Student Motivation for Academic Performance in Higher Education in Nepal

Bhimsen Devkota, PhD
Professor, TU, Mahendra Ratna Campus Tahachal
devkotabhim@gmail.com

Surendra Giri, PhD
Professor, and Executive Director, CERID, T.U.
surendra.giri2010@gmail.com

Abstract

Motivation plays a key role in improving students' learning outcomes. This study explored student motivation for better learning efforts and performance in examination in various campuses, which were classified as high, medium and low performing ones in connection with their academic performance. Students' motivation was assessed in terms of their perception towards relevancy of the academic programme, motivation and commitment to complete the study, family environment and responsibility. Factors motivating students to attend the classes regularly were also examined. Utilizing a cross-sectional mixed-methods research design, 800 participants were selected to take part in the study from three ecological belts of Nepal. FGD and self-administered questionnaires were used as tools for data collection. Data were analyzed using SPSS 20.0. The results showed the students' commitment to complete the academic programme in time was weak as less than half (42.5%) of them were committed to completing their studies with excellent grades/marks. It was found that only a quarter of the students (26.6%) considered that the curriculum they studied was highly relevant; even a quarter of the students (24.4%) from high-performing campuses reported it—only one-fifth of them from high performing campuses expected to achieve A+ or distinction marks. The study environment in the family was found to be less enabling as only half of the students had separate study rooms at home. Students had to take responsibility for caring for their family members and children as well. Majority of students (68.4%)self-reported that they were always regular in the class, highest in low performing campuses (71.1%), followed by high performing (67.7%) and medium performing campuses (65.3%). By university, the population of students who were always regular was highest in KU (81.2%), followed by

TU (68.5%), PU (62.9%) and PokU (61.1%). It has been suggested that the students should be provided with the opportunity for learning and earning environment and the curricula should be amended from time to time to make them employment oriented.

Keywords: Self-awareness, perception, chi-square test**,** category of campuses, attendance,

Introduction

Student motivation is a crucial factor in higher educational institutions for academic achievement. Motivation can be defined as the act or process of motivating; the condition of being motivated; a motivating force, stimulus, or influence, incentive, drive, something that causes a person to act (Merriam-Webster, 1997). Motivation is one of the major factors required to achieve anything, which pushes the individual to become successful. Wigfield and Tonks (2002) and Gardner (2001) maintain that a motivated individual strives to achieve the goal, is insistent and attentive to the task, enjoys running for the goal, regards success as positive reinforcement, and uses strategies to reach the goal. Therefore, motivation can be considered goal-directed behaviour (Demir, 2011).

Student motivation, as mentioned by a social-cognitive model of motivation, includes the dimensions of expectancy beliefs (self-efficacy, attributions, control beliefs), value choices (goal orientation, interest, importance), and metacognition (self-regulated learning) (Pintrich and others, 1993). Following this model, meta-cognition and motivation form a symbiotic and dynamic relationship. A person continually evaluates intrinsic and extrinsic feedback to dynamically adjust their motivation towards learning (Schunk and Zimmerman, 2012). When this happens, a student is said to be self-regulating their learning, with the cognitive 'energy 'expended being labeled as motivation (ibid., p. 22).

Research has revealed that motivation is an important predictor of students' achievement (Beal and Stevens, 2007; Broussard and Garrsion, 2004; Johnson, 1996; Sandra, 2002; E. M. Skaalvik and S. Skaalvik, 2006; Zhu and Leung, 2011). Motivation behaviour encompasses many aspects, including motivational orientation – which acts as a driving force that encourages a person to engage in a task (Stewart and others, 2010). Motivational orientations consist of several constructs, including intrinsic motivation,

extrinsic motivation, personal relevance, self-efficacy, self-determination, and assessment anxiety.

Modern theories of motivation have focused on exploring the relationship between individual's beliefs, values, goals and their association with achievement outcomes (Eccles and Wigfield, 2002). Motivational forces are most often described as either being intrinsic (driven by curiosity or pleasure derived from performing the task) or extrinsic (the product of external reward) in nature. behavior (Shamloo and Cox, 2010). This study mainly focused on internal and external motivational factors playing a role in the students' academic performance.

Intrinsic motivation is the inner force that motivates students to engage in academic activities because they are interested in learning and enjoy the learning process (Schiefele, 1991). As Harter (1978) explained, intrinsic motivation is the true drive in human nature, which drives individuals to search for and face new challenges, as a result of which they are eager to learn even when there are no external rewards. Students with the learning goals of mastery over science content and skills are said to be intrinsically motivated (Cavallo and others, 2003). They engage in mental and physical activities holistically, remain highly focused throughout the activities with clearly defined goals; they are self-critical; self-reflected, their actions are realistic; and they are usually relaxed and not afraid to failure during learning. A research study done by Stipek (1988) concluded that intrinsically motivated students learn independently and always choose to do challenging tasks. They integrate their knowledge acquired in school with their experiences gained from outside school. They often ask questions to broaden their knowledge and learn regardless of external push factors or help from teachers. They take pride in their work and express positive emotions during the learning process. Highly intrinsically motivated students are able to learn new concepts successfully and show a better understanding of the subject matter (Stipek, 1988).

Extrinsic motivation drives students to engage in academic tasks for external reasons. Such factors include parental expectations or the expectations of other trusted role models, etc. According to Benabou and Tirole (2003), extrinsic motivation promotes effort and performance, with rewards serving as positive reinforcers for the desired behaviour. This sort of motivation typically produces immediate results and requires less effort in comparison to intrinsic motivation (Ryan and Deci, 2000). A problem with extrinsic motivators is that they typically do not work over the long term. Once the

rewards are removed, students can lose their motivation (DeLong and Winter, 2002). Extrinsically motivated students tend to focus on earning higher grades and obtaining rewards. It has been pointed out that extrinsic motivational factors can make negative impacts on students' intrinsic motivation (Biehler and Snowman, 1990; Bain, 2004).

In the context of higher education in Nepal, in general, the pass rate of Bachelor's level students (20.2%) has been poorer compared to that of Master's degree level(61.1%) (UGC, 2016). In this connection, an exploration into the role of motivation for student learning has been much relevant. Thus, the main purpose of this study was to explore student motivation for learning efforts and performance in university exams.

Study area

The study covered the seven provinces of Nepal, spanning over three ecological regions (mountain, hill and terai). The study also covered four universities: Tribhuvan University (TU), Kathmandu University (KU), Purbanchal University (PU) and Pokhara University (PokU). Faculty/School/Department, University Campuses, Controller of Examination, Dean, HoD, Campus Chief, students, and faculty members were involved. The higher education institutions, including the universities and the campuses that were the primary beneficiaries of the Higher Education Reforms Project (2014-2020), were also covered in the study.

Methodology

The study followed a cross-sectional design, using both quantitative and qualitative methods and tools for data collection. Samples were drawn from all categories of campuses, including constituent, affiliated, community and private categories. Based on the average pass percentage of students in the campuses, they were categorized into three types– high performing (upper 66.6% and above), average/medium performing (33.6 % to 66.5%), and low performing (less than 33.5%), in addition to representing the high, average and low performing campuses, accredited and non-accredited campuses were also included in the sample.

Multi-stage cluster sampling was employed for campus selection after the determination of sampling frame identifying the high performing, average performing and low performing campuses. Sampling ensured the selection of constituent, affiliated, community and private campuses from four faculties/streams. After that, sample students were selected by applying

proportionate sampling based on the proportion of enrolled students in the four universities.

A self-administered questionnaire was used to collect data from 800 students from the selected campuses. The quantitative data was collected by administering this questionnaire among the final year and/or final semester students. In addition, a qualitative method was also used, including focus group discussion (FGD) and interviews (semi-structured). FGDs were conducted with students and teachers while interviews covered a wide spectrum of stakeholders, from students to the Deans and Heads of Department (HODs). Students who participated in the questionnaire survey were not involved in FGDs and interviews. After seeking approval from the university and campus authorities and written consent from the study participants, data were collected. Interviews were tape-recorded after receiving permission. Interview notes were prepared in the Nepali language, translated into English for coding and analysis.

Secondary data were also included in the initial phase. The study team reviewed documents such as the Second Higher Education Project reports, informational documents related to the Higher Education Reform Plan, and all available Education Management Information System (EMIS) documents. The research team designed the survey based on these documents. The research team prepared the initial draft questionnaires, FGD guidelines and class observation tools.

Results and discussion

In this study, student motivation was assessed in terms of their perception towards relevancy of the academic programmes, motivation and commitment to complete the study, motivation for future employment and factors motivating students to attend the classes regularly.

Perception towards the relevance of academic programme and curriculum

In simple terms, a curriculum can be considered in four facets: Content, methods, purposes and evaluation. The existing pattern of curriculum and teaching-learning process is perceived as traditional and questionable in our context due to lack of integrated curriculum which did not include an open system based, problem-based and theme-based curriculum. It means individual, community, and national needs are not considered while designing the curriculum. Besides, evidence and research-based curriculum

frameworks are ignored while constructing the curriculum. Descriptive statistics presented in Table 1shows that only a quarter of the students (26.6%) have realized that the course they studied is highly relevant. The number of students reporting high relevance of the curriculum is limited to just about a quarter of respondents (24.4%), even in the high-performing campuses. The courses were moderately relevant for most students (59.9%), while 10.7% of students found the courses less relevant.

Table 1

Student perception on the relevance of the curriculum

SN	Response categories (Ranked)	Campus categories			Total % (N=831)
		High performing % (n=405)	Medium performing% (n=143)	Low performing% (n=283)	
1	Highly relevant	24.4	30.1	27.9	26.6
2	Moderately relevant	57.8	55.9	65.0	59.9
3	Less relevant	13.6	13.3	5.3	10.7
4	Not relevant	4.2	0.7	1.8	2.8

FGD data also demonstrated that the curriculum was not relevant under the Faculty of Education. Regarding course implementation, the students were found quite dissatisfied in the case of TU because there was an absence of course orientation in the second and third semesters. Regarding exam hall environment, some exam centers were found strict and some were loose which even allowed writing while goofing around. Urmila, during an informal talk, shared that she has a habit of rampant cheating in examinations. She saithe d, "*If you visit the toilet during exams, you will find a library there*." Students mentioned that exams must include practicals, not just written exams. In the existing practical exams, we find biases in scoring.

Students' commitment towards completing the degree

Under the influence of globalization, after 1990, Nepali students started to migrate away in foreign study, learning and employment opportunities. Existing social discrimination, exploitation, alienation and lack of employment opportunities in Nepal also push the student community towards foreign land. The majority of students studying in a running

programme in the present classroom are waiting for visas and passports. Table 2 shows the students' perception towards commitment to complete the current study programme.

Table 2

Students' commitment to complete the current study programme

SN	Perceived commitment (Ranked scale)	Campus categories			Total % (N=835)
		High performing% (n=404)	Medium performing % (n=147)	Low performing% (n=284)	
1	Complete with excellent grade/mark	41.8	44.9	42.3	42.5
2	Complete it easily	42.1	31.3	35.6	38.0
3	Try to complete it	14.4	22.4	21.8	18.3
4	Not sure to complete	1.7	1.4	0.4	1.2

As indicated in Table 2, only 42.5 percent of the students were committed to completing their study with excellent grades/marks (the proportion was found similar in the students studying in high, medium and low performing campuses). Thus, the majority of respondents were not motivated to complete their current degree with excellent grades; though, a little more than one-third (38%) of the student participants reported that they could easily complete it. Nearly one-fifth (18.3%) of them expected to try to complete the course, while a small minority was unsure if they could complete the course.

According to FGD information, some of the students perceived that the current degree programme could not provide learning and earning opportunities for them, as there is a lack of linkage between education and employment. They want to migrate to a foreign land for study, employment opportunities, and practical and skill-based education. Thus, they could not commit to completing their current study programme.

Students expected grades in the running programme

After conducting the assessment system, teachers applied the letter grading system to measure the effectiveness of teaching-learning through formative

and summative evaluation. The semester system has launched a letter grading system of evaluation to motivate students with the aim of meeting quality education. Student grade point average (GPA) has been at the heart of decades of developmental and educational investigation which has addressed a range of contextual, motivational and psychological variables which influence and predict student GPA (Coleman and others, 1966; Eccles and Wigfield, 2002; Robbins and others, 2004).

At TU, letter grading is done on a four-point scale ranging from 0 to 4 grades. A student must secure a minimum GPA of 2.7 or grade 'B minus' (Grade B-) in each course. In order to pass the semester examination, students must secure a minimum of Grade B or Cumulative Grade Point Average (CGPA) of 3. All affiliated and constituent campuses of TU follow the same examination system. There is 40 percent weightage of internal assessment, and 60 percent weightage is in the external examination (Office of the Controller of Examinations, TU, 2019).

According to the COE of KU, there is the practice of continuous assessment and end-of-semester exam system. In continuous assessment, the weightage of internal assessment is 50 percent and end-of-semester/external examination is 50 percent. However, in some colleges, 60 percent weightage is given to internal assessment and 40 percent to the end of semester examination.

In PoKU, Internal assessment and external/final examination cover 50 percent each. Similarly, at PU, the weightage of internal assessment and final/external examination comprise 30 percent and 70 percent, respectively.

Students have obtained higher marks in the internal assessments and relatively lower marks in all universities and academic programs in the external/final evaluation. The related descriptive statistics are presented in Table 3.

Table3

Students' expected grade in study programme by categories of campuses

SN	Expected grade	High performing% (n=405)	Medium performing % (n=146)	Low performing% (n=283)	Total % (N=834)
1	A+/distinction	22.7	26.0	21.2	22.8
2	B+ - A/first division	59.8	45.2	55.8	55.9

3	B/ average	16.5	25.3	21.9	19.9
4	Non Response	1.0	3.4	1.1	1.4

Table 3 indicates that on the whole, the majority of the students (55.9%), more from the high performing campuses, expected to achieve B+- A/first division(more from the high performing than other campuses), while one-fifth(22.8%)of students expected to achieve A+/distinction. The study data indicate that majority of the students from different categories of campuses expected the grade in a similar pattern. Internal and external motivating factors are more responsible for achieving an excellent grade.

According to FGD information, students perceived that physical facilities at campuses (e.g., classroom hygiene, library, laboratory, internet facilities), psychological environment at a campus, competent teachers, use of teaching technology, teachers' friendly behaviour, examination system, calendar system as well as socioeconomic background of family and students' needs, solid desires and interest are more responsible for securing expected grades during the campus period.

It can be concluded that weightage in the examination system, physical facilities, teacher competency, students' socioeconomic background, and needs/desires play a vital role in securing the expected grade in the academic programme at the campus level.

Factors associated with the motivation of students regularly present in classes

Students' regular presence in class is important to maintain students' academic performance in higher education. Student engagement plays a key role in increasing their academic achievement. Descriptive data are presented in Tables 4, 5 and 6 by categories of universities and campuses.

Table 4

Student motivation to attend classes regularly by universities

SN	Motivating factors	TU (n=635)	KU (n=64)	POKU (n=72)	PU (n=62)
1	Final Examination rules for eighty percent attendance	15.0	50.0	33.3	19.4
2	Enjoyment in teachers' lectures & class activities	57.9	32.8	56.9	62.9
3	Encouraging classroom/college environment	12.4	6.2	1.4	4.8
4	Lack of other works (lack of employment)	6.1	1.6	-	4.8
5	Easy way to pass time	1.1	3.1	2.8	8.1
6	Others (self-awareness, knowledge, family background and support)	7.6	6.2	5.6	-

As shown in Table 4, eighty percent class attendance requirement to attend the final examinations was a main motivating factor for KU students, while joyful lectures were the motivating factor for students in PU, PokU and TU. 'Joyful activities' in the classroom were the second most important motivating factor for KU students. Classroom and college environments were not considered strong factors for student motivation. Unemployment also played a role in regular class attendance at TU and PU. Similarly, other factors for students' motivation for regular classes were found in TU (7.6%), KU (6.2%) and PoKU (5.6%) – which include support of family, good economic status, late marriage, the interest of campus administration, self-awareness, an expectation of good grade achievement, and dream of students for passing examination.

Table 5
Factors motivating students to attend the classes regularly by categories of campuses

SN	Causes of motivation	Campus categories			Total % (N=820)
		High performing % (n=401)	Medium performing % (n=141)	Low performing % (n=278)	
1	Final examination rule for eighty percent class attendance	29.4	15.6	7.6	19.6
2	Students enjoy lecture method in a classroom	47.6	56.0	68.7	56.2
3	Encouraging classroom/college environment	10.2	11.3	10.1	10.4
4	Students do not have part-time jobs	3.5	5.0	7.6	5.1
5	Others(self-awareness, knowledge, family background and support)	6.2	9.2	6.1	6.7

As shown in Table 5, the main factors motivating the students to attend classes regularly include the requirement of 80 percent attendance, which was found in 'high performing' categories of campuses than others. Over two-thirds of the students from low-performing campuses reported that they enjoyed teachers' lectures in the class. However, only one out of ten students considered that their classroom/college environment was encouraging.

Nearly seven percent of students also mentioned some other factors that motivated them for regularity – which include: self-knowledge, awareness of the importance of education, family background and support, teachers' friendly behaviour, suitable location of campuses, peaceful campus environment and systematic campus administration.

When data were considered by campus types, joyful lectures were rated as the main motivating factors by students mainly from affiliated (76.2%) and autonomous (64.3%) campuses; however, it was the main motivating factor

for students of constituent (51.4%), community (59.4%) and private (55.6%) campuses.

Table 6

Student motivation to attend classes regularly by the type of campuses

Motivating factors	Campus types					Total
	Constituent	Community	Private	Affiliated	Autonomous	
80 percent attendance required for final exam	26.8	12.9	18.3	14.3	2.4	19.6
Students enjoying lectures	51.4	59.4	55.6	76.2	64.3	56.2
Encouraging classroom/college environment	8.2	13.4	11.9	2.4	16.7	10.4
Students not having part-time jobs	3.8	5.5	5.9	7.1	9.5	5.1
Easy way to pass time	2.5	1.8	2.0	-	-	2.0
Others(self-awareness, knowledge, family background and support)	7.4	6.9	6.5	-	7.1	6.7

As some students mentioned, joyful teacher lectures in classroom activities are the most powerful motivating factors for class attendance. They mentioned that they are dependent on the teacher-centered method from the beginning of their school life to college life – as there were insufficient learning materials such as textbooks and references books in the local context.

The following statement from a student during data collection illustrates a case in point:

> After being in the University Campus, I found huge buildings from outside; but inside, it is just in a shallow and

> hollow foundation. Due to corruption, all activities conducted inside University Campus were shocking for me. I have 80 percent of my attendance which is compulsory in a semester system but if there is a political connection, such 80 percent of attendance is not necessary, but I have not had the link to political connection.

It can be said that joyful lectures were rated by students as the main motivating factors for class attendance in different categories of higher education institutions. Teachers played a key role in creating suitable and joyful classes in this way. Regular campus attendance rules for a final examination, the physical environment of classroom and campus, fair administration, good economic background, and supportive family environment of students are also found to contribute positively to students' regular presence in the class.

Family environment and responsibility of students

Family is the social production, reproduction, educational unit and first school for children. A family's socioeconomic and educational resource creates the social status of the family environment. The dynamics of a family is located within the social structure and status (class/ caste in many cases). A good socioeconomic environment in the family can support the students' academic performance. Parents' socioeconomic status (SES) also determines the household's living condition (e.g., reflected in study rooms, internet facilities, etc.). In addition to SES, students' family environment works as an important factor in predicting academic achievement (Davis-Kean, 2005; Duncan and others, 1994; Gutman and others, 2003; Jacobs and Harvey, 2005; Turner and others, 2009). For many students, the family is a primary source of support and a key environment of socialization (Hill and Tyson and others, 2009); and, early research revealed that the quality of the relationships within a students' home environment, be this with parents, siblings or caregivers, has an important bearing on their academic performance (Duff and Swick, 1978; Jacobs and Harvey, 2005). This section has focused on the interlink between students' family household environment and academic performance, as elaborated below.

Table 7 presents the descriptive statistics related to parents' socioeconomic status. A little more than half of the students (56.3%) had a separate study room at home, which means 43.7 percent of students did not have a separate room for study. The proportion of students in affiliated campuses was a little

higher than in constituent campuses.

Table 7
Distribution of students who have separate study rooms at home by **categories of campuses**

	Constituent campus % (N=372)	Affiliated campus % (N=461)	Total % (N=833)
Yes	54.8	57.5	56.3
No	45.2	42.5	43.7

By campus types, almost the same proportion of students reported that they have separate study rooms (54.8% in constituents and 57.5% affiliated).[$\chi 2$=0.585, p=.444. It can be argued that family standard of living indicates the students' living conditions, and more than half of the respondents have separate study rooms at home, which might contribute to enhanced academic performance at the campus.

As shown in Table 8 and 9, one out of five students reported that they were fully responsible to their family's management while studying; whereas more than half of them (55.2%) had no role for family's responsibility and considered themselves as free and self-motivated for study during campus period. Responsibility of helping younger siblings was a little higher among students from low-performing campuses. In total, 1.3% of students had responsibility for their children. Overall, one-third of students are directly or indirectly linked with family responsibility in terms of financial and other kinds of support in the high, middle and low performing campuses as well as a constituent and affiliated campuses. Students in the majority were found self-motivated and feeling free for study.

Table 8

Responsibilities of students during the study in high, mid and low performing campuses

SN	Students' Responses	Campus categories			Total % (N=834)
		High performing % (n=404)	Medium performing % (n=147)	Low performing % (n=283)	
1	Full responsibility of family	20.0	17.0	24.7	21.1
2	Responsibility of brothers/sisters	13.1	13.6	19.4	15.3
3	Responsibility of own children	2.2	0.7	0.4	1.3
4	Free for study/No responsibility of others	58.2	58.5	49.1	55.2
5	Others (family income management, caring illness)	6.4	10.2	6.4	7.1

Table 9

Family responsibility of students during the study by campus categories

Students Responses	Constituent campus % (N=373)	Affiliated campus % (N=461)	Total % (N=834)
Full responsibility of a family	24.4	18.4	21.1
Responsibility of brothers/sisters	16.9	14.1	15.3
Responsibility of own children	2.7	0.2	1.3
Free for study/No responsibility of others	48.0	61.0	55.2
Others (family income management, taking care during illness)	8.0	6.3	7.1

Table 9 revealed that, compared to constituent campuses, more students from affiliated campuses were found to have no family responsibility during their study, whereas 24.4 percent students from constituent campuses and 18.4 percent of them from affiliated campuses reported they had full responsibility of family [$\chi 2=21.184$, $p=0.000$]. Overall, data indicate that students free of responsibility and having time for self-study were in good numbers, which is the source of motivation to study. This, in turn, must have played a vital role in their academic performance.

Motivation towards the study of existing courses and programmes

Various factors make an impact on the motivation of students entering higher education. Such factors range from their preparation for university (how much information they know about the university), course choice, future aspirations, and perceptions about higher education. Studies have indicated that student motivation has strongly been linked with academic performance, in particular higher GPA in higher education (Richardson and others, 2012; Robbins and others, 2004; Lazowski and Hulleman, 2016). In addition to its direct association with GPA, motivation has consistently been shown to influence a range of student-level pro-educational characteristics and behaviours which support the development of learning, namely deeper learning strategies, superior student adjustment and a greater level of academic engagement (Busato and others, 2000; Vansteenkiste and others, 2005; Richardson and others, 2012). Evidence has also suggested that high levels of motivation in one particular area (for example, maths or science) can also be applied to other areas (Gottfried, 1990). Taken together, the evidence supporting the role of motivation in predicting optimum academic achievement has allowed it to become a crucial component in research exploring academic success (Robbins and others, 2004; Pinder, 2011 cited in Gamble, 2019). Regarding this study, main variables include students' self'- and family engagement for supporting their study.

Table 10

Motivators for students to study the course by categories of campuses

Categories	Constituent campus % (N=374)	Affiliated campus % (N=459)	Total % (N=833)
None but myself/ (Self awareness	70.6	61.0	65.3
Parents	22.2	32.9	28.1
Senior siblings	4.0	4.8	4.4
Others (campus administration, teachers' behaviour, senior friends and peers)	3.2	1.3	2.2

Most of the students from both constituent (70.6%) and affiliated (61%) campuses responded that they were inspired by themselves to study the course. Parents were more influential in the case of students from affiliated campuses (32.9% against 22.2% from constituent campuses). The differences were significant (χ^2=15.039, p=0.002). It reveals that students' self-motivation towards their study course is good in general, and a bit higher in the case of Constituent campuses compared to the affiliated ones.

Attendance in classes in different categories of campuses and university

In theory, students are required to have 75-80 percent attendances in each course at the graduate and post-graduate levels for attending their final examination; but in practice it is not strictly followed in different campuses. Attendance is generally not taken except in technical subjects. Under the semester system, students must have eighty percent attendance for appearing in the external (or final) examination. Oghuvbu (2010) and found that students' attendance was positively and significantly related to academic performance. In the same way, Stinebrickner and Stinebrickner (2008) also found a significant and substantial effect of attendance on students' academic performance.

As shown in Table 11, a little more than two-third (68.4%) of students claimed that they were always regular in class; and it was reported highest by the students from low performing campuses (71.1%), followed by the students from high performing campuses (67.7%) and medium performing campuses (65.3%).

Table 11

Frequency of student attendance at class by categories of campuses

SN	Frequency of attendance	Categories of campuses			Total %
		High performing %	Medium performing %	Low performing %	
1	Always regular	67.7	65.3	71.1	68.4
2	Sometimes miss class	29.6	28.6	26.8	28.5
3	Rarely attend class	2.0	4.8	1.8	2.4
4	Never attend classes	0.7	1.4	0.4	0.7
5	Total N	406	147	280	833

As Table 12 reveals, the number of students who were always regular was found highest at KU (81.2%), followed by TU (68.5%), PU (62.9%) and

PokU (61.1%). Chi-square test result [χ^2=41.067, p=0.000] indicated a statistically significant relationship between the regularity of students and categories of universities. It means there is a significant association between the regularity of students by categories of the university.

Table 12

Frequency of student attendance by university

SN	Frequency of attendance	TU %	KU %	PokU %	PU %
1	Always regular	68.5	81.2	61.1	62.9
2	Miss class sometimes	27.9	17.2	37.5	35.5
3	Rarely attend class	3.0	-	-	1.6
4	Never attend class	0.6	1.6	1.4	-

Conclusion

The perception of students on the relevance of existing courses and programmes indicates that only a quarter of the students believe that the courses or programme they are studying are relevant for them. Some students raised questions on the relevance of the course due to lack of job market, the traditional pattern of curriculum and poor management of the evaluation system. Moreover, students' commitment to complete the course with good performance was weak, as less than half of them were committed to completing their studies with excellent grades. Only one-fifth of them from high-performing campuses have the expectation of achieving the highest marks. These things have contributed to somehow reduced motivation of students in their study. However, nearly two-thirds of students have been self-motivated towards studying the existing programme. By university, students who were always regular were found highest at KU, followed by TU, PU and PokU, respectively.

Acknowledgments

This article is based on a study conducted on students' academic performance in higher education in 2016. We express our sincere gratitude to University Grants Commission (UGC), Sanothimi Bhaktapur, for financial support for this research work. Sincere thanks also go to Prof. Dr Mahendra Maharjan, Prof. Dr Dinesh Pathak, Dr Govinda Tamang,

and all CERID faculties for their constructive support during data collection, analysis and report writing.

References

Ayotola, A. (1998). Motivating learners for more effective achievement in mathematics. *Nigerian Journal of Applied Psychology*, 4(1), pp. 27-34.

Bain, K. (2004). *What the best college teachers do*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. Stanford: W.H. Freeman.

Beal, C. R., and Stevens, R.H. (2007). Student motivation and performance in scientific problem-solving simulations. In R. Luckin, K. R. Koedinger, and J. Greer (Eds.) *Artificial intelligence in education: Building technology rich learning contexts that work*, pp. 539-541. Amsterdam: IOS Press.

Benabou, R., and Tirole, J. (2003). *Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation*. Review of Economic Studies, 70, 489-520.

Bhatta, Pramod. (2015). Trajectories of Higher Education Expansion in post-1990 Nepal. *Studies in Nepali History and Society* 20(2): pp. 303-333. Kathmandu: Mandala Book Point.

Biehler, R.F., and Snowman, J. (1990). Psychology applied to teaching (6th ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Broussard, S. C., and Garrison, M. E. (2004). The relationship between classroom motivation and academic achievement in elementary school-aged children. *Family Consumer Science Research Journal*, 33(2), pp. 106-120.

Busato, V. V.; Prins, F. J.; Elshout, J. J., and Hamaker, C. (2000). Intellectual ability, learning style, personality, achievement motivation and academic success of psychology students in higher education. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 29(6), pp. 1057-1068.

Cavallo, A. M. L.; Rozman, M.; Blinkenstaff, J.; and Walker, N. (2003). Students' learning approaches, reasoning abilities, motivational goals and epistemological beliefs in differing college science courses. *Journal of College Science Teaching*; 33, pp. 18-23.

Coate, K. (2006). Imagining women in the curriculum: the transgressive impossibility of women's studies. *Studies in Higher Education*, 31 (4): pp. 407-21.

Coleman, J. S.; Campbell, E.Q.; Hobson, C. J.; McPartland, J.; Mood, A. M.; Weinfeld, F.D.; and York, R.L. (1966). *Equality of Educational Opportunity*. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.

Davis, G. P. (2009). *The relationship between racial identity, motivation, and the academic performance of African American students at a predominately white institution* (unpublished doctoral thesis).The George Washington University, USA. Retrieved on September 18, 2012 from http://gradworks.umi.com/3344940.

Davis-Kean, P.E. (2005). The influence of parent education and family income on child achievement: the indirect role of parental expectations and the home environment. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 19(2), 294.

Deci, EL, and Ryan, R.M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behaviour*. New York: Plenum.

DeLong, M., and Winter, D. (2002). Strategies for motivating students. *Learning to teach and teaching to learn mathematics: Resources for professional development* (pp.159-168). Washington, D. C.: Mathematical Association of America.

Demir, Ç. (2011). English Teachers' Role in Boosting English Learners' Motivation. *2nd International Conference on New Trends in Education and Their Implications*. Antalya-Turkey.

Duff, R.E., and Swick, K. J. (1978). Parent-teacher interaction: A developmental process. *The Clearing House*, 51(6), 265-268.

Duncan, G. J., Brooks-Gunn, J., and Klebanov, P. K. (1994). Economic deprivation and early childhood development. *Child Development*, 65(2), pp. 296-318.

Duncan, T. G., and McKeachie, W. J. (2005). The making of the motivated strategies for learning questionnaire. *Educational Psychologist*, 40(2), pp. 117-128. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep4002_6

Eccles, J. S., and Wigfield, A. (2002). Motivational beliefs, values, and goals. *Annual Review Of Psychology*, 53(1), pp. 109-132.

Eccles, J. S.; Midgley, C.; Wigfield, A.; Buchanan, C. M.; Reuman, D.; Flanagan, C.; and Mac Iver, D. (1993). Development during adolescence: The impact of stage environment fit on young adolescents' experiences in schools and in families. *American Psychologist*, 48(2), 90. Review of research. Review of educational research, 75(3), 417-453.

Gamble, R., Cassidy, T., McLaughlin, and M., Giles, M. (2018). Predicting academic development: The role of psychosocial and family factors. *International Journal of Recent Scientific Research* 9 (9), pp. 28847-28853.

Gamble, S. R. (2019). *Exploring the factors which influence and support the development of academic growth in Higher Education*. Ph.D. Thesis, Faculty of Life and Health Sciences, Ulster University.

Gardner, R. C. (2001). Integrative motivation and second language acquisition, in Z. Dörnyei and R. Schmidt (eds.) *Motivation and second language learning* (pp. 1-20). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i Press.

Garland, E., Gaylord, S., and Park, J. (2009). The role of mindfulness in positive reappraisal. *Explore*, 5(1), pp. 37-44

Gottfried, A. E. (1990). Academic intrinsic motivation in young elementary school children. *Journal of Educational psychology*, 82(3), 525.

Gottfried, A. W., Gottfried, A. E., and Guerin, D. W. (2006). The fullerton longitudinal study: A long-term investigation of intellectual and motivational giftedness. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 29(4), pp. 430-450.

Graham, J. W. (1985). The challenge of higher education, *Education and Development.* Kathmandu: Research Centre for Educational Innovation and Development, Tribhuvan University.

Graham, S., and Weiner, B. (1996).Theories and principles of motivation. In D. C. Berliner, and R. C. Calfee (Eds.), *Handbook of educational psychology*. New York: Macmillan.

Gutman, L., Sameroff, A., and Cole, R. (2003). Academic trajectories from first to twelfth grades: Growth curves according to multiple risk and early child factors. *Developmental Psychology*, 39, pp. 777-790.

Harter, S. (1978). Effectance motivation reconsidered: Toward a developmental model. *Human Development*, 21, pp. 34-64

Hill, NE, and Tyson, D.F. (2009). Parental involvement in middle school: A metaanalytic assessment of the strategies that promote achievement. *Developmental Psychology*, 45(3), 740.

Richardson, M.; Abraham, C.; and Bond, R. (2012). Psychological correlates of university students' academic performance: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 138(2), 353.

Jacobs, N., and Harvey, D. (2005). Do parents make a difference to children's academic achievement? Differences between parents of higher and lower achieving students. *Educational Studies*, 31(4), pp. 431-448.

Johnson, J.O. (1996). *Child psychology*. Calabar, Nigeria: Wusen Press Limited.

Lazowski, R. A., and Hulleman, C. S. (2016). Motivation interventions in education: A meta-analytic review. *Review of Educational research*, 86(2), pp. 602-640.

Merriam-Webster. (1997). *Merriam-Webster's Dictionary*, Houghton-Mifflin.

Oghuvbu, Enamiroro Patrick. (2010). Attendance and academic performance of students in secondary schools: A correlational approach. *Stud Home CommSci*, 4(1), pp. 21-25.

Pinder, W.C.C. (2011). *Work motivation in organizational behaviour* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Psychology Press.

Pintrich, P.R., and Schunk, D.H. (2002). *Motivation in education: Theory, research, and applications* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Pintrich, P. R., Marx, R. W., and Boyle, R. A. (1993). Beyond cold conceptual change: The role of motivational beliefs and classroom contextual factors in the process of conceptual change. *Review of Educational Research*, 63(2), pp. 167-199. https://doi.org/10.2307/1170472.

Robbins, S.B.; Lauver, K.; Le, H., Davis, D.; Langley, R., and Carlstrom, A. (2004). Do psychosocial and study skill factors predict college outcomes? A meta analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 130(2), 261.

Ryan, R. M. and Deci, EL (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions, *Contemporary Educational Psychology* 25, pp. 54–67

Sandra, D. (2002). Mathematics and science achievement: Effects of motivation, interest and academic engagement. *Journal of Educational Research*, 95(6), pp. 323-332.

Schiefele, U. (1991). Interest, learning, and motivation. *Educational Psychologist* (26) pp. 299-323 urn:nbn:de:kobv:517-opus-33536.

Schunk, D. H., and Zimmerman, B. J. (2007). Influencing children's self-efficacy and self-regulation of reading and writing through modeling. *Reading and Writing Quarterly*, 23, pp. 725.

Schunk, D. H., and Zimmerman, B. J. (2012). *Motivation and self-regulated learning: Theory, research, and applications*. Routledge.

Schunk, D. H., Pintrich, P. R., and Meece, J. L. (2008). *Motivation in education: Theory, research and applications* (3rd ed.). New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Shamloo, Z.S. and Cox, W. Mile. (2010). The relationship between motivational structure, sense of control, intrinsic motivation and university students' alcohol consumption.35 (2):140-6.doi: 10.1016/j.addbeh.2009.09.021. Epub 2009 Oct 1.

Skaalvik, E. M., and Skaalvik, S. (2006). Self-concept and self-efficacy in mathematics: Relation with mathematics motivation and achievement. In Prescott, A.P. (Ed.) *The concept of self in education, family and sports* (pp. 51–74). Nova Science Publishers.

Smith, P.L. and Ragan, T.J. (1999), *Instructional Design* (2nd Ed), Wiley.

Stewart, C.; Bachman, C.; and Johnson, R. (2010). Students' characteristics and motivation orientations for online and traditional degree programs. *Journal of Online Learning and Teaching*, 6(2), pp. 367-379.

Stinebrickner and Stinebrickner, R. (2008). The causal effect of studying on academic performance. *Frontiers of Economic Analysis and Policy* 8(1), pp. 1868-1868

Stipek, D. (1988). *Motivation to learn: From theory to practice*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Turner, E. A.; Chandler, M., and Heffer, R.W. (2009). The influence of parenting styles, achievement motivation, and self-efficacy on academic performance in college students. *Journal of College Student Development*, 50(3), pp. 337-346.

UGC (University Grants Commission). (2014). *EMIS Report on Higher Education 2012/12*. Bhaktapur: UGC.

University Grants Commission (2014). *Education Management Information System: Report on Higher Education 2012/13 (2069/70) Nepal*. Bhaktpur: UGC.

University Grants Commission. (2016). *Education management information system: Report on higher education 2014/15 (2071/72) Nepal*. Bhaktpur: UGC.

University Grants Commission. (2019). Education management information system (EMIS): Report on higher education 2017/18 (2075/76) Nepal. p. 9. Kathmandu: UGC.

Vansteenkiste, M.; Simons, J.; Lens, W.; Soenens, B.; and Matos, L. (2005). Examining the motivational impact of intrinsic versus extrinsic goal framing and autonomy supportive versus internally controlling communication style on early adolescents' academic achievement. *Child Development*, 76(2), pp. 483-501.

Wigfield, A.; and Tonks, S. (2002). Adolescents' expectancies for success and achievement task values during the middle and high school years, in F. Pajares and T. Urdan (eds.). *Academic motivation of adolescents* (pp. 53-82). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Zhu, Y., and Leung, F. K. S. (2011). Motivation and achievement: Is there an East Asian model? *International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education*, 9; 1189-1212.

Zimmerman, B.J. (2000). Self-efficacy: An essential motive to learn. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25(1), pp. 82-91.

Zimmerman, B.J.; and Martinez-Pons, M. (1990). Student differences in self-regulated learning: Relating grade, sex, and giftedness to self-efficacy and strategy use. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82. 1, pp. 51-59.