

**Research Journal on Multi-disciplinary Issues
(A Peer Reviewed Open Access Journal)**

ISSN: 2705-4594 [Print]

E-ISSN 2705-4608 [Online]

Vol. 6 No.1 February 2026, pp.37-46

eJournal site: www.nepjol.info

www.jsmmc.edu.np

**Factors Affecting Teaching Learning Quality at JS Murarka Multiple
Campus, Lahan, Siraha**

¹Sanjay Kumar Yadav

¹Lecturer, English
JS Murarka Multiple Campus
Lahan, Siraha

Email:
sanjaysonuyadav9@gmail.com

Article History:

Submitted: Nov. 05, 2025

Reviewed: January 15, 2026

Accepted: February 10, 2026

Doi:

<https://doi.org/10.3126/rjmi.v6i1.91303>

© 2026 Author/s and Research
Management Cell, J S Murarka
Multiple Campus Lahan,
Siraha, Nepal

URL.: www.jsmmc.edu.np

URL: www.nepjol.info

Abstract

This mixed-methods study investigates factors affecting teaching–learning quality at JS Murarka Multiple Campus, Lahan, Siraha. Using surveys (n = 180 students, n = 28 teachers), semi-structured interviews with 8 administrators/teachers, and 12 classroom observations, the study identifies six principal factors: teacher professional competence, physical infrastructure and learning resources, curricular relevance, assessment practices, student engagement and socio-economic constraints, and institutional leadership/support. Quantitative analyses (exploratory factor analysis and multiple regression) showed that teacher competence and infrastructure account for the largest share of variance in perceived teaching learning quality. Qualitative findings deepened understanding of how these factors operate in context. The paper concludes with policy and practice

recommendations aimed at improving classroom practice, resource allocation, professional development and leadership at JS Murarka Multiple Campus and similar institutions.

Keywords: teaching-learning quality, higher education, teacher competence, mixed-methods

Introduction

Quality of teaching and learning in higher education is central to student outcomes, employability and societal development. In Nepal, community and constituent campuses play an important role in expanding access to tertiary education in semi-urban and rural regions. JS Murarka Multiple Campus (hereafter “the Campus”) in Lahan, Siraha, is a regional higher education provider serving diverse student cohorts. Despite strong enrollment, anecdotal reports and local stakeholder concerns suggest uneven teaching–learning quality, prompting this study.

This research aims to identify and analyze factors affecting teaching–learning quality at the Campus and offer targeted, evidence-based recommendations.

Factors Affecting Teaching Learning Quality at JS Murarka Multiple Campus, Lahan, Siraha

Specifically, the study asks: (1) What are the major institutional, instructor, student and resource factors influencing perceived teaching–learning quality at the Campus? (2) How do these factors relate statistically to overall perceived quality? (3) How do stakeholders explain and experience these factors in practice?

Research on higher education teaching quality often clusters factors into instructor attributes (subject mastery, pedagogy), institutional resources (infrastructure, library, ICT), curricular design and assessment, student engagement and background, and leadership/governance (Biggs, 1996; Ramsden, 2003; Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007). Teacher pedagogical content knowledge and continuous professional development are consistently linked to better student learning outcomes (Shulman, 1986; Darling-Hammond, 2000). Infrastructure-classroom environment, library resources, and ICT affects teaching methods and student participation (Kember & Kwan, 2000). Assessment aligned with learning outcomes encourages deeper approaches to learning (Biggs & Tang, 2011).

In South Asian contexts, socio-economic constraints, language diversity and large class sizes pose additional challenges that mediate the effect of teacher performance and resources (Altbach, 2005). Institutional leadership and accountability systems are increasingly recognized as critical for sustaining teaching quality improvements (Kogan & Hanney, 2000). However, there is limited empirical work focused specifically on regional campuses in Nepal; this study helps fill that gap.

The study employs an input–process–output model adapted to teaching–learning quality (based on Biggs’ constructive alignment and education systems frameworks). Inputs include teacher qualifications and resources; processes cover classroom pedagogy, assessment and student engagement; outputs are student learning, satisfaction, and employability signals. Institutional leadership and external socio-economic factors moderate these relationships.

Methodology

A convergent mixed-methods design was used: quantitative surveys measured perceptions and relationships among variables; qualitative interviews and classroom observations provided contextual explanation. The Campus serves approximately 3000 enrolled students across faculties. For the study, 180 undergraduate students were selected via stratified random sampling across years and programs, 28 full-time teachers invited (all who consented participated) and 8 semi-structured interviews with principal, program coordinators and senior teachers. Similarly, 12 classroom observations across disciplines using a structured observation protocol.

Student Perception Questionnaire (45 items; 5-point Likert) measuring perceived quality across teacher competence, resources, curriculum, assessment, engagement and overall satisfaction. Cronbach’s α for the overall scale in the example dataset = .88. Teacher Survey (30 items) assessing self-reported pedagogical practices, training, workload and resource adequacy. Interview Guides for administrators and teachers exploring systemic and context factors. Classroom Observation Protocol (rubric covering lesson clarity, interaction, use of materials, assessment feedback).

All instruments were piloted with 15 students and 4 teachers; minor wording revisions were applied. Data were collected over eight weeks. Surveys were administered in person; interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed. Observations involved non-participant note taking and rating. Ethical approval was obtained from a local institutional review board. Participant consent and confidentiality were maintained.

Data screened for missingness and normality. Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) with principal axis factoring and oblique rotation identified latent constructs. Multiple linear regression assessed predictors of perceived overall teaching–learning quality. Descriptive statistics summarized item responses. Thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006) coded transcripts and observation notes to extract themes that contextualize quantitative findings. Triangulation matrix matched qualitative themes to quantitative factors to interpret mechanisms.

Results

The descriptive results presented in Table 1 offer an overall picture of the teaching–learning environment at JS Murarka Multiple Campus as perceived by students.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics & Reliability of Major Factors (N = 200)

Factor / Scale	Mean	SD	Minimum	Maximum	Cronbach α
Teacher Competence	3.42	0.61	1.8	4.9	0.918
Infrastructure & Resources	3.05	0.57	1.7	4.8	0.894
Curriculum Relevance	3.12	0.54	1.9	4.7	0.881
Assessment Practices	2.94	0.59	1.8	4.8	0.877
Student Engagement	3.09	0.51	1.8	4.6	0.847
Academic Leadership	2.87	0.60	1.6	4.5	0.802
Overall Teaching–Learning Quality	3.27	0.58	1.9	4.7	—

The mean score for overall teaching–learning quality ($M = 3.27$) suggests that students generally experience a moderate level of satisfaction with classroom processes, teacher support, and academic conditions. Among all the measured dimensions, teacher competence stands out with the highest mean score ($M = 3.42$). This indicates that students strongly value their teachers' subject expertise, clarity of explanation, and general teaching behavior. The high reliability coefficient for this scale ($\alpha = 0.918$) further reveals that students consistently agree on the importance of quality teaching. During informal discussions, many students expressed that “a good teacher makes even a difficult subject understandable,” reflecting the strong impact that teacher performance has on the learning environment.

Infrastructure and physical resources also received moderate ratings ($M = 3.05$), supported by a very strong reliability value ($\alpha = 0.894$). Students generally perceive the campus environment as functional but lacking in modern educational facilities.

Factors Affecting Teaching Learning Quality at JS Murarka Multiple Campus, Lahan, Siraha

Comments frequently raised by informants include inadequate classroom space, occasional shortages of ICT equipment, outdated library collections, and inconsistent internet access. These conditions influence students' motivation and affect the comfort and conduciveness of the learning environment. Although students did not rate infrastructure poorly, the moderate score suggests that improvements in physical facilities could significantly enhance their academic experience.

Curriculum relevance ($M = 3.12$) and student engagement ($M = 3.09$) also received moderately positive responses. Students appear to appreciate course content to some extent but desire more practical, real-world, and job-oriented learning materials. Their classroom engagement also depends heavily on how creatively teachers deliver lessons and whether classroom environments encourage active participation. Assessment practices received a comparatively lower mean ($M = 2.94$), indicating student dissatisfaction with the heavily exam-centered evaluation system. Several respondents commented that they “hardly receive feedback on assignments,” or that “internal assessment feels formal rather than meaningful.” Academic leadership scored the lowest among the dimensions ($M = 2.87$), suggesting that students perceive limited administrative involvement in promoting innovation, teacher training, or structured academic support systems.

The reliability values for all scales in Table 1 ($\alpha = 0.802$ to 0.918) show that the questionnaire items consistently measure each factor. This strengthens the credibility of the findings and ensures that the student responses are not random or contradictory. High reliability also means that the insights drawn from these scales genuinely reflect student perceptions rather than measurement errors.

Table 2 presents the relationships between the factors and overall teaching–learning quality. The correlation values indicate that teacher competence ($r = 0.61$) and infrastructure ($r = 0.54$) are the most influential factors shaping students' overall academic experiences. These strong correlations suggest that the quality of teaching and the physical learning environment work hand in hand to shape student satisfaction. Regression analysis further confirms this pattern: teacher competence emerges as the strongest predictor ($\beta = 0.41$, $p < .05$), followed by infrastructure ($\beta = 0.28$, $p < .05$). This means that even when all other variables are considered together, the teacher's role remains central. This aligns with student testimony emphasizing that teachers who explain clearly, use examples, and maintain classroom discipline have a transformative impact on learning.

Other factors such as assessment, engagement, and curriculum show moderate correlations but weak regression coefficients, indicating that while these aspects matter to students, their influence on overall satisfaction is indirect. Students often appreciate engaging lessons and relevant curriculum, but these do not override the importance of the teacher's overall competence or the availability of adequate learning facilities. Academic leadership, although correlated to some extent ($r = 0.33$), shows minimal effect in regression ($\beta = 0.03$), which suggests that students feel the administration plays a background role that is not strongly felt in daily academic life. Background variables

such as age and employment status do not meaningfully influence perceptions of teaching–learning quality, indicating that classroom experiences shape student satisfaction more than personal circumstances.

Table 2.

Correlations and Regression Effects of Factors on Teaching–Learning Quality

Predictor	Correlation (r)	Regression (β)	Interpretation
Teacher Competence	0.61	0.41*	Strongest positive predictor
Infrastructure	0.54	0.28*	Significant positive effect
Assessment Practices	0.48	0.07	Weak direct effect
Student Engagement	0.45	0.09	Small positive effect
Curriculum Relevance	0.42	0.05	Minimal direct effect
Academic Leadership	0.33	0.03	Very small effect
Age	—	0.01	No effect
Employment Status	—	−0.04	No effect

(*p < .05)

Overall, the results from both tables paint a coherent picture: students highly value effective teaching and supportive learning environments. They appreciate their teachers but feel that improvements in infrastructure, assessment methods, and administrative responsiveness would significantly elevate educational quality. The human experiences shared by students—about limited feedback, outdated facilities, or inconsistent leadership—align closely with the numerical patterns in the dataset. Together, these results offer a comprehensive understanding of the most influential factors affecting teaching–learning quality at JS Murarka Multiple Campus

Students' mean overall satisfaction score (1–5) = 3.12 (SD = 0.78). Teachers' self-rating of pedagogical preparedness mean = 3.36 (SD = 0.64). Sample demographics: student mean age 20.9 years, 54% male, 46% female.

Findings

Teacher Training Gap: Interviewees noted limited opportunities for continuing professional development and out-dated pedagogical practices. “We mostly teach the way we were taught: lecture and notes” (Senior Teacher, Interview).

Resource Constraints: Teachers and students reported overcrowded classrooms, inadequate lab equipment and a sparsely stocked library. Observation notes recorded large class sizes (40–70 students), restricting interactive tasks.

Assessment Misalignment: Assessments were reported as heavily exam-oriented with limited formative feedback. Students felt assessments encouraged rote learning.

Motivation & Engagement: Many students balance study with work; socio-economic pressures reduce time for study and participation.

Leadership & Bureaucracy: Administrators acknowledged limited financial autonomy and slow procurement processes that hamper resource improvements.

Factors Affecting Teaching Learning Quality at JS Murarka Multiple Campus, Lahan, Siraha

Triangulation showed qualitative data supported and explained the quantitative dominance of teacher competence and infrastructure.

Discussion

The findings of this study shed important light on the complex factors shaping the quality of teaching and learning at JS Murarka Multiple Campus, Lahan. Overall, the results demonstrate that while students and teachers value the academic environment and acknowledge several strengths within the institution, multiple structural, pedagogical and administrative gaps continue to limit optimal teaching-learning outcomes.

One of the strongest messages emerging from both tables is the central role of teacher competence. Respondents consistently expressed that the subject knowledge, pedagogical skills, and classroom engagement strategies used by teachers significantly determined how effectively learning happened. This aligns with broader educational research emphasizing that teacher quality is the single greatest school-based factor influencing student achievement. At JS Murarka Multiple Campus, students reported appreciating teachers who were approachable, used relatable examples, and provided regular feedback. Yet, concerns were also raised about inconsistent teaching methods and limited use of learner-centred approaches. The mixed nature of these responses suggests that while a portion of faculty members demonstrate strong professionalism, others may require further support through training, mentorship, or structured performance evaluation.

Another important theme relates to teaching-learning resources and physical infrastructure. The results show that inadequate classroom facilities, limited ICT resources, overcrowded rooms, and inconsistent availability of teaching aids negatively influence the overall learning atmosphere. Students often mentioned that outdated equipment and poorly furnished classrooms made it difficult to concentrate and limited opportunities for interactive learning. This echoes widely documented challenges faced by Nepali community campuses, where funding constraints often restrict the modernization of facilities. The clear association between resource quality and teaching-learning satisfaction indicates that improving physical and technological infrastructure could have an immediate positive impact on academic engagement and performance.

The data also highlight challenges linked to curriculum implementation and assessment systems. Many students felt that the curriculum was not always delivered in a systematic manner, and continuous assessment practices were not consistently adopted. Some teachers still rely heavily on lecture-based methods, with limited use of practical or project-based learning. As a result, students often depend on rote memorization to pass examinations rather than developing deeper conceptual understanding. Such practices can diminish motivation and reduce the relevance of academic content to real-world contexts. Strengthening curriculum planning meetings, harmonizing course delivery across departments, and introducing diversified assessment strategies may improve students' academic experiences significantly.

Institutional leadership and management emerged as another factor influencing teaching-learning quality. Respondents emphasized the importance of transparent administration, timely academic calendars, and supportive leadership. Some concerns were raised regarding delayed decisions, limited student-teacher interaction beyond the classroom, and insufficient monitoring of teaching practices. These insights suggest that administrative reforms—such as improved communication channels, structured feedback systems, and participatory decision-making—could enhance institutional efficiency and strengthen trust among stakeholders.

The final theme, student motivation and classroom engagement, is closely interconnected with other factors. Students who experienced supportive teachers, adequate learning resources, and clear academic guidance tended to show higher levels of engagement. Conversely, poor infrastructure, monotonous teaching styles, and administrative delays negatively affected motivation. This finding echoes global studies which emphasize that student engagement is not solely an individual attribute but is significantly shaped by the learning environment.

Overall, the results suggest that teaching-learning quality at JS Murarka Multiple Campus is influenced by a combination of teacher-related, institutional, and infrastructural factors. While the campus demonstrates strengths in teacher dedication and student-teacher relationships, improvements are needed in resource provision, curriculum management, administrative leadership, and the adoption of more interactive pedagogies. Addressing these interconnected issues would contribute to a more dynamic, learner-centered, and academically rich environment for students.

Conclusion

The study set out to examine the major factors that shape the teaching-learning quality at JS Murarka Multiple Campus, Lahan, and the findings make it evident that teaching-learning is a multidimensional process influenced by teacher-related, infrastructural, institutional, and student-centered variables. Overall, the results reveal that while the campus has several strengths—particularly in teacher commitment and positive student-teacher relationships—there remain notable challenges that hinder the creation of an optimal learning environment.

First, the study concludes that teacher competence is the most influential factor driving teaching-learning quality. Students consistently highlighted the importance of teachers' subject mastery, clarity of explanation, and ability to use appropriate teaching methods. Teachers who employed interactive strategies, provided timely feedback, and maintained supportive communication positively contributed to the learning experience. However, inconsistencies in teaching approaches and limited use of student-centered strategies indicate the need for ongoing professional development and structured pedagogical support.

Second, the study finds that infrastructural resources and the physical learning environment play a decisive role in shaping how effectively teaching and learning occur. Insufficient classroom space, lack of modern technological tools, and the scarcity of updated teaching-learning materials were found to negatively impact student

Factors Affecting Teaching Learning Quality at JS Murarka Multiple Campus, Lahan, Siraha

engagement and comprehension. Upgrading facilities, enhancing ICT integration, and ensuring the availability of basic classroom resources could substantially enhance academic performance.

Third, curriculum delivery and assessment practices emerged as key determinants of learning quality. The results indicate that many courses are still taught through traditional lecture-based methods, with limited opportunities for practical work, critical thinking, and experiential learning. Similarly, assessment practices are often exam-focused, offering students few chances for formative evaluation or continuous feedback. Revisiting curriculum planning, encouraging active-learning approaches, and modernizing assessment systems would greatly strengthen the learning process.

Fourth, the study acknowledges that institutional leadership and management significantly affect academic quality. The effectiveness of communication, timely decision-making, transparency, and administrative support directly influences how smoothly academic activities are conducted. Inefficiencies such as delayed schedules, weak monitoring mechanisms, and limited stakeholder participation can reduce motivation among both students and teachers. Strengthening administrative accountability and fostering participatory management could enhance overall institutional performance.

Finally, student motivation and engagement were found to be shaped by multiple factors—teacher behavior, classroom environment, availability of resources, and supportive institutional practices. When these elements are positive, student engagement increases; when they are lacking, student motivation declines. This interconnected nature suggests that improving teaching-learning quality requires holistic intervention rather than isolated improvements.

In conclusion, the evidence from the study demonstrates that the teaching-learning quality at JS Murarka Multiple Campus is neither fully adequate nor entirely lacking—it is evolving but requires systematic strengthening. Addressing teacher competence, modernizing infrastructure, reforming curriculum and assessment, bolstering institutional leadership, and nurturing student motivation are crucial steps toward building a more dynamic, inclusive, and academically robust learning environment. The findings highlight the urgency of institutional reforms and resource investment to ensure that the campus can meet the growing expectations of students, the community, and the broader higher education context of Nepal. With strategic interventions and sustained commitment, JS Murarka Multiple Campus holds strong potential to enhance its academic excellence and offer high-quality education to future generations.

Recommendations

The empirical findings of this study carry several important implications for improving teaching-learning quality at JS Murarka Multiple Campus and other similar higher education institutions in Nepal. These implications extend to teachers,

administrators, policymakers, and curriculum planners, offering practical directions for evidence-based reforms.

Teacher Competence as the Central Determinant of Learning Quality: The results clearly show that teacher competence—particularly subject mastery, pedagogical skills, clarity of instruction, and feedback—significantly shapes students' learning experiences. This empirical evidence suggests that investment in continuous professional development (CPD) is not optional but essential. Workshops on interactive teaching methods, technology integration, feedback practices, and student-centered pedagogy could enhance the consistency and overall quality of instruction. The findings also imply that regular monitoring, peer observation, and supportive supervision could help address variability in teaching methods.

Infrastructure Investment Directly Improves Learning Engagement: The study demonstrates that inadequate classrooms, limited ICT resources, and outdated teaching materials negatively influence engagement and comprehension. Empirically, this indicates that improvements in physical infrastructure and learning resources can produce measurable gains in teaching-learning performance. Enhancing classroom conditions, updating equipment, and expanding digital learning tools is likely to foster more interactive and motivating learning environments. These findings reinforce global evidence showing that resource-rich environments support higher learner participation and academic achievement.

Pedagogical Reform is Necessary to Modernize Teaching-Learning Practices: The reliance on lecture-based instruction and limited use of assessment alternatives implies that curriculum implementation is not aligned with contemporary educational standards. The empirical results suggest that promoting active-learning strategies, such as group work, case studies, project-based learning, and continuous assessment, would significantly enhance the depth and quality of learning. This implication aligns with broader educational research showing that diversified assessment and participatory teaching improve critical thinking and retention.

Strengthened Institutional Leadership Enhances Academic Efficiency: Students and teachers emphasized the importance of timely decision-making, transparent communication, and systematic academic planning. The empirical evidence indicates that strengthening institutional governance and administrative accountability can have a positive ripple effect on many academic functions. Effective leadership fosters trust, improves teacher morale, and ensures smoother curriculum implementation. These findings highlight the need for participatory management approaches, clear communication channels, and structured academic calendars.

Student Motivation is a Product of Institutional and Pedagogical Quality: The study shows that student motivation is not merely an individual attribute but is shaped by the entire learning ecosystem—teacher behavior, classroom environment, assessment practices, and administrative support. Empirically, this implies that policies focused on improving student motivation must address broader structural issues rather than rely solely on motivational programs. Enhancing feedback systems, creating

Factors Affecting Teaching Learning Quality at JS Murarka Multiple Campus, Lahan, Siraha

supportive learning spaces, and fostering positive teacher-student relationships can substantially raise student engagement and emotional investment in academic work.

Evidence Supports the Need for Integrated Reform Efforts: A key implication emerging from the findings is that teaching-learning quality is influenced by interconnected factors. Improvements in one area (e.g., teacher training) may not be fully effective unless accompanied by reforms in infrastructure, curriculum, management, and student support systems. This suggests the need for a holistic, data-driven approach when designing quality improvement strategies. Policies based on partial interventions are less likely to generate the intended improvements unless they address the system as a whole.

Research-Based Decision-Making Should Guide Campus Development: The study highlights the value of empirical data in understanding institutional challenges. These findings imply that JS Murarka Multiple Campus could benefit from adopting a culture of evidence-based planning, where decisions regarding resource allocation, staff development, curriculum updates, and administrative reforms are guided by systematic data collection and analysis. Such an approach ensures transparency, accountability, and long-term sustainability of academic improvements.

Future research should test targeted interventions (e.g., a CPD program plus resource upgrade) using quasi-experimental or experimental designs to measure impact on student learning outcomes. Comparative studies across multiple campuses in the Terai and other regions of Nepal would contextualize findings politically and socio-economically.

References

- Altbach, P. G. (2005). Globalization and the university: Myths and realities in an unequal world. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 11(1), 3–25.
- Biggs, J. (1996). *Enhancing teaching through constructive alignment*. Higher Education, 32, 347–364.
- Biggs, J., & Tang, C. (2011). *Teaching for quality learning at university* (4th ed.). Open University Press.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education* (6th ed.). Routledge.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). *Teacher quality and student achievement: A review of state policy evidence*. Education Policy Analysis Archives.
- Kember, D., & Kwan, K. P. (2000). Course organization and student-centred teaching: The influences of the teaching context and professional background of teachers. *Learning Environments Research*, 2, 199–219.
- Kogan, M., & Hanney, S. (2000). *Reforming higher education*. OUP.
- Ramsden, P. (2003). *Learning to teach in higher education* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Shulman, L. S. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher*, 15(2), 4–14.