Prioritizing the Forces of Brain Drain: Perspectives of Nepali Youths

Rajesh Kumar Chaudhary[1*], Keshav Gautam[2]

Journal of Emerging Management Studies
Volume 4 Issue 1

https://doi.org/10.3126/jems.v4i1.95438

Abstract

Purpose – This paper aims to provide the current scenario of the brain drain of Nepali youths. It also intended to investigate how poor governance, limited access to quality education, misplacement of talent and low occupational income affect the Nepalese brain drain.

Design/methodology/approach – This research is quantitative in nature and adopted a descriptive and correlational design. 405 Nepali youths currently living abroad or planning to migrate to abroad were taken as the sample for study. The data were collected from structured questionnaire through both online and hard copies survey. The used questionnaire was developed on a five-point Likert scale. The collected data were processed and output of data generated with aid of MS-Excel and SPSS.

Findings and Conclusion – This paper finds that poor governance, low occupational income, and limited access to quality education are major causes of brain drain in Nepal. Although talent misplacement is still a known issue, its lack of statistical significance suggests that more concrete, structural variables have a bigger impact on migration decisions.

Implications – This study applies the push-pull migration framework to Nepalese brain drain, identifying low income, weak governance, and poor education access as key push factors. Practically, it urges policymakers to prioritize wage reforms, education-labor alignment, and merit-based hiring. Public-private partnerships, skill industry investments, and reintegration programs are essential. A multi-stakeholder approach involving government, academia, and business is needed to reduce brain drain and leverage diaspora expertise for national development.

Keywords – Brain drain, Governance, Income level, Nepal, Quality education

[1]Faculty of Management
DAV Business School, Kathmandu, Nepal
Email: crj.raj208@gmail.com

[2] MBA Graduate
DAV Business School, Kathmandu, Nepal
Email: keshavgautam441@gmail.com

[*] Corresponding author:

Received: March 12, 2026
Revised: March 28, 2026
Accepted: April 23, 2026

How to cite this paper:

Chaudhary, R. K., & Gautam, K. (2026). Prioritizing the forces of brain drain: Perspectives of Nepali youths. *Journal of Emerging Management Studies, 4*(1), 92-102. https://doi.org/10.3126/jems.v4i1.95438

1. Introduction

The worldwide brain drain from underdeveloped to rich countries has significantly increased in recent time. Globalization, which takes the form of free commerce, intellectual interchange, and the movement of human capital, is one of the most important factors reshaping our world in past few years. Cross-border migration has a significant impact on economic development, investment trends, innovation, and knowledge transfer (Gheasi & Nijkamp, 2017). One of the main causes of this phenomena is the expansion of the world's economy, which has led to many nations losing a significant portion of their most skilled and highly educated citizens to possibilities outside (Roudgar & Richards, 2015). Brain drain is the migration of skilled labor from their home countries to places where their expertise is better rewarded (Ghanbari-Jahromi & Marzaleh, 2024; Ogaboh, 2020). It is the movement of highly qualified workers, motivated by possibilities in commerce, education, and other fields. Even though every part of the world needs a skilled and competent labor force, wealthy nations frequently entice talent away from less developed regions. Higher pay, improved living standards and quality of life, access to cutting-edge technology, and more stable political situations are also strong pull factors (Hashish & Ashour, 2020).

Brain drain, also known as human capital flight, is a major problem in many regions of the world and is particularly prevalent in developing countries (Beine et al., 2008; Panagiotakopoulos, 2020). Brain drain remains unsettled issue that features high in the political agenda of many countries around the world. While it brings some positive aspects, such as increased remittances and the acquisition of new skills and technologies, its overall impact on the nation is a cause for concern (Gheasi & Nijkamp, 2017). Addressing the issue of brain drain is crucial for Nepal's sustainable development and requires a comprehensive understanding of its causes and consequences (Dangol & Mishra, 2024; Mishra, 2023). Brain drain currently creates risk to Nepal's social stability going beyond economic concerns. Therefore, this area is desperately needed an in-depth investigation for the creation of relevant policies. Also, Nepal offers a rich yet unexplored area for high-impact research due to its unique demographic and political history. Examining this issue is a unique opportunity to develop solutions that might conserve the nation's future and stop the quiet depletion of its human capital.

2. Literature Review and Hypotheses Development

The movement of very intelligent and competent people to countries that provide better working conditions and greater financial benefits is known as "brain drain." This problem manifests itself in two ways: either skilled workers leave in order to gain better futures and higher earnings, or students who seek education overseas decide not to return home (Faini, 2003; Roudgar & Richards, 2015). Brain drain defines the migration of competent, educated, and skilled people from their native countries in search of a greater standard of living and improved quality of life across the globe. This phenomenon is frequently motivated by higher salaries, access to modern technology, and more reliable political environments (Beine et al., 2008; Crush, 2009). This issue is described in the research on economic growth as the migration of talented workers that speeds up capital depreciation and reduces the constant growth rate of an economy (Hall, 2005).

A painful imbalance is created by brain drain: wealthy nations get the trained labor they require, while poor nations lose their valuable human capital. In the meantime, those who are meant to bring about change leave their country in search of personal growth (Ghanbari-Jahromi & Marzaleh, 2024). This crisis affects a country in two ways: economically, by depriving it of its skilled labor force and the resources invested in their education, and socially, by sowing the seeds of long-term tragic decline (Adams, 2003; Kousar et al., 2020; United Nations, 2017). The trends of the world's economy either side, and the social, political, and economic conditions that exist locally on the other, are major causes of brain drain in developing countries (Roudgar & Richards, 2015). While foreign interventions and economic disparity worsen emigration, governance issues as; political stability and the rule of law stands out as being essential reducing human capital outflows. In sociological perspectives, migrants are active actors who challenge conventional ideas of citizenship and belonging by transforming global networks (Vega-Munoz et al., 2025).

Brain Drain in Nepal

A large number of Nepali youths aspire to study overseas as soon as they finish their higher secondary education (i.e., grade 12). The government granted 82,409 no-objection certificates (NOCs) for abroad study in the first half of 2022, which is almost twice as much as the 44,843 issued in the same time the year before. Every day, on average 3,000 students with student visas leave the airport in Kathmandu.

Remittances provide a significant contribution to Nepal's GDP, but their constant outflow threatens both long-term economic growth and the development of human capital. About 775,000 Nepali moved abroad for work in the year 2021–2022, while an additional 100,000 did so for further study. These numbers do not include those who went to India. Villages are hauntingly empty as a result of the migration, and many young people in cities are only waiting for their chance to depart (Kumar, 2023; Nepal Database Writer, 2023). Unemployment has been the main cause of brain drain in a growing country like Nepal. A research claims that in 2022, the net migration rate was 4.353 per 1,000 people, a shocking 19.72% rise from the year before (Maharjan, 2022). Although skilled labor migration is a prevalent problem, least developed nations like Nepal face more complexity as a result. The attraction of better chances, attractive scholarships, and superior infrastructure is luring highly trained professionals to rich countries (Gyanwali & Bashyal, 2025). The ultimate goal for today's Nepali youth is to get around overseas and never return. Even a recent high school graduate wants to finish their studies abroad. Sadly, these young people hardly come home. Nepal thus loses finest minds year after year. If this flow is allowed to continue, one day this beautiful nation may be barren, only surrounded by weak old people and helpless small children (Kumar, 2023; Singh, 2007).

Low occupational income and brain drain

Low occupational income is defined as earnings from employment that are below industry standards or social norms, leaving people financially insecure and extremely unsatisfied (Todaro & Smith, 2020; UNESCO, 2015). It is a sign that pay is not keeping up with professional standards or fundamental necessities, frequently falling short of global norms (World Bank, 2020). Brain drain and poor occupational income are closely related. One of the main causes of brain drain is low occupational income. When highly qualified workers are underpaid, they relocate to more prosperous nations that provide better pay, better working conditions, and more promising career opportunities (Docquier & Rapoport, 2012; Gheasi & Nijkamp, 2017). This cross-border income gap creates an unstoppable pull factor (Beine et al., 2001; Faggian et al., 2007). Talented youths' movement depletes essential human capital, hindering long-term development and economic progress in emerging countries. Low occupational income is therefore more than just a salary problem. It serves as the silent catalyst for a silent disaster continuously losing the country's most brilliant brains (Cakir & Demirag, 2025). Thus, on the basis of the discussion, it is hypothesized that;

H_1: There is a significant relationship between Low Occupational Income and Brain drain

Misplacement of talents and brain drain

Talent misplacement occurs when talented people are assigned to positions that do not fully utilize their ability. Their knowledge, skills, and potential are still mostly unrealized due to lack of working arrangement and engagement, which eventually results in inefficiency, discontent, and unfulfilled potential (Bloom & Reenen, 2010; Cappelli, 2008; Mijar & Giri, 2025; Shilpakar et al., 2024). Professionals are stuck in roles that don't match their skills due to this systemic problem (ILO, 2019). The brain and talent misplacement are closely related. Frustration naturally grows when local economies consistently mismatch responsibilities with qualified experts. Highly skilled professionals travel to nations where their skills are respected and appropriately used after realizing their value is underappreciated at home (Adams, 2003; Ghanbari-Jahromi & Marzaleh, 2024). As a result, talent misplacement is a quiet beginning to brain drain rather than just an HR issue. Skilled professionals first suffer the silent humiliation of being overqualified, underpaid, and disregarded before they even make a flight reservation (Veg-Munoz et al., 2025). Thus, we can hypothesize as;

H_2: There is a significant relationship between Misplacement of Talents and Brian drain

Access to quality education and brain drain

The limitations that keep people from obtaining a high-quality education that satisfies accepted standards of excellence are referred to as limited access to excellent education. Inadequate resources, inadequate infrastructure, remote location, socioeconomic inequality, prejudice, exclusionary policies, and bureaucratic hurdles are some of these challenges in Nepal (Mijar & Giri, 2025). When combined, they produce significant disparities in educational opportunities and results (UNESCO, 2019). Brain drain is caused by a lack of access to high-quality education, which in turn weakens the very educational institutions it depletes. Numerous countries have evidence of this self-reinforcing cycle. A mass migration of young people has occurred in Punjab, India, due to inadequate higher education and improper policies (Kaur et al., 2025). Citing institutional discontent, academics in Yemen directly attribute educational deterioration to brain drain (Muthanna, 2015). On the other hand, Moi University in Kenya saw a decline in quality as a result of increased staff emigration (Wosyanju et al., 2012). Thus, it is hypothesized that;

H_3: There is a significant relationship between Limited access to quality education and Brian drain

Lack of good governance and brain drain

The term "poor governance" describes corrupt, inefficient, or repressive actions that occur inside government bodies and are characterized by discriminatory decision-making, abuse of authority, misuse of public resources, and failure of accountability. Such governance reduces public trust, promotes inequality, and threatens legitimacy (Kaufmann et al., 2010). One of the main causes of brain drain is this disappointing condition. The migration of skilled people from developing countries is strongly correlated with poor governance, economic instability, low quality of life, and inadequate infrastructure (Kousar et al., 2020). The main cause of brain drain is corruption, a critical governance indicator that surpasses all other considerations (Li et al., 2023). Institutional quality is critical for keeping highly trained personnel from leaving (Chen et al., 2023). Studies particular to a country support this connection. Ighoshemu and Ogidiagba (2022) found that corruption, inadequate governance, and deteriorating infrastructure were the main causes in Nigerian brain drain. Weak administration, lack of social fairness, and declining peace and order are the main causes of brain drain in Pakistan (Sanaullah & Iftikhar, 2025). On the basis of the discussion, it is hypothesized that;

H_4: There is a significant relationship between Lack of Good Governance and Brian drain

3. Method

Research Design

This research is quantitative in nature and adopted a descriptive and correlational design. With this research approach, this paper aims to provide the current scenario of the brain drain of Nepali youths. It also intended to investigate how poor governance, limited access to quality education, misplacement of talent and low occupational income affect the Nepalese brain drain in natural settings. The descriptive design allows for detailed insights into the experiences and perspectives of Nepali youths regarding their migration decisions. Also, correlational design helps to understand the association among different factors causing brain drain. It assists in forecasting potential occurrences using existing information as well as finding trends and links between variables (Pant, 2016).

Population and Sampling

Nepali youths currently living abroad or planning to migrate to abroad for different reasons were the targeted population for this research. However, there is no exact data of Nepali youths migrated to overseas and potential to migrate. Therefore, about 500 Nepali youths of this categories were contacted as per the convenience and requested to fill the questionnaire physically and through online platforms. Although we received 437 filled questionnaires out of 500 distributed, 405 responses were found complete and useful for the further analysis. Hence, these 405 respondent were treated as the sample for this research, meeting the criterion of Hair et al. (2016), as it was recommended that the sample size can be representative while it is 5 to 10 times the number of the questionnaire items used.

Measurement

The structure questionnaire was used as tool for data collection in which 20 questionnaire items exist. Five items to measure the perception about brain drain were brought from Docquier and Marfouk (2006); Dreher et al. (2008); and Beine et al. (2013). Similarly, to measure misplacement of talent, five items were extracted from Tessema (2010), Docquier and Rapoport (2012), and Levy and Murnane (2012). Likewise, to measure lack of good governance, five items were taken from Dreher et al. (2008) and Kraay et al. (2013). Also, to quantify low occupational income, five items were brought from Beine et al. (2001) and Piketty (2014). Furthermore, to measure limited access to quality education, five items were extracted from Psacharopoulos and Patrinos (2004); Hanushek and Woessmann (2008); and Docquier and Rapoport (2012).

The collected data were processed and output of data generated with aid of MS-Excel and SPSS. Descriptive statistics were applied to assess the current scenario of brain drain in Nepal. Also, correlation and regression analysis were used to examine the association and impact of different independent factors on brain drain in Nepal.

4. Data Analysis and Results

Table 1
Respondents' Profile

Category	Sub-category	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	231	57.0%
	Female	174	43.0%
Age Group (in years)	Below 20	49	12.1%
	20 to 30	257	63.5%
	30 to 40	84	20.7%
	Above 40	15	3.7%
Preferred Nation	USA	150	37.0%
	Australia	90	22.2%
	Canada	43	10.6%
	New Zealand	20	4.9%
	European Nation	50	12.3%
	Others	52	12.8%
Returning Intention	Yes	191	47.2%
	No	100	24.7%
	Don't Know	114	28.1%

Table 1 demonstrated that the population surveyed was mostly male (57%), indicating that males have greater migration intentions, possibly because of traditional worker roles or the need for labor abroad. The table shows the majority of respondents (63.5%) were from the age group of 20 to 30 years. It indicates that these respondents are at the start of their higher education or jobs. This suggests that Nepali youths in their early careers are more inclined to go abroad in search of better career perspectives. The favorite destinations for Nepali youths were the USA (37.0%) and Australia (22.2%) followed by Canada (10.6%) and Europe (12.3%). This suggests that the respondents think these countries attracted talent away from Nepal by providing better education, easy migration routes, and higher earnings potentials. Regarding the return plan in Nepal, just 47.2% of displays plan to return, whereas 28.1% are unsure and 24.7% clearly do not want to return. This lower intention to return indicates the possibility of weakened Nepalese human capital and sustainable growth.

Table 2
Descriptive Statistics and Reliability Test

Constructs	Questionnaire Items	Mean	Std. Deviation	Summated Mean	Summated Std. Deviation	Cronbach's Alpha
Brain Drain	BD1	4.03	1.247	3.97	1.198	0.81
	BD2	3.81	1.190			
	BD3	3.81	1.187			
	BD4	4.07	1.211			
	BD5	4.11	1.157			
Misplacement of Talents	MPT1	2.48	1.362	3.07	1.270	0.76
	MPT2	3.43	1.197			
	MPT3	3.29	1.238			
	MPT4	2.64	1.331			
	MPT5	3.50	1.224			

Constructs	Questionnaire Items	Mean	Std. Deviation	Summated Mean	Summated Std. Deviation	Cronbach's Alpha
Lack of Good Governance	LGG1	3.79	1.277	3.87	1.187	0.84
	LGG2	3.95	1.217			
	LGG3	3.79	1.129			
	LGG4	3.77	1.147			
	LGG5	4.07	1.163			
Low Occupational Income	LOI1	3.21	1.359	3.60	1.254	0.78
	LOI2	3.80	1.247			
	LOI3	3.18	1.375			
	LOI4	4.01	1.168			
	LOI5	3.80	1.122			
Access to Quality Education	AQE1	3.37	1.237	3.63	1.187	0.75
	AQE2	3.64	1.172			
	AQE3	3.79	1.181			
	AQE4	3.77	1.137			
	AQE5	3.60	1.209			

Note. *BD=Brain Drain, MPT=Misplacement of Talents, LGG= Lack of Good Governance, LOI= Low Occupational Income, AQE= Access to Quality Education*

Table 2 shows the reasons of brain drain among young Nepali using a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree). There is more acceptance that the factor influences movement when the mean score is higher. Respondents are strongly convinced that brain drain is a serious problem (Summated Mean = 3.97). The highest scores for items BD4 (4.07) and BD5 (4.11) support the general belief that a significant number of talented young people are leaving the country. Talent misplacement has a moderately (Summated mean = 3.07), MPT1 (2.48) and MPT4 (2.64) show disagreement over Nepal's significant underutilization of talent. MPT5 (3.50), however, raises some concerns about the mismatch between work and talent.

The poor governance was identified as a significant push factor (summated mean = 3.87). Every item has a score higher than 3.77, with LGG5 (4.07) being the highest. It indicated that migration intentions are strongly influenced by political unpredictability, corruption, and inadequate public service delivery. Similarly, medium to substantial perceived influence was seen for low occupational income (Mean = 3.60). Inadequate pay structures are highlighted as crucial in LOI4 (4.01). Because of sectoral differences or remittance expectations, LOI1 (3.21) and LOI3 (3.18) could be lower. Furthermore, governance was determined to be a more critical factor than access to high-quality education (Mean = 3.63). Dissatisfaction with access to high-quality education is shown in AQE3 (3.79) and AQE4 (3.77), which force young people overseas in search for higher education. Additionally, five items were used to measure each construct, and all of them are retained as per their reliability statistics. Strong construct reliability was shown by the items' alpha values, which were above the acceptable level of 0.7 (Nunnally, 1978).

Table 3
Correlation Analysis

	BD	MPT	LGG	LOI	AQ
BD	1				
MPT	.412**	1			
LGG	.662**	.457**	1		
LOI	.640**	.535**	.657**	1	
AQE	.595**	.371**	.615**	.647**	1

Note. *BD=Brain Drain, MPT=Misplacement of Talents, LGG= Lack of Good Governance, LOI= Low Occupational Income, AQE= Access to Quality Education*

** *Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)*

Table 3 shows a correlation analysis among five constructs (BD, MPT, LGG, LOI, and AQE) using responses from 405 Nepali youths. It found a significant association (r = 0.662) between LGG and BD. This indicated that Nepali youths' intentions to migrate correlate most significantly with their thoughts on political instability, corruption, and poor government. Similarly, the strong association (r = 0.640) between LOI and BD shows that brain drain is strongly influenced by low income. The table shows a moderate to strong correlation (r = 0.595) between AQE and BD, indicating that youngsters who are dissatisfied with their access to high-quality education are much more likely to migrate abroad. The table also reveals a moderately high association (r = 0.412) between MPT and BD, indicating that indirect underutilization of skills and talent misplacement contribute to migration. Additionally, a notable correlation exists between LGG and LOI (0.657) and AQE (0.615), suggesting there exist a connection between these issues. Weak governance likely causes low pays and poor access to quality education, which in turn increases brain drain. The results of the overall correlation analysis revealed that the brain drain is driven by income, education, and governance, with governance emerging as the primary component. It suggests that comprehensive policy measures that focus on pay structures, educational quality, and institutional improvements are necessary to prevent brain drain.

Regression Analysis

Table 4
Model Summary

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.730[a]	.533	.528	.68977

Table 4 shows the summary of overall effects of LGG, LOI, MPT, and AQE on BD. The R value of 0.73 indicated that strong positive connection between these predictors and brain drain. Also, the R^2 value of 0.533 indicates that these factors can cause about 53.3% of the variance in brain drain. The robustness of this model is confirmed by the adjusted R^2 value of 0.528, although considering four predictors in the model. The standard error of the estimate, at 0.68977 reflecting how accurate the model is in predicting brain drain.

Table 5
ANOVA Table

ANOVA[a]					
Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	216.856	4	54.214	113.947	.000[b]
Residual	190.312	400	.476		
Total	407.168	404			

Table 4.5 supported the relevance of the research model. The F-statistic of 113.947 and the p-value of 0.000 show the model is statistically significant. It indicates that at least one of the variables has a meaningful relationship with brain drain. This high F value highlights how effectively the regression model comprises the link between the independent variables and brain drain. It suggests that MPT, LGG, LOI, and AQE combined have a significant impact on brain drain.

Table 6
Regression Coefficients & Hypothesis Test

Hypothesis	Unstandardized Coefficients	Standard Error	Standardized Coefficients	t-value	P-value	Result
H1: LOI --->BD	0.289	0.058	0.261	4.965	0.000	Supported
H2: MPT--->BD	0.044	0.046	0.039	0.956	0.340	Not Supported
H3: AQE---> BD	0.212	0.052	0.195	4.103	0.000	Supported
H4: LGG--->BD	0.365	0.050	0.353	7.238	0.000	Supported

Four hypotheses about the causes of brain drain among Nepali youths were tested using regression analysis. The result confirmed hypothesis 1, which proposed a connection between brain drain and low occupational income ($B = 0.289$, $p < 0.001$). It suggests that the one of primary causes of brain drain are low pay and insufficient financial incentives. This result is in line with previous research highlighting the economic drivers of migration, particularly in developing nations like Nepal where monetary benefits frequently fall short of people's abilities and desires. On the other hand, the results did not support hypothesis 2, which looked at the connection between brain drain and talent misplacement. The regression coefficient ($B = 0.044$, $p = 0.340$) was small and not statistically significant. It implies that migration decisions are not significantly affected by the discrepancy between job roles and individual qualifications. The data accepted hypothesis 3, which proposed a link between brain drain and poor access to high-quality education ($B = 0.212$, $p < 0.001$).

The results show that the desire to pursue education and work outside is greatly encouraged by a lack of scholarships, poor infrastructure, and a general perception of poor educational chances in Nepal. This tendency reflects a larger trend seen in many developing countries, where people seek out international education as an effective way to improved employment possibilities in addition to intellectual growth. The fourth hypothesis looked at the connection between brain drain and a lack of good governance (LGG). With a high beta coefficient ($B = 0.365$, $p < 0.001$), the results found LGG to be the leading predictor of all the variables studied at. These findings show that governance related problems, such as influence on politics, corruption, partiality, and ineffective administration, play a significant role in influencing people's decisions to move abroad. The lack of meritocracy and accountability in public systems was a major source of dissatisfaction which frustrates Nepali youths from seeing a safe and prosperous future within Nepal. Overall, this study finds that poor governance, low occupational income, and limited access to high-quality education are major causes of brain drain in Nepal. The results emphasize the need for better career guidance and better alignment between learning outcomes and labor market needs. These results highlight the critical need for structural changes in the economic, educational, and governmental institutions in order to retain local talent and stop the migration of highly qualified people from Nepal.

5. Discussion

This paper investigated the primary reasons for the brain drain among Nepali youths. The analysis of survey data found strong connection between brain drain and a number of structural problems in Nepal. Most notably, poor governance, low occupational income, and limited access to high-quality education were found as important leading causes to Nepal's brain drain problem. This research found lack of good governance, which includes problems like political influence in hiring procedures, ineffective bureaucracy, and widespread nepotism, as the most statistically significant push factor for brain drain. This result is consistent with research by Kaufmann et al. (2010), which shows that governance quality directly affects individual migration decisions. Also, Ghanbari-Jahromi and Marzaleh (2024) and Panagiotakopoulos (2020) support the argument by pointing out key governance problems such as political corruption, unstable governments and policies, insufficient political effort to address systemic issues, and a lack of state support for social welfare as major causes of brain drain.

There also existed a clear link between low occupational income and Nepal’s brain drain. Respondents said they wanted to look for financial security elsewhere and were unhappy with the existing salary levels. This result is in line with Hashish (2020) and Ghanbari-Jahromi and Marzaleh (2024), who identified economic and financial factors as the most important ones. These factors include low wages and salaries, weak incentives, and inadequate compensation and facilities that force people to think about migrating in order to improve their standard of living.

Additionally, Beine et al. (2008) emphasized the wage-driven professional migration trend on a worldwide scale. Another important element driving Nepalese brain drain has been identified as access to high-quality education. Several respondents expressed dissatisfaction with Nepal's educational system's weaknesses and cited improved academic prospects elsewhere as the main driver of migration. This result is consistent with worldwide trends, where young migration outside is increasingly driven by educational goals (UNESCO, 2019; Gheasi & Nijkamp, 2017). It is interesting to note that misplacement of talent was found theoretically meaningful and qualitatively clear in survey responses, but this paper was not found a statistically significant predictor of brain drain. This might imply that while underemployment does occur, it might not be as strong a driving force as economic crisis or poor governance.

6. Conclusions

The results reveal that brain drain in Nepal is a complex problem influenced by interconnected institutional, educational, and economic deficiencies, each of which encourages young people migration. The paper concludes that systemic weaknesses, such as consistently low occupational income, limited access to high-quality education, and weak governance systems, are the main causes of brain drain in Nepal. Although talent misplacement is still a known issue, its lack of statistical significance suggests that more concrete, structural variables have a bigger impact on migration decisions. Nepal must implement planned, focused changes to improve economic prospects, match educational outputs with labor market demands, and reestablish institutional integrity in order to stop the flow of skilled migration. If these measures are not taken, the country runs the threat of experiencing a long-term loss of its human capital, which could hinder socioeconomic advancement and increase its vulnerability in a highly competitive global environment.

6. Implications

This paper finding have significant relevance for both theoretical comprehension and the development of workable policies for preventing brain drain in Nepal. The study theoretically supports the push-pull migration framework's application by signifying that structural push factors such as low occupational income, weak governance, and limited access to high-quality education are the main drivers of Nepalese brain drain. The significant impact of governance-related concerns emphasizes the crucial role that political transparency plays in influencing migration decisions, adding further evidence to the expanding body of research that connects talent migration and governance. In practice, the study's findings urge on decision-makers to give top priority to extensive changes that improve pay structures, match educational requirements with labor market demands, and promote open, merit-based hiring practices. To establish appealing domestic possibilities that promote talent retention, public-private collaborations, educational upgrading, and investments in high-skill industries are also essential. Establishing reintegration programs and forums to interact with the Nepali community and leverage their international expertise for national development would also be advantageous for institutions. These outcomes show that in order to reduce brain drain and fully use Nepal's human resource, a multifaceted, cooperative strategy including the government, academic institutions, and the corporate sector is required.

7. Limitations and the Direction for Future Research

This study provides insightful information on the factors that contribute to brain drain in Nepal however it has few limitations as well. The findings are contextually limited to Nepal and may not be relevant to other developing nations with distinct socioeconomic dynamics. Furthermore, the majority of the sample consisted of people who are either already overseas or want to migrate, which may ignore the viewpoints of those who decide to stay in Nepal or return after migrating. The use of self-reported data also adds possible biases because participant replies may be influenced by social desirability or personal perceptions. Furthermore, the study's focus was limited to four key variables: low occupational income, talent misplacement, limited access to high-quality education, and poor governance. Other significant factors, such as psychological motivations, international pull factors, or family expectations, were not included. Finally, the research's cross-sectional design makes it more difficult to evaluate how opinions and patterns have changed over time. In order to give a more thorough understanding of the brain drain phenomena, these limitations point to directions for future studies. The longitudinal studies, comparison analysis with other nations, and the incorporation of broader socio-cultural and psychological characteristics can add more insights on the occurrence of brain drain.

Conflict of Interest

The authors have no conflict of interest while preparing this article.

References

Adams, R. (2003). International migration, remittances, and the brain drain: A study of 24 labor-exporting countries. *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper*.

Beine, M., Docquier, F., & Rapoport, H. (2001). Brain drain and economic growth: Theory and evidence. *Journal of Development Economics*, *64*(1), 275-289.

Beine, M., Docquier, F., & Rapoport, H. (2008). Brain drain and human capital formation in developing countries: Winners and losers. *The Economic Journal*, *118*(4), 631-652. https://www.jstor.org/stable/20108815

Beine, M., Docquier, F., & Schiff, M. (2013). International migration, transfer of norms and home country fertility. *The Canadian Journal of*

Economics/Revue canadienne d'Economique, *46*(4), 1406-1430

Bloom, N., & Reenen, J. V. (2010). Why do management practices differ across firms and countries? *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, *24*, 203-224.

Cakir, S., & Demirag, S. (2025). Factors influencing brain drain: perspectives from a medical school in Turkey. *Medical Journal of Clinical Trials & Case Studies, 9*(1), 1-9. https://doi.org/10.23880/mjccs-16000391

Chen, F., Wong, Z.W., & Law, S.H. (2023). Brain drain: what is the role of institutions? *Journal of Industrial and Business Economics, 51*, 605 - 628.

Dahal, A. (2023). Brain drain in Nepal: Causes, consequences, and solutions. *Nepal Database*. https://www.nepaldatabase.com/brain-drain-in-nepal-causes-consequences-and-solutions

Dangol, S., & Mishra, R. (2024). Patient characteristics on satisfaction with healthcare quality in a teaching hospital in Nepal. *Baneshwor Campus Journal of Academia*, 121-132. https://doi.org/10.3126/bcja.v3i1.65632

Docquier, F., & Marfouk, A. (2006). International migration by education attainment (1990-2000). *International Migration, Remittances and the Brain Drain*.

Docquier, F., & Rapoport, H. (2012). Globalization, brain drain, and development. *Journal of Economic Literature*, *50*(3), 681-730.

Dodani, S., & LaPorte, R. E. (2005). Brain drain from developing countries: How can brain drain be converted into wisdom gain? *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*, *98*(11), 487-491.

Dreher, A., Gaston, N., & Martens, P. (2008). Measuring globalization – Gauging its consequences. *World Development*, *37*(1), 162-174.

Dreher, A., Kotsogiannis, C., & McCorriston, S. (2007). Corruption around the world: Evidence from a structural model. *Journal of Comparative Economics*, *35*(3), 443-466.

Dynarski, S. M. (2000). Hope for whom? Financial aid for the *National Tax Journal*, *53*(3), 629-662.

Faini, R. (2003). Is the brain drain an unmitigated blessing? *WIDER Discussion Paper No. 2003/64*. WIDER (World Institute for Development Economic Research).

Ghanbhari-Jahromi, M., & Marzaleh, M.A. (2024). Factors affecting brain drain and a solution to reduce it in Iran's health system: a qualitative study. Archives of Iranian Medicine, 27(8), 427-438. https://doi.org/10.34172/aim.28863

Gheasi, M., & Nijkamp, P. (2017). A brief overview of international migration motives and impacts, with specific reference to FDI. *Economics, 5*(3), 1-11. https://doi.org/10.3390/economies5030031

Gyanwali, G.P., & Bashyal, K. (2025). Brain-Drain: Challenges and Opportunities in Nepal. *SS Multidisciplinary Research Journal, 2(*1), 17-45). https://doi.org/10.3126/ssmrj.v2i1.86628

Hall, P. (2005). Brain drain and brain gain: Causes, consequences and policy. *International Journal of Social Economics*, *32*(11), 939-950.

Hanushek, E. A., & Kimko, D. D. (2000). Schooling, labor-force quality, and the growth of nations. *American Economic Review*, *90*(5), 1184-1208.

Hanushek, E. A., & Woessmann, L. (2008). The role of cognitive skills in economic development. *Journal of Economic Literature*, *46*(3), 607-668.

Hashish, E.A., & Ashour, H.M. (2020). Determinants and mitigating factors of the brain-drain among Egyptian nurses: a mixed-method study. *Journal of Research in Nursing,* 1-21. https://doi.org/10.1177/1744987120940381

Ighoshemu, B. O., & Ogidiagba, U. B. (2022). Poor governance and massive unemployment in Nigeria: as causes of brain-drain in the Buhari administration. *Insights into Regional Development, 4*(2), 73-84. https://doi.org/10.9770/ird.2022.4.2(6)

Kaufmann, D., Kraay, A., & Mastruzzi, M. (2010). The worldwide governance indicators: Methodology and analytical issues.

Kaur, J., Singh, J., & Kandekar, S. (2025). Brain-gain or brain-drain? Rethinking educational migration from Punjab, India. *Lex Localis-Jouranl of Local Self-government, 23*(6), 23-31. https://doi.org/10.52152/801743

Kousar, S., Ahmed, F., & Bukhari, A. A. (2020). Macroeconomic determinants of brain drain in the era of globalization: evidence from Pakistan. *Liberal Arts and Social Sciences International Journal, 4*(2), 24-41.

Kraay, A., Zoido-Lobaton, P., & Kaufmann, D. (2013). Governance matters. *World Bank*.

Kumar, R. (2023). Push factors driving Nepali out. *Nepali Times*. https://nepalitimes.com/news/push-factors-driving-nepalis-out

Levy, F., & Murnane, R. (2012). Dancing with robots: Human skills for computerized work. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*.

Li, Q., An, L., & Zhang, R. (2023). Corruption drives brain-drain: Cross-country evidence from machine learning. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4372122

Maharjan, K. (2022). The immeasurable cost of brain-drain in Nepal and possible measures to mitigate it. *Online Khabar*. https://english.onlinekhabar.com/cost-of-brain-drain-in-nepal-people.html

Mijar, M., & Giri, B. (2025). Framing social inclusion in Nepal's bureaucracy: A critical discourse analysis. *NPRC Journal of Multidisciplinary Research, 2*(6), 121–142. https://doi.org/10.3126/nprcjmr.v2i6.80878

Mishra, A. K. (2023). Anatomy of brain-drain: A painful reality. *International Research Journal of Parroha Multiple Campus (IRJPMC), 2*(1), 1-12. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10251093

Muthanna, A. (2015). Quality education improvement: Yamen and the problem of the brain drain. Policy in Future Education, *13*(1). 141-148. https://doi.org/10.1177/1478210314566734

Nepal Database Writer (2023). *Brain Drain in Nepal: Causes, Consequences, and Solutions.*

Ngoma, A. L., & Ismail, N. W. (2013). The determinants of brain drain in developing countries. *International Journal of Social Economics*, *40*(8), 744-754.

Nunnally, J.C. (1978). *Psychometric Theory*, New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Ogaboh, A. A. (2020). Why brain drain in the Nigerian health sector? *Asian Journal of Applied Sciences*, *8*. https://ajouronline.com/index.php/AJAS/article/view/5990

Panagiotakopoulos, A. (2020). Investigating the factors affecting brain drain in Greece: looking beyond the obvious. *World Journal of Entrepreneurship, Management and Sustainable Development, 16*(3), 207-218. https://doi.org/10.1108/WJEMSD-10-2019-0076

Piketty, T. (2014). *Capital in the twenty-first century*. Harvard University Press.

Psacharopoulos, G., & Patrinos, H. A. (2004). Returns to investment in education: A further update. *Education Economics*, *12*(2), 111-134.

Roudgar, I., & Richards, C. (2015). The policy challenge of the global brain drain: addressing the dilemmas of contributing push-pull factors. *International Journal of Public Policy, 11*(1-3), 73-85. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJPP.2015.068841

Sanaullah, A., & Iftikhar, H. (2025). Migration and "Brain Drain" from Pakistan: A Barrier to Sustainable Development. *Social Science Review Archives*, *4*(1), 994–1001. https://doi.org/10.70670/sra.v4i1.1617

Shilpakar, N., Giri, B., & Pokhrel, S. K. (2024). Flexible working arrangements and employee turnover intention: Mediating role of employee engagement. *SAIM Journal of Social Science and Technology, 1*(1), 27–39. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13576403

Singh, R. (2007). Brain drain: Nepal's major problem. *The Himalayan Times*.

Spitz-Oener, A. (2006). Technical change, job tasks, and rising educational demands: Looking outside the wage structure. *Journal of Labour Economics*, *24*(2), 235-270.

Svenson, J. (2005). Eight questions about corruption. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, *19*(3), 19-42. https://pubs.aeaweb.org/doi/pdfplus/10.1257/089533005774357860

Tansel, A., & Gungor, N. D. (2003). Brain drain from Turkey: Survey evidence of student non-return. *Career Development International*, *8*(2), 52-69.

Tessema, M. T. (2010). Causes, challenges and prospects of brain drain: The case of Eritrea. *International Migration*.

United Nations Economic and Social Council (2015). Occupational wage inequality: Theory, evidence, and policy implications.

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (2019). *Education for All 2000-2015: Achievements and challenges*.

United Nations. (2017). *International migration report*. Department of Economic and Social Affairs.

Upadhyay, D. J. (2017). Brain drain of Nepalese students. *International Journal of Management*, *8*(1), 180-187.

Vega-Munoz, A., Mino, P.G., & Contreras-Barraza, N. (2025). The role of brain drain and the role of citizenship in skilled migration. *Social Sciences, 14*(3), 1-21). https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci14030132

Wosyanju, M.G., Kindiki, J., & Kalai, J. (2012). Impact of brain drain on the quality of education in Moi University, Kenya. *Journal of Emerging Trends in Educational Research and Policy Studies, 3,* 241-246.