

# Choice Of Management Education And Proposed Model For Perceived Differences Between Post Graduate Diploma In Management (Pgdm) And Masters In Business Administration (Mba) In India

Dr. Himanshu Misra<sup>1</sup>, Dr. Masood Siddiqui<sup>2</sup>, Dr. Shalini Singh<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Associate Professor, Jaipuria Institute of Management, Lucknow

<sup>2</sup>Professor, Jaipuria Institute of Management, Lucknow

<sup>3</sup>Assistant Professor, Jaipuria Institute of Management, Lucknow

## ABSTRACT:

**Introduction:** India has more than 3000 institutes offering post graduate management programs in form of Master of Business Administration (MBA) and/or Post Graduate Diploma in Management (PGDM). The paper empirically finds out the reasons for inclination of students towards management education and also identifies the perceived differences between PGDM and MBA.

**Methodology:** A questionnaire was prepared after review of literature and conducting 27 telephonic interviews of directors of coaching institutes and 4 telephonic interviews of online advisory sites. Interviews were done to capture the real insights and common queries raised by prospective students in India. Total 240 responses were found to be complete in all respect and were used for analysis.

**Results:** Non-Parametric k-related Friedman Test and Kendall's W tests were applied to test the null hypothesis. Logistic Regression Analysis was also used to examine the role of variables in the choice-discrimination between PGDM and MBA institutes. Hit ratio of the proposed model was found to be 80%. **Discussion:** The results indicate that students choose management education for better career opportunities and to enhance their learning which is influenced by faculty, academic environment and peer learning. Accreditation and Ranking was also found to be significant leading to preference for PGDM over MBA.

## Keywords:

Coaching institutes, advisory sites, management education, logistic regression, hit ratio.

## INTRODUCTION

Education is not only one of the basic need for human development but is also necessary for national development and an indicator of social, economic and prosperous society (Brennan & Teichler, 2008). On one hand the decision to join a particular institute is important for students (Avram, 2014), on the other it is also important for institutes to understand the factors affecting such choices (Avram, 2014; Ming & Kee, 2010)

Firstly, the paper attempts to understand the reasons for pursuing management education, and then also maps the perceived differences by prospective students between MBA and PGDM.

The study was done in state of Uttar Pradesh in India, as it has maximum number of management institutes in the country and also happens to be the most populous state of India. It is noteworthy to clarify here that

PGDM and MBA both are 2 year post-graduate management programs offered in India. PGDM is a diploma course offered by private institutes whereas MBA is a degree course offered by Universities or institutes which are affiliated to them. As far as regulatory bodies are concerned all PGDM institutes fall in domain of All India Council of Technical Education (AICTE- [www.aicte-india.org](http://www.aicte-india.org)), and all MBA institutes are within the ambit of University Grant Commission (UGC- <https://www.ugc.ac.in/>).

## MANAGEMENT INSTITUTES IN INDIA: INDICATION OF EARLY DECLINE

Management education in India started around 1950s and has witnessed many changes in its journey of 70 years. With efforts of AICTE and UGC the number of institutes offering MBA and PGDM witnessed immense growth in terms of numbers and rose from few hundreds to few thousands. The number of institutes offering management program in post-graduation in India is presented in Table 1

Table 1

*Number of Management Institutes in India*

Year	No of Institutes	Total Sanctioned Intake
2012-13	3861	4,42,922

2020-21	3094	4,34,778
% Change	- ( 19.86)	- (1.83)

Source: <https://facilities.aicte-india.org/dashboard/pages/dashboardaicte.php> accessed on 22 Sept, 2020

As evident from table 1, the number of management institutes in India declined by 19.86% and the sanctioned intake has also been reduced by approx. 1.83% in last 08 years.

The closure of considerable number of management institutes encouraged us to find the reasons for pursuing management education at the first place and then to identify factors influencing choice of PGDM or MBA. No study focusing upon perceived differences between MBA and PGDM could not be found in Indian context.

### DECISION MAKING MODELS IN EDUCATION CHOICE

Some of the prominent and well documented models for university choice are discussed below.

#### ECONOMIC MODEL

Economic model, of university choice highlights the rational behavior of students and efforts put by them in evaluating the information available as per their preferences at the time of decision making (Des Jardins & Toutkoushian, 2005). On one hand the model seems to have a very rationalistic approach on the other hand keeping in mind the number of management institutes in India and perceived differences between them selecting the right one seems to be a daunting task.

Research work of Fernandez (2010) suggests that student will select those institutions which provides them more benefits as compared to other students. This comparison can be on many tangible benefits like infrastructure and location of the institute and some intangible factors as well like reputation or image of the institute. The student decision to join a university is a result of comparison between expected benefits and expected cost or total investment made in college education (Paulsen, 2001). This also means that the students will choose university which offers highest utility or maximum benefits. (DesJardins & Toutkoushian, 2005).

#### SOCIOLOGICAL MODEL

Sociological approaches for university selection focuses on role various socio-cultural factors like socioeconomic background, future prospects etc. (Perna, 2006). These factors might play a crucial role in selection of management institutes in India keeping in mind the huge income disparities and differences in social strata prevailing in the country.

Other researches on sociological models focus on 3 main variables which includes parental encouragement, influence of significant others and academic performance (Hossler, Braxton, & Coopersmith, 1989). The interrelationship between these 3 factors also plays a crucial role. From sociological perspective the role of reference group affecting the choice of management institute cannot be ignored and this may include opinion

of teachers, coaching institutes, advisory sites, friends, relative etc.

#### MARKETING MODEL

Marketing concepts has also been applied by some researchers to better understand the selection of higher education institutions. However, this concept, approaches prospective students as consumers, which is highly debatable but has gained acceptance over a period of time (Obermeit, 2012). The marketing approach takes into consideration economic and sociological models as well and applies model of consumer behavior to understand the same. It incorporates internal factors like cultural, social, personal, psychological characteristics etc. and external factors which are social, cultural, product and price etc. These factors are further supplemented by communication strategies and effort of the provider as well (Obermeit, 2012).

Marketing concept have approached selection of educational institutes from various perspectives and has some overlapping with economic and socio cultural models as well.

Apart from these 3 models, research works have focused on combination of above mentioned models as well. Like Hossler & Gallagher (1987) talk about a three-staged model. These 3 stages are a) predisposition stage b) search stage and c) choice. Perna (2006) also discussed a combined model for university choice. She proposed that the university choice is result of sociological and economic factors.

#### ROLE OF COACHING INSTITUTES AND ADMISSION COUNSELLING SITES IN INDIA IN MANAGEMENT EDUCATION

Another interesting aspect of decision making of students for management education in India is presence of large number of coaching institutes, advisory sites and admission counsellors both at national and regional levels. These coaching institutes play a very important role not only in preparing students for the entrance examinations required by management institutions but also in influencing the choice and selection of management institutions. The oldest Top-3 coaching institutes in India are T.I.M.E (Triumphant Institute of Management Education Pvt. Ltd, <https://www.time4education.com/> ), Career Launcher (<https://www.careerlauncher.com/>) and IMS (<https://www.imsindia.com/>).

Also the advisory sites who counsel students for various undergraduate and post graduate education including management education also plays a pivotal role in influencing choice of the institute. Some most popular sites in India are Shiksha (<https://www.shiksha.com/>), Collegedunia (<https://collegedunia.com/>), Careers 360

(<https://www.careers360.com/>), MBA Universe (<https://www.mbauniverse.com/>). These sites attract millions of students and provide guidance on a variety of courses including management. The footfalls on these sites and the number of institutes covered by them indicates their role in choice made by students.

### **METHODOLOGY**

This study was conducted keeping in mind following key questions:

- a) The reason behind choice of management education for post-graduation study.
- b) The perceived differences between PGDM and MBA courses.

The entire research was done in two phases:

- i) In the 1<sup>st</sup> phase telephonic interviews of coaching institutes and online advisory sites were done with an objective to capture real insights and approach of students in India, as they have a wide presence and interact, counsel and guide millions of students each year.
- ii) In the 2<sup>nd</sup> phase, based on the findings of interviews and after review of related literature, a questionnaire was made and administered to students, first part focused on why students choose management education for post-graduation and second part focused on what basis they differentiate between PGDM and MBA courses.

For first phase, total 27 telephonic interviews of directors of coaching institutes were done in 12 cities in Uttar Pradesh. Those cities were selected which are considered as educational hub in respective regions. Apart from these, 4 telephonic interviews of online advisory sites were also done. The purpose was to understand the common questions asked by students related to management education and also to understand queries of students related to differences between PGDM and MBA institutes. Thus these interviews helped in capturing real insights and mindset of students. Interesting fact which emerged from interviews was that majority of students perceived PGDM to be superior as compared to MBA which encouraged us more to find the reason for the same.

### **LITERATURE REVIEW**

Ehrman (2006) in his studies mentioned that modern universities are witnessing a 'buyers' market' wherein the students are buying higher education from universities through curriculum, faculty members, library facilities, and other resources available etc. Therefore understanding students' expectations becomes important to score a competitive advantage in a market characterized by over-supply and where seat occupancy is a challenge.

Further, the institutions also have to understand the importance of creating an attractive image of quality education providers which will lead to loyal customers (Briukhanov, Kiselev, Timchenko, & Vdovin, 2010). This image formation can be enhanced further if we

communicate as per students' expectations from institutes.

An extensive review of literature was conducted to arrive at the major factors influencing choice of a management education. One of the very basic expectation during selection of educational institutes is quality education, which has been studied by various researchers in deep detail and included factors like student quality, along with faculty credentials, salient academic features and administrative support provided (Akareem & Hossain, 2012). Sarpkaya (2010) was of the opinion that students give more importance to employment potential and satisfaction. Similarly, Coates (2005) was of the opinion that quality is interpreted with the efforts made to engage the students and how they are encouraged in purposeful educational activities.

The marketing theory focusses on understanding the expectation of customers as a prerequisite for delivering high quality services. This theory perceives students as consumers (Tsiligiris, 2011). Understanding of expectations becomes all the more important keeping in mind the number of PGDM institutes in India resulting in stiff competition.

### **FACULTY AND ACADEMIC ENVIRONMENT**

When it comes to educational institute, faculty and academic environment acts like a spine and runs across to almost all functions of the institutes. Previous research works have also recognized the importance of faculty and academic quality. The constituents of academic quality in previous works are teaching quality, qualification of teachers, curriculum quality, research quality and medium of instruction (Padlee, Kamaruddin, & Baharun, 2010).

Reddy (2011) in his work on preference of B-Schools by Indian students identified 6 factors amongst which academic activities was found to have significant effect on preference of B-Schools. Similarly, in his works Webb (1993) establishes the role of academic reputations, role of accreditations, proximity, costs associated, and potential marketability and acceptance of the degree as crucial factors. Chapman, (1993); Coccari & Javalgi, (1995) propose that quality of faculty members, overall academic reputation of institution are important.

Soutar & Turner (2002) classified the factors into two broad categories; namely the university related factors and the personal factors. Within university related he discussed factors like teaching staff quality, types of courses, academic reputation, campus etc.

### **INFRASTRUCTURE FACILITIES**

Infrastructure facilities provide the necessary support for effective delivery of services in a given environment. In similar works done in past library and information technology facilities came out to be crucial factors (Price, Matzdorf, Smith, & Agahi, 2003). Similar results were found in research works of

Mudholkar (2012). Reddy (2011) found that Indian students consider physical facilities when selecting a B-School. In their work Joseph & Joseph (2000) concluded that physical infrastructure and facilities are important issues which should be kept in mind by educational institutions in their endeavor to create a sustainable competitive advantage.

### **PLACEMENT OPPORTUNITIES**

As per the economic model of decision making, students will take a decision which maximizes their utility which is exercised by students by comparing the cost i.e. fee with placement outcome or package offered. During the telephonic interviews with coaching and advisory sites this factor was highly emphasized upon. Also since management program are professional program the student expects that they should end with a decent placement as well. Some researchers have also indicated the importance of placement. Sainy & Gangwani (2010) suggested that the most important factor rated by both male and female student was placement. Kaynama & Smith (1996); Maringe (2006); Alves & Raposo (2007); Ho & Hung (2008); Briggs (2006); Hoyt & Brown (2003); Mudholkar (2012) and few other researchers have identified employability, job prospects etc. as crucial factors affecting selection of B-Schools. Similarly, Strasser, Ozgur, & Schroeder (2002) clubbed various factors affecting choice of B-schools into 3 groups out of which career prospects was significantly found to be effecting the B-School choice. Hence, for this study as well placement opportunities was also included in study.

### **ACCREDITATIONS AND RANKING**

In India, management institutes vie for various accreditation and good rankings as well. National Board of Accreditation (NBA) and National Assessment and accreditation Council (NAAC) are most common and happen to be trusted as well. As far as rankings are concerned there are various agencies publishing the same. Some publishing groups, some advisory websites and some independent organizations rank management institutes based on their predefined criteria and publish their ranking. This ranking are viewed with lot of suspicion and trust alike. Despite their criticism ranking test are the litmus test of quality and reputation of any educational institute. (Rauhvargers, 2011). Thus it is not surprising to find similar institutes enjoying different positions in different rankings and of course they boast of the surveys where they received the best ranks. The telephonic surveys with coaching and advisory sites also indicated that many of them have devised a ranking mechanism of their own on the basis of which they guide their students in selecting the best possible B-School.

In Indian ranking context most significant happening was launch of National Institutional Ranking Framework (NIRF) with due approval from Ministry of Human Resource Development, India on 29<sup>th</sup> Sept,

2015. Since 2016 every year NIRF ranking are released and they are considered to be most reliable and highly credible sources of ranking. These rankings helps in formation of a reputation or good brand of institute. Since these rankings are published, widely circulated and readily on various offline and online platforms they play an important role in choosing a management institute. Similarly, according to Webb (1993) important factors included are accreditation of institution, proximity, cost associated, reputation of institution and marketability of degree etc. Many studies (Isherwood, 1991; Briggs, 2006; Hillenbrand & Money, 2007; Soutar & Turner, 2002; Hoyt & Brown, 2003; Veloutsou, Lewis, & Paton, 2004; Walsh & Beatty, 2007) clearly indicate the importance and role of university's reputation in decision making and choice process.

Bastedo & Bowman (2010) state that in assessment of academic reputation, ranking of institution, tier and change in tier plays a crucial role. The academic reputation will also result in increase or decrease of number of applications as well especially in case of international students (Dichev, 2001)

According to Bowman & Bastedo (2009) the report of ranking and their portrayals on front page of media also has a significant impact on admissions. Any institution which is labeled as 'top tier institute' carries substantial weight as well.

The previous work on ranking clearly indicate that, rankings do play a very critical role in choice of B-School. A good ranking will help in attracting more number of applicants as well.

### **PEER GROUP**

In previous research works peer group has been defined as close friends or a very large network as extreme sides (Véronneau, Vitaro, Brendgen, Dishion & Tremblay, 2010) with many forms between. Researchers have been defined as classmates or roommates as well in research works (Sacerdote, 2001; Winston & Zimmerman, 2004; Zimmerman, 2003; Arcidiacono & Nicholson, 2005).

Peer groups have been defined as persons with whom students spend personal time, with whom they interact on regular basis through personal interactions or via various media, with whom they meet outside class, share personal issues with them as well and trust them as well. (Baldwin, Bedell, & Johnson, 1997; Cho, Davidson & Ingraffea, 2007; Hommes et al., 2012; Huston & Levinger, 1978; Ryan, 2001; Thomas, 2000).

Peers are found to enhance motivation for achievement as also inspire student's academic vigor as well (Lashbrook, 2000). Olalekan (2016) was of the opinion that peer group has a lot of influence on students and it is observable as well. Many researchers have found similar results about the relationship between academic performance and peer group influence as well as this is



found to be a very significant motivating factor as well. (Bankole & Ogunsakin, 2016; Sacerdote, Barnes, Beaver, Young, & Ten Eyck, 2014; Foster, 2005; Mayer & Puller, 2008; Vaquero & Cebrian, 2013; Winston & Zimmerman, 2004; Woolf, Potts, Patel, & McManus, 2012; Sacerdote, 2001). Kindermann (1993) found that the peer groups play an important role in engagement of students in various learning activities as well.

Peer groups are not only motivating, they also facilitate better engagement and help in improving the academic performance as well.

#### **STRONG ALUMNI NETWORKING BASE**

Alumnus aspire the students to aim high, they are like role models and it's no surprise that all the reputed management institutes in India boast of their alma mater and portray their successful alumnus in their communication in print media as well as social platform. Strong alumni base offers many other benefits to the educational institutes. Some tangible measureable benefits of alumni can be financial assistance, internship assistance, delivery of guest lectures, and they can also play crucial role in advisory boards as well (Ebert, Axelsson & Harbor, 2015; Moore & Kuol 2007). Their involvement can also provide a peek into improving educational experience, by contributing in improving current curricula and future job opportunities (Ebert, Axelsson & Harbor, 2015; Moore & Kuol 2007).

Their engagement not only influences the designing and delivery of curricula thus influencing their education but it also helps in engagement with prospective future employees as well (Plewa, Galan, Davey, 2015).

Keeping in mind the benefit of alumni to educational institutes, repeated mention of their importance in telephonic interviews with coaching institutes and websites, their portrayal by management institutes in their communication activities and with favorable support from previous research works this factor was also included in this study as well.

#### **CO AND EXTRA-CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES (CCA AND ECA)**

These activities are usually connected with academic matters and are organized or designed to help the students to enhance the understanding of the course, and also to facilitate their diverse skills (Ingale, 2014). Thus the CCAs are such activities that supplement and complement the curricular or main syllabi activities (Leung, Ng & Chan, 2011). The CCAs usually focus on enhancing the students' intellectual capability, mental capability, analytical ability, developing their leadership quality and interpersonal communication skills and allowing them to engage in diverse social networks (Leung, Ng & Chan, 2011; Daniyal, Nawaz, Hassan & Mubeen, 2012; Bartkus, Nemelka & Gardener, 2012). Extra-curricular Activities or ECAs

usually refer to those activities performed by the students that take place outside the regular school curriculum. These activities are generally voluntary and the students do not receive any academic credit or grades out of their participation (Lunenborg, 2010; Singh & Mishra, 2015). The ECAs allow the students to engage themselves in various social services and nation building activities (Lunenborg, 2010; Bartkus, Nemelka & Gardener, 2012; Le, 2013; Singh & Mishra, 2015; Chua, Chuatoco, Pena & Jimenez, 2017).

There is sufficient volume of literature in the academic world about the effects of the CCAs and ECAs on the academic performance and social skill development of the students across the world (Daniyal, Nawaz, Hassan & Mubeen, 2012; Mehmood, et al. 2012; Ivaniushina & Zapletina, 2015).

Review of literature and interviews indicated that the choice of management education is a result of personal aspirations, social interaction and institute related factors.

#### **THE QUESTIONNAIRE DESIGN AND DATA COLLECTION**

Based on findings of 27 interviews conducted with coaching institutes and 4 interviews with advisory sites and after review of related literature, a questionnaire was prepared. The questionnaire was divided in 2 parts. In first part reasons for choosing management education were mentioned, the 2<sup>nd</sup> part of the questionnaire focused upon the perceived differences between PGDM and MBA institutes. The statements of 2<sup>nd</sup> part were drawn largely from the insights captured during the interview as no such previous study could be found. The students were asked to mark their agreement and disagreement on a 5 point Likert Scale.

The questionnaire was administered to students enrolled with these coaching institutes. Total 240 responses were found to be complete in all respect and were used for analysis.

#### **ANALYSIS AND RESULTS**

As mentioned earlier the questionnaire was divided into two parts, in the first part, variables were taken to understand reason for choosing management education. Here, Non-Parametric k-related sample tests were applied to test the null hypothesis of equal importance provided to all variables by the respondents. Friedman Test was used for this purpose. As per the Table 3, the p-value (sig. = 0.000 < 0.05) suggests that null hypothesis is rejected at 5% level of significance. Hence, there exists a significant difference amongst the variables as perceived by the candidates in their decision to go for management education. As per the Table 2, which presents top 5 variables it is evident that the most important perceived variable is 'Better Career Opportunities' (Mean Rank = 3.29), followed by 'Enhance my Learning' (Mean Rank = 3.17) and so on.

**Table 2: Ranks for reason for choosing Management education**

	Mean Rank
Better Career Opportunities	3.29
Enhance my Learning	3.17
Makes me Future Ready	3.02
Realizing my potential	2.80
Status and Social Acceptance	2.72

**Table 3: Test Statistics**

N	240
---	-----

Chi-Square	26.962
Df	4

Asymp. Sig.	.000
-------------	------

a. Friedman Test

In order to confirm the results, obtained by Friedman Test, another Non- Parametric k-related sample test

Kendall’s W Test was employed which also gave same results. The test statistics for Kendall W test are presented in Table 4.

**Table 4: Test Statistics**

N	240
Kendall's Wa	.028
Chi-Square	26.962
Df	4
Asymp. Sig.	.000

a. Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance

Further, Logistic Regression Analysis was used to examine the role of variables in the choice-discrimination between PGDM and MBA institutes, since the dependent variable is categorical in nature

(PGDM/MBA). Binary Logistic Regression Analysis has been employed as it requires minimum of assumptions for the predictors, even normality assumption is not required for the predictors. This tool has incorporated all 240 cases that are valid (non-missing) (Table 5).

**Table 5: Case Processing Summary**

Unweighted Cases	N	Percent
Included in analysis	240	100.0
Selected cases		
Missing cases	0	.0
Total	240	100.0
Unselected cases	0	.0
Total	240	100.0

a. If weight is in effect, see classification table for the total number of cases.

**Table 6: Dependent Variable Encoding**

Original Value	Internal Value
MBA	0
PGDM	1

**Table 7: Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients**

	Chi-square	Df	Sig.
Step	130.431	7	.000
Step 1 Block	130.431	7	.000

Model	130.431	7	.000
-------	---------	---	------

As per the Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients, results compiled in Table 7 suggests that the proposed binary logistic regression model, consisting of binary choice (PGDM/MBA) as dependent variable and the seven criteria variables as predictors, is significant (sig.  $0.000 < 0.05$ ) at 5% level of significance. This indicates that the considered predictors are able to decipher in between the choices for the management education.

Hosmer Lemeshow Test has been used to examine the fit of the proposed binary logistic regression. Here, the

p-value (sig. =  $0.632 > 0.05$ ) suggests that the model has a 'good' fit (Table 9). Two pseudo r-squares have been taken up here, values of Nagelkerke R Square (0.564) and Cox & Snell R Square (0.419) suggest that the predictive accuracy of the logistic regression model is moderately strong (Table 8). Finally, Hit Ratio (percentage of correct predication) of 80% as per the Classification Table (Table 10), gives the level of predictive accuracy as 80%. This is a high value suggesting that the proposed logistic regression model may be able to correctly predict 80% of the cases.

**Table 8: Model Summary**

Step	-2 log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square
1	196.237a	.419

- a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 6 because parameter estimates changed by less than .001

**Table 9: Hosmer and Lemeshow Test**

Step	Chi-square	Df	Sig.
1	6.137	8	.632

**Table 10: Classification Table**

	Observed	Predicted		
		Preference for the type of management course		Percentage correct
		No	Yes	
Step 1	Preference for the type of Management Course			
	MBA	75	26	74.3
	PGDM	22	117	84.2
	Overall percentage			80.0

- a. The cut value is .500

As per the Table 11, variables in the equation, peer group (sig. =  $0.000 < 0.05$ ), placement opportunities (sig. =  $0.000 < 0.05$ ), strong alumni networking base (sig. =  $0.043 < 0.05$ ), accreditation and affiliations (sig. =  $0.017 < 0.05$ ), and faculty & academic environment (sig. =  $0.000 < 0.05$ ) have been found to be significant.

Further, according to the values of Wald's coefficient, placement opportunities (Wald Coeff. = 29.339) has been found to be most important predictor for the proposed model, followed by faculty & academic environment (Wald Coeff. = 21.342) and peer group (Wald Coeff. = 17.199). Accreditation and affiliations (Wald Coeff. = 5.659) and strong alumni networking base (Wald Coeff. = 4.096) were the last predictors.

**Table 11: Variables in Equation**

	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp (B)
Placement opportunities	.786	.145	29.339	1	.000	2.194
Faculty and academic environment	.756	.164	21.342	1	.000	2.130
Peer group	.576	.139	17.199	1	.000	1.778
Accreditation and Ranking	.543	.228	5.659	1	.017	1.721
Strong alumni networking base	-.457	.226	4.096	1	.043	.633
Infrastructure facilities	.088	.214	.168	1	.682	1.092
Co and extra-curricular exposure	-.034	.188	4.096	1	.043	.633

Constant	-9.548	1.428	44.700	1	.000	.000
----------	--------	-------	--------	---	------	------

The proposed binary logistic model has been proposed as:

$$\log (p/ (1-p)) = -9.548 + 0.576 * (\text{Peer Learning and Support}) + 0.786 * (\text{Placement Opportunities}) - .034 * (\text{Co-and Extra Curricular Exposure}) - .457 * (\text{Strong Alumni Networking Base}) + \dots + .088 * (\text{Infrastructure Facilities})$$

where, p = Probability of the case belonging to 1<sup>st</sup> Group (PGDM) and p/ (1-p) = Odd Ratio.

**IMPLICATIONS FOR MANAGEMENT INSTITUTES**

The findings of the paper have important implications for management institutes indicating that student willingness to pursue management education is because of its association with better career opportunities (Mean Value 3.29, Table 2). Previous studies in different context and countries have also established the importance of career opportunities or employability, Kaynama & Smith (1996), Maringe (2006), Alves & Raposo (2007), Ho & Hung (2008), Briggs (2006), Hoyt & Brown (2003), Mudholkar (2012). Management institutes have to be really cautious about and prepare well to ensure that they have strong linkages with corporates and accordingly prepare their students so that they get better career opportunities. Further the management institutes also have to highlight career opportunities available with them in their communication and promotions. Placement opportunities was found to be most important predictor in the model as thus a key differentiator between PGDM and MBA institutes (Wald Coeff. 29.339, Table 11), which reinforces the importance of placement and career opportunities provided by the management institutes.

The prospective students appear to be logical in their approach as well, as enhance my learning (mean value 3.17, Table 2) figures to be the 2<sup>nd</sup> reason for pursuing management education, further as per Table 11, based on Wald Coefficient faculty and academic environment (Wald Coeff. 21.342, Table 11) and peer learning (Wald Coeff. 17.199, Table 11) happens to be the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> important predictor.

Taking all the above 3 inputs together, it may be interpreted that a student chooses management education to enhance his learning and his preference for management institutes is strongly driven by faculty and academic environment and opportunities for peer learning.

The quality of teaching, faculty quality has been found to be instrumental in previous researches as well (Padlee, Kamaruddin, Baharun, 2010, Chapman, 1993, Coccari & Javalgi, 1995). Similarly, previous research work suggests that peer group has a strong influence on academic performance and is a huge motivating factor

(Bankole & Ogunsakin, 2016. Sacerdote, Barnes, Beaver, Young, & Ten Eyck, 2014; Foster, 2005; Vaquero & Cebrian, 2013, Winston & Zimmerman, 2004; Woolf, Potts, Patel, & McManus, 2012, Sacerdote, 2001)

Thus the relationship appears to be a very logical triad wherein on one side we have enhancement of learning and this is supported by faculty and academic environment on one side and peer group on the other. Management institutes have to ensure that they provide enough learning opportunities to their students and this will also help them in spreading a positive word of mouth for the institutes. The preference for PGDM institutes is because of their faculty, academic environment and peer groups. Thus indicating the need for PGDM institutes to create a mechanism to ensure effective peer learning which may be imparted by various group activities wherein the team members have to work together and thus learn from each other.

The results also indicate that the choice for management education is influenced by a desire to become future ready and in realizing the potential as indicated by mean values in Table 2. Realizing my potential can be linked to variety of exposure and variety of learning opportunities which are being made available to students. Becoming future ready is becoming more confident about the future outlook. This has important implication for management institutes as well wherein the design and delivery of the curriculum has to be done in such a manner so that the student become confident of handling any challenge in life and becomes more assured and confident of his future. The future readiness may also be approached from the perspective of placement wherein the student is confident that he will be able to perform well at the time of recruitment and will be able to make it to a company of his choice.

In the model, Accreditation and Ranking was also found to be significant and it leads to preference for PGDM institutes over MBA institutions. Here this also needs to be emphasized that good rank and accreditations are basically effect of variety of factors. In most of the ranking framework placement and academic quality carries a high weightage and can ensure good ranking. So putting it all together if the institute has good quality faculty members and well-structured learning processes in place this may lead to better learning for students which might help them in getting better placement opportunities. If all this happens it will automatically help the institute in getting a better rank and desired accreditations.

The relationship of infrastructure facilities and co-and extra-curricular exposure was not found to significant in the study (Table 11).



Just to reiterate, strong pillars for success of management institutes are placement opportunities available with them and their ability to ensure effective learning with the help of quality faculty, peer groups and how with the help of system and processes they can create a conducive academic environment.

### LIMITATIONS OF RESEARCH AND ROAD AHEAD

State of Uttar Pradesh (U.P) was chosen for the study as it is home to maximum number of management institutes in the country, with close to 3000 management institutes, U.P is home to 363 management institutes in year 2020-21 as compared to 556 institutes in the year 2012-12. Closure of more than 193 (34.71 %) management institutes in a span of 08 years made U.P a perfect choice of study. Hence, selection of U.P for study seems to be justified but the findings cannot be extended to be the representative of entire country hence similar studies in other states or study covering various studies may be pursued in future to understand the sentiment of Indian students about management education.

### REFERENCES

1. Akareem, H. S., & Hossain, S. S. (2012). Perception of education quality in private universities of Bangladesh: A study from students' perspective. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, 22 (1), 11–33. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1080/08841241.2012.705792>
2. Alves, H., & Raposo, M. (2007). Conceptual model of student satisfaction in higher education. *Total Quality Management*, 18(5), 571–588.
3. Arcidiacono, P., & Nicholson, S. (2005). Peer effects in medical school. *Journal of Public Economics*, 89 (2), 327-350. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2003.10.006>
4. Avram, E.M. (2014). Higher education Students choice influencing factors. Retrieved from <ftp://ftp.repec.org/opt/ReDIF/RePEc/hmm/v1i1/6/7.pdf>.
5. Baldwin, T.T., Bedell, M.D., & Johnson, J.L. (1997), The social fabric of a team-based MBA program: Network effects on student satisfaction and performance. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 40 (6), 369-1397.
6. Barnes, J.C., Beaver, K.M., Young J.T., & TenEyck, M. (2014). A behavior genetic analysis of the tendency for youth to associate according to GPA. *Social Networks*, 38, 41-49. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socnet.2014.01.001>
7. Bankole, E. T., & Ogunsakin, F. C. (2015). Influence of peer group on academic performance of secondary school students in Ekiti State. *International Journal of Innovative Research and Development*, 4(1), 324-331.
8. Barkus, K. R., Nemelka, B., Nemelka, M. & Gardner, P. (2012). Clarifying the Meaning of the Extracurricular Activity: A Literature Review of Definitions. *American Journal of Business Education*, 5(6), 693-704.
9. Bastedo, M.N., & Bowman, N.M. (2010). The U.S. News and World Report College Rankings: Modelling Institutional Effects on Organizational Reputation. *American Journal of Education*, 116(2), 163–183. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1086/649437>
10. Bowman, N.A., & Bastedo, M.N. (2009). Getting on the Front Page: Organisational Reputation, Status Signals and the Impact of U.S. News and World Report on Student Decisions. *Research in Higher Education*, 50(5), 415-436. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-009-9129-8>
11. Brennan, J., & Teichler, U. (2008). The future of higher education and of higher education research. *Higher Education*, 56(3), 259–264. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-008-9124-6>
12. Briggs, S. (2006). An exploratory study of the factors influencing undergraduate student choice: the case of higher education in Scotland. *Studies in Higher Education*, 31, 705-722. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070601004333>
13. Briukhanov, V., Kiselev, V., Timchenko, N., & Vdovin, V. (2010). Monitoring the opinions of parents of college students as a component of the institution's In-house education quality management system. *Russian Education & Society*, 52(5), 79–88. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.2753/RES1060-9393520507>
14. Chapman, R. G. (1993). Non-simultaneous relative importance-performance analysis: Meta-results from 80 college choice surveys with 55,276 respondents. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, 4(1–2), 405–422. Retrieved from [https://doi.org/10.1300/J050v04n01\\_27](https://doi.org/10.1300/J050v04n01_27)
15. Cho, H., Gay, G., Davidson, B., & Ingraffea, A., (2007). Social networks, communication styles, and learning performance in a CSCL community. *Computers & Education*, 49 (2), 309-329. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2005.07.003>
16. Chua, C.J. E., Chuato, I.A. G., Dela Pena, A. M.C., Jimenez, D.L. F. & Co, D. A. (2017). The Influence of Participation in Extracurricular Activities to the Employability of Industrial Engineering Graduates of One Private University in the Philippines. *The Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 5:2, 163-170.
17. Coates, H. (2005). The value of Student Engagement for Higher Education Quality Assurance. *Quality in Higher Education*, 11(1), 25-36. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1080/13538320500074915>

18. Coccari, R. L., & Javalgi, R. G. (1995). Analysis of students' needs in selecting a college or university in a changing environment. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, 6(2), 27–40. Retrieved from [https://doi.org/10.1300/J050v06n02\\_03](https://doi.org/10.1300/J050v06n02_03)
19. Daniyal, M., Nawaz, T., Hassan, A., & Mubeen, I. (2012). The Effect of Co-Curricular Activities on the Academic Performances of the Students: A Case Study of the Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Pakistan. *Bulgarian Journal of Science and Education Policy*, 6:2, 257-272.
20. Des Jardins, S. L., & Toutkoushian, R. K. (2005). *Are students rational? The development of rational thought and its application to student choice*, Higher education: Handbook of theory and research 23, 191–240. New York, NY: Springer. Retrieved from [https://doi.org/10.1007/1-4020-3279-X\\_4](https://doi.org/10.1007/1-4020-3279-X_4)
21. Dichev, I. (2001). News or Noise? Estimating the Noise in the U.S. News University Ranking. *Research in Higher Education*, 42(3): 237–266.
22. Ebert, K., Axelsson, L., & Harbor, J. (2015). Opportunities and challenges for building alumni networks in Sweden: A case study of Stockholm University. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 37(2), 252–262. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2015.1019117>
23. Ehrman, C. (2006). On using benefit segmentation for a service industry: A study on college career counseling services. *Journal of American Academy of Business*, 8(2), 179–185.
24. Fernandez, J. L. (2010). An exploratory study of factors influencing the decision of students to study at Universiti Sains Malaysia. *Kajian Malaysia*, 28(2), 107–136.
25. Foster, G. (2005). Making friends: A non-experimental analysis of social pair formation, *Human Relations*, 58 (11), 1443-1465.
26. Hillenbrand, C., & Money, K. (2007). Corporate responsibility and corporate reputation: two separate concepts or two sides of the same coin. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 10(4), 261–277. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.crr.1550057>
27. Ho, H. F., & Hung, C. C. (2008). Marketing mix formulation for higher education: An integrated analysis employing analytic hierarchy process, cluster analysis and correspondence analysis. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 22(4), 328–340. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1108/09513540810875662>
28. Hommes, J., Rienties, B., De Grave, W., Bos, G., Schuwirth, L., & Scherpbier, A. (2012) Visualising the invisible: A network approach to reveal the informal social side of student learning, *Advances in Health Sciences Education*, 17 (5), 743-757. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10459-012-9349-0>
29. Hossler, D., Braxton, J., & Coopersmith, G. (1989). Understanding student college choice. *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research*, 5, 231-288.
30. Hoyt, J. E., & Brown, A. B. (2003). Identifying college choice factors to successfully market your institution. *College and University*, 78(4), 3–10.
31. Huston, T.L., & Levinger, G. (1978). Interpersonal attraction and relationships. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 29 (1), 115-156. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ps.29.020178.000555>
32. Ingale, A. R. (2014). Role of Co-Curricular Activities in Student's Life. *Scholarly Research Journal for Humanity Science and English Language*, 1: IV, 592-594.
33. Isherwood, G. B. (1991). College choice: A survey of English-speaking high school students in Quebec. *Canadian Journal of Education* 72–81. Retrieved from <https://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1495218>
34. Ivaniushina, V. A., & Zapletina, O.O. (2015). Participation in Extracurricular Activities and Development of Personal and Interpersonal Skills in Adolescents. *Journal of Siberian Federal University*, 8:11, 2408-2420. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.17516/1997-1370-2015-8-11-2408-2420>
35. Joseph, M., & Joseph, B. (2000). Indonesian students' perceptions of choice criteria in the selection of a tertiary institution: strategic implications. *The International Journal of Educational Management*, 14(1), 40–44. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1108/09513540010310396>
36. Kaynama, S. A., & Smith, L. W. (1996). Using consumer behavior and decision models to aid students in choosing a major. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, 7(2), 57–73. Retrieved from [https://doi.org/10.1300/J050v07n02\\_05](https://doi.org/10.1300/J050v07n02_05)
37. Kindermann, T.A. (1993). Natural peer groups as contexts for individual development: The case of children's motivation in school. *Developmental psychology*, 29, 970-977. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.29.6.970>
38. Lashbrook, J. T. (2000). Fitting in: Exploring the emotional dimension of adolescent pressure. *Adolescence*, 35(140), 747-757.
39. Le, T. (2013). *Does Participation in Extracurricular Activities Reduces Risky Behavior?* Youth in Focus Project Discussion Paper Series, No. 13. The Australian National University.
40. Leung, C., Ng, C. W. R., & Chan, P. (2011). Can Co-Curricular Activities Enhance the Learning

- Effectiveness of Students? An Application to the Sub Degree Students in Hong Kong. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 23:3, 329-341.
41. Lunenburg, F. C. (2010). Extracurricular Activities. Sam Houston State University. *Schooling*, 1:1, 1-4.
  42. Maringe, F. (2006). University and course choice - Implications for positioning, recruitment and marketing. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 20(6), 466–479.
  43. Ming, J., & Kee, S. (2010). Institutional Factors Influencing Students' College Choice Decision in Malaysia: A Conceptual Framework. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 1(3), 53-58.
  44. Moore, S., & Kuol, N. (2007). Retrospective insights on teaching: Exploring teaching excellence through the eyes of the alumni. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 31(2), 133–143.
  45. Mudholkar, D. B. S. (2012). A Study Student's Choice Factors for Selecting B-Schools with Special Reference to Mumbai. *Zenith International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*.
  46. Obermeit, K. (2012). Students' choice of universities in Germany: structure, factors and information sources used. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, 22(2), 206–230. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1080/08841241.2012.737870>
  47. Padlee, Falindah.S ., Kamaruddin., Razak.A., & Baharun, Rohaizat. (2010). International students' choice behavior for higher education at malaysian private universities. *International Journal of Marketing Studies*, 2. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijms.v2n2p202>
  48. Paulsen, M. B. (2001). *The economics of human capital and investment in higher education*. In M. B. Paulsen, and J. Smart (Eds.), *The finance of higher education: Theory, research, policy & practice* 55–94). New York, NY: Agathon Press.
  49. Perna, L. W. (2006). Understanding the relationship between information about college prices and financial aid and students' college-related behaviors. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 49(12), 1620–1635. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764206289144>
  50. Plewa, C., Galan-Muros, V., & Davey, T. (2015). Engaging business in curriculum design and delivery: A higher education institution perspective. *Higher Education*, 70(1), 35–53. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-014-9822-1>
  51. Price, I. F., Matzdorf, F., Smith, L., & Agahi, H. (2003). The impact of facilities on student choice of university. *Facilities*, 21(10), 212–222. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1108/02632770310493580>.
  52. Rauhvargers, A. (2011) Global University Rankings and their Impact, *Brussels: European University Association*.
  53. Reddy, M. (2011). Determinants of Student Choice of Business Schools in India: A factor Analytic Investigation. *International Journal of Management*, 28(3), 751-62.
  54. Sainy,R., & Gangwani, S. (2010). A Study of Factors Affecting the Selection of B- Schools by Students in Indore Region. *Drishtikon : A Management Journal*(2).
  55. Sarpkaya, R. (2010). Factors affecting individual education demand at the entrance to university: Adnan menderes university sample. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice*, 10(1), 475–488.
  56. Singh, A., & Mishra, S. (2015). Extracurricular Activities and Student's Performance in Secondary School of Government and Private Schools, *International Journal of Sociology and Anthropology Research*, 1:1, 53-61.
  57. Soutar, G. N., & Turner, J. P. (2002). Students' preferences for university: A conjoint analysis. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 16(1), 40–45. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1108/09513540210415523>
  58. Strasser, S. E., Ozgur, C., & Schroeder, D. L. (2002). Selecting a business college major: An analysis of criteria and choice using the analytical hierarchy process. *American Journal of Business*, 17(2), 47–56. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1108/19355181200200010>
  59. Thomas, S.L. (2000).Ties that bind: A social network approach to understanding student integration and persistence. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 71 (5) (2000), pp. 591-615. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2000.11778854>
  60. Tsiligiris, V. (2011). *Measuring cultural influence on students' expectations and perceptions in Cross Border Higher Education*. Presentation at The UK and Ireland Institutional Research (HEIR) Network Conference 16-17 June 2011. Kingston University, London.
  61. Vaquero, L.M., & Cebrian, M. (2013). The rich club phenomenon in the classroom, *Scientific Reports*, 3, 1174. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep01174>
  62. Veloutsou, C., Lewis, J. W., & Paton, R. A. (2004). University selection: information requirements and importance. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 18(3), 160–171. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1108/09513540410527158>.
  63. Veronneau, M.H., Vitaro, F., Brendgen, M., Dishion, T.J., & Tremblay, R.E. (2010). Transactional analysis of the reciprocal links

- between peer experiences and academic achievement from middle childhood to early adolescence, *Developmental Psychology*, 46 (4), 773-790. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0019816>.
64. Walsh , G., & Beatty, S. E. (2007). Customer-based corporate reputation of a service firm: Scale development and validation. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 35(1), 127–143. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-007-0015-7>
65. Webb, M. S. (1993). Variables influencing graduate business students 'college selections, college and University, 68(1), 38–46.
66. Winston, G.C., & Zimmerman, D.J. (2004). *Peer effects in higher education*, C.M. Hoxby (Ed.), College choices: The economics of where to go, when to go, and how to pay for it, University of Chicago Press.
67. Woolf, K., Potts, H.W., Patel, S., & McManus, I.C. (2012), The hidden medical school: A longitudinal study of how social networks form, and how they relate to academic performance. *Medical Teacher*, 34 (7), 577-586. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.3109/0142159X.2012.669082>
68. Zimmerman, D.J. (2003), Peer effects in academic outcomes: Evidence from a natural experiment. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 85 (1), 9-23. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1162/003465303762687677>