

# Factors Influencing Student's Choice in Selecting Management Institutes in Karnataka State



D.M. Arvind Mallik, Ananthpadhmanabha Achar

**Abstract:** Since liberation impact in India, Business education spread its wings across boundaries and have excelled in enhancing quality higher education and directly responsible for fierce competition among MBA institutions and changed the landscape of how corporates viewed like never before. development of Multi-National Companies has spurred employment opportunity in Indian This factor has augmented the entryway of specialized training in the nation. Professional Degrees like Engineering Institutes at present are making a praiseworthy showing in giving down to earth and executing a commendable job and rendering education is appreciable and committing in creating ecosphere of synergy between expectations and reality on students choosing their Post-graduation is largely influenced with many factors to mention. The reason for conceptualizing paper is to analyze the key variables which impact student's choice in selecting a Management Institutes which is in descriptive in nature and data was computed with a sample size of 684 respondents collected from final year students and Department in charge.

**Keywords:** Choices Factors, Management Education. Management Institutes, Students decision

## I. INTRODUCTION

Management education is today's hottest topic across the globe. 93% students\* opt for MBA in various streams after completing their graduation. Today students can find varied specializations of MBA related to their field in graduation, for example the new specializations are MBA in Hospital management, MBA in Technology management to name a few. But because of the job constraints in India for the specialized fields, most of the B Schools are offering only traditional specializations like Marketing, Finance, HR, Retail Management, International Business to name a few. Indian business management educational landscape as well as its impact on global competitiveness has reached threshold and is much stronger than before as they are growing at higher rate than expected. Encouraged by modest development of global economic advantages which has gone beyond boundaries, B-Schools have positioned themselves as an adhered institution which can bring effective utilization if available resources such as finances, marketing and others to benefit society at large.

Revised Manuscript Received on December 30, 2019.

\* Correspondence Author

D.M. Aravind Mallik\*, Assistant Professor, PGDMS&RC, PESITM, Shivamogga, Karnataka, India.

Dr. AnanthPadmanabha Achar, Professor and Dean- Corporate Affairs, JKSHIM, Nittie. Karnataka, India.

© The Authors. Published by Blue Eyes Intelligence Engineering and Sciences Publication (BEIESP). This is an [open access](http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/) article under the CC-BY-NC-ND license <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

To survive in this competitive environment, institutions must have an advantage (balaji s. mudholkar, 2012). The fast changes in the worldwide and statistic shifts have altogether changed the individuals' frame of mind towards education. The total impact of these occasions is down to earth in encountering how Management Institutes have changed and are taking a stab at a believable picture and notoriety. The idea of marking has gotten pervasive and has penetrated in to the acts of Institutional Building. The private Sector with expectation perusing the overall situation has very much tapped into the requirement for top-notch Management Institutes in India. The savage challenge among these private area players has brought about making marking an ordinary vocabulary in Management Education (Dixit Amit, Sharma Kapil, 2017)

## II. LITERATURE REVIEW

I. Sidin et al. (2003) inspected the criteria with which Students select their tertiary foundations. They found that student's choice of universities relies upon a few criteria, including academic quality, facilities, campus surroundings, and personal characteristics. They additionally found that salary influences the selection of understudies. Also, they gave proof that the factors of costs, duration of studies, and academic quality are also important considerations for students and their families.

II. Zabid and Ling (2003) examined the factors considered important in hiring local and foreign MBA graduates and found decision-making ability, written communication, oral communication, analytical skills, and interpersonal skills are the most skills looked into and they have suggested that frequent updating MBA program will give a competitive advantage in meeting industry expectations for graduates' Who lacks managerial, technical, business, and work skills.

III. Ming (2010) expressed his intention in understanding which factors primarily affecting students' college choice decision were selective and they are location, academic programme, college reputation, educational facilities, cost, availability of financial aid, employment status

IV. Ghourchian, N., Moghadam, M., Kani, M., Azar, A., & Bahreini, S. (2013) reciprocated that Elements affecting overseas students' choice of university from the point of view of Iranian students is well organized curriculum and balanced approach towards teaching and learning Galhena and Rathnayake (2011) used survey method to explore primarily those influence affecting srilankan student's factors were skills and abilities,

## Factors Influencing Student's Choice in Selecting Management Institutes in Karnataka State

education and personality are the most influential factors and also found that teachers became their greatest influencers on determining students' career choice.

VI. Shetty and Gujarathi (2013) used questionnaire to examine the students' perception about the quality of the MBA program in India and USA. From their findings they arrived at a conclusion as Indians completing MBA from USA, perceived good quality with the only problem of finding a good job in America after completion of an MBA was an extreme challenge

VII. Emad M. Wajeeh & Ted Micceri (nd) conducted a study titled "Factors Influencing Students' College Choice at Traditional and Metropolitan Universities". The College decision is a choice affected by various statistic, financial, social, political, and institutional components. Various kinds of students chose specific colleges based on at least one factors that have connection straightforwardly to their expectations and necessities. Main considerations referred are the parent's guidance, Academic excellence, accessibility of the ideal program, accessibility of money related guide, cost of attending to the programmes, and the area of the establishment. Be that as it may, the overall significance of these variables is to a great extent dictated by the qualities of the understudy and the sorts of the college

VIII. Jacqueline Liza Fernandez(nd) says the higher education sector in Malaysia includes public and private tertiary institutions are facing a host of challenges, including a high degree of competition among institutions due to the emergence of new colleges and universities, reduced funding from the government, and the need to upgrade education services continuously to meet the demands of the market. The results of this study indicate that the main reasons that students pursue higher education are to improve their job prospects and to gain knowledge and experience.

IX. Robinson, A. and J. Bornholt, (2007) analyzed Choice and resolution making in higher education has gained greater importance because higher education has become competitive and driven by market-oriented. The results of study conducted in Australia, argued that the enrolment choice heavily depends upon students' family background, their demographics and shifts from one learning environment to other. They likewise depicted that college choice relies on how college approaches and measure appraisals and capability of teaching staff. In the programme setting, method of educating, staff and reactions of other enrolled understudies in course structure the establishment for decision obviously

### III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This Study is about analyzing the student's factors influencing their choices before opting Higher Education in Management Institutes. Data was obtained by disturbing structured questionnaires and personal discussions with Head of the Department of management institutes and respondent's data was collected by administrating belonging

to the student belonging to the various management institutes Karnataka.

#### A. Objective

1. Recognize the strategic influences which impacts student's decision in choosing a Management Institutes

#### B. Sample Design

1. Sample Size- 684 sample (444- urban and 240 Rural)- 66 Management Institutes
2. Sampling Type- Probability
3. Sample Method- Stratified sampling
4. Sampling Unit- Final Year MBA Students

#### C. Limitations:

1. Research was confined with choice factors only.
2. Respondents was restricted to 2nd year students of MBA
3. Respondents answers may be biased

### IV. ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

#### 1. Recognize the significant factors which influences student's decision in choosing a Management Institutes

Table No -1 shows set of most critical success factors independent variable questions have asked for 684 students selected across 66 Management Institutes across Karnataka. have been asked to respond and recorded their answers on what are the major success factors to which they have taken important when shortlisting any management institutes with 15 variables (*Uniqueness of the Programme, Faculty reputation, Institution Reputation, Cost of the Programme, Campus Placement, Institute Location Benefits, Quality of Teaching and Learning facilities, Institute Director Profile, Accreditation Student Testimonials, Failure to gain Alternative, Employment perspective, Industry Institute Interaction, Campus Cultural Life, Collaboration With Foreign Institutes*) for students to select, and rank accordingly was given a question to choose appropriately while choosing any MBA colleges from a scale of 1-15 (1 is Highest Ranking and 15 is least Ranking) and for analysis, Garrets Mean Score.

Table 1. Students Critical Success factors

Variables		Rank in Order														
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Uniqueness of the Programme	Urban	25.9	17.6	10.1	7.4	11	8.8	5.2	3.2	2.9	4.3	2	0.7	0.5	0.2	0.2
	Rural	46.7	12.5	17.9	2.9	8.3	4.6	2.5	2.9	0	0.8	0	0	0.4	0	0.4
	<b>Total</b>	33.2	15.8	12.9	5.8	10.1	7.3	4.2	3.1	1.9	3.1	1.3	0.4	0.4	0.1	0.3
Faculty reputation	Urban	43	9.9	8.1	5.2	5.6	5.2	4.1	4.1	2.9	4.5	1.6	2.3	2	0.7	0.9
	Rural	44.2	29.6	13.8	5	4.6	2.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	43.4	16.8	10.1	5.1	5.3	4.4	2.6	2.6	1.9	2.9	1	1.5	1.3	0.4	0.6
Institution Reputation	Urban	41.2	12.4	11.5	5.6	5.4	2.9	3.2	3.6	1.4	2.3	3.2	2.5	2	1.1	1.8
	Rural	48.3	18.8	16.7	5.8	2.9	1.3	2.5	2.1	0	0.4	0.4	0.8	0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	43.7	14.6	13.3	5.7	4.5	2.3	2.9	3.1	0.9	1.6	2.2	1.9	1.3	0.7	1.2
Cost of the Programme	Urban	15.1	8.8	12.8	8.8	8.1	9.2	6.1	5.9	3.8	7.7	3.6	3.2	3.4	1.8	1.8
	Rural	24.2	22.9	18.8	4.6	5.8	6.3	3.8	3.3	0.4	5.8	1.7	0	0.4	0.4	1.7
	<b>Total</b>	18.3	13.7	14.9	7.3	7.3	8.2	5.3	5	2.6	7	2.9	2	2.3	1.3	1.8
Campus Placement	Urban	23.4	17.8	7	6.1	9.9	10.1	5.9	4.3	1.4	3.8	1.8	2	2.5	0.7	3.4
	Rural	35.8	22.1	12.5	4.6	5.8	1.3	2.5	1.7	0.8	5.4	0.8	0.4	0	0	6.3
	<b>Total</b>	27.8	19.3	8.9	5.6	8.5	7	4.7	3.4	1.2	4.4	1.5	1.5	1.6	0.4	4.4
Institute Location Benefits	Urban	15.3	13.1	6.5	6.3	11.5	10.6	7.7	3.2	2.9	6.3	3.4	2.3	4.1	1.8	5.2
	Rural	35.8	17.1	10	10	9.2	6.3	3.8	1.3	0.8	1.7	0.4	1.3	0.4	0	2.1
	<b>Total</b>	22.5	14.5	7.7	7.6	10.7	9.1	6.3	2.5	2.2	4.7	2.3	1.9	2.8	1.2	4.1
Quality of Teaching and Learning facilities	Urban	28.2	18.9	18.9	5.9	7.9	7	1.4	0.9	1.4	1.4	1.1	1.4	1.4	2	2.5
	Rural	43.3	18.3	19.2	4.6	7.1	2.5	0.4	2.5	0.4	0.8	0.4	0	0	0.4	0
	<b>Total</b>	33.5	18.7	19	5.4	7.6	5.4	1	1.5	1	1.2	0.9	0.9	0.9	1.5	1.6
Institute Director Profile	Urban	2.9	0	2.7	9.2	16	11.3	14.9	8.3	3.8	9.7	5.4	4.5	2.7	2	6.5
	Rural	46.7	25.4	18.8	5.8	0	1.7	0	1.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	18.3	8.9	8.3	8	10.4	7.9	9.6	6	2.5	6.3	3.5	2.9	1.8	1.3	4.2
Accreditation	Urban	1.8	1.8	3.2	2.5	4.3	9	8.3	12.2	8.3	7.4	13.1	10.8	5.6	10.1	1.6
	Rural	2.5	2.9	3.8	0	0	2.5	4.6	15	9.2	5.4	17.5	15	6.7	14.2	0.8
	<b>Total</b>	2	2.2	3.4	1.6	2.8	6.7	7	13.2	8.6	6.7	14.6	12.3	6	11.5	1.3
Student Testimonials	Urban	18.9	16.7	6.5	9	8.8	10.8	6.3	4.7	5.9	5.6	2.3	2.7	1.1	0.2	0.5
	Rural	19.6	25	20.4	7.9	11.3	1.3	7.1	0.8	0.4	2.1	0	2.1	0	0	2.1
	<b>Total</b>	19.2	19.6	11.4	8.6	9.6	7.5	6.6	3.4	3.9	4.4	1.5	2.5	0.7	0.1	1
Failure to gain Alternative	Urban	3.2	5.2	6.1	5	9	8.8	11	9	7.7	9	9.7	5.4	4.5	2.3	4.3
	Rural	9.2	26.7	15.8	7.5	8.8	7.5	5.8	5	0.8	4.2	3.8	0.4	0.8	0.4	3.3
	<b>Total</b>	5.3	12.7	9.5	5.8	8.9	8.3	9.2	7.6	5.3	7.3	7.6	3.7	3.2	1.6	3.9
Employment perspective	Urban	13.7	12.4	6.3	3.8	6.3	8.8	5.4	8.3	7.7	5.9	8.1	6.8	2.3	4.3	0
	Rural	30.4	24.6	13.3	7.1	2.1	7.5	3.8	3.3	2.1	1.3	1.3	0.4	0.4	0.8	1.7
	<b>Total</b>	19.6	16.7	8.8	5	4.8	8.3	4.8	6.6	5.7	4.2	5.7	4.5	1.6	3.1	0.6
Industry Institute Interaction	Urban	6.5	5.4	2.9	4.5	9.9	8.1	7.7	5.6	6.3	7.7	11.3	9	7.4	3.6	4.1
	Rural	21.7	14.2	8.3	7.5	2.9	4.2	3.3	3.8	5.8	2.5	9.2	8.3	3.8	2.1	2.5
	<b>Total</b>	11.8	8.5	4.8	5.6	7.5	6.7	6.1	5	6.1	5.8	10.5	8.8	6.1	3.1	3.5
Campus Cultural Life	Urban	6.1	6.5	5.9	3.2	6.3	6.5	7.2	5.2	8.1	5.6	9.9	13.7	5.4	6.5	3.8
	Rural	31.3	19.6	15.4	8.3	4.6	3.8	2.1	1.7	3.8	1.7	0.8	2.5	0.4	0.4	3.8
	<b>Total</b>	14.9	11.1	9.2	5	5.7	5.6	5.4	3.9	6.6	4.2	6.7	9.8	3.7	4.4	3.8
Collaboration With Foreign Institutes	Urban	5.6	4.3	4.5	2.3	6.8	6.5	4.1	6.5	7.2	5.9	9.9	9.5	6.5	8.8	11.7
	Rural	17.5	16.3	11.7	5.8	5	3.8	2.5	2.5	2.9	2.1	4.2	5.4	6.3	4.2	10
	<b>Total</b>	9.8	8.5	7	3.5	6.1	5.6	3.5	5.1	5.7	4.5	7.9	8	6.4	7.2	11.1

## Factors Influencing Student's Choice in Selecting Management Institutes in Karnataka State

With Garret's Table formulation, an effort has gone to identify and recognize various Critical success factor has been used. Post analyzing for each factors, scores were added and total value with mean values of score was taken and value for Urban and Rural were undertaken by Factor Analysis were analyzed and interpreted accordingly and Considering Students success ration across Urban and Rural location, Faculty Reputation, Institution reputation, Quality of Teaching and Learning facilities will remain top 3 major success factors and Industry Institute Interaction, Collaboration with Foreign Institutes and Accreditation took last 3 least important factor for any students to opt any Management Institute.

Factors	Garret's Mean	R an k	Garret's Mean	R an k	Garret's Mean	R an k
	Urban		Rural)		Score	
Uniqueness of the Programme	67.5	4	74.3	5	69.9	4
Faculty reputation	69.2	2	76.9	2	71.9	1
Institution Reputation	69.2	1	75.9	3	71.6	2
Cost of the Programme	59.7	7	68.2	11	62.7	8
Campus Placement	64.2	5	69.2	8	65.9	5
Institute Location Benefits	58.8	8	70.5	6	62.9	7
Quality of Teaching and Learning facilities	68.3	3	74.8	4	70.6	3
Institute Director Profile	50.5	11	77.2	1	59.9	10
Accreditation	45.5	14	42.9	15	44.6	15
Student Testimonials	63.6	6	68.5	10	65.3	6
Failure to gain Alternative	50.7	10	63.4	12	55.1	12
Employment perspective	57.2	9	70	7	61.7	9
Industry Institute Interaction	49.8	12	59.9	13	53.4	13
Campus Cultural Life	49.1	13	68.6	9	55.9	11
Collaboration With Foreign Institutes	45	15	56.9	14	49.2	14
<b>Mann Whitney test</b>	<b>Z=2.00, p= .004, HS</b>					

Post garrets scale, Further analysis were carried out with the of factor analysis as process was used to identify latent variables. Particularly purpose was driven in analyzing is to reduce as many individual items into fewer number of dimensions and aimed at simplifying the data obtained such as reducing the number of variables which can be used for regression models for future purposes,

### FACTOR ANALYSIS

Factor analysis of the obtained data analysis were used on two locations namely Urban and Rural students as a technique used which will reduce a large number of variables into fewer numbers of factors. This technique removes maximum common variance from all variables used in analyzing the data and puts them into a common score by using The Kaiser-Meyer Olkin (KMO) and Bartlett's Test measure of sampling is obtained for the analysis and tabulated below as mentioned separately from Urban and Rural locations -

#### I. LOCATION = URBAN

##### KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.727
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	1253.123
	df	105
	Sig.	.000

a. Location = Urban

##### Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	3.383	22.550	22.550	3.383	22.550	22.550	2.107	14.046	14.046
2	1.662	11.077	33.627	1.662	11.077	33.627	2.047	13.646	27.692
3	1.639	10.926	44.553	1.639	10.926	44.553	1.979	13.195	40.887
4	1.131	7.539	52.092	1.131	7.539	52.092	1.681	11.204	52.092
5	.957	6.377	58.469						
6	.924	6.161	64.629						
7	.862	5.748	70.378						
8	.789	5.261	75.639						
9	.720	4.801	80.440						
10	.576	3.843	84.283						
11	.561	3.676	87.959						
12	.529	3.525	91.484						
13	.504	3.362	94.846						
14	.411	2.743	97.589						
15	.362	2.411	100.000						

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. Location = Urban

#### II. LOCATION = RURAL

##### KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.744
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	909.192
	df	105
	Sig.	.000

a. Location = Rural

Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	4.091	27.273	27.273	4.091	27.273	27.273	2.727	18.180	18.180
2	1.558	10.385	37.658	1.558	10.385	37.658	2.131	14.204	32.384
3	1.351	9.007	46.665	1.351	9.007	46.665	1.558	10.385	42.768
4	1.089	7.258	53.923	1.089	7.258	53.923	1.378	9.189	51.957
5	1.011	6.737	60.660	1.011	6.737	60.660	1.305	8.702	60.660
6	.918	6.118	66.778						
7	.858	5.722	72.500						
8	.766	5.105	77.605						
9	.742	4.946	82.552						
10	.653	4.355	86.907						
11	.606	4.041	90.947						
12	.440	2.937	93.884						
13	.359	2.394	96.278						
14	.320	2.131	98.409						
15	.239	1.591	100.000						

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. Location = Rural

Rotated Component Matrix<sup>b</sup>

	Component				
	1	2	3	4	5
Uniqueness of the Programme	.542				
Faculty reputation				.707	
Institution Reputation			.780		
Cost of the Programme			.583		
Campus Placement			.561		
Institute Location Benefits		.767			
Quality of Teaching and Learning facilities		.455			
Institute Director Profile					.738
Accreditation					.663
Student Testimonials		.809			
Failure to gain Alternative	.646				
Employment perspective	.693				
Industry Institute Interaction	.559				
Campus Cultural Life		.499			
Collaboration With Foreign Institutes	.738				

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

a. Rotation converged in 7 iterations.

b. Location = Rural

## V. CONSOLIDATE FACTOR ANALYSIS OF URBAN AND RURAL

### KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.823
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	2482.751
	df	105
	Sig.	.000

# Factors Influencing Student's Choice in Selecting Management Institutes in Karnataka State

Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	4.337	28.914	28.914	4.337	28.914	28.914	2.610	17.398	17.398
2	1.421	9.472	38.386	1.421	9.472	38.386	2.284	15.226	32.624
3	1.385	9.236	47.622	1.385	9.236	47.622	2.188	14.586	47.210
4	1.072	7.144	54.766	1.072	7.144	54.766	1.133	7.556	54.766
5	.949	6.327	61.093						
6	.884	5.892	66.985						
7	.794	5.295	72.280						
8	.690	4.599	76.880						
9	.667	4.448	81.328						
10	.604	4.029	85.357						
11	.557	3.714	89.071						
12	.503	3.350	92.421						
13	.421	2.810	95.231						
14	.369	2.462	97.693						
15	.346	2.307	100.000						

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotated Component Matrix

	Component			
	1	2	3	4
Uniqueness of the Programme			.492	
Faculty reputation		.694		
Institution Reputation		.591		
Cost of the Programme			.745	
Campus Placement			.782	
Institute Location Benefits		.571		
Quality of Teaching and Learning facilities		.613		
Institute Director Profile		.661		
Accreditation				.885
Student Testimonials			.552	
Failure to gain Alternative	.550			
Employment perspective	.659			
Industry Institute Interaction	.690			
Campus Cultural Life	.711			
Collaboration With Foreign Institutes	.723			

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

a. Rotation converged in 6 iterations.

## Final

Variables		Urban				Rural					Total			
		1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4
Uniqueness of the Programme		0.835			0.605	0.542								0.492
Faculty reputation	0.778	0.653											0.694	
Institution Reputation	0.742						0.78	0.707					0.591	
Cost of the Programme	0.664		0.712				0.583							0.745
Campus Placement			0.696				0.561							0.782
Institute Location Benefits			0.694	0.594		0.767							0.571	
Quality of Teaching and Learning facilities						0.455							0.613	
Institute Director Profile		0.546		0.759					0.738				0.661	

Accreditation								0.663				0.885	
Student Testimonials		0.789		0.581		0.809					0.552		
Failure to gain Alternative		0.784							0.55				
Employment perspective		0.779			0.646				0.659				
Industry Institute Interaction					0.693				0.69				
Campus Cultural Life						0.499			0.711				
Collaboration With Foreign Institutes	0.528				0.738				0.723				
<b>Variance</b>	<b>14.046</b>	<b>13.646</b>	<b>13.195</b>	<b>11.204</b>	<b>18.18</b>	<b>14.204</b>	<b>10.385</b>	<b>9.189</b>	<b>8.702</b>	<b>17.398</b>	<b>15.228</b>	<b>14.566</b>	<b>7.556</b>
<b>KMO</b>	<b>0.787</b>				<b>0.744</b>				<b>0.823</b>				

From the consolidated data obtained from both urban and rural data confines and measure KMO(Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin) which must be less than 0.5 for a satisfactory factor analysis to continue Also, it is recommended by KMO value must vary between 0.7-0.8 which would be acceptable, and values above 0.9 are superb. It is evident from the above data analysis that the KMO measure is 0.787, 0.744 and 0.823, which is close of 0.5 and hence the above values can be accepted for further evaluation

### VI. CONCLUSION

Urban and Rural location, Faculty Reputation, Institution reputation, Quality of Teaching and Learning facilities will remain top 3 major success factors and Industry Institute Interaction, Collaboration with Foreign Institutes and Accreditation took last 3 least important factor for any students to opt any Management Institute. The exploration ponders endeavors to give a comprehensive point of view by distinguishing 15 essential variables which significantly add to building a brand of a Management Institute. Despite the fact that these six factors will act as a job facilitator and acclaimed scholastic establishment or a college ought to have as essential mainstays of higher learning. The organizations/colleges ought to act naturally responsible tnot let the student to engage themselves in creating an ecosphere of inculcating Culture and embedded in their DNA. Business Management will engulf current barrier in expanding frontiers with encouraging and retaining best faculty and give them autonomy to implement world best teaching methods to students. The essential focal point of any foundation or college ought to be to influence understudy to take part in showing learning process instead of to be a client to the organization or college. For organizations and colleges to create powerfully and to have a solid brand issues, colleges and the foundations ought to comprehend that having best Business Program will serve to lead in race of gaining momentum in an edifying background which serves progressively and increases less.

### REFERENCES

- Dixit Amit, Sharma Kapil, A Study Identifying Factors Affecting Branding of Management Institutes in Madhya Pradesh, 2017, Vol.6, Issue-3, 1-10
- Dr. Balaji S. Mudholkar, Study Student's Choice Factors For Selecting B-Schools With Special Reference To Mumbai, 2012, International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research Vol.2 Issue 4, April 2012, ISSN 2231 5780
- Emad M. Wajeeh & Ted Micceri (1997), "Factors Influencing Students' College Choice at Traditional and Metropolitan Universities", in proceeding of 37th Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research Orlando, Held on May 18-21, 1997, Florida

- Galhena, B., & Rathnayake, R. (2011). Determinants of career choice decision of management undergraduates in Sri Lanka. Proceedings of the International Conference on Business and Information. Retrieved from <http://www.kln.ac.lk/fcms/ICBI2011/ICBI%20CD/ICBI%202011/Papers/HRM%20919.pdf>
- Ghouchian, N., Moghadam, M., Kani, M., Azar, A., & Bahreini, S. (2013). Factors affecting foreign students' choice of university from the point of view of foreign students in Iran. World Sciences Journal, 1(12), 106-116.
- Jacqueline Liza Fernandez, "An exploratory study of factors influencing the decision of students to study at university sains Malaysia", Kajian Malaysia, Vol. 28, No. 2, 2010, pp. 107-136
- Joseph Sia Kee Ming (2010), "Institutional Factors Influencing Students' College Choice Decision in Malaysia: A Conceptual Framework", International Journal of Business and Social Science, Vol. 1 No. 3; December 2010, pp.53-58
- Ming, J. (2010). Institutional factors influencing students' college choice decision in Malaysia: A conceptual framework. International Journal of Business and Social Science, 1(3), 53-58.
- Robinson, A. and J. Bornholt, 2007. Pathways theory of progression through higher education. Australian Journal of Educational & Developmental Psychology, 7, 49-62.
- Shetty, B., & Gujarathi, R. (2013). Students' perception about management education in India and USA, MERC Global's. International Journal of Management, 1(1), 1-14.
- Sidin, S., Hussin, S., & Soon, T. (2003). An exploratory study of factors influencing the college choice decision of undergraduate students in Malaysia. Asia Pacific Management Review, 8(3), 259-280.
- Zabid, M., & Ling, C. (2003). Malaysian employer perceptions about local and foreign MBA Graduates. Journal of Education for Business, 79(2), PP 111-117.

### AUTHORS PROFILE



Dr(h.c). DM Arvind Mallik is a young, record-setting academic, TedX speaker, multiple world record holder and an Eduventor, with over 10 years' experience in the teaching industry. He has successfully introduced world-class teaching methods like Flipped Classroom, Design Thinking for Educators with Mobile Learning, Digital Learning (social media) and Virtual Reality. He has won 6 world records, 12 national, 5 global awards and has created a new benchmark in Management Education today. Recently his Experiential Learning on introducing Virtual Reality into academics for the first time entered the Limca Book of Records 2019. He also won Best Marketing Professor endorsed by CMO Asia 2018. He has a versatile interest in art, literature, photography, music and is a voracious reader. He is working on VR eradicating social phobia and is keen on AI and Neuro Marketing. In recognizing his remarkable achievement in higher education, he has received Honorary Doctorate in Business Administration from IVUP accredited to ICPEM and recognized by the United Nations.



## Factors Influencing Student's Choice in Selecting Management Institutes in Karnataka State



Dr. Ananthapadmanabha Achar, Professor and Dean corporate programmes. He has 30 years of experience in teaching training and consultancy in Management. Before joining JKSHIM, Dr Achar had worked as Director of Sahyadri School of Management Mangalore for 5 years and of he had worked as professor in Manipal group of institutions for than two decades. During his tenure as professor at Manipal Institute of Management, he had occupied several administrative positions like Head centre for Small Business Management, Chairman placement committee, student welfare officer etc. His areas of specialization in teaching are Human Resource Management and Entrepreneurship. He has conducted nearly 100 short and long term executive education programmes for both and SME and Large organization and has coordinated several research projects in the area of poverty elevation, rural development and women empowerment. He has presented nearly 30 research papers in the national and international conference. Presently, he is working on collaborative research on "Impact of leadership on school performance - A cross cultural comparison of schools in Malaysia and Karnataka". He also provides consultancy services for designing Training and Development Programmes to corporate organizations