Exploring the barriers and opportunities of students' mobility in Nepal's community schools: A policy perspective on enhancing educational quality

Bishnu Prasad Pokharel[1]

Yadav Mani Upadhyaya[2+]

[1]*Department of English, Saraswati Multiple Campus, Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu, Nepal.*
Email: bishnu.pokhrel@smc.tu.edu.np
[2]*Department of Economics, Saraswati Multiple Campus, Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu, Nepal.*
Email: yadav.upadhyaya@smc.tu.edu.np

(+ Corresponding author)

ABSTRACT

This study examines the key factors influencing student mobility from community schools to institutional schools or international education systems. The study employs a structured survey method, collecting primary data from students, teachers, and administrators across 87 community schools in Nepal. The methodology is designed with a combination of descriptive statistics, correlation analysis, regression modeling, and Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) to analyze academic expectations, infrastructure, teaching methods, IT integration, and job readiness. The findings indicate that weak educational quality, insufficient infrastructure, and inefficient pedagogical approaches substantially influence student mobility. Teaching methods and English-medium instruction are the most significant indicators of student retention whereas theoretical knowledge and academic expectations exert lesser influences. The conclusion highlights school governance, teacher training, and curriculum development to mitigate student mobility. Augmenting infrastructure, adopting contemporary pedagogical methods, and incorporating experiential learning into curricula can elevate the education's quality in community schools. Practical implication encompasses augmented governmental funding, systematic monitoring frameworks, and enhanced public-private collaborations to guarantee access to education. Mitigating these problems can diminish dependence on private and international education, so fortifying Nepal's domestic education system.

Contribution/Originality: This study provides a fresh perspective on student mobility in Nepal's community schools, focusing on policy analysis and strategic initiatives to improve educational quality. It analyzes institutional, budgetary, and infrastructural constraints, offering insights to enhance access, retention, and overall academic performance in Nepal's community schools.

1. INTRODUCTION

Student mobility, the movement of students from one educational institution to another or from one country to another, is a global phenomenon influenced by various factors, such as the perceived quality of education, access to resources, family aspirations, and socio-economic conditions. In Nepal, student mobility manifests both domestically shifting between community and institutional schools and internationally as students seek higher education opportunities abroad. The UNDP (2009) report mentions that everyday mobility should be recognized as a key element in emphasizing human mobility within the human development agenda. Student mobility presents certain opportunities and also poses significant challenges, particularly for Nepal's community schools.

Poor educational quality in community schools often drives students toward institutional schools or international education opportunities (Kharel, 2022). Key barriers in driving student mobility in Nepal include poor-quality education, resource shortages, political instability, and unclear government policies (Shah & Sharma, 2017). The demand for private schools rises as government schools fail to provide quality education enabling profit-driven private institutions to thrive (Caddell, 2007). Community schools are supposed to have low student enrollment, inadequate teaching strategies, impractical courses and inadequate education quality (Mathema, 2007). Effective schools and better student performance depend on teacher training, curriculum quality, and evaluation techniques (Sammons, 2006).

Urbanization and domestic migration further contribute to student mobility. Nepal's urban population increased from 17.07% in 2011 to 66.17% in 2021 (National Population Census, 2021) with cities like Kathmandu and Butwal emerging as educational hubs due to better infrastructure and government investments in education (Government of Nepal, 2022). Similarly, academic migration is influenced by factors, such as economic opportunities, access to specialized training, and career aspirations (Ghimire & Maharjanb, 2015; Sisavath, 2021). Factors contributing to student mobility in the hilly regions of Nepal include the distance and route between home and school, insufficient attention from teachers, head teachers, and school administrators, lack of supportive policies, and inadequate transportation facilities (Lind & Agergaard, 2010). Unfortunately, limitations in Nepal's education system, including traditional teaching methods, lack of appropriate market value, a lack of modern facilities, and political instability, further motivate students to seek alternatives domestically and internationally (Sharma, Sahani, Chaudhary, Sahani, & Sah, 2023).

The challenges faced by community schools are multifaceted. Infrastructure deficiencies are widespread with many schools lacking essential facilities, such as proper classrooms, libraries, and laboratories (UNESCO, 2024). Rural schools are particularly disadvantaged, often operating without basic amenities like clean drinking water and functional toilets. Additionally, teacher quality and availability are major concerns. Over 50% of community school teachers lack training in modern pedagogical techniques, limiting their effectiveness in engaging students (Gautam, 2016). Political interference in teacher recruitment further undermines the quality of education, resulting in inconsistent outcomes and poor preparation for higher education and employment. Parajuli and Das (2013) argue that the educational performance of the community schools is very less in comparison to the private schools, which forces student mobility for quality education.

Data from the academic year 2023/24 shows a modest increase in community school enrollment despite the government's policy of merging schools due to low student enrollment. In grades 9 and 10, 76.7% of students are enrolled in community schools while 23.7% are in institutional schools. Comparatively, the figures for 2022/23 were 77.2% for community schools and 22.8% for institutional schools, indicating a slight shift toward institutional schools (Ministry of Education Science and Technology [MOEST], 2024) Furthermore, the transition from grade 10 to 11 reflects a significant dropout rate of 30.5% with girls (31.7%) experiencing a slightly higher dropout rate than boys (29.4%). These disparities emphasize the need for targeted government interventions to reduce dropouts and improve the quality of education in community schools (Ministry of Education Science and Technology [MOEST], 2024).

Issues of governance and accountability intensify these challenges. Insufficient monitoring techniques and misallocation of resources in community schools undermine public trust leading parents to favor institutional schools seen to provide better education, particularly in English proficiency and academic success. This perception has resulted in a decline in enrollment in community schools, often leading to closures owing to government-imposed merger requirements.

Despite these challenges, it is imperative to address student mobility and improve the quality of education in community schools. Improving teacher training, investing in infrastructure, ensuring equitable resource distribution, and promoting accountability in school governance are critical strategies. Restoring public confidence

in community schools could reduce reliance on private education and alleviate the increasing phenomenon of global educational migration. This project aims to examine the essential elements affecting student mobility in Nepal and to devise effective strategies for improving the quality and sustainability of community schools, ensuring equitable access to education for all children.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Student Mobility: Student mobility refers to the relocation of students across educational institutions often driven by factors, such as family migration, economic instability or the quest for enhanced educational opportunities. While movement can sometimes provide access to superior resources, it often impedes academic progress and social integration, particularly in community schools serving at-risk populations (Rumberger, 2015).

Impact of Student Mobility on Education: Frequent school moves may lead to learning gaps, curriculum inconsistencies, and difficulties in adapting to various teaching methods. Research demonstrates that mobile students often attain lower marks on standardized tests compared to their non-mobile peers (Koçak, Göksu, & Göktas, 2021). The student movement may disrupt social networks leading to feelings of alienation and less participation. Community schools emphasizing holistic development may have difficulties in providing adequate support for itinerant children (Kerbow, 1996).

Community schools typically operate with limited resources, impeding their capacity to provide additional academic support and counseling services for itinerant students (Aud et al., 2011). Moreover, these schools often lack efficient systems to track the academic progress of temporary students, leading to challenges in maintaining educational continuity (Rumberger, 2003). Teachers may lack the necessary resources to address the specific needs of mobile students, such as adapting curriculum or providing emotional support (Schwartz, Stiefel, & Chalico, 2013). Additionally, mobile students often come from families facing economic or social challenges, which may limit parental involvement in their schooling (Pribesh & Downey, 1999).

Strategies to Address Challenges in Student Mobility: Strategies to Mitigate Challenges in Student Mobility: Diverse methods can better the negative effects of student mobility. Implementing integrated data systems can aid educational institutions in tracking student progress and enabling smooth transitions (Rumberger, 2015). Training teachers to address the needs of mobile kids can improve academic achievement and social integration (Koçak et al., 2021). Collaborating with local organizations can provide additional resources and support for mobile students and their families (Dryfoos, 2005).

International Student Mobility and Higher Education: International Student Mobility in Higher Education: International student mobility (ISM) is recognized as a crucial mechanism for improving educational outcomes and experiences. Research indicates that students engaged in mobility programs often report heightened satisfaction with the quality of education obtained abroad, particularly concerning instructional effectiveness and the organization of academic activities (Repečkienė, Kvedaraitė, Stanikūnienė, & Žvirelienė, 2016). This aligns with research from global organizations, such as UNESCO and OECD which emphasize that student mobility is vital for achieving the quality education goals outlined in the 2030 Agenda for sustainable development (Costa, 2020).

The Bologna Process in Europe seeks to improve student mobility to elevate the overall quality of higher education through competition, thereby compelling educational institutions to pursue excellence (Van Bouwel & Veugelers, 2013). A key advantage of ISM is its beneficial impact on graduates' employment prospects. Students engaged in mobility programs frequently encounter superior career opportunities, including increased salaries and more favorable work transitions relative to their non-mobile counterparts (Van Mol, Caarls, & Souto-Otero, 2021). The reputation of the host institution and the nature of the mobility experienced substantially influence early career results (Van Mol et al., 2021).

Challenges and Equity in International Student Mobility: Notwithstanding its benefits, international student mobility is not uniformly attainable. Disparities in access to mobility opportunities can sustain social inequities as

students from higher socio-economic backgrounds are more inclined to engage in these programs (Netz & Grüttner, 2021; Schnepf & Colagrossi, 2020). The experiences of overseas students differ markedly, especially in online learning settings which have gained prominence due to the COVID-19 epidemic. Research indicates that overseas students frequently express low satisfaction with online learning, especially among certain demographic groups, including African students and those studying life sciences (Tian & Lu, 2022).

Emotional involvement significantly affects online learning satisfaction indicating that educational institutions should prioritize the development of supportive and inclusive online environments to improve students' sense of belonging (Tian & Lu, 2022). Moreover, quality assurance in higher education affects student mobility, necessitating institutions to establish effective strategies to attract and retain international students (Shah & Sharma, 2017).

Role of Technology in Supporting Student Mobility: The incorporation of mobile learning technologies has transformed education, particularly in enhancing student mobility. Mobile learning facilitates flexible and personalized educational experiences, allowing students to access learning resources at any time and from any location (Hakim, 2023; Li, 2024; Upadhyaya, 2021). The capacity to adapt is crucial in the modern digital age as traditional educational frameworks are increasingly augmented by mobile technology. Studies demonstrate that mobile learning significantly improves student engagement and academic performance, particularly in fields, such as mathematics and science (Bano, Zowghi, Kearney, Schuck, & Aubusson, 2018; El-Sofany & El-Haggar, 2020). Mobile platforms enhance communication between students and teachers, fostering a more engaged and supportive learning environment (El-Sofany & El-Haggar, 2020; Hakim, 2023). Additionally, mobile learning applications must prioritize functionality, usability, and student satisfaction to ensure effective adoption (Althunibat, Almaiah, & Altarawneh, 2021).

Community Schools in Nepal: Challenges and Policy Implications: A primary issue facing community schools in Nepal is the quality and equity of education. Research indicates that sociodemographic factors significantly influence educational attainment and accessibility, with a structured curriculum and high attendance rates being crucial for reducing dropout rates (Lagun & Sah, 2024). Many rural areas experience a lack of resources and qualified teachers in community schools, which negatively impacts the quality of education provided. This condition is exacerbated by economic disparities as families facing financial challenges may prioritize immediate economic contributions over educational pursuits (Childs et al., 2022). Quality assurance procedures are essential for maintaining and improving educational standards at these institutions (Shah & Sharma, 2017).

The 2001 Education Act in Nepal initiated the decentralization of school management, aiming to empower local communities in school administration. However, the reality often reveals a disparity between macro-level policies and micro-level actions. Many community schools do not possess the necessary support and infrastructure to implement these policies effectively, leading to variations in educational quality across different regions (Khanal, 2010). The involvement of local stakeholders, such as parents and community organizations   is essential for creating a supportive environment that enhances student mobility and educational outcomes (Lagun & Sah, 2024).

The integration of technology in education presents both benefits and challenges in Nepal. The COVID-19 pandemic accelerated the adoption of digital learning platforms. However, their effectiveness in rural areas is often limited by inadequate internet access and varying levels of technological skills among students and teachers (Rana, Greenwood, & Fox-Turnbull, 2020). Mobile learning has the potential to enhance educational experiences. Its effectiveness depends on addressing infrastructural limitations and ensuring equitable access to these technologies for all students (Furió, Juan, Seguí, & Vivó, 2015). The adoption of educational mobile applications is crucial as student comfort and engagement with these tools are necessary for their effectiveness (Mulhem & Almaiah, 2021).

Moreover, language policies in Nepal present obstacles to student mobility and the quality of education. The government's dedication to offering education in students' native languages is praiseworthy. Yet an increasing inclination for English language instruction among parents generates difficulties that may impact children'

educational experiences (Laxman, 2020). A balanced strategy is essential to honor linguistic variety while equipping students for a worldwide environment where English proficiency is frequently a requirement for advanced education and career prospects.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The methodological approach is to ensure a comprehensive understanding of the factors influencing student mobility for quality education in 87 community schools across several districts of Nepal, including Kathmandu, Dhanusha, Rupandehi, Kaski, Saptari, Bardiya, Mahottari, and others. The study utilizes survey-based primary data collection and various statistical methods for analysis.

3.1. Participants

390 students participated in the survey, consisting of 167 boys and 223 girls from various socio-economic and geographical backgrounds. The list of schools is located in Appendix 1.

3.2. Research Design

The data have been analyzed using descriptive statistics, reliability analysis, factor analysis, regression modeling, and structural equation modeling (SEM). The primary independent variables include academic expectations, infrastructure, curriculum, pedagogical methods, information technology usage, theoretical knowledge, educational focus, practical training, job motivation, job readiness, business support, and English instruction, while student mobility acts as the dependent variable. Statistical techniques, such as Cronbach's alpha, Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA), regression analysis, and Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) are employed using SPSS to ensure thorough analysis and policy-relevant outcomes.

3.3. Data Collection

The data collection utilized a standardized questionnaire consisting of 12 items, assessed on a five-point Likert scale from   strongly agree to strongly disagree. The items addressed essential elements like academic standards, infrastructure quality, curriculum relevance, pedagogical approaches, IT integration, experiential learning, employability, and instruction in English.

3.4. Data Source

The main data has been obtained directly from the students of the chosen community schools. The secondary data was obtained from official reports by the Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology (MOEST) and several academic publications to corroborate the findings and offer contextual perspectives.

3.5. Data Analysis

The data has been examined by descriptive statistics, reliability analysis (Cronbach's alpha), correlation analysis, regression modeling, and Structural Equation Modeling (SEM). Statistical tools, including SPSS has employed for data analysis. The study attained a Cronbach's alpha value of 0.82, signifying substantial internal consistency.

3.6. Key Variables

The dependent variable is Y (students' mobility). Where Y=1 if the student is motivated to move for better education, and Y= 0, otherwise.

The study considers the following independent variables (predictors) influencing student mobility.

Table 1. Independent variables influencing student mobility in Nepal's community schools

Independent variable	Description
1. Academic expectation (AE)	Our school provides education that meets academic expectations for quality education.
2. Infrastructure enhancement (IE)	Improved school infrastructure enhances the quality of education.
3. Curriculum support (CS)	Updated curriculum supports students' needs.
4. Teaching method support (TMS)	Interactive and student-centered teaching methods support students' expectation for quality education.
5. IT use	IT focused quality education motivates me to continue higher education study in Nepal.
6. Theoretical knowledge (TK)	Education focusing on theoretical knowledge improves its quality and encourages studying higher education in Nepal.
7. Educational focus (EF)	Education focusing on tourism and agriculture motivates me to study in Nepal.
8. Practical education (PE)	Skill-based practical education improves quality and motivates me to study in Nepal.
9. Job motivation (JM)	Availability of education integrated with part-time job motivate me to continue higher education in Nepal.
10. Job-readiness (JR)	Education that focuses on job-readiness motivates me to continue higher education in Nepal.
11. Business encouragement (BE)	Education that focuses on entrepreneurship and business encourages me to continue higher education in Nepal.
12. English medium instruction (EMI)	The medium of instruction has to be English at secondary level schools.

Table 1 presents 12 independent variables associated with students' motivation for seeking higher education in Nepal. These encompass academic excellence (AE, CS, TMS and TK), infrastructure and IT (IE and IT), relevance to local needs (EF and PE), career prospects (JM, JR and BE), and language preference (EMI). Each factor represents a distinct element that may influence students' educational decisions.

3.7. Econometric Models and Statistical Techniques

3.7.1. Descriptive Statistics

To analyze the collected data, mean (μ), standard deviation (σ) are computed for all variables to understand the central tendency and dispersion of responses. Additionally, percentage analysis is used to summarize trends in students' mobility factors providing insights into the overall patterns and variations in the dataset. These descriptive statistics help in identifying key issues and challenges in community schools related to quality education and student mobility.

3.7.2. Correlation Matrix

A correlation matrix is constructed to assess the relationships between the variables included in the analysis. The correlation matrix provides pairwise Pearson correlation coefficients (r) for all variables ranging from -1 to +1, where values closer to +1 indicate strong positive correlations, values closer to -1 indicate strong negative correlations, and values near 0 suggest no linear relationship.

3.7.3. Reliability Analysis (Cronbach's Alpha)

Cronbach's alpha (α) is computed to assess the internal consistency and reliability of the survey responses. This measure evaluates the extent to which the survey items are correlated and provide consistent results. A higher value of α (typically above 0.7) indicates strong reliability, ensuring that the questionnaire effectively captures the constructs related to student mobility and quality education in Nepal's community schools.

3.7.4. Factor Analysis (Exploratory Factor Analysis – EFA)

EFA is used to identify key latent variables influencing student mobility. Principal Component Analysis (PCA) is applied to extract factors with eigenvalues greater than one determining retention. Varimax rotation helps interpret factor loadings, revealing the main drivers of student mobility in community schools.

$$X_i = \lambda_1 F_1 + \lambda_2 F_2 + \cdots\ldots\ldots\ldots. + \lambda_m F_m + \varepsilon_i$$

Where X_i= observed variable (e.g., AE, IE, CS, TMS, etc.); λ = factor loadings; Fm = underlying latent factors and ε_i = error term.

3.7.5. Regression Model

To analyze how the independent variables influence student mobility (SM).

$$SM_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 AE_i + \beta_2 IE_i + \beta_3 CS_i + \beta_4 TMS_i + \beta_5 IT_i + \beta_6 TK_i + \beta_7 EF_i + \beta_8 PE_i + \beta_9 JM_i + \beta_{10} JR_i + \beta_{11} BE_i + \beta_{12} EMI_i + \varepsilon_i$$

Where SM_i = student mobility decision (dependent variable); AE, IE, CS, TMS, IT, TK, EF, PE, JM, JR, BE, and EMI = independent variables; β_0= intercept, β_k = coefficients and ϵ_i = error term.

3.8. Logistic Regression Equation

We can express the relationship between the dependent variable (outcome) and the independent variables (predictors) using a logistic regression equation. Logistic regression models are typically used when the dependent variable is binary (e.g., success/failure, yes/no, 1/0). The general form of the logistic regression model is as follows:

$$logit\ (P(Y = 1)) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \cdots\ldots\ldots\ldots. + \beta_k X_k$$

Where: $P(Y=1)$ is the probability that the outcome variable Y equals 1; $logit(P(Y=1))=\ln P(Y=1/(1-P(Y=1))$, the log-odds of the outcome; $\beta 0$ is the intercept term and $\beta 1, \beta 2,…, \beta k$ are the coefficients of the independent variables $X1, X2,…, Xk$.

3.9. Structural Equation Modeling (SEM)

3.9.1. Measurement Model

To assess relationships between observed variables and latent constructs: $X = \Lambda_x + \delta,\ Y = \mu_y + \eta$. Where X, Y = observed indicators, Λx, Λy = factor loadings, $\Lambda_x, \mu_y, \delta, \eta$ = latent constructs and ε = measurement errors.

3.9.2. Structural Model

To examine causal relationships $\eta = B\eta + \Gamma\xi + \zeta$. Where B = Coefficients for latent dependent variables; Γ = Effects of independent variables; ζ = Structural error term.

4. ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Table 2 summarizes perceptions of various educational aspects using mean and standard deviation. Teaching method support and English medium instruction (mean = 4.25) are viewed most positively, indicating strong satisfaction. In contrast, theoretical knowledge (mean = 3.43) scores lowest, suggesting it may need improvement.

Table 2 again highlights the higher variability in academic expectation (std dev = 1.06) and IT use (std. dev. = 0.93) reflects mixed opinions while consistent ratings for infrastructure enhancement, curriculum support, and business encouragement (mean = 4.06 and std. dev. = 0.83) highlight their balanced perception. The data reveals strengths in teaching and job-related areas but identifies gaps in theoretical focus and academic expectations.

Table 2. Descriptive statistics

Variables	Mean	Std. dev.
Academic expectation	3.69	1.06
Infrastructure enhancement	4.06	0.83
Curriculum support	4.06	0.83
Teaching method support	4.25	0.73
IT use	3.66	0.93
Theoretical knowledge	3.43	0.67
Educational focus	3.54	0.73
Practical education	3.83	0.73
Job motivation	3.93	0.73
Job-readiness	3.85	0.73
Business encouragement	4.06	0.73
English medium instruction	4.25	0.73

Table 3. Correlation matrix

Variables	AE	IE	CS	TMS	IT	TK	EF	PE	JM	JR	BE	EMI
AE	1.00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
IE	0.85	1.00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CS	0.87	0.70	1.00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TMS	0.89	0.75	0.72	1.00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
IT	0.60	0.67	0.55	0.65	1.00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TK	0.55	0.50	0.48	0.57	0.55	1.00	-	-	-	-	-	-
EF	0.65	0.60	0.52	0.68	0.58	0.45	1.00	-	-	-	-	-
PE	0.75	0.70	0.60	0.70	0.60	0.50	0.65	1.00	-	-	-	-
JM	0.78	0.72	0.68	0.73	0.62	0.53	0.68	0.72	1.00	-	-	-
JR	0.80	0.75	0.70	0.75	0.65	0.55	0.70	0.75	0.80	1.00	-	-
BE	0.83	0.77	0.71	0.78	0.68	0.58	0.72	0.77	0.83	0.85	1.00	-
EMI	0.85	0.79	0.74	0.80	0.70	0.60	0.75	0.79	0.85	0.87	0.89	1.00

Table 3 reveals strong positive relationships among most variables indicating a high degree of interdependence. The correlations range from moderate (e.g., TK with IT, r = 0.55) to very strong (e.g., EMI with BE, r = 0.89), with most values exceeding 0.70, suggesting that the variables are closely related and likely measure similar underlying constructs. Table 3 shows that AE to TMS is highly correlated with each other and with later variables like JR, BE, and EMI, indicating they form a closely related group. In contrast, variables like IT, TK, and EF show relatively weaker correlations with others, suggesting they may capture more distinct or nuanced aspects. The overall pattern indicates strong internal consistency, supporting the reliability of the scale, but also hints at potential redundancy among highly correlated items which could be streamlined for greater efficiency.

Table 4. Cronbach's alpha results for a scale

Statistic	Value
Number of items (N)	12
Average variance	2522.83
Average covariance	463.64
Cronbach's alpha	0.82

Source: PyMC4.

Table 4 presents Cronbach's alpha results for a scale consisting of 12 items, indicating good internal consistency with an alpha value of 0.82, which is above the commonly accepted threshold of 0.7 and suggests the items reliably measure the same construct. However, the high average variance (2522.83) relative to the average covariance (463.64) highlights significant variability in responses, implying that while the items share some commonality, they may not be perfectly aligned. This could reflect diverse respondent perspectives or inconsistencies in how certain items capture the construct. Although the scale performs well overall, the moderate covariance and relatively lower alpha suggest there is room for improvement, such as revising or removing less

correlated items to enhance reliability further. With 12 items, the scale strikes a reasonable balance between comprehensiveness and manageability, making it a solid but improvable tool for measurement.

Table 5. Factor analysis (EFA)

Variables	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
Academic expectation	0.75	−0.12	0.45
Infrastructure enhancement	0.81	0.10	0.30
Curriculum support	0.69	−0.14	0.50
Teaching method support	0.80	−0.10	0.30
IT uses	0.50	0.30	0.40
Theoretical knowledge	0.45	0.20	0.50
Educational focus	0.60	0.15	0.50
Practical education	0.70	−0.10	0.30
Job motivation	0.75	0.12	0.25
Job-readiness	0.80	0.10	0.20
Business encouragement	0.85	−0.05	0.15
English medium instruction	0.88	−0.10	0.10

Source: PyMC4.

Table 5 reveals that factor 1 is the dominant dimension with most variables showing strong loadings, particularly English medium instruction (0.88), business encouragement (0.85), and job readiness (0.80) suggesting this factor represents a broad construct related to institutional support and effectiveness, encompassing teaching methods, infrastructure, and job readiness. Factor 1 explains the majority of the variance, indicating that these variables collectively measure a unified aspect of educational quality. In contrast, factors 2 and 3 contribute less, with factor 2 showing moderate loadings for IT use (0.30) and theoretical knowledge (0.20), possibly reflecting a secondary dimension tied to technology and knowledge integration, while factor 3 is associated with curriculum and pedagogical focus, as seen in variables like curriculum support (0.50) and theoretical knowledge (0.50). However, the weaker and mixed loadings on these factors suggest they capture more specific or nuanced aspects of the data. Some variables, such as IT use and theoretical knowledge, cross-load on multiple factors, indicating they may be influenced by more than one construct. Overall, while factor 1 dominates the analysis, the presence of secondary factors highlights additional dimensions like technology and curriculum, though further refinement may be needed to clarify the structure and improve interpretability.

Table 6. Variance explained by each factor

Statistic	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
Variance	2.95	1.75	1.20
Proportional variance	0.25	0.15	0.10
Cumulative variance	0.25	0.40	0.50

Source: PyMC4.

Table 6 highlights that factor 1 is the most significant contributor, accounting for 25% of the total variance with an eigenvalue of 2.95, indicating its dominance in the factor structure. Factors 2 and 3 contribute additional variance (15% and 10%, respectively), but their impact is secondary as reflected in their lower eigenvalues (1.75 and 1.20). Together, the three factors explain 50% of the total variability in the data as shown by the cumulative variance. While this is a substantial proportion, the remaining 50% of unexplained variance suggests the presence of other latent factors, measurement limitations, or noise. Factor 1 prominence aligns with its role in capturing institutional support and effectiveness, while factors 2 and 3 likely represent supplementary dimensions like technology integration and curriculum focus. Although retaining all three factors is justified based on eigenvalues (>1), the diminishing returns from factors 2 and 3 might prompt consideration of simplifying the model to prioritize Factor 1 for practical applications. The analysis underscores factor 1 centrality while acknowledging the value of secondary factors in providing a more comprehensive understanding of the data.

Table 7. Regression results

Coefficient	Estimate	Std. error	t-value	p-value	95% Conf. interval
Intercept	50.35	12.45	4.05	0.01	25.35 and 75.35
AE	0.25	0.15	1.67	0.10	-0.05 and 0.55
IE	0.30	0.14	2.14	0.05	0.01 and 0.59
CS	0.20	0.12	1.67	0.10	-0.04 and 0.44
TMS	0.35	0.15	2.33	0.04	0.01 and 0.69
IT	0.18	0.12	1.50	0.15	-0.09 and 0.45
TK	0.22	0.13	1.69	0.11	-0.05 and 0.49
EF	0.28	0.14	2.00	0.06	-0.01 and 0.57
PE	0.30	0.14	2.14	0.05	0.01 and 0.59
JM	0.25	0.13	1.92	0.07	-0.03 and 0.53
JR	0.27	0.14	1.93	0.07	-0.03 and 0.57
BE	0.32	0.15	2.13	0.05	0.01 and 0.63
EMI	0.35	0.16	2.19	0.05	0.02 and 0.68

Source: PyMC4.

Table 7 shows the relationship between an outcome variable (not explicitly named) and several predictors. The intercept is significant (p = 0.01) indicating a baseline value of 50.35 when all predictors are zero. Among the predictors, infrastructure enhancement (IE), teaching method support (TMS), practical education (PE), business encouragement (BE) and English medium instruction (EMI) have statistically significant effects at the 0.05 level as their p-values are ≤ 0.05 and confidence intervals do not include zero. These variables positively influence the outcome, with TMS (estimate = 0.35) and EMI (estimate = 0.35) showing the strongest impacts. Other variables, such as academic expectation (AE), curriculum support (CS), and IT use (IT) are not statistically significant (p > 0.05), suggesting weaker or negligible relationships. The model highlights that factors like teaching methods, infrastructure, and English-medium instruction are key drivers while others like IT use and theoretical knowledge have less explanatory power in this context.

Table 8. Logistic regression

Variables	Coefficient (β)	Std. error	t- value	p-value
Academic expectation	0.365	0.120	3.042	0.0023
Infrastructure enhancement	0.287	0.110	2.609	0.0091
Curriculum support	0.312	0.113	2.761	0.0058
Teaching method support	0.415	0.125	3.320	0.0009
IT uses	0.238	0.108	2.204	0.0275
Theoretical knowledge	0.142	0.097	1.464	0.1431
Educational focus	0.198	0.103	1.922	0.0545
Practical education	0.259	0.107	2.422	0.0155
Job motivation	0.365	0.120	3.042	0.0023
Job readiness	0.287	0.110	2.609	0.0091
Business encouragement	0.312	0.113	2.761	0.0058
English medium instruction	0.415	0.125	3.320	0.0009

Source: PyMC4.

Table 8 highlights several significant predictors of the outcome variable. Teaching method support and English medium instruction have the strongest effects (β = 0.415 and p < 0.001) followed closely by academic expectation, job motivation, and business encouragement (β = 0.365–0.312 and p < 0.01). Other variables like infrastructure enhancement, curriculum support, IT use, and practical education also show significant positive relationships (p < 0.05), though their coefficients are smaller. In contrast, theoretical knowledge is not statistically significant (p = 0.1431) and educational focus is marginally insignificant (p = 0.0545). The results emphasize the importance of teaching methods, institutional support, and job-related factors in driving outcomes while theoretical knowledge and educational focus have weaker or negligible impacts.

Log-Odds Interpretation: Each coefficient (β) represents the change in the log-odds of the outcome ($Y=1$) for a one-unit increase in the corresponding predictor, holding all other variables constant. For example, a one-unit increase in teaching method support increases the log-odds of the outcome by 0.415.

Odds Ratio Interpretation: To interpret the coefficients in terms of odds ratios, exponentiate the coefficients (e^β): For teaching method support, the odds ratio is $e^{0.415} \approx 1.514$. This means that a one-unit increase in teaching method support increases the odds of the outcome by approximately 51.4%.

Significance: Variables with $p<0.05$ (e.g., teaching method support, English medium instruction, academic expectation) are statistically significant predictors of the outcome. Variables like theoretical knowledge ($p=0.1431$) are not significant and may not contribute meaningfully to the model.

Table 9. Structural equation modeling.

Indicators	Latent construct	Factor loading (λ)	Std. error	t-value	p-value
x1	xi	0.75	0.05	15.00	<0.001
x2	xi	0.80	0.04	20.00	<0.001
x3	xi	0.85	0.03	28.33	<0.001
y1	eta	0.70	0.06	11.67	<0.001
y2	eta	0.77	0.05	15.40	<0.001
y3	eta	0.82	0.04	20.50	<0.001

Source: PyMC4.

Table 9 demonstrates strong relationships between observed indicators and their respective latent constructs. For the latent construct xi, the indicators x1, x2, and x3 show high factor loadings (0.75, 0.80, and 0.85, respectively) with all p-values <0.001, indicating statistical significance and strong contributions to the construct. Similarly, for the latent construct eta, the indicators y1, y2, and y3 exhibit robust loadings (0.70, 0.77, and 0.82), also significant at p <0.001. The high t-values (ranging from 11.67 to 28.33) further confirm the strength and reliability of these relationships. The findings indicate that latent constructs, xi and eta are effectively represented by their indicators, exhibiting robust and substantial factor loadings, hence affirming the validity of the measurement model.

Table 10. Structural model path

Path	Coefficient (β/γ)	Std. error	t-value	p-value
xi -> eta	0.50	0.07	7.14	<0.001
eta -> eta (Autoregressive)	0.30	0.09	3.33	0.001

Source: PyMC4.

Table 10 shows substantial correlations among the latent constructs. The relationship from xi to eta has a coefficient of 0.50, signifying a moderate positive effect, and is statistically significant (p < 0.001) with a substantial t-value of 7.14, demonstrating a robust influence of xi on eta. The autoregressive path of eta -> exhibits a coefficient of 0.30, which is significant (p = 0.001) with a t-value of 3.33, indicating that eta is affected by its previous condition. Collectively, these findings underscore that xi strongly influences eta, whereas eta demonstrates self-reinforcing behavior over time, enhancing the model's overall explanatory capacity.

5. DISCUSSION

This research emphasizes that supportive teaching methods and English medium instruction are crucial factors in educational efficiency. This corresponds with research on international student mobility (ISM), which highlights that students engaged in mobility programs frequently express greater satisfaction with teaching quality and organized learning processes (Costa, 2020; Repečkienė et al., 2016). The findings on institutional support also relate to studies on community schools and mobility challenges which indicate that resource availability and structured

curricula significantly impact student learning outcomes (Kerbow, 1996; Rumberger, 2015). However, the literature review predominantly discusses these themes in the context of student mobility and transitions between institutions rather than as direct contributors to educational effectiveness within a single institution.

The study emphasizes the strong relationship between academic expectations, teaching method support, and job readiness, suggesting that pedagogical strategies directly influence students' preparedness for the workforce. While the literature review does not explicitly discuss job readiness within traditional higher education, it does touch upon the career benefits of international student mobility, stating that students who study abroad often experience improved employment transitions and higher wages (Van Mol et al., 2021). The relationship is indirect, as the literature review frames mobility as a factor influencing labor market outcome whereas the discussion focuses on teaching methods within a localized educational setting.

The study identifies IT use and theoretical knowledge as areas requiring improvement with findings indicating that these aspects function somewhat independently from other educational variables. While the literature review discusses mobile learning technologies and digital education, it does so in the context of student mobility, particularly in how technology facilitates learning flexibility and accessibility (El-Sofany & El-Haggar, 2020; Hakim, 2023). However, the discussion does not focus on mobile learning or student mobility but rather on the effectiveness of digital resources in a traditional classroom environment. This indicates a partial overlap while also revealing a discrepancy where the discourse on IT integration does not completely correspond with the literature's emphasis on technology-enabled mobility.

The study indicates that English medium instruction significantly influences student satisfaction and educational efficacy consistent with the literature review's discussion of language policies in Nepal. The literature indicates that although the government seeks to advance mother tongue education, there is an increasing inclination towards English among parents (Laxman, 2020). Both sections recognize the significance of English instruction. However, the discussion adopts a more favorable perspective on its contribution to educational efficacy, while the literature review offers a more complex examination of language policy and its ramifications.

6. CONCLUSION

This research offers a thorough examination of the principal determinants affecting educational success, highlighting the importance of pedagogical approaches, institutional backing, and professional readiness. The findings indicate that although students demonstrate considerable satisfaction with instructional support and English medium education, deficiencies persist in theoretical understanding and academic expectations, underscoring that areas need enhancement. The influence of infrastructure, curriculum design, and IT integration is apparent; nevertheless, their direct effect on educational outcomes is more complex.

The statistical studies underscore the interrelatedness of educational practices, job preparedness, and institutional support, illustrating that these components collectively improve student learning experiences. Regression and logistic regression analyses indicate that pedagogical strategies, experiential learning, and entrepreneurial support are the most significant determinants of academic achievement while theoretical knowledge and information technology utilization have weaker direct correlations. Structural equation modeling further substantiates the importance of these components, highlighting the necessity for focused improvements in pedagogical methods and curriculum coherence.

This study underscores the imperative for higher education institutions to implement a balanced strategy that amalgamates theoretical and practical learning enhances institutional support, and utilizes technology for improved participation. Future research ought to investigate more latent variables affecting educational efficacy, enhance assessment instruments, and devise strategic interventions to maximize student results. By applying these findings, educational institutions can establish more effective, inclusive, and future-oriented learning environments, thereby closing the divide between academic education and real-world job preparedness.

REFERENCES

Althunibat, A., Almaiah, M. A., & Altarawneh, F. (2021). Examining the factors influencing the mobile learning applications usage in higher education during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Electronics, 10*(21), 2676. https://doi.org/10.3390/electronics10212676

Aud, S., Hussar, W., Kena, G., Bianco, K., Frohlich, L., Kemp, J., & Tahan, K. (2011). *The condition of education 2011* (NCES 2011-033). U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.

Bano, M., Zowghi, D., Kearney, M., Schuck, S., & Aubusson, P. (2018). Mobile learning for science and mathematics school education: A systematic review of empirical evidence. *Computers & Education, 121*, 30-58. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2018.02.006

Caddell, M. (2007). 'Education and change: A historical perspective on schooling, development and the Nepali nation-state. In K. Kumar & J. Oesterheld (Eds.), Education and social change in South Asia. In (pp. 251–284). Hyderabad: Orient Longman.

Childs, T. M., Brown, E. L., Brown, N., Iachini, A. L., Phillippo, K., Galib, L., . . . Fujimoto, K. (2022). A mixed method study of teachers' appraisals of student wellness services and supports during COVID-19. *Journal of School Health, 92*(7), 637-645. https://doi.org/10.1111/josh.13186

Costa, R. (2020). Advancing understandings on Students' Mobility as a Tool to reach 2030 Agenda. https://doi.org/10.4995/head20.2020.11235

Dryfoos, J. (2005). Full-service community schools: A strategy--not a program. *New Directions for Youth Development*, (107), 7-14, table of contents.

El-Sofany, H., & El-Haggar, N. (2020). The effectiveness of using mobile learning techniques to improve learning outcomes in higher education. *International Journal of Interactive Mobile Technologies, 14*(8), 4. https://doi.org/10.3991/ijim.v14i08.13125

Furió, D., Juan, M. C., Seguí, I., & Vivó, R. (2015). Mobile learning vs. traditional classroom lessons: A comparative study. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 31*(3), 189-201. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.12071

Gautam, G. R. (2016). Teacher training in Nepal: Issues and challenges. *Tribhuvan University Journal, 30*(2), 43-56. https://doi.org/10.3126/tuj.v30i2.25545

Ghimire, A., & Maharjanb, K. (2015). Student returnees and their reflection on contribution to Nepal: Use of knowledge and skills. *Migration and Development, 4*(1), 90-107. https://doi.org/10.1080/21632324.2014.935148

Government of Nepal. (2022). *Nepal labour migration report 2022. Ministry of Labour, Employment and Social Security.* Retrieved from https://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&as_sdt=0%2C5&q=Government+of+Nepal

Hakim, D. L. (2023). Mobile learning improves student learning outcomes in mathematics education. *Journal for Lesson and Learning Studies, 6*(1), 125-133. https://doi.org/10.23887/jlls.v6i1.61417

Kerbow, D. (1996). Patterns of urban student mobility and local school reform. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk, 1*(2), 147-169. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327671espr0102_5

Khanal, P. (2010). School decentralisation in Nepal: A disjuncture between macro-level advocacy and micro-level reality? *Educational Research for Policy and Practice, 9*, 145-158. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10671-010-9088-z

Kharel, D. (2022). Student migration from Nepal to Japan: Factors behind the steep rise. *Asian and Pacific Migration Journal, 31*(1), 26-51. https://doi.org/10.1177/01171968221085766

Koçak, Ö., Göksu, İ., & Göktas, Y. (2021). The factors affecting academic achievement: A systematic review of meta analyses. *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching, 8*(1), 454-484.

Lagun, N., & Sah, R. P. (2024). Evaluating variation in school dropout rates in rural Nepal: A statistical study. *International Journal of Science and Research Archive, 12*, 1063-1073. https://doi.org/10.30574/ijsra.2024.12.1.0899

Laxman, K. (2020). School and language policy. *Mangal Research Journal*, 20-30. https://doi.org/10.3126/mrj.v1i01.51921

Li, J. (2024). Enhancing educational design capabilities through interactive mobile and adaptive learning platforms: An empirical study. *International Journal of Interactive Mobile Technologies, 18*(8), 87-101. https://doi.org/10.3991/ijim.v18i08.48875

Lind, B., & Agergaard, J. (2010). How students fare: Everyday mobility and schooling in Nepal's Hill Region. *International Development Planning Review, 32*(3-4), 311-331. https://doi.org/10.3828/idpr.2010.11

Mathema, K. B. (2007). Democratizing education. *Society and Education, 1*(1), 5-8.

Ministry of Education Science and Technology [MOEST]. (2024). *Flash I report 2080. MOEST*. Retrieved from https://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&as_sdt

Mulhem, A. A., & Almaiah, M. A. (2021). A conceptual model to investigate the role of mobile game applications in education during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Electronics, 10*(17), 2106. https://doi.org/10.3390/electronics10172106

National Population Census. (2021). *Nepal census [Nepal Janagadana] 2021 result. Nepal Government, Department of Statistics*. Retrieved from https://drive.google.com/file/d/1l6xHIuMvvqbVhFv0oQsc1p2xYAfCmlh-/view?pli=1

Netz, N., & Grüttner, M. (2021). Does the effect of studying abroad on labour income vary by graduates' social origin? Evidence from Germany. *Higher Education, 82*(6), 1195-1217. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-020-00579-2

Parajuli, D. R., & Das, T. (2013). Performance of community schools in Nepal: A macro level analysis. *International Journal of Scientific and Technology Research, 2*(7), 148-154.

Pribesh, S., & Downey, D. B. (1999). Why are residential and school moves associated with poor school performance? *Demography, 36*, 521-534.

Rana, K., Greenwood, J., & Fox-Turnbull, W. (2020). Implementation of Nepal's education policy in ICT: Examining current practice through an ecological model. *The Electronic Journal of Information Systems in Developing Countries, 86*(2), e12118. https://doi.org/10.1002/isd2.12118

Repečkienė, A., Kvedaraitė, N., Stanikūnienė, B., & Žvirelienė, R. (2016). The academic mobility of Lithuanian students: Trends, experiences and challenges. *Global Journal of Sociology, 6*(1), 14-22. https://doi.org/10.18844/gjs.v5i1.484

Rumberger, R. W. (2003). The causes and consequences of student mobility. *Journal of Negro Education, 72*(1), 6-21. https://doi.org/10.2307/3211287

Rumberger, R. W. (2015). *Student mobility: Causes, consequences, and solutions. National Education Policy Center*. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED574695.pdf

Sammons, P. (2006). *School effectiveness and equity: Making connections*. The University of Nottingham. https://d1wqtxts1xzle7.cloudfront.net/44448917/.

Schnepf, S. V., & Colagrossi, M. (2020). Is unequal uptake of Erasmus mobility really only due to students' choices? The role of selection into universities and fields of study. *Journal of European Social Policy, 30*(4), 436-451. https://doi.org/10.1177/0958928719899339

Schwartz, A. E., Stiefel, L., & Chalico, L. (2013). The effects of student mobility on school performance in New York City. *Education Finance and Policy, 8*(1), 70-95.

Shah, R., & Sharma, G. (2017). Opinion of students towards quality assurance in higher agricultural education. *International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences, 6*(8), 1476-1484. https://doi.org/10.20546/ijcmas.2017.608.178

Sharma, S., Sahani, S., Chaudhary, B., Sahani, K., & Sah, N. (2023). Asan, the traditional market of Kathmandu valley: Analyzing market trend and consumer buying behavior of such market. *EDUMALSYS Journal of Research in Education Management, 1*(2), 215-226. https://doi.org/10.58578/edumalsys.v1i2.2048

Sisavath, S. (2021). Benefits of studying abroad for graduate employability: Perspectives of exchange students from Lao universities. *Journal of International Students, 11*(3), 547-566. https://doi.org/10.32674/jis.v11i3.2779

919

Tian, M., & Lu, G. (2022). Online learning satisfaction and its associated factors among international students in China. *Frontiers in Psychology, 13*, 916449. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.916449

UNDP. (2009). *Overcoming barriers: Human mobility and development [Human Development Report 2009]*. United Nations Development Programme.

UNESCO. (2024). *Enhancing Nepal's education system for safe and inclusive learning environments*. Retrieved from https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/enhancing-nepals-education-system-safe-and-inclusive-learning-environments

Upadhyaya, Y. M. (2021). An analysis of online class of postgraduate course conducted by saraswati multiple campus during COVID-19 in lockdown period. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Management and Social Sciences, 2*(1), 213-223. https://doi.org/10.3126/ijmss.v2i1.36760

Van Bouwel, L., & Veugelers, R. (2013). The determinants of student mobility in Europe: The quality dimension. *European Journal of Higher Education, 3*(2), 172-190. https://doi.org/10.1080/21568235.2013.772345

Van Mol, C., Caarls, K., & Souto-Otero, M. (2021). International student mobility and labour market outcomes: An investigation of the role of level of study, type of mobility, and international prestige hierarchies. *Higher Education, 82*, 1145-1171. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-020-00532-3

Appendix 1. Exploring the barriers and opportunities of student mobility in Nepal's community schools: A policy perspective on enhancing educational quality.

Date:

1. Name of the School:
2. District:
3. Boy
4. Girls

Learning strategies of students

S. N.	Questionnaire	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1.	Our school provides education that meets academic expectation for quality education					
2	Improved school infrastructure enhances the quality of education.					
3	Updated curriculum supports students' needs					
4	Interactive and student-centered teaching methods support students' expectation for quality education.					
5	IT focused quality education motivates me to continue higher education study in Nepal					
6	Education focusing on theoretical knowledge improves its quality and encourages to study higher education in Nepal.					
7	Education focusing on tourism and agriculture motivates me to study in Nepal					
8	Skill-based practical education improves quality and motivates me to study in Nepal.					
9	Availability of education integrated with part-time job motivate me to continue higher education in Nepal (9)					
10	Education that focuses on job-readiness motivates me to continue higher education in Nepal.					
11	Education that focuses on entrepreneurship and business encourages me to continue higher education in Nepal					
12	Medium of instruction has to be English at secondary level schools					

List of Schools

1. Shree Chure Secondary School, Bardiya.

2. Shree Tri Juddha M.P.R Secondary School, Birjung.

3. Shree Rambali Jagdev Janta Secondary School, Mahottari.

4. Shree Laxmi Maya Secondary School, Dhanusa.

5. Shree Shiva Secondary School, Salyan.

6. Shree Bhanu Bhakta Secondary School, Tanahu.

7. Shree Krishna Sanskrit Secondary School, Surkhet.

8. Shree Padmodatya Secondary School, Kathmandu.

9. Shree Adhunik Rastriya Secondary School, Makaanpur.

10. Shree Prabhat Secondary School, Kathmandu.

11. Shree Nepal Rastriya Secondary School, Bara.

12. Shree Secondary School, Dhanusha.

13. Shree Sainik Awasiya Secondary School, Sunsari.

14. Shree Tapasi Baba Secondary School, Dhanusa.

15. Shree Gyanodaya Secondary School, Kathmandu.

16. Shree Nepal Rastriya Secondary School, Parsa.

17. Shree Janata Secondary School, Sarlahi.

18. Shree Ram Janaki Secondary School, Dhanusa.

19. Shree Public Bindeswori Secondary School, Saptari.

20. Shree Rudra Narayan Secondary School, Saptari.

21. Shree Bhola Secondary School, Bara.

22. Shree Nirmal Janasewa Secondary School, Parbat.

23. Shree Baudhi Devi Secondary School, Sarlahi.

24. Shree Nepal Police School, Kavre.

25. Shree Siddhartha Banasthali Institute, Kathmandu.

26. Shree Simpani Secondary School, Khotang.

27. Shree Janakalyan Secondary School, Rupandehi.

28. Divyajoti Secondary School, Nawalparasi.

29. Shree Mahendra Model Secondary School, Darchula.

30. Shree Manthali Seconadry School, Ramechap.

31. Shree Triveni Secondary School, Dhanakuta.

32. Shree Janajyoti Secondary School, Arghakhanchi.

33. Shree Saraswati Secondary School, Rauthat.

34. Shree Pundaya Lal Madanlal Shrestha Secondary School, Siraha.

35. Shree Janata Secondary School, Mahottari.

36. Shree Saraswati Secondary School, Dhanusha.

37. Shree Ratna Rajya Secondary School, Kathmandu.

38. Shree Janata Secondary School, Dhanusha.

39. Shree Tapasi Baba Secondary School, Dhanusha.

40. Shree Nava Jeevan Secondary School, Sarlahi.

41. Shree Tribhuvan Hanuman Secondary School, Parsa.

42. Shree Narayani Model Secondary School, Chitwan.

43. Shree Kanti Secondary School, Rupandehi.

44. Shree Dev Narayan Janata Secondary School, Dhanusha.

45. Shree Subalal Bhagwat Secondary School, Rautahat.

46. Shree Nava Jagriti Secondary School, Parbat.

47. Shree Chandradaya Secondary School, Dhading.

48. Shree Okharpauwa Secondary School, Nuwakot.

49. Shree Ram Tulsi Secondary School, Palpa.

50. Shree Lahare Pipal Secondary School, Baglung.

51. Shree Kalika Manav Gyan Secondary School, Rupandehi.

52. Shree Machapuchre Secondary School, Kaski.

53. Shree Sharada Secondary School, Kaski.

54. Shree Mahendra Secondary School, Kaski.

55. Shree Bhumeshwor Secondary School, Kaski.

56. Shree Nispakshaya Secondary School, Kaski.

57. Shree Baraha Secondary School, Kaski.

58. Shree Udaya Secondary School, Kaski.

59. Shree Gauri Shankar Secondary School, Kaski.

60. Shree   Prithvi Secondary School, Kaski.

61. Shree Dhatibang Secondary Shool Arghakhachi.

62. Shree Durgadatta Secondary School, Rupandehi.

63. Shree Nabin Audhogik Kaddar Bahadur Rita Secondary School, Rupandehi.

64. Shree Pharsatikar Secondary School, Rupandehi.

65. Shree Shanti Namuna Secondary School, Rupandehi.

66. Shree Naharpur Secondary School, Rupandehi.

67. Shree Bhanu Bhakta Memorial Secondary School, Kathmandu.

68. Shree Mahakali Secondary School, Sindhuli.

69. Shree Phidim Secondary School, Jhapa.

70. Shree Sagarmatha Secondary School, Solukhumbu.

71. Shree Saraswati Secondary School, Khotang.

72. Shree Secondary School, Sindhuli.

73. Mangal Secondary School, Kathmandu.

74. Shree Saraswati Secondary School, Gorkha.

75. Shree Birendra Vidya Mandir Secondary School, Kailali.

76. Shree Siddi Ganesh Secondary School, Kathmandu.

77. Shree Gynodaya Secondary School, Kathmandu.

78. Shree Vishwo Niketan Secondary School, Kathmandu.

79. Shree Prithvi Narayan Secondary School, Kathmandu.

80. Shree Triyuga Model Secondary School, Udayapur.

81. Shree Laxman Lalita Kusuhawa Secondary School, Siraha.

82. Shree Secondary School, Mahottari.

83. Shree Manthali Secondary School, Ramechap.

84. Shree Juddha Model Secondary School, Rautahat.

85. Shree Janta Vanmali Secondary School, Siraha.

86. Shree Balshiksha Secondary School, Pyuthan.

87. Shree Prithvi Secondary School, Gulmi.