GLOBAL CONNECTIONS AND INDUSTRY EXPOSURE-A SURVEY BASED STUDY ON EMERGING TRENDS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Ritu Sharma*
Chaitanya Vyas**

ABSTRACT

In recent years there has been a growing interest observed in investigations associated with global university ranking. Reaching out to students' perception of university ranking has become a key factor affecting admission strategies. This paper studies factors of importance and interests for University students in India. In addition to faculty profile, research, placement records, and infrastructure; internship opportunities provided by the university during the program, types and number of International collaboration and opportunities, infrastructure facilities and support for higher education offered by the university are new emerging decision criteria. The present paper is based on a study conducted on a group of university students in India. Total 256 students recently registered in the university participated in this study via survey method. Single-cross sectional convenience sampling is taken using descriptive research design and quantitative research approach is applied. Findings of the paper examine the factors of importance to students in the process of decision making for admission. The results of this study will be of interest to students, academics, university administrators, and government officials from around the world. Researchers through this study have tried to uncover the choice and preferences of college students which influences their decision making while selecting Universities for higher studies.

Keywords: *Internationalization, Higher Education, Internships, University Ranking, University Students*

Associate Professor, Pandit Deendayal Petroleum University, Gujarat, India, e-mail: ritu.sharma@sls.pdpu.ac.in

****Assistant Professor, Pandit Deendayal Petroleum University, Gujarat, India, e-mail: chaitanya.vyas@sls.pdpu.ac.in***

INTRODUCTION

A survey conducted on Higher Education in 2014-15, by Government of India counts 760 universities, 38498 colleges and 12,276 stand-alone institutions in India. There are different categories of higher education institutions in India as shown below:

Central University

Central Open University

Institute of National Importance

State Public University

State Open University

State Private University

State Private Open University

Institute under State Legislature Act

Deemed University-Government

Deemed University-Government Aided

Deemed University-Private

Central University

State Public University

According to All India Survey on Higher Education (AISHE) final report 2014-15, Gross Enrolment Ratio (GER) in higher education in India is 24.3% and the estimated total enrolment is 34.2 million. Approximately 79.4% of the students are enrolled in Under Graduate programs. 42,293 foreign students are in higher education in India. These students are from 164 different countries, largely from India's neighboring countries such as Nepal (21%), Afghanistan (9%), Bhutan (6%), Malaysia and Sudan (5%).Pupil Teacher Ratio (PTR) in higher education is 21.

Table 1. All India PTR in Higher Education

All Institutions		Uni. & Colleges		Uni. & its Constituent Units	
Regular & Distance mode	Regular Mode	Regular & Distance mode	Regular Mode	Regular & Distance mode	Regular Mode
23	21	24	22	37	15

(Source: PUPIL TEACHER RATIO IN HIGHER EDUCATION, Table 25, All India Survey On Higher Education 2014.15 (Final Report), p.131)

After India's independence from British government in 1947, free and compulsory education to children up to the age of 14 became a directive. In the first Five Year Plan, education had been allocated with 7.9% of total plan outlay. In 1950, there were 30 universities and 695 colleges in India. The number grew to 757 Universities and 38,056 colleges in 2014. While total enrolled students in India in the year 1950 were 43,000 and 3,32,72,722 in 2014. That means in last 13 years, number of universities and colleges has increased by 196% each while number of student enrollments in the same time span

has increased by 296% surprisingly.

In 2013, central government of India launched a scheme named Rashtriya Uchchatar Shiksha Abhiyan (RUSA) with an objective to grant to educational institutions of the states. Ranging from 60% to 100%, the fund is allocated on the bases of categories of the states. Quality improvements, reforms in academic and affiliation, research supported atmosphere, capacity addition, etc. are some of the objectives of RUSA.

Choosing dream University/college is one of the most important decisions in contributing the aspiring dream career. Table 2 highlights global factors of consideration in the process college/University selection by various stakeholders. This paper studies factors of importance and interests for University students in India. This research also confirms how important such factors as internship opportunities provided, types and number of international collaboration and opportunities, infrastructure facilities and support for higher education are new emerging decision criteria. Present paper is a part of a study to explore emerging expectations of undergraduate students in India highlighting the changing scenario due to technological advancement. Primary objective of this study is to investigate the significant factors playing role in the selection of colleges/university by the students. The paper further explores role of internationalization as a selection criterion and its impact on other traditional factors like placements, program fees etc.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Monks and Ehrenberg (1999) observed that though college rankings by certain media reports are very popular; applications, enrollment decisions, and institutions' pricing policies are not supported by empirical analysis with regard to impact of these rankings. The research analyzed that institutions accept a larger applicants and then the group of students is found of lower quality (by average SAT scores). The decrease in tuition fees because of loans, employment, and grant aid provided by institutions are to attract more number of students. This was observed more in institutions with declined ratings. The authors further noted that change in rank has a significant influence on students' enrollment decisions and on admission applications. India is the world's third largest academic systems. It is growing rapidly and will continue to do so, according to UNESCO World Conference on Higher Education report by Altbach, Reisberg, & Rumbley. In this report, India was listed as the country with 35% to 60% enrolment in private higher education institutions in India.

Different stakeholders have different expectations from education institutions and systems. Former President of India and known as Missile Man of India, Late Dr. APJ Abdul Kalam, who preferred to call him a teacher, once said, "When the students pass out of senior secondary schools, they should have two certificates–of passing 10+2 examination and of a specific skill acquired by him during schooling". He also said, "In the present context, the education system has to be designed in a way that produces large number of employment generators and not just employment seekers." Universities and colleges today cannot ignore expectations of the students, one of the important stakeholders.

Value and satisfaction matter in managing higher education. A student perceives high value and satisfaction if perceived benefits exceed the cost of higher education. There are many factors, which form students' expectations about what they will receive from the higher education institute. Ravindran and Kalpana (2012) studied expectation, perception and satisfaction of management stream students studying in institutions in Coimbatore, India. The authors identified six dimensions such as location, academics, infrastructure, image, cost, and personnel to check students' expectations, perceptions, and satisfaction. A significant difference was found between the students' perception in six dimensions of institution quality. Except cost, other five factors significantly influenced the

students' overall satisfaction towards the institution. Institutional quality was found as the most important for education administrators to concentrate on, according to this study. A similar study [Butt & ur Rehman (2010)] conducted on 350 students of government and private universities in Pakistan, about students' satisfaction taking different set of factors such as courses offered, teachers' expertise, learning environment, and classroom facilities. Teachers' expertise was found to be the most influential factor among all other. Courses offered and learning environment were the next important factors. The classroom facilities were counted as the least important factor among all. Quantitatively measuring student satisfaction is not obvious. Such similar index was developed (and tested) by researchers Temizer and Turkyilmaz (2012). The tool was called Student Satisfaction Index (SSI) and was developed in the background of higher education institutions' growing number and competition for attracting and retaining students. Satisfaction Index model for the higher education institutions was developed to measure the higher education students' satisfaction on such factors as image of the university, expectations, perceived quality, perceived value, and loyalty. This model was estimated using Partial Least Squares method and was tested in a Turkish private university. With a focus on determinants of satisfaction among business college/university students, DeShields, Kara, and Kaynak (2005) linked Herzberg's Two Factor Theory with a set of empirical data collected from 160 undergraduate students. The authors imply that colleges/universities can become more customeroriented by focusing on antecedents of student satisfaction and that students who have a positive college experience are more likely to be satisfied with the college/university than students who do not have one. Colleges or universities can deliver satisfaction to the students only when they know what is expected by the students. Voss et al. (2007) found in that students expect their teachers to be knowledgeable, enthusiastic, approachable, and friendly. Moreover, vocational aspect of the studies motivates students more than academic interests do. The study was targeted to develop understanding of effective teachers' teaching qualities expected by students.

There are studies done on similar track, for example, Bowman and Bastedo (2009) conducted similar research on students' decisions and organizations' reputation, status, and media reports. The authors used top-tier institutions' admissions data from 1998 to 2005. The authors found that getting front-page appearance in the U.S. News rankings increases the following year's admissions indicators. This was found to be true for all institutions. Moreover, the admissions outcomes of liberal arts colleges, which were falling in the lower half of the top tier were more strongly influenced by institutional fees. Another research report prepared for the UNESCO World Conference on Higher Education (Altbach, Reisberg, and Rumbley, 2009) found that higher education is influenced by globalization, including but not limited to sending students abroad to study, setting up an overseas campus, inter-institutional partnership, etc. This report quotes The Bologna Process and Lisbon Strategy in Europe as an example of international engagement. Further, it was noted that the rankings of academic institutions and degree programs add to the center-periphery dynamic, desired by world-class universities in the Developing countries. Around 30% of global higher education enrollment is private and India is identified as the country with 35% to 60% private enrolment, as per this report.

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHOD

An empirical study using a survey-based approach was conducted in Indian University. Students recently admitted to the first semester of undergraduate program were taken as sample of the study. Non-probability (convenience) sampling was used. Sample size was 255 with 46% male students and 54% female students. All the potential participants were individually approached. Voluntary participation was sought and informed consent was taken. Each participant was provided with survey sheet containing consent form, demographic details, and list of factors that affected decision making in selection of a college. The students were from mixed streams of studies (science/commerce/arts) and

belonged to the different parts of India. A single cross sectional sampling is used. A structured non-disguised questionnaire was used to collect data. Types of questions included open ended, MCQs, and ten-point scaled questions. Below is the list of decision factor selected for this study

Table 2. List of factors that affected choice of college selection

Factor No.	Decision Factors
1	College/University Ranking in general through word of mouth
2	Program Fees
3	Education Loan Facility
4	Scholarship Availability
5	College/University Affiliation -Private
6	College/University Affiliation -Government
7	College University Trustees/Promoters
8	Infrastructure Facility
9	International Collaborations and Opportunities
10	Internship Opportunities
11	International Exposure Program
12	College /University Culture
13	Diversity of Students Background
14	College/Uni. is co-ed or single education
15	Student activities
16	Sports Activities
17	Recreational activities
18	Number of core courses/ Elective offered
19	Types of core courses/Elective offered
20	PG Courses Availability
21	Number of Students Studying
22	Hostel Availability
23	Canteen Facility
24	Bank Facility
25	Library Services
26	Campus Safety
27	Location
28	Transportation Facility
29	Faculty Profile
30	Faculty Research Work
31	Number of Faculty
32	Placement and Career Assistance
33	Past Placement Record
34	Support for Higher Education

The analysis highlights respondent's views on following factors:

1. Ranking of decision factors that affected selection of colleges by the students.
2. Correlation and frequency distribution of decision factors that significantly impacts in process of college selection.

FINDINGS

The results of the study are analyzed by primarily comparing the mean and standard deviations of the participant's responses. The mean scores of the factors that affect the choice of college selection are documented in the following table. Responses recorded represent equal number of males and females. The respondents' age group was between 17 to 20 years. In the below decision factors are segregated in three categories high, moderate and low. These categories indicate significance of decision factor in choice of university wherein of the total 34 decision factors after survey analysis; six factors were identified in high category, twenty-one factors in moderate category and seven factors in low category. Majority of participants found Internship Opportunities, International Collaborations and Opportunities, Infrastructure Facility, Support for Higher Education, International Exposure Program, Placement and Career Assistance & Campus Safety as the most significant factor influencing personal choices during selecting University for admissions. In a study conducted in 2011 it was found that globalization of higher education was dependent on global commercialization. The study created education specific internationalization pattern in higher education, which included modes of entry, programme delivery methods and potential areas of further development. Surprisingly factors like Program fees, Education loan, college/University affiliation with government and college university trustees and promoters was identified as factor of low significance during decision making of university. As the respondent's socio-economic strata was upper middle class and above need for financial assistance was not a major concern during the process of decision.

Table 3. Comparison of Significance of Decision Factor across high, moderate and low mean scores

Significance of Decision Factor in choice of University	Factor No	Decision Factor	Mean scores of respondents
HIGH	10	Internship Opportunities	8.95
	9	International Collaborations and Opportunities	8.87
	8	Infrastructure Facility	8.85
	34	Support for Higher Education	8.8
	11	International Exposure Program	8.75
	32	Placement and Career Assistance	8.69
MODERATE	26	Campus Safety	8.57
	25	Library Services	8.51
	12	College /University Culture	8.39
	29	Faculty Profile	8.37

Significance of Decision Factor in choice of University	Factor No	Decision Factor	Mean scores of respondents
MODERATE	33	Past Placement Record	8.37
	15	Student activities	8.36
	18	Number of core courses/ Elective offered	8.3
	19	Types of core courses/Elective offered	8.25
	30	Faculty Research Work	8.11
	17	Recreational activities	7.95
	16	Sports Activities	7.89
	27	Location	7.78
	23	Canteen Facility	7.73
	1	College/University Ranking in general through word of mouth	7.71
	31	Number of Faculty	7.71
	28	Transportation Facility	7.69
	22	Hostel Availability	7.66
	24	Bank Facility	7.58
	4	Scholarship Availability	7.48
	5	College/University Affiliation -Private	7.26
	13	Diversity of Students Background	7.26
LOW	14	College/Uni. is co-ed or single education	6.98
	20	PG Courses Availability	6.98
	6	College/University Affiliation -Government	6.7
	21	Number of Students Studying	6.7
	7	College University Trustees/Promoters	6.65
	2	Program Fees	6.5
	3	Education Loan Facility	5.78

(Where total sample population (N)=255;Mean =7.83;standard deviation=0.8; Mean +sd=8.62 & Mean –sd=7.03)

Table 4. Description of modal frequencies

Modal Frequency 10		**Modal Frequency 9**		**Modal Frequency 7**		**Modal Frequency 8**		**Modal Frequency 1**	
Factor No.	**Decision Factor**	**Factor No.**	**Decision Factor**	**Factor No.**	**Decision Factor**	**Factor No.**	**Decision Factor**	**Factor No.**	**Decision Factor**
1	College/University Ranking in general through word of mouth	7	Promoters/trustees of university	5	University affiliation with private organizations	2	Program fees	3	Education loan facilities
4	Scholarship Availability	13	Diversity in	6	University affiliation with government	21	Number of students presently studying		
8	Infrastructure Facility	17	Recreational activities	20	Availability of Postgraduate courses				
9	International Collaborations and Opportunities	22	Hostel availability						
10	Internship Opportunities	28	Transportation facilities						
11	International Exposure Program								
12	College /University Culture								
14	College/Uni. is co-ed or single education								
15	Student activities								
16	Sports Activities								
18	Number of core courses/ Elective offered								
19	Types of core courses/Elective offered								
23	Canteen Facility								
24	Bank Facility								

Modal Frequency 10		Modal Frequency 9		Modal Frequency 7		Modal Frequency 8		Modal Frequency 1	
Factor No.	Decision Factor	Factor No.	Decision Factor	Factor No.	Decision Factor	Factor No.	Decision Factor	Factor No.	Decision Factor
25	Library Services								
26	Campus Safety								
27	Location								
29	Faculty Profile								
30	Faculty Research Work								

For twenty three decision factors, which comprise (67.65) as mentioned in table no 5 modal frequencies of 10 was recorded. All the factors, which are of high significance belong to this category. For modal frequency 1 only factor no 3 was observed in terms of responses which validates the observation represented in table no.3.

Table 5. Descriptive analysis of 23 important factors

Factor	1	4	8	9	10	11	12	14	15	16	18	19	23	24	25	26	27	29	30	31	32	33	34
Mean	7.70	7.47	8.84	8.87	8.95	8.74	8.38	6.97	8.35	7.89	8.29	8.24	7.72	7.57	8.50	8.57	7.78	8.36	8.10	7.71	8.69	8.36	8.80
Standard Error	0.14	0.42	0.41	0.10	0.10	0.11	0.12	0.18	0.12	0.14	0.11	0.12	0.13	0.14	0.12	0.12	0.15	0.12	0.13	0.15	0.12	0.13	0.11
Median	8	7	9	9	9	9	9	8	9	8	9	9	8	8	9	9	9	9	8	8	9	9	10
Mode	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
Standard Deviation	2.3	6.66	6.61	1.741	1.66	1.774	2.051	2.88	1.979	2.243	1.749	2.034	2.173	2.289	2.019	1.941	2.497	2.052	2.076	2.395	1.987	2.102	1.865
Sample Variance	5.29	44.3	43.6	3.03	2.75	3.14	4.20	8.29	3.91	5.03	3.05	4.13	4.72	5.24	4.07	3.76	6.23	4.20	4.30	5.73	3.94	4.41	3.47
Kurtosis	0.88	186.	213	7.053	9.227	5.969	3.368	-0.24	4.675	1.644	3.554	3.614	1.15	0.97	4.908	3.656	0.657	4.857	3.641	1.139	4.493	3.168	5.545
Skewness	-1.208	12.66	13.97	-2.495	-2.791	-2.218	-1.833	-0.947	-2.045	-1.403	-1.601	-1.845	-1.114	-1.127	-2.132	-1.861	-1.184	-2.111	-1.773	-1.303	-2.134	-1.787	-2.246
Count	252	250	251	254	252	252	252	245	250	251	251	251	253	252	251	251	250	252	248	248	248	248	247

Table 6. Correlation among 34 factors

Factor No.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
1	1.00																
2	0.19	1.00															
3	0.03	0.43	1.00														
4	0.15	0.36	0.48	1.00													
5	0.21	0.06	0.13	0.26	1.00												
6	0.11	0.26	0.36	0.32	0.51	1.00											
7	0.21	0.32	0.37	0.40	0.29	0.41	1.00										

Factor No.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
8	0.29	0.14	0.14	0.28	0.26	0.15	0.39	1.00									
9	0.37	0.20	0.06	0.29	0.39	0.17	0.27	0.57	1.00								
10	0.36	0.21	0.03	0.28	0.31	0.23	0.20	0.54	0.80	1.00							
11	0.40	0.23	0.09	0.29	0.33	0.17	0.30	0.52	0.82	0.79	1.00						
12	0.28	0.18	0.11	0.20	0.32	0.18	0.15	0.42	0.54	0.52	0.52	1.00					
13	0.14	0.07	0.13	0.19	0.43	0.30	0.21	0.23	0.36	0.31	0.36	0.46	1.00				
14	0.19	0.15	0.08	0.08	0.25	0.23	0.40	0.26	0.24	0.15	0.28	0.18	0.40	1.00			
15	0.35	0.25	0.11	0.27	0.17	0.21	0.33	0.48	0.56	0.55	0.54	0.44	0.30	0.30	1.00		
16	0.07	0.18	0.13	0.15	0.12	0.18	0.26	0.34	0.31	0.28	0.29	0.33	0.26	0.23	0.49	1.00	
17	0.24	0.30	0.20	0.24	0.24	0.16	0.31	0.48	0.49	0.49	0.49	0.45	0.29	0.26	0.58	0.48	1.00
18	0.25	0.22	0.08	0.17	0.27	0.23	0.18	0.34	0.51	0.54	0.50	0.45	0.21	0.19	0.47	0.23	0.46
19	0.25	0.19	0.06	0.15	0.19	0.20	0.06	0.29	0.43	0.51	0.46	0.39	0.24	0.05	0.42	0.16	0.39
20	0.15	0.27	0.33	0.16	0.08	0.25	0.24	0.15	0.20	0.24	0.23	0.23	0.21	0.14	0.19	0.24	0.26
21	0.24	0.05	0.20	0.12	0.10	0.18	0.27	0.13	0.11	0.09	0.15	0.16	0.26	0.28	0.14	0.20	0.11
22	0.12	0.17	0.24	0.22	0.11	0.14	0.13	0.29	0.19	0.18	0.15	0.20	0.23	0.13	0.15	0.15	0.23
23	0.26	0.29	0.22	0.23	0.12	0.17	0.28	0.37	0.34	0.36	0.34	0.35	0.19	0.13	0.30	0.21	0.33
24	0.11	0.29	0.31	0.26	0.10	0.19	0.32	0.30	0.25	0.23	0.22	0.21	0.17	0.17	0.25	0.26	0.24
25	0.27	0.24	0.10	0.26	0.16	0.15	0.18	0.41	0.52	0.53	0.54	0.34	0.21	0.21	0.52	0.27	0.38
26	0.27	0.21	0.14	0.30	0.21	0.22	0.21	0.44	0.59	0.58	0.52	0.40	0.28	0.07	0.45	0.34	0.49
27	0.24	0.20	0.21	0.24	0.11	0.16	0.17	0.26	0.27	0.33	0.31	0.27	0.19	0.03	0.15	0.21	0.35
28	0.17	0.12	0.16	0.18	0.22	0.32	0.25	0.33	0.34	0.37	0.38	0.31	0.27	0.22	0.33	0.35	0.32
29	0.32	0.24	0.15	0.29	0.40	0.35	0.33	0.51	0.61	0.61	0.61	0.42	0.30	0.28	0.57	0.31	0.52
30	0.32	0.20	0.18	0.23	0.29	0.30	0.31	0.41	0.50	0.45	0.49	0.36	0.27	0.28	0.46	0.21	0.41
31	0.30	0.25	0.29	0.17	0.26	0.27	0.33	0.33	0.34	0.35	0.35	0.32	0.25	0.35	0.31	0.21	0.34
32	0.38	0.23	0.16	0.36	0.26	0.25	0.28	0.49	0.63	0.66	0.63	0.42	0.28	0.18	0.48	0.28	0.52
33	0.42	0.25	0.20	0.28	0.22	0.26	0.26	0.38	0.46	0.54	0.52	0.40	0.27	0.17	0.36	0.23	0.43
34	0.32	0.24	0.17	0.36	0.28	0.25	0.32	0.46	0.62	0.62	0.63	0.47	0.27	0.18	0.51	0.30	0.47

Factor No.	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34
1																	
2																	
3																	
4																	
5																	
6																	
7																	
8																	
9																	
10																	
11																	
12																	
13																	
14																	
15																	
16																	
17																	
18	1.00																
19	0.60	1.00															
20	0.32	0.38	1.00														
21	0.09	0.15	0.28	1.00													
22	0.19	0.21	0.22	0.30	1.00												
23	0.39	0.29	0.30	0.23	0.47	1.00											
24	0.31	0.18	0.33	0.16	0.58	0.56	1.00										
25	0.48	0.48	0.23	0.15	0.35	0.38	0.46	1.00									
26	0.39	0.40	0.20	0.16	0.16	0.30	0.23	0.50	1.00								
27	0.32	0.31	0.29	0.16	0.23	0.28	0.23	0.25	0.46	1.00							
28	0.37	0.28	0.31	0.21	0.20	0.28	0.27	0.36	0.36	0.40	1.00						
29	0.52	0.47	0.28	0.14	0.21	0.41	0.29	0.52	0.53	0.27	0.49	1.00					
30	0.51	0.40	0.29	0.26	0.25	0.42	0.34	0.46	0.44	0.32	0.34	0.66	1.00				
31	0.38	0.32	0.28	0.42	0.25	0.26	0.30	0.33	0.28	0.29	0.43	0.41	0.53	1.00			
32	0.45	0.46	0.28	0.20	0.16	0.34	0.18	0.50	0.61	0.47	0.40	0.59	0.52	0.40	1.00		
33	0.36	0.33	0.30	0.31	0.28	0.33	0.21	0.42	0.43	0.46	0.43	0.44	0.42	0.48	0.69	1.00	
34	0.48	0.36	0.31	0.14	0.22	0.36	0.33	0.61	0.55	0.35	0.40	0.58	0.52	0.37	0.65	0.56	1.00

Calculating correlation of 34 factors with other 33 factors one by one, the strongest correlation (0.823388067) is found between International collaborations and International Exposure programs while the weakest correlation (0.027396313) is found between College/University ranking and Education loan facility. Factor no. 21 i.e. Number of students has negative correlation with 10 other factors, which is maximum. (Factor 34 was selected to analyze respondents' preference regarding support for higher education in the process of decision making for selecting university. It was important factor to select it as reference point because background of all the respondents was undergraduate whose choice was to pursue higher education.

On an importance scale of 1 to 10, 33 respondents ranked 10 while 7 respondents ranked 1 to ranking of college/university factor. Those 33 (17 male and 16 female) respondents, who gave highest importance to ranking of college/university, came to know about college/awareness from friends, use WhatsApp most among social media websites and messaging applications, have ranked Pinterest and LinkedIn highest, spend on an average 4 hours on using internet. These respondents access internet from multiple sources such as from their home, cyber café, hostel, and from college/school. Their median age is 18 years. Those 7 (4 male and 3 female) respondents, who gave the lowest importance to ranking of college/university, came to know about college/awareness from equally different sources such as friends, relatives, websites, social media, consultant, newspapers, and alumni. These respondents like the other group of 33 respondents, use WhatsApp most, have ranked Pinterest and LinkedIn highest, spend on an average 4 hours on internet and access internet mostly from their residence. In addition, their median age is 18 years. (Vyas & Sharma, 2013).Another study by Janda (2016) shows that there are two broad categories of students on the basis of their motivation, preferences and attitudes towards study abroad. Results from the same study indicated that the majority of students were interested in short-term study abroad.

DISCUSSION

Decision making for major life events is challenging task. Influences from people of significant importance in our life are unavoidable yet salient features of the objects characteristics plays more fundamental role. An analysis of the prominent popular factor indeed gives a changing trend in higher education in India. Exploring the very reason behind students' interest to persue higher education can give satisfying answer. According to Malaney (1987), general motives include; the desire to learn more about a specialty, personal satisfaction, improved job prospects, and an advanced degree needed for advancement within a chosen field are significant related to reasons why students pursue graduate education, how they find out about a program, and why they apply to a specific school. The study by Kallio (1995) examined the relative importance of 31 institutional characteristics in 1,068 graduate students' decisions to register in the institution. Factors having the greatest influence included residency status, quality and other academic environment characteristics, work-related concerns, spouse considerations, financial aid, and campus social environment.

The results of this study primarily recommend in selection process of university program students base their decisions on relatively new factors of significance like internship opportunities, International collaboration & opportunities, infrastructure facility, placement and career assistance, support for higher education, international exposure program. Findings of this paper are also in sync with other studies done in past on factors like campus safety, library services, college/university culture, faculty profile, number of faculty, past placement records, student activities, numbers and types of core courses/elective offered, faculty research work, recreation and sports activities, location, canteen facility, college/university ranking in general through word of mouth, transport, hostel, bank facility etc. Preference patterns of students indicate clearly changing scenario in which industry exposure in form of internship and global connect is more trending as significant criteria in the process of making

decision. The need of future students are changing and they are more searching for campuses facilitating global integration and support for higher education have the maximum influence on students decisions.

CONCLUSION AND FUTURE DIRECTION

In conclusion, the present study is a step forward in empirical assessment of list of decision factors that affected college selection process by students. Recent study conducted in 2017 suggests that student's international mobility is facilitated by the location of the institute. Finding suggests that perusing higher education abroad is directly dependant on the International exposure received during undergraduate studies. Influence of education is strongly associated with international exposure/mobility, in turn influencing global talent flows. It is interesting to know the support provided by Universities in higher education and exposure to industry is primary factor for selecting universities by youth in recent times. Further going global is becoming a buzz word and any university focusing internationalization again becoming first preference by the youth the in present times.

REFERENCES

All India Survey on Higher Education 2014 15 (2015) (Final Report), Government of India, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Department of Higher Education, New Delhi,

[http://aishe.nic.in/aishe/viewDocument.action?documentId=206, Accessed on 22/01/2018]

Altbach, Philip, Reisberg Liz, and Rumbley Laura (2009), Trends in Global Higher Education: Tracking an Academic Revolution - A Report Prepared for the UNESCO 2009 World Conference on Higher Education

Babar Zaheer Butt, and Kashif Ur Rehman, (2010), A study examining the students satisfaction in higher education, Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences, vol 2, pp. 5446–5450

Bowman, N. A., & Bastedo (2009), Getting on the Front Page: Organizational Reputation, Status Signals, and the Impact of U.S. News and World Report on Student Decisions, Research in Higher Education, vol 50, No. 5, pp. 415–436.

http://mhrd.gov.in/rusa

http://www.dreducation.com/2012/06/latest-statistics-indian-higher.html

http://www.economicsdiscussion.net/articles/development-of-education-in-india-after-independence/2293

Kallio, R. E. (1995). Factors influencing the college choice decisions of graduate students. Research in Higher Education, vol 36, No. 1, pp. 109-124.

Leyla Temizer, and Ali Turkyilmaz, Implementation of student satisfaction index model in higher education institutions, 2012, Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, vol 46, pp. 3802 – 3806.

Malaney, G. D. (1987). Why Students Pursue Graduate Education, How They Find Out about a Program, and Why They Apply to a Specific School. College and University, vol 62, No. 3, 247-58.

Monks, James, and Ehrenberg, Ronald, (1999), The Impact of US News and World Report College Rankings on Admission Outcomes and Pricing Decisions at Selective Private Institutions, NBER Working Paper No. 7227.

Nan Jiang, Victoria Carpenter, (2011) "Market entry dynamic framework for higher education internationalisation", Journal of International Education in Business, vol 4, No. 2, pp.141 – 158.

Oscar W. DeShields Jr, Ali Kara, and Erdener Kaynak, (2005) "Determinants of business student satisfaction and retention in higher education: applying Herzberg's two factor theory", International Journal of Educational Management, vol 19, No. 2, pp.128 – 139.

Ravindrana, Sudharani, and Kalpana M., (2012), Students' Expectation, Perception and Satisfaction towards the Management Educational Institutions, Procedia Economics and Finance, vol. 2, pp. 401 – 410.

Sari Silvanto , Jason Ryan , Vipin Gupta , (2017) "A Study Of The Impact Of Business Education On Global Mobility: An Analysis Of Location And International Orientation", Journal Of International Education In Business, vol 10, No. 1.

Swinder Janda , (2016). Segmenting Students Based On Study Abroad Motivations, Attitudes, and Preferences, Journal Of International Education in Business, vol 9, No. 2, pp. 111-122.

Vossa, Roediger, Gruberb, Thorsten, and Szmiginc, Isabelle (2007), Service quality in higher education: The role of student expectations, Journal of Business Research, vol 60, No. 9, pp. 949–959.

Vyas and Sharma (2013), Online and offline strategies by Indian Colleges and Universities: A Comparative analysis of Students' perception, Jindal Journal of Business research, vol. 2, No.2, Sage Publication, pp. 116-126.

"Make Education System More Skill-Oriented, Says Former President APJ Abdul Kalam", Press Trust of India, July 02, 2015 [https://www.ndtv.com/india-news/make-education-system-more-skill-oriented-says-former-president-apj-abdul-kalam-777659, Accessed on March 2017].

Voss, R., Gruber, T., & Szmigin, I. (2007). Service quality in higher education: The role of student expectations. Journal of Business Research, 60(9), 949-959.

Butt, B. Z., & ur Rehman, K. (2010). A study examining the students satisfaction in higher education. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 2(2), 5446-5450.