experiences and broader social structures. Understanding these relationships can help higher education institutions move from simply identifying students who leave toward developing effective, equitable, and context-sensitive retention and support mechanisms.

REFERENCES

1. Aina, C., Baici, E., Casalone, G., & Pastore, F. (2022). The determinants of university dropout: A review of the socio-economic literature. *Socio-Economic Planning Sciences*, 79, 101102.
2. Behr, A., Giese, M., Kamdjou, H. D. T., & Theune, K. (2020). Dropping out of university: A literature review. *Review of Education*, 8(2), 614–652. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rev3.3202>
3. Lorenzo-Quiles, O., Galdón-López, S., & Lendínez-Turón, A. (2023). Factors contributing to university dropout: A review. *Frontiers in Education*, 8, 1159864.
4. Tete, M. F., Sousa, M. de M., Santana, T. S., & Silva, S. F. (2022). Predictive models for higher education dropout: A systematic literature review. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 30, 149.
5. Valencia-Arias, A., Valera Aredo, J. C., Valencia, J., Cardona-Acevedo, S., Patiño-Vanegas, J. C., & Uribe Bedoya, H. (2026). Key determinants of university dropout: Academic, economic, and

psychosocial factors in student retention. *Frontiers in Education*, 10, 1701644. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1701644>

6. Vines, L. W. L. (2025). Factors associated with university student dropout: Systematic review. *Salud, Ciencia y Tecnología*, 5.
7. Reyes-González, N., & Meneses-Báez, A. L. (2023). Psychosocial factors associated with dropout, performance and adjustment in university first year: A systematic review of reviews. *Revista Electrónica Educare*, 28(2), 1–23