

Factors Influencing Student Dropout at the Faculty of Education, Myanglung Campus

Prakash Kumar Dhungana 
Campus Chief, Myanglung Campus

Abstract	Article Info
Student dropout is a significant challenge in higher education, impacting both individual progress and institutional reputation. Understanding the underlying factors contributing to dropout in Nepalese campuses is essential for developing effective retention strategies. This study aimed to analyze the factors influencing student dropout at the Faculty of Education, Myanglung Campus, focusing on student-related, campus-related, and family-related indicators. A descriptive research design was employed. Fifteen Bachelor of Education (B.Ed.) dropout students were selected as respondents using judgmental purposive sampling. The study was grounded on theoretical frameworks including Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs, Motivation and Engagement theory, and Cognitive Load theory. The findings revealed that dropout is significantly influenced by three main categories of factors: student-related factors such as low academic achievement in examinations and irregular class attendance; campus-related factors including lack of academic support, feedback, motivation, and encouragement from teachers; and family-related factors such as insufficient financial support and various family problems. The study highlights the critical role of student, campus, and family environments in student retention. Addressing these factors is vital to reducing dropout rates and enhancing higher education outcomes in Nepal. <i>Keywords:</i> cognitive load, dropout, higher education policy, hierarchy of needs, motivation, engagement	<i>Email</i> prakash.dhungana523@gmail.com <i>Article History</i> Received: 2025, May 12 Accepted: 2025, June 26 Published: 2025, August 29 <i>Cite</i> Dhungana, P. K. (2025). Factors influencing student dropout at the faculty of education, Myanglung campus. <i>Intellectual Journal of Academic Research (IJAR)</i>, 3(1), 57–69. https://doi.org/10.3126/ijar.v3i1.83625

Introduction

Dropping out in higher education is a global phenomenon that affects virtually all universities. Consequently, higher education institutions have been researching the types, causes, and consequences of student dropout since the early 20th century, with particular emphasis from the 1970s onward. However, recent research tends to focus predominantly on initial dropout, primarily

addressing internal and institutional dropout for practical reasons.

In the context of Nepal, there is ongoing debate regarding the factors influencing dropout rates in higher education. Opinions vary on whether college education should predominantly follow an open learning model or emphasize skill-based or technical education. This study aims to explore the factors that influence dropout rates in bachelor's degree programs in Nepal.

The current high rate of college dropout is likely detrimental both to students and to the national economy. Higher education is widely recognized as a symbol of economic and social development in the country. It plays a crucial role in preserving and developing the nation's historical and cultural heritage. Additionally, it contributes to producing competent manpower capable of meeting the demands of a globalized context and promotes research across various educational fields.

The goals of higher education in Nepal, as outlined in the ([University Grants Commission \[UGC\] Report, 2021](#)), include:

- o Producing capable, scientific, innovative, globally competent, and research-oriented human resources capable of leading diverse sectors and contributing to the construction of a knowledge-based society and economy through accessible, quality higher education.
- o Enhancing all levels and types of education by developing criteria and standards aligned with national and international experiences and best practices.

With the expansion of higher education, the number of constituent university campuses has increased to over 150, alongside 537 community colleges and 753 private colleges affiliated with various universities. This totals approximately 1,440 colleges across the country.

Despite this expansion, many students seek higher education abroad due to concerns about quality and limited opportunities in technical fields at home. According to data for the academic year 2022/23, nearly 72,000 students left Nepal for higher education abroad, with projections estimating this number will reach 90,000 in the near future.

Understanding and addressing the factors contributing to dropout rates in Nepalese higher education are therefore vital for sustainable

socioeconomic development and for retaining talented students within the country's education system.

Rational of the Study

In the rapidly evolving landscape of science and technology, individuals are continuously adapting to new inventions and innovations. The current generation of students increasingly prefers to pursue higher education in colleges and universities that emphasize information technology and technical-vocational education. However, the majority of institutions in Nepal have yet to adequately address the demand for such career-oriented programs, which contributes to a growing concern regarding high dropout rates in higher education ([Ghimire et al., 2024](#)).

This phenomenon has significant repercussions. Students who drop out of higher education face elevated risks of unemployment and diminished earning potential compared to graduates. Moreover, dropout students are more vulnerable to engaging in illegal activities, dependency on welfare, and health-related problems, thus creating societal challenges ([Mishra, 2023a](#)). Within the Nepali context, higher education institutions are grappling with persistent dropout issues, underscoring the need for targeted studies and interventions.

This study aims to investigate the dropout problem at Myanglung Campus, Terhathum, where Bachelor of Education (B.Ed.) students frequently discontinue their studies before completion. By identifying the internal and external factors contributing to dropout, this research intends to provide strategic recommendations to mitigate student attrition. The findings are expected to benefit not only educators and campus administrators but also guardians and policymakers by enhancing their understanding of dropout dynamics at various student levels ([Ghimire et al., 2024](#)).

Furthermore, this study holds particular relevance for stakeholders involved in the development, management, and expansion of higher education programs in Nepal. It will serve

as a valuable resource for future researchers and students interested in exploring student motivation and retention within the higher education sector (Mishra, 2024a). Ultimately, addressing dropout at Myanglung Campus will contribute to strengthening the overall quality and accessibility of Nepalese higher education—a critical factor for national human capital development and socio-economic progress (Mishra, 2023b; Mishra, 2024b).

Research Objective

To analyze the factors and structure influencing the dropout rate in the Bachelor of Education (B.Ed.) program and to recommend effective strategies for reducing dropout problems.

Limitations of the Study

The study of mini research has limited to the following points:

- o The study has limited to Myanglung campus BED as the sample.
- o This study is focused only on dropout students.
- o Research instrument has only telephone call & interview.

Literature Review

Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs Theory

Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs theory posits that every individual has a set of basic needs that must be fulfilled in a hierarchical order, ranging from physiological needs to self-actualization (Maslow, 1943). Within the context of higher education, institutions are responsible for addressing these fundamental needs of students to minimize dropout rates. When student needs—such as safety, belonging, esteem, and self-actualization—are unmet, students are more likely to become disengaged and discontinue their studies. Therefore, fulfilling these needs within campus environments is crucial for fostering student retention and academic success (Subedi, 2023).

Motivation and Engagement Theory

Emerging from psychological research by Richard M. Ryan in the 1970s and 1980s, motivation theory aims to understand human behavior by identifying key drivers behind positive and negative actions. Studies reveal that motivation is central to academic achievement and persistence. According to Glaser (1998), human behavior is driven by five core needs: survival, freedom, power, fun, and love/belonging. In educational settings, teachers play a vital role in motivating students through their instructional style, body language, relationships, and relevance of assignments. Academic engagement—characterized by active participation and consistent attendance—is tightly linked to motivation and is a critical predictor of student retention (Hammond, 2001).

Academic engagement encompasses four dimensions: academic, behavioral, psychological, and social engagement. Research indicates that engagement within the campus community significantly motivates students to continue their studies. Conversely, disengagement initiates a downward spiral, leading to academic decline and eventual dropout. Thus, creating learning environments that promote motivation and engagement is essential to reducing dropout rates (Subedi, 2023).

Cognitive Load Theory

Cognitive Load Theory explains that learning initially occurs in working memory, which has limited capacity for processing new information. Complex and demanding learning material requires the gradual construction of mental schemas over time. This theory emphasizes the importance of instructional design, assessment methods, and teaching approaches that minimize cognitive overload, especially for first-time learners encountering multiple new concepts simultaneously. Overloading working memory can hinder learning progress and contribute to student dropout, highlighting the need for well-structured academic support in early learning phases (Subedi, 2023).

Review of Related Empirical Literature

The literature on dropout in higher education identifies numerous interrelated factors influencing student attrition, yet gaps remain in context-specific studies such as for Myanglung Campus, Terhathum. Existing research primarily focuses on initial dropout and internal institutional factors while emphasizing the multifaceted nature of the problem. Studies have identified that student engagement, motivation, and the fulfillment of Maslow's hierarchical needs significantly impact college retention rates. Moreover, academic environments that foster positive teacher-student relationships, provide relevant instruction, and maintain supportive campus climates tend to lower dropout rates.

Previous investigations have often lacked comprehensive coverage of dropout causes in faculty-specific and regional contexts, underscoring the need for targeted analysis in Nepalese campuses. This study seeks to bridge that gap by examining the dropout phenomenon specifically at Myanglung Campus, integrating theoretical insights with empirical data to offer a nuanced understanding of the factors involved and effective strategies for intervention.

In a longitudinal study conducted by [Edstrom et al. \(1986\)](#) 248 girls & 247 boys were followed from grade 7-12. The researchers examined behavioral, demographical & cognitive factors. They concluded that students who were previously known to have demonstration high levels of aggressive behavior issues & scored lower academically were those that became dropouts.

In a longitudinal study conducted by [Cairns et al. \(1989\)](#), relationships between cognitive, demographic & behavioral factors were analyzed. They assessed 248 girls & 247 boys & observed them from grade seven through dropout of high school. The study included individual interviews to assess the 14% who left school before grade 11. The researchers concluded that 82% of the males & 4% of the female with increased aggressiveness & low performing academics in the seventh grade had decided to drop out.

According to [Wells et al. \(1989\)](#) family related factors are more likely the cause of students leaving school. Parental support, parenthood, other home life related factors are the very ones that contribute to a student's decision to leave school. He explained that a lack of parent support along with an insulting home is connected with a higher dropout.

A team of researchers made up [Wells et al. \(1989\)](#) found that a combination of factors, which they identified into four broad categories influence student's decisions to leave before graduation. These categories, which are student related, campus related, family related & community related are used to categorize the factors that were identified throughout this study


Implication of the Reviewed Literature

Reviewing the related literature is one of the most important part of study. Above stated reviews of related literature are supporting document for research. It has to help the researcher to be familiar with technicality, participatilty, procedures of conducting research. The review of theoretical literature provided researcher with a theoretical background and has broadened knowledge base in research area. It informed about the several issues, problems related to factors affecting dropout in higher education. similarly, the review of empirical literature helped to develop the conceptual framework and bring purely and focus to the research problems.

Many researchers have conducted research related to the factors affecting dropout rate in school & campus level. The researcher got maximum ideas from the reviewed literature. The most important of literature review is to examine & evaluate what has been said before on a topic & establish the relevance of this information to this research.

Conceptual Framework

The study on factors influencing student's dropout in bachelor's level is based on the following conceptual framework.

Figure 1*Conceptual Framework*

Methodology

Research Design

This study employed a qualitative research design with a descriptive approach. The descriptive method was appropriate to systematically document and describe the dropout rate and underlying factors influencing dropout among Bachelor of Education (B.Ed.) students at Myanglung Campus, Terhathum. Following Fowler (2014), survey research facilitates gathering detailed information regarding behaviors, experiences, and attitudes relevant to the subject matter. In this study, the primary data collection method was telephone interviewing, consistent with Cohen et al. (2011), who note that qualitative data in educational research often derives from semi-structured or unstructured interviews to capture rich, contextual insights. The study focused exclusively on telephone interviews to obtain in-depth information directly from dropout students.

Sources of Data

Data were collected from both primary and secondary sources. The primary data source consisted of 15 dropout students from the Faculty of Education who were purposively selected. Secondary data were gathered from campus administrative records, relevant academic articles, official documents, journals, and books related to student dropout and higher education.

Sample Population

The population comprised 50 students who had dropped out at the bachelor's level from the Faculty of Education at Myanglung Campus. From

this population, 15 dropout students were selected as the study's sample (Chaudhary et al., 2021).

Sampling Procedure

Purposive non-random sampling was employed to select the 15 dropout students from the total 50. The researcher liaised with campus administration to identify and contact the dropout students. After obtaining initial cooperation and building rapport via telephone, the researcher conducted unstructured interviews to collect comprehensive and nuanced information relevant to the dropout phenomenon.

Data Collection Tools

An unstructured telephone interview schedule was the primary data collection tool. This format allowed flexibility to explore participants' experiences and perspectives in depth while being efficient for data collection given the dispersed locations of dropout students.

Data Collection Procedure

- a) Obtained contact numbers of dropout students from campus administration.
- b) Secured permission and introduced the purpose of the study, establishing rapport with respondents via telephone.
- c) Conducted unstructured telephone interviews with the 15 purposively selected dropout students, recording their responses with consent.
- d) Transcribed recorded interviews verbatim, translating and interpreting the data based on the thematic indicators:

student-related, family-related, and campus-related factors.

Data Analysis Procedure

The qualitative data were analyzed descriptively. Transcriptions were systematically coded and categorized according to the aforementioned thematic indicators. Findings are presented in narrative form, supplemented by tables where appropriate to enhance clarity and interpretation.

Results and Discussion

This chapter includes the analysis of data and interpretation of the results as well as summary of the finding. The data were elicited by using telephone interviewing to the dropout students.

Table 1

Academic Year 2077 BS–2080 BS

Level	Academic Year	Enrolled students	Exam form filled up	Dropout number	Dropout percentage
BED 1 st	2077	50	47	3	6 %
BED 2 nd	2078	47	42	5	10.67%
BED 3 rd	2079	42	38	4	9.52%
BED 4 th	2080	35	32	3	8.57%
Grand Total		50		15	30%

Note. Campus Administration Record

Table-1 shows that 50 students enrolled in 2077 BS under the Faculty of Education. However, only 47 students filled up final examination form and 3 students left campus in first year. As a result, there was 6% student's dropout in first year. Similarly, 47 students enrolled in second year but only 42 students filled up final examination form and 5 students left campus in 2078 BS. Thus, 10.67% students left campus in B.Ed., second year. It is the highest number of year wise dropout rate. In the same way, 42 students enrolled in B.Ed. third year in 2079 but only 38 students filled up final examination form and 4 students left campus. This indicates that 9.52% students left campus in 2079 BS. Finally, 35 students enrolled in B.Ed. fourth year where only 32 students filled up final examination

Systematically collected data from 15 dropout students of bachelor's degree under the Faculty of Education at Myanglung Campus Tehrathum were analyzed and interpreted to find out the factors affecting dropout rate in campus level.

Structural Overview of Students' Dropout Rate

Myanglung Campus Tehrathum is a community based and leading higher educational institution of Tehrathum established in 2038 BS and affiliated to Tribhuvan University, it has been offering various programs like Master in Nepali an art, Master in EPM & Bachelor of Business Studies (BBS), Bachelor of an Arts (BA) and BED in various subjects. However, student's dropout rate is increasing every year.

form and 3 students left campus. This situation shows that 8.57% students left their study in 2080 BS. Therefore, there were 50 students in total in the batch of 2077 to 2080 BS but 15 students from total number of students left their study during four years' period. Thus, 30% students left in bachelor's degree under the Faculty of Education. This structural overview shows that dropout rate is serious problem at Myanglung Campus Tehrathum

Factors that influence students' dropout

The researchers Wells et al. (1989) created a framework that categorized factors of student dropout into four main categories. The data collected during the interviews were analyzed within this framework. The four categories included: student related indicators, campus-

related indicators, family-related indicators and community-related indicators. Here the researcher selected only three indicators except community related indicators.

Student-related indicators

One of the listed categories of Wells et al. (1989) is student-related factors that the student can control these factors. Student-related factors are most often described as student actions that occur both inside and outside of the campus setting. Disruptive behavior of students that cause them to become less engaged in campus. These factors included areas such as student behavior, academic achievement, and attendance. The researcher identified the following student-related factors during telephone interviewing:

- o Low academic achievement (failed in exam)
- o Unable to take regular class (irregularity in class)
- o Employment opportunity in village.
- o Getting permanent job.
- o Unemployment problem and inability to pay campus fee.
- o Learning English, Korean and Japanese language for going abroad to study/work.
- o Health problem.
- o Change campus.
- o Involving in business.
- o Not motivated towards study and feeling difficulty.
- o Long distance from home to campus.
- o Getting married, childbearing and child-caring problems.

Most of the students start campus with expectations of success. Unfortunately, some of them encounter obstacles or barriers that lead them towards dropping out instead of graduation. This research finds that academic performance is one of the most influencing factors that cause students to

quit campus. When respondents were asked about why they left campus, many said that they were unable to take regular classes due to their personal problems and could not regular in class as a result they failed in final examination taken by Tribhuwan University. So, the main reason of dropout explored from student-related indicators was their low academic achievement in examination.

One of the Respondents Stated that:

When I enrolled in B.Ed. first year, fortunately, I was selected in Nepal Army. So I even could not attend in final examination due to my training. However, I am happy to get job in Nepal army and I don't think about my further study.

Another respondent stated that:

When I joined in B.Ed. first year and taking regular class, one of my friends told me to learn Japanese language. Then I took Japanese language class and could not regular in my college class. Anyway I took the examination of B.Ed. first year but in result I failed in most of the subjects. I realized that without taking regular classes I could not complete bachelor's degree. He further said that during second year, I got a job in a FM. Radio. I left my study as I failed in most of the subjects in first year.

According to Cognitive Load Theory, learning new material or a skill, for which a schema in long term memory is undeveloped or nonexistent, can cause working memory to quickly overload its limited capacity. This overloading can result in a learner becoming highly anxious and losing confidence, which in turn can lead to the learning process, in effect, freezing and the learner being unable to continue.

Next student expressed that:

In B.Ed. first year I took regular classes but I could not continue my classes when I lost my mother and my younger sister in a landslide. Then I was badly distracted and I returned my village. Now I am living with my father and

brother and I don't think about my study. I am helping my father in our household work and farming.

Another respondent stated that:

I got married when I was studying at B. Ed. Second year. Then I came in Kathmandu and now I am studying re-joining in BBS first year. "Irregularity in class was another immense student-related factor. In fact, most of the respondents said they frequently missed classes due to various reasons related to their personal barriers, it caused failed in exam. Therefore, irregularity in class also causes low academic achievement and lastly they compelled to leave campus."

In relation to irregularity, one respondent who left in B.Ed. third year said that:

Initially, in B.Ed. first year, I took regular classes but I could not continue regular classes due to my family problems that I needed to go abroad or got a job. Therefore, I went to Korean language institute to learn Korean language. Fortunately, I was selected to go to Korea in working visa. I was able to take the exam of first year and second year but my result was poor due to irregularity in class. I thought that without taking regular classes, it was very difficult to complete bachelor's degree.

In this way, the two main factors of dropout according to most of the respondents were:

- a) Low academic achievement.
- b) Irregularity.

However, other influencing factors related to students were: employment opportunity. getting permanent job, unemployment problem and inability to pay campus fee, learning English, Korean and Japanese language for going abroad to study work. health problem, change campus, involving in business, not motivated towards study and feeling difficulty and getting married, childbearing and child-caring problems.

Campus-related Indicators

Those factors that occur during the campus and are related to the structures and activities within campus represent campus related indicators. These factors include things such as campus climate and learning environment, teacher-student engagement, campus structure, and campus vision. Throughout the interviews, respondents shared information that falls within this category as Wells et al. (1989) created the framework. The researcher identified the following campus-related influencing factors during telephone interviewing:

- o Lack of sufficient guidelines, academic support, feedback, motivation and encouragement from teachers.
- o Problem of institutional information system (such as lack of timely information to fill up exam form, registration form, scholarship form through SMS, telephone, notice board etc.
- o Lack of understanding students expectations and follow up services from campus administration.
- o Lack of financial support for needy students. (such as scholarship)
- o Difficulty to understand the course. (related to teaching-learning strategies)
- o Program not suitable with expectations.
- o Dissatisfaction towards examination system and library facility.
- o Indifferent behavior of administrative staff.
- o At least 75% attendance in teaching practice program.
- o Feeling burden of practical of different subjects.

The theory behind Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs that must be fulfilled. Within the campus environment, the shades educators are striving to accomplish. According to the theory, when such these needs were not met they were more likely to drop out (Maslow, 1940), 195 when students

lack the feeling of achieving their full potential or success, it results in giving up.

Manyaga (2008), states that quality education is acquired by having colleges with conducive teaching and learning environment, adequate number of teachers, available infrastructure, curriculum that bases on the community needs and proper management and examining systems. This helps to reduce various problems that are common in college such as absenteeism, drop out and other misconducts.

Many reasons given by the respondents came within the frameworks of (Wells et al., 1989), Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs, and Motivational and Engagement Theories. Motivation along with engagement plays a role in student success. Student engagement is about interaction and relationships. It involves participation during instruction and classroom activities along with the overall community life of campus. Indicators of engagement are participation in campus activities, regularity, effort in classroom activities and cooperation among students and teachers in teaching learning strategies.

Other indicators for psychological engagement are interests and enthusiasm, a feeling of belonging, and identifying with the campus community. Motivation and engagement both can be connected within teaching learning activities. When students lack intrinsic motivation, and they are not engaged in class instruction or classroom activities, they tend to fall behind (Hewitt, 2011).

So, the main reason of dropout explored from campus-related indicators was lack of academic support, feedback, motivation and encouragement. In relation to this indicator, one of the informants said:

I enrolled in B.Ed. first year with full of energies and enthusiasm but when I took regular classes, in first year however I remained just passive listener that no teachers asked me whether I understood or not. Most of the teachers come to class with their age long note copy and delivered their lectures

and obliged us to copy their notes without any interaction. I knew, I was not perfect at study but I expected to be good with teachers' additional support, motivation, feedback and encouragement but I could not get so. However, I took the final exam of first year but I failed in all subjects except compulsory Nepali. Then I thought that I could not complete bachelor's degree and I left campus.

While Cognitive Load Theory has mostly been concerned with how instructional design of learning materials, assessment activities and teaching approaches can ameliorate or mitigate cognitive overload in the learning of new and complex material, it is argued here that it applies equally to the multiple learning tasks that form the early part of the learning journey of a first time learner. It stands to reason that the scale and scope of the new learning required can easily overload a learner's working memory. This shows that teaching learning strategies need to be changed into learner-centered by creating favorable environment with sufficient support, encouragement, motivation and feedback mainly for the students having low academic achievement.

Problem of institutional information system was another immense campus-related factor that was mentioned many times throughout the telephone interviewing. One of the informants mentioned,

I took the exam of first and second year by taking regular classes. I could not take regular classes in third year due to my family problem. Anyway, I thought I had to take exam. I was in village and I came to campus to fill up exam form but it was too late and I could not fill up the exam form. I did not know about getting chance to fill up exam form even after publishing exam routine of TU. I expected that campus would provide every important notices and information through mobile SMS services because we didn't have internet access in village. Due to lack of form fill up information I was compelled to leave campus in third year.

Another respondent said that:

I joined in first year but cannot regular in campus class due to my job in my village. However, I take final exam and also attend in my practical exam. But when I get my first year result, I just get 12 marks out of 25 in my English practical. Then I ask my English teacher why had he given such low marks in my practical though I got good marks in theory, the teacher replied me as I was not regular in class, I could not get good marks in practical. It makes me too angry towards Campus and the English teacher. So, I don't like to regular my study in that campus.

In this way, the two main campus-related factors of dropout according to most of the respondents were,

- a) Lack of sufficient academic support, feedback, motivation and encouragement from teachers and;
- b) Problem of institutional information system.

However, other influencing factors related to students were lack of understanding student's expectations and follow up services from campus administration, lack of financial support for needy students, difficulty to understand the course, program not suitable with expectations, dissatisfaction towards examination system and library facility, indifferent behavior of administrative staff.

Family-related indicators

Family-related factors include things like family composition, socio-economic status, and drug use in the home. Parental support, parenthood, and other home life related factors are the very ones that contribute to a student's decision to leave or stay in college (Wells et al., 1989). However, the researcher identified the following family-related influencing factors during telephone interviewing:

- o Lack of financial support from home
- o Family problems (such as illness of family members, marriage, pregnancy, child caring, loss of family members etc)

- o Lack of support, motivation and encouragement from family
- o Lack of parental awareness towards education
- o Family obligations
- o Family migration
- o Low socio-economic status of family
- o Lack of favorable environment for study

So, the main reason of dropout explored from campus-related indicators was lack of financial support from home, in relation to it, one of the male informants said:

I had desire to complete at least bachelor's degree so, I admitted in B Ed. first year though there were lots of problems in my family Unfortunately, I lost one of my family members when I was in second year. Then I had to take whole responsibility of family I went abroad due to financial problem and I stayed in abroad for two years then returned. Now I have been running small business in my village. The main reason I left campus was due to financial problem at home.

Family problem was another significant family-related factor that was mentioned many times throughout the telephone interviewing. One of the female informants mentioned:

When I studied in B.Ed. first year, I got married. I continued my study up to second year but in third year, I gave birth of a baby. Then I had to spend much time to take care of my baby as well as other works at home. In addition to it, my husband is abroad employee and my family also did not support and encourage continuing my study. So, the main reason I left campus was due to my family problem.

Another respondent said that,

When I was at first year I got married. Due to family financial problem, my husband was in Japan then. So I also start to learn Japanese language and went to Japan. Now, I am living with my husband and my daughter in Japan.

The main reason I left campus was my family financial problem and my husband was in Japan.

In this way, the two main family-related factors of dropout according to most of the respondents were:

- a) Lack of financial support from home and,
- b) Family problems.

However, other influencing factors related to family were lack of support, motivation and encouragement from family, lack of parental awareness towards education, family obligations, family migration, low socio-economic status of family, and lack of favorable environment for study.

Data collected through telephone interviewing was analyzed to explore the major factors influencing students' dropout rate in bachelor's degree at Myanglung Campus Tehrathum under the Faculty of Education. This study found that the three main indicators play a highly significant role in determining dropout rate. A variety of influential factors were identified as:

- o Student-related indicators,
- o Campus-related indicators, and
- o Family-related indicators.

The main reasons of dropout explored from student-related indicators were their low academic achievement in examination and irregularity in class. This study identified the main reasons of dropout explored from campus-related indicators were lack of academic support, feedback, motivation and encouragement from teachers, and problem of institutional information system. Lastly, the study explored the main factors of dropout explored from family-related indicators were lack of financial support from home and, different family problems.

Conclusion

This chapter presents the conclusion and recommendations derived from the comprehensive analysis and interpretation of the study investigating the factors influencing student

dropout in the Bachelor of Education program at Myanglung Campus, Terhathum. The primary objective of the study was to identify and analyze the significant factors driving student dropout and to propose actionable strategies for mitigation. The research categorized the influential factors into three interrelated domains: student-related, campus-related, and family-related, with each domain further subdivided into key contributing elements. The study's findings were based on data collected from a purposively selected sample of 15 dropout students.

The study revealed that dropout among Bachelor of Education students at Myanglung Campus is a multifaceted issue influenced by a complex interplay of student, institutional, and familial factors. Among student-related factors, low academic achievement and irregular attendance emerged as the most salient contributors, underscoring academic preparedness and engagement as critical elements for retention. Additionally, external socioeconomic pressures, such as employment opportunities in rural areas, aspirations for overseas study or work (language proficiency in English, Korean, and Japanese), health challenges, and familial responsibilities—including marriage and childcare—significantly affect students' persistence.

Campus-related factors also play a substantial role. Insufficient academic support, lack of timely and constructive feedback, and deficient motivation and encouragement from faculty diminished students' ability to remain engaged. Institutional limitations such as ineffective information systems, inadequate financial assistance, dissatisfaction with curricular relevance and assessment methods, and unresponsive administrative behaviors were further identified as barriers to student continuation.

Family-related factors, notably the lack of financial support and familial problems, contribute substantially to dropout rates. The absence of parental encouragement, limited awareness regarding the importance of higher education, family obligations, migration, and the low

socioeconomic status of households were recurrent themes, highlighting the critical influence of the home environment on academic success.

Collectively, these insights underscore that dropout is not attributable to any singular cause but is rather the product of intertwined factors spanning personal, academic, and social spheres. Addressing dropout consequently requires a holistic, multi-dimensional approach aligned with the varied challenges students face.

Recommendations

In light of these findings, the following recommendations are proposed to the concerned stakeholders—campus administrators, faculty members, policymakers, and community leaders—to effectively reduce dropout rates:

Enhancement of Academic Support:

Given that low academic achievement is the leading factor, it is imperative to establish remedial and supplementary learning programs aimed at strengthening students' foundational knowledge and skills. Remedial classes should be tailored to identify and address individual learning gaps.

Promotion of Regular Attendance and Engagement:

Irregularity in attendance significantly impairs academic progress. Campuses should foster a supportive, motivating environment that encourages consistent class participation. Building harmonious relationships among students, faculty, and administrative staff will promote a more inclusive and engaging climate.

Improvement in Faculty-Student Interaction

To counteract the lack of encouragement and perceived teacher bias, faculty development programs emphasizing equitable student support, positive communication, and student-centered pedagogies should be implemented. Teachers are encouraged to utilize innovative and interactive teaching strategies beyond traditional lecturing, including active learning techniques and technology integration.

Optimization of Campus Information Systems:

A robust and transparent information system must be developed to disseminate academic schedules, scholarship opportunities, examination notices, and career counseling services promptly, ensuring that students remain well-informed and guided throughout their academic journey.

Provision of Financial and Socioeconomic Support:

To alleviate family-related financial burdens, expanded scholarship programs, economic assistance, and flexible payment options should be offered. Additionally, soft skill development courses, career counseling, and linkage to employment opportunities are essential to motivate students and enhance their future prospects.

Community and Family Engagement:

Raising awareness among families regarding the value of higher education and encouraging their involvement and support can create a conducive environment for students to persevere. Outreach initiatives should be designed to educate parents about the critical role they play in their children's academic journeys.

References

- Cairns, R. B., Cairns, B. D., & Neckerman, H. J. (1989). Early school dropout: Configurations and determinants. *Child Development*, 60(6), 1437–1452. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1130933>
- Chaudhary, K. K., Mishra, A. K., & Thapa, R. R. (2021). *Easy teaching textbook of integrated probability and statistics*. Princeton Press Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5727953>
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2011). *Research methods in education* (7th ed.). Routledge.
- Ekstrom, R. B., Goertz, M. E., Pollack, J. M., & Rock, D. A. (1986). Who drops out of high school and why? Findings from a national study. *Teachers College Record*, 87(3), 356–373. <https://doi.org/10.1177/016146818608700308>

- Fowler, F. J., Jr. (2014). *Survey research methods* (4th ed.). Sage Publication.
- Ghimire, M. N., Mishra, A. K., & Bolar, J. (2024). Exploring dropouts as challenges in higher education in Nepal: A comprehensive review. *International Research Journal of MMC*, 5(2), 21–28. <https://doi.org/10.3126/irjmmc.v5i2.67727>
- Glasser, W. (1999). *Choice theory: A new psychology of personal freedom*. Harper Perennial.
- Hammond, J. (2001). *Scaffolding: Teaching and learning in language and literacy education*. Primary English Teaching Assoc.
- Huitt, W. (2011). Motivation to learn: An overview. In *Educational psychology interactive*. Valdosta State University.
- Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50(4), 370–396. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0054346>
- Manyaga, T. (2008). Standards to assure quality in tertiary education: the case of Tanzania. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 16(2), 164–180.
- Mishra, A. K. (2023b). Together we build human capital. *Apex Journal of Business and Management*, 1(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.8402501>
- Mishra, A. K. (2023a). Welcome to an action against mental colonialism. *Intellectual Journal of Academic Research*, 1(1), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.8273123>
- Mishra, A. K. (2024b). Actions of academic institutions for optimization of human capital. *Apex Journal of Business and Management*, 2(1), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.61274/apxc.2024.v02i01.001>
- Mishra, A. K. (2024a). Exploring entrepreneurial success factors in Nepal. *New Perspective: Journal of Business and Economics*, 7(1), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.3126/npjbe.v7i1.70019>
- Subedi, L. N. (2023). Factors influencing students' dropout in bachelor's program in Kalika Multiple Campus, Pokhara. *Kalika Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, 5(1), 47–62. <https://doi.org/10.3126/kjms.v5i1.60909>
- UGC. (2021). *Annual report*. University Grants Commission.
- Wells, S., Bechard, S., & Hambly, J. V. (1989). *How to identify at risk students*. National Dropout Prevention Center at Clemson University.



