GYANBODH

ISSN:3048-9792
Volume: 2
Issue: 3
May-June:2025

Analyzing the Reasons for Declining Student Interest in Education

[1]Dr. Sanjay Christian; [2]Ms. Khushi Kansara; [3]Ms. Nishi Dharu

[1] Assistant Professor

[2,3]Research Assistant

[1,2,3]JG Institute of Business Administration, Ahmedabad

(Affiliated to Gujarat University)

[1]christian.statistics@gmail.com

Abstract

The present study explores the growing trend among college students of not sharing details about their academic performance, friendships, and daily activities with their parents. Using a structured questionnaire, data was collected from a sample of undergraduate students across various disciplines. The study aims to understand the underlying reasons for this behavior, the influence of peer groups and social media, and the role of parental expectations and communication patterns. The research employs both quantitative and qualitative methods to analyze the data and draws insights into how modern student-parent relationships are evolving. Data analysis was conducted using SPSS software, applying ANOVA and Chi-square tests to examine significant patterns and relationships. The findings indicate a significant communication gap influenced by changing societal norms, increased digital engagement, and generational differences in values and expectations. Recommendations are offered for fostering healthier communication and trust between students and their parents.

Keywords: *College students, parent-child communication, academic disclosure, peer influence, social media, generational gap, student behavior, family dynamics, youth psychology.*

Introduction

The Role of Education in Personal and Societal Growth: Education is a cornerstone of both individual and societal development. Personally, it cultivates essential skills, critical thinking, confidence, and lifelong learning. Socially, education builds a skilled workforce, promotes equality, reduces crime, and fosters civic responsibility and cultural tolerance.

Student Interest and Engagement in Education: Student interest—driven by relevance, supportive environments, engaging curricula, and external factors—plays a vital role in academic success. Engagement includes emotional, cognitive, and behavioral investment in learning activities and

GYANBODH
ISSN:3048-9792
Volume: 2
Issue: 3
May-June:2025

social relationships within the educational setting. Key components such as real-world application, interactive methods, technology use, and strong teacher-student bonds significantly enhance engagement.

Impact of Interest on Academic Outcomes: When students are interested, they demonstrate deeper focus, improved retention, and greater motivation, often resulting in higher academic performance and resilience.

Concerns About Declining Interest: Recent trends highlight reduced student interest, evident through absenteeism, low grades, disengagement, and higher dropout rates. Behavioral issues and surveys point to a disconnect between education and student aspirations, suggesting a growing need to realign educational approaches with student needs.

Literature Review

Scott (1986) highlighted a decline in academic standards among students and faculty, attributing it to external pressures and a shift from theoretical learning to a more practical, job-focused approach. Using a qualitative and critique-based method, the author analyzed literature to assess changes in reading comprehension and literacy without applying statistical techniques. **Trout (1997)** examined student disengagement through qualitative observations, noting that many college students showed reduced participation and motivation. These students often expected high grades for minimal effort, avoided rigorous coursework, and showed resentment toward academic demands. **Vedder-Weiss and Fortus (2010)** explored student motivation in science among 5th to 8th graders in Israel. Through Likert-scale questionnaires, they found that students in traditional schools showed a marked decline in motivation, while those in democratic schools maintained higher engagement. This suggested school culture significantly impacts student motivation during adolescence. **Laad (2011)** used non-probability sampling to study the declining interest in Physics among Indian students. Key factors identified included poor prior education, outdated syllabi, underqualified teachers, and a perception that Physics offers limited career prospects, especially in rural areas. **Deeba (2012)** reported that negative attitudes toward science contributed to declining interest, while Lyons emphasized the importance of teaching methods. Martin highlighted motivation as a key factor, and Squire, Jenkins, Kirriemuir, and McFarlane suggested digital games could enhance engagement and learning outcomes in science education. **Oon and Subramaniam (2013)** analyzed the perspectives of 190 secondary and junior college Physics teachers in Singapore. Their findings emphasized the importance of hands-on activities and co-curricular programs in sustaining student interest. The study

GYANBODH
ISSN:3048-9792
Volume: 2
Issue: 3
May-June:2025

also noted a lack of Asian-focused research in this domain. **Wijsman et al. (2015)** supported the significance of school culture, showing that students in democratic schools maintained interest in science, whereas those in traditional schools showed a motivational decline from basic to middle school. **Akram, Ijaz, and Ikram (2017)** used stratified random sampling and statistical tools (mean, standard deviation, correlation, t-test, ANOVA) to identify reasons for declining interest in chemistry among 9th and 10th-grade students in Lahore. Findings revealed students enjoyed experiments but lacked enthusiasm for chemistry careers due to limited awareness, ineffective teaching, and career-related misconceptions. **Rone et al. (2023)** conducted a descriptive qualitative study in San Mariano Elementary School using purposive sampling. They found students preferred socializing over classroom engagement, and teachers struggled to maintain motivation due to time and resource limitations.

Research Gaps Identified from the Reviewed Research Paper

Scott (1986) and Trout (1997) analyze student disengagement and declining performance qualitatively but do not use statistical techniques or empirical validation. **More quantitative research is needed to measure the extent and causes of these trends.** Vedder-Weiss & Fortus (2010) emphasize school culture over home influence in shaping students' motivation but do not explore how parental expectations impact student engagement. **A deeper study on parental influence in different educational settings is needed.** Many studies (Vedder-Weiss & Fortus, 2010; Wijsman et al., 2015; Akram et al., 2017) focus on school students (grades 5-12), **but fewer examine why motivation declines at the university level.** While studies like Laad (2011) and Akram et al. (2017) discuss declining interest in Physics and Chemistry at the school level, **research is lacking on why students in higher education choose to avoid certain subjects**, especially in STEM fields. Oon & Subramaniam (2013) highlight that most research on student disengagement in science comes from Western contexts. More studies focusing on Asian higher education institutions would provide a diverse perspective. Deeba (2012) and other researchers suggest that digital games can improve student engagement, but most studies focus on school-level education. **Further research is needed to explore how digital learning tools impact motivation and engagement in higher education.** Rone et al. (2023) found that students prioritize socializing over studying in elementary schools, **but there is little research on how this trend affects university students' academic performance and career choices.**

Significance of the Study

GYANBODH
ISSN:3048-9792
Volume: 2
Issue: 3
May-June:2025

1. Helps understand why students are losing interest in education.
2. Provides ideas for improving teaching methods to make learning more engaging.
3. Assists policymakers in creating better education-related policies.
4. Examines the role of technology and its impact on students' learning.
5. Encourages a love for learning beyond formal education.
6. Highlights the influence of social, cultural, and family factors on education.

Objectives of the Study

1. To Assess the Role of Personal Motivation (Investigate how individual goals, career aspirations, and personal interests impact students' academic engagement.)
2. To Understand the Role of Social and Technological Distractions (Examine the influence of social media, peer pressure, and extracurricular activities on students' focus and prioritization of education.)
3. To Know Liberal Paper Checking and Passing Policies is one of the factors.
4. To Explore Institutional Impact (Analyze how teaching methods, faculty-student relationships, curriculum design, and infrastructure affect student interest in studies.)
5. To examine whether there is a significant difference in the motivation for pursuing education between male and female students.
6. To analyze whether there is a significant difference in academic preferences between undergraduate and postgraduate students.
7. To examine the association between gender and participation in extracurricular activities among students.
8. To examine the association between gender and the influence of college events or parties on students' choice of college or university.
9. To examine the association between gender and the amount of time spent daily on non-academic activities such as gaming and social media.
10. To examine the association between gender and the impact of technology distraction while studying.

Research Methodology

This study uses a descriptive and analytical design to examine factors affecting students' academic engagement—such as motivation, distractions, institutional impact, and grading policies—and explores gender-based differences in academic motivation and preferences.

GYANBODH
ISSN:3048-9792
Volume: 2
Issue: 3
May-June:2025

Data Sources:

- Secondary: Academic journals and published literature
- Primary: Surveys of college students on academic and social sharing behavior

A quantitative approach is adopted using a structured questionnaire with multiple-choice and Likert-scale items. Data is collected via Google Forms, distributed through email, social media, and college networks.

Sampling Design:

- Population: UG and PG students from various institutions
- Sample Size: 381
- Technique: Simple Random Sampling

Data Analysis:

- Descriptive: Charts, tables, percentages, and averages
- Inferential: ANOVA and Chi-Square tests with p-values to test hypotheses

Scope of the Study

1. The study explores why students pursue higher education, with a focus on career opportunities, personal growth, and enjoyment of practical subjects.
2. It examines how technology serves as both a tool and a distraction, affecting study habits, productivity, and academic performance.
3. The study evaluates student perceptions of grading leniency and its impact on academic seriousness, highlighting the need for stricter evaluation methods.
4. The effectiveness of current teaching methodologies and teacher approachability is assessed to determine areas for improvement in student engagement.
5. The study investigates variations in motivation levels between male and female students, identifying the need for targeted support programs.
6. It analyzes whether students' enjoyment of academics varies by their level of education, helping institutions refine their curriculum design.
7. The study assesses whether gender influences participation in extracurricular activities and whether institutions are providing equal opportunities.
8. It examines whether college events play a significant role in students' decisions to enroll, guiding resource allocation for event planning.

GYANBODH
ISSN:3048-9792
Volume: 2
Issue: 3
May-June:2025

9. The research explores how students balance academic and non-academic activities, with a focus on gender-based differences in time management.
10. The study highlights how male and female students are differently affected by technology distractions, leading to recommendations for better study environments and awareness programs.

Limitation of the Study

1. The research is limited to higher education students and will not cover primary or secondary school experiences, nor will it explore every possible factor affecting student engagement.
2. The study relies on survey responses, which may be influenced by students' personal biases, social desirability, or misinterpretation of questions.
3. While the study examines academic policies, technology, and institutional factors, other personal and socio-economic factors that could impact student engagement are not deeply explored.
4. The structured questionnaire with closed-ended and Likert scale-based questions restricts participants from providing detailed, qualitative insights.
5. As data collection is conducted online via Google Forms, students without stable internet access or those less engaged with digital platforms may be underrepresented.
6. The study primarily focuses on students' viewpoints, omitting insights from faculty and administrators who play a key role in shaping academic policies and engagement strategies.

Data Analysis & Interpretation

Demographic

Gender	Frequency	Percent
Female	205	53.8
Male	176	46.2
Total	**381**	**100**
Age Interval	**Frequency**	**Percent**
Under 18	33	8.7
18-22	281	73.8
23-27	45	11.8

GYANBODH
ISSN:3048-9792
Volume: 2
Issue: 3
May-June:2025

28 and above	22	5.8
Total	**381**	**100**
Level of Education	**Frequency**	**Percent**
Postgraduate	100	26.2
Undergraduate	281	73.8
Total	**381**	**100**
Field of Study	**Frequency**	**Percent**
Arts/Humanities	16	4.2
Commerce/Management	280	73.5
Engineering/Technology/Diploma	50	13.1
Science	33	8.7
Total	**381**	**100**
Family Income	**Frequency**	**Percent**
Less than 20,000	97	25.5
21,001 - 30,000	68	17.8
30,001 - 50,000	94	24.7
50,001 -70,000	57	15
More than 70,000	65	17.1
Total	**381**	**100**

The survey included **381 students**, offering a balanced gender mix with **53.8% females** and **46.2% males**, ensuring diverse perspectives. A vast majority (**73.8%**) were aged **18–22**, representing typical undergraduate learners, while **17.6%** were 23 and above—highlighting a segment of older or postgraduate students.

As expected, **73.8%** were **undergraduates**, with **26.2%** pursuing **postgraduate studies**. Most respondents (**73.5%**) came from **Commerce/Management** fields, indicating strong representation from business-oriented disciplines, while others belonged to **Engineering/Technology (13.1%)**, **Science (8.7%)**, and **Arts (4.2%)**.

GYANBODH
ISSN:3048-9792
Volume: 2
Issue: 3
May-June:2025

The **family income** distribution was varied, with **43.3%** of students from families earning **₹30,000 or less per month**, suggesting a notable presence of economically modest backgrounds. Meanwhile, **41.8%** had incomes above ₹30,000, reflecting economic diversity in the sample.

Objective 1: To Assess the Role of Personal Motivation (Investigate how individual goals, career aspirations, and personal interests impact students' academic engagement.)

Primary Motivation for pursing education

Descriptive Statistics				
	N	Min	Max	Mean
[Career Opportunities]	381	1	5	1.90
[Personal Growth]	381	1	5	1.97
[Family Expectations]	381	1	5	2.24
[Peer Influence]	381	1	5	2.68

This table presents descriptive statistics for different primary motivations for pursuing education, based on responses from 381 individuals. The responses were likely measured on a Likert scale (e.g., 1 = Most Preferred, 5 = Least Preferred).

1. Most students are driven by career opportunities and personal growth, with family expectations playing a moderate role. Peer influence is the least motivating factor.
2. *(Lower mean = higher importance; Career: 1.90, Growth: 1.97, Family: 2.24, Peer: 2.68)*

Do you believe education is essential for your future success?

The survey results indicate that a strong majority of students believe education is essential for their future success.

- 82.7% (combining "Strongly Agree" and "Agree") view education as a key factor in their success.
    - 44.9% (171 students) "Strongly Agree," showing a firm belief in the importance of education.
    - 37.8% (144 students) "Agree," suggesting they also recognize its value, though perhaps with slightly less conviction.
- 14.2% (54 students) remain "Neutral," indicating uncertainty about the direct impact of education on their success.

GYANBODH
ISSN:3048-9792
Volume: 2
Issue: 3
May-June:2025

- 3.1% (combining "Disagree" and "Strongly Disagree") do not see education as essential to success.
    - 1.3% (5 students) "Disagree" and 1.8% (7 students) "Strongly Disagree," showing a very small minority who might believe in alternative routes to success.

Enjoy most about Academics (Multi Grid-Likert Scale)

Descriptive Statistics					
	N	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Deviation
[Practical Subject]	381	1	5	1.89	1.297
[Theory Subject]	381	1	5	2.60	1.300
[Subject material]	381	1	5	2.35	1.181
[Interaction with peers]	381	1	5	2.34	1.235
[Activities/Days Celebration]	381	1	5	2.26	1.381
[Projects]	381	1	5	2.19	1.318
[Seminars/Workshops]	381	1	5	2.27	1.343
Valid N (listwise)	381				

This table presents descriptive statistics for what students enjoy most about academics, based on responses from 381 individuals using a Likert scale (e.g., 1 = Most Preferred, 5 = Least Preferred). Among various academic aspects, practical subjects top the list of what students enjoy most, reflecting a strong preference for hands-on learning. Projects, celebrations, and seminars also rank well, indicating interest in interactive and engaging experiences. In contrast, theory subjects are the least enjoyed, suggesting a need for more dynamic teaching methods. Peer interaction and study material fall in the middle, showing moderate enjoyment.

Objective 2: To Understand the Role of Social and Technological Distractions (Examine the influence of social media, peer pressure, and extracurricular activities on students' focus and prioritization of education.)

How frequently do you participate in extracurricular activities organized by your institution?

The survey results suggest a mixed level of participation in extracurricular activities among students, with occasional involvement being the most common response.

- 40.9% (156 students) participate "Occasionally," indicating that while they engage in extracurricular activities, their involvement is not consistent.

GYANBODH
ISSN:3048-9792
Volume: 2
Issue: 3
May-June:2025

- 29.4% (112 students) participate "Frequently," suggesting that nearly a one third of students are actively involved in extracurricular events.
- 22.3% (85 students) participate "Rarely," meaning they engage in such activities only under specific circumstances.
- 7.3% (28 students) "Never" participate, implying either a lack of interest, time constraints, or limited availability of activities that appeal to them.

Do you feel that college events or parties are major reason for choosing your college or university?

The survey results indicate that college events or parties are not a major deciding factor for most students when choosing their institution, though they do influence some students.

- 48.3% (184 students) responded "No," meaning nearly half of the students do not consider college events or parties as a significant factor in their choice of institution.
- 33.3% (127 students) said "Yes," showing that for about one-third of students, events and parties play an important role in their decision.
- 18.4% (70 students) responded "Somewhat," suggesting that while events might be a factor, they are not the primary reason for choosing their college or university.

Do you think attending college events or parties affects your academic performance?

The survey results suggest that a significant portion of students believe attending college events or parties has a positive impact on their academic performance, while only a small fraction see a negative impact.

- 41% (157 students) believe attending events positively affects their academic performance, possibly by improving social skills, networking, stress relief, or motivation.
- 31% (119 students) feel there is "No impact," indicating a large group of students feel that events have no direct effect on their studies, meaning they likely balance academics and social life effectively.
- 21% (81 students) are "Not sure," suggesting uncertainty about whether these activities help or hinder their studies.
- Only 6% (24 students) believe attending events negatively affects their academic performance, implying that very few students see parties and events as a distraction or hindrance.

Do you give importance in attending college events or parties over completing academic assignments or studying?

GYANBODH
ISSN:3048-9792
Volume: 2
Issue: 3
May-June:2025

The survey results indicate a mixed attitude toward prioritizing college events or parties over academic assignments or studying. While many students occasionally prioritize events, a significant portion still values academics first.

- Over 71.9% (38.8% (148 students) answered "Sometimes" suggests that while academics are important, social engagement is a major factor in student life and 33.1% (126 students) responded "Yes, often," suggesting that a considerable number of students frequently give preference to social events over academic responsibilities.)
- Only 17.6% "Never" choose events over academics, meaning a small portion of students remain fully committed to their academic work without distractions.
- The 10.5% who "Rarely" prioritize events likely maintain a strong academic focus but still engage socially when necessary.

How much time do you spend daily on non-academic activities? (e.g., gaming, social media etc.)?

The survey results suggest that most students engage in non-academic activities daily, with nearly half spending a moderate amount of time (1-3 hours), while a smaller portion spends excessive time.

- 48.6% (185 students) spend 1-3 hours daily on non-academic activities, This suggests that non-academic activities are an important part of students' routines, possibly serving as relaxation, social engagement, or entertainment.
- A Notable Percentage (32%) Engage for 3+ Hours – (21% (80 students) spend 3-5 hours & 11% (42 students) spend more than 5 hours daily) This may raise concerns about potential distractions or time management issues for students who spend excessive time on social media, gaming, or other non-academic activities.
- 19.4% (74 students) spend less than 1 hour, showing that a minority of students limit their non-academic screen time significantly.

Do you feel distracted by technology while studying?

The survey results indicate that a significant portion of students experience distraction due to technology while studying.

- 47.8% (182 students) reported that they do feel distracted by technology, suggesting that nearly half of the respondents struggle to maintain focus due to digital devices, social media, or other technological interruptions.
- 33.6% (128 students) responded with "Sometimes", implying that they occasionally experience distractions but not always.

GYANBODH
ISSN:3048-9792
Volume: 2
Issue: 3
May-June:2025

- 18.6% (71 students) stated that they do not feel distracted, indicating that a smaller group of students can effectively manage their focus despite technological influences.

Objective 3: To Know Liberal Paper Checking and Passing Policies is one of the factors.

Do you think the quality of education suffers due to liberal paper checking?

The survey results suggest that a majority of students believe that liberal paper checking negatively impacts the quality of education.

- 60.1% (229 students) either "Strongly Agree" (21%) or "Agree" (39.1%), indicating a clear concern that lenient grading practices may lower academic standards, reduce motivation for rigorous learning, and potentially devalue academic achievements.
- 32.8% (125 students) selected "Neutral", meaning they may not have a strong opinion or believe the impact of liberal paper checking on education quality is situational.
- Only 7.1% (27 students) either "Disagree" (5%) or "Strongly Disagree" (2.1%), suggesting that a small fraction of students believe liberal grading does not significantly affect educational quality.

How often do students in your college pass exams despite minimal preparation?

The survey results suggest that a significant number of students in the college pass exams with minimal preparation, raising concerns about academic rigor and assessment effectiveness.

- Majority i.e., 86.9% (combining "Sometimes" and "Very Often") of students acknowledge that exams can be passed with minimal effort, suggesting that either the exams are too lenient, grading is too liberal, or students rely on shortcuts like rote memorization.
- Limited Rigorous Examination Pressure: Since only 13.1% (combining "Rarely (11.5% (44 Students))" and "Never (1.6% (6 Students)") believe that passing without effort is uncommon, it suggests that rigorous preparation is not always necessary for success in exams.

Do you believe Passing students easily by universities/colleges encourage a lack of seriousness toward studies?

The survey results indicate that a majority of students believe that easily passing students encourages a lack of seriousness toward studies, though opinions vary in intensity.

- 43% (164 students) responded "Somewhat," suggesting that many students feel lenient passing criteria contribute to a decline in academic seriousness but not entirely.
- 39.6% (151 students) answered "Yes, significantly," indicating that a large portion strongly believes that easy passing directly reduces students' commitment to their studies.

GYANBODH
ISSN:3048-9792
Volume: 2
Issue: 3
May-June:2025

- 11.8% (45 students) responded "Not much," implying that some students think lenient grading has only a minor effect on academic seriousness.
- Only 5.5% (21 students) answered "Not at all," showing that very few believe lenient passing has no impact on student effort or attitude toward studies.

Do you think strict evaluation methods would improve students academic performance?

The survey results indicate that a majority of students believe that stricter evaluation methods would improve academic performance.

- 80.3% (combining "To some extent" and "Yes, significantly") think that stricter evaluation would lead to better academic outcomes.
    - 45.4% (173 students) chose "Yes, significantly," suggesting a strong belief that rigorous assessment would push students to study more seriously.
    - 34.9% (133 students) selected "To some extent," indicating that while strict evaluation may help, other factors also play a role in academic performance.
- 15% (57 students) responded "Not much," implying that they feel strict evaluation would have a limited effect on performance.
- 4.7% (18 students) said "No," meaning they believe strict evaluation would not improve student performance at all.

Objective 4: To Explore Institutional Impact (Analyze how teaching methods, faculty-student relationships, curriculum design, and infrastructure affect student interest in studies.)

Do you find the teaching methods engaging and effective?

The survey results suggest that a majority of students find the teaching methods engaging and effective to some extent, but there is room for improvement.

- 63.5% (combining "Always" and "Often") find the teaching methods engaging and effective.
    - 36.7% (140 students) chose "Always," indicating a strong approval of the teaching methods.
    - 26.8% (102 students) selected "Often," suggesting that while teaching is generally engaging, it may not always be consistent.
- 29.1% (111 students) answered "Sometimes," meaning that engagement levels may vary based on the subject, instructor, or teaching style.
- 7.3% (combining "Rarely" and "Never") expressed dissatisfaction.

GYANBODH
ISSN:3048-9792
Volume: 2
Issue: 3
May-June:2025

- 4.7% (18 students) said "Rarely," while 2.6% (10 students) said "Never," indicating that a small percentage of students consistently find teaching methods ineffective.

Are you satisfied with the resources and facilities provided by your educational institution?

The survey results suggest that a majority of students are satisfied with the resources and facilities provided by their educational institution, but a significant portion sees room for improvement.

- 57.7% (220 students) responded "Yes," indicating that most students are content with the resources and facilities available.
- 24.9% (95 students) chose "Somewhat," suggesting that while they find some aspects satisfactory, there may be areas needing improvement.
- 17.3% (66 students) answered "No," meaning a considerable number of students are dissatisfied with the institution's resources and facilities. (might feel that certain facilities—such as internet access, lab equipment, classrooms, or study spaces—are insufficient or outdated.)

How approachable are your teachers or academic mentors when you need help?

The survey results suggest that a majority of students find their teachers or academic mentors approachable, but a notable portion believes there is room for improvement.

- 57.5% (219 students) selected "Very approachable," indicating that most students feel comfortable seeking academic help from their teachers or mentors.
- 37.8% (144 students) chose "Somewhat approachable," suggesting that while teachers are available, some students may feel hesitant or face challenges in reaching out.
- 4.7% (18 students) answered "Not approachable," meaning a small fraction of students find it difficult to seek support from their educators.

How satisfied are you with the teaching methods at your institution?

The survey results suggest that a majority of students are satisfied with the teaching methods at their institution, but a notable percentage remain neutral or dissatisfied.

- 68.8% (combining "Satisfied" and "Very satisfied") find the teaching methods effective.
  - 44.1% (168 students) chose "Satisfied," indicating that most students generally approve of the teaching approaches.
  - 24.7% (94 students) selected "Very satisfied," reflecting a strong level of approval.
- 23.4% (89 students) responded "Neutral," suggesting that these students may find teaching methods neither highly effective nor particularly ineffective.

GYANBODH
ISSN:3048-9792
Volume: 2
Issue: 3
May-June:2025

- 7.8% (combining "Dissatisfied" and "Very dissatisfied") expressed dissatisfaction.
    - 5.2% (20 students) were "Dissatisfied," while 2.6% (10 students) were "Very dissatisfied," indicating that a small portion of students are unhappy with the teaching methods.

Objective 5: To examine whether there is a significant difference in the motivation for pursuing education between male and female students.

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

H_0: The variance is equal for Male and Female.

H_1: The variance is not equal for Male and Female.

Test of Homogeneity of Variances			
Motivation			
Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
2.077	1	379	.150

As $p - value\ (0.150) > 0.05$, We fail to reject H_0 and conclude that the variance is equal with respect to Gender (Male and Female)

H_0: The mean motivation for pursuing education is same for both Male and Female.

H_1: The mean motivation for pursuing education is not same for both Male and Female.

ANOVA					
Motivation					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	5.572	1	5.572	6.075	.014
Within Groups	347.575	379	.917		
Total	353.147	380			

From the above table, $p - value\ (0.014) < 0.05$, We reject H_0 and conclude that the mean motivation for pursuing education is not same for Male and Female.

GYANBODH
ISSN:3048-9792
Volume: 2
Issue: 3
May-June:2025

Objective 6: To analyze whether there is a significant difference in academic preferences between undergraduate and postgraduate students.

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

H_0: The variance is equal for Graduate and Postgraduate.

H_1: The variance is equal for Graduate and Postgraduate.

Test of Homogeneity of Variances			
Enjoy			
Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
.357	1	379	.551

As $p - value\ (0.150) > 0.05$, we fail to reject H_0 we conclude that the variance is equal with respect to Level of Education. (Graduate and Post Graduate)

H_0: There is no significant difference in the mean scores of "Enjoy Most About Academics" between Graduates and Post Graduates.

H_1: There is significant difference in the mean scores of "Enjoy Most About Academics" between Graduates and Post Graduates.

ANOVA					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.060	1	.060	.066	.797
Within Groups	343.821	379	.907		
Total	343.881	380			

From the above table, $p - value\ (0.797) > 0.05$, We fail to reject H_0 and conclude that no significant difference in the mean scores of "Enjoy Most About Academics" between Graduates and Post Graduates.

Objective 7: To examine the association between gender and participation in extracurricular activities among students.

Chi-Square Test

H_0: There is no association between gender and participation in extracurricular activities organized by institution.

GYANBODH
ISSN:3048-9792
Volume: 2
Issue: 3
May-June:2025

H_1: There is an association between gender and participation in extracurricular activities organized by institution.

			Participation in extracurricular activities organized by your institution				Total
			Frequently	Never	Occasionally	Rarely	
Gender	Female	Count	48	16	92	49	205
		Expected Count	60.3	15.1	83.9	45.7	205.0
	Male	Count	64	12	64	36	176
		Expected Count	51.7	12.9	72.1	39.3	176.0
Total		Count	112	28	156	85	381
		Expected Count	112.0	28.0	156.0	85.0	381.0

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.708[a]	3	.052
Likelihood Ratio	7.706	3	.052
N of Valid Cases	381		
a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.93.			

As $p - value\ (0.052) > 0.05$, We fail to reject H_0 and conclude that there is no association between gender and participation in extracurricular activities organized by institution.

Objective 8: To examine the association between gender and the influence of college events or parties on students' choice of college or university.

Chi-square Test

H_0: There is no association between gender and the influence of college events or parties on students' choice to enrol college or university.

H_0: There is an association between gender and the influence of college events or parties on students' choice to enrol college or university.

GYANBODH
ISSN:3048-9792
Volume: 2
Issue: 3
May-June:2025

			College events or parties are major reason for choosing your college or university			Total
			No	Somewhat	Yes	
Gender	Female	Count	104	39	62	205
		Expected Count	99.0	37.7	68.3	205.0
	Male	Count	80	31	65	176
		Expected Count	85.0	32.3	58.7	176.0
Total		Count	184	70	127	381
		Expected Count	184.0	70.0	127.0	381.0

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.919[a]	2	.383
Likelihood Ratio	1.917	2	.383
N of Valid Cases	381		
a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 32.34.			

As $p - value\ (0.383) > 0.05$, We fail to reject H_0 and conclude that there is no association between gender and the influence of college events or parties on students' choice to enrol college or university.

Objective 9: To examine the association between gender and the amount of time spent daily on non-academic activities such as gaming and social media.

Chi-square Test

H_0: There is no association between gender and the amount of time spent daily on non-academic activities such as gaming and social media.

H_1: There is an association between gender and the amount of time spent daily on non-academic activities such as gaming and social media.

GYANBODH
ISSN:3048-9792
Volume: 2
Issue: 3
May-June:2025

			Time spend daily on non-academic activities?				Total
			1-3 hours	3-5 hours	Less than 1 hour	More than 5 hours	
Gender	Female	Count	109	31	43	22	205
		Expected Count	99.5	43.0	39.8	22.6	205.0
	Male	Count	76	49	31	20	176
		Expected Count	85.5	37.0	34.2	19.4	176.0
Total		Count	185	80	74	42	381
		Expected Count	185.0	80.0	74.0	42.0	381.0

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	9.827[a]	3	.020
Likelihood Ratio	9.843	3	.020
N of Valid Cases	381		
a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 19.40.			

As $p - value\ (0.02) < 0.05$, We reject H_0 and conclude that there is an association between gender and the amount of time spent daily on non-academic activities such as gaming and social media.

Objective 10: To examine the association between gender and the impact of technology distraction while studying.

Chi-square Test

H_0: There is no association between gender and the impact of technology distraction while studying.

H_1: There is association between gender and the impact of technology distraction while studying.

GYANBODH
ISSN:3048-9792
Volume: 2
Issue: 3
May-June:2025

			Do you feel distracted by technology while studying?			Total
			No	Sometimes	Yes	
Gender	Female	Count	33	84	88	205
		Expected Count	38.2	68.9	97.9	205.0
	Male	Count	38	44	94	176
		Expected Count	32.8	59.1	84.1	176.0
Total		Count	71	128	182	381
		Expected Count	71.0	128.0	182.0	381.0

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.906[a]	2	.004
Likelihood Ratio	11.053	2	.004
N of Valid Cases	381		
a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 32.80.			

As $p - value\ (0.004) < 0.05$, We reject H_0 and conclude that there is an association between gender and the impact of technology distraction while studying.

GYANBODH
ISSN:3048-9792
Volume: 2
Issue: 3
May-June:2025

Comparison with respect to Male and Female

Mean differences in academic engagement, perception of college events, technology & education quality perception and satisfaction with teaching methods and institutional resources.

Gender	Male			Female		
	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Do you believe education is essential for your future success?	1.63	205	.766	1.94	176	.954
How frequently do you participate in extracurricular activities organized by your institution?	2.16	205	.874	1.98	176	.919
Do you feel that college events or parties are major reason for choosing your college or university?	1.89	205	.695	1.81	176	.715
Do you think attending college events or parties affects your academic performance?	2.30	205	1.247	2.35	176	1.176
Do you give importance in attending college events or parties over completing academic assignments or studying?	2.20	205	1.076	2.05	176	1.041
How much time do you spend daily on non-academic activities? (e.g., gaming, social media etc.)?	2.05	205	.684	2.22	176	.724
Do you feel distracted by technology while studying?	1.73	205	.722	1.68	176	.808
Do you think the quality of education suffers due to liberal paper checking?	2.32	205	.877	2.21	176	.954

GYANBODH
ISSN:3048-9792
Volume: 2
Issue: 3
May-June:2025

How often do students in your college pass exams despite minimal preparation?	1.86	205	.710	1.73	176	.680
Do you believe Passing students easily by universities/colleges encourage a lack of seriousness toward studies?	1.86	205	.860	1.80	176	.821
Do you think strict evaluation methods would improve students academic performance?	1.83	205	.829	1.74	176	.907
Do you find the teaching methods engaging and effective?	1.68	205	.621	1.80	176	.720
Are you satisfied with the resources and facilities provided by your educational institution?	1.71	205	.876	1.63	176	.818
How approachable are your teachers or academic mentors when you need help?	1.42	205	.560	1.53	176	.613
How satisfied are you with the teaching methods at your institution?	2.09	205	.922	2.26	176	.974

1. Importance of Education & Academic Engagement:

- Both **males (Mean = 1.63)** and **females (Mean = 1.94)** strongly agree that education is essential for future success. However, males express stronger agreement than females.
- Males (Mean = 2.16) participate in extracurricular activities slightly more than females (Mean = 1.98).

2. College Events & Academic Distraction:

- College events/parties are **not a major reason for choosing their institution** (Mean = 1.85 overall).
- Attending events is perceived to **slightly affect academic performance** (Mean = 2.33 overall).
- Both genders generally **prioritize academics over college events**, with females (Mean = 2.05) placing slightly more emphasis on studies than males (Mean = 2.20).

GYANBODH
ISSN:3048-9792
Volume: 2
Issue: 3
May-June:2025

- Daily time spent on non-academic activities is moderate (Mean = 2.13 overall), with females spending slightly more time than males.

3. Technology & Education Quality Perception:

- Technology is a **distraction while studying** for both genders (Mean = 1.71 overall).
- Students feel that **liberal paper checking lowers education quality** (Mean = 2.27 overall).
- Many students believe **strict evaluation methods could improve performance** (Mean = 1.79 overall), with females supporting this slightly more than males.

4. Academic Integrity & Teaching Methods:

- Students feel that **many peers pass with minimal preparation** (Mean = 1.80 overall).
- The perception that **lenient passing policies reduce seriousness toward studies** is common (Mean = 1.83 overall).
- **Teaching methods are found engaging (Mean = 1.73),** but females rate them slightly better than males.
- **Satisfaction with resources and facilities is moderate (Mean = 1.67 overall),** with males slightly more satisfied.
- Teachers are considered **approachable (Mean = 1.47 overall),** with males finding them slightly more accessible.
- **Overall satisfaction with teaching methods is moderate (Mean = 2.17 overall),** with males being slightly more satisfied than females.

Comparison with respect to Undergraduate and Postgraduate

Mean Differences in academic engagement, perception of college events, and academic integrity between undergraduate and postgraduate students.

Current Level of Education	Undergraduate			Postgraduate		
	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Do you believe education is essential for your future success?	1.80	281	.876	1.70	100	.859
How frequently do you participate in extracurricular activities organized by your institution?	2.12	281	.906	1.95	100	.869

GYANBODH
ISSN:3048-9792
Volume: 2
Issue: 3
May-June:2025

Do you feel that college events or parties are major reason for choosing your college or university?	1.88	281	.704	1.78	100	.705
Do you think attending college events or parties affects your academic performance?	2.38	281	1.216	2.18	100	1.201
Do you give importance in attending college events or parties over completing academic assignments or studying?	2.18	281	1.072	1.97	100	1.020
How much time do you spend daily on non-academic activities? (e.g., gaming, social media etc.)?	2.12	281	.704	2.13	100	.720
Do you feel distracted by tech3logy while studying?	1.73	281	.751	1.66	100	.794
Do you think the quality of education suffers due to liberal paper checking?	2.29	281	.895	2.21	100	.967
How often do students in your college pass exams despite minimal preparation?	1.81	281	.723	1.75	100	.626
Do you believe Passing students easily by universities/colleges encourage a lack of seriousness toward studies?	1.85	281	.853	1.78	100	.811
Do you think strict evaluation methods would improve students academic performance?	1.85	281	.883	1.63	100	.800
Do you find the teaching methods engaging and effective?	1.75	281	.662	1.68	100	.695

GYANBODH
ISSN:3048-9792
Volume: 2
Issue: 3
May-June:2025

Are you satisfied with the resources and facilities provided by your educational institution?	1.68	281	.855	1.64	100	.835
How approachable are your teachers or academic mentors when you need help?	1.46	281	.579	1.51	100	.611
How satisfied are you with the teaching methods at your institution?	2.14	281	.865	2.26	100	1.151

1. Importance of Education & Academic Engagement

- Both **undergraduates (Mean = 1.80)** and **postgraduates (Mean = 1.70)** strongly agree that **education is essential for future success**, with postgraduates showing slightly stronger agreement.
- **Postgraduates (Mean = 1.95)** participate more in **extracurricular activities** than undergraduates (Mean = 2.12).
- **Postgraduates (Mean = 1.78)** place slightly less importance on **college events/parties** when selecting a university compared to undergraduates (Mean = 1.88).

2. Impact of College Events & Non-Academic Activities

- Postgraduates believe **college events affect academic performance less (Mean = 2.18)** than undergraduates (Mean = 2.38).
- **Undergraduates (Mean = 2.18)** prioritize attending **college events slightly more** than postgraduates (Mean = 1.97), but both groups still prioritize academics.
- **Time spent on non-academic activities (Mean ≈ 2.12)** is similar for both groups.
- **Technology distraction is a concern for both groups**, but slightly more for undergraduates (Mean = 1.73) than postgraduates (Mean = 1.66).

3. Perception of Academic Integrity & Evaluation Methods

- **Postgraduates (Mean = 2.21)** feel slightly stronger than undergraduates (Mean = 2.29) that **education quality suffers due to lenient paper checking**.
- **Both groups believe that some students pass exams with minimal preparation**, but undergraduates (Mean = 1.81) perceive this issue more than postgraduates (Mean = 1.75).
- **Postgraduates (Mean = 1.63)** show **stronger support for strict evaluation methods** to improve academic performance compared to undergraduates (Mean = 1.85).

GYANBODH
ISSN:3048-9792
Volume: 2
Issue: 3
May-June:2025

4. Teaching Methods, Resources, and Institutional Satisfaction

- **Teaching methods are found slightly more engaging** by postgraduates (Mean = 1.68) than undergraduates (Mean = 1.75).
- **Institutional resources and facilities satisfaction** is nearly the same for both groups (Mean ≈ 1.67).
- **Teacher approachability is rated positively by both groups**, with slight variation (Mean ≈ 1.47).
- **Overall satisfaction with teaching methods** is **lower among postgraduates (Mean = 2.26)** compared to undergraduates (Mean = 2.14), indicating that postgraduates may expect a higher standard of education.

Findings

1. Education is highly valued; career opportunities and personal growth are the most significant motivations for pursuing education; practical subjects are the most enjoyed aspect of academics.
2. Technology is a common distraction, Students do not prioritize college events over academics, though they acknowledge its impact; Spending excessive time on non-academic activities may affect study habits, focus, and productivity
3. Students believe lenient grading reduces academic seriousness; Students want stricter evaluation methods to improve performance.
4. Teaching methods are somewhat engaging, and teacher approachability is rated well.
5. Mean Motivation for Pursuing Education by Gender differ significantly as p-value is 0.014, which is less than 0.05.
6. Mean Enjoyment of Academics by Education Level has no significant difference as p-value is 0.797, which is greater than 0.05.
7. Gender and Participation in Extracurricular Activities organized by the institution has no association as p-value is 0.052, which is greater than 0.05.
8. Gender and Influence of College Events on Enrollment Decisions has no significant association as p-value is 0.383, which is greater than 0.05.
9. Gender and Time Spent on Non-Academic Activities has association as p-value is 0.020, which is less than 0.05.

GYANBODH
ISSN:3048-9792
Volume: 2
Issue: 3
May-June:2025

10. Gender and Impact of Technology Distraction While Studying has significant association as p-value is 0.004, which is less than 0.05.

Recommendation

1. Students value education for career growth, colleges should offer more practical and industry-relevant courses.
2. Encourage responsible technology use by promoting digital well-being programs to minimize distractions.
3. Implement more rigorous grading policies to maintain academic seriousness and improve student performance.
4. Teaching methods are rated well, incorporating interactive and student-centered approaches can further enhance engagement.
5. Motivation for pursuing education differs by gender, targeted support programs should be developed.
6. Enjoyment of academics does not differ by education level, so maintaining a diverse mix of teaching strategies can cater to all students.
7. Gender has no impact on extracurricular participation, institutions should continue promoting equal opportunities.
8. Events do not significantly impact enrollment, resources should be allocated based on their actual impact.
9. Gender affects time spent on non-academic activities, tailored strategies can help students maintain a balanced academic life.
10. Develop awareness programs and provide focused study environments to minimize the negative impact of technology while studying.\

Conclusion

The study highlights that education is primarily driven by career opportunities and personal growth, with students showing a preference for practical subjects. However, technology remains a major distraction, impacting focus and productivity. While students prioritize academics over college events, they acknowledge the influence of extracurricular activities. Concerns over lenient grading suggest a need for stricter evaluation to enhance academic seriousness. Teaching methods are generally engaging, and faculty approachability is rated positively. Significant gender differences were observed in motivation for education, time spent on non-academic activities, and the impact of

GYANBODH
ISSN:3048-9792
Volume: 2
Issue: 3
May-June:2025

technology distractions, indicating the need for targeted interventions. However, factors like education level and participation in extracurricular activities showed no significant gender-based differences. Based on these findings, recommendations focus on enhancing career-oriented learning, implementing stricter grading policies, promoting responsible technology use, and ensuring inclusive engagement strategies for all students. Addressing these aspects will contribute to a more effective and balanced academic environment.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Akram, T., Aijaz, A., & Ikram, H. (2017). Exploring the factors responsible for declining students' interest in chemistry. *International Journal of Information and Education Technology, 7*(2), 88-94.

Deeba, F. (2012). Use of digital games to address the decline of students' participation in science. *[Journal Name]*, *[Volume]*(Issue), 306-311.

Laad, M. (2011). Causes responsible for declining interest of students in learning physics at a higher level: An Indian perspective. *International Journal of Pure and Applied Physics*, *7*(2), 151-158.

Oon, P.-T., & Subramaniam, R. (2011). On the declining interest in physics among students: From the perspective of teachers. *International Journal of Science Education, 33*(5), 727-746.

Rone, N. A., Guao, N. A. A., Jariol Jr., M. S., Acedillo, N. B., Balinton, K. R., & Francisco, J. O. (2023). Students' lack of interest, motivation in learning, and classroom participation: How to motivate them? *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal, 60*(4), 636-645.

Scott, B. A. (1986). The decline of literacy and liberal learning. *Journal of Education, 168*(1), 105-116.

Trout, P. A. (1997). Disengaged students and the decline of academic standards. *Journal of Higher Education, 68*(1), 46-56.

Vedder-Weiss, D., & Fortus, D. (2011). Adolescents' declining motivation to learn science: Inevitable or not? *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 48*(2), 199-216.

Wijsman, L. A., Warrens, M. J., Saab, N., van Driel, J. H., & Westenberg, P. M. (2016). Declining trends in student performance in lower secondary education. *Educational Review, 68*(5), 555-612.