

## Analysis of Parents' Socio Profile and Motivation Factors to Choose the Management Course in Student Higher Education

S. Deepavani<sup>1</sup> and V. Kumaravel<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Anna University, Tamilnadu, India

<sup>2</sup>Vivekanandha Business School for Women, Elayampalayam, Tiruchengode 637 205, Namakkal District, Tamilnadu, India

Contact: <sup>1</sup><91 9841514099>, <sup>2</sup><91 9842510595>,

E-mail: <sup>1</sup><mba.deepavani@rediffmail.com>, <sup>2</sup><kumaravelphd@gmail.com>

**KEYWORDS** Employability. Graduation. Multiple Regression. Rank Correlation. Subject Selection

**ABSTRACT**In India, students' education directly or indirectly involves their parents. They give much importance to the choice of course and choice of school, and even the choice of peers for their child. The empirical study of this paper is the analysis of parents' socio profile and motivational factors for choosing the business management courses selected in the Namakkal District of Tamil Nadu, India. The main objective of the paper is to help the students select their higher education in the field of management through socio profile of parents and their motivation factors. For the empirical analysis, percentage analysis, rank correlation method and multiple regression analysis have been implemented. The analysis has proven that there is a significance of parents' profile and other motivation factors in the choice of every student in their higher education. As the students' employability factor is involved, this study is very important for both sides, that is, students and the institutions.

### INTRODUCTION

Education of students helps their future glow successful and it helps them to know the current trends and academic society. It also helps them to know what the society expects (Afthanorhan 2013). The course should also help them to learn things and provide them the greatest platform for easy career opportunities, where they will not suffer or struggle for the particular knowledge (Mande et al. 2013). The virtual campus at universities are ever-present, as they assume that the teaching as information transfer prototype (Bartolome and Cebrian-de-la-Serna 2017). Students prefer those platforms with less complex functionality, which allows for an individualized organization of their learning resources (Bartolome and Cebrian-de-la-Serna 2017). This clear motivation is experienced by the students when choosing the course, and the course should help them with their future career (Iacobucci 2009). The students are choosing the course through the motivation from in and around factors like their parents' socio economic profile, relationship and so on.

A great education cannot happen in a cave, or in an ivory tower, but it lives in the dynamic world. Education means not only exposing stu-

dents to the Nash Equilibrium, that is, balancing their knowledge, which was described by the mathematician Nash, but also helps to understand and practice decision-making, leadership, and untangle resolutions. Education's value therefore is beyond simply exposing people to the knowledge of logos; it is also introducing the tools of citizenship, which will impact how they critically examine all aspects of their life (Ryan 2017).

Educational environment requires three aspects, namely classrooms, instructional resources and teachers to teach the students (Afthanorhan and Ahmad 2014). A grading matrix increases the integrity of the process, as well as provides useful feedback to the student (Ryan 2017). For students, grading matrixes allow them to clearly understand the expectations of the work, including how the professor will evaluate their work (Ryan 2017).

The students seek affordability and motivation in the choice of course and the institution. These factors are a pre-requirement to get into education but their aim is better career opportunity. Some of the most important 'wider issues' are essential to understand the overall contribution that can make education better and what factors to continue with to delay success (Twiner

et al. 2014). Valuable learning and teaching give the opportunity to achieve their aims (de Carvalho and Chima 2014). For educational and personal expenditure, the students depend on their parents. How the parents' socio-economic profile and motivational factors associate with the selection of business management courses has been analyzed in this research paper.

### Objectives of the Study

The main aim of the study is to analyze the parents' socio-economic profile factors and motivational factors associated with the selection of business management course. The specific objectives of this paper include:

1. To review the literature on assessment of students course selection in their higher education.
2. To analyze the relationship between the socio-economic profile of the parents and their children and how they choose management courses in Namakkal District, Tamil Nadu.
3. To investigate the motivation factors that relate to profile factor of the parents.

### Review of Literature

Ming (2010) developed a conceptual framework to explore the institution factors that influence students' college choice decisions in Malaysia. The independent variables that have been identified to influence students' college choice decision are location, college reputation, cost, education facilities, employment opportunities, availability of financial aid, academic programs, advertising, Higher Education Institutions, representatives and campus visits.

CRISCI (2012) analyzed Structural Equation Models (SEM) and, in particular, some of the different estimation methods mostly adopted the maximum Likelihood, the partial Least Squares and the Generalized Maximum Entropy by illustrating their main differences and similarities.

Camgoz-Akdag and Zaim's (2012) study concerns students in higher education institutions in Istanbul, Turkey. Their paper uses several items or instrument of service quality, which is applicable for TQM in education industry taking the SERVQUAL five dimensions for quality as the basis. Confirmatory Factor Analyses (CFA) and Exploratory Analyses (EA) empirical-

ly verified the underlying the dimensions of student satisfaction. Organizational performance structural equation modeling was used to compare coefficients and estimate the models and latent means.

Mande et al. (2013) replicate and build upon board process constructs cognitive conflict, use of knowledge and skills, effort norms and groupthink. Their study has concluded that the constructs are valid measures of the latent constructs and significantly relate to board performance. In addition, the findings in this study suggested that individual board processes affecting specific board performance indicators, such as usage of skills, effort norms and group think tend to stand out.

Shahmandi et al. (2013) examined the relationship between six leadership competencies and four EALS (Effective Academic Leadership Styles) in the present context of globalization and academic excellence. Based on results in SEM, contributions of leadership competencies depend on leadership styles in certain situations. Most of the competencies have relationship to EALS, except for two dimensions, communication, and organizational strategy.

Afthanorhan (2013) aims to examine which one of the structural equation modeling is appropriate to use for confirmatory factor analysis by using SMARTPLS and AMOS. In this instance, the data of volunteerism program was chosen as a research subject to prove this issue. They revealed that PLS-SEM path modeling using SMARTPLS is appropriate to carry on the confirmatory factor analysis, which is more reliable and valid.

De Carvalho and Chima (2014) provided basic knowledge of structural equation modeling methodology for testing relationships between indicator variables and latent constructs where SEM is the analysis technique of the research statistical design. It was noteworthy that SEM provides the way to test the specified set of relationships among observed and latent variables as a whole, and allows theory testing even when experiments were not possible. Consequently, these methodological approaches have become ubiquitous in the scientific research process of all discipline.

Veerabramham and Kolla (2014) studied basic concepts related to SEM and examine the awareness and preferences of SEM. The results revealed that majority of academicians and

marketing practitioners were aware of SEM, and they prefer to use SEM for research purpose.

Niemela-Nyrhinen and Leskinen (2014) defined the aim is to empirically illustrate using real data with a multi co-linearity problem, in which the ridge constant is added manually only to the diagonal elements of correlation matrix of the explanatory endogenous and exogenous variables in the model. In evaluating suitable values of the ridge constant, the ridge trace method is used. It is concluded that ridge trace estimation is an effective way of mitigating the effects of multi co-linearity in SEM.

Afthanorhan and Ahmad (2014) have proposed that the method is absolutely powerful to intensify the statistical analysis besides obey all the regression assumptions suggested, and reveals that the direct effect of government support of barrier, benefits, challenge and motivation have a significant relationship. One of the indirect effects, namely, benefits has a significant impact on motivation. Based on these findings suggested and the benefits factor was the most crucial to give an immense impact on motivation.

Shin et al. (2017) state that the motivation to learn is an essential element in science learning, and there were substantial differences in science motivation across gender and academic years. Generally, females and students in higher academic years exhibited a lower level of science motivation. Female students especially showed a low level of career motivation. In this study, high-school students' academic track choice is of significant interest. Students' motivation declined when they progressed to higher academic years, whereas in some school contexts, declining motivation over time.

Ryan (2017) examined the rights a student has when calling into question the authority and decision-making abilities of teachers in a classroom setting and examines the way in which the system of higher education lacks due process for students who wish to appeal to their teachers about their grades. Ultimately, the goal is to help facilitate conversations about academic review, including how professors can use syllabi and grading matrixes to protect themselves and their students, and well as ensure that conflicts can be avoided.

Seatter and Ceulemans (2017) state that higher education for sustainable development (HESD) was inspired by the aim to help students develop sustainability attitudes, skills, and knowledge that inform decision-making for the benefit of themselves and others, now and in

the future, and act upon these decisions and education for sustainable development, or the inclusion of key sustainability issues in all types of teaching and learning, has been supported and promoted over the last decades by global frameworks such as the United Nations' Decade of Education for Sustainable Development.

Bartolome and Cebrian-de-la-Serna (2017) found some notable contradictions between the theoretical models and the practical applications that seemed more coherent and logical. Students broadened the use of these PLEs to other subjects and non-formal learning situations.

Krezel and Krezel (2017) reviewed numerous models of student choice and identified inconsistencies in the role of social factors in the student choice. These inconsistencies are of special importance in the current higher education landscape and growing prominence of peer-to-peer communication via social media. Consequently, a thorough understanding of influences that effect student choice of higher education institutions is imperative.

## METHODOLOGY

In the present study, exploratory research design has been used to fulfill the objectives of the study. The survey was conducted among 200 students those who are studying higher educational institutions in Namakkal district in Tamil Nadu, India. Out of these, 25 questionnaires were incomplete and removed from the study. Finally, 175 samples were included for analysis.

## RESULTS

### Socio Profile Factor Analysis

Socio profile factors have been included with percentage analysis. According to the gender factor, 59 respondents (42.14%) are male and 81 respondents (57.86%) are female. It is concluded that most of the respondents are female factors. According to place of residence factor, 24 respondents' (17.14%) residence is rural, 57 respondents' (40.71%) residence is urban and 59 respondents' (42.14%) residence is semi-urban. It is concluded that, the most of the respondents' residence is semi-urban. According to parents education factor, 18 respondents' (12.86%) parents' education qualification is up to school, 27 respondents' (19.29%) parents'

education qualification is under graduation in arts and science, 25 respondents' (17.86%) parents' education qualification is under graduation in engineering, 10 respondents' (7.14%) parents' education qualification is post-graduation in arts and science, 27 respondents' (19.29%) parents' education qualification is post-graduation in engineering, 29 respondents' (20.71%) parents' education qualification is professional like doctor and lawyer, and 4 respondents' (2.86%) parents' education qualification is others like diploma and ITI. It is concluded that most of the respondents' parents' qualification is professional like doctor and lawyer. Table 1 illustrates the socio profile factor analysis.

**Table 1: Socio profile factor analysis**

<i>Profile factor</i>	<i>Number of respondents</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
<i>Gender</i>		
Male	59	42.14
Female	81	57.86
<i>Place of Residence</i>		
Rural	24	17.14
Urban	57	40.71
Semi Urban	59	42.14
<i>Parents Education</i>		
Uptoschool	18	12.86
UG in arts & science	27	19.29
UG in engineering	25	17.86
PG in arts & science	10	7.14
PG in engineering	27	19.29
Professional	29	20.71
Others	4	2.86
<i>Parents Occupation</i>		
Agriculture	22	15.71
Business	51	36.43
Private Employee	37	26.43
Government Employee	11	7.86
Professional	19	13.57
<i>Family Annual Income</i>		
Upto 2 lakhs	41	29.29
2-4 lakhs	57	40.71
5 lakhs and above	42	30.00
<i>Medium of Education</i>		
Tamil	61	43.57
English	79	56.43
<i>School Type</i>		
Government	48	34.29
Private	92	65.71
<i>UG College Type I</i>		
Private	52	37.14
Government	88	62.86
<i>UG College Type II</i>		
University Affiliated	59	42.14
Autonomous	81	57.86
<i>UG College Type III</i>		
Regular	56	40.00
Distance	84	60.00

According to the parents' occupation factor, 22 respondents' (15.71%) parents are working agriculture oriented jobs, 51 respondents' (36.43%) parents are doing business, 37 respondents' (26.43%) parents work as employees with private ventures, 11 respondents' (7.86%) parents work as government employees, and 19 respondents' (13.57%) parents are working as professionals. It is concluded that most of the respondents' parents are doing business. According to family annual income factor, 41 respondents' (29.29%) family annual income is up to 2 lakhs, 57 respondents' (40.71%) family annual income is 2 to 4 lakhs, and 42 respondents' (30.00%) family annual income is above 5 lakhs. It is concluded that most of the respondents' family annual income is 2 to 4 lakhs.

According to medium of education factor, 61 respondents' (43.57%) medium of study is Tamil, and 79 respondents' (56.43%) medium of study is English. It is concluded that most of the respondents' medium of study is English. According to school type factor, 48 respondents (34.29%) completed their school studies in government school' and 92 respondents (65.71%) completed their school studies in private school. It is concluded that most of the respondents completed their school studies in private school.

Under graduate college type I factor variables classified as private and government colleges, 52 respondents (37.14%) completed their under graduation in a private college, and 88 respondents (62.86%) completed their under graduation in a government college. It is concluded that most of the respondents completed their under graduation in government college. Under graduate college type II factor variables classified as university affiliated and autonomous, 59 respondents (42.14%) completed their under graduation in a university affiliated college, and 81 respondents (57.86%) completed their under graduation in an autonomous college. It is concluded that most of the respondents completed their under graduation in autonomous college. Under graduate college type III factor variables classified as regular and distance, 56 respondents (40.00%) completed their under graduation in the regular stream, and 84 respondents (60.00%) completed their under graduation in distance mode. It is concluded that most of the respondents completed their under graduation in distance mode.

### Motivation Factor Analysis

Motivation factors have been analyzed using rank correlation method. Totally eight factors are selected in the questionnaire for analysis. The factors are lifetime ambition, availability of more job opportunities, attractive salary package, growth opportunities, self-interest, motivated by friends/relatives/family members/faculty members, and advice from the experts in media and to become an entrepreneur. Lifetime ambition factor has been marked as M1, and similarly, each factor has been marked up to M8. According to the respondents' opinion, the marks have been allocated for each factor. If the respondent gave rank 1 for a factor, 8 marks have been allocated to it. If the respondent gave rank 8 for a factor, 1 mark has been allocated to it. Finally, the total value has computed. Through that total value, the factors were ordered or ranked. Table 2 illustrates the rank correlation for motivation factors.

### Profile of the Respondents and the Motivational Factors to Choose the Management Course in Higher Education

To explore the relationship between the profile of the respondents and the motivational factors to choose the management course in higher education, the regression analysis has been applied.

**H<sub>0</sub>:** The socio profile factors of the parents.

**H<sub>1</sub>:** The other motivation factors to choose the management course in higher education.

Table 3 illustrates the relationship between the profile of the respondents and the motivational factors.

The gender factor is correlated with the motivational factors. The correlation coefficient value is  $r=0.95552$ . The level of significance is less than 0.05. The p values for the motivation factors 4 and 5 are greater than 0.1, therefore these factors are not significant. The p values for the motivational factors 2, 3 and 7 are less than 0.05, and therefore these factors are significant. The p values for the motivational factors 1, 6 and 8 are less than 0.01, and therefore these factors are highly significant.

The residence place factor is correlated with the motivational factors. The correlation coefficient value is  $r=0.95224$ . The level of significance

is less than 0.05. The p values for the motivation factors 4 and 6 are greater than 0.1, therefore these factors are not significant. The p values for the motivational factors 1, 3, 5 and 8 are less than 0.05, and therefore these factors are significant. The p values for the motivational factors 2 and 7 are less than 0.01, and therefore these factors are highly significant.

The parent's education factor is correlated with the motivational factors. The correlation coefficient value is  $r=0.90059$ . The level of significance is less than 0.05. The p value for the motivation factors 2, 3, 4, 6, 7 and 8 is greater than 0.1, therefore these factors are not significant. The p value for the motivational factors 1 and 5 is less than 0.05, and therefore these factors are significant.

The parents' occupation factor is correlated with the motivational factors. The correlation coefficient value is  $r=0.91164$ . The level of significance is less than 0.05. The p value for the motivation factors 4 and 6 is greater than 0.1, therefore these factors are not significant. The p value for the motivational factors 1, 3, 5 and 8 is less than 0.05, and therefore these factors are significant. The p value for the motivational factors 2 and 7 is less than 0.01, and therefore these factors are highly significant.

Family annual income factor is correlated with the motivational factors. The correlation coefficient value is  $r=0.93818$ . The level of significance is less than 0.05. The p value for the motivation factors 1, 2, 3 and 8 is greater than 0.1, therefore these factors are not significant. The p value for the motivational factors 4 and 7 is less than 0.05, and therefore these factors are significant. The p value for the motivational factor 5 is less than 0.01, and therefore this factor is highly significant.

Medium of education factor is correlated with the motivational factors. The correlation coefficient value is  $r=0.95495$ . The level of significance is less than 0.05. The p value for the motivation factors 2 and 6 are greater than 0.1, and therefore these factors are not significant. The p value for the motivational factors 1, 4, 5 and 7 are greater than 0.01, and therefore these factors are significant. The p value for the motivational factors 3 and 8 are less than 0.01 and therefore these factors are highly significant.

School type factor is correlated with the motivational factors. The correlation coefficient value is  $r=0.96340$ . The level of significance is



**Table 3: Relationship between the respondents' parents' profile and motivational factors**

Profile Factor	Motivation Factor (p Value)								Multiple R
	M1	M2	M3	M4	M5	M6	M7	M8	
Gender	0.00032	0.05357	0.02140	0.15373	0.27467	0.00738	0.03112	0.00976	0.95552
Place of residence	0.03098	0.00854	0.01011	0.18950	0.02137	0.15844	0.00696	0.04150	0.95224
Parents' education	0.03734	0.39619	0.22695	0.30614	0.02878	0.11728	0.06191	0.58211	0.90059
Parents occupation	0.00073	0.30841	0.70771	0.30311	0.11154	0.08643	0.57336	0.01690	0.91164
Family annual income	0.33591	0.27026	0.13972	0.01197	0.00002	0.05555	0.01662	0.96112	0.93818
Medium of education	0.01118	0.15312	0.00180	0.03155	0.05273	0.51357	0.01328	0.00079	0.95495
School Type	0.04711	0.11496	0.00200	0.00001	0.13729	0.14569	0.00283	0.01015	0.96340
UG college type I	0.02431	0.02921	0.00005	0.15531	0.36979	0.00010	0.52153	0.00007	0.96115
UG college type II	0.00011	0.49407	0.02762	0.01751	0.02967	0.09089	0.00051	0.21682	0.95627
UG college type III	0.02852	0.35615	0.00013	0.00078	0.00176	0.27998	0.01458	0.10566	0.95817

less than 0.05. The p value for the motivation factors 2, 5 and 6 are greater than 0.1, therefore these factors are not significant. The p value for the motivational factors 1 and 8 are greater than 0.01, and therefore, these factors are significant. The p value for the motivational factors 3, 4 and 7 are less than 0.01, and therefore, these factors are highly significant.

UG college type I factor is correlated with the motivational factors. The correlation coefficient value is  $r = 0.96115$ . The level of significance is less than 0.05. The p value for the motivation factors 4, 5 and 7 is greater than 0.1, and therefore these factors are not significant. The p value for the motivational factors 1 and 2 are greater than 0.01, and therefore, these factors are significant. The p value for the motivational factors 3, 6 and 8 is less than 0.01, and therefore, these factors are highly significant.

UG college type II factor is correlated with the motivational factors. The correlation coefficient value is  $r = 0.95627$ . The level of significance is less than 0.05. The p value for the motivation factors 2 and 8 are greater than 0.1, therefore these factors are not significant. The p value for the motivational factors 3, 4, 5 and 6 are greater than 0.01. Therefore, these factors are significant. The p value for the motivational factors 1 and 7 are less than 0.01. Therefore, these factors are highly significant.

UG college type III factor is correlated with the motivational factors. The correlation coefficient value is  $r = 0.95817$ . The level of significance is less than 0.05. The p value for the motivation factors 2, 6 and 8 are greater than 0.1, there-

fore these factors are not significant. The p value for the motivational factors 1 and 7 are greater than 0.01. Therefore, these factors are significant. The p value for the motivational factors 3, 4 and 5 are less than 0.01. Therefore, these factors are highly significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected.

Joseph SiaKee Ming (2010) developed a conceptual framework to explore the institution factors that influence students' college choice decision in Malaysia. The independent variables that have been identified to influence students' college choice decision are location, college reputation, cost, education facilities, employment opportunities, availability of financial aid, academic program, and advertising, Higher Education Institutions, representatives and campus visit. As per his identification the location, cost, financial aid has been fulfilled by the parents and relatives. Though the socio profile is analyzed in the circumstance of Malaysia, this research is concentrated on employment opportunities that are not included in that previous research.

Shin et al. (2017) state that female students especially showed a low level of career motivation. The current researchers took 57.86 percent of female respondents for the study. From the motivation factor analysis founded, that the attractive salary and job opportunities factors got first two ranks. From the study proved that in Namakkal district, the female candidates are mostly willing to upgrade their career and they are willing to get more salary with the help of management course.

From this analysis founded that there is a perfect positive relationship between gender and motivational factors. There is a significant difference in the motivational factors among different groups based on gender. There is a significant difference (0.05%) in the opinion about motivational factors and gender. **Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected.** There is perfect positive relationship between residence place and motivational factors. There is a significant difference in the motivational factors among different groups based on residence place. There is a significant difference (0.05%) in the opinion about motivational factors and place of residence. **Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected.** There is perfect positive relationship between parent's education and motivational factors. There is a significant difference in the motivational factors among different groups based on parent's education. There is a significant difference in the opinion about motivational factors and parents education. **Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected.** There is perfect positive relationship between parent's occupation and motivational factors. There is a significant difference in the motivational factors among different groups based on parents' occupation. There is a significant difference in the opinion about motivational factors and place of residence. **Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected.** There is perfect positive relationship between family annual income and motivational factors. There is a significant difference in the motivational factors among different groups based on family annual income. There is a significant difference in the opinion about motivational factors and family annual income. **Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected.** There is perfect positive relationship between medium of education and motivational factors. There is a significant difference in the motivational factors among different groups based on medium of education. There is a significant difference in the opinion about motivational factors and medium of education. **Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected.** There is perfect positive relationship between medium of education and motivational factors. There is a significant difference in the motivational factors among different groups based on school type. There is a significant difference in the opinion about motivational factors and school type. **Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected.** There is perfect positive relationship between UG col-

lege type I and motivational factors. There is a significant difference in the motivational factors among different groups based on UG college type I. There is a significant difference in the opinion about motivational factors and UG College type I. **Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected.** There is perfect positive relationship between UG college type II and motivational factors. There is a significant difference in the motivational factors among different groups based on UG college type II. There is a significant difference in the opinion about motivational factors and UG college type II. **Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected.** There is perfect positive relationship between UG College type III and motivational factors. There is a significant difference in the motivational factors among different groups based on UG college type III. There is a significant difference in the opinion about motivational factors and UG college type III. **Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected.**

## DISCUSSION

The opinion given by the respondents about the socio profile factor analysis founded that most of the female respondents are selecting the management course for their life improvements. The female respondents are living in semi-urban areas and most of the respondents' parent's educational qualification is a professional degree. Most of the respondents' parent's occupation is business and their family annual income is 2 to 4 lakhs. Most of the respondents' medium of study is English and their school type is private. Most of the respondents' under graduate college is a government and their college has autonomous status. Most of the respondents' completed their under graduate degree in distance mode.

The gender factor is correlated with the motivational factors. The p value for the motivational factors 1, 6 and 8 are less than 0.01, therefore these factors are highly significant. The residence place factor is correlated with the motivational factors. The p value for the motivational factors 2 and 7 are less than 0.01, therefore these factors are highly significant. The parent's education factor is correlated with the motivational factors. The p value for the motivational factors 1 and 5 are less than 0.05, therefore these factors are significant. The parents' occupation



factor is correlated with the motivational factors. The p value for the motivational factors 2 and 7 are less than 0.01, therefore these factors are highly significant. Family annual income factor is correlated with the motivational factors. The p value for the motivational factor 5 is less than 0.01, and therefore this factor is highly significant. Medium of education factor is correlated with the motivational factors. The p value for the motivational factors 3 and 8 are less than 0.01. Therefore, these factors are highly significant. School type factor is correlated with the motivational factors. The p value for the motivational factors 1 and 8 are greater than 0.01. Therefore, these factors are significant. The p value for the motivational factors 3,4 and 7 are less than 0.01. Therefore, these factors are highly significant. UG college type I factor is correlated with the motivational factors. The p value for the motivational factors 3, 6 and 8 are less than 0.01. Therefore, these factors are highly significant. UG college type II factor is correlated with the motivational factors. The p value for the motivational factors 1 and 7 are less than 0.01. Therefore, these factors are highly significant. UG college type III factor is correlated with the motivational factors. The p value for the motivational factors 3, 4 and 5 are less than 0.01. Therefore, these factors are highly significant. Afthanorhan (2013) states that in his study the respondents were selecting the research subject for volunteerism program. The current study founded that the most of the respondents, that is, 57.86 percentage of female respondents selected the management course as their higher education. Krezel and Krezel (2017) said that in their study the students were using social media for selecting the higher education institutions. But the current study founded that the students fully depend on the parents' socio profile and their friends and relatives to select a management course for their higher education. It has been founded from the motivation factor analysis that members ranked the being motivated by friends/relatives/family members factor as fifth but advice from the experts in media factor got the seventh rank. Through this analysis it was founded that in the study area the majority of the students had got the advice from their friends/relatives/family member to select the management course for their higher education.

## CONCLUSION

Though the education of a student is affected by their parents and other environments, the choice of the course and the institution is not directly much affected. The data collected shows that the parents' socio profile is not purely related to the students choosing the course. Other motivational factors are somewhat affecting the choice of the course. Mostly the students are choosing the course based on their own aim and ambition and they rarely depend upon their parents due to various reasons such as they may be the first generation students. They will be more concerned about their future that would be a part of future India. They think more and more to choose their course and institution by calculating their employability and academic growth.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

The authors give the suggestion to analyze the variables, which are used to select the business management course other than the parents' socio profile like employability. Since the management course selection process has been done by the students, the course material should be correlated with the employability and skill development. This can be analyzed separately. Next recommendation is that the final exam format be changed to evaluate the employability skill and application of the knowledge that a student acquired from the course. This can be analyzed separately. Next suggestion is that to be more careful and aware of the students' surroundings and contribute more towards a better and more sustainable environment. The students' environment might be analyzed in detail. At last, the learning and perhaps the difficult subjects should be enhanced by using contemporary teaching methods that would be a part of motivational factors.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors are thankful to the principals, directors, and heads of the departments of the higher educational institutions in Namakkal District, Tamil Nadu India for permitting their students to participate in the survey and contribute their viewpoints towards the this study.

## REFERENCES

- Afthanorhan Wan Mohamad Asyraf Bin Wan 2013. A comparison of Partial Least Square Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) and Covariance Based Structural Equation Modeling (CB-SEM) for confirmatory factor analysis. *International Journal of Engineering Science and Innovative Technology*, 2(5): 198-205.
- Afthanorhan Wan Mohamad Asyraf Bin Wan, Ahmad Sabri 2014. Path analysis in covariance-based structural equation modeling with AMOS 18.0. *European Journal of Business and Social Sciences*, 3(2): 59-68.
- Bartolome Antonio, Cebrian-de-la-Serna Manuel 2017. Personal learning environments: A study among Higher Education students' designs. *International Journal of Education and Development Using Information and Communication Technology (IJEDICT)*, 13(2): 21-41.
- Biggart Andy, Kerr Karen, O'Hare Liam, Connolly Paul 2013. A randomized control trial evaluation of a literacy after-school programme for struggling beginning readers. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 62: 129-140.
- Camgoz-Akdag Hatice, Zaim Selim 2012. Education: A comparative structural equation modeling study. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 47: 874-880.
- CRISCI Anna 2012. Estimation methods for the structural equation models: Maximum likelihood, partial least squares E-generalized maximum entropy. *Journal of Applied Quantitative Methods*, 7(2): 3-17.
- De Carvalho Jackson, Chima Felix O 2014. Applications of structural equation modeling in social sciences research. *American International Journal of Contemporary Research*, 4(1): 6-11.
- Gelli Aulo, Masset Edoardo, Diallo Amadou Sekou, Assima Amidou, Hombrados Jorge, Watkins Kristie, Drake Lesley 2014. Agriculture, nutrition and education: On the status and determinants of primary schooling in rural Mali before the crises of 2012. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 39: 215-225.
- Iacobucci Dawn 2009. Everything you always wanted to know about SEM (Structural Equations Modeling) but were afraid to ask. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 19: 673-680.
- Krezel Joanna, Krezel Z Adam 2017. Social influence and student choice of a higher education institution. *Journal of Education Culture and Society*, 2: 116-130.
- Mande Bashir, Ishak Zuani, Idris Kamil, Ammani Sahiba 2013. Using structural equation modeling to explain board process and board performance in a developing economy. *International Journal of Global Business*, 6(1): 58-80.
- Ming Joseph Sia Kee 2010. Institutional factors influencing students' college choice decision in Malaysia: A conceptual framework. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 1(3): 53-58.
- Niemela-Nyrhinen Jenni, Leskinen Esko 2014. Multicollinearity in marketing models: Notes on the application of ridge trace estimation in structural equation modeling. *The Electronic Journal of Business Research Methods*, 12(1): 3-15.
- Riddell Abbey, Nin o-Zarazu Miguel 2016. The effectiveness of foreign aid to education: What can be learned? *International Journal of Educational Development*, 48: 23-36.
- Ryan Brendan M 2017. A review of protocols in higher education: How my experience made me question the process. *Higher Education Studies*, 7(4): 71-73.
- Sabic-El-Rayess Amra, Mansur Naheed Natasha 2016. Favor reciprocity theory in education: New corruption typology. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 50: 20-32.
- Seatter Carol Scarff, Ceulemans Kim 2017. Teaching sustainability in higher education: Pedagogical styles that make a difference. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 47(2): 47-70.
- Shahmandi Elham, Silong Abu Daud, Ismail Ismi Arif, Samah Bahaman Abu, Omar Zohara 2013. Structural equation modeling test for relationship between selected leadership competencies and effective academic leadership styles. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 21(11): 1566-1576.
- Shin Sein, Lee Jun-Ki, Ha Minsu 2017. Influence of career motivation on science learning in Korean High-School students. *EURASIA Journal of Mathematics Science and Technology Education*, 13(5): 1517-1538.
- Twiner Alison, Littleton Karen, Coffin Caroline, White-lock Denise 2014. Meaning making as an interactional accomplishment: A temporal analysis of intentionality and improvisation in classroom dialogue. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 63: 94-106.
- Veerabramham B, Kolla Nagaraju 2014. Structural equation modeling: A recent trend in marketing research. *International Journal of Application or Innovation in Engineering and Management*, 3(4): 96-99.

Paper received for publication on November 2017  
 Paper accepted for publication on February 2018