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#### Abstract

Education is a very important source of knowledge in today's world. India has a good traditions of providing quality education. One can trace the history of Indian Education back to the ancient era. The schools in those times were mostly residential types and were called as Gurukuls. With the changing periods, the education has also changed and contributed to the development of country. There are numerous Indians also who have made notable contributions in the educational scenario. This emphasis on providing education to all was continued in post independence era. This has been achieved with the help of establishment of various commissions for systemic implementation of education to all in India post independence period.

Indian education system is characterized by hierarchical structure. The $10+2+3$ structure suggested by the Kothari Commission was an important suggestion implemented later nationwide. This hierarchical structure has provided more significance to higher education i.e. education after $10+2$. In this context, key elements in providing higher education are the students and the educational institutes (junior colleges) imparting education to them.

The purpose of this study is to identify the influential aspects that are responsible for creating positive perception of the junior colleges amongst the students and parents in Pune city. It is also attempted to assess the impact of these aspects on perception building and amongst the B school faculty members in Pune region.

These features may be grouped into factors such as Sources of Information and Influences, College Basics, Significant Factors, Infrastructure, Student Specific Factors and Social Life on Campus. Each of these has their corresponding sub-factors too. All these aspects are contributing to building the perception and their extent varies from one to another.
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## Chapter 1: Introduction


#### Abstract

Chapter 1 is titled as, 'Introduction and Objectives, which deals with the study, objectives and study related topics such as history of various commissions and national policies and frameworks for imparting education in India, and perception, study objectives and so on.


### 1.1 History of Education in India

One can trace the history of Indian Education back to the ancient era. The schools in those times were mostly residential types and were called as Gurukuls. Initially education commenced under a guru who was the head teacher of the Gurukuls. The guru and his disciples stayed together at these Gurukuls thereby facilitating continuous learning. (Shodhganga)

The Gurukuls were usually located in areas which were not in close proximity to where there was habitation. The guru was regarded as an extremely respected and revered figure. Education then was totally different than what is seen now. Traditional aspects like Indian religions, Indian mathematics, and Indian logic formed a major part of the curriculum. Hence education was mostly in relevance with the societal needs.

Formal learning mediums like books were not in use in these Gurukuls. Students were taught in the verbal form and made to practice a lot to achieve perfection. The concept of fees was not at all a consideration. Most of the Gurukuls were funded from public donation and royal patronage. The concept of Free Education can be thus traced back to these Gurukuls.

Education in the pre-colonial and early colonial period had a definite impact on education in India. India then comprised of many small states. These states constantly had disputes over territorial limits.

In the Renaissance period and in the 14th, 15th and 16th century, the major developments took place in Europe. The British set out to expand their control and went in search of new lands to further their movements. This period also coincided with the time which saw missionaries arriving in Asia. They also took a liking to India especially because it was regarded as a seat of learning.

Once the British established control over a large part of India, it became necessary for them to have constant communication with the officials they had appointed at various places. The first thing they embarked on was making the English language compulsory for the Indian officials. This was done with the intention of facilitating administrative requirements. The pre-existing monarch relied on the interpreter or messenger system. This system thus became redundant.

The colonial period time and again stressed on English schools and oriental education. They were to include the same content in learning in compliance with the requirements of the Western Schools. The first English schools were mediums to weaken the traditions and popular culture of the states of India. However few reformers treated this as an opportunity to imbibe some essential qualities. This later led to a change in the educational structure of India as a whole.

Thus beginning from the early times till the time of the colonial era, it was the indigenous education that was given greater importance. Thomas Babington Macaulay can be given credit for his contribution to Indian education. He was the one who introduced English education in India. He firmly believed that traditional Indian education had very little to look up to with regards to modern skills and requirements. He strongly believed that if the best education had to happen English would be inevitable.

He called for such an educational system which would create a class of anglicized Indians. This was done with the purpose of having a special class which would serve as cultural intermediaries between the Indians and the Britishers and would thus facilitate ease in administration.

Macaulay was successful in the implementation of ideas that were previously put forth by William Bentinck who was the Governor General since 1929. Bentick had proposed to replace Persian with English as the official language and also as the medium of instruction. He had also suggested training the English-speaking Indians so that they could be the resources for teaching.

John Wilson was a Scottish Christian missionary. He was one educationist who made a significant contribution to the education system in India. He was determined to set up educational institutions for the youth in Bombay. In 1832, he first established an English school. Through the medium of this school John was able to introduce the European education, the system of examinations and the use of textbooks for learning to the people in Bombay. The Wilson College in Mumbai which was established in 1839 is named after John Wilson.

In 1857 John was helpful in the establishment of the Bombay University, and later in 1869, went on to become its Vice-Chancellor.

There are numerous Indians also who have made notable contributions in the educational scenario.

With the inspiration from Vishnushastri Chiplunkar, in 1880 Lokmanya Tilak co-founded the New English School for secondary education. A few of his college friends including Gopal Ganesh Agarkar, Mahadev Ballal, Namjoshi, and Vishnushastri Chiplunkar were also the co-founders with him. The aim of this school was improvement in the quality of education for the young.

The purpose of the inception of this school was completely fulfilled. Its success story laid the foundation for the establishment of the Deccan Education Society in 1884 . The society aimed at creating a totally new way of education that taught the young Indians ideas of nationalism with an emphasis on the culture of India. The Deccan Education Society expanded its horizons and established the Fergusson College in 1885 for post-secondary studies. This college is recognized as a premier institute even today.

The contribution of Mahatma Jyotirao Phule and his wife Savitribai Phule are also notable. Both of them are revered as the pioneers of women's education in India. Jyotirao Phule is mostly known for the efforts he has taken to educate women and people of lower castes. The couple was among the first native Indians to open a school for girls in India.

Dhondo Keshav Karve was instrumental in empowering women in the preindependence period in India. He promoted widows' education and started the first school for widows in 1896. Later in 1916, he set up India’s first university for women.

Rabindranath Tagore was one such versatile personality whose contributions in all walks of life have made a difference to the cultural tradition of India. He was of the opinion that the best education can happen in nature. So he took teaching out of the confines of the four walls and established a unique concept of schooling which he thought would be 'the connecting thread' between India and the world. He named this school 'Shantiniketan' and teaching here was mostly done under the trees in picturesque surroundings. Tagore can be thus said to be the reinventor of the concept of 'Gurukul'.

### 1.1.1 Commissions Post Independence

## Commissions Post Independence

Following are the various commissions established for systematic implementation of education to all in India post independence. They are as shown below:

Figure 1: Commissions Post Independence


### 1.1.1.1 University Education Commission (1948-49)

University Education Commission (1948-49) - The main commission for changes in instruction, after freedom, was established under the chairmanship of Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, noted educationist and later the President of India, in 1948. Hence it was also commonly called Radhakrishnan commission. The commission submitted its report in August 1949. (Radhakrishnan Commission)

Some of the main recommendations of the Radhakrishnan Commission are:

- Indianisation of education.
- Twelve years of pre-university instructive course.
- Emphasis was to be on subjects like agribusiness, business, training, design, innovation, medicine and law which would build up the nation's scholarly assets significantly.
- A university degree should not be considered as fundamental for the authoritative administrations.
- Tutorials and classes were made a part of college exercises to enhance the standard of examination.
- A University Grants Commission should be set up to direct and fund the colleges.


### 1.1.1.2 Secondary Education Commission (1952-53)

Secondary Education Commission (1952-53) - This was also known as Mudaliar Commission. (Secondary Commission)

The Union Government assigned the Secondary Education Commission in 1952, under the chairmanship of Dr. A. Lakshmanswami Mudaliar, the then Vice- Chancellor of Madras University, on the proposal of Dr. Tara Chand

Committee and Central Education Advisory Board. It was referred to as Mudaliar Commission.

The Commission investigated the then auxiliary training structure in secondary education and gave different recommendations for changes. Important ones among these were the widening of the programmes that were in existence in education, and setting up a considerable number of multireason schools. The courses of study given in these schools were aimed at fulfilling the distinct aptitudes of the students.

According to the proposition of the Mudaliar Commission, the structures for the upgrade of educational programs were picked. In similar manner, the examination of some required subjects was made mandatory for all students.

Additionally, the optional subjects were isolated as seven social events for empowering students and motivating them to take up the opportunity to pursue and a subject of their choice. A format of these educational programmes is given underneath:

Three Main Suggestions by Mudaliar Commission to Improve Secondary Education in India are stated below: (Suggestions)
(1) Duration of Secondary Education:

The age at which the kid is to begin his optional instruction and the age up to which it must proceed, is a matter of significance. All things considered, the time of optional training covers the age gathering of around 11 to 17 years.

Properly planned education, which covered around 7 years, should be with the purpose of empowering the school to give a careful preparation of the courses of study that the student would take up and furthermore be helpful to him for attaining a sensible level of maturity in knowledge. The Commission also prescribed that middle or junior secondary or senior fundamental stage should be of 3 years duration and the higher secondary of 4 years duration.
(2) Diversification of Courses

The Commission laid stress on expanded courses of studies which were to incorporate both general and professional vocational subjects and to ensure that students should get a chance to take up the ones as per their requirements.

## (3) Multipurpose School:

A multipurpose school hopes to give various kinds of courses for students with various focuses, interests and capacities. It endeavours to accommodate every individual student, and provide reasonable opportunities to use and develop his natural inclination and propensities in the studies picked by him.

### 1.1.1.3 Education Commission (1964-66)

This is about the Indian Education Commission (or, in other words known as "Kothari Commission"). The Commission was set up by the Government of India on 14 July 1964 and was chaired by Dr. Daulat Singh Kothari, the then executive of the University Grants Commission and was established in November 1964. The Commission's gone for looking at all parts of the education sector nationwide. Among different goals behind setting up of this Commission likewise included advancement of a general pattern of education. The commission, under the chairmanship of D. S. Kothari, was the 6th commission in India post independence and the first commission with clear terms of reference on education. The Commission had presented its Report on 29 June 1966; and its suggestions were included in India's first National Policy on Education in 1968. (Commission K. ) (Commission R. o.) (Commission E. C.)

Some of the main recommendations with regards to education are as follows:
(1) Education to be free and compulsory.
(2) Status, Emoluments and Education of Teachers
(a) The academic freedom given to teachers to look for and distribute autonomous studies and examines and to talk and write about significant national and international issues of significance ought to be protected.
(b) Teacher training, particularly in-service learning and training should get due significance and accentuation.
(3) Development of Languages
(a) Immediate action to include the regional languages as media of education for the basic and as well as higher education.
(b) Three-Language Formula: At the secondary stage, the State Governments should consider, and enthusiastically execute, the three-language formula which 'incorporates the investigation of an advanced Indian lingo, ideally one of the southern tongues, aside from Hindi and English in the Hindi-speaking States, and of Hindi simultaneously with the provincial dialect and English in the non-Hindi speaking States. Fitting courses in Hindi and in English should be available in colleges and universities. This is aimed with a view to enhance the capability and professionalism in students in these dialects up to the prescribed university standards.
(c) Hindi: Every effort should be directed for the promotion of the development of Hindi.
(d) Sanskrit: Considering the noteworthiness of Sanskrit to the development and improvement of Indian lingos and its exceptional contribution to the social solidarity of the nation, facilities for its teaching it should be offered on a more liberal scale at the school and college levels.
(e) International Languages: Special importance and prominence should be given to the study of English and other global dialects.
(4) Equalization of Opportunity for Education
(a) Strenuous endeavors to be made to equalize educational prospects.
(b) Modification of Regional disparity in educational facilities needs to be modified and proper educational services should be provided in rural and other lesser developed regions.
(c) To advance social solidarity and national integration in the Common School System as suggested by the Education Commission ought to be embraced.
(d) The education of girls should receive accentuation, on grounds of social equity as well as in the light of fact that it accelerates social change.
(e) The training of young ladies ought to get complement, on grounds of social value and additionally in the light of certainty that it quickens social change.
(d) Need for serious endeavours for development of education among the backward classes and particularly among the tribal people.
(e) Educational offices for the physically incapacitated and mentally debilitated to be extended. Further undertakings to be undertaken to make, fabricate incorporated projects enabling the incapacitated children to consider in typical schools.
(5) Science Education and Research

With a view to acceleration of the development of the national economy, science instruction and research ought to get high priority. Science and arithmetic ought to be in general training till the end of the school.

## (6)The Education Framework

It would be beneficial to have an extensively uniform instructive structure in all parts of the country. The conclusive objective is to receive the $10+2+3$ example, the higher optional phase of two years being situated in schools, universities or both according to close-by conditions.

### 1.1.1.4 National Policy on Education (NPE)

Since the nation had become independent in 1947, the Indian government upheld differing undertakings to address the issues of illiteracy in urban as well as rural India. Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, India's first Minister of Education, envisioned strong focal government initiatives about education to all, with a uniform framework set up. (Education)

In the light of the report and proposition of the Education Commission (19641966), the administration of Prime Minister Indira Gandhi proclaimed the main National Policy on Education in 1968, which required a "radical revamping" and levelling educational opportunities so as to accomplish national integration and more noteworthy social and monetary advancement. The arrangement called for fulfilling compulsory instruction for all kids up to the age of 14 years as stipulated by the Constitution of India, and the better preparing and capability of instructors. The arrangement called for accentuation on learning of regional lingos, laying out the "three language formula" to be implemented in auxiliary training - the guidance of the English vernacular, the official tongue of the state where the school was based, and Hindi. Dialect instruction was seen as essential to decrease distance between the academic individuals and the general population. Disregarding the way that the decision to embrace Hindi as the national language was questioned,
the methodology called for use and learning of Hindi to promote a typical lingo for all Indians. The methodology similarly upheld the instructing of the antiquated Sanskrit dialect, which was seen as principal part of India's way of life and legacy. The NPE of 1968 called for education spending to increase to six percent of the national income.

In January, 1985, the legislature of Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi presented another National Policy on Education in May, 1986. The new strategy called for "one of a kind accentuation on the evacuation of irregularities and to balance educational opportunities," especially for Indian ladies, Scheduled Tribes (ST) and the Scheduled Caste (SC) communities. To achieve such a social blend, the strategy called for increment in awards, instructing the grown-ups, enrolling more instructors from the SCs, motivating forces for poor families to send their children to class on normal premise, creation and enhancement of new foundations and giving lodging and administrations. The NPE required a "child-centered methodology" in essential instruction, and launched "Operation Blackboard" to improve elementary schools in the nation. The policy also called for the development of the "Rural University" model, with the view of the philosophy of the great leader Mahatma Gandhi, to promote monetary progress and social improvement at the grassroots level in rural India. It was expected that NPE 1986 education strategy would see cost spent on education to be about 6\% of the Gross Domestic Product (GDP).

### 1.1.1.5 The National Curriculum Framework (NCF 2005)

The National Curriculum Framework (NCF 2005) is one of the four National Curriculum Frameworks dispersed in 1975, 1988, 2000 and 2005 by the National Council of Educational Research and Training (NCERT) in India. (NCERT)

NCF permits framework for making plans (the prospectus), the perusing materials (course books) and training framework or routine inside the school instruction programs in India. The NCF 2005 record draws its methodology premise from prior government reports on education as Learning without
burden and National Policy of Education 1986-1992 and other focus group discussions.

## Viewpoints of NCF

The NCF was framed considering the enunciated thoughts in the past, for example,

- To move learning away from repetitive technique.
- Connecting learning with life outside the school.
- To coordinate examination and classroom learning and make it more adaptable.
- To improve the educational modules to go beyond reading materials.
- Nurturing a superseding personality informed by mindful concerns with the fair commonwealth of the nation.


## NCF concentrated on

- Learning without any stress so that learning was joyful and moving away from standard course readings to be a reason for examination and relieve children from tension. It suggested important changes in the syllabus structure.
- To build up confidence and pride in an individual which would enhance social relationship and would encourage a feeling of peace and unity over the general public.
- To build up a child centered methodology or thought and to accelerate general enrollment and retention up to the age of 14 years.
- To teach the sentiment of unity, democracy and solidarity to students through the curriculum that reinforced our national character and help to empower the thought of the new generation.

With regards to social setting, NCF 2005 has ensured that irrespective of caste, belief, religion and sex all would get a standardized educational framework.

The NCF has gone for acknowledging changes in the training framework to realize educational modules that is student driven, has a versatile system, gives
freedom, where the instructors are facilitators and reinforce and empower learning, incorporate dynamic contribution of students, make multidisciplinary educational modules about training, achieve different and exceptional presentation, ceaseless examination in instructive structure.

## University Grants Commission (UGC)

The UGC was formally established in November 1956 as a statutory body of the Government of India through an Act of Parliament for the coordination, assurance and support of standards of university education in India. ((UGC))

### 1.1.2 Structure of Indian Education System

Indian education system is characterized by hierarchial structure. A broad schematics showing a typical Indian education system is as shown below in Figure 2. ((UGC))

Figure 2: Structure of Indian Education System


The Indian school education system has been segmented in either of the following ways: (Council, 2014)

- By means of levels of education
- By means of ownership of educational institutions
- By means of educational board affiliations

Segmentation by means of levels of education

- Pre-Primary
- Primary School
- Middle School / Upper Primary School
- Secondary School
- Higher Secondary or Pre-University

This is as shown below in Figure 3.

Figure 3: Segmentation of Indian schools by means of Level of Education


Segmentation by means of ownership of educational institutions

- Government Educational Institutions
- Local Body Institutions
- Private-Aided Institutions
- Private Unaided Institutions

Segmentation by means of educational board affiliations

- National Boards
- Central Board of Secondary Education (CBSE)
- Council of Indian School Certificate Examinations (CISCE)
- State Government Boards
- National Institute of Open Schooling (NIOS)
- International Boards
- International Baccalaureate Organisation (IBO)
- Cambridge International Examinations (CIE)


### 1.1.3 Importance of Junior Colleges

## Importance of Junior Colleges / Why +2 is important?

The $10+2+3$ structure suggested by the Kothari Commission was an important suggestion implemented later nationwide. (Structure)

In 1977, the government of India instituted the $10+2+3$ system. Before that there were other patterns of school leaving that were operational in India. These are $11+3,10+2+2+2$ and $11-12+1+3$.

Hence there was a need for a national system which insisted on eight years of elementary education and could achieve uniformity into the school system, facilitate mobility across states and was comparable to the rest of the world.

The creation of the +2 level therefore had certain specific objectives. This level was called the Secondary Certificate. After the first ten years, the +2 education was for those students who wanted to continue their formal education further. Therefore at this level the emphasis was on 'academic' and 'vocational' courses. This could therefore be referred to as a preparatory stage for the pursuit of higher education later.

The community college concept in the US is exactly like a junior college as it offers two year degrees, professional training and prepares a student to transfer to a 4 -year college or university.

### 1.2 Background of Study

The researcher was given the responsibility as an In-charge of a newly opened junior college having HSC curriculum. The researcher came to understand that the biggest challenge faced by newly opened colleges was that of intake.

The researcher was also exposed to the CAP (Centralized Admission Process) which was to be done online. Various problems were encountered during the first years of the process. The two main problems that came to the forefront were lack of computer literacy on the part of parents and students in understanding how the process functioned and the more important was everyone wanted to get into the top colleges irrespective of marks. As parents and students waited in an attempt to get the top college of their choice, it resulted into time lags and complications for colleges as well as the CAP committee. Every year new methods are devised to reduce lags and make the system more and more transparent, student friendly, and ensuring that each student gets admitted into a college close to his residence and in the stream he wished as per the cutoffs.

The researcher during the online admission process realized that perceptions of parents and students seemed to be a major factor in making preferences in respect of choice of junior college. This made the researcher think as to what were the factors that led to students not inclined for admissions in new colleges and what were the factors in other colleges of repute that they became the most sought after colleges.

This led the researcher to undertake this research so as to identify areas which could help in building a positive perception for newly opened junior colleges.

### 1.3 Significance of Study

Educational institutions play a major role in the way education happens. It is commonly seen that the perceptions of parents and students are the deciding factors in the process of choice of educational institution. The primary decision of choice of school totally depends on the decision of the parents.

After the first entry into school, the decision of choice has to be exercised only after Std. X. This is the time when the student has a fair idea of what are his areas of interest and he can be a part of the decision making process. The students have to make a choice of stream, subjects etc which acts as a deciding factor considering the future prospects. As such this choice needs to be made consciously. Hence it is important to study the perceptions and the factors affecting them in respect of both parents and students.

It is important even for educational institutions to create a positive perception that may satisfy the parents and students in the ever-changing face of education in the larger perspective. Management has to plan its strategies so as to build and retain a positive perception. The changing demands, constraints and preferences and also the changing admission processes greatly influence management strategies.

As such, the research findings will also allow college management to continuously develop new ideas (for their employees, students) that provides quality teaching-learning experience to their students, enhancing the reputation of the institution.

This research work would help college managements to take proactive steps for making their institutions successful in every way.

This research work would also help college management representatives to decide what it takes for an institution to be more appreciable to the students and the parents. Overall this research would provide a tool to junior colleges management in identifying parameters that need to be met to be a successful institution as seen by the students and the parents.

Contribution of Research Work:

- This research would help parents to understand the preferences of their wards and both together could make the best choice of junior college.
- This research would highlight the impact of perception on the choices made by parents and students
- This research would help educational institutions to take steps to accommodate to these perceptions and add to the goodwill of the institution.
- This research would be a guideline to new junior colleges as to what strategies to formulate for the development of a quality institute.
- This research would highlight the impact of perceptions on management strategies of junior colleges in Pune city.

Overall this research would help to understand the importance of management strategies of junior colleges.

### 1.4 Statement of Problem

The purpose of this study is to understand how parents and students perceive about a college, and what needs to be done by new colleges so as to create a positive perception like reputed colleges.

### 1.4.1 Need for Study

The admissions to junior colleges are done through a Centralized Admission Process (CAP) to ensure that all students get admission. Admissions are allotted as per cut off and preferences given by students. But it has been observed that most students aspire for admission in reputed colleges even though they do not match their high cut-offs. Reputed Colleges are put under pressure because of this and newly opened colleges have to struggle to get intakes.

The management therefore has a great role to play in effective learning strategies, resource management as well as strategy building for positive perception of the institute as a whole.

## Gap in Research

Based on literature review, it was observed that not much research has been done regarding perceptions about choice of educational institutions particularly junior colleges. The present research study is an attempt to bridge this gap.

### 1.4.2 Understanding the Concept of Perception

It is said that beauty lies in the eyes of beholder. It is even valid for the term 'perception'. Individuals may differ in the manner in which they see, decipher and comprehend a specific circumstance or occasion. People likewise contrast as they would see it however the occasion or circumstance might be the equivalent. For instance, in an organization where food is given by organization in sponsored way might be seen by the employees in an alternate way. Some may regard this as "appropriate" to get sponsored nourishment, the other may feel that it is given out of the profits accomplished by the organization while the some others may express it is obligatory for the management to give food at low costs and by doing it so they are not helping out to them.

Definition: Perception is characterized as "a procedure by which people sort out and decipher their tangible (sensory) impressions with the end goal to give significance to their environment".
(a) What one sees might be not be quite the same as target reality. A man coming late in the workplace might be viewed as not genuine and drowsy while there might be social issues looked by him.
(b) There is regularly a difference among the people in the organization with regards to payments and allowances, administrative back up, policies and procedures and the work environment itself. A person who shows a positive attitude may see above factors as great and helpful for workplace while the others may think of them as deficient. Employees additionally analyze
themselves on work designation. On the off chance that the work is assigned to one person who may consider the work in abundance to his work profile unexpectedly on the off chance that he isn't given the work, he may think about it as dismissing him in allocation of responsibilities.
(c) It would regularly be seen that the manager is evaluated differently by his subordinates as a result of the distinctive impression of the person about the manager. The study of perception is very important in the organization because it is essential for the manager to see people effectively independent of their status and see everyone of the circumstance as close to the real fact or as it exists by deciphering the tangible reflects in right way. Sensation and observation (i.e. perception) are mind boggling marvel. Perception is result of sensation and is substantially more extensive in its nature. Perception includes watching information, choosing, and sorting out the information based on tangible reflects and translating the equivalent according to the identity properties of the perceiver. That is the reason no two people can see an employee in the similar way, for one he might be effective while for the other he might be seen as pointless.

### 1.4.3 Factors Influencing Perception

Following three factors influence the perception as shown below in Figure 4.

Figure 4: Factors Influencing Perception (Kondalkar)

## Factors Influencing Perception:

| Perceiver |
| :--- |
| $\downarrow$ |
| Attitude |
| Motives |
| Interests |
| Experience |
| Expectations |



Perceiver: When an individual looks at the object and endeavours to translate the equivalent, what he or she sees it is to a great extent affected by the individual qualities. Discernment involves mentality that can be positive or negative. Some workers would feel and see that the existing working conditions in the organizations are harmonious for work and it contributes empathetically while for other people, it would be lacking and request enhancement. This is demonstrative of positive and negative state of mind responses. Rationale is another factor that assumes a vital job in observation. Intention is nothing but unsatisfied necessities. This applies impressive impact on recognition. Supervisor who is uncertain sees subordinate who does well as danger to his position. Individual instability is a risk to individual survival in a job particularly in the event that one is regularly transferred. Intrigue is people enjoying for a specific thing in a person. May be a few people get pulled to eyes of a young lady since he has enthusiasm for the eyes while other individual might be keen on haircut, in this manner diverse individual (perceiver) will see a young lady based dependent on perceivers' advantage. It has also been observed in the work places that workers would show enthusiasm according to their preferring. Students in the class when distracted are not mindful in the class. Past experience additionally assumes plays an essential role in perception. Similarly as intrigue limits one's observation so does past involvement. Interesting past experience invalidates object interest for instance, second or resulting visit to a notable place. Object or occasions that have not been experienced before are more discernible and makes an intrigue for instance, going to the show. Expectations can distort one's observation (perception) in what one sees and what one hopes to see. For instance power hungry police officer to be strict regardless of his real attributes.

The Target: Objects, occasions that are like each other tend to aggregate together and have a propensity of seeing them as common group, for instance, Blacks, Whites or Indians etc. regardless of their distinctive qualities. Physical and time vicinity additionally drives us to seeing a circumstance in an unexpected manner in comparison to actual reality. Increase in the sales revenues may be attributed to newly appoint sales manager. In reality the
increase in sales revenues may have been the result of diligent work done in the past by sales representatives and public contact. Soldiers in identical uniform and their uprightness is seen as being strict, savage and extreme, in actuality they are calm, delicate and exceptionally sensitive at heart. It is thusly critical to analyze the occasion, circumstance, or an object in its right point of view and be driven by comparability, physical and time vicinity.

The Situation: Change in situation or circumstance results in incorrect perception about a person. Time is one factor, which impacts the recognition (perception). Time is identified with work setting and social setting. An individual decked up for gathering may not be recognizable but rather a similar dress in office would be seen unmistakably, though the individual has not changed. You would have as often as possible heard individuals say that their manager is different during working hours and inverse while in social setting. Indeed individual is the same yet the perceiver sees the manager according to systematic setup while on work, while the individual is seen on a private or a personal platform when meeting him in the club or at home. What is critical to recall is the recognition ought to be done in a right way and not to be driven because of work setting or social setting and that the circumstance isn't permitted to see perceive wrongly. An object can be distinguished by its size, shade, shape, sound it makes and background. It very well may be recognized dependent on its development (movement). In darkness it may be distinguished by its outline, for instance caravan moving on skyline at the dawn.

### 1.4.4 Attribution Theory of Perception

In everyday life, we go over individuals with whom we communicate. Thought processes, aims, intentions, convictions and attitude of individuals have an effect about how they carry on. It has been seen that our recognition about the general public is enormously affected by the suspicion we make about a person and not by reality.

There are two variables which affects human behaviour. First is internally caused behaviour - refers to internal factors on which individual has a full control, secondly the externally caused behaviour- refers to the behaviour which has been caused due to external factors and that the individual has no control over it.

Attribution theory of perception recommend that when we assess human conduct, it is either internally caused or it is caused due to external factors as explained above.

The determination however depends on the three factors. See Figure 5 below:

The determination however depends on the following three factors. See Figure 5 below:

Figure 5: Attribution Theory of Perception (Kondalkar)

(a) Distinctiveness: Let us for assessment purposes take an example of X worker coming late for duty. When we complete translation there are two variable, one in the case of arriving late is normal or surprising behaviour. On the off chance that it is regular, it is credited to internal factor on which X has full control. At the point when the conduct is bizarre or unusual then it very well may be ascribed to external factors. In the previous circumstance individual could be advised suitably, in the later circumstance, the external
variables cannot be revised. In the event that these external factors are high, at that point late coming ought not to be ascribed to the individual conduct.
(b) Consensus: This factor refers to aggregate conduct. In the event that the whole gathering taking a similar course came late on duty, the causation is ascribed to external variables. Be that as it may, by some possibility if just X was late then the causation would be internal.
(c) Consistency: If the conduct of Mr. X is consistence, or in other words, is regularly coming late then attribution ought to be to internal variables (factors). In such cases there is a high internal causation. In the event that X came late now and the causation would be low and ascribed to external variable (factors). More reliable the conduct, the more the eyewitness is inclined to credit it to internal causes. It has been seen that we tend to under estimate the impact of external variables (factors) and over estimate the impact of internal variable (factors) or individual components (factors) while doing discernment. This phenomenon is called the fundamental attribution error. Fall in sales of a commodity is generally attributed to inability and inefficiency of the sales force rather than market trend, recession or innovative product launched by the competitor. There is also a self-serving bias error caused by the people who tend to ascribe their very own prosperity to internal causation like ability, diligent work and self-esteem and the disappointment, to external variable like Luck. This phenomenon is called as self-serving bias shown by the people. There are inclinations which distort attribution generally across culture. Amid World War II, it was considered by Allies that Japanese are strong, yet the attribution ended up being false at later date when tide went ahead and Japanese needed to endure demolition. Self-serving inclination is not applicable for all, where cultural identity has been established like Defense Services of India. Where the leader assumes the responsibility for the failure of group task and attributes success to aggregate endeavours. This is the fundamental reason that soldiers have great confidence in their leader and his ability and that is the way the soldiers are driven in war and they pursue the leader blindly because they have a correct perception of their leader.

### 1.4.5 Conceptual and Working Definitions

### 1.4.5.1 Conceptual Definitions

## Perception

Perception is defined as "a process by which individuals organize and interpret their sensory impressions in order to give meaning to their environment". (Robbins)

## Junior College

An educational institution that offers two years of studies corresponding to these in the first two years of a four year college and that often offers technical, vocational and liberal studies to the adults of a community. (Edition)

Higher Secondary School /Junior College mean an institution which provides instructions leading to Higher Secondary Certificate Examination. (DYDE)

## Management

According to Henry Fayol, "to manage is to forecast and plan, to organize, to command, to coordinate and to control. (Fayol H. , 1997) (Fayol H. )

## Strategy

A strategy is defined as the determination of the basic long term goals of an enterprise and the adoption of courses of action and the allocation of resources necessary for carrying out these goals. (Heracleous) (Chandler, 2013)

### 1.4.5.2 Working Definitions

## Perceptions

A general understanding, view or opinion about a certain thing or situation.

## Junior College

For this study, colleges in Pune city having junior college (Std. 11th and 12th) and those running the curriculum of Maharashtra State Board of Secondary and Higher Secondary Education (HSC Board) are referred to as junior colleges.

## Management

The authority or committee (Principal, Vice-Principal or In-charge) that runs the day to day operations of the Junior College are referred to as Management for this study.

## Management Strategy

Any directives or decisions taken by the management that may have impact on the institution, its staff, students and parents are seen as management strategies in the context of this study.

### 1.5 Objectives of the Study

## Aims and objectives of the study are:

i. To identify and analyze the factors that determine the Perceptions of Parents about the choice of junior college.
ii. To identify and analyze the factors that determine the Perceptions of Students about the choice of junior college.
iii. To compare the Perceptions of Parents and Students.
iv. To study the impact of the perceptions on strategies adopted by the management of various junior colleges both established and new.
v. To suggest a model for management for positive perception building.
vi. To suggest a framework of management strategies.

### 1.6 Hypothesis of the Study

Study Hypotheses (Null) and corresponding alternative Hypotheses are as given below.

- $\mathrm{H}_{01}$ - There is significant correlation between Location of the college and Conveyance available.
- $\mathrm{H}_{1}$ - There is no significant correlation between Location of the college and Conveyance available.
- $\mathrm{H}_{02}$ - There is significant correlation between Reputation of the Institute and Courses Offered.
- $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ - There is no significant correlation between Reputation of the Institute and Courses Offered.
- $\mathrm{H}_{03}$ - There is significant correlation between Reputation of the Institute and Qualified Staff.
- $\mathrm{H}_{3}$ - There is significant correlation between Reputation of the Institute and Qualified Staff.
- $\mathrm{H}_{04}$ - The perceptions of parents with respect to significant factors have an impact on management strategies.
- $\mathrm{H}_{4}$ - The perceptions of parents with respect to significant factors does not have an impact on management strategies.
- $\mathrm{H}_{05}$ - The perceptions of students with respect to significant factors have an impact on management strategies.
- $\mathrm{H}_{5}$ - The perceptions of students with respect to significant factors does not have an impact on management strategies.


### 1.7 Research Questions

1) Which factors are important from the parents' point of view?
2) Which factors are important from the students' point of view?
3) Which factors are commonly considered by both Parents and Students while making choice of junior college?
4) What is the impact of the perceptions of parents and students on formulation of management strategy?
5) What can be done by the educational institutions to build a positive perception?

### 1.8 Scope of the Study

Scope of the study was limited to junior colleges in Pune city.
Respondents to this study are the students in the junior colleges in Pune city and their parents. Structured questionnaires were used as the instrument for the data collection. College management representatives are also respondents to this study.

### 1.9 Limitations of the Study

Major limitations of this study are as follows:
i. The study is limited to geographic area of Pune City.
ii. The study is only related to all streams of HSC curriculum.
iii. The study has not considered CBSE and IB higher secondary institutions.
iv. The study analyzes current scenario of choice of junior colleges. The research may not be applicable for any procedural changes.
v. The findings may vary with change in educational structures and policies.
vi. Limited time available for conducting research along with normal professional duties of researcher.

## Chapter 2: Review of Literature

Chapter 2 is titled as, 'Review of Literature, which narrates an overall appraisal of research studies done earlier in the areas of assessment of students and parents about higher education and various aspects related to it.

A review of some of the recent literature used in analyzing views and opinions of students and parents about higher education and surrounding factors is presented here.
2.1 Husain Salilul Akareem and Syed Shahadat Hossain (2016) in their study ("Determinants of education quality: what makes students' perception different?") published in (Open Review of Educational Research, 3:1, 52-67); mentioned that some parameters decide the quality of education. These are student constitution, extracurricular activities, background of parents and the students themselves.

Comment: The researcher agrees with some of these parameters but would like to present some other aspects too.
2.2 Excellence in higher education may be described in many methods. Longanecker and Blanco (2003) in their review (Public policy implications of changing student attendance patterns) appeared in (New Directions for Higher Education, 2003 (121), 51-68) characterized it as by the way of teaching process and the educator who educates them.

Comment: Here the views and opinions of institution are also highlighted which are of interest to the researcher. The researcher goes along with the findings.
2.3 Koslowski (2006) presented independent views in the study (Quality and assessment in context: A brief review) that appeared in (Quality Assurance in Education, 2006 14(3), 277-288). As said therein institution and their staff have major part to play when it comes to providing good education. It is more
important than other accomplishments such as types of courses, standing of the institution and so on.

Comment: The researcher has the same opinion.
2.4 Fish (2003) in the review (First, kill all the administrators) available in (The Chronicle of Higher Education, 2003, 49(30) expressed that absence of good management may have impact in providing better learning environment. Comment: The researcher concurs with this.
2.5 Koslowski (2006) in the review (Quality and assessment in context: A brief review) available at (Quality Assurance in Education, 2006 14(3), 277-288) stated features of quality education. It is said that this depends on standing of the institution, qualification of the (teaching) personnel, charging affordable cost of education and students' requirements, and inclinations.

Comment: The researcher agrees with some of these parameters.
2.6 Mitchell (2010) in the study (Approaching common ground: Defining quality in online education (published in (New Directions for Community Colleges, 2010(150), 89-94) characterized it with the help of certain factors. These are partners' discernments, quantifiable components, course contents, and third party standards.

Comment: The researcher agrees with some of these parameters.
2.7 Moreover, a current report by Bertolin (2011), titled (The quasi-markets in higher education: From the improbable perfectly competitive markets to the unavoidable state regulation) available in (Educação e Pesquisa, 37(2), 237248), characterized eminence of higher education instinctively, which is governed by gatherings of colleagues.

Comment: The researcher concurs with this.
2.8 Ashraf et al. (2009) in their study (Quality Education Management at Private Universities in Bangladesh: An Exploratory Study) published in Jurnal Pendidik dan Pendidikan, 24, 17-32) highlights the competitive nature of higher education aimed at better division and target promoting.

Comment: The researcher concurs with this.
2.9 Kotler and Armstrong (2010), in (Principles of Marketing, (13th Global ed.) Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.), utilized segmentation and specified that the aggregate student market has several subgroups. According to the nature and need of subgroup and relevant strategy in place, each of these may be approached for future promotions.

Comment: The researcher agrees with this.
2.10 Ehrman (2006) (On using benefit segmentation for a service industry: A study on college career counseling services) published in (Journal of American Academy of Business, 8(2), 179-185), expressed that recent colleges are seeing a 'buyer's market'. The students are availing educational services in terms of their educational programs, teaching resources, library, and so on. Comment: The researcher has the same opinion.
2.11 This fact is supported by Akareem and Hossain (2012) in their study (Perception of education quality in private universities of Bangladesh: A study from students' perspective) available in (Journal of Marketing for Higher Education, 22 (1), 11-33), as mentioned therein, the colleges need to guarantee a standard (of their education services) so as to remain in the market they work in. The study identifies some aspects for maintaining high standards such as constitution of students; staff accreditations, institution highlights, and the management style.
Comment: The researcher will be in agreement with this.
2.12 Ginns, Prosser, and Barrie (2007) as stated in (Students' perceptions of teaching quality in higher education: The perspective of currently enrolled students. Studies in Higher Education, 32(5), 603-615) emphasized on various assessment mechanisms. This may include students' assessment of specific courses or the assessments of specific instructors by them to measure the standard (of services they are availing).

Comment: The researcher will be in agreement with this.
2.13 Lizzio, Wilson, and Simons (2002) (University students' perceptions of the learning environment and academic outcomes: Implications for theory and practice) available at (Studies in Higher Education, 27(1), 27-52), given considerable importance to the viewpoint of the students about their learning conditions that exist during their entire course.

Comment: The researcher will be in agreement with this.
2.14 Additionally, as stated in the study of Akareem and Hossain (2012), titled (Perception of education quality in private universities of Bangladesh: A study from students' perspective) available in (Journal of Marketing for Higher Education, 22 (1), 11-33), students' background is of immense importance. E.g. existing way of living, financial condition, interest to learn more certainly have impact of their views about standards education.

Comment: The researcher has the same opinion.
2.15 Rahman and Uddin (2009) in their review (Statistical analysis of different socio economic factors affecting education of NW. FP (Pakistan), published in (Journal of Applied Quantitative Methods, 4(1), 88-94), emphasized on the background of parents in the context of better education. It is felt that the background of parents, their occupation, monetary conditions have impact on the education of children.

Comment: The researcher agrees with this.
2.16 Sarpkaya (2010) in the review (Factors affecting individual education demand at the entrance to university: Adnan menderes university sample) available at (Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice, 10(1), 475-488), stated that the students are more concerned about their individual fulfillment and possibility of getting a good job (for themselves). They are not much concerned about promotional aspects used by the colleges.

Comment: The researcher concurs with this.
2.17 In the context of teaching standards, credentials of educators are important. Arnon and Reichel (2007) in their study (Who is the ideal teacher? Am I? Similarity and difference in perception of students of education regarding the qualities of a good teacher and of their own qualities as teachers), published in (Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 13(5), 441-464) stated that students see individual characteristics and professional expertise so as to become perfect educator.
Comment: The researcher concurs with this.
2.18 Ingvarson, Beavis, and Kleinhenz (2007) in their investigation (Factors affecting the impact of teacher education programmes on teacher preparedness: Implications for accreditation policy) available at (European Journal of Teacher Education, 30(4), 351-381.) stressed upon on the mechanism of 'train the teachers' with suitable programs.
Comment: The researcher concurs with this.
2.19 The standards of education are also governed by academic features inside the colleges. Lizzio et al. (2002) with the review (University students' perceptions of the learning environment and academic outcomes: Implications for theory and practice), available in (Studies in Higher Education, 27(1), 27-52), examined that recognition about learning conditions (existing in the college) adds to scholastic results.

Comment: The researcher concurs with this.
2.20 According to Walker (2008), students' desire can be estimated by clarifying three general classes: course substance, scholarly staff, and grades. The review (What Do students think they (should) learn at college? Student perceptions of essential learning outcomes), available at (Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 8(1), 45-60.), mentioned that students' reactions are diverse in nature.

Comment: The researcher agrees with this.
2.21 Ginns et al. (2007) as stated in (Students' perceptions of teaching quality in higher education: The perspective of currently enrolled students. Studies in Higher Education, 32(5), 603-615), stated that learning may be independent thing and not in conjunction with nature of the course. It may happen that what student is being taught does not generally reflect in their assessments. Comment: The researcher agrees with this.
2.22 The governance in terms of management of the college will have impact on provision of standardized education. In their examination, (Students' perceptions of service quality in higher education), available at (Total Quality Management, 20(5), 523-535.) by Nadiri, Kandampully, and Hussain (2009) made an effort to assess services offered by various administration departments. This may include services provided by laboratory, library, admission office, sports department, and general administration department. Comment: The researcher agrees with this.
2.23 In the context of provision of good standard educational services, assurance of quality is necessary and vital. This fact is stressed by Woodhouse (1998) in their review (Quality assurance in higher education: The next 25 years) available at (Quality in Higher Education, 4(3), 257-273.

Comment: The researcher concurs with this. guarantee the desired standards for higher education amongst Southeast Asian nations through the ASEAN University Network (AUN). Umemiya (2008) in the study titled (Regional quality assurance activity in higher education in Southeast Asia: Its characteristics and driving forces), available at (Quality in Higher Education, 14(3), 277-290), highlights the scope of activities of AUN's. These are interexchange of scholarly staff and students, doing collective research exercises, exchange of information and endorsement of ASEAN learning.

Comment: The researcher concurs with this.
2.25 Briukhanov, Kiselev, Timchenko, and Vdovin (2010) in their study (Monitoring the opinions of parents of college students as a component of the institution's In-house education quality management system), published in (Russian Education \& Society, 52(5), 79-88), recognizes the significance of creating good image of standardized value based education services in the minds of potential customers.

Comment: The researcher agrees with this.
2.26 Wilkinson and Yussof (2005) stated that the propensity of private colleges is to get their specialization in money-spinning and lucrative themes only. As mentioned in the review (Public and private provision of higher education in Malaysia: A comparative analysis), available at (Higher Education, 50(3), 361-386.), thus it is of urgent requirement to ensure provision of standardized educational services for the benefit of general public.

Comment: The researcher agrees with this.
2.27 Sivakumar and Sarvalingam (2010) in their study (Human deprivation index: A measure of multidimensional poverty.), mentioned that education is the most powerful weapon to fight and rise above the poverty. Getting education is vital for national advancement and a prosperous society.

Comment: The researcher agrees with this.

Furthermore, Brennan and Teichler (2008) in their study (The future of higher education and of higher education research) available at (Higher Education, 56(3), 259-264) there is need of providing education (to all). This may have social and economic implications in the public arena. Thus, governments and society have a personal stakes in guaranteeing a steady stream of students in education sector.

Comment: The researcher agrees with this.
2.29 In general people believe more in word-of-mouth references rather than sponsored advertising and promotional activities, according to Hennig-Thurau et. al. (2004) as stated in their study (Electronic word-of-mouth via consumeropinion platforms: What motivates consumers to articulate themselves on the internet?) available at (Journal of Interactive Marketing, 18(1), 38-52). Hence it may be good thing to formulate any promotional content (by gaining perspectives using informal references) instead of paid sponsorships. This will make a superior image for the foundation.

Comment: The researcher agrees with this.
2.30 Lareau (2002) expressed that the family income level of students impacts their impression of eminence of higher education. This is stated in the report (Invisible inequality: Social class and childrearing in black families and White families) published in American Sociological Review, 67, 747-776). Comment: The researcher agrees with this.
2.31 Bailey, Chow, and Haddad (1999) in their investigation (Continuous improvement in business education: Insights from the for-profit sector and business school deans) published in (Journal of Education for Business, 74(3), 165-180), said that the age and HSC or proportionate outcomes are the individual attributes of student that demonstrates development and past instructive achievement. For the two attributes, students with lower ages and lower achievements in the past have higher perceptions about the training quality than the students with higher ages and accomplishments.

Comment: The researcher does not agree with this.

Bay (1999) in the study (Balancing theory and practice in teaching) available at (http://core.journals.yorku.ca/index.php/core/article/view/2724/1929) suggests that there should be proper mix of academic aspects and practical education in the entire study course. There is difference in between learning in the classroom and its application at workplaces with job oriented expertise.

Comment: The researcher concurs with this.
2.33 Hill (2014) in the book (International business: Competing in the global marketplace (Vol. 10E). New York, NY: McGraw Hill Education) emphatically expressed there is considerable importance of parents' background and their education. Parents with enhanced socio-economic profile will prefer more value based education for their children.

Comment: The researcher has the same opinion.
2.34 Sulyana Borghi et. al. (2016), in their examination (Expectations of higher education students: a comparison between the perception of student and teachers) published in (Tertiary Education and Management) emphasized importance of higher education (by using technology) and its benefits to the society. Amidst aggressive marketplace, colleges are making efforts to match the student expectations so as to attract and keep them satisfied.

Comment: The researcher agrees with this.
2.35 Family is one of the most recognized impacting factors on the kids with regards to imparting education at school level. Parent support is necessary and crucial in achieving achievements for the child. Mehak A. et. al. (2016) in their investigation (Parents Involvement at University Level Education: Students Perception in Under Developing Country) published in (European Scientific Journal, August 2016, Vol.12, No. 22) highlights the importance of family.

Comment: The researcher has the same opinion.
2.36 Epstein (1995) in the review (School/family/community partnerships: Caring for the children we share) in (Phi Delta Kappan, 76 (9), 701 - 12), mentioned the considerable importance of society and family. The study affirmed that both of these play a dynamic part in making thoughtful learning conditions by conferring education to their children's.

Comment: The researcher has the same opinion.
2.37 Redding (1992) [as referred in Coleman (1998)] titled (Coleman, P. (1998), Parent, student and teacher collaboration: The Power of Three Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin Press) characterizes value of parent participation. Active parent participation will facilitate child development.

Comment: The researcher has the same opinion.
2.38 Wong (2008) in the research titled (Perceptions of parental involvement and autonomy support: Their relations with self-regulation, academic performance, substance use and resilience among adolescents) published in (North American Journal of Psychology, 10(3), 497 - 518), mentions that parent involvement plays an important part in making day to day tasks of their kids (at colleges and at home) more passionate.

Comment: The researcher concurs with this.
2.39 Burke (2010) describes parent participation in the review (Benefits of parental involvement in education) which is published in Jamaica Gleaner News (http://www.jamaicagleaner.com/gleaner/20101004/news/news7.html).

Parent contribution has many advantages. The students also indicated that such interaction is needed at college level.

Comment: The researcher concurs with this.
2.40 Henderson and Berla (1994) in their review (A new generation of evidence: The family is critical to student achievement) available at (National Committee for Citizens in Education, Centre for Law and Education) recommended that the most specific indicator of student's accomplishment is not the monetary or societal position but it is the degree to which that student's
family can interact, take notice, and make the home as encouraging place for learning.

Comment: The researcher agrees with this.
2.41 Drake (2000) study (Parents and families as partners in the education process: Collaboration for the success of students in public schools) available at (ERS Spectrum, 18(2)) thinks that engagements of parents have more benefits beyond academics. This leads to student enhancement which incorporates: better social abilities, enhanced conduct, self-belief, an awesome feeling of individual capability, and so on.

Comment: The researcher agrees with this.
2.42 Gurin, P. et. al. (2002) in the study (Diversity and higher education: Theory and impact on educational outcomes), published in (Harvard Educational Review, 72(3), $330-366$ ), specified that higher education establishments are the places that give new encounters to students to investigate further. It also gives them revelation of better approaches for being significant, considering and understanding the world and modifying in various circumstances.

Comment: The researcher agrees with this.
2.43 Mattanah et. al. (2011) in their investigation (The contributions of parental attachment bonds to college student development and adjustment: A metaanalytic review) available at (Journal of Counselling Psychology, 58(4), 565 596), mentioned that there is a definite link between participation of parents and developments of students in their school years. Such interactions help students to test themselves with regards to self-thinking, resilience, and building connections.

Comment: The researcher agrees with this.
2.44 According to Wartman and Savage (2008) study, (Parental involvement in higher education: Understanding the relationship among students, parents, and the institution), available at (ASHE Higher Education Report, 33(6), 1 - 125), students have given significant importance to their parents and interactions with them. These may include diverse topics such as investments, wellbeing, profession, and prosperity.

Comment: The researcher concurs with this.
2.45 Family circumstances and background builds considerable impression on the students, according to Bronfenbrenner (1988) review (Interacting systems in human development. Research paradigms: Present and future) published in (Cambridge University Press). The said study has given importance to personal aspects of the circumstances (e.g. family, school, and neighbourhood).
Comment: The researcher concurs with this.
2.46 Fleming et al. (2002) study supports this fact. The said study (Interactive influences of perceived social contexts on the reading achievement of urban middle scholars with learning disabilities) available at (Learning Disabilities Research \& Practice, 17 (1)), underlined that living with the family facilitates achieving excellence at school levels.

Comment: The researcher concurs with this.
2.47 Christenson (2004) study (The family-school partnership: An opportunity to promote the learning competence of all students) available at (School Psychology Review, 33(1), is related to participation of family in education. The said study mentioned that family is major influencing source that makes students more social and help them to realize educational achievements. Comment: The researcher has the same opinion.

While looking into students' expectations (which may become demands or desires in future), authorities of educational establishments need to understand these needs. Over the years, it may happen these demands have changed and
have become more vivid in nature with greater diversity. Some of these demands (as revealed from the earlier writing) are introduced here.

Martínez \& Toledo (2013) study (What do graduates thinks? An analysis of intention to repeat the same studies and university) available at (Journal of Marketing for Higher Education, 23) mentioned mandatory features for the educational programs. The enhanced prerequisites are considered important in an assessment of student satisfaction. It implies that the course has more elevated amounts of (qualification) necessities.

Comment: The researcher has the same opinion.
2.49 The course content is vital factor in imparting education according to the study by Suarman et. al. (2013). The study titled (The quality of teaching and learning towards the satisfaction among the university students) published in (Asian Social Science, 9), emphasized that the course contents should be attractive, most recent and in accordance with the market trends and work requirements.
Comment: The researcher agrees with some of these parameters.

Apart from offering quality learning, it is vital that the school or organization provide social interaction in the form of enthusiastic social life on the campus, according to Ravindran and Kalpana (2012) study titled (Student's expectation, perception and satisfaction towards the management educational institutions) available in (Procedia Economics and Finance, 2).
Comment: The researcher agrees with this.
2.51 Parahoo et. al. (2013) in their study expressed that social life on the campus is essential for students for their personal development. The study titled (Factors influencing student satisfaction in universities in the Gulf region: Does gender of students matter? Journal of Marketing for Higher Education) available in (Journal of Marketing for Higher Education, 23) is of the opinion that such enhanced social life bring in new experiences to the students in their life.

Comment: The researcher has the same opinion.
2.52 Mainardes et. al. (2013) in their review has given importance to physical facilities. The review titled (Portuguese public university student satisfaction: A stakeholder theory-based approach) published in (Tertiary Education and Management, 19) is of the opinion that a good infrastructure in place may create good perception about the college amongst the prospective students. Comment: The researcher will be in agreement with this.
2.53 Mudholkar (2012) in their review has listed some features that are important to students. The review titled (A Study of Student's Choice Factors for Selecting B-Schools with Special reference to Mumbai) published in (International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research, Vol. 2, Issue 4) states that in-house resources (staff), choice of subjects, image of the college and available facilities, are the important choice factors of the students. Comment: The researcher will be in agreement with this.
2.54 Appleton-Knapp \& Krentler (2006) in their study titled (Measuring student expectations and their effects on satisfaction: The importance of managing student expectation) published in (Journal of Marketing Education, 28) conveys that qualified staff is good factor to attract and retain the students. Comment: The researcher concurs with this.
2.55 Apart from regular studied, students are also giving importance to extracurricular activities and they will prefer the colleges supporting the same. This was mentioned by Al-Fattal and Ayoubi (2013) in their study (Student needs and motives when attending a university: Exploring the Syrian case published in (Journal of Marketing for Higher Education).

Comment: The researcher concurs with this.
2.56 The qualified staff is an important asset to the any institution. In the review undertaken by Sampaio et. al. (2012) titled (Students' trust, value and loyalty: Evidence from higher education in Brazil) published in (Journal of Marketing for Higher Education, 22), it was felt that students expects participation from such qualified staff in delivering quality course contents.

Comment: The researcher will be in agreement with this.
2.57 Crisp et. al. (2009) in their study titled (First year student expectations: Results from a university-wide student survey available at (Journal of University Teaching \& Learning Practice, 6) too perceives significance of qualified staff with regards to new students experiencing new school / college conditions. Authors stated that that this school condition gives the students opportunity of thought and articulation.

Comment: The researcher has the same opinion.
2.58 Mainardes, E., Raposo, M., \& Alves, H. (2012), in their study titled (Public university students' expectations: An empirical study based on the stakeholders theory) published in (Transylvanian Review of Administrative Sciences, 35) recommend consideration of courses with more pragmatic classes instead of hypothetical ones.

Comment: The researcher agrees with this.
2.59 Literature survey demonstrates that over the time the student expectations have changed and become more complex in nature. In this context, Headar et. al. (2013) in their study (Antecedents and consequences of student satisfaction with e-learning: The case of private universities in Egypt) published in (Journal of Marketing for Higher Education, 23) expressed that these desires rely upon different components: way of life, sex, age, sort of college and study methods.

Comment: The researcher agrees with this.
2.60 Jillapalli \& Jillapalli (2014) are of the view that study and understanding of student desires have become a part of management planning and strategy. Comment: The researcher concurs with this.
2.61 According to Gruber, T. (2014), in their study (Academic sell-out: How an obsession with metrics and rankings is damaging academia) published in (Journal of Marketing for Higher Education, 24), it is those features of the institutions that they are promoting to attract prospective students and parents. In this context, association with overseas educational establishments may provide competitive edge.

Comment: The researcher has the same opinion.
2.62 Mavondo et. al. (2004) in their study titled (International and local student satisfaction: Resources and capabilities perspective) published in (Journal of Marketing for Higher Education, 14) expressed that the family background of the students is very important in achieving any academic accomplishments. Comment: The researcher agrees with this.
2.63 Marimuthu \& Ismail (2012) in their study titled (Service quality in higher education: Comparing the perceptions of stakeholders) presented in (Ninth AIMS International Conference on Management (pp. 515-523) unequivocally expressed that course contents and choice of subjects (according to the interest of the students) will make the establishments exceedingly appealing for the prospective students.

Comment: The researcher has the same opinion.

Today we are witnessing use of technology is every aspect of education. Junior college admissions of students are now administered by centralized process. This is just one example of technology inclusion in education domain. Some of the related citations regarding this (as revealed from past research studies) are presented here.
2.64 Mehul Gupta et. al. (2017) in their study titled (Automated Online College Admission Management System) published in (International Journal of Computer Science Trends and Technology (IJCST) highlighted the importance of use of technology in making the admission process much easier. Comment: The researcher has the same opinion.
2.65 S.R.Bharamagoudar et. al. (2013) in their study titled (Web Based Student Information Management System) published in (International Journal of Advanced Research in Computer and Communication Engineering) expressed that technology has helped the education sector by development of web based automated systems. Such automated systems are comprehensive in nature with easy user interface and has replaced existing paper based systems.

Comment: The researcher agrees with this.
2.66 Ashwini Somnathe (2017) in their research titled (Simplified Online Admission Process) published in (International Conference on Emanations in Modern Technology and Engineering) stated that simplified online admission process is now most commonly used in the education sector.

Comment: The researcher concurs with this.
2.67 Web based systems such as College Management Software are practiced today now. Such web enabled software is developed so as to manage the entire operations of an institution. In the review undertaken by S. Walia, and S. Kaur Gill (2014) titled (Web Based Student Record Management System) published in (IJCSMC Vol. 3, Issue 8), it was felt that such web based systems are necessary today.
Comment: The researcher will be in agreement with this.
2.68 As stated earlier choice of subjects and course contents are vital ingredients in shaping the students perceptions. In the article titled (Most of the students show interest in commerce) appeared in (Times of India), it was mentioned that highest number of class X students in the state has indicated their liking towards commerce. Another field of liking is fine arts.

Comment: The researcher has the same opinion.

With the development of technology, education sector has changed significantly. It now has traditional class room based education and also has technology based distance education (e-learning). Ongoing and increasing popularity of MOOCs (massive open online courses) are an indication of future things.

After the review of literature, the researcher identifies some of the factors that are contributing towards overall assessment of students and parents about higher education and various aspects related to it.

For this study we have considered following factors:

- Sources of Information and Influences
- College Basics
- Significant Factors
- Infrastructure
- Student Specific Factors
- Social life on Campus

More details about above mentioned factors are provided in Chapter 3 'Research Methodology' subsequently.

## Chapter 3: Research Methodology

Chapter 3 is titled as, 'Research Methodology'. This chapter describes framework of concept, hypotheses of the study, the methodology used for data collection and other information of relevance.

### 3.1 Conceptual Framework

Title of the study -
"A Study of the Perceptions of Parents and Students and Its Impact on Management Strategies of Junior Colleges with reference to Pune City".

Various factors contribute to Perceptions of Parents and Students which influence Management Strategies. This study relates to Junior Colleges in Pune City.

Titles of factors considered for the study:
a. Sources of Information and Influences
b. College Basics
c. Significant Factors
d. Infrastructure
e. Student Specific Factors
f. Social Life on Campus

The above listed factors were finalized based upon interaction with the experts and literature review.

The typical conceptual framework for this study is as shown below:

Figure 1: Conceptual Framework


The above-listed factors include sub-factors as listed below. They are explained here

## Sources of Information and Influences

- For Parent's questionnaire the sources chosen are as follows:
- Ward (Own Child)
- Spouse
- Friends
- Relatives
- Former Students
- Campus Visit
- For Student's questionnaire the sources chosen are as follows:
- Mother
- Father
- Friends
- Relatives
- Former Students
- Campus Visit

For Parent's questionnaire as well as for the Student's questionnaire following parameters include same sub-parameters.

## College Basics

- Old
- New
- Aided
- Unaided
- School-Affiliated
- Senior College Affiliated


## Significant Factors

- Location
- Conveyance Available
- Family Tradition
- Reputation of Institution
- Courses Offered
- Tuition Fees


## Infrastructure

- Library
- Sport Facilities
- Auditorium
- Canteen
- IT Lab
- Guidance and Counselling


## Student Specific Factors

- Qualified Staff
- Choice of Subjects
- Scholarships Available
- Uniform
- Attendance
- College Timings


## Social life on Campus

- Student Composition
- Extra Curricular Activities
- Use of Mobile Phones
- NCC
- Safety and Security


### 3.2 Research Design

Present research will come under the descriptive inferential type of research, which will investigate the factors which affect the perceptions of both parents and students. It can also be a status report of the present conditions seen in junior colleges in Pune city.

### 3.2.1 Type of Research

- It is descriptive, applied and action research study.
- Mono method study that uses survey based quantitative analysis.


### 3.2.2 Population and Sample Size

Selection of Respondents:
Selection of respondents was based on certain conditions. These are as follows:

- The student is studying in junior college (Std. XI or XII)
- The respondents are from Pune city / Pune metropolitan area.
- For the field survey, Pune city was divided into seven areas (as decided by HSC Board and listed in their admission manual) as listed below: (DYDE)
- City / Peth
- Kothrud / Karvenagar
- Parvati / Dhankawadi / Swargate
- Sinhagad Road
- Camp / Yerwada
- Hadapsar and
- Shivajinagar / Aundh / Pashan
- It was ensured that field survey includes the respondents (both the parents and students) residing in each of these above listed areas.

Figure 2: Steps of Research

Preparation of First
Draft

Suggestions by Experts

Pilot Study and
Finalization of
Questionniare

> Execution of the Survey

## Data Analysis and Drawing Conclusions

Figure 3: Respondents for the Study - Students by Area and Stream


This is applicable for Area 2, Area 3, Area 4, Area 5, Area 6, and Area 7.

Figure 4: Respondents for the Study - Parents classified as per Annual Income Level, Work Profile, Education and Area


This is applicable for Area 2, Area 3, Area 4, Area 5, Area 6, and Area 7.

Area-wise respondent details are presented in the Chapter 4 titled 'Data Analysis and Interpretation'.

## Sample Size:

Sample size selection is based on following factors

1. Population size- mostly variable.
2. Margin of error (confidence interval)- normally taken as $\pm 2 \%$ to $5 \%$.
3. Confidence level---normally $90 \%-95 \%$ is taken. For every confidence level one can get a $Z$ score from $z$ score table.

A typical z score table is as shown below. (Z Value Table University of Florida)
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4. Standard deviation--- mostly taken as 0.5 .

The sample size is then decided as (Surveysystem)
$=z$ score ${ }^{2 *}$ std. dev.* (1-std.dev.)/margin of error ${ }^{2}$

If the sample size is known then following formula is used $=\left[\mathrm{z} \mathrm{score}{ }^{2 *}\right.$ std. dev.* (1-std.dev.)/margin of error$\left.{ }^{2}\right] / 1+\left[\mathrm{z}\right.$ score ${ }^{2 *}$ std. dev.* (1std.dev.)/margin of error $\left.{ }^{2 *} \mathrm{~N}\right]$

Where N is the population

Size of sample is very critical when the population is very large. When population is not large one can use representative sampling method.

The population of junior colleges in Pune city is large and the populations of students going to junior colleges are very significant.
E.g. the recommended sample size for a population of $10,00,000$, a confidence level of $90 \%$, and a margin of error (degree of accuracy) of $5 \%$ would be 270 . (Surveymonkey)

Thus, it was decided to take 300 as sample size for students and as well as for the parents. Random stratified samples were chosen so as to have representation of all seven areas of Pune city.

As stated earlier, data was gathered from the respondents i.e. the students and parents. In the said survey, 300 numbers of junior college students and 300 numbers of parents participated. These are samples for the study selected using random stratified sampling. The parent data set may not necessarily belong to the student data set. Hence there may be some parents who may be participants for this survey but their wards (as students) may not be participant for this survey and vice versa.

Figure 5: Sampling (Population and Sample) - Sample Size


In addition to this, we have also contacted 50 numbers of management representatives of the select junior colleges in Pune City.

### 3.2.3 Tools for Data Collection

## Primary Data Sources

Data was gathered from the respondents i.e. survey among the respondents. These include the junior college students, their parents (both residing in Pune city in different areas as mentioned above), in one part of the study. In another part the respondents were management representatives of select educational institutions (junior colleges) in Pune city. Structured questionnaires were used as the instrument for the data collection.

## Secondary Data Sources

The secondary data regarding the said research study was collected from various research papers, books, newspapers and websites. This data was useful for developing the conceptual framework.

Survey questionnaire was used to collect the data from the respondents.

For this study, we have prepared questionnaires for the parents and the students. (Refer Appendix)

The survey questionnaire is used to obtain information about different aspects. Table 1 shows the respective questionnaire details for the parents and the students.

Table 1: Survey Questionnaire Details [Parents and Students]

| Variables | Particulars |
| :--- | :--- |
| Demographic <br> Information (Parents and <br> Students) | Name, contacts and residence |
| Academic Information <br> (Parents) | UG, PG and Others |
| Work Information <br> (Parents) | Housewife, Service <br> Business, |
| Income details (Parents) | As per specified range |
| Other variables | Sources of Information and <br> Influences, College details, <br> Factors of Significance, <br> Physical Facilities, Student <br> related, Campus Life |

For this study, we have also prepared a separate questionnaire for the management representatives of junior colleges in Pune city. Table 2 shows the management representatives questionnaire details.

Table 2: Survey Questionnaire Details [Management Representatives]

| Variables | Particulars |
| :--- | :--- |
| Institution details | Type, Location, <br> Affiliation |
| Promotional Features | Open ended questions |
| Other variables | College details, Factors <br> of Significance, Physical <br> Facilities, Student <br> related, Campus Life |

## Data Collection Plan:

- Identifying the schools and colleges in Pune city for collection of primary data.
- Obtaining contact details of parents of students in Std. XI and XII in schools and colleges in Pune city for interview as well as questionnaire.
- Obtaining contact details of institutional heads and management persons from established and new junior colleges in Pune city.
- Presenting the purpose of the research to the schools, colleges, institutional heads, management persons, parents, and students in Std. XI and XII.
- Interview some institutional heads to study what factors do they think are important in view of the reputation of educational institution.
- Interview some management persons about the impact of perceptions on strategies of junior colleges and strategies commonly employed and changes that have been effectively noted.
- Collect information about choice made and factors considered with the help of a questionnaire from the following categories of the respondents:
- Parents whose wards have already enrolled in junior colleges.
- Students of Std. XI and XII.
- College Management Representatives.
- Pilot survey for data collection.
- Validation and collating the data.
- Modifications (in any needed) based on the Pilot survey
- Deciding on the exact research methodology and techniques depending upon the data collected.
- Main survey or field survey for data collection.
- Analyzing collected data using appropriate tools and methods.
- Testing of hypothesis.
- Finding and conclusion.
- Giving suggestions.

The survey was conducted using face to face interview method. As stated earlier, a structured questionnaire was prepared and used as survey tool. This was filled by the required number of respondents (both the parents and the students of the proposed survey and management representative), which were randomly selected.

### 3.2.4 Data Analysis

Data was collected by face to face interactions i.e. through field survey method that includes personal interviews. The questions in the questionnaire were close ended for parents and students. In case of management representatives, some open ended questions were included. Since the survey was about the influential factors (opinion and attitude based), Likert rating scale was used.

Figure 6: Data Collection and Analysis Tools


The collected data was tabulated and presented in the form of tables and graphs. Data was statistically analyzed. Various statistical test techniques (such as F test, T test, Mann Whitney test) were used to test and analyze the collected data.

- It was decided to use Cronbach's Alpha for checking data reliability and validate the data collected during pilot study as well as main study.
- The collected data has been tabulated in both the forms like Simple Tabulation with one variable and Cross Tabulation having two variables.
- The tabulated data has been analyzed by using SPSS 18.0 that comprises of the following statistical techniques:
- Univariate Analysis - It has been used to test a single variable for analysis. The methods related to this analysis included are Simple Percentage Method.
- Bivariate Analysis - It has been used for testing two variables for analysis. The methods related to this analysis included are Pearson Correlation test of two variables.
- Multivariate Analysis - It has been used for testing multiple variables across different categories of respondents. It also includes the methods of explaining the associations among more than two variables simultaneously.


## Chapter 4: Data Presentation and Analysis

Chapter 4 narrates 'Data Analysis and Interpretation', in which collected data has analyzed and interpretation has been provided by researcher.

### 4.1 Cronbach's Alpha

For this study we have two datasets for the students and parents (for Part B, C, D, E, F, and G) respectively. For this study we have also considered datasets for the management representatives (for Part D, E, F, and G) respectively.

For these three datasets we have calculated Cronbach's alpha using various statistical tests.

Details are as presented herewith.

Cronbach's Alpha for the Dataset of Parents

| SUMMARY |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Groups | Count | Sum | Average | Variance |  |  |
| WARD (OWN CHILD) | 300 | 1383 | 4.61 | 0.2387 |  |  |
| SPOUSE | 300 | 1230 | 4.10 | 0.1906 |  |  |
| FRIENDS | 300 | 840 | 2.80 | 0.8428 |  |  |
| RELATIVES | 300 | 780 | 2.60 | 0.8428 |  |  |
| FORMER STUDENTS | 300 | 975 | 3.25 | 1.0911 |  |  |
| CAMPUS VISIT | 300 | 1122 | 3.74 | 0.5944 |  |  |
| OLD | 300 | 1029 | 3.43 | 1.3897 |  |  |
| NEW | 300 | 903 | 3.01 | 1.1337 |  |  |
| AIDED | 300 | 975 | 3.25 | 1.0510 |  |  |
| UNAIDED | 300 | 903 | 3.01 | 0.8327 |  |  |
| SCHOOL AFFILIATED | 300 | 1038 | 3.46 | 1.1121 |  |  |
| SENIOR COLLEGE | 300 | 1183 | 3.94 | 0.6690 |  |  |
| AFFILIATED | 300 | 1290 | 4.30 | 0.2107 |  |  |
| LOCATION | 300 | 1259 | 4.20 | 0.1585 |  |  |
| CONVEYANCE | 300 | 873 | 2.91 | 1.0053 |  |  |
| AVAILABLE |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FAMILY TRADITION |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| REPUTATION OF |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| INSTITUTION | 300 | 1239 | 4.13 | 0.2539 |  |  |
| COURSES OFFERED | 300 | 1185 | 3.95 | 0.6497 |  |  |
| TUTION FEES | 300 | 921 | 3.07 | 0.8881 |  |  |
| LIBRARY | 300 | 1275 | 4.25 | 0.1881 |  |  |
| SPORTS FACILITIES | 300 | 984 | 3.28 | 0.7641 |  |  |
| AUDITORIUM | 300 | 621 | 2.07 | 1.1088 |  |  |
| CANTEEN | 300 | 960 | 3.20 | 0.8227 |  |  |
| IT LAB | 300 | 1005 | 3.35 | 1.1313 |  |  |
| GUIDANCE AND | 300 | 1182 | 3.94 | 0.5583 |  |  |
| COUNSELLING | 300 | 1380 | 4.60 | 0.2408 |  |  |
| QUALIFIED STAFF | 300 | 1365 | 4.55 | 0.2483 |  |  |
| CHOICE OF SUBJECTS | 300 | 1023 | 3.41 | 0.4835 |  |  |
| SCHOLARSHIPS | 300 | 567 | 1.89 | 0.8206 |  |  |
| AVAILABLE | 300 | 1095 | 3.65 | 0.6095 |  |  |
| UNIFORM | 300 | 1239 | 4.13 | 0.2138 |  |  |
| ATTENDANCE | 300 | 1197 | 3.99 | 0.6320 |  |  |
| COLLEGE TIMINGS | 300 | 1151 | 3.84 | 0.8127 |  |  |
| STUDENT COMPOSITION | 300 | 810 | 2.70 | 1.1739 |  |  |
| EXTRA CURRICULAR | 300 | 1008 | 3.36 | 0.6124 |  |  |
| ACTIVITIES | 300 | 1389 | 4.63 | 0.2339 |  |  |
| USE OF MOBILE PHONES |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NCC |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SAFETY AND SECURITY |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |

Anova: Single Factor for Part D, E, F, G

| Source of Variation | $S S$ | $d f$ | $M S$ | $F$ | $P-$ <br> value | F crit |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Between Groups | 4942.2099 | 34 | 145.3591 | 213.6760 | 0 | 1.4306 |
| Within Groups | 7119.11 | 10465 | 0.6802 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 12061.32 | 10499 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alpha |  | 0.9953 |  |  |  |  |

Anova: Two Factor without Replication for Part D, E, F, G

| Source of Variation | $S S$ | $d f$ | $M S$ | $F$ | $P-$ <br> value | F crit |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| Rows | 1092.6455 | 299 | 3.6543327 | 6.0548663 | $6.65 \mathrm{E}-$ <br> 192 | 1.1407 |
| Columns | 4601.6702 | 33 | 139.44455 | 231.04577 | 0 | 1.4376 |
| Error | 5955.0945 | 9867 | 0.6035365 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 11649.41 | 10199 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alpha |  | 0.9957 |  |  |  |  |

According to rule of thumb the values of alpha shown here are in the range of commonly accepted values ( 0.6 to 0.9 ) and thus indicate acceptable reliability.
Cronbach's Alpha for the Dataset of Students

| SUMMARY |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Groups | Count | Sum | Average | Variance |  |  |
| MOTHER | 300 | 1362 | 4.5400 | 0.4700 |  |  |
| FATHER | 300 | 1287 | 4.2900 | 1.0494 |  |  |
| FRIENDS | 300 | 837 | 2.7900 | 1.3103 |  |  |
| RELATIVES | 300 | 626 | 2.0867 | 1.3303 |  |  |
| FORMER STUDENTS | 300 | 936 | 3.1200 | 1.1093 |  |  |
| CAMPUS VISIT | 300 | 865 | 2.8833 | 1.8425 |  |  |
| OLD | 300 | 1015 | 3.3833 | 1.0733 |  |  |
| NEW | 300 | 758 | 2.5267 | 0.9257 |  |  |
| AIDED | 300 | 1199 | 3.9967 | 1.4615 |  |  |
| UNAIDED | 300 | 837 | 2.7900 | 0.6079 |  |  |
| SCHOOL AFFILIATED | 300 | 860 | 2.8667 | 1.0792 |  |  |
| SENIOR COLLEGE AFFILIATED | 300 | 1008 | 3.3600 | 1.1141 |  |  |
| LOCATION | 300 | 1298 | 4.3267 | 0.5819 |  |  |
| CONVEYANCE AVAILABLE | 300 | 1221 | 4.0700 | 0.5871 |  |  |
| FAMILY TRADITION | 300 | 741 | 2.4700 | 1.7081 |  |  |
| REPUTATION OF INSTITUTION | 300 | 1286 | 4.2867 | 0.6466 |  |  |
| COURSES OFFERED | 300 | 1272 | 4.2400 | 0.4639 |  |  |
| TUTION FEES | 300 | 1080 | 3.6000 | 0.6421 |  |  |
| LIBRARY | 300 | 1137 | 3.7900 | 1.2099 |  |  |
| SPORTS FACILITIES | 300 | 1053 | 3.5100 | 1.0735 |  |  |
| AUDITORIUM | 300 | 1032 | 3.4400 | 1.1101 |  |  |
| CANTEEN | 300 | 1140 | 3.8000 | 1.0836 |  |  |
| IT LAB | 300 | 1068 | 3.5600 | 1.4512 |  |  |
| GUIDANCE AND COUNSELLING | 300 | 1059 | 3.5300 | 1.1730 |  |  |
| QUALIFIED STAFF | 300 | 1323 | 4.4100 | 0.4233 |  |  |
| CHOICE OF SUBJECTS | 300 | 1380 | 4.6000 | 0.3211 |  |  |
| SCHOLORSHIPS <br> AVAILABLE | 300 | 1158 | 3.8600 | 0.6425 |  |  |
| UNIFORM | 300 | 582 | 1.9400 | 1.5014 |  |  |
| ATTENDANCE | 300 | 660 | 2.2000 | 1.4047 |  |  |
| COLLEGE TIMINGS | 300 | 1128 | 3.7600 | 1.4071 |  |  |
| STUDENT COMPOSITION | 300 | 1210 | 4.0333 | 0.5808 |  |  |
| EXTRA CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES | 300 | 1143 | 3.8100 | 0.8367 |  |  |
| USE OF MOBILE PHONES | 300 | 1071 | 3.5700 | 1.1891 |  |  |
| NCC | 300 | 840 | 2.8000 | 0.9833 |  |  |
| SAFETY AND SECURITY | 300 | 1320 | 4.4000 | 0.6221 |  |  |

Anova: Single Factor for Part D, E, F, G

| Source of Variation | $S S$ | $d f$ | $M S$ | $F$ | $P$-value | $F$ crit |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Between Groups | 5500.852 | 34 | 161.78976 | 161.71281 | 0 | 1.4306 |
| Within Groups | 10469.98 | 10465 | 1.0004759 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 15970.832 | 10499 |  |  |  |  |
| Alpha |  | 0.9938 |  |  |  |  |

Anova: Two Factor without Replication for Part D, E, F, G

| Source of Variation | $S S$ | $d f$ | $M S$ | $F$ | $P$-value | $F$ crit |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Rows |  |  |  |  | $3.1623 \mathrm{E}-$ |  |
| Columns | 5169.39294 | 299 | 5.0145 | 5.6033 | 171 | 1.1407 |
| Error | 8830.13647 | 9867 | 156.6483 | 175.0424 | 0 | 1.4376 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 15498.8529 | 10199 |  |  |  |  |
| Alpha |  | 0.9943 |  |  |  |  |

According to rule of thumb the values of alpha shown here are in the range of commonly accepted values ( 0.6 to 0.9 ) and thus indicate acceptable reliability.

Cronbach's Alpha for the Dataset of Management Representatives

| SUMMARY |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Count | Sum | Average | Variance |
| LOCATION | 55 | 219 | 3.9818 | 0.4997 |
| CONVEYANCE AVAILABLE | 55 | 209 | 3.8000 | 0.5333 |
| FAMILY TRADITION | 55 | 170 | 3.0909 | 1.1212 |
| REPUTATION OF INSTITUTION | 55 | 233 | 4.2364 | 0.3320 |
| COURSES OFFERED | 55 | 224 | 4.0727 | 0.6613 |
| TUTION FEES | 55 | 190 | 3.4545 | 1.1414 |
| LIBRARY | 55 | 235 | 4.2727 | 0.2020 |
| SPORTS FACILITIES | 55 | 193 | 3.5091 | 0.9582 |
| AUDITORIUM | 55 | 148 | 2.6909 | 1.6990 |
| CANTEEN | 55 | 185 | 3.3636 | 1.1246 |
| IT LAB | 55 | 195 | 3.5455 | 1.2155 |
| GUIDANCE AND COUNSELLING | 55 | 228 | 4.1455 | 0.5710 |
| QUALIFIED STAFF | 55 | 223 | 4.0545 | 0.5710 |
| CHOICE OF SUBJECTS | 55 | 215 | 3.9091 | 0.4175 |
| SCHOLORSHIPS AVAILABLE | 55 | 196 | 3.5636 | 0.6949 |
| UNIFORM | 55 | 127 | 2.3091 | 1.2916 |
| ATTENDANCE | 55 | 209 | 3.8000 | 0.7185 |
| COLLEGE TIMINGS | 55 | 231 | 4.2000 | 0.2370 |
| STUDENT COMPOSITION | 55 | 243 | 4.4182 | 0.4700 |
| EXTRA CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES | 55 | 199 | 3.6182 | 1.3515 |
| USE OF MOBILE PHONES | 55 | 177 | 3.2182 | 1.9145 |
| NCC | 55 | 177 | 3.2182 | 1.2108 |
| SAFETY AND SECURITY | 55 | 243 | 4.4182 | 0.2478 |
|  |  |  |  |  |


| Anova: Single Factor for Part D, E, F, G |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Source of Variation | SS | $d f$ | MS | $F$ | $P$-value | $\begin{gathered} F \\ c r i t \end{gathered}$ |
| Between Groups | 360.18182 | 22 | 16.3719008 | 19.6280 | $1.182 \mathrm{E}-65$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.55 \\ 07 \end{array}$ |
| Within Groups | 1035.9636 | 1242 | 0.8341 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 1396.1455 | 1264 |  |  |  |  |
| Alpha | 0.9491 |  |  |  |  |  |


| Anova: Two-Factor without Replication for Part D, E, F, G |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Source of Variation | $S S$ | $d f$ | $M S$ | $F$ | $P$-value | $F$ crit |
| Rows | 166.7520 | 54 | 3.08800 | 4.1577 | $3.59 \mathrm{E}-20$ | 1.3479 |
| Columns | 355.3157 | 21 | 16.9197 | 22.7812 | $2.984 \mathrm{E}-72$ | 1.5651 |
| Error | 842.2297 | 1134 | 0.7427 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1364.297 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 5 | 1209 |  |  |  |  |
| Alpha | 0.9561 |  |  |  |  |  |

According to rule of thumb the values of alpha shown here are in the range of commonly accepted values ( 0.6 to 0.9 ) and thus indicate acceptable reliability.

### 4.2 Survey Findings - Parents and Students PARENTS SURVEY - RESPONDENT'S PROFILE <br> Data Analysis - Parents Data - Final

No. of Respondents $(\mathrm{n})=300$

All of the respondents were parents of the students in junior colleges in Pune city.

## Part A1: PARENT DETAILS

## Respondent's Profile

## Residing Area / Location in Pune City

Table 1: Respondents (By Residing Area)

| RESIDING AREA / LOCTION | IN \% |
| :--- | :---: |
| CAMP / YERAWADA | $13 \%$ |
| CITY / PETH | $18 \%$ |
| HADAPSAR | $10 \%$ |
| KOTHRUD / KARVENAGAR | $18 \%$ |
| PARVATI / DHANKAWADI / SWARGATE | $15 \%$ |
| SHIVAJINAGAR / AUNDH / PASHAN | $13 \%$ |
| SINHAGAD ROAD | $13 \%$ |

About $18 \%$ of the respondents are from two areas CITY / PETH area and KOTHRUD / KARVENAGAR area. This is followed by $15 \%$ of the respondents from PARVATI / DHANKAWADI / SWARGATE area.

Figure 1: Respondents (By Residing Area)
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Table 2: Parent's Education

| PARENT 'S EDUCATION LEVEL | MOTHER | FATHER |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| LESS THAN HIGH SCHOOL | $5 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| HIGH SCHOOL | $2 \%$ | $3 \%$ |
| DIPLOMA | $2 \%$ | $5 \%$ |
| GRADUATE | $49 \%$ | $61 \%$ |
| POST GRADUATE | $42 \%$ | $30 \%$ |

Figure 2: Parent's Education


Most of the parents, both Mother and Father are well educated to the Graduate and Post Graduate levels.

## Work Related

Table 3: Parent's Work Profile

| PARENT 'S WORK PROFILE | MOTHER | FATHER |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| HOME MAKER | $36 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| BANKER | $2 \%$ | $5 \%$ |
| TEACHER | $5 \%$ | $3 \%$ |
| SERVICE | $45 \%$ | $42 \%$ |
| BUSINESS | $12 \%$ | $50 \%$ |

Figure 3: Parent's Work Profile
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Most of the parents, both Mother and Father are working with either service or having an own business.

## Income Level

Table 4: Parent's Annual Income

| PARENT 'S ANNUAL INCOME LEVEL | IN \% |
| :--- | :---: |
| RS. 1 LAKH TO Rs. 3 LAKH | $15 \%$ |
| RS. 3 LAKH TO Rs. 5 LAKH | $44 \%$ |
| MORE THAN Rs. 5 LAKH | $41 \%$ |

Figure 4: Parent's Annual Income


About less than half of the respondents (about 44\%) are with annual income Rs. 3 Lakh to Rs. 5 Lakh. This was followed by about $41 \%$ of the respondents having annual income of more than Rs. 5 Lakh.

## Part A2: STUDENT DETAILS

Respondents were selected randomly. Thus the sample survey consists of parents whose wards (as students) have responded to this survey

## STUDENT SURVEY - RESPONDENT'S PROFILE

## Data Analysis - Students Data - Final

No. of Respondents $(\mathrm{n})=300$

All of the respondents were students in junior colleges in Pune city.

## Part A1: STUDENT DETAILS

## Respondent's Profile

## Gender

Table 5: Gender Analysis

| GENDER | IN \% |
| :--- | :--- |
| MALE | $55 \%$ |
| FEMALE | $45 \%$ |

Figure 5: Gender Analysis


About half of the respondents (i.e. $55 \%$ ) are male and remaining are female students.

## Stream

Table 6: Respondents (By Stream)

| STREAM | IN \% |
| :--- | :--- |
| ARTS | $23 \%$ |
| COMMERCE | $27 \%$ |
| SCIENCE | $50 \%$ |

Figure 6: Respondents (By Stream)


About half of the respondents (i.e. 50\%) are from Science branch.

## Standard

Table 7: Respondents (By Standard)

| STANDARD | IN \% |
| :--- | :--- |
| XI | $67 \%$ |
| XII | $33 \%$ |

Figure 7: Respondents (By Standard)


More than two third of the respondents (i.e. 67\%) are studying in XIth standard in the first year of the junior college and the remaining are studying in XIIth standard.

## Residing Area / Location in Pune City

Table 8: Respondents (By Residing Area)

| RESIDING AREA / LOCTION | IN \% |
| :--- | :---: |
| CAMP / YERAWADA | $12 \%$ |
| CITY / PETH | $11 \%$ |
| HADAPSAR | $9 \%$ |
| KOTHRUD / KARVENAGAR | $19 \%$ |
| PARVATI / DHANKAWADI / SWARGATE | $28 \%$ |
| SINHAGAD ROAD | $11 \%$ |
| SHIVAJINAGAR / AUNDH / PASHAN | $11 \%$ |

All of the respondents are living in different areas of the Pune city. Nearly one fourth of the respondents (i.e. $28 \%$ ) are from PARVATI / DHANKAWADI / SWARGATE area. Another one fifth of the respondents (i.e. 19\%) are from KOTHRUD / KARVENAGAR area.

Figure 8: Respondents (By Residing Area)


## Part A2: PARENT DETAILS

Academic / Level of Education
Table 9: Parent's Education

| PARENT 'S EDUCATION LEVEL | MOTHER | FATHER |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| LESS THAN HIGH SCHOOL | $5 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| HIGH SCHOOL | $2 \%$ | $3 \%$ |
| DIPLOMA | $2 \%$ | $5 \%$ |
| GRADUATE | $49 \%$ | $61 \%$ |
| POST GRADUATE | $42 \%$ | $30 \%$ |

Figure 9: Parent's Education


Most of the parents, both Mother and Father are well educated to the Graduate and Post Graduate levels.

### 4.3 Part B: Sources of Information and Influence

Subsequent survey findings are presented here.

### 4.3.1 Part B: Parents

## Part B: SOURCES OF INFORMATION AND INFLUENCES

Table 10: Part B: Parents

|  | WARD <br> (OWN <br> CHILD) | SPOUSE | FRIENDS | RELATIVES | FORMER <br> STUDENTS | CAMPUS <br> VISIT |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NO IMPORTANCE | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| LESS <br> IMPORTANT | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $35 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
| NEUTRAL | $0 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $39 \%$ | $48 \%$ | $42 \%$ | $34 \%$ |
| IMPORTANT | $39 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $35 \%$ | $46 \%$ |
| MOST <br> IMPORTANT | $61 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $16 \%$ |

It was observed that for the parents their wards (own child) have strong influence over the students in making the choice of college their wards.

Figure 10: Part B: Parents


The top two influencing factors are their ward (Own Child) and their partner (Spouse). This was followed by Campus Visit.

|  | WARD (OWN <br> CHILD) | SPOU <br> SE | FRIEN <br> DS | RELATIV <br> ES | FORMER <br> STUDENTS | CAMPUS <br> VISIT |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Top 2 <br> Rankings | $100 \%$ | $95 \%$ | $21 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $43 \%$ |  |

The bottom influencing factors are Relatives and friends as most of the respondents have indicated no importance or less important response to this factor. This factor highlights the presence of nuclear families in the society.

|  | WARD (OWN <br> CHILD) | SPOU <br> SE | FRIEN <br> DS | RELATIV <br> ES | FORMER <br> STUDENTS | CAMPUS <br> VISIT |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bottom 2 <br> Rankings | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $40 \%$ |  |  |

All the sources (except ward and spouse) have received higher response as
Neutral from most of the respondents.

|  | WARD (OWN <br> CHILD) | SPOU <br> SE | FRIEN <br> DS | RELATIV <br> ES | FORMER <br> STUDENTS | CAMPUS <br> VISIT |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Neutral <br> Rankings | $0 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $39 \%$ | $48 \%$ | $42 \%$ |  |

Correlation between Part B Factors

|  | WARD (OWN <br> CHILD) | SPOU <br> SE | FRIEN <br> DS | RELATI <br> VES | FORMER <br> STUDENTS | CAMPUS <br> VISIT |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| WARD (OWN <br> CHILD) | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| SPOUSE | 0.1834 | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| FRIENDS | 0.3177 | 0.3254 | 1 |  |  |  |
| RELATIVES | 0.1805 | 0.1252 | 0.5198 | 1 |  |  |
| FORMER <br> STUDENTS | -0.3195 | 0.4657 | -0.0663 | 0.2023 |  |  |
| CAMPUS VISIT | -0.2967 | 0.0179 | -0.2107 | -0.2372 | -0.0228 | 1 |

There is no significant correlation amongst the opinions of these factors. Although the important ones (showing good correlation coefficient) are, Ward, Friends, and Relatives.

## Inferences

## Part B: SOURCES OF INFORMATION AND INFLUENCES (Parents)

- For most of the respondents, their wards (own child) and their partner (Spouse) are the main controlling elements in the context of selection of the institution (college).
- Other elements are campus visit and former students, but none of them are too strong to influence the respondents.
- A large portion of the respondents indicated Neutral response to all the elements except the wards (own child) and their partner (Spouse). This shows that these elements may have the potential to become one of the influencing factors.


### 4.3.2 Part B: Students

## Part B: SOURCES OF INFORMATION AND INFLUENCES

Table 11: Part B: Students

|  | MOTHER | FATHER | FRIENDS | RELATIVES | FORMER <br> STUDENTS | CAMPUS <br> VISIT |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| NO IMPORTANCE | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $46 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $27 \%$ |
| LESS IMPORTANT | $0 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $8 \%$ |
| NEUTRAL | $11 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $28 \%$ | $25 \%$ |
| IMPORTANT | $24 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $42 \%$ | $30 \%$ |
| MOST IMPORTANT | $65 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $10 \%$ |

It was observed that parents have strong influence over the students in making the choice of college for themselves.

Figure 11: Part B: Students


The top two influencing factors are Mother and Father. This was followed by Former Students.

|  | MOTHER | FATHER | FRIENDS | RELATIVES | FORMER <br> STUDENTS | CAMPUS <br> VISIT |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Top <br> Rankings | $89 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $40 \%$ |

The bottom influencing factor is Relatives as most of the respondents have indicated no importance or less important response to this factor. This factor highlights the presence of nuclear families in the society.

|  | MOTHER | FATHER | FRIENDS | RELATIVES | FORMER <br> STUDENTS | CAMPUS <br> VISIT |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Bottom 2 <br> Rankings | $0 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $35 \%$ | $61 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $35 \%$ |

Friends have received higher response as Neutral from most of the respondents.

|  | MOTHER | FATHER | FRIENDS | RELATIVES | FORMER <br> STUDENTS | CAMPUS <br> VISIT |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Neutral <br> Rankings | $11 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $28 \%$ | $25 \%$ |

## Correlation between Part B Factors

|  | MOTHER | FATHER | FRIENDS | RELATIVES | FORMER <br> STUDENTS | CAMPUS <br> VISIT |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| MOTHER | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| FATHER | 0.4714 | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| FRIENDS | 0.3197 | 0.2620 | 1 |  |  |  |
| RELATIVES | 0.1479 | 0.1796 | 0.0792 |  | 1 |  |
| FORMER <br> STUDENTS | 0.2759 | 0.0265 | 0.6674 | -0.1490 |  |  |
| CAMPUS VISIT | 0.0643 | -0.1319 | 0.2468 | 0.1624 | 0.2321 |  |

There is no significant correlation amongst the opinions of these factors. Although the important ones (showing good correlation coefficient) are, Mother, Father and Former Students.

## Inferences

## Part B: SOURCES OF INFORMATION AND INFLUENCES (Students)

- For most of the respondents, their parents both Mother and Father are controlling elements in the context of selection of the institution (college).
- Other elements are former students, friends, relatives and campus visits but none of them are too strong to influence the respondents.
- A large portion of the respondents indicated Neutral response to Friends. This shows that this aspect may have the potential to become one of the influencing factors.

Now a day, the respondents do not need Relatives to make their decisions. They are of lower importance to them. This fact highlights the presence of nuclear families in the society.

### 4.3.3 Part B: Difference

Part B: SOURCES OF INFORMATION AND INFLUENCES (Common Factors)

Part B is about various sources of information available with both the students and parents. In this Part $B$, the common source of information for both the students and the parents are:

- Friends
- Relatives
- Former Students and
- Campus Visit

All these factors were acting as sources of information for the students as well as parents and may influence their decisions in some or other ways.

Analysis of responses to these factors individually is presented subsequently.

- Friends

Table 12: Part B: Difference (Friends)

| FRIENDS | STUDENTS | PARENTS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| NO IMPORTANCE | $18 \%$ | $5 \%$ |
| LESS IMPORTANT | $17 \%$ | $35 \%$ |
| NEUTRAL | $40 \%$ | $39 \%$ |
| IMPORTANT | $18 \%$ | $17 \%$ |
| MOST IMPORTANT | $7 \%$ | $4 \%$ |

Figure 12: Part B: Difference (Friends)


- A equal number of the respondents (though small), considered 'Friends' as useful aspect in the context of selection of the institution (college). About $25 \%$ of the students and about $21 \%$ of the parents are of this opinion.
- A large number of the respondents (both the students and parents), have shown 'Neutral' response to this factor. About $40 \%$ of the students and about $39 \%$ of the parents are of this opinion. This indicates that in most of the cases the control of this factor on influencing the decision is not clearly observed.
- For some of the respondents it is the 'Less Important' aspect. About $17 \%$ of the students and about $35 \%$ of the parents are of this opinion. This means that parents are less concerned about external factors and tend to give more importance to their internal factors.
- Relatives

Table 13: Part B: Difference (Relatives)

| RELATIVES | STUDENTS | PARENTS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| NO IMPORTANCE | $46 \%$ | $14 \%$ |
| LESS IMPORTANT | $15 \%$ | $26 \%$ |
| NEUTRAL | $26 \%$ | $48 \%$ |
| IMPORTANT | $12 \%$ | $10 \%$ |
| MOST IMPORTANT | $2 \%$ | $2 \%$ |

Figure 13: Part B: Difference (Relatives)


- A equal number of the respondents (though small), considered 'Relatives' useful during selection of the institution (college). About $14 \%$ of the students and about $12 \%$ of the parents were agreeable on this.
- A large number of the respondents (especially the parents), have shown 'Neutral' response to this factor. About $26 \%$ of the students and about $48 \%$ of the parents are of this opinion. This indicates that in most of the cases especially the parents were undecided on this factor on influencing their decision.
- For some of the respondents it is the 'Less Important' aspect. About $15 \%$ of the students and about $26 \%$ of the parents are of this opinion.
- A large number of the respondents (especially the students), have shown 'No Importance' response to this factor. About $46 \%$ of the students as compared to about $14 \%$ of the parents are of this opinion. This indicates that in most of the cases especially the students were listening to their parents.
- Former Students

Table 14: Part B: Difference (Former Students)

| FORMER STUDENTS | STUDENTS | PARENTS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| NO IMPORTANCE | $10 \%$ | $11 \%$ |
| LESS IMPORTANT | $17 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
| NEUTRAL | $28 \%$ | $42 \%$ |
| IMPORTANT | $42 \%$ | $35 \%$ |
| MOST IMPORTANT | $3 \%$ | $8 \%$ |

Figure 14: Part B: Difference (Former Students)


- A equal number of the respondents (and moderate), considered 'Former Students' as helpful resource during selection of the institution (college). About $45 \%$ of the students and about $43 \%$ of the parents were agreeable on this.
- A large number of the respondents (especially the parents), have shown 'Neutral' response to this factor. About $28 \%$ of the students and about $42 \%$ of the parents are of this opinion. This indicates that in most of the cases especially the parents were undecided on this factor on influencing their decision.
- For some of the respondents it is the 'Less Important' aspect. About $17 \%$ of the students and about $4 \%$ of the parents are of this opinion.
- An equal number of the respondents (both the students and parents), have shown 'No Importance' response to this factor.
- Campus Visit

Table 15: Part B: Difference (Campus Visit)

| CAMPUS VISIT | STUDENTS | PARENTS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| NO IMPORTANCE | $27 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| LESS IMPORTANT | $8 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
| NEUTRAL | $25 \%$ | $34 \%$ |
| IMPORTANT | $30 \%$ | $46 \%$ |
| MOST IMPORTANT | $10 \%$ | $16 \%$ |

Figure 15: Part B: Difference (Campus Visit)


- A large number of the respondents (especially parents), considered 'Campus Visit' as the most important resource during selection of the institution (college). About $40 \%$ of the students only think this as compared with about $62 \%$ of the parents, those were agreeable on this.
- A moderate number of the respondents (especially the parents), have shown 'Neutral' response to this factor. About $25 \%$ of the students and about $34 \%$ of the parents are of this opinion. This indicates that in most of the cases especially the parents were undecided on this factor on influencing their decision.
- Mostly the students feel that there is 'No Importance' to this Campus Visit. About one fourth of the respondents (nearly $27 \%$ ), agreed to this.

A combined scanrio for Part B: Sources of Information and Influences is presented as below.

Table 16: Part B: Difference (All)

| Part B | FRIENDS |  | RELATIVES |  | FORMER STUDENTS |  | CAMPUS VISIT |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | STUDENT <br> S | PARENTS | STUDENT <br> S | PARENTS | STUDENTS | PARENTS | STUDENTS | PARENTS |
| NO <br> IMPORTAN <br> CE | $18 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $46 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| LESS <br> IMPORTAN <br> T | $17 \%$ | $35 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
| NEUTRAL | $40 \%$ | $39 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $48 \%$ | $28 \%$ | $42 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $34 \%$ |
| IMPORTAN <br> T | $18 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $42 \%$ | $35 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $46 \%$ |
| MOST <br> IMPORTAN <br> T | $7 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $8 \%$ |  |  |

Figure 16: Part B: Difference (All)

Part B: SOURCES OF INFORMATION AND INFLUENCES (AS \% OF RESPONDENTS) STUDENT'S AND PARENTS' RESPONSES TO COMMON FACTORS - WHERE DO THEY DIFFER?


### 4.4 Part C: College Basics

Subsequent survey findings are presented here.

### 4.4.1 Part C: Parents

## Part C: COLLEGE BASICS

Table 17: Part C: Parents

|  | OLD | NEW | AIDED | UNAIDED | SENIOR <br> AFFILIATED | COLLEGE <br> AFFILIATED |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NO <br> IMPORTANCE | $15 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| LESS <br> IMPORTANT | $8 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| NEUTRAL | $0 \%$ | $56 \%$ | $43 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $36 \%$ |
| IMPORTANT | $73 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $33 \%$ |
| MOST <br> IMPORTANT | $4 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $31 \%$ |

It was observed that established colleges (older institutions), with secondary education facilities (school affiliation) are preferred by the parents; when they have to make the choice of college for their wards.

Figure 17: Part C: Parents


The top two influencing factors amongst the College Basics are established colleges (older institutions) followed by either senior college affiliated junior colleges or school affiliated junior colleges.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | OLD | NEW | AIDED | UNAIDED | SENIOR <br> SFFILIATED | COLLEGE <br> AFFILIATED |
| Top <br> Rankings | 2 | $77 \%$ | $24 \%$ | $32 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $63 \%$ |

The bottom two influencing factors amongst the College Basics are school affiliated junior colleges and unaided institutions.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | OLD | NEW | AIDED | UNAIDED | SENIOR <br> AFFILIATED | OOLLEGE <br> AFFILIATED |
| Bottom <br> Rankings | 2 | $23 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $30 \%$ |

Unaided, Aided and New from the Colleges Basics have received higher response as Neutral from most of the respondents.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | OLD | NEW | AIDED | UNAIDED | SENIOR <br> AFFILIATED | COLLEGE <br> AFFILIATED |
| Neutral <br> Rankings | $0 \%$ | $56 \%$ | $43 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $36 \%$ |

## Correlation between Part C Factors

|  | OLD | NEW | AIDED | UNAIDED | SCHIOR <br> AFFILIATED | SENFILIATED <br> COLLEGE <br> AFFILAT |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| OLD | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| NEW | 0.1404 | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| AIDED | -0.2387 | 0.1448 | 1 |  |  |  |
| UNAIDED | -0.1439 | 0.0894 | 0.5014 | 1 |  |  |
| SCHOOL <br> AFFILIATED | 0.0394 | 0.3235 | 0.6079 | 0.7424 | 1 | 1 |
| SENIOR <br> COLLEGE <br> AFFILIATED | -0.4845 | -0.0800 | 0.2802 | 0.3951 | -0.0162 |  |

There is no significant correlation amongst the opinions these factors. Although the important ones (showing good correlation coefficient) are government funded (aided) institutions and secondary and higher education together (school and senior college affiliation), as well as the private institutions (unaided) and secondary and higher education together (school and senior college affiliation).

## Inferences

## Part C: COLLEGE BASICS (Parents)

- For most of the respondents, they prefer established colleges those are privately run and have facility school education and higher education together.
- Other factor of preference is opportunity of having higher education in the same premises (by the institution).
- It was observed that the respondents wants their ward to easily get admission to higher education, hence the idea of secondary and higher education together received more preference from the respondents (parents).
- Other factor with lesser preference is institutions with no assistance from government (unaided)
- A larger segment of the respondents have shown Neutral response to the factors such as establishment of colleges (newer institutions) lack of government backing (unaided) and support from government (aided). This means that this aspect is beyond their control and they have to deal with it anyway.


### 4.4.2 Part C: Students

## Part C: COLLEGE BASICS

Table 18: Part C: Students
$\left.\begin{array}{|l|l|l|l|l|l|l|}\hline & & & & & \text { SCHOOL } \\ \text { OLD } & \text { NEW } & \text { AIDED } & \text { UNAIDED } & \begin{array}{l}\text { SENIOR } \\ \text { COLLEGE } \\ \text { AFFILIATED }\end{array} \\ \text { AFFILIATED }\end{array}\right]$

It was observed that established colleges (older institutions), with government support (aided) and coupled with higher education facilities (senior college affiliation) are preferred by the students; when they have to make the choice of college for themselves.

Figure 18: Part C: Students


The top two influencing factors amongst the College Basics are government support (aided) and established colleges (older institutions). This was followed by senior college affiliated junior colleges.

|  |  |  |  |  | SCHOOL <br> SENIOR <br> COLLEGE |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | OLD | NEW | AIDED | UNAIDED | AFFILIATED | AFFILIATED |$|$| Top 2 Rankings | $47 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $12 \%$ | $64 \%$ |
| $11 \%$ | $31 \%$ |

The bottom two influencing factors amongst the College Basics are facility of secondary and higher education together (school and senior college affiliation) and new colleges (upcoming institutions). This was followed by institute without government assistance (unaided).

|  |  |  |  |  | SCHOOL | SENIOR <br> COLLEGE |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| OFFILIATED |  |  |  |  |  |  |$|$

Unaided and New from the Colleges Basics have received higher response as Neutral from most of the respondents.

|  |  |  |  |  | SCHOOL <br> SENIOR | COLLEGE <br> OFFILIATED |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Neutral Rankings | $38 \%$ | $51 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $56 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $30 \%$ |

## Correlation between Part C Factors

|  | OLD | NEW | AIDED | UNAIDED | SCHOOL <br> AFFILIATED | SENIOR <br> COLLEGE <br> AFFILIATED |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| OLD | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| NEW | -0.0254 | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| AIDED | 0.1719 | 0.0906 | 1 |  |  |  |
| UNAIDED | -0.0573 | -0.1419 | -0.0859 | 1 |  |  |
| SCHOOL <br> AFFILIATED | -0.0238 | -0.0199 | 0.2393 | 0.4402 | 1 |  |
| SENIOR <br> COLLEGE <br> AFFILIATED | -0.1297 | 0.3725 | 0.3155 | -0.2126 | -0.2489 | 1 |

There is no significant correlation amongst the opinions these factors. Although the important ones (showing good correlation coefficient) are provision of higher education (senior college affiliation), government assistance (aided) and upcoming colleges (newer institutions).

## Inferences

## Part C: COLLEGE BASICS (Students)

- For most of the respondents, they prefer established colleges with the assistance from local authorities or the government.
- Other factor of preference is opportunity of having higher education in the same premises (by the institution).
- It was observed that the respondents wants the college to have its own identity, hence the idea of secondary and higher education together received lesser demand from the respondents.
- Other factors with lesser preference are emerging colleges (newer institutions). This was followed by absence of government assistance (unaided).
- A larger segment of the respondents have shown Neutral response to the factors lack of government backing (unaided) and establishment of colleges (newer institutions). This means that this aspect is beyond their control and they have to deal with it anyway.


### 4.4.3 Part C: Difference

## Part C: COLLEGE BASICS

Part C is about basic aspects related to type of the college and facilities therein that may apparently become as influential factors available with both the students and parents. In this Part C, the basic information about the college (available for both the students and the parents) includes:

- Old (Established College)
- New (Recently Set-up College)
- Aided (College backed up with Government Assistance)
- Unaided (Privately Operated College with no Government Support)
- School Affiliated (College with the facility of School Education)
- Senior College Affiliated (College with the facility of Senior College Education)

All these factors were acting as sources of information for the students as well as parents and may influence their decisions in some or other ways.

Analysis of responses to these factors individually is presented subsequently.

- Old (Established College)

Table 19: Part C: Difference (Old)

| OLD | STUDENTS | PARENTS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| NO IMPORTANCE | $7 \%$ | $15 \%$ |
| LESS IMPORTANT | $8 \%$ | $8 \%$ |
| NEUTRAL | $38 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| IMPORTANT | $33 \%$ | $73 \%$ |
| MOST IMPORTANT | $13 \%$ | $4 \%$ |

Figure 19: Part C: Difference (Old)


- A large number of the respondents (especially the parents), preferred 'Old' established colleges. For them it is the significant factor in the context of selection of the institution (college). This fact was not much supported by the students. As compared to about $46 \%$ of the respondents (students) nearly $77 \%$ of the respondents (parents) are with this opinion.
- A large number of the respondents (especially the students), have shown 'Neutral' response to this factor. About $38 \%$ of the students are of this
opinion. This shows that the impact of this factor on decision making is not known. This in fact indicates the sense of uncertainty amongst them
- For some of the respondents it is not that much 'main' aspect. About $15 \%$ of the students and about $23 \%$ of the parents are of this opinion.
- New (Recently Set-up College)

Table 20: Part C: Difference (New)

| NEW | STUDENTS | PARENTS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| NO IMPORTANCE | $22 \%$ | $13 \%$ |
| LESS IMPORTANT | $15 \%$ | $7 \%$ |
| NEUTRAL | $51 \%$ | $56 \%$ |
| IMPORTANT | $12 \%$ | $14 \%$ |
| MOST IMPORTANT | $0 \%$ | $10 \%$ |

Figure 20: Part C: Difference (New)


- A equal number of the respondents (though small), considered 'New' colleges as helpful resource during selection of the institution (college). About $12 \%$ of the students and about $24 \%$ of the parents were agreeable on this.
- A large number of the respondents (both the students and parents), preferred to stay 'Neutral' on this aspect. Nearly $51 \%$ of the respondents (students) and about $56 \%$ of the respondents (parents) are with this opinion. This in fact indicates the sense of uncertainty amongst them. This
may be because of the mechanism followed during the admission process of the students by these colleges. There start discussion on the pros and cons of the 'Centralized Admission Process'.
- For some of the respondents it not that much 'key' aspect. About $37 \%$ of the students and about $20 \%$ of the parents are of this opinion. They feel that they won't have any control over it.
- Aided (College backed up with Government Assistance)

Table 21: Part C: Difference (Aided)

| AIDED | STUDENTS | PARENTS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| NO IMPORTANCE | $6 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| LESS IMPORTANT | $3 \%$ | $25 \%$ |
| NEUTRAL | $27 \%$ | $43 \%$ |
| IMPORTANT | $12 \%$ | $14 \%$ |
| MOST IMPORTANT | $51 \%$ | $18 \%$ |

Figure 21: Part C: Difference (Aided)


- A large number of the respondents (especially students), preferred 'Aided' colleges when it comes to the selection of the institution (college). About $63 \%$ of the students and about $32 \%$ of the parents were agreeable on this.
- A large number of the respondents (especially the parents), preferred to stay 'Neutral' on this aspect. About $27 \%$ of the respondents (students) and nearly $43 \%$ of the respondents (parents) are with this opinion. This in fact
indicates the sense of uncertainty amongst them. This may be because of the mechanism followed during the admission process of the students by these colleges. This may initiate debate over the presently followed ‘Centralized Admission Process’.
- For some of the respondents it not that much 'considerable' aspect. About $9 \%$ of the students and about $25 \%$ of the parents are of this opinion. They feel that they won't have any control over it.
- Unaided (Privately Operated College with no Government Support)

Table 22: Part C: Difference (Unaided)

| UNAIDED | STUDENTS | PARENTS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| NO IMPORTANCE | $3 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| LESS IMPORTANT | $30 \%$ | $30 \%$ |
| NEUTRAL | $56 \%$ | $50 \%$ |
| IMPORTANT | $7 \%$ | $9 \%$ |
| MOST IMPORTANT | $4 \%$ | $11 \%$ |

Figure 22: Part C: Difference (Unaided)


- A equal number of the respondents (though small), considered 'Unaided' colleges as significant aspect during selection of the institution (college). About $11 \%$ of the students and about $20 \%$ of the parents were agreeable on this.
- A large number of the respondents (both the students and the parents), preferred to stay 'Neutral' on this aspect. About $56 \%$ of the respondents (students) and nearly $50 \%$ of the respondents (parents) are with this opinion. This in fact indicates that there is some feeling of insecurity amongst the respondents. This may be because of the method followed during the admission procedure of the newer students by these colleges. This may begin discussion about the 'Centralized Admission Process'.
- For some of the respondents it not that much 'Important' aspect. A equal number of the respondents (though moderate), considered 'Unaided' colleges as insignificant aspect during selection of the institution (college). About $33 \%$ of the students and about $30 \%$ of the parents were agreeable on this.
- School Affiliated (College with the facility of School Education)

Table 23: Part C: Difference (School Affiliated)

| SCHOOL AFFILIATED | STUDENTS | PARENTS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| NO IMPORTANCE | $9 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| LESS IMPORTANT | $30 \%$ | $30 \%$ |
| NEUTRAL | $30 \%$ | $7 \%$ |
| IMPORTANT | $27 \%$ | $50 \%$ |
| MOST IMPORTANT | $4 \%$ | $13 \%$ |

Figure 23: Part C: Difference (School Affiliated)


- A large number of the respondents (especially the parents), preferred 'School Affiliated' colleges. For them it is the significant factor in the context of selection of the institution (college). They think that it is much easier to get admission to their ward from the in-house quota when the school is having college attached with it. This fact was not much supported by the students. As compared to about $31 \%$ of the respondents (students) nearly $63 \%$ of the respondents (parents) are with this opinion.
- A large number of the respondents (especially the students), preferred to stay 'Neutral' on this aspect. About 30\% of the respondents (students) and only $7 \%$ of the respondents (parents) are with this opinion.
- A equal number of the respondents (though moderate), considered 'School Affiliated' colleges as not an important factor during selection of the institution (college). About $39 \%$ of the students and about $30 \%$ of the parents were agreeable on this
- Senior College Affiliated (College with the facility of Senior College Education)
- 

Table 24: Part C: Difference (Senior College Affiliated)

| SENIOR COLLEGE AFFILIATED | STUDENTS | PARENTS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| NO IMPORTANCE | $6 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| LESS IMPORTANT | $14 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| NEUTRAL | $30 \%$ | $36 \%$ |
| IMPORTANT | $38 \%$ | $33 \%$ |
| MOST IMPORTANT | $12 \%$ | $31 \%$ |

Figure 24: Part C: Difference (Senior College Affiliated)


- A large number of the respondents (especially the parents), preferred 'Senior College Affiliated' colleges. For them it is the one of the important factors when it comes to selecting the institution (college). They think that it is much easier to get admission to their ward from the in-house quota when the college is having senior college attached to it. This fact was moderately supported by the students. As compared to about $50 \%$ of the respondents (students) nearly $61 \%$ of the respondents (parents) are with this opinion.
- A noticeable section of the respondents (both the students and the students), preferred to stay 'Neutral' on this aspect. About $30 \%$ of the respondents (students) and $36 \%$ of the respondents (parents) are with this opinion.
- Some of the respondents (especially the students), considered 'Senior College Affiliated' colleges as not considerable factor during selection of the institution (college). About 20\% of the students were agreeable on this. This certainly indicates that the students may pursue their higher studies from other institutions.

A combined sceanrio for Part C: College Baiscs is presented as below.

Table 25: Part C: Difference (All)

| Part C | OLD |  | NEW |  | AIDED |  | UNAIDED |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { SCHOOL } \\ \text { AFFILIATED } \end{gathered}$ |  | SENIORCOLLEGEAFFILIATED |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { STUD } \\ & \text { ENTS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { PARE } \\ \text { NTS } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { STUD } \\ & \text { ENTS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { PARE } \\ \text { NTS } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { STUD } \\ & \text { ENTS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { PAR } \\ \text { ENT } \\ \mathrm{S} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { STUD } \\ & \text { ENTS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { PARE } \\ \text { NTS } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { STUD } \\ & \text { ENTS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { PARE } \\ \text { NTS } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { STUD } \\ & \text { ENTS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PARE } \\ & \text { NTS } \end{aligned}$ |
| NO <br> IMPOR <br> TANCE | 7\% | 15\% | 22\% | 13\% | 6\% | 0\% | 3\% | 0\% | 9\% | 0\% | 6\% | 0\% |
| LESS <br> IMPOR <br> TANT | 8\% | 8\% | 15\% | 7\% | 3\% | 25\% | 30\% | 30\% | 30\% | 30\% | 14\% | 0\% |
| NEUTR AL | 38\% | 0\% | 51\% | 56\% | 27\% | 43\% | 56\% | 50\% | 30\% | 7\% | 30\% | $\begin{aligned} & 36 \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ |
| IMPOR TANT | 33\% | 73\% | 12\% | 14\% | 12\% | 14\% | 7\% | 9\% | 27\% | 50\% | 38\% | $\begin{aligned} & 33 \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ |
| MOST <br> IMPOR <br> TANT | 13\% | 4\% | 0\% | 10\% | 51\% | 18\% | 4\% | 11\% | 4\% | 13\% | 12\% | 31 $\%$ |

Figure 25: Part C: Difference (All)


### 4.5 Part D: Significant Factors

Subsequent survey findings are presented here.

### 4.5.1 Part D: Parents

## Part D: SIGNIFICANT FACTORS

Table 26: Part D: Parents

|  | LOCATION | CONVEYANCE <br> AVAILABLE | FAMILY <br> TRADITION | REPUTATION <br> OF <br> INSTITUTION | COURSES <br> OFFERED | TUTION <br> FEES |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NO <br> IMPORTANCE | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| LESS <br> IMPORTANT | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $28 \%$ |
| NEUTRAL | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $65 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $35 \%$ | $50 \%$ |
| IMPORTANT | $70 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $73 \%$ | $35 \%$ | $9 \%$ |
| MOST <br> IMPORTANT | $30 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $13 \%$ |

It was observed that amongst the Significant Factors parents have indicated their preference for location (of the institution), conveyance available (to reach the institution); reputation (of the institution), and courses offered (by the institution) when they have to make the choice of college for their wards.

Figure 26: Part D: Parents


The top influencing factors amongst the Significant Factors are the location (of the institution), conveyance available (to reach the institution), reputation (of the institution), and courses offered (by the institution).

|  | LOCA <br> TION | CONVEYANCE <br> AVAILABLE | FAMILY <br> TRADITION | REPUTATION <br> OF <br> INSTITUTION | COURSES <br> OFFERED | TUITION <br> FEES |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Top <br> Rankings | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $93 \%$ | $65 \%$ | $22 \%$ |

The bottom influencing factor amongst the Significant Factors is Tuition Fees.

|  | LOCA <br> TION | CONVEYANCE <br> AVAILABLE | FAMILY <br> TRADITION | REPUTATION OF <br> INSTITUTION | COURSES <br> OFFERED | FUITION <br> FEES |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Bottom 2 <br> Rankings | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $21 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $28 \%$ |

Family Tradition and Tuition Fees is the only factor from the Significant Factors that has received higher response as Neutral from most of the respondents.

|  | LOCATION | CONVEYANCE <br> AVAILABLE | FAMILY TRADITION | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { REPUTATION } \\ \text { OF } \\ \text { INSTITUTION } \end{array}$ | COURSES OFFERED | TUTION <br> FEES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Neutral <br> Rankings | 0\% | 0\% | 65\% | 7\% | 35\% | 50\% |

Correlation between Part D Factors

|  | LOCA <br> TION | CONVEYANCE <br> AVAILABLE | FAMILY <br> TRADITION | REPUTATION OF <br> INSTITUTION | COURSES <br> OFFERED | TUITION <br> FEES |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| LOCATION | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| CONVEYANCE <br> AVAILABLE | 0.6460 | 1 | -0.0309 | 1 |  |  |
| FAMILY <br> TRADITION | 0.2769 | 0.0555 | -0.3806 | 1 |  |  |
| REPUTATION OF <br> INSTITUTION | 0.1200 |  |  |  |  |  |
| COURSES <br> OFFERED | 0.6192 | 0.3017 | 0.0524 |  |  |  |
| TUTION FEES | 0.5389 | 0.1147 | 0.2439 |  | 0.4278 | 1 |

There is no significant correlation amongst the opinions these factors. Although the important ones (showing good correlation coefficient) are location of the institution, conveyance available courses offered, and (their) tuition fees, which is noticeable and understandable.

## Inferences

## Part D: SIGNIFICANT FACTORS (Parents)

- For most of the respondents, they prefer colleges with good reputation and offer a wide range of courses.
- Other factors of preference are location (of the institution) and transportation facilities available (to reach the institution).
- It was observed that the respondent's wants to give freedom to their ward to pursue their own ideas and taking up education accordingly. They are going away from the so called Family Traditions.
- A large section of the respondents have given Neutral rating to the factor Family Tradition. This means that parents now are enforcing their thought in their wards and allowing them to select newer and better career options.


### 4.5.2 Part D: Students

## Part D: SIGNIFICANT FACTORS

Table 27: Part D: Students

|  | LOCA <br> TION | CONVEYANCE <br> AVAILABLE | FAMILY <br> TRADITION | REPUTATION <br> OF <br> INSTITUTION | COURSES <br> OFFERED | FUITION <br> FEES |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| NO <br> IMPORTA <br> NCE | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |  |  |  |  |
| LESS <br> IMPORTA <br> NT | $3 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $2 \%$ |
| NEUTRAL | $8 \%$ | $17 \%$ |  |  |  |  |
| IMPORTA <br> NT | $41 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $27 \%$ |
| MOST <br> IMPORTA <br> NT |  |  | $18 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $48 \%$ | $57 \%$ |

It was observed that amongst the Significant Factors students have indicated their preference for location (of the institution), reputation (of the institution), courses offered (by the institution) and conveyance available (to reach the institution); when they have to make the choice of college for themselves.

Figure 27: Part D: Students


The top influencing factors amongst the Significant Factors are the location (of the institution), reputation (of the institution), courses offered (by the institution) and conveyance available (to reach the institution).

|  | LOCATION | CONVEYANCE <br> AVAILABLE | FAMILY <br> TRADITION | REPUTATION <br> OF <br> INSTITUTION | COURSES <br> OFFERED | TUITION <br> FEES |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Top 2 <br> Rankings | $89 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $90 \%$ | $86 \%$ | $64 \%$ |

The bottom influencing factor amongst the Significant Factors is Family Tradition.

|  | LOCATION | CONVEYANCE <br> AVAILABLE | FAMILY <br> TRADITION | REPUTATION <br> OF <br> INSTITUTION | COURSES <br> OFFERED | TUITION <br> FEES |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Bottom 2 <br> Rankings | $3 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $57 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $9 \%$ |

Tuition Fees is the only factor from the Significant Factors that has received
higher response as Neutral from most of the respondents.

|  |  | CONVEYANCE | FAMILY | REPUTATION <br> OF | COURSES | TUITION <br> FAEES |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Neutral <br> Lanking | $8 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $27 \%$ |

Correlation between Part D Factors

|  | LOCATION | CONVEYANCE AVAILABLE | FAMILY TRADITION | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { REPUTATION } \\ \text { OF } \\ \text { INSTITUTION } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | COURSES OFFERED | $\begin{gathered} \text { TUITI } \\ \text { ON } \\ \text { FEES } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LOCATION | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| CONVEYANCE AVAILABLE | 0.3327 | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| FAMILY TRADITION | -0.0639 | 0.0606 | 1 |  |  |  |
| REPUTATION OF INSTITUTION | 0.0213 | -0.0218 | 0.2946 | 1 |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { COURSES } \\ & \text { OFFERED } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 0.0353 | 0.0510 | -0.1234 | 0.5762 | 1 |  |
| TUTION FEES | 0.2090 | -0.0251 | 0.0364 | 0.3291 | 0.1826 | 1 |

There is no significant correlation amongst the opinions these factors. Although the important ones (showing good correlation coefficient) are reputation of the institution, courses offered, and (their) tuition fees, which is noticeable and understandable.

## Inferences

## Part D: SIGNIFICANT FACTORS (Students)

- For most of the respondents, they prefer colleges with good reputation and offer a wide range of courses.
- Other factors of preference are location (of the institution) and transportation facilities available (to reach the institution).
- It was observed that the respondent's wants to pursue their own ideas and taking up education accordingly. They are going away from the so called Family Traditions.

A large section of the respondents have given Neutral rating to the factor Tuition Fees. This means that this aspect is beyond their control and they have to accept it anyway.

### 4.5.3 Part D: Difference

## Part D: SIGNIFICANT FACTORS

Part D is about significant element related to the college and facilities therein that may apparently become as influential factors available with both the students and parents. In this Part D, the significant factors about the college include:

- Location
- Conveyance Available
- Family Tradition
- Reputation of the Institution
- Courses Offered
- Tuition Fees

All these factors were acting as sources of information for the students as well as parents and may influence their decisions in some or other ways.

Analysis of responses to these factors individually is presented subsequently.

- Location

Table 28: Part D: Difference (Location)

| LOCATION | STUDENTS | PARENTS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| NO IMPORTANCE | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| LESS IMPORTANT | $3 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| NEUTRAL | $8 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| IMPORTANT | $41 \%$ | $70 \%$ |
| MOST IMPORTANT | $47 \%$ | $30 \%$ |

Figure 28: Part D: Difference (Location)


- It is clearly seen that for a large number of the respondents (both the students and the parents), 'Location' is an important factor. About $87 \%$ of the respondents (students) and nearly all of the respondents (parents) agree with this opinion.
- Conveyance Available

Table 29: Part D: Difference (Conveyance Available)

| CONVEYANCE <br> AVAILABLE | STUDENTS | PARENTS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| NO IMPORTANCE | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| LESS IMPORTANT | $3 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| NEUTRAL | $17 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| IMPORTANT | $50 \%$ | $80 \%$ |
| MOST IMPORTANT | $30 \%$ | $20 \%$ |

Figure 29: Part D: Difference (Conveyance Available)


- What is true with the location is true with the conveyance. Better the location it is much easier to reach. It is clearly seen that for a large number of the respondents (both the students and the parents), 'Conveyance Available' too is significant aspect. About $80 \%$ of the respondents (students) and nearly all of the respondents (parents) agree with this opinion.
- Family Tradition

Table 30: Part D: Difference (Family Tradition)

| FAMILY <br> TRADITION | STUDENTS | PARENTS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| NO IMPORTANCE | $30 \%$ | $12 \%$ |
| LESS IMPORTANT | $27 \%$ | $9 \%$ |
| NEUTRAL | $18 \%$ | $65 \%$ |
| IMPORTANT | $17 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
| MOST IMPORTANT | $9 \%$ | $10 \%$ |

Figure 30: Part D: Difference (Family Tradition)


- Some of the respondents (though small and especially the students as compared to the parents), considers 'Family Tradition' as significant aspect during selection of the institution (college). About 26\% of the students and about $14 \%$ of the parents were agreeable on this.
- Some of the respondents (though small and especially the parents as compared to the students), considers 'Family Tradition' as not that major aspect during selection of the institution (college). About $57 \%$ of the students and about $21 \%$ of the parents are of this opinion. This indicates that the parents are not enforcing their views on the wards. Now the students are selecting their career options and taking up education of their own interest.
- A large number of the respondents (especially the parents), are 'Neutral' about this aspect. They think that it is much more important what their ward wants and not the family tradition. This fact was not much supported by the students. As compared to about $18 \%$ of the respondents (students) and about $65 \%$ of the respondents (parents) go with this view.
- Reputation of the Institution

Table 31: Part D: Difference (Reputation of the Institution)

| REPUTATION OF INSTITUTION | STUDENTS | PARENTS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| NO IMPORTANCE | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| LESS IMPORTANT | $6 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| NEUTRAL | $4 \%$ | $7 \%$ |
| IMPORTANT | $45 \%$ | $73 \%$ |
| MOST IMPORTANT | $45 \%$ | $20 \%$ |

Figure 31: Part D: Difference (Reputation of the Institution)


- Better the institution is known in the society, it will be preferred by both the students and the parents. It is clearly seen that for a large number of the respondents (both the students and the parents), 'Reputation of the Institution' is noteworthy aspect. About $90 \%$ of the respondents (students) and $93 \%$ of the respondents (parents) go with this view.
- Courses Offered

Table 32: Part D: Difference (Courses Offered)

| COURSES OFFERED | STUDENTS | PARENTS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| NO IMPORTANCE | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| LESS IMPORTANT | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| NEUTRAL | $14 \%$ | $35 \%$ |
| IMPORTANT | $48 \%$ | $35 \%$ |
| MOST IMPORTANT | $38 \%$ | $30 \%$ |

Figure 32: Part D: Difference (Courses Offered)


- In the development of reputation of the institution, the courses offered by the institutions play a major role. Better the range of courses provided, the institution will be preferred by both the students and the parents. It is clearly observed that for a large number of the respondents (both the students and the parents), 'Courses Offered' is noteworthy aspect. The students have a more voice in this. As compared to about $86 \%$ of the respondents (students) and about $65 \%$ of the respondents (parents) go with this view.
- Tuition Fees

Table 33: Part D: Difference (Tuition Fees)

| TUTION FEES | STUDENTS | PARENTS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| NO IMPORTANCE | $2 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| LESS IMPORTANT | $7 \%$ | $28 \%$ |
| NEUTRAL | $27 \%$ | $50 \%$ |
| IMPORTANT | $57 \%$ | $9 \%$ |
| MOST IMPORTANT | $7 \%$ | $13 \%$ |

Figure 33: Part D: Difference (Tuition Fees)


- Education has become a costly affair now days. Thus 'Tuition Fees' has remained a worrisome aspect for the students. It is clearly noticed that for a large number of the respondents (especially the students), 'Tuition Fees' is noteworthy aspect. Surprisingly the students have a more voice in this. As compared to about $64 \%$ of the respondents (students) and only about $22 \%$ of the respondents (parents) go with this view.
- A large number of the respondents (especially the parents), preferred to stay 'Neutral' on this aspect. As compared to about $27 \%$ of the respondents (students), about $50 \%$ of the respondents (parents) are with this opinion. This in fact indicates the sense of uncertainty amongst them. They feel that they do not have any control on this factor.

A combined scanrio for Part D: Significant Factors is presented as below.

Table 34: Part D: Difference (All)

| Part D | LOCATION |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CONVEYANCE } \\ & \text { AVAILABLE } \end{aligned}$ |  | FAMILY TRADITION |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { REPUTATION } \\ \text { OF } \\ \text { INSTITUTION } \end{gathered}$ |  | COURSES OFFERED |  | TUTION <br> FEES |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { STUD } \\ & \text { ENTS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { PAR } \\ \text { ENT } \\ \text { S } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { STUD } \\ & \text { ENTS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { PAR } \\ \text { ENT } \\ \text { S } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { STUD } \\ & \text { ENTS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { PARE } \\ \text { NTS } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { STUD } \\ & \text { ENTS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { PARE } \\ \text { NTS } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { STUD } \\ & \text { ENTS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PARE } \\ & \text { NTS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { STUD } \\ & \text { ENTS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { PARE } \\ \text { NTS } \end{array}$ |
| NO <br> IMPOR <br> TANCE | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 30\% | 12\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 2\% | 0\% |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { LESS } \\ & \text { IMPOR } \\ & \text { TANT } \end{aligned}$ | 3\% | 0\% | 3\% | 0\% | 27\% | 9\% | 6\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 7\% | 28\% |
| NEUTR AL | 8\% | 0\% | 17\% | 0\% | 18\% | 65\% | 4\% | 7\% | 14\% | 35\% | 27\% | 50\% |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { IMPOR } \\ & \text { TANT } \end{aligned}$ | 41\% | 70\% | 50\% | 80\% | 17\% | 4\% | 45\% | 73\% | 48\% | 35\% | 57\% | 9\% |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { MOST } \\ & \text { IMPOR } \\ & \text { TANT } \end{aligned}$ | 47\% | 30\% | 30\% | 20\% | 9\% | 10\% | 45\% | 20\% | 38\% | 30\% | 7\% | 13\% |

Figure 34: Part D: Difference (All)


### 4.6 Part E: Infrastructure

Subsequent survey findings are presented here.

### 4.6.1 Part E: Parents

## Part E: INFRASTRUCTURE

Table 35: Part E: Parents

|  | LIBRARY | SPORTS FACILITIES | AUDITORIUM | CANTEEN | IT LAB | GUIDANCE AND COUNSELLING |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{NO}$ <br> IMPORTANCE | 0\% | 0\% | 34\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| LESS IMPORTANT | 0\% | 15\% | 39\% | 18\% | 25\% | 0\% |
| NEUTRAL | 0\% | 55\% | 17\% | 59\% | 35\% | 31\% |
| IMPORTANT | 75\% | 17\% | 6\% | 8\% | 20\% | 44\% |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { MOST } \\ & \text { IMPORTANT } \end{aligned}$ | 25\% | 13\% | 4\% | 15\% | 20\% | 25\% |

It was observed that amongst the Infrastructure facilities parents have indicated their preference for Library, Guidance and Counselling, and IT Lab; when they have to make the choice of college for their wards.

Figure 35: Part E: Parents


The top influencing factors amongst the Infrastructure facilities are Library and Guidance and Counselling and IT Lab.

|  |  |  |  |  | GUIDANCE <br> SPORTS <br> ATD |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | LIBRARY | FACILITIES | AUDITORIUM | CANTEEN | LAB | COUNSELLING |
| Top 2 Rankings | $100 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $23 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $69 \%$ |

The bottom influencing factors amongst the Infrastructure facilities are Auditorium and IT Lab.

|  |  |  |  |  | GUIDANCE <br> SPORTS |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| IT | AND |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | LIBRARY | FACILITIES | AUDITORIUM | CANTEEN | LAB | COUNSELLING |
| Bottom <br> Rankings | 2 | $0 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $73 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $25 \%$ |

Sports facilities and Canteen from the Infrastructure facilities have received higher response as Neutral from most of the respondents.

|  |  |  |  |  |  | GUIDANCE |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
|  |  | SPORTS |  | CANTE | IT | AND |
|  | IBRARY | FACILITIES | UDITORIUM | EN | LAB | COUNSELLING |
| Neutral |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rankings | $0 \%$ | $55 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $59 \%$ | $35 \%$ | $31 \%$ |

Correlation between Part E Factors

|  | LIBRARY | SPORTS FACILITIES | AUDITORIUM | CANTEEN | IT LAB | GUIDANCE AND COUNSELLING |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LIBRARY | 1.0000 |  |  |  |  |  |
| SPORTS <br> FACILITIES | 0.4587 | 1.0000 |  |  |  |  |
| AUDITORIUM | 0.5034 | 0.4546 | 1.0000 |  |  |  |
| CANTEEN | 0.2975 | 0.0093 | 0.3775 | 1.0000 |  |  |
| IT LAB | 0.3752 | 0.4914 | 0.3603 | -0.0589 | 1.0000 |  |
| GUIDANCE AND COUNSELLING | 0.1806 | 0.3638 | 0.3964 | 0.1559 | 0.2790 | 1.0000 |

There is no significant correlation amongst the opinions these factors. Although the important ones (showing good correlation coefficient) are Library, Sports Facilities and Auditorium.

## Inferences

## Part E: INFRASTRUCTURE (Parents)

- For most of the respondents, they prefer colleges with sound infrastructure in place.
- Facilities preferred are Library, Guidance and Counselling and IT Lab.
- Other facility with least preference is Auditorium.
- The existences of such infrastructure vary from college to college.
- It was observed that the respondent's (parents) gave given lesser preference to Canteen facilities as they think that outside food is not hygienic and it is better for their wards (the students) to carry their own food from home.

A large section of the respondents have given Neutral rating to all the factors in Infrastructure facilities. This means that respondents were undecided on these aspects. It is obvious that the responsibility of providing of such facilities does not rest with them and thus they have to accept what is there. It entirely depends upon the institution, its management and financial capacity to create and provide such facilities.

### 4.6.2 Part E: Students

## Part E: INFRASTRUCTURE

Table 36: Part E: Students

|  | LIBRARY | SPORTS <br> FACILITIES | AUDITOR <br> IUM | CANTEEN | IT LAB | CUIDANCE AND <br> COUNSELLING |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| NO <br> IMPORTANC <br> E |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LESS <br> IMPORTANT | $3 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $7 \%$ |
| NEUTRAL | $34 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $7 \%$ |
| IMPORTANT | $24 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $30 \%$ |
| MOST <br> IMPORTANT | $34 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $32 \%$ | $55 \%$ | $38 \%$ | $38 \%$ |

It was observed that amongst the Infrastructure facilities students have indicated their preference for Canteen, Library and IT Lab; when they have to make the choice of college for themselves.

Figure 36: Part E: Students


The top influencing factors amongst the Infrastructure facilities are Canteen,
Library and IT Lab.

|  | LIBRARY | SPORTS <br> FACILITIES | AUDITORIUM | CANTEEN | IT <br> LAB | GUIDANCE AND <br> COUNSELLING |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Top <br> Rankings | $58 \%$ | $48 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $76 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $56 \%$ |

The bottom influencing factors amongst the Infrastructure facilities are
Auditorium, and Sports Facilities.

|  | LIBRARY | SPORTS <br> FACILITIES | AUDITORIUM | CANTEEN | IT <br> LAB | GUIDANCE AND <br> COUNSELLING |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Bottom <br> Rankings | $8 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $14 \%$ |

All of the factors (except Canteen and IT Lab), from the Infrastructure facilities have received higher response as Neutral from most of the respondents.

|  | LIBRARY | SPORTS <br> FACILITIES | AUDITORIUM | CANTEEN | IT <br> LAB | GUIDANCE AND <br> COUNSELLING |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Neutral <br> Rankings | $34 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $30 \%$ |

Correlation between Part E Factors

|  | LIBRARY | SPORTS <br> FACILITIES | AUDITORIUM | CANTEEN | TAB | $\begin{aligned} & \text { GUIDANCE AND } \\ & \text { COUNSELLING } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LIBRARY | 1.0000 |  |  |  |  |  |
| SPORTS FACILITIES | 0.3173 | 1.0000 |  |  |  |  |
| AUDITORIUM | 0.2387 | 0.6669 | 1.0000 |  |  |  |
| CANTEEN | -0.0806 | -0.0074 | 0.0043 | 1.0000 |  |  |
| IT LAB | -0.0119 | 0.2045 | 0.0714 | 0.5110 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 1.0 \\ & 000 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { GUIDANCE } \\ & \text { AND } \\ & \text { COUNSELLING } \end{aligned}$ | 0.0881 | -0.0927 | -0.0351 | 0.3761 | $\begin{aligned} & 0.3 \\ & 818 \end{aligned}$ | 1.0000 |

There is no significant correlation amongst the opinions these factors. Although the important ones (showing good correlation coefficient) are Canteen, IT Lab, Sports Facilities and Auditorium.

## Inferences

## Part E: INFRASTRUCTURE (Students)

- For most of the respondents, they prefer colleges with sound infrastructure in place.
- Facilities preferred are Canteen, Library and IT Lab.
- Other facilities with least preference are auditorium and sports facilities.
- The existences of such infrastructure vary from college to college.
- It was observed that the respondents were engaged for most of the time in the institutions as a part of their learning process. Pune being educational hub of the state attracts students those are not residing here. Thus having the canteen facility within the college premises is advantageous according to the respondents. They feel that such provision saves their time in going out of the colleges and allows them to concentrate on their education.
- A large section of the respondents have given Neutral rating to all the factors in Infrastructure facilities. This means that respondents were undecided on these aspects. It is obvious that the responsibility of providing of such facilities does not rest with them and thus they have to accept what is there. It entirely depends upon the institution, its management and financial capacity to create and provide such facilities.


### 4.6.3 Part E: Difference

Subsequent survey findings are presented here.

## Part E: INFRASTRUCTURE

Part E is about the infrastructure available with the college and facilities therein that may apparently become as influential factors available with both the students and parents. In this Part E, the basic infrastructure components associated with the college includes:

- Library
- Sports Facilities
- Auditorium
- Canteen
- IT Lab
- Guidance and Counselling

All these factors were acting as sources of information for the students as well as parents and may influence their decisions in some or other ways.

Analysis of responses to these factors individually is presented subsequently.

- Library

Table 37: Part E: Difference (Library)

| LIBRARY | STUDENTS | PARENTS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| NO IMPORTANCE | $5 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| LESS IMPORTANT | $3 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| NEUTRAL | $34 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| IMPORTANT | $24 \%$ | $75 \%$ |
| MOST IMPORTANT | $34 \%$ | $25 \%$ |

Figure 37: Part E: Difference (Library)


- It is clearly seen that for a large number of the respondents (both the students and the parents), 'Library' is an essential element. About $58 \%$ of the respondents (students) and nearly all of the respondents (parents) agree with this opinion.
- Some of the respondents (especially the students) are 'Neutral' on this aspect. This indicates that the students prefer to have their 'own study method'. About $34 \%$ of the respondents (students) are going with this view.
- Sports Facilities

Table 38: Part E: Difference (Sports Facilities)

| SPORTS FACILITIES | STUDENTS | PARENTS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| NO IMPORTANCE | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| LESS IMPORTANT | $19 \%$ | $15 \%$ |
| NEUTRAL | $33 \%$ | $55 \%$ |
| IMPORTANT | $26 \%$ | $17 \%$ |
| MOST IMPORTANT | $22 \%$ | $13 \%$ |

Figure 38: Part E: Difference (Sports Facilities)


- Along with the education, sport activities play a major role in the development of the students. It is clearly observed that for a large number of the respondents (especially the students), 'Sports Facilities' is significant thing. The students have a more voice here. As compared to about $48 \%$ of the respondents (students) and about $30 \%$ of the respondents (parents) go with this view.
- A large number of the respondents (especially the parents), preferred to stay 'Neutral' on this aspect. The parents have a more voice here. As compared to about $33 \%$ of the respondents (students), about $55 \%$ of the respondents (parents) are with this opinion.
- Auditorium

Table 39: Part E: Difference (Auditorium)

| AUDITORIUM | STUDENTS | PARENTS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| NO IMPORTANCE | $0 \%$ | $34 \%$ |
| LESS IMPORTANT | $25 \%$ | $39 \%$ |
| NEUTRAL | $25 \%$ | $17 \%$ |
| IMPORTANT | $32 \%$ | $6 \%$ |
| MOST IMPORTANT | $18 \%$ | $4 \%$ |

Figure 39: Part E: Difference (Auditorium)


- Along with the education, cultural activities are also essential for the advancement of the students. It is clearly observed that for a large number of the respondents (especially the students), 'Auditorium' is significant thing. The students have a more voice here. As compared to about $50 \%$ of the respondents (students) and only about $10 \%$ of the respondents (parents) go with this view.
- A large number of the respondents (especially the parents) have indicated that this aspect does not have that much of significance according to them. The parents have a more voice here. As compared to about $25 \%$ of the respondents (students), about $73 \%$ of the respondents (parents) are with this opinion.
- Canteen

Table 40: Part E: Difference (Canteen)

| CANTEEN | STUDENTS | PARENTS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| NO IMPORTANCE | $7 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| LESS IMPORTANT | $4 \%$ | $18 \%$ |
| NEUTRAL | $13 \%$ | $59 \%$ |
| IMPORTANT | $55 \%$ | $8 \%$ |
| MOST IMPORTANT | $21 \%$ | $15 \%$ |

Figure 40: Part E: Difference (Canteen)

Part E: INFRASTRUCTURE (AS \% OF RESPONDENTS) STUDENT'S AND PARENTS' RESPONSES - CANTEEN WHERE DO THEY DIFFER?


- With long duration of colleges students feel exhausted and they do not have time to go for eating. Thus canteen becomes the necessity for the students. It is noticed that for a large number of the respondents (especially the students), 'Canteen' is important. The students have a more voice here. As compared to about $76 \%$ of the respondents (students) and only about $23 \%$ of the respondents (parents) go with this view. Students think that it is the best place to enjoy lecture breaks along with other students. Also it is good place to eat their Tiffin.
- A large number of the respondents (especially the parents), preferred to stay 'Neutral' on this aspect. The parents also have a more voice here. As compared to about $13 \%$ of the respondents (students), about $59 \%$ of the respondents (parents) are with this opinion. This in fact indicates that parents are more concerned about health of their ward. They do not want their ward to eat outside food that is unhygienic and prefer that their ward carries home food.
- IT Lab

Table 41: Part E: Difference (IT Lab)

| IT LAB | STUDENTS | PARENTS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| NO IMPORTANCE | $12 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| LESS IMPORTANT | $2 \%$ | $25 \%$ |
| NEUTRAL | $26 \%$ | $35 \%$ |
| IMPORTANT | $38 \%$ | $20 \%$ |
| MOST IMPORTANT | $22 \%$ | $20 \%$ |

Figure 41: Part E: Difference (IT Lab)

Part E: INFRASTRUCTURE (AS \% OF RESPONDENTS) STUDENT'S AND PARENTS' RESPONSES - IT LAB - WHERE DO THEY DIFFER?


- With the advent of information technology, the pattern of education has changed. Students feel that they should be updated with the current technology. It is noticed that for a large number of the respondents (especially the students), 'IT Lab' is significant thing. The students have a more voice here. As compared to about $60 \%$ of the respondents (students) and about $40 \%$ of the respondents (parents) go with this view.
- A large number of the respondents (especially the parents), preferred to stay 'Neutral' on this aspect. The parents also have a more voice here. As compared to about $26 \%$ of the respondents (students), about $35 \%$ of the respondents (parents) are with this opinion. This in fact indicates that provision of such facility is entirely depends on the institution and parents do not have any control over it.
- Guidance and Counselling

Table 42: Part E: Difference (Guidance and Counselling)

| GUIDANCE AND <br> COUNSELLING | STUDENTS | PARENTS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| NO IMPORTANCE | $7 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| LESS IMPORTANT | $7 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| NEUTRAL | $30 \%$ | $31 \%$ |
| IMPORTANT | $18 \%$ | $44 \%$ |
| MOST IMPORTANT | $20 \%$ |  |

Figure 42: Part E: Difference (Guidance and Counselling)


- A equal number of the respondents (though small), stated that 'Guidance and Counselling' is not an important factor during selection of the institution (college). About 7\% of the students and about 7\% of the parents go with this view.
- A large number of the respondents (both the students and the parents), preferred to stay 'Neutral' on this aspect. As compared to about $30 \%$ of the respondents (students), about $31 \%$ of the respondents (parents) are with this opinion. This in fact indicates that both the students and parents may take the help of any other sources for this purpose.
- With the progress technology, new opportunities have created in emerging sectors. This has lead to introduction of new courses with basic skills and specialization. It is noticed that for a large number of the respondents (especially the parents), 'Guidance and Counselling' is significant thing. The parents have a more voice here. As compared to about $56 \%$ of the respondents (students) and about $64 \%$ of the respondents (parents) agree with this opinion.

A combined scanrio for Part E: Infrastructure is presented as below.

Table 43: Part E: Difference (All)


Figure 43: Part E: Difference (All)


### 4.7 Part F: Significant Factors

Subsequent survey findings are presented here.

### 4.7.1 Part F: Parents

## Part F: STUDENT SPECIFIC FACTORS

Table 44: Part F: Parents

|  | QUALIFIED <br> STAFF | CHOICE OF <br> SUBJECTS | SCHOLARSHIPS <br> AVAILABLE | UNIF <br> ORM | ATTEND <br> ANCE | COLLEGE <br> TIMINGS |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NO <br> IMPORTAN <br> CE | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |  |  |  |  |
| LESS <br> IMPORTANT | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $0 \%$ |  |
| NEUTRAL | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $5 \%$ |
| IMPORTANT | $40 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $38 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $59 \%$ | $77 \%$ |
| MOST <br> IMPORTANT | $60 \%$ | $55 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $18 \%$ |

It was observed that amongst the Student Specific Factors parents have shown their choices for Qualified Staff, Choice of Subjects and Timings of the Colleges; when they have to make the choice of college for their wards.

Figure 44: Part F: Parents


The top controlling elements amongst the Student Specific Factors are Qualified Staff, Choice of Subjects, College Timings and Attendance.

|  | QUALIFIED <br> STAFF | CHOICE OF <br> SUBJECTS | SCHOLARSHIPS <br> AVAILABLE | UNIFO <br> RM | ATTENDA <br> NCE | COLLEGE <br> TIMINGS |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Top <br> Rankings | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $43 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $66 \%$ | $95 \%$ |

The least or bottom controlling element amongst the Student Specific Factors is Uniform.

|  | QUALIFIED <br> STAFF | CHOICE OF <br> SUBJECTS | SCHOLARSHIPS <br> AVAILABLE | UNIFORM | ATTENDANCE | COLLEGE <br> TIMINGS |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Bottom 2 <br> Rankings | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $78 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $0 \%$ |

The factors Scholarships Available and Attendance from the Student Specific Factors have received moderate responses as Neutral from most of the respondents.

|  | QUALIFIED <br> STAFF | CHOICE OF <br> SUBJECTS | SCHOLARSHIPS <br> AVAILABLE | UNIFORM | ATTENDANCE | COLLEGE <br> TIMINGS |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Neutral <br> Rankings | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $5 \%$ |


|  | QUALIFIED <br> STAFF | CHOICE <br> OF <br> SUBJECTS | SCHOLARSHIPS <br> AVAILABLE | UNIFORM |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ATTENDANCE | COLLEGE |
| :---: |
| TIMINGS |$|$

There is no significant correlation amongst the opinions these factors. Although the important ones (showing good correlation coefficient) are Qualified Staff, Choice of Subjects, and Attendance.

## Inferences

## Part F: STUDENT SPECIFIC FACTORS (Parents)

- For most of the respondents, they prefer colleges with experienced faculties.
- For most of the respondents, they prefer colleges that allow them freedom to choose the subjects.
- Other factor with least preference is uniform (in the colleges).
- It was observed that there is negative correlation in between the factors Uniform and Attendance. It is seen that those colleges in Pune city having uniform compulsory for students will also make attendance mandatory for them. Thus parents feel that it is not necessary to continue the school pattern in the colleges.
- It was observed that there a positive correlation in between the factors Qualified Staff and Attendance. Thus according to parents, qualified staff will make studying, learning interesting to the students and hence encourage the students to attend lectures regularly. Thus the colleges must ensure that the faculty members are with relevant experience and knowledge so that they along with the participation of the students will make the overall learning process more interactive and joyful. There also exists a positive correlation in between the factors Choice of Subjects and Attendance. It is much obvious that students will like to attend the lectures of the subjects of their interest.
- A large section of the respondents have given Neutral rating to some of the Student Specific Factors. This means that the respondents were undecided about them. It is obvious that compulsion of such factors is not in their control. It entirely depends upon the institution, its management and their decisions to formulate rules and regulations for their institute.


### 4.7.2 Part F: Students

## Part F: STUDENT SPECIFIC FACTORS

Table 45: Part F: Students

|  | QUALIFI <br> ED <br> STAFF | CHOICE <br> OF <br> SUBJECTS | SCHOLORSHIPS <br> AVAILABLE |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| UNIFORM | CTTENDANCE | COLLEGE <br> TIMINGS |  |  |  |  |
| NO <br> IMPORTAN <br> CE | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |  |  |  |  |
| LESS | $0 \%$ | $55 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $7 \%$ |  |  |
| IMPORTANT | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $35 \%$ | $5 \%$ |
| NEUTRAL | $9 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $28 \%$ |
| IMPORTANT | $41 \%$ | $32 \%$ | $34 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $25 \%$ |
| MOST <br> IMPORTANT | $50 \%$ | $64 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $35 \%$ |

It was observed that amongst the Student Specific Factors students have shown their choices for Qualified Staff, Choice of Subjects and Timings of the Colleges; when they have to make the choice of college for themselves.

Figure 45: Part F: Students


The top controlling elements amongst the Student Specific Factors are Qualified Staff, Choice of Subjects and College Timings.

|  | QUALIFIED <br> STAFF | CHOICE OF <br> SUBJECTS | SCHOLORSHIPS <br> AVAILABLE | UNIFO <br> RM | ATTENDA <br> NCE | COLLEGE <br> TIMINGS |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Top <br> Rankings | $91 \%$ | $96 \%$ | $60 \%$ |  |  |  |

The bottom controlling elements amongst the Student Specific Factors are Uniform and Attendance.

|  | QUALIFIED <br> STAFF | CHOICE OF <br> SUBJECTS | SCHOLORSHIPS <br> AVAILABLE | UNIFO <br> RM | ATTEND <br> ANCE | COLLEGE <br> TIMINGS |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Bottom <br> Rankings | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $69 \%$ | $68 \%$ | $12 \%$ |

All of the factors (except Qualified Staff and Choice of Subjects), from the Student Specific Factors have received moderate responses as Neutral from most of the respondents.

|  | QUALIFIED <br> STAFF | CHOICE OF <br> SUBJECTS | SCHOLORSHIPS <br> AVAILABLE | UNIFO <br> RM | ATTENDA <br> NCE | COLLEGE <br> TIMINGS |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Neutral <br> Rankings | $9 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $28 \%$ |

## Correlation between Part F Factors

|  | QUALIFIED <br> STAFF | CHOICE OF <br> SUBJECTS | SCHOLORSHIPS <br> AVAILABLE | UNIF <br> ORM | ATTEND <br> ANCE | COLLEGE <br> TIMINGS |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| QUALIFIED <br> STAFF | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| CHOICE <br> SUBJECTS | 0.5098 | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| SCHOLORSHIPS <br> AVAILABLE | 0.3028 | 0.1782 | 1 |  |  |  |
| UNIFORM | -0.0152 | -0.1551 | 0.0595 | 1 |  |  |
| ATTENDANCE | -0.0330 | -0.2440 | -0.0549 | 0.5034 | 1 |  |
| COLLEGE <br> TIMINGS | 0.0413 | 0.1901 | 0.0736 | 0.1189 | 0.3673 | 1 |

There is no significant correlation amongst the opinions these factors. Although the important ones (showing good correlation coefficient) are Qualified Staff, Choice of Subjects, Uniform and Attendance.

## Inferences

## Part F: STUDENT SPECIFIC FACTORS (Students)

- For most of the respondents, they prefer colleges with experienced faculties.
- For most of the respondents, they prefer colleges that allow them freedom to choose the subjects.
- Other factors with least preference are uniform and attendance (in the colleges).
- It was observed that there is positive correlation in between the factors Uniform and Attendance. It is seen that those colleges in Pune city having uniform compulsory for students will also make attendance mandatory for them. They feel that it is continuation of the school pattern with the aim of imparting more discipline to students.
- It was observed that there a negative correlation in between the factors Qualified Staff and Attendance. It is seen that in most of the colleges students are not attending the classes regularly. They are entirely taking the help of outside coaching classes for their studies. With the absence of qualified staff (in the colleges), this is bound to happen. Thus the colleges must attempt to provide knowledge based and experience faculties to the students which will make the learning process interactive and joyful.

A large section of the respondents have given Neutral rating to some of the Student Specific Factors. This means that the respondents were undecided about them. It is obvious that compulsion of such factors is not in their control. It entirely depends upon the institution, its management and their decisions to formulate rules and regulations for their institute.

### 4.7.3 Part F: Difference

## Part F: STUDENT SPECIFIC FACTORS

Part F is about Student Specific Factors that the college is taking care of and accordingly created policies for itself, which may apparently become as influential factors available with both the students and parents.

In this Part F, Student Specific Factors taken care by the college includes:

- Qualified Staff
- Choice of Subjects
- Scholarships Available
- Uniform
- Attendance
- College Timings

All these factors were acting as sources of information for the students as well as parents and may influence their decisions in some or other ways.

Analysis of responses to these factors individually is presented subsequently.

- Qualified Staff

Table 46: Part F: Difference (Qualified Staff)

| QUALIFIED STAFF | STUDENTS | PARENTS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| NO IMPORTANCE | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| LESS IMPORTANT | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| NEUTRAL | $9 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| IMPORTANT | $50 \%$ | $40 \%$ |
| MOST IMPORTANT |  | $60 \%$ |

Figure 46: Part F: Difference (Qualified Staff)


- It is clearly seen that for a large number of the respondents (both the students and the parents), 'Qualified Staff' is an important factor. About $91 \%$ of the respondents (students) and nearly all of the respondents (parents) agree with this opinion.
- Choice of Subjects

Table 47: Part F: Difference (Choice of Subjects)

| CHOICE OF SUBJECTS | STUDENTS | PARENTS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| NO IMPORTANCE | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| LESS IMPORTANT | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| NEUTRAL | $4 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| IMPORTANT | $32 \%$ | $45 \%$ |
| MOST IMPORTANT | $64 \%$ | $55 \%$ |

Figure 47: Part F: Difference (Choice of Subjects)


- What is true with the qualified staff is true with the choice of subjects. Better the choice of subjects more is the preference to the institution. It is noticed that for a large number of the respondents (both the students and the parents), 'Choice of Subjects' is significant aspect. About $96 \%$ of the respondents (students) and nearly all of the respondents (parents) agree with this opinion.
- Scholarships Available

Table 48: Part F: Difference (Scholarships Available)

| SCHOLARSHIPS <br> AVAILABLE | STUDENTS | PARENTS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| NO IMPORTANCE | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| LESS IMPORTANT | $0 \%$ | $7 \%$ |
| NEUTRAL | $40 \%$ | $50 \%$ |
| IMPORTANT | $34 \%$ | $38 \%$ |
| MOST IMPORTANT | $26 \%$ | $5 \%$ |

Figure 48: Part F: Difference (Scholarships Available)


- Some of the respondents (especially the students as compared to the parents), considers 'Scholarships Available' as an important factor during selection of the institution (college). About $60 \%$ of the students and about $43 \%$ of the parents are of this opinion. This indicates that the students now a day are also concerned about the cost of education today.
- A large number of the respondents (both the students and the parents), are 'Neutral' about this aspect. As compared to about $40 \%$ of the respondents (students) and about $50 \%$ of the respondents (parents) go with this view. This means that the respondents were unsure about these facts and are of the opinion that provision of scholarships may depend on the institution and they may have no control over this factor.
- Uniform

Table 49: Part F: Difference (Uniform)

| UNIFORM | STUDENTS | PARENTS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| NO IMPORTANCE | $55 \%$ | $40 \%$ |
| LESS IMPORTANT | $14 \%$ | $38 \%$ |
| NEUTRAL | $18 \%$ | $15 \%$ |
| IMPORTANT | $8 \%$ | $7 \%$ |
| MOST IMPORTANT | $5 \%$ | $0 \%$ |

Figure 49: Part F: Difference (Uniform)


- An equal number of the respondents (though small and both the students and the parents), stated that 'Uniform' is an important part during selection of the institution (college). About 13\% of the students and about $7 \%$ of the parents go with this view.
- In fact a large number of the respondents (both the students and the parents), stated that 'Uniform' should not be made mandatory and is less important to them. About $69 \%$ of the students and about $78 \%$ of the parents go with this view.
- Attendance

Table 50: Part F: Difference (Attendance)

| ATTENDANCE | STUDENTS | PARENTS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| NO IMPORTANCE | $33 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
| LESS IMPORTANT | $35 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| NEUTRAL | $19 \%$ | $30 \%$ |
| IMPORTANT | $5 \%$ | $59 \%$ |
| MOST IMPORTANT | $8 \%$ | $7 \%$ |

Figure 50: Part F: Difference (Attendance)


- Attendance in colleges is a debatable factor amongst the students and parents. In fact a large number of the respondents (especially the parents), stated that 'Attendance' is important to them. As compared to about only $13 \%$ of the students, about $66 \%$ of the parents go with this view.
- Students feel that attending college is not a significant thing for them. In fact a large number of the respondents (especially the students), stated that 'Attendance' is not important to them. As compared to about $68 \%$ of the students, only about $4 \%$ of the parents agree with this. The institution may be responsible for this situation, and there may be several reasons to ponder.
- College Timings

Table 51: Part F: Difference (College Timings)

| COLLEGE TIMINGS | STUDENTS | PARENTS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| NO IMPORTANCE | $7 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| LESS IMPORTANT | $5 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| NEUTRAL | $28 \%$ | $5 \%$ |
| IMPORTANT | $25 \%$ | $77 \%$ |
| MOST IMPORTANT | $35 \%$ | $18 \%$ |

Figure 51: Part F: Difference (College Timings)


- College Timing is an important aspect for parents but not for the students. It was noticed that a large number of the respondents (especially the parents), stated that 'College Timings' is important to them. As compared to about $60 \%$ of the students, about $95 \%$ of the parents go with this view.

A combined scanrio for Part F: Student Specific Factors is presented as below.

Table 52: Part F: Difference (All)

| Part F | QUALIFIED STAFF |  | CHOICE OF SUBJECTS |  | SCHOLARSHI <br> PS <br> AVAILABLE |  | UNIFORM |  | ATTENDANC E |  | COLLEGE TIMINGS |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { STUD } \\ & \text { ENTS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { PAR } \\ \text { ENT } \\ S \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { STUD } \\ & \text { ENTS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { PAR } \\ \text { ENT } \\ \mathrm{S} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { STUD } \\ & \text { ENTS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { PAR } \\ \text { ENT } \\ \text { S } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { STUD } \\ & \text { ENTS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { PAR } \\ \text { ENT } \\ \text { S } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { STUD } \\ & \text { ENTS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { PAR } \\ \text { ENT } \\ \text { S } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { STUD } \\ & \text { ENTS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { PAR } \\ \text { ENT } \\ \mathrm{S} \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { NO } \\ & \text { IMPOR } \\ & \text { TANCE } \end{aligned}$ | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 55\% | 40\% | 33\% | 4\% | 7\% | 0\% |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { LESS } \\ & \text { IMPOR } \\ & \text { TANT } \end{aligned}$ | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 7\% | 14\% | 38\% | 35\% | 0\% | 5\% | 0\% |
| NEUTR AL | 9\% | 0\% | 4\% | 0\% | 40\% | 50\% | 18\% | 15\% | 19\% | 30\% | 28\% | 5\% |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { IMPOR } \\ & \text { TANT } \end{aligned}$ | 41\% | 40\% | 32\% | 45\% | 34\% | 38\% | 8\% | 7\% | 5\% | 59\% | 25\% | 77\% |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { MOST } \\ & \text { IMPOR } \\ & \text { TANT } \end{aligned}$ | 50\% | 60\% | 64\% | 55\% | 26\% | 5\% | 5\% | 0\% | 8\% | 7\% | 35\% | 18\% |

Figure 52: Part F: Difference (All)


### 4.8 Part G: Social Life on Campus

Subsequent survey findings are presented here.

### 4.8.1 Part G: Parents

## Part G: SOCIAL LIFE ON CAMPUS

Table 53: Part G: Parents

|  | STUDENT <br> COMPOSITION | EXTRA <br> CURRICULAR <br> ACTIVITIES | USE OF <br> MOBILE <br> PHONES | NCC | SAFETY <br> AND <br> SECURITY |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NO | $0 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| IMPORTANCE | $0 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $38 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| LESS <br> IMPORTANT | $32 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $34 \%$ | $53 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| NEUTRAL | $37 \%$ | $63 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $38 \%$ | $37 \%$ |
| IMPORTANT | $31 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $63 \%$ |
| MOST <br> IMPORTANT |  |  |  |  |  |

With the advent smartphones now a day everybody is engrossed with social media. It was seen that respondents want consideration of their social life by the educational institutions. Amongst the Social Life on Campus parents have shown their preferences for safety and security, extracurricular activities followed by student composition.

Figure 53: Part G: Parents


The top influencing factors amongst the Social Life on the Campus are Safety and Security, Extra Curricular Activities and Student Composition.

|  | STUDENT <br> COMPOSITION | EXTRA CURRICULAR <br> ACTIVITIES | USE OF MOBILE <br> PHONES | C <br> C | SAFETY AND <br> SECURITY |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Top 2 | $68 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $\%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Rankings | $6 \%$ |  | 42 |  |  |

The bottom influencing factor amongst the Social Life on the Campus is Use of Mobile Phones.

|  | STUDENT <br> COMPOSITION | EXTRA CURRICULAR <br> ACTIVITIES | USE OF MOBILE <br> PHONES | NCC | SAFETY <br> AND |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bottom 2 <br> Rankings | $0 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $48 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $0 \%$ |

NCC is the only factors from the Social Life on the Campus that has received higher response as Neutral from most of the respondents. This was followed by Student Composition and Extra Curricular Activities.

|  | STUDENT <br> COMPOSITION | EXTRA <br> CURRICULAR <br> ACTIVITIES | USE OF <br> MOBILE <br> PHONES | NCC | AFETY <br> SECURITY |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Neutral <br> Rankings | $32 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $34 \%$ | $53 \%$ | $0 \%$ |

## Correlation between Part G Factors

|  | STUDENT <br> COMPOSITION | EXTRA <br> CURRICULAR <br> ACTIVITIES | USE OF <br> MOBILE <br> PHONES | NCC | SAFETY AND <br> SECURITY |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| STUDENT <br> COMPOSITION | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| EXTRA <br> CURRICULAR <br> ACTIVITIES | -0.1236 |  | 1 |  |  |
| USE OF <br> MOBILE <br> PHONES | 0.4624 | -0.2661 |  | 1 |  |
| NCC | 0.1563 | 0.5766 | 0.1120 | 1 |  |
| SAFETY AND <br> SECURITY | -0.2184 | 0.2061 | -0.1934 | -0.1152 |  |

There is no significant correlation amongst the opinions these factors. Although the important ones (showing good correlation coefficient) are Student Composition, Use of Mobile Phones, Extra Curricular Activities, NCC.

## Inferences

## Part G: SOCIAL LIFE ON CAMPUS (Parents)

- Most of the respondents like to opt for colleges with safe and secure environment.
- Maximum numbers of the respondents will prefer colleges with scholar students around them.
- For most of the respondents, they select colleges that allow them to think out of the box and allow doing other activities besides attending the educational chores.
- Other factor with least preference is Use of Mobile Phones (in the colleges). Parents want their wards to concentrate on their studies and engage themselves in frequent use of mobile phones.
- It was observed that there is positive correlation in between the factors Student Composition and Use of Mobile Phones (in the colleges).
- It was seen that there exists positive correlation in between the factors NCC and Extra Curricular Activities.
- In this era of freedom parents do not want to have compulsory activities such as NCC.
- A large section of the respondents have given Neutral rating to some of the aspects related to Social Life on the Campus. This means that the respondents were undecided about them. It is obvious that some of these factors are out of their boundary. It entirely depends upon the institution, its management and their decisions to formulate rules and regulations for maintaining Social Life on the Campus.


### 4.8.2 Part G: Students

## Part G: SOCIAL LIFE ON CAMPUS

Table 54: Part G: Students

|  | STUDENT <br> COMPOSITION | EXTRA <br> CURRICULAR <br> ACTIVITIES | USE OF <br> MOBILE <br> PHONES | NCC | SAFETY <br> AND <br> SECURITY |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NO <br> IMPORTANCE | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| LESS <br> IMPORTANT | $4 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $42 \%$ | $5 \%$ |
| NEUTRAL | $15 \%$ | $44 \%$ | $21 \%$ | $31 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
| IMPORTANT | $54 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $37 \%$ |
| MOST <br> IMPORTANT | $27 \%$ | $31 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $54 \%$ |

With the advent smartphones now a day everybody is engrossed with social media. It was seen that respondents want consideration of their social life by the educational institutions. Amongst the Social Life on Campus students have shown their preferences for safety and security, student composition, and use of mobile phones.

Figure 54: Part G: Students


The top influencing factors amongst the Social Life on the Campus are Safety and Security, Student Composition and Use of Mobile Phones.

|  | STUDENT <br> COMPOSITION | EXTRA CURRICULAR <br> ACTIVITIES | USE OF <br> MOBILE <br> PHONES | NCC | SAFETY <br> AND <br> SECURITY |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Top 2 <br> Rankings | $81 \%$ | $53 \%$ |  |  |  |

The bottom influencing factor amongst the Social Life on the Campus is NCC.

|  | STUDENT <br> COMPOSITION | EXTRA CURRICULAR <br> ACTIVITIES | USE OF <br> MOBILE <br> PHONES | NCC | SAFETY <br> AND <br> SECURITY |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bottom 2 <br> Rankings | $4 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $46 \%$ | $5 \%$ |

All of the factors (except Safety and Security and Student Composition), from the Social Life on the Campus have received moderate responses as Neutral from most of the respondents.

|  | STUDENT <br> COMPOSITION | EXTRA CURRICULAR <br> ACTIVITIES | USE OF <br> MOBILE <br> PHONES | NCC | SAFETY <br> AND <br> SECURITY |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Neutral <br> Rankings | $15 \%$ |  |  |  |  |

## Correlation between Part G Factors

|  | STUDENT <br> COMPOSITION | EXTRA <br> CURRICULAR <br> ACTIVITIES | USE OF <br> MOBILE <br> PHONES | NCC | SAFETY <br> AND <br> SECURITY |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| STUDENT <br> COMPOSITION | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| EXTRA <br> CURRICULAR <br> ACTIVITIES | 0.5464 |  |  |  |  |
| USE OF MOBILE <br> PHONES | 0.0415 | 1 |  |  |  |
| NCC | 0.3186 | -0.0285 |  | 1 |  |
| SAFETY AND <br> SECURITY | 0.2949 | 0.5295 | 0.2450 | 1 |  |

There is no significant correlation amongst the opinions these factors. Although the important ones (showing good correlation coefficient) are Student Composition, Extra Curricular Activities, NCC.

## Inferences

## Part G: SOCIAL LIFE ON CAMPUS (Students)

- Most of the respondents like to opt for colleges with safe and secure environment.
- Maximum numbers of the respondents will prefer colleges with scholar students around them.
- For most of the respondents, they select colleges that allow them to think out of the box and allow doing other activities besides attending the educational chores.
- Other factor with least preference is NCC (in the colleges).
- It was observed that there is positive correlation in between the factors Student Composition and Extra Curricular Activities.
- It was seen that there exists positive correlation in between the factors NCC and Extra Curricular Activities.
- It was observed that there is a good correlation in between the factors Use of Mobile Phones and Safety and Security. Indeed the mobile phone is seen as an effective device that can be used in case of any emergency situations. With decreasing law and order scenario and increasing threat to individuals institutions must maintain their campus safe and secure for their students.
- In this era of freedom students do not want to have compulsory activities such as NCC.
- A large section of the respondents have given Neutral rating to some of the aspects related to Social Life on the Campus. This means that the respondents were undecided about them. It is obvious that some of these factors are out of their boundary. It entirely depends upon the institution, its management and their decisions to formulate rules and regulations for maintaining Social Life on the Campus.


### 4.8.3 Part G: Difference

## Part G: SOCIAL LIFE ON CAMPUS

With the advent of technology and increased availability of smartphones and growing awareness of social media, the young generation is hooked to social media. Part G is about Social Life on the Campus. It deals with rules and regulations by the colleges to be followed by the students when they are on campus. These rules of the college and accordingly framed policies for itself may apparently become as influential factors available with both the students and parents. In this Part G, Social Life on the Campus elements includes:

- Student Composition
- Extra Curricular Activities
- Use of Mobile Phones
- NCC
- Safety and Security

All these factors were acting as sources of information for the students as well as parents and may influence their decisions in some or other ways.

Analysis of responses to these factors individually is presented subsequently.

- Student Composition

Table 55: Part G: Difference (Student Composition)

| STUDENT COMPOSITION | STUDENTS | PARENTS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| NO IMPORTANCE | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| LESS IMPORTANT | $4 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| NEUTRAL | $15 \%$ | $32 \%$ |
| IMPORTANT | $54 \%$ | $37 \%$ |
| MOST IMPORTANT | $27 \%$ | $31 \%$ |

Figure 55: Part G: Difference (Student Composition)


- It is clearly seen that for a large number of the respondents (both the students and the parents), 'Student Composition' is an essential element. About $81 \%$ of the respondents (students) and about $68 \%$ of the respondents (parents) agree with this opinion.
- Some of the respondents (especially the parents) are 'Neutral' on this aspect. This indicates that the parents were not sure about what kind of student composition the institute is going to have. About $32 \%$ of the respondents (parents) are going with this view.
- Extra Curricular Activities

Table 56: Part G: Difference (Extracurricular Activities)

| EXTRA CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES | STUDENTS | PARENTS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| NO IMPORTANCE | $0 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
| LESS IMPORTANT | $3 \%$ | $5 \%$ |
| NEUTRAL | $44 \%$ | $11 \%$ |
| IMPORTANT | $22 \%$ | $63 \%$ |
| MOST IMPORTANT | $31 \%$ | $17 \%$ |

Figure 56: Part G: Difference (Extracurricular Activities)


- It is noticed that a large number of the respondents (especially the parents), 'Extra Curricular Activities' is an essential element. The parents have a more voice here. As compared to about $53 \%$ of the respondents (students), about $80 \%$ of the respondents (parents) are with this opinion. This in fact indicates that the parents want their ward to focus on study as well as on other activities.
- Some of the respondents (especially the students) are 'Neutral' on this aspect. This indicates that the parents were not sure about what kind of student composition the institute is going to have. About $44 \%$ of the respondents (students) are going with this view.
- Use of Mobile Phones

Table 57: Part G: Difference (Use of Mobile Phones)

| USE OF MOBILE PHONES | STUDENTS | PARENTS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| NO IMPORTANCE | $9 \%$ | $10 \%$ |
| LESS IMPORTANT | $5 \%$ | $38 \%$ |
| NEUTRAL | $21 \%$ | $34 \%$ |
| IMPORTANT | $50 \%$ | $8 \%$ |
| MOST IMPORTANT | $15 \%$ | $10 \%$ |

Figure 57: Part G: Difference (Use of Mobile Phones)


- Use of mobile phones in colleges is another debatable factor amongst the students and parents. In fact a large number of the respondents (especially the parents), stated that 'Use of Mobile Phones' is of less significant to them. As compared to about only $14 \%$ of the students, about $48 \%$ of the parents go with this view.
- Students feel that they may be allowed to use mobile phones in the college and is a significant thing for them. In fact a large number of the respondents (especially the students), stated that 'Use of Mobile Phones' is very much important to them. As compared to about $65 \%$ of the students, only about $18 \%$ of the parents agree with this.
- NCC

Table 58: Part G: Difference (NCC)

| NCC | STUDENTS | PARENTS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| NO IMPORTANCE | $4 \%$ | $5 \%$ |
| LESS IMPORTANT | $42 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| NEUTRAL | $31 \%$ | $53 \%$ |
| IMPORTANT | $16 \%$ | $38 \%$ |
| MOST IMPORTANT | $7 \%$ | $4 \%$ |

Figure 58: Part G: Difference (NCC)


- Students feel that NCC is not of much attraction to them. In fact a large number of the respondents (especially the students), stated that ' NCC ' does not offer much value to them. As compared to about $46 \%$ of the students, only about $5 \%$ of the parents agree with this. The parents have another view. They stated that 'NCC' may offer much value to the students. As compared to only $23 \%$ of the students, about $42 \%$ of the parents go with this view.
- In fact a large number of the respondents (both the students and especially the parents), stated their response 'Neutral' to this factor. About $31 \%$ of the students and about $53 \%$ of the parents agree with this.
- Safety and Security

Table 59: Part G: Difference (Safety and Security)

| SAFETY AND SECURITY | STUDENTS | PARENTS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| NO IMPORTANCE | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| LESS IMPORTANT | $5 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| NEUTRAL | $4 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| IMPORTANT | $37 \%$ | $37 \%$ |
| MOST IMPORTANT | $54 \%$ | $63 \%$ |

Figure 59: Part G: Difference (Safety and Security)


- Today with increasing crime and threat to personal life, safety and security of individual has become an essential and important aspect. It is observed that for a large number of the respondents (both the students and the parents), 'Safety and Security' is significant aspect. About $91 \%$ of the respondents (students) and nearly all of the respondents (parents) agree with this opinion.

A combined scanrio for Part G: Social Life on the Campus is presented as below.

Table 60: Part G (All)

| Part G | STUDENTCOMPOSITION |  | EXTRA <br> CURRICULAR <br> ACTIVITIES |  | USE OF <br> MOBILE <br> PHONES |  | NCC |  | SAFETY AND SECURITY |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { STUD } \\ & \text { ENTS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { PARE } \\ \text { NTS } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { STUD } \\ & \text { ENTS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { PARE } \\ \text { NTS } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { STUD } \\ & \text { ENTS } \end{aligned}$ | PARE <br> NTS | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { STUD } \\ & \text { ENTS } \end{aligned}$ | PARE <br> NTS | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { STUD } \\ & \text { ENTS } \end{aligned}$ | PARE <br> NTS |
| NO <br> IMPORT <br> ANCE | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 4\% | 9\% | 10\% | 4\% | 5\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| LESS <br> IMPORT <br> ANT | 4\% | 0\% | 3\% | 5\% | 5\% | 38\% | 42\% | 0\% | 5\% | 0\% |
| NEUTR <br> AL | 15\% | 32\% | 44\% | 11\% | 21\% | 34\% | 31\% | 53\% | 4\% | 0\% |
| IMPORT <br> ANT | 54\% | 37\% | 22\% | 63\% | 50\% | 8\% | 16\% | 38\% | 37\% | 37\% |
| MOST <br> IMPORT <br> ANT | 27\% | 31\% | 31\% | 17\% | 15\% | 10\% | 7\% | 4\% | 54\% | 63\% |

Figure 60: Part G (All)


### 4.9 Survey Findings - Management Representatives

MANAGEMENT REPRESENTATIVES SURVEY INFORMATION

## Data Analysis Management Representatives of Jr. Colleges $\mathrm{N}=50$

Type:

Table 61: Respondents (By Type)

| Type | In \% |
| :--- | ---: |
| Aided | $35 \%$ |
| Unaided | $65 \%$ |

Figure 61: Respondents (By Type)


Facility:

Table 62: Respondents (By Facility)

| Facility | In $\%$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| School Affiliated | $55 \%$ |
| Senior College Affiliated | $45 \%$ |

Figure 62: Respondents (By Facility)


### 4.9.1 Promotional Features: Management Representatives

## Part B: INSTITUTION FEATURE DETAILS

We have asked respondents to list top 10 features that they promote so as to attract students and parents towards their college as their preferred institution. This was open ended question and hence we have received diverse responses.

Method A1: Based upon number of responses received (frequency) for first THREE RANKS, the analysis was done. Details are presented below.

## Rank 1 Feature (as \% of Responses)

Table 63: Feature Promoted (Rank 1)

| FEATURE PROMOTED (RANK 1) | In \% |
| :--- | ---: |
| CONVEYANCE | $38 \%$ |
| QUALIFIED STAFF | $30 \%$ |
| LOCATION | $14 \%$ |
| REPUTATION AND MANAGEMENT | $11 \%$ |
| EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES | $4 \%$ |
| NO COMPULSION FOR ATTENDENCE | $4 \%$ |

Figure 63: Feature Promoted (Rank 1)


## Rank 2 Features (as \% of Responses)

Table 64: Feature Promoted (Rank 2)

| FEATURE PROMOTED (RANK 2) | In \% |
| :--- | ---: |
| QUALIFIED STAFF | $45 \%$ |
| CHOICE OF SUBJECTS | $29 \%$ |
| REPUTATION AND MANAGEMENT | $9 \%$ |
| CONVEYANCE | $9 \%$ |
| EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES | $4 \%$ |
| NO COMPULSION FOR ATTENDENCE | $4 \%$ |

Figure 64: Feature Promoted (Rank 2)


Rank 3 Features (as \% of Responses)

Table 65: Feature Promoted (Rank 3)

| FEATURE PROMOTED (RANK 3) | In \% |
| :--- | ---: |
| CHOICE OF SUBJECTS | $46 \%$ |
| SCHOOL AFFILIATION | $18 \%$ |
| QUALIFIED STAFF | $14 \%$ |
| EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES | $7 \%$ |
| LINKAGES WITH OTHER INSTITUTIONS | $7 \%$ |
| LOCATION | $7 \%$ |

Figure 65: Feature Promoted (Rank 3)


The combined graph for the three ranks is as shown below.

Table 66: Features Promoted (First 3 Ranks Combined)

| INSTITUTION FEATURES | RANK 1 | RANK 2 | RANK 3 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| CONVEYANCE | $38 \%$ | $9 \%$ | ---- |
| QUALIFIED STAFF | $30 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $14 \%$ |
| LOCATION | $14 \%$ | ---- | $7 \%$ |
| REPUTATION AND MANAGEMENT | $11 \%$ | $9 \%$ | ---- |
| EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES | $4 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $7 \%$ |
| NO COMPULSION FOR ATTENDENCE | $4 \%$ | $4 \%$ | ---- |
| CHOICE OF SUBJECTS | ---- | $29 \%$ | $46 \%$ |
| SCHOOL AFFILIATION | ---- |  | $18 \%$ |
| LINKAGES WITH OTHER INSTITUTIONS | ---- | ---- | $7 \%$ |

Figure 66: Features Promoted (First 3 Ranks Combined)


Method A2: Based upon the total number of responses received (frequency) without considering ANY RANKINGS, the analysis was done.

The top institution features as revealed from the survey are:

- Qualified staff
- Choice of Subjects
- Conveyance Available
- Reputation of the Institution and Management
- Location (of the Institution)
- Extracurricular Activities
- School Affiliation
- No Compulsion for Attendance
- Infrastructure

Details are presented below.

Table 67: Institution Features Promoted (on the basis of Overall Responses)

| Institution Features Promoted | In $\%$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| QUALIFIED STAFF | $32 \%$ |
| CHOICE OF SUBJECTS | $20 \%$ |
| CONVEYANCE | $17 \%$ |
| REPUTATION AND MANAGEMENT | $7 \%$ |
| LOCATION | $7 \%$ |
| EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES | $5 \%$ |
| SCHOOL AFFILIATION | $3 \%$ |
| NO COMPULSION FOR ATTENDENCE | $3 \%$ |
| INFRASTRUCTURE | $1 \%$ |
| LIBRARAY | $1 \%$ |
| LINKAGES WITH OTHER INSTITUTIONS | $1 \%$ |
| EQUIPPED LABORATORIES | $1 \%$ |
| NACC | $1 \%$ |
| PG RESEARCH CENTRE | $1 \%$ |
| USE OF TECHNICAL AIDS | $1 \%$ |

Figure 67: Institution Features Promoted (on the basis of Overall Responses)


### 4.9.2 Ranking of Major Parameters: Management Representatives

## Parameters and their Rankings

Table 68: Parameters and Their Rankings

| Parameter | College <br> Basics | Significant <br> Factors | Infrastructure | Student <br> Specific <br> Factors | Social Life on <br> the Campus |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rank 1 | $33 \%$ | $49 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Rank 2 | $36 \%$ | $31 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Rank 3 | $27 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $2 \%$ |
| Rank 4 | $4 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $65 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $25 \%$ |
| Rank 5 | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $73 \%$ |

Figure 68: Parameters and Their Rankings


The top ranked factors amongst all of these are the Significant Factors and College Basics.

|  | College <br> Basics | Significan <br> t Factors | Infrastructure | Student <br> Specific <br> Factors | Social Life on <br> the Campus |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Top <br> Rankings | $69 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $51 \%$ | $0 \%$ |

The bottom ranked factors amongst all of these are the Infrastructure and Social Life on the Campus.

|  | College <br> Basics | Significant <br> Factors | Infrastructure | Student <br> Specific <br> Factors | Social Life on <br> the Campus |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Bottom 2 <br> Rankings | $4 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $90 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $98 \%$ |

### 4.9.3 Part D: Management Representatives

## Part D: SIGNIFICANT FACTORS

Table 69: Part D: Management Representatives

|  | LOCA <br> TION | CONVEYANCE <br> AVAILABLE | FAMILY <br> TRADITION | REPUTATION OF <br> INSTITUTION | COURSES <br> OFFERED | TUITION <br> FEES |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NO <br> IMPORTA <br> NCE | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $0 \%$ |  |  |
| LESS <br> IMPORTA <br> NT | $0 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $5 \%$ |  | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| NEUTRAL | $25 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $7 \%$ |  |  |
| IMPORTA <br> NT | $51 \%$ | $55 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $62 \%$ | $20 \%$ |  |
| MOST <br> IMPORTA |  |  |  |  | $35 \%$ | $18 \%$ |
| NT | $24 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $13 \%$ |  | $31 \%$ | $36 \%$ |

It was observed that amongst the Significant Factors management representatives have indicated their preference for location (of the institution), conveyance available (to reach the institution); reputation (of the institution), and courses offered (by the institution).

Figure 69: Part D: Management Representatives


The top influencing factors amongst the Significant Factors are the reputation (of the institution), and courses offered and (by the institution) and the location (of the institution), conveyance available (to reach the institution).

|  | LOCA <br> TION | CONVEYANCE <br> AVAILABLE | FAMILY <br> TRADITION | REPUTATION <br> OF <br> INSTITUTION | COURSES <br> OFFERED | TUITION <br> FEES |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Top <br> Rankings | $75 \%$ | $69 \%$ | $24 \%$ | $93 \%$ | $71 \%$ | $42 \%$ |

The bottom influencing factor amongst the Significant Factors is Tuition Fees.

|  | LOCATION | CONVEYANC <br> E AVAILABLE | FAMILY <br> TRADITION | REPUTATION <br> OF <br> INSTITUTION | COURSES OFFERED | TUITI ON <br> FEES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bottom 2 <br> Rankings | 0\% | 4\% | 16\% | 0\% | 0\% | 20\% |

Family Tradition and Tuition Fees are the factors from the Significant Factors that has received higher response as Neutral from most of the respondents.

|  | LOCA <br> TION | CONVEYANCE <br> AVAILABLE | FAMILY <br> TRADITIO <br> $\mathbf{N}$ | REPUTATION OF <br> INSTITUTION | COURSES <br> OFFERED | TUITIO <br> N FEES |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Neutral <br> Rankings | $25 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $38 \%$ |


|  | COCATION | CONVEYANCE <br> AVAILABLE | FAMILY TRADITION | $\begin{aligned} & \text { REPUTATION } \\ & \text { OF } \\ & \text { INSTITUTION } \end{aligned}$ | COURSES OFFERED | TUITION <br> FEES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LOCATION | 1.0000 |  |  |  |  |  |
| CONVEYAN <br> CE <br> AVAILABLE | 0.7462 | 1.0000 |  |  |  |  |
| FAMILY TRADITION | 0.3734 | 0.0958 | 1.0000 |  |  |  |
| REPUTAT <br> ION OF <br> INSTITUT <br> ION | 0.0562 | -0.1496 | -0.2180 | 1.0000 |  |  |
| COURSES OFFERED | 0.2601 | 0.0561 | 0.0137 | 0.3974 | 1.0000 |  |
| TUITION <br> FEES | 0.2564 | 0.0949 | 0.2575 | 0.3337 | 0.2597 | 1.0000 |

There is no significant correlation amongst the opinions these factors. Although the important ones (showing good correlation coefficient) are location of the institution, conveyance available and reputation of the institution, courses offered, and tuition fees, which is noticeable and understandable.

## Inferences

## Part D: SIGNIFICANT FACTORS (Management Representatives)

- For most of the respondents, they indicated that colleges with good reputation and those offering a wide range of courses (having reasonable Tuition Fees) are in demand.
- Other factors of preference are location (of the institution) and transportation facilities available (to reach the institution).
- According to the respondent's with the available knowledge, parents are now encouraging their wards to pursue their own ideas and taking up education accordingly. The concept of Family Traditions is no longer valid.
- Some respondents are of the opinion 'Neutral' to the parameters Location and Conveyance.


### 4.9.4 Part E: Management Representatives

## Part E: INFRASTRUCTURE

Table 70: Part E: Management Representatives

|  | LIBRARY | SPACILITIES <br> SUUDITORIUM | CANTEEN | IT LAB | GUIDANCE <br> AND <br> COUNSELLING |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NO <br> IMPORTANCE | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| LESS <br> IMPORTANT | $0 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| NEUTRAL | $0 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $42 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $22 \%$ |
| IMPORTANT | $73 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $42 \%$ |
| MOST <br> IMPORTANT | $27 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $36 \%$ |

It was observed that amongst the Infrastructure facilities management representatives think that their preference is for Library, Guidance and Counselling, and IT Lab.

Figure 70: Part E: Management Representatives

## Part E: INFRASTRUCTURE (AS \% OF RESPONDENTS) MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSES



\author{
z <br>  <br> ```
■NO IMPORTANCE ■LESS IMPORTANT ■ NEUTRAL <br> ■IMPORTANT ■MOST IMPORTANT

```
}

The top influencing factors amongst the Infrastructure facilities are Library and Guidance and Counselling and IT Lab.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & LIBRARY & SPORTS FACILITIES & AUDITORIUM & CANTEEN & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { IT } \\
\text { LAB }
\end{gathered}
\] & GUIDANCE
AND
COUNSELLING \\
\hline Top 2 Rankings & 100\% & 45\% & 33\% & 36\% & 51\% & 78\% \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

The bottom influencing factors amongst the Infrastructure facilities are Auditorium.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & LIBRARY & \begin{tabular}{l}
SPORTS \\
FACILITIES
\end{tabular} & AUDITORIUM & CANTEEN & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { IT } \\
\text { LAB }
\end{gathered}
\] & \begin{tabular}{c} 
GUIDANCE \\
AND \\
COUNSELLING \\
\hline
\end{tabular} \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
Bottom \\
Rankings
\end{tabular} & 0\% & 15\% & 45\% & 22\% & 22\% & 0\% \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Sports facilities and Canteen from the Infrastructure facilities have received higher response as Neutral from most of the respondents.
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|l|c|c|c|}
\hline & IBRARY & \begin{tabular}{c} 
SPORTS \\
FACILITIES
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
AUDITORIU \\
M
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
CANTE \\
EN
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
IT \\
LAB
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
GUIDANCE AND \\
COUNSELLING
\end{tabular} \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
Neutral \\
Rankings
\end{tabular} & \(0 \%\) & \(40 \%\) & \(22 \%\) & \(42 \%\) & \(27 \%\) & \(22 \%\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Correlation between Part E Factors}
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|r|r|r|r|r|}
\hline & \begin{tabular}{c} 
LIBR \\
ARY
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
SPORTS \\
FACILITIES
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
AUDITO \\
RIUM
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
CANTE \\
EN
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
IT \\
LAB
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
GUIDANCE \\
AND \\
COUNSELLING
\end{tabular} \\
\hline LIBRARY & 1.0000 & & & & & \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
SPORTS \\
FACILITIES
\end{tabular} & 0.5204 & 1.0000 & & & & \\
\hline AUDITORIUM & 0.3362 & 0.1401 & 1.0000 & & & \\
\hline CANTEEN & 0.1766 & -0.2887 & 0.2972 & 1.0000 & & \\
\hline IT LAB & 0.4043 & 0.4586 & 0.0808 & -0.1728 & 1.0000 & \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
GUIDANCE \\
AND \\
COUNSELLING
\end{tabular} & 0.2082 & 0.1484 & 0.2909 & 0.0483 & 0.2364 & 1.0000 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

There is no significant correlation amongst the opinions these factors. Although the important ones (showing good correlation coefficient) are Library, Sports Facilities and IT Lab.

\section*{Inferences}

\section*{Part E: INFRASTRUCTURE (Management Representatives)}
- For most of the respondents, they prefer to have colleges equipped with adequate infrastructure in place.
- Facilities preferred are Library, Guidance and Counselling and IT Lab.
- Other facility with least preference is Auditorium.
- The existences of such infrastructure vary from college to college.

A large section of the respondents have given Neutral rating to all the factors in Infrastructure facilities. This means that respondents were undecided on these aspects. It is obvious that the responsibility of providing of such facilities does not rest with them and thus they have to accept what is there. It entirely depends upon the institution, its management and financial capacity to create and provide such facilities.

\subsection*{4.9.5 Part F: Management Representatives}

\section*{Part F: STUDENT SPECIFIC FACTORS}

Table 71: Part F: Management Representatives
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \begin{tabular}{l} 
QUALIFIE \\
D STAFF
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l} 
HOICE OF \\
UBJECTS
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l} 
SCHOLARSHIPS \\
AVAILABLE
\end{tabular} & UNIFORM & \begin{tabular}{l} 
ATTEN \\
DANCE
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l} 
COLLEGE \\
TIMINGS
\end{tabular} \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
NO \\
IMPORTAN
\end{tabular} & \(0 \%\) & \(0 \%\) & \(0 \%\) & & & \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
LESS \\
IMPORTANT
\end{tabular} & \(0 \%\) & \(0 \%\) & \(9 \%\) & \(31 \%\) & \(0 \%\) & \(0 \%\) \\
\hline NEUTRAL & \(25 \%\) & \(25 \%\) & \(38 \%\) & \(24 \%\) & \(25 \%\) & \(4 \%\) \\
\hline IMPORTANT & \(44 \%\) & \(58 \%\) & \(40 \%\) & \(13 \%\) & \(55 \%\) & \(73 \%\) \\
\hline MOST & \(31 \%\) & \(16 \%\) & \(13 \%\) & \(4 \%\) & \(16 \%\) & \(24 \%\) \\
\hline IMPORTANT & \(31 \%\) & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

It was observed that amongst the Student Specific Factors, the management representatives have shown their choices for College Timings, Qualified Staff, Choice of Subjects and Attendance.

Figure 71: Part F: Management Representatives


The top controlling elements amongst the Student Specific Factors are College Timings, Qualified Staff, Choice of Subjects, and Attendance.
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|l|l|l|l|}
\hline & \begin{tabular}{l} 
QUALIFIED \\
STAFF
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l} 
CHOICE OF \\
SUBJECTS
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l} 
SCHOLARSHIPS \\
AVAILABLE
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l} 
UNIF \\
ORM
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l} 
ATTEND \\
ANCE
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l} 
COLLEGE \\
TIMINGS
\end{tabular} \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
Top \\
Rankings
\end{tabular} & \(75 \%\) & \(75 \%\) & \(53 \%\) & \(16 \%\) & \(71 \%\) & \(96 \%\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

The least or bottom controlling element amongst the Student Specific Factors is Uniform.
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|l|l|l|l|}
\hline & \begin{tabular}{l} 
QUALIFIED \\
STAFF
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l} 
CHOICE OF \\
SUBJECTS
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l} 
SCHOLARSHIPS \\
AVAILABLE
\end{tabular} & UNIFORM & ATTENDANCE & \begin{tabular}{l} 
COLLEGE \\
TIMINGS
\end{tabular} \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
Bottom 2 \\
Rankings
\end{tabular} & \(0 \%\) & \(0 \%\) & \(9 \%\) & \(60 \%\) & \(4 \%\) & \(0 \%\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

The factors Scholarships Available, Qualified Staff, Choice of Subjects, and Attendance from the Student Specific Factors have received moderate responses as Neutral from most of the respondents.
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|l|l|l|l|}
\hline & \begin{tabular}{c} 
QUALIFIED \\
STAFF
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
OHOICE \\
OF \\
SUBJECTS
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
SCHOLARSHIPS \\
AVAILABLE
\end{tabular} & UNIFORM & ATTENDANCE & \begin{tabular}{c} 
COLLEGE \\
TIMINGS
\end{tabular} \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
Neutral \\
Rankings
\end{tabular} & \(25 \%\) & \(25 \%\) & \(38 \%\) & \(24 \%\) & \(25 \%\) & \(4 \%\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Correlation between Part F Factors
\begin{tabular}{|l|r|r|r|r|r|r|}
\hline & \begin{tabular}{c} 
QUALIFIED \\
STAFF
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
CHOICE \\
OF \\
SUBJECTS
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
SCHOLARSHIPS \\
AVAILABLE
\end{tabular} & & UNIFORM & \begin{tabular}{c} 
ATTENDAN \\
CE
\end{tabular} \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
QUALIFIED \\
STAFF
\end{tabular} & 1.0000 & & & & \\
COLLEGE \\
TIMINGS
\end{tabular}\(|\)

There is no significant correlation amongst the opinions these factors. Although the important ones (showing good correlation coefficient), are Qualified Staff, Choice of Subjects, and Attendance and College Timings.

\section*{Inferences}

\section*{Part F: STUDENT SPECIFIC FACTORS (Management Representatives)}
- For most of the respondents, it is essential to have experienced faculties.
- Other factor with least preference is uniform (in the colleges).
- It was observed that there a small positive correlation in between the factors Qualified Staff and Attendance. This may indicate that qualified staff will make studying, learning interesting to the students and hence encourage the students to attend lectures regularly. Thus the colleges must ensure that the faculty members are with relevant experience and knowledge so that they along with the participation of the students will make the overall learning process more interactive and joyful. There also exists a positive correlation in between the factors Choice of Subjects and Attendance. It is much obvious that students will like to attend the lectures of the subjects of their interest.
- A large section of the respondents have given Neutral rating to some of the Student Specific Factors. This means that the respondents were undecided about them. It is obvious that compulsion of such factors is not in their control. It entirely depends upon the institution, its management and their decisions to formulate rules and regulations for their institute.

\subsection*{4.9.6 Part G: Management Representatives}

\section*{Part G: SOCIAL LIFE ON CAMPUS}

Table 72: Part G: Management Representatives
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \begin{tabular}{c} 
STUDENT \\
COMPOSITION
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
EXTRA \\
CURRICULAR \\
ACTIVITIES
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
USE OF \\
MOBILE \\
PHONES
\end{tabular} & NCC & \begin{tabular}{c} 
SAFETY \\
AND \\
SECURITY
\end{tabular} \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
NO \\
IMPORTANCE
\end{tabular} & \(0 \%\) & \(7 \%\) & \(15 \%\) & \(15 \%\) & \(0 \%\) \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
LESS \\
IMPORTANT
\end{tabular} & \(0 \%\) & \(13 \%\) & \(16 \%\) & \(0 \%\) & \(0 \%\) \\
\hline NEUTRAL & \(11 \%\) & \(11 \%\) & \(27 \%\) & \(42 \%\) & \(0 \%\) \\
\hline IMPORTANT & \(36 \%\) & \(49 \%\) & \(16 \%\) & \(36 \%\) & \(58 \%\) \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
MOST \\
IMPORTANT
\end{tabular} & \(53 \%\) & \(20 \%\) & \(25 \%\) & \(7 \%\) & \(42 \%\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

With the advent smartphones now a day everybody is engrossed with social media. It was seen that respondents want consideration of their social life by the educational institutions. Amongst the Social Life on Campus respondents have shown their preferences for safety and security, student composition followed by extracurricular activities.

Figure 72: Part G: Management Representatives


The top influencing factors amongst the Social Life on the Campus are Safety and Security, Student Composition and Extra Curricular Activities.
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \begin{tabular}{c} 
STUDENT \\
COMPOSITION
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
EXTRA CURRICULAR \\
ACTIVITIES
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
USE OF MOBILE \\
PHONES
\end{tabular} & NCC & \begin{tabular}{c} 
SAFETY \\
AND
\end{tabular} \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
Top 2 \\
Rankings
\end{tabular} & \(89 \%\) & \(69 \%\) & \(42 \%\) & \(44 \%\) & \(100 \%\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

The bottom influencing factor amongst the Social Life on the Campus is Use of Mobile Phones.
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \begin{tabular}{c} 
STUDENT \\
COMPOSITION
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
EXTRA CURRICULAR \\
ACTIVITIES
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
USE OF MOBILE \\
PHONES
\end{tabular} & NCC & \begin{tabular}{c} 
AFETY \\
SECURITY
\end{tabular} \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
Bottom 2 \\
Rankings
\end{tabular} & \(0 \%\) & \(20 \%\) & \(31 \%\) & \(15 \%\) & \(0 \%\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

NCC is the only factors from the Social Life on the Campus that has received higher response as Neutral from most of the respondents. This was followed by Use of Mobile Phones, Student Composition and Extra Curricular Activities.
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \begin{tabular}{c} 
STUDENT \\
COMPOSITION
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
EXTRA CURRICULAR \\
ACTIVITIES
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
USE OF MOBILE \\
PHONES
\end{tabular} & NCC & \begin{tabular}{c} 
SAFETY \\
AND \\
SECURITY
\end{tabular} \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
Neutral \\
Rankings
\end{tabular} & \(11 \%\) & \(11 \%\) & \(27 \%\) & \(42 \%\) & \(0 \%\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Correlation between Part G Factors}
\begin{tabular}{|l|r|r|r|r|c|}
\hline & \begin{tabular}{c} 
STUDENT \\
COMPOSITION
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
EXTRA \\
CURRICULAR \\
ACTIVITIES
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
USE OF \\
MOBILE \\
PHONES
\end{tabular} & NCC & \begin{tabular}{c} 
SAFETY AND \\
SECURITY
\end{tabular} \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
STUDENT \\
COMPOSITION
\end{tabular} & 1.0000 & & & & \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
EXTRA \\
CURRICULAR \\
ACTIVITIES
\end{tabular} & -0.2606 & 1.0000 & & & \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
USE OF MOBILE \\
PHONES
\end{tabular} & 0.1753 & -0.2696 & 1.0000 & & \\
\hline NCC & -0.0250 & 0.4282 & -0.1535 & 1.0000 & \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
SAFETY AND \\
SECURITY
\end{tabular} & -0.1421 & 0.3130 & -0.1887 & 0.0670 & 1.0000 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

There is no significant correlation amongst the opinions these factors. Although the important ones (showing good correlation coefficient) are Student Composition, Use of Mobile Phones, Extra Curricular Activities, NCC.

\section*{Inferences}

\section*{Part G: SOCIAL LIFE ON CAMPUS (Management Representatives)}
- Most of the respondents are ensuring that the college is offering it's a safe and secure environment.
- Maximum numbers of the respondents have indicated that student composition also matters to them and they will prefer scholar students in their institutions.
- For most of the respondents, they are of the opinion that their colleges may allow students to think out of the box and allow them to do other activities besides attending the educational chores.
- Other factor with least preference is Use of Mobile Phones (in the colleges). Management representatives want their students to concentrate on their studies and do not engage themselves in frequent use of mobile phones.
- It was observed that there is positive correlation in between the factors Student Composition and Use of Mobile Phones (in the colleges).
- It was seen that there exists positive correlation in between the factors NCC and Extra Curricular Activities.
- A large section of the respondents have given Neutral rating to some of the aspects related to Social Life on the Campus. This means that the respondents were undecided about them. It is obvious that some of these factors are out of their boundary. It entirely depends upon the institution, its management and their decisions to formulate rules and regulations for maintaining Social Life on the Campus.

\subsection*{4.9.7 Part H: Management Representatives}

Part H: Your opinion about impact of perceptions of students and their parents on the management strategy:

H1: The perceptions of Parents and Students impact your institution's strategic plan and management policies.

Table 73: Part H: Management Representatives
\begin{tabular}{|l|r|}
\hline Parameter / Opinion & \multicolumn{1}{|c|}{ In \% } \\
\hline Disagree & \(9 \%\) \\
\hline Neutral & \(64 \%\) \\
\hline Agree & \(27 \%\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Figure 73: Part H: Management Representatives


\section*{Inferences}

\section*{Part H: Opinion on the Statement H1 (Management Representatives)}
- Most of the respondents are remained silent or Neutral on the said statement.
- This indicates that there is no direct mechanism to measure the impact of the students and parents inputs on the management.
- Only about \(27 \%\) of the respondents agree that there is some consideration of the inputs made by the students and the parents. This shows that there may be some interaction or meetings between parents and management representatives (as required).

\subsection*{4.10 Comparative Rankings}

Comparative rankings were calculated for each group. These are based on the responses (converted to scores) as received by the respondents viz. the students, the parents and the management representatives. Details are as given below.

\subsection*{4.10.1 Ranking of Groups: Parents}

Group B [Sub-parameter-wise]

Table 74: Group B: Scores and Ranks (Parents)
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|r|r|}
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{ Group B: Influencing Factors } \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{c} 
Sub- \\
Parameter
\end{tabular} & \multicolumn{1}{|c|}{ Description } & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Average \\
Score
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Sub-Parameter \\
Rank
\end{tabular} \\
\hline B1 & Ward (Own Child) & 4.6100 & 1 \\
\hline B2 & Spouse & 4.1000 & 2 \\
\hline B3 & Friends & 2.8000 & 5 \\
\hline B4 & Relatives & 2.6000 & 6 \\
\hline B5 & Former Students & 3.2500 & 4 \\
\hline B6 & Campus Visit & 3.7400 & 3 \\
\hline & Group B Overall & 3.5167 & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Here top 2 ranks within this Group B are Ward (Own Child) and Spouse respectively.

Group C [Sub-parameter-wise]
Table 75: Group C: Scores and Ranks (Parents)
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|r|r|}
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{ Group C: College Basics } \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{c} 
Sub- \\
Parameter
\end{tabular} & \multicolumn{1}{|c|}{ Description } & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Average \\
Score
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Sub-Parameter \\
Rank
\end{tabular} \\
\hline C1 & Old & 3.4300 & 3 \\
\hline C2 & New & 3.0100 & 6 \\
\hline C3 & Aided & 3.2500 & 4 \\
\hline C4 & Unaided & 3.0100 & 5 \\
\hline C5 & School Affiliated & 3.4600 & 2 \\
\hline C6 & Senior College Affiliated & 3.9333 & 1 \\
\hline & Group C Overall & 3.3506 & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Here top 2 ranks within this Group C are Senior College Affiliated and School Affiliated respectively.

Group D [Sub-parameter-wise]
Table 76: Group D: Scores and Ranks (Parents)
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|r|r|}
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{ Group D: Significant Factors } \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{c} 
Sub- \\
Parameter
\end{tabular} & \multicolumn{1}{|c|}{ Description } & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Average \\
Score
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Sub-Parameter \\
Rank
\end{tabular} \\
\hline D1 & Location & 4.3000 & 1 \\
\hline D2 & Conveyance Available & 4.1967 & 2 \\
\hline D3 & Family Tradition & 2.9100 & 6 \\
\hline D4 & Reputation of Institution & 4.1300 & 3 \\
\hline D5 & Courses Offered & 3.9500 & 4 \\
\hline D6 & Tuition Fees & 3.0700 & 5 \\
\hline & Group D Overall & 3.7594 & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Here top 2 ranks within this Group D are Location and Conveyance Available respectively.

Group E [Sub-parameter-wise]
Table 77: Group E: Scores and Ranks (Parents)
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|r|r|}
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{ Group E: Infrastructure } \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{c} 
Sub- \\
Parameter
\end{tabular} & \multicolumn{1}{|c|}{ Description } & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Average \\
Score
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Sub-Parameter \\
Rank
\end{tabular} \\
\hline E1 & Library & 4.2500 & 1 \\
\hline E2 & Sports Facilities & 3.2800 & 3 \\
\hline E3 & Auditorium & 2.0700 & 6 \\
\hline E4 & Canteen & 3.2000 & 5 \\
\hline E5 & IT Lab & 3.3500 & 4 \\
\hline E6 & Guidance and Counselling & 3.9400 & 2 \\
\hline & Group E Overall & 3.3483 & \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{ Here top 2 ranks within this Group E are Library and Guidance and }
\end{tabular}

Counselling respectively.

Group F [Sub-parameter-wise]
Table 78: Group F: Scores and Ranks (Parents)
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|r|r|}
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{ Group F: Student Specific Factors } \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{c} 
Sub- \\
Parameter
\end{tabular} & \multicolumn{1}{c|}{ Description } & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Average \\
Score
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Sub-Parameter \\
Rank
\end{tabular} \\
\hline F1 & Qualified Staff & 4.6000 & 1 \\
\hline F2 & Choice of Subjects & 4.5500 & 2 \\
\hline F3 & Scholarships Available & 3.4100 & 5 \\
\hline F4 & Uniform & 1.8900 & 6 \\
\hline F5 & Attendance & 3.6500 & 4 \\
\hline F6 & College Timings & 4.1300 & 3 \\
\hline & Group F Overall & 3.7050 & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Here top 2 ranks within this Group F are Qualified Staff and Choice of
Subjects respectively.

Group G [Sub-parameter-wise]
Table 79: Group G: Scores and Ranks (Parents)
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|r|r|}
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{ Group G: Social Life on the Campus } \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{c} 
Sub- \\
Parameter
\end{tabular} & \multicolumn{1}{c|}{ Description } & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Average \\
Score
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Sub-Parameter \\
Rank
\end{tabular} \\
\hline G1 & Student Composition & 3.9900 & 2 \\
\hline G2 & Extracurricular Activities & 3.8300 & 3 \\
\hline G3 & Use of Mobile Phones & 2.7000 & 5 \\
\hline G4 & NCC & 3.3600 & 4 \\
\hline G5 & Safety and Security & 4.6300 & 1 \\
\hline & Group G Overall & 3.7033 & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Here top 2 ranks within this Group G are Safety and Security and Student Composition respectively.

\section*{All Group-wise Overall}

Table 80: Overall Group Scores and Ranks (Parents)
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|r|r|}
\hline \multicolumn{1}{|c|}{ Group } & \multicolumn{1}{|c|}{ Description } & \multicolumn{1}{c|}{\begin{tabular}{c} 
Average \\
Score
\end{tabular}} & \multicolumn{1}{c|}{ Rank } \\
\hline Group B & Influencing Factors & 3.5167 & 4 \\
\hline Group C & College Basics & 3.3506 & 5 \\
\hline Group D & Significant Factors & 3.7594 & 1 \\
\hline Group E & Infrastructure & 3.3483 & 6 \\
\hline Group F & Student Specific Factors & 3.7050 & 2 \\
\hline Group G & Social Life on the Campus & 3.7033 & 3 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\subsection*{4.10.2 Ranking of Groups: Students}

Group B [Sub-parameter-wise]
Table 81: Group B: Scores and Ranks (Students)
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|r|r|}
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{ Group B: Influencing Factors } \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{c} 
Sub- \\
Parameter
\end{tabular} & \multicolumn{1}{|c|}{ Description } & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Average \\
Score
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Sub-Parameter \\
Rank
\end{tabular} \\
\hline B1 & Mother & 4.5400 & \\
\hline B2 & Father & 4.2900 & 1 \\
\hline B3 & Friends & 2.7900 & 2 \\
\hline B4 & Relatives & 2.0867 & 5 \\
\hline B5 & Former Students & 3.1200 & 6 \\
\hline B6 & Campus Visit & 2.8833 & 3 \\
\hline & Group B Overall & 3.2850 & 4 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Here top 2 ranks within this Group B are Mother and Father respectively.

Group C [Sub-parameter-wise]
Table 82: Group C: Scores and Ranks (Students)
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|r|r|}
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{ Group C: College Basics } \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{c} 
Sub- \\
Parameter
\end{tabular} & \multicolumn{1}{|c|}{ Description } & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Average \\
Score
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Sub-Parameter \\
Rank
\end{tabular} \\
\hline C1 & Old & 3.3833 & 2 \\
\hline C2 & New & 2.5267 & 6 \\
\hline C3 & Aided & 3.9967 & 1 \\
\hline C4 & Unaided & 2.7900 & 5 \\
\hline C5 & School Affiliated & 2.8667 & 4 \\
\hline C6 & Senior College Affiliated & 3.3600 & 3 \\
\hline & Group C Overall & 3.1539 & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Here top 2 ranks within this Group C are Aided and Old respectively.

Group D [Sub-parameter-wise]
Table 83: Group D: Scores and Ranks (Students)
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|r|r|}
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{ Group D: Significant Factors } \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{c} 
Sub- \\
Parameter
\end{tabular} & \multicolumn{1}{|c|}{ Description } & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Average \\
Score
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Sub-Parameter \\
Rank
\end{tabular} \\
\hline D1 & Location & 4.3267 & 1 \\
\hline D2 & Conveyance Available & 4.0700 & 4 \\
\hline D3 & Family Tradition & 2.4700 & 6 \\
\hline D4 & Reputation of Institution & 4.2867 & 2 \\
\hline D5 & Courses Offered & 4.2400 & 3 \\
\hline D6 & Tuition Fees & 3.6000 & 5 \\
\hline & Group D Overall & 3.8322 & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Here top 2 ranks within this Group D are Location and Reputation of Institution respectively.

Group E [Sub-parameter-wise]
Table 84: Group E: Scores and Ranks (Students)
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|r|r|}
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{ Group E: Infrastructure } \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{c} 
Sub- \\
Parameter
\end{tabular} & \multicolumn{1}{|c|}{ Description } & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Average \\
Score
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Sub-Parameter \\
Rank
\end{tabular} \\
\hline E1 & Library & 3.7900 & 2 \\
\hline E2 & Sports Facilities & 3.5100 & 5 \\
\hline E3 & Auditorium & 3.4400 & 6 \\
\hline E4 & Canteen & 3.8000 & 1 \\
\hline E5 & IT Lab & 3.5600 & 3 \\
\hline E6 & Guidance and Counselling & 3.5300 & 4 \\
\hline & Group E Overall & 3.6050 & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Here top 2 ranks within this Group E are Canteen and Library respectively.

Group F [Sub-parameter-wise]
Table 85: Group F: Scores and Ranks (Students)
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|r|r|}
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{ Group F: Student Specific Factors } \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{c} 
Sub- \\
Parameter
\end{tabular} & \multicolumn{1}{c|}{ Description } & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Average \\
Score
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Sub-Parameter \\
Rank
\end{tabular} \\
\hline F1 & Qualified Staff & 4.4100 & 2 \\
\hline F2 & Choice of Subjects & 4.6000 & 1 \\
\hline F3 & Scholarships Available & 3.8600 & 3 \\
\hline F4 & Uniform & 1.9400 & 6 \\
\hline F5 & Attendance & 2.2000 & 5 \\
\hline F6 & College Timings & 3.7600 & 4 \\
\hline & Group F Overall & 3.4617 & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Here top 2 ranks within this Group F are Choice of Subjects and Qualified
Staff respectively.

Group G [Sub-parameter-wise]
Table 86: Group G: Scores and Ranks (Students)
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|r|r|}
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{ Group G: Social Life on the Campus } \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{c} 
Sub- \\
Parameter
\end{tabular} & \multicolumn{1}{c|}{ Description } & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Average \\
Score
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Sub-Parameter \\
Rank
\end{tabular} \\
\hline G1 & Student Composition & 4.0333 & 2 \\
\hline G2 & Extracurricular Activities & 3.8100 & 3 \\
\hline G3 & Use of Mobile Phones & 3.5700 & 4 \\
\hline G4 & NCC & 2.8000 & 5 \\
\hline G5 & Safety and Security & 4.4000 & 1 \\
\hline & Group G Overall & 3.7227 & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Here top 2 ranks within this Group G are Safety and Security and Student
Composition respectively.

\section*{All Group-wise Overall}

Table 87: Overall Group Scores and Ranks (Students)
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|r|r|}
\hline \multicolumn{1}{|c|}{ Group } & \multicolumn{1}{c|}{ Description } & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Average \\
Score
\end{tabular} & \multicolumn{1}{c|}{ Rank } \\
\hline Group B & Influencing Factors & 3.2850 & 5 \\
\hline Group C & College Basics & 3.1539 & 6 \\
\hline Group D & Significant Factors & 3.8322 & 1 \\
\hline Group E & Infrastructure & 3.6050 & 3 \\
\hline Group F & Student Specific Factors & 3.4617 & 4 \\
\hline Group G & Social Life on the Campus & 3.7227 & 2 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\subsection*{4.10.3Ranking of Groups: Management Representatives}

Group D [Sub-parameter-wise]
Table 88: Group D: Scores and Ranks (Management Representatives)
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|r|r|}
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{ Group D: Significant Factors } \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{c} 
Sub- \\
Parameter
\end{tabular} & \multicolumn{1}{|c|}{ Description } & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Average \\
Score
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Sub-Parameter \\
Rank
\end{tabular} \\
\hline D1 & Location & 3.9818 & \\
\hline D2 & Conveyance Available & 3.8000 & 3 \\
\hline D3 & Family Tradition & 3.0909 & 4 \\
\hline D4 & Reputation of Institution & 4.2364 & 6 \\
\hline D5 & Courses Offered & 4.0727 & 1 \\
\hline D6 & Tuition Fees & 3.4545 & 2 \\
\hline & Group D Overall & 3.7727 & 5 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Here top 2 ranks within this Group D are Reputation of Institution and Courses Offered respectively.

Group E [Sub-parameter-wise]
Table 89: Group E: Scores and Ranks (Management Representatives)
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|r|r|}
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{ Group E: Infrastructure } \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{c} 
Sub- \\
Parameter
\end{tabular} & \multicolumn{1}{|c|}{ Description } & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Average \\
Score
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Sub-Parameter \\
Rank
\end{tabular} \\
\hline E1 & Library & 4.2727 & 1 \\
\hline E2 & Sports Facilities & 3.5091 & 4 \\
\hline E3 & Auditorium & 2.6909 & 6 \\
\hline E4 & Canteen & 3.3636 & 5 \\
\hline E5 & IT Lab & 3.5455 & 3 \\
\hline E6 & Guidance and Counselling & 4.1455 & 2 \\
\hline & Group E Overall & 3.5879 & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Here top 2 ranks within this Group E are Library and Guidance and Counselling respectively.

Group F [Sub-parameter-wise]
Table 90: Group F: Scores and Ranks (Management Representatives)
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|r|r|}
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{ Group F: Student Specific Factors } \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{c} 
Sub- \\
Parameter
\end{tabular} & \multicolumn{1}{|c|}{ Description } & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Average \\
Score
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Sub-Parameter \\
Rank
\end{tabular} \\
\hline F1 & Qualified Staff & 4.0545 & 2 \\
\hline F2 & Choice of Subjects & 3.9091 & 3 \\
\hline F3 & Scholarships Available & 3.5636 & 5 \\
\hline F4 & Uniform & 2.3091 & 6 \\
\hline F5 & Attendance & 3.8000 & 4 \\
\hline F6 & College Timings & 4.2000 & 1 \\
\hline & Group F Overall & 3.6394 & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Here top 2 ranks within this Group F are College Timings and Qualified Staff respectively.

Group G [Sub-parameter-wise]
Table 91: Group G: Scores and Ranks (Management Representatives)
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|r|r|}
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{ Group G: Social Life on the Campus } \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{c} 
Sub- \\
Parameter
\end{tabular} & \multicolumn{1}{|c|}{ Description } & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Average \\
Score
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Sub-Parameter \\
Rank
\end{tabular} \\
\hline G1 & Student Composition & 4.4182 & \\
\hline G2 & Extracurricular Activities & 3.6182 & 2 \\
\hline G3 & Use of Mobile Phones & 3.2182 & 3 \\
\hline G4 & NCC & 3.2182 & 4 \\
\hline G5 & Safety and Security & 4.4182 & 5 \\
\hline & Group G Overall & 3.7782 & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Here top 2 ranks within this Group G are Safety and Security and Student Composition respectively.

\section*{All Group-wise Overall}

Table 92: Overall Group Scores and Ranks (Management Representatives)
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|r|r|}
\hline \multicolumn{1}{|c|}{ Group } & \multicolumn{1}{|c|}{ Factor } & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Average \\
Score
\end{tabular} & \multicolumn{1}{c|}{ Rank } \\
\hline Group D & Significant Factors & 3.7727 & 2 \\
\hline Group E & Infrastructure & 3.5879 & 4 \\
\hline Group F & Student Specific Factors & 3.6394 & 3 \\
\hline Group G & Social Life on the Campus & 3.7782 & 1 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\subsection*{4.10.4Summary of Ranking of Groups}

Summary of Comparative Rankings for the major groups is presented here.

\section*{PARENTS}

Table 93: Overall Group Rankings (Parents) By Rank
\begin{tabular}{|c|l|l|r|}
\hline Rank & \multicolumn{1}{|c|}{ Group } & \multicolumn{1}{|c|}{ Description } & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Average \\
Score
\end{tabular} \\
\hline 1 & Group D & Significant Factors & 3.7594 \\
\hline 2 & Group F & Student Specific Factors & 3.7050 \\
\hline 3 & Group G & Social Life on the Campus & 3.7033 \\
\hline 4 & Group B & Influencing Factors & 3.5167 \\
\hline 5 & Group C & College Basics & 3.3506 \\
\hline 6 & Group E & Infrastructure & 3.3483 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Note: These ranking are based on the total scores obtained by that particular sub-parameter.

\section*{STUDENTS}

Table 94: Overall Group Rankings (Students) By Rank
\begin{tabular}{|c|l|l|c|}
\hline Rank & \multicolumn{1}{|c|}{ Group } & \multicolumn{1}{|c|}{ Description } & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Average \\
Score
\end{tabular} \\
\hline 1 & Group D & Significant Factors & 3.8322 \\
\hline 2 & Group G & Social Life on the Campus & 3.7227 \\
\hline 3 & Group E & Infrastructure & 3.6050 \\
\hline 4 & Group F & Student Specific Factors & 3.4617 \\
\hline 5 & Group B & Influencing Factors & 3.2850 \\
\hline 6 & Group C & College Basics & 3.1539 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Note: These ranking are based on the total scores obtained by that particular sub-parameter.

\section*{MANAGEMENT REPRESENTATIVES}

Table 95: Overall Group Rankings (Management Representatives) By Rank
\begin{tabular}{|c|l|l|r|}
\hline Rank & \multicolumn{1}{|c|}{ Group } & \multicolumn{1}{c|}{ Factor } & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Average \\
Score
\end{tabular} \\
\hline 1 & Group G & Social Life on the Campus & 3.7782 \\
\hline 2 & Group D & Significant Factors & 3.7727 \\
\hline 3 & Group F & Student Specific Factors & 3.6394 \\
\hline 4 & Group E & Infrastructure & 3.5879 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Note: These ranking are based on the total scores obtained by that particular sub-parameter.

Based on above, here are the important parameters that are ranked higher by the students, the parents and the management representatives across all groups.

Table 96: Important Parameters with Higher Rankings
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Group & Description & Respondent Category & Rank 1 SubParameter & Rank 2 SubParameter \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Group B} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Influencing Factors} & Students & Mother & Father \\
\hline & & Parents & Ward (Own Child) & Spouse \\
\hline & & Management Representatives & ---- & ---- \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Group C} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{College Basics} & Students & Aided & Old \\
\hline & & Parents & Senior
Affiliated College & School Affiliated \\
\hline & & Management Representatives & ---- & ---- \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Group D} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Significant Factors} & Students & Location & Reputation of Institution \\
\hline & & Parents & Location & Conveyance Available \\
\hline & & Management Representatives & Reputation of
Institution & Courses Offered \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Group E} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Infrastructure} & Students & Canteen & Library \\
\hline & & Parents & Library & Guidance and Counselling \\
\hline & & Management Representatives & Library & Guidance and Counselling \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Group F} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Student Specific Factors} & Students & Choice of Subjects & Qualified Staff \\
\hline & & Parents & Qualified Staff & Choice of
Subjects \\
\hline & & Management Representatives & College Timings & Qualified Staff \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Group G} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Social Life on the Campus} & Students & Safety and Security & Student Composition \\
\hline & & Parents & Safety and Security & Student Composition \\
\hline & & Management Representatives & Safety and Security & Student Composition \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Note: Based upon field survey data.

Based on the above table as well as correlation matrix (Pearson Coefficient) of various parameters within the groups, it was attempted to select pairs of essential parameters (those have received higher rankings) for further hypothesis formation.

Some of these pairs are as shown below:

Table 97: Parameter Pairs for Hypotheses Testing
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|}
\hline Reputation of Institution & Courses Offered \\
\hline Qualified Staff & Reputation of Institution \\
\hline Location & Conveyance Available \\
\hline Student Composition & Extracurricular Activities \\
\hline Student Composition & Courses Offered \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Using these parameters, various hypotheses of the studies were formulated and later these are tested using appropriate statistical tests.

\subsection*{4.11 Overview of Correlation Matrices}

For each of respondent's category larger correlation matrices were prepared based upon the responses received for each section viz. the students, the parents and the management representatives. Details are as given below.

\subsection*{4.11.1 Correlation Matrices: Parents}

\section*{Correlation Matrix for all parameters for Parents}

Part B: Sources of Information and Influences
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & WARD (OWN CHILD) & SPOUSE & FRIENDS & Relatives & \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { FORMER } \\
\text { STUDENTS }
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { CAMPUS } \\
\text { VISIT } \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] \\
\hline WARD (OWN CHILD) & 1.0000 & & & & & \\
\hline SPOUSE & 0.1834 & 1.0000 & & & & \\
\hline FRIENDS & 0.3177 & 0.3254 & 1.0000 & & & \\
\hline RELATIVES & 0.1805 & 0.1252 & 0.5198 & 1.0000 & & \\
\hline FORMER STUDENTS & -0.3195 & -0.4657 & -0.0663 & 0.2023 & 1.0000 & \\
\hline CAMPUS VISIT & -0.2967 & 0.0179 & -0.2107 & -0.2372 & -0.0228 & 1.0000 \\
\hline OLD & -0.2247 & -0.1358 & 0.1941 & 0.3140 & 0.4991 & -0.5353 \\
\hline NEW & -0.0118 & 0.0266 & 0.1971 & 0.2915 & -0.1045 & -0.0090 \\
\hline AIDED & 0.4758 & 0.3400 & 0.5757 & 0.2985 & -0.4427 & 0.0275 \\
\hline UNAIDED & 0.4589 & -0.0613 & 0.2579 & 0.3841 & 0.0921 & -0.0106 \\
\hline SCHOOL AFFILIATED & 0.4532 & 0.0741 & 0.4546 & 0.5465 & -0.1928 & -0.2103 \\
\hline SENIOR COLLEGE AFFILIATED & -0.0471 & -0.0122 & -0.0463 & -0.1684 & 0.0558 & 0.6554 \\
\hline LOCATION & 0.3147 & 0.3504 & 0.4603 & 0.1825 & -0.2267 & 0.1172 \\
\hline CONVEYANCE AVAILABLE & 0.0861 & 0.1174 & 0.3642 & 0.0512 & -0.0382 & -0.1597 \\
\hline FAMILY TRADITION & 0.0032 & 0.0283 & 0.3510 & 0.4731 & 0.0663 & 0.0518 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { REPUTATION OF } \\
& \text { INSTITUTION } \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] & 0.2202 & 0.5487 & 0.3456 & -0.0318 & -0.1255 & 0.1303 \\
\hline COURSES OFFERED & 0.0268 & 0.3659 & 0.1085 & -0.2802 & -0.2155 & 0.5549 \\
\hline TUTION FEES & 0.5389 & 0.4219 & 0.4376 & 0.3379 & -0.2659 & 0.1172 \\
\hline LIBRARY & 0.3354 & 0.3974 & 0.5292 & 0.2772 & -0.0424 & -0.0850 \\
\hline SPORTS FACILITIES & 0.3114 & 0.2331 & 0.5326 & 0.2734 & 0.0769 & 0.1382 \\
\hline AUDITORIUM & -0.1288 & 0.3412 & 0.4089 & 0.0775 & 0.0144 & 0.3232 \\
\hline CANTEEN & -0.0649 & 0.3462 & 0.2008 & 0.0241 & -0.3636 & -0.0641 \\
\hline IT LAB & 0.4824 & 0.1620 & 0.3699 & 0.0548 & -0.3530 & 0.2623 \\
\hline GUIDANCE AND COUNSELLING & -0.1468 & 0.0390 & 0.1775 & -0.1570 & 0.0236 & 0.3909 \\
\hline QUALIFIED STAFF & -0.2065 & 0.1873 & 0.0371 & -0.2747 & 0.2153 & 0.3607 \\
\hline CHOICE OF SUBJECTS & -0.2562 & 0.0077 & 0.0439 & -0.3728 & 0.2682 & 0.3212 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
SCHOLARSHIPS \\
AVAILABLE
\end{tabular} & -0.3153 & -0.0143 & 0.1132 & 0.2420 & 0.3879 & 0.0061 \\
\hline UNIFORM & 0.2352 & 0.2647 & 0.7215 & 0.5904 & -0.1228 & -0.0267 \\
\hline ATTENDANCE & -0.1048 & 0.0638 & 0.1680 & -0.1027 & 0.2594 & 0.4095 \\
\hline COLLEGE TIMINGS & -0.1153 & -0.0812 & 0.0457 & 0.1702 & 0.0987 & 0.5079 \\
\hline STUDENT
COMPOSITION & 0.0502 & 0.2438 & -0.0211 & -0.3675 & -0.2064 & 0.3613 \\
\hline EXTRA CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES & 0.1738 & 0.0671 & 0.4575 & 0.3855 & 0.4093 & -0.0565 \\
\hline USE OF MOBILE PHONES & -0.0954 & 0.0212 & -0.4304 & -0.4842 & -0.0074 & 0.2667 \\
\hline NCC & -0.2526 & -0.3113 & -0.0019 & -0.0829 & 0.6055 & 0.0725 \\
\hline SAFETY AND SECURITY & 0.5479 & 0.1441 & 0.5032 & 0.3812 & -0.2069 & -0.2858 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Note: Correlation Coefficients values more than 0.60 are highlighted.

Here the following parameters within this Group B are showing good correlation:
- Former Students and NCC
- Campus Visit and Senior College Affiliated

Part C: College Basics
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & OLD & NEW & AIDED & UNAIDED & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { SCHOOL } \\
\text { AFFILIATED }
\end{gathered}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
SENIOR COLLEGE \\
AFFILIATED
\end{tabular} \\
\hline WARD (OWN CHILD) & -0.2247 & -0.0118 & 0.4758 & 0.4589 & 0.4532 & -0.0471 \\
\hline SPOUSE & -0.1358 & 0.0266 & 0.3400 & -0.0613 & 0.0741 & -0.0122 \\
\hline FRIENDS & 0.1941 & 0.1971 & 0.5757 & 0.2579 & 0.4546 & -0.0463 \\
\hline RELATIVES & 0.3140 & 0.2915 & 0.2985 & 0.3841 & 0.5465 & -0.1684 \\
\hline FORMER STUDENTS & 0.4991 & -0.1045 & -0.4427 & 0.0921 & -0.1928 & 0.0558 \\
\hline CAMPUS VISIT & -0.5353 & -0.0090 & 0.0275 & -0.0106 & -0.2103 & 0.6554 \\
\hline OLD & 1.0000 & & & & & \\
\hline NEW & 0.1404 & 1.0000 & & & & \\
\hline AIDED & -0.2387 & 0.1448 & 1.0000 & & & \\
\hline UNAIDED & -0.1439 & 0.0894 & 0.5014 & 1.0000 & & \\
\hline SCHOOL AFFILIATED & 0.0394 & 0.3235 & 0.6079 & 0.7424 & 1.0000 & \\
\hline SENIOR COLLEGE AFFILIATED & -0.4845 & -0.0800 & 0.2802 & 0.3951 & -0.0162 & 1.0000 \\
\hline LOCATION & -0.2330 & 0.1102 & 0.6787 & 0.5517 & 0.4809 & 0.5710 \\
\hline CONVEYANCE AVAILABLE & 0.0971 & 0.0032 & 0.3790 & 0.5009 & 0.3733 & 0.3732 \\
\hline FAMILY TRADITION & 0.0413 & 0.3392 & 0.1261 & 0.1070 & 0.3050 & 0.1243 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { REPUTATION OF } \\
& \text { INSTITUTION }
\end{aligned}
\] & -0.1451 & -0.2206 & 0.2541 & -0.0537 & -0.2388 & 0.1802 \\
\hline COURSES OFFERED & -0.4595 & -0.1904 & 0.4199 & 0.0643 & -0.1617 & 0.7719 \\
\hline TUTION FEES & -0.2500 & 0.1326 & 0.6500 & 0.4114 & 0.4252 & 0.3176 \\
\hline LIBRARY & -0.1259 & 0.0018 & 0.5209 & 0.5429 & 0.4058 & 0.4172 \\
\hline SPORTS FACILITIES & -0.1464 & 0.0617 & 0.3545 & 0.3529 & 0.1863 & 0.4152 \\
\hline AUDITORIUM & -0.0647 & -0.0961 & 0.3276 & 0.0898 & -0.0381 & 0.5133 \\
\hline CANTEEN & -0.0807 & 0.0845 & 0.1295 & -0.2449 & -0.0021 & -0.0793 \\
\hline IT LAB & -0.4779 & -0.1626 & 0.7630 & 0.5374 & 0.4523 & 0.5073 \\
\hline GUIDANCE AND
COUNSELLING & -0.3617 & -0.2094 & -0.0196 & -0.1119 & -0.2620 & 0.4213 \\
\hline QUALIFIED STAFF & -0.0775 & -0.1972 & -0.0798 & -0.1479 & -0.4382 & 0.5683 \\
\hline CHOICE OF SUBJECTS & 0.0288 & -0.1176 & -0.0867 & -0.1445 & -0.4703 & 0.5526 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
SCHOLARSHIPS \\
AVAILABLE
\end{tabular} & 0.3350 & 0.2790 & -0.0176 & -0.0065 & -0.0118 & 0.1939 \\
\hline UNIFORM & 0.0256 & 0.1780 & 0.5015 & 0.3088 & 0.4873 & 0.0909 \\
\hline ATTENDANCE & -0.0213 & -0.0159 & -0.0742 & 0.0002 & -0.2060 & 0.3983 \\
\hline COLLEGE TIMINGS & -0.2747 & 0.2827 & 0.1852 & 0.2188 & 0.2199 & 0.2671 \\
\hline STUDENT COMPOSITION & -0.4343 & -0.2330 & 0.3355 & 0.0923 & -0.1301 & 0.5803 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { EXTRA CURRICULAR } \\
& \text { ACTIVITIES } \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] & 0.1922 & -0.0297 & -0.0461 & 0.1362 & -0.0685 & 0.2097 \\
\hline USE OF MOBILE PHONES & -0.2076 & -0.3395 & -0.2123 & -0.0646 & -0.3413 & 0.2562 \\
\hline NCC & 0.1978 & -0.2211 & -0.3001 & -0.0332 & -0.4121 & 0.3455 \\
\hline SAFETY AND SECURITY & -0.1013 & -0.0188 & 0.4300 & 0.4025 & 0.4857 & -0.1631 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Note: Correlation Coefficients values more than 0.60 are highlighted.

Here the following parameters within this Group C are showing good correlation:
- Aided and School Affiliated
- Aided and Location
- Aided and Tuition Fees
- Aided and IT Lab
- Unaided and School Affiliated
- Senior College Affiliated and Campus Visit

Part D: Significant Factors
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & LOCATION & \begin{tabular}{l}
CONVEYANCE \\
AVAILABLE
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
FAMILY \\
TRADITION
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { REPUTATION } \\
\text { OF } \\
\text { INSTITUTION } \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
COURSES \\
OFFERED
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { TUITION } \\
\text { FEES } \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { WARD (OWN } \\
& \text { CHILD) }
\end{aligned}
\] & 0.3147 & 0.0861 & 0.0032 & 0.2202 & 0.0268 & 0.5389 \\
\hline SPOUSE & 0.3504 & 0.1174 & 0.0283 & 0.5487 & 0.3659 & 0.4219 \\
\hline FRIENDS & 0.4603 & 0.3642 & 0.3510 & 0.3456 & 0.1085 & 0.4376 \\
\hline RELATIVES & 0.1825 & 0.0512 & 0.4731 & -0.0318 & -0.2802 & 0.3379 \\
\hline FORMER STUDENTS & -0.2267 & -0.0382 & 0.0663 & -0.1255 & -0.2155 & -0.2659 \\
\hline CAMPUS VISIT & 0.1172 & -0.1597 & 0.0518 & 0.1303 & 0.5549 & 0.1172 \\
\hline OLD & -0.2330 & 0.0971 & 0.0413 & -0.1451 & -0.4595 & -0.2500 \\
\hline NEW & 0.1102 & 0.0032 & 0.3392 & -0.2206 & -0.1904 & 0.1326 \\
\hline AIDED & 0.6787 & 0.3790 & 0.1261 & 0.2541 & 0.4199 & 0.6500 \\
\hline UNAIDED & 0.5517 & 0.5009 & 0.1070 & -0.0537 & 0.0643 & 0.4114 \\
\hline SCHOOL AFFILIATED & 0.4809 & 0.3733 & 0.3050 & -0.2388 & -0.1617 & 0.4252 \\
\hline SENIOR COLLEGE AFFILIATED & 0.5710 & 0.3732 & 0.1243 & 0.1802 & 0.7719 & 0.3176 \\
\hline LOCATION & 1.0000 & & & & & \\
\hline CONVEYANCE AVAILABLE & 0.6460 & 1.0000 & & & & \\
\hline FAMILY TRADITION & 0.2769 & -0.0309 & 1.0000 & & & \\
\hline REPUTATION OF INSTITUTION & 0.1200 & 0.0555 & -0.3806 & 1.0000 & & \\
\hline COURSES OFFERED & 0.6192 & 0.3017 & 0.0524 & 0.4278 & 1.0000 & \\
\hline TUTION FEES & 0.5389 & 0.1147 & 0.2439 & 0.3470 & 0.3965 & 1.0000 \\
\hline LIBRARY & 0.8147 & 0.6246 & 0.2749 & 0.2946 & 0.4472 & 0.4807 \\
\hline SPORTS FACILITIES & 0.4318 & 0.2929 & 0.2616 & 0.3802 & 0.3902 & 0.5770 \\
\hline AUDITORIUM & 0.4823 & 0.4218 & 0.2626 & 0.3799 & 0.6386 & 0.2782 \\
\hline CANTEEN & 0.2570 & 0.1130 & 0.3288 & 0.0088 & 0.1876 & 0.0383 \\
\hline IT LAB & 0.5926 & 0.4135 & 0.0077 & 0.2206 & 0.5667 & 0.5360 \\
\hline GUIDANCE AND COUNSELLING & 0.1989 & 0.1073 & 0.1490 & 0.1984 & 0.4837 & -0.0320 \\
\hline QUALIFIED STAFF & 0.3118 & 0.2157 & 0.0829 & 0.3327 & 0.6934 & 0.0318 \\
\hline CHOICE OF SUBJECTS & 0.2120 & 0.2453 & -0.0612 & 0.3669 & 0.5933 & -0.0324 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
SCHOLARSHIPS \\
AVAILABLE
\end{tabular} & 0.1687 & 0.0219 & 0.4129 & -0.0572 & 0.0964 & 0.0785 \\
\hline UNIFORM & 0.4335 & 0.2642 & 0.5635 & 0.0534 & 0.0657 & 0.4674 \\
\hline ATTENDANCE & 0.2473 & 0.0716 & 0.1391 & 0.1840 & 0.3654 & 0.0789 \\
\hline COLLEGE TIMINGS & 0.1465 & -0.2483 & 0.1912 & -0.0728 & 0.0713 & 0.2937 \\
\hline STUDENT
COMPOSITION & 0.3474 & 0.1964 & 0.0240 & 0.2621 & 0.6986 & 0.3090 \\
\hline EXTRA CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES & 0.1915 & 0.1364 & 0.3500 & 0.3414 & 0.1406 & 0.2615 \\
\hline USE OF MOBILE
PHONES & -0.1748 & 0.0830 & -0.4590 & 0.1881 & 0.3006 & -0.1628 \\
\hline NCC & -0.0503 & 0.1370 & 0.0542 & 0.1778 & 0.2142 & -0.1522 \\
\hline SAFETY AND SECURITY & 0.2004 & 0.2055 & -0.1310 & 0.3078 & -0.1163 & 0.3432 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Note: Correlation Coefficients values more than 0.60 are highlighted.

Here the following parameters within this Group D are showing good correlation:
- Location and Aided
- Location and Conveyance Available
- Location and Courses Offered
- Location and Library
- Conveyance Available and Library
- Courses Offered and Qualified Staff
- Courses Offered and Student Composition
- Tuition Fees and Aided

Part E: Infrastructure
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & LIBRARY & \begin{tabular}{l}
SPORTS \\
FACILITIES
\end{tabular} & AUDITORIUM & CANTEEN & IT LAB & \[
\begin{array}{|c}
\hline \text { GUIDANCE } \\
\text { AND } \\
\text { COUNSELLIN } \\
G
\end{array}
\] \\
\hline WARD (OWN CHILD) & 0.3354 & 0.3114 & -0.1288 & -0.0649 & 0.4824 & -0.1468 \\
\hline SPOUSE & 0.3974 & 0.2331 & 0.3412 & 0.3462 & 0.1620 & 0.0390 \\
\hline FRIENDS & 0.5292 & 0.5326 & 0.4089 & 0.2008 & 0.3699 & 0.1775 \\
\hline RELATIVES & 0.2772 & 0.2734 & 0.0775 & 0.0241 & 0.0548 & -0.1570 \\
\hline FORMER STUDENTS & -0.0424 & 0.0769 & 0.0144 & -0.3636 & -0.3530 & 0.0236 \\
\hline CAMPUS VISIT & -0.0850 & 0.1382 & 0.3232 & -0.0641 & 0.2623 & 0.3909 \\
\hline OLD & -0.1259 & -0.1464 & -0.0647 & -0.0807 & -0.4779 & -0.3617 \\
\hline NEW & 0.0018 & 0.0617 & -0.0961 & 0.0845 & -0.1626 & -0.2094 \\
\hline AIDED & 0.5209 & 0.3545 & 0.3276 & 0.1295 & 0.7630 & -0.0196 \\
\hline UNAIDED & 0.5429 & 0.3529 & 0.0898 & -0.2449 & 0.5374 & -0.1119 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
SCHOOL \\
AFFILIATED
\end{tabular} & 0.4058 & 0.1863 & -0.0381 & -0.0021 & 0.4523 & -0.2620 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { SENIOR COLLEGE } \\
& \text { AFFILIATED } \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] & 0.4172 & 0.4152 & 0.5133 & -0.0793 & 0.5073 & 0.4213 \\
\hline LOCATION & 0.8147 & 0.4318 & 0.4823 & 0.2570 & 0.5926 & 0.1989 \\
\hline CONVEYANCE AVAILABLE & 0.6246 & 0.2929 & 0.4218 & 0.1130 & 0.4135 & 0.1073 \\
\hline FAMILY TRADITION & 0.2749 & 0.2616 & 0.2626 & 0.3288 & 0.0077 & 0.1490 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { REPUTATION OF } \\
& \text { INSTITUTION } \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] & 0.2946 & 0.3802 & 0.3799 & 0.0088 & 0.2206 & 0.1984 \\
\hline COURSES OFFERED & 0.4472 & 0.3902 & 0.6386 & 0.1876 & 0.5667 & 0.4837 \\
\hline TUTION FEES & 0.4807 & 0.5770 & 0.2782 & 0.0383 & 0.5360 & -0.0320 \\
\hline LIBRARY & 1.0000 & & & & & \\
\hline SPORTS FACILITIES & 0.4587 & 1.0000 & & & & \\
\hline AUDITORIUM & 0.5034 & 0.4546 & 1.0000 & & & \\
\hline CANTEEN & 0.2975 & 0.0093 & 0.3775 & 1.0000 & & \\
\hline IT LAB & 0.3752 & 0.4914 & 0.3603 & -0.0589 & 1.0000 & \\
\hline GUIDANCE AND COUNSELLING & 0.1806 & 0.3638 & 0.3964 & 0.1559 & 0.2790 & 1.0000 \\
\hline QUALIFIED STAFF & 0.3143 & 0.3399 & 0.5786 & 0.1653 & 0.0641 & 0.5546 \\
\hline CHOICE OF SUBJECTS & 0.2128 & 0.3132 & 0.5000 & -0.0074 & 0.0016 & 0.4931 \\
\hline SCHOLARSHIPS AVAILABLE & 0.2689 & 0.0746 & 0.2439 & 0.1665 & -0.3439 & 0.0346 \\
\hline UNIFORM & 0.4192 & 0.4276 & 0.4464 & 0.2426 & 0.4115 & 0.1335 \\
\hline ATTENDANCE & 0.2494 & 0.2323 & 0.3716 & -0.0142 & 0.0151 & 0.3079 \\
\hline COLLEGE TIMINGS & 0.0542 & 0.1330 & -0.0256 & -0.1100 & 0.0772 & 0.0711 \\
\hline STUDENT
COMPOSITION & 0.3371 & 0.3169 & 0.5282 & 0.1837 & 0.4472 & 0.3706 \\
\hline EXTRA CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES & 0.4041 & 0.5463 & 0.3362 & -0.0213 & 0.0110 & 0.1840 \\
\hline USE OF MOBILE PHONES & -0.2313 & 0.0395 & 0.1504 & -0.1565 & 0.1553 & 0.2090 \\
\hline NCC & 0.1576 & 0.2970 & 0.3508 & -0.1253 & -0.1398 & 0.2601 \\
\hline SAFETY AND SECURITY & 0.2511 & 0.3962 & -0.0409 & -0.0823 & 0.4672 & -0.0246 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Note: Correlation Coefficients values more than 0.60 are highlighted.

Here the following parameters within this Group E are showing good correlation:
- Library and Location
- Library and Conveyance Available
- IT Lab and Aided

Part F: Student Specific Factors
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { QUALIFIED } \\
& \text { STAFF } \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { CHOICE OF } \\
& \text { SUBJECTS } \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
SCHOLARSHIPS \\
AVAILABLE
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { UNIFOR } \\
& \text { M } \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { ATTENDA } \\
& \text { NCE } \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { COLLEGE } \\
& \text { IMINGS } \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline WARD (OWN CHILD) & -0.2065 & -0.2562 & -0.3153 & 0.2352 & -0.1048 & -0.1153 \\
\hline SPOUSE & 0.1873 & 0.0077 & -0.0143 & 0.2647 & 0.0638 & -0.0812 \\
\hline FRIENDS & 0.0371 & 0.0439 & 0.1132 & 0.7215 & 0.1680 & 0.0457 \\
\hline RELATIVES & -0.2747 & -0.3728 & 0.2420 & 0.5904 & -0.1027 & 0.1702 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
FORMER \\
STUDENTS
\end{tabular} & 0.2153 & 0.2682 & 0.3879 & -0.1228 & 0.2594 & 0.0987 \\
\hline CAMPUS VISIT & 0.3607 & 0.3212 & 0.0061 & -0.0267 & 0.4095 & 0.5079 \\
\hline OLD & -0.0775 & 0.0288 & 0.3350 & 0.0256 & -0.0213 & -0.2747 \\
\hline NEW & -0.1972 & -0.1176 & 0.2790 & 0.1780 & -0.0159 & 0.2827 \\
\hline AIDED & -0.0798 & -0.0867 & -0.0176 & 0.5015 & -0.0742 & 0.1852 \\
\hline UNAIDED & -0.1479 & -0.1445 & -0.0065 & 0.3088 & 0.0002 & 0.2188 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { SCHOOL } \\
& \text { AFFILIATED }
\end{aligned}
\] & -0.4382 & -0.4703 & -0.0118 & 0.4873 & -0.2060 & 0.2199 \\
\hline SENIOR
COLLEGE
AFFILIATED & 0.5683 & 0.5526 & 0.1939 & 0.0909 & 0.3983 & 0.2671 \\
\hline LOCATION & 0.3118 & 0.2120 & 0.1687 & 0.4335 & 0.2473 & 0.1465 \\
\hline CONVEYANCE AVAILABLE & 0.2157 & 0.2453 & 0.0219 & 0.2642 & 0.0716 & -0.2483 \\
\hline FAMILY TRADITION & 0.0829 & -0.0612 & 0.4129 & 0.5635 & 0.1391 & 0.1912 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { REPUTATION } \\
& \text { OF } \\
& \text { INSTITUTION }
\end{aligned}
\] & 0.3327 & 0.3669 & -0.0572 & 0.0534 & 0.1840 & -0.0728 \\
\hline COURSES OFFERED & 0.6934 & 0.5933 & 0.0964 & 0.0657 & 0.3654 & 0.0713 \\
\hline TUTION FEES & 0.0318 & -0.0324 & 0.0785 & 0.4674 & 0.0789 & 0.2937 \\
\hline LIBRARY & 0.3143 & 0.2128 & 0.2689 & 0.4192 & 0.2494 & 0.0542 \\
\hline SPORTS FACILITIES & 0.3399 & 0.3132 & 0.0746 & 0.4276 & 0.2323 & 0.1330 \\
\hline AUDITORIUM & 0.5786 & 0.5000 & 0.2439 & 0.4464 & 0.3716 & -0.0256 \\
\hline CANTEEN & 0.1653 & -0.0074 & 0.1665 & 0.2426 & -0.0142 & -0.1100 \\
\hline IT LAB & 0.0641 & 0.0016 & -0.3439 & 0.4115 & 0.0151 & 0.0772 \\
\hline GUIDANCE AND COUNSELLING & 0.5546 & 0.4931 & 0.0346 & 0.1335 & 0.3079 & 0.0711 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { QUALIFIED } \\
& \text { STAFF } \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] & 1.0000 & & & & & \\
\hline CHOICE OF SUBJECTS & 0.8069 & 1.0000 & & & & \\
\hline SCHOLARSHIPS AVAILABLE & 0.4038 & 0.3412 & 1.0000 & & & \\
\hline UNIFORM & -0.0993 & -0.1841 & -0.0131 & 1.0000 & & \\
\hline ATTENDANCE & 0.4889 & 0.4878 & 0.1174 & 0.1818 & 1.0000 & \\
\hline COLLEGE TIMINGS & -0.0501 & -0.0501 & 0.2185 & 0.1141 & 0.2469 & 1.0000 \\
\hline STUDENT
COMPOSITION & 0.5727 & 0.4360 & 0.2131 & -0.0480 & 0.1829 & -0.0328 \\
\hline EXTRA CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES & 0.3054 & 0.3123 & 0.1712 & 0.4284 & 0.4222 & -0.1013 \\
\hline USE OF MOBILE PHONES & 0.3900 & 0.3004 & -0.1159 & -0.4972 & -0.0692 & -0.2490 \\
\hline NCC & 0.5156 & 0.6226 & 0.2441 & -0.1091 & 0.3219 & -0.1575 \\
\hline SAFETY AND SECURITY & -0.4002 & -0.3046 & -0.4226 & 0.3267 & -0.2644 & -0.0683 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Note: Correlation Coefficients values more than 0.60 are highlighted.

Here the following parameters within this Group F are showing good correlation:
- Qualified Staff and Courses Offered
- Qualified Staff and Choice of Subjects

Part G: Social Life on Campus
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { STUDENT } \\
\text { COMPOSITION }
\end{gathered}
\] & EXTRA
CURRICULAR
ACTIVITIES & \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { USE OF } \\
\text { MOBILE } \\
\text { PHONES } \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] & NCC & SAFETY AND SECURITY \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { WARD (OWN } \\
& \text { CHILD) }
\end{aligned}
\] & 0.0502 & 0.1738 & -0.0954 & -0.2526 & 0.5479 \\
\hline SPOUSE & 0.2438 & 0.0671 & 0.0212 & -0.3113 & 0.1441 \\
\hline FRIENDS & -0.0211 & 0.4575 & -0.4304 & -0.0019 & 0.5032 \\
\hline RELATIVES & -0.3675 & 0.3855 & -0.4842 & -0.0829 & 0.3812 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { FORMER } \\
& \text { STUDENTS } \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] & -0.2064 & 0.4093 & -0.0074 & 0.6055 & -0.2069 \\
\hline CAMPUS VISIT & 0.3613 & -0.0565 & 0.2667 & 0.0725 & -0.2858 \\
\hline OLD & -0.4343 & 0.1922 & -0.2076 & 0.1978 & -0.1013 \\
\hline NEW & -0.2330 & -0.0297 & -0.3395 & -0.2211 & -0.0188 \\
\hline AIDED & 0.3355 & -0.0461 & -0.2123 & -0.3001 & 0.4300 \\
\hline UNAIDED & 0.0923 & 0.1362 & -0.0646 & -0.0332 & 0.4025 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { SCHOOL } \\
& \text { AFFILIATED }
\end{aligned}
\] & -0.1301 & -0.0685 & -0.3413 & -0.4121 & 0.4857 \\
\hline SENIOR COLLEGE AFFILIATED & 0.5803 & 0.2097 & 0.2562 & 0.3455 & -0.1631 \\
\hline LOCATION & 0.3474 & 0.1915 & -0.1748 & -0.0503 & 0.2004 \\
\hline CONVEYANCE AVAILABLE & 0.1964 & 0.1364 & 0.0830 & 0.1370 & 0.2055 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { FAMILY } \\
& \text { TRADITION }
\end{aligned}
\] & 0.0240 & 0.3500 & -0.4590 & 0.0542 & -0.1310 \\
\hline REPUTATION OF INSTITUTION & 0.2621 & 0.3414 & 0.1881 & 0.1778 & 0.3078 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { COURSES } \\
& \text { OFFERED }
\end{aligned}
\] & 0.6986 & 0.1406 & 0.3006 & 0.2142 & -0.1163 \\
\hline TUTION FEES & 0.3090 & 0.2615 & -0.1628 & -0.1522 & 0.3432 \\
\hline LIBRARY & 0.3371 & 0.4041 & -0.2313 & 0.1576 & 0.2511 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
SPORTS \\
FACILITIES
\end{tabular} & 0.3169 & 0.5463 & 0.0395 & 0.2970 & 0.3962 \\
\hline AUDITORIUM & 0.5282 & 0.3362 & 0.1504 & 0.3508 & -0.0409 \\
\hline CANTEEN & 0.1837 & -0.0213 & -0.1565 & -0.1253 & -0.0823 \\
\hline IT LAB & 0.4472 & 0.0110 & 0.1553 & -0.1398 & 0.4672 \\
\hline GUIDANCE AND COUNSELLING & 0.3706 & 0.1840 & 0.2090 & 0.2601 & -0.0246 \\
\hline QUALIFIED STAFF & 0.5727 & 0.3054 & 0.3900 & 0.5156 & -0.4002 \\
\hline CHOICE OF SUBJECTS & 0.4360 & 0.3123 & 0.3004 & 0.6226 & -0.3046 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
SCHOLARSHIPS \\
AVAILABLE
\end{tabular} & 0.2131 & 0.1712 & -0.1159 & 0.2441 & -0.4226 \\
\hline UNIFORM & -0.0480 & 0.4284 & -0.4972 & -0.1091 & 0.3267 \\
\hline ATTENDANCE & 0.1829 & 0.4222 & -0.0692 & 0.3219 & -0.2644 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
COLLEGE \\
TIMINGS
\end{tabular} & -0.0328 & -0.1013 & -0.2490 & -0.1575 & -0.0683 \\
\hline STUDENT COMPOSITION & 1.0000 & & & & \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { EXTRA } \\
& \text { CURRICULAR } \\
& \text { ACTIVITIES } \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] & -0.1236 & 1.0000 & & & \\
\hline USE OF MOBILE PHONES & 0.4624 & -0.2661 & 1.0000 & & \\
\hline NCC & 0.1563 & 0.5766 & 0.1120 & 1.0000 & \\
\hline SAFETY AND SECURITY & -0.2184 & 0.2061 & -0.1934 & -0.1152 & 1.0000 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Note: Correlation Coefficients values more than 0.60 are highlighted.

Here the following parameters within this Group G are showing good correlation:
- Student Composition and Courses Offered
- NCC and Former Students

\subsection*{4.11.2 Correlation Matrices: Students}

\section*{Correlation Matrix for all parameters for Students}

Part B: Sources of Information and Influences
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & MOTHER & FATHER & FRIENDS & RELATIVES & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { FORMER } \\
\text { STUDENTS }
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { CAMPUS } \\
\text { VISIT } \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] \\
\hline MOTHER & 1.0000 & & & & & \\
\hline FATHER & 0.2620 & 1.0000 & & & & \\
\hline FRIENDS & 0.3197 & 0.4714 & 1.0000 & & & \\
\hline RELATIVES & 0.1479 & 0.1796 & 0.6674 & 1.0000 & & \\
\hline FORMER STUDENTS & 0.2759 & 0.0265 & 0.0792 & -0.1490 & 1.0000 & \\
\hline CAMPUS VISIT & 0.0643 & -0.1319 & 0.2468 & 0.1624 & 0.2321 & 1.0000 \\
\hline OLD & 0.4799 & 0.0997 & 0.2289 & 0.1764 & 0.0711 & -0.3010 \\
\hline NEW & 0.0744 & 0.0617 & 0.4439 & 0.3445 & -0.0329 & 0.2982 \\
\hline AIDED & 0.2766 & 0.4383 & 0.2291 & -0.1029 & 0.3050 & -0.2693 \\
\hline UNAIDED & 0.0564 & 0.0765 & 0.2277 & 0.4517 & 0.0226 & 0.0115 \\
\hline SCHOOL AFFILIATED & 0.0545 & 0.2910 & 0.2773 & 0.3084 & 0.0789 & -0.2577 \\
\hline SENIOR COLLEGE AFFILIATED & 0.0540 & 0.2805 & 0.3894 & 0.2682 & -0.1924 & 0.1415 \\
\hline LOCATION & 0.3459 & 0.0538 & 0.0865 & -0.0361 & 0.3881 & 0.2307 \\
\hline CONVEYANCE AVAILABLE & 0.0488 & -0.0430 & -0.0823 & 0.0120 & 0.1429 & -0.0082 \\
\hline FAMILY TRADITION & 0.1712 & 0.2326 & 0.4217 & 0.6141 & -0.0970 & 0.1272 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { REPUTATION OF } \\
& \text { INSTITUTION } \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] & 0.2097 & 0.5199 & 0.4035 & 0.2436 & 0.0106 & -0.4074 \\
\hline COURSES OFFERED & 0.0295 & 0.2690 & 0.0048 & -0.0691 & 0.0669 & -0.4435 \\
\hline TUTION FEES & 0.0779 & 0.2396 & 0.2217 & -0.0926 & 0.2869 & 0.0277 \\
\hline LIBRARY & 0.1952 & 0.0305 & -0.0192 & 0.0592 & 0.0478 & -0.0613 \\
\hline SPORTS FACILITIES & 0.0112 & -0.1524 & 0.1301 & 0.4191 & -0.2187 & 0.1209 \\
\hline AUDITORIUM & -0.0661 & -0.1000 & 0.1212 & 0.3676 & -0.1382 & 0.2020 \\
\hline CANTEEN & 0.1144 & 0.4153 & 0.3211 & 0.2178 & -0.1336 & -0.1775 \\
\hline IT LAB & 0.1469 & 0.3748 & 0.3233 & 0.3718 & -0.0400 & -0.0417 \\
\hline GUIDANCE AND COUNSELLING & 0.0367 & 0.3885 & 0.3086 & 0.3433 & 0.0115 & -0.2808 \\
\hline QUALIFIED STAFF & 0.2368 & 0.0267 & -0.1041 & -0.0074 & 0.0305 & -0.2486 \\
\hline CHOICE OF SUBJECTS & 0.4288 & 0.1198 & -0.1042 & -0.2897 & 0.4113 & -0.0739 \\
\hline SCHOLORSHIPS AVAILABLE & 0.1624 & 0.0903 & -0.0176 & 0.1181 & 0.2418 & -0.1657 \\
\hline UNIFORM & 0.0586 & 0.1152 & 0.1651 & 0.1599 & -0.3676 & -0.0706 \\
\hline ATTENDANCE & -0.2075 & 0.0127 & 0.1494 & 0.2075 & -0.2122 & 0.0769 \\
\hline COLLEGE TIMINGS & 0.0365 & 0.3217 & 0.2115 & 0.0177 & 0.0954 & -0.0361 \\
\hline STUDENT COMPOSITION & 0.4903 & 0.2832 & 0.3531 & 0.2364 & 0.1325 & 0.0199 \\
\hline EXTRA CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES & 0.0682 & 0.0661 & 0.2780 & 0.3992 & -0.1950 & 0.1302 \\
\hline USE OF MOBILE PHONES & 0.0835 & 0.3066 & 0.1230 & 0.0085 & -0.2316 & -0.1764 \\
\hline NCC & 0.0708 & 0.1462 & 0.2870 & 0.4568 & -0.2267 & 0.0174 \\
\hline SAFETY AND SECURITY & 0.0445 & 0.4189 & 0.3193 & 0.2485 & -0.1385 & -0.1156 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Note: Correlation Coefficients values more than 0.50 are highlighted.

Here the following parameters within this Group B are showing good correlation:
- Father and Reputation of the Institution
- Friends and Relatives
- Relatives and Family Tradition

Part C: College Basics
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & OLD & NEW & AIDED & UNAIDED & \begin{tabular}{l}
SCHOOL \\
AFFILIATED
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
SENIOR COLLEGE \\
AFFILIATED
\end{tabular} \\
\hline MOTHER & 0.4799 & 0.0744 & 0.2766 & 0.0564 & 0.0545 & 0.0540 \\
\hline FATHER & 0.0997 & 0.0617 & 0.4383 & 0.0765 & 0.2910 & 0.2805 \\
\hline FRIENDS & 0.2289 & 0.4439 & 0.2291 & 0.2277 & 0.2773 & 0.3894 \\
\hline RELATIVES & 0.1764 & 0.3445 & -0.1029 & 0.4517 & 0.3084 & 0.2682 \\
\hline FORMER STUDENTS & 0.0711 & \[
0.0329
\] & 0.3050 & 0.0226 & 0.0789 & -0.1924 \\
\hline CAMPUS VISIT & -0.3010 & 0.2982 & -0.2693 & 0.0115 & -0.2577 & 0.1415 \\
\hline OLD & 1.0000 & & & & & \\
\hline NEW & -0.0254 & 1.0000 & & & & \\
\hline AIDED & 0.1719 & 0.0906 & 1.0000 & & & \\
\hline UNAIDED & -0.0573 & \[
0.1419
\] & -0.0859 & 1.0000 & & \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { SCHOOL } \\
& \text { AFFILIATED }
\end{aligned}
\] & -0.0238 & \[
0.0199
\] & 0.2393 & 0.4402 & 1.0000 & \\
\hline SENIOR COLLEGE AFFILIATED & -0.1297 & 0.3725 & 0.3155 & -0.2126 & -0.2489 & 1.0000 \\
\hline LOCATION & 0.1246 & \[
0.0711
\] & 0.0955 & -0.0192 & 0.1480 & -0.1258 \\
\hline CONVEYANCE AVAILABLE & 0.1304 & \[
0.0456
\] & -0.0214 & -0.1097 & 0.1630 & -0.1595 \\
\hline FAMILY TRADITION & 0.0172 & 0.2201 & 0.0137 & 0.3171 & 0.3099 & 0.1921 \\
\hline REPUTATION OF INSTITUTION & 0.2691 & 0.0852 & 0.5858 & 0.1763 & 0.4743 & 0.2799 \\
\hline COURSES OFFERED & 0.1251 & \[
0.1272
\] & 0.4477 & 0.0385 & 0.3195 & 0.0562 \\
\hline TUTION FEES & -0.1168 & 0.0226 & 0.3369 & 0.2826 & 0.2531 & 0.0641 \\
\hline LIBRARY & 0.1589 & \[
0.2554
\] & 0.0800 & 0.1278 & 0.2388 & -0.1478 \\
\hline SPORTS FACILITIES & 0.1382 & \[
0.0288
\] & -0.3377 & 0.3607 & 0.0012 & -0.0522 \\
\hline AUDITORIUM & 0.1759 & \[
0.0611
\] & -0.3848 & 0.3938 & -0.0226 & -0.1399 \\
\hline CANTEEN & 0.0310 & 0.0047 & 0.4725 & 0.1953 & 0.2134 & 0.4006 \\
\hline IT LAB & -0.0145 & 0.1631 & 0.4078 & 0.1505 & 0.2362 & 0.3196 \\
\hline GUIDANCE AND COUNSELLING & 0.1283 & 0.0233 & 0.3436 & 0.2154 & 0.5386 & 0.0695 \\
\hline QUALIFIED STAFF & 0.3019 & 0.2873 & -0.0238 & 0.0121 & 0.0910 & -0.2108 \\
\hline CHOICE OF SUBJECTS & 0.3703 & \[
0.1644
\] & 0.2275 & -0.3043 & -0.1989 & -0.0436 \\
\hline SCHOLORSHIPS AVAILABLE & 0.1091 & \[
0.2120
\] & 0.1169 & 0.2739 & 0.3912 & -0.2802 \\
\hline UNIFORM & 0.0024 & 0.2226 & -0.0137 & -0.0167 & 0.1461 & 0.2624 \\
\hline ATTENDANCE & -0.3568 & 0.4118 & -0.1209 & -0.0557 & 0.1603 & 0.2550 \\
\hline COLLEGE TIMINGS & -0.2297 & \[
0.0383
\] & 0.3656 & -0.0583 & 0.2616 & 0.2482 \\
\hline STUDENT COMPOSITION & 0.4158 & 0.2268 & 0.2724 & 0.2144 & 0.1746 & 0.1139 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { EXTRA } \\
& \text { CURRICULAR } \\
& \text { ACTIVITIES } \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] & 0.2006 & 0.1673 & -0.1185 & 0.2674 & 0.0507 & 0.1681 \\
\hline USE OF MOBILE PHONES & 0.0191 & \[
0.0894
\] & 0.4556 & -0.1105 & 0.0260 & 0.4575 \\
\hline NCC & 0.1270 & 0.0757 & -0.0954 & 0.1575 & 0.1721 & 0.2288 \\
\hline SAFETY AND SECURITY & -0.1433 & 0.1666 & 0.4398 & -0.0044 & 0.2939 & 0.5496 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Note: Correlation Coefficients values more than 0.50 are highlighted.

Here the following parameters within this Group C are showing good correlation:
- Aided and Reputation of the Institution
- School Affiliated and Guidance and Counselling
- Senior College Affiliated and Safety and Security

Part D: Significant Factors
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { LOCATIO } \\
N \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { CONVEYANC } \\
E \\
\text { AVAILABLE } \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
FAMILY \\
TRADITION
\end{tabular} & REPUTATION OF INSTITUTION & \begin{tabular}{l}
COURSES \\
OFFERED
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { TUITION } \\
\text { FEES }
\end{gathered}
\] \\
\hline MOTHER & 0.3459 & 0.0488 & 0.1712 & 0.2097 & 0.0295 & 0.0779 \\
\hline FATHER & 0.0538 & -0.0430 & 0.2326 & 0.5199 & 0.2690 & 0.2396 \\
\hline FRIENDS & 0.0865 & -0.0823 & 0.4217 & 0.4035 & 0.0048 & 0.2217 \\
\hline RELATIVES & -0.0361 & 0.0120 & 0.6141 & 0.2436 & -0.0691 & -0.0926 \\
\hline FORMER STUDENTS & 0.3881 & 0.1429 & -0.0970 & 0.0106 & 0.0669 & 0.2869 \\
\hline CAMPUS VISIT & 0.2307 & -0.0082 & 0.1272 & -0.4074 & -0.4435 & 0.0277 \\
\hline OLD & 0.1246 & 0.1304 & 0.0172 & 0.2691 & 0.1251 & -0.1168 \\
\hline NEW & -0.0711 & -0.0456 & 0.2201 & 0.0852 & -0.1272 & 0.0226 \\
\hline AIDED & 0.0955 & -0.0214 & 0.0137 & 0.5858 & 0.4477 & 0.3369 \\
\hline UNAIDED & -0.0192 & -0.1097 & 0.3171 & 0.1763 & 0.0385 & 0.2826 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
SCHOOL \\
AFFILIATED
\end{tabular} & 0.1480 & 0.1630 & 0.3099 & 0.4743 & 0.3195 & 0.2531 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { SR. COLLEGE } \\
& \text { AFFILIATED } \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] & -0.1258 & -0.1595 & 0.1921 & 0.2799 & 0.0562 & 0.0641 \\
\hline LOCATION & 1.0000 & & & & & \\
\hline CONVEYANCE AVAILABLE & 0.3327 & 1.0000 & & & & \\
\hline FAMILY TRADITION & -0.0639 & 0.0606 & 1.0000 & & & \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { REPUTATION } \\
& \text { OF } \\
& \text { INSTITUTION }
\end{aligned}
\] & 0.0213 & -0.0218 & 0.2946 & 1.0000 & & \\
\hline COURSES OFFERED & 0.0353 & 0.0510 & -0.1234 & 0.5762 & 1.0000 & \\
\hline TUTION FEES & 0.2090 & -0.0251 & 0.0364 & 0.3291 & 0.1826 & 1.0000 \\
\hline LIBRARY & 0.3531 & 0.3112 & 0.0526 & 0.1893 & 0.1478 & 0.0637 \\
\hline SPORTS FACILITIES & 0.1016 & 0.2666 & 0.1879 & -0.0356 & -0.1219 & -0.1482 \\
\hline AUDITORIUM & -0.0421 & 0.0611 & 0.1675 & 0.0006 & -0.0032 & -0.0998 \\
\hline CANTEEN & -0.0649 & -0.0201 & 0.2070 & 0.5002 & 0.2613 & 0.2646 \\
\hline IT LAB & 0.0041 & 0.1204 & 0.3251 & 0.4759 & 0.2596 & 0.0353 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { GUIDANCE } \\
& \text { AND } \\
& \text { COUNSELLING }
\end{aligned}
\] & -0.0524 & 0.1446 & 0.2298 & 0.5277 & 0.4028 & 0.1565 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { QUALIFIED } \\
& \text { STAFF } \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] & 0.2279 & 0.2911 & -0.1644 & 0.0495 & 0.2602 & -0.2553 \\
\hline CHOICE OF SUBJECTS & 0.2182 & 0.2881 & -0.2421 & 0.0323 & 0.2496 & 0.0000 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { SCHOLORSHIP } \\
& \text { S AVAILABLE }
\end{aligned}
\] & 0.2008 & 0.1467 & 0.0886 & 0.2960 & 0.3190 & 0.0739 \\
\hline UNIFORM & -0.2402 & 0.0437 & 0.3643 & 0.2381 & 0.0654 & -0.1165 \\
\hline ATTENDANCE & -0.1280 & 0.0250 & 0.3558 & 0.0519 & 0.0025 & 0.0493 \\
\hline COLLEGE TIMINGS & 0.0832 & 0.0517 & 0.1744 & 0.3213 & 0.2495 & 0.2716 \\
\hline STUDENT
COMPOSITION & 0.2746 & 0.2194 & 0.2931 & 0.5083 & 0.2680 & 0.1150 \\
\hline EXTRA CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES & 0.0988 & 0.1670 & 0.3127 & 0.2516 & 0.1432 & -0.0538 \\
\hline USE OF MOBILE PHONES & -0.0236 & -0.1320 & 0.0860 & 0.3813 & 0.2025 & 0.1508 \\
\hline NCC & -0.0858 & 0.1021 & 0.7128 & 0.3070 & -0.0822 & -0.1136 \\
\hline SAFETY AND SECURITY & 0.1712 & 0.1361 & 0.3653 & 0.5832 & 0.2814 & 0.2540 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Note: Correlation Coefficients values more than 0.50 are highlighted.

Here the following parameters within this Group D are showing good correlation:
- Family Tradition and Relatives
- Family Tradition and NCC
- Reputation of Institution and Father
- Reputation of Institution and Aided
- Reputation of Institution and Courses Offered
- Reputation of Institution and Canteen
- Reputation of Institution and Guidance and Counselling
- Reputation of Institution and Student Composition
- Reputation of Institution and Safety and Security

Part E: Infrastructure
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & LIBRARY & \begin{tabular}{l}
SPORTS \\
FACILITIES
\end{tabular} & AUDITORIUM & CANTEEN & IT LAB & GUIDANCE AND COUNSELLING \\
\hline MOTHER & 0.1952 & 0.0112 & -0.0661 & 0.1144 & 0.1469 & 0.0367 \\
\hline FATHER & 0.0305 & -0.1524 & -0.1000 & 0.4153 & 0.3748 & 0.3885 \\
\hline FRIENDS & -0.0192 & 0.1301 & 0.1212 & 0.3211 & 0.3233 & 0.3086 \\
\hline RELATIVES & 0.0592 & 0.4191 & 0.3676 & 0.2178 & 0.3718 & 0.3433 \\
\hline FORMER STUDENTS & 0.0478 & -0.2187 & -0.1382 & -0.1336 & -0.0400 & 0.0115 \\
\hline CAMPUS VISIT & -0.0613 & 0.1209 & 0.2020 & -0.1775 & -0.0417 & -0.2808 \\
\hline OLD & 0.1589 & 0.1382 & 0.1759 & 0.0310 & -0.0145 & 0.1283 \\
\hline NEW & -0.2554 & -0.0288 & -0.0611 & -0.0047 & 0.1631 & 0.0233 \\
\hline AIDED & 0.0800 & -0.3377 & -0.3848 & 0.4725 & 0.4078 & 0.3436 \\
\hline UNAIDED & 0.1278 & 0.3607 & 0.3938 & 0.1953 & 0.1505 & 0.2154 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
SCHOOL \\
AFFILIATED
\end{tabular} & 0.2388 & 0.0012 & -0.0226 & 0.2134 & 0.2362 & 0.5386 \\
\hline SENIOR COLLEGE AFFILIATED & -0.1478 & -0.0522 & -0.1399 & 0.4006 & 0.3196 & 0.0695 \\
\hline LOCATION & 0.3531 & 0.1016 & -0.0421 & -0.0649 & 0.0041 & -0.0524 \\
\hline CONVEYANCE AVAILABLE & 0.3112 & 0.2666 & 0.0611 & -0.0201 & 0.1204 & 0.1446 \\
\hline FAMILY TRADITION & 0.0526 & 0.1879 & 0.1675 & 0.2070 & 0.3251 & 0.2298 \\
\hline REPUTATION OF INSTITUTION & 0.1893 & -0.0356 & 0.0006 & 0.5002 & 0.4759 & 0.5277 \\
\hline COURSES OFFERED & 0.1478 & -0.1219 & -0.0032 & 0.2613 & 0.2596 & 0.4028 \\
\hline TUTION FEES & 0.0637 & -0.1482 & -0.0998 & 0.2646 & 0.0353 & 0.1565 \\
\hline LIBRARY & 1.0000 & & & & & \\
\hline SPORTS FACILITIES & 0.3173 & 1.0000 & & & & \\
\hline AUDITORIUM & 0.2387 & 0.6669 & 1.0000 & & & \\
\hline CANTEEN & -0.0806 & -0.0074 & 0.0043 & 1.0000 & & \\
\hline IT LAB & -0.0119 & 0.2045 & 0.0714 & 0.5110 & 1.0000 & \\
\hline GUIDANCE AND COUNSELLING & 0.0881 & -0.0927 & -0.0351 & 0.3761 & 0.3818 & 1.0000 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { QUALIFIED } \\
& \text { STAFF }
\end{aligned}
\] & 0.4432 & 0.3089 & 0.1799 & -0.1007 & 0.0901 & 0.2222 \\
\hline CHOICE OF SUBJECTS & 0.1653 & -0.1698 & -0.1300 & -0.0510 & 0.0304 & 0.1177 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
SCHOLORSHIPS \\
AVAILABLE
\end{tabular} & 0.3838 & 0.1185 & 0.1484 & -0.1098 & -0.0640 & 0.3862 \\
\hline UNIFORM & 0.0303 & 0.2191 & 0.1449 & 0.0771 & 0.1384 & 0.0190 \\
\hline ATTENDANCE & -0.0062 & 0.0474 & -0.0198 & -0.0949 & 0.0525 & 0.1647 \\
\hline COLLEGE TIMINGS & -0.0285 & -0.3790 & -0.3755 & 0.2671 & 0.3588 & 0.4612 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { STUDENT } \\
& \text { COMPOSITION }
\end{aligned}
\] & 0.3196 & 0.1817 & 0.2191 & 0.2782 & 0.2528 & 0.2622 \\
\hline EXTRA CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES & 0.2095 & 0.6108 & 0.5902 & 0.1988 & 0.2881 & 0.2134 \\
\hline USE OF MOBILE PHONES & -0.0114 & -0.0539 & -0.1724 & 0.5604 & 0.3265 & 0.1257 \\
\hline NCC & 0.1637 & 0.3568 & 0.2734 & 0.2203 & 0.2397 & 0.1239 \\
\hline SAFETY AND SECURITY & 0.0200 & -0.1318 & -0.2487 & 0.5051 & 0.5625 & 0.4322 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Note: Correlation Coefficients values more than 0.50 are highlighted.

Here the following parameters within this Group E are showing good correlation:
- Sports Facilities and Extracurricular Activities
- Auditorium and Extracurricular Activities
- Canteen and Reputation of the Institution
- Canteen and Use of Mobile Phones
- Canteen and Safety and Security
- Guidance and Counselling and School Affiliated
- Guidance and Counselling and Reputation of the Institution

Part F: Student Specific Factors
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { QUALIFIED } \\
\text { STAFF } \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
CHOICE OF \\
SUBJECTS
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
SCHOLORSHIPS \\
AVAILABLE
\end{tabular} & UNIFORM & ATTENDANCE & \begin{tabular}{l}
COLLEGE \\
TIMINGS
\end{tabular} \\
\hline MOTHER & 0.2368 & 0.4288 & 0.1624 & 0.0586 & -0.2075 & 0.0365 \\
\hline FATHER & 0.0267 & 0.1198 & 0.0903 & 0.1152 & 0.0127 & 0.3217 \\
\hline FRIENDS & -0.1041 & -0.1042 & -0.0176 & 0.1651 & 0.1494 & 0.2115 \\
\hline RELATIVES & -0.0074 & -0.2897 & 0.1181 & 0.1599 & 0.2075 & 0.0177 \\
\hline FORMER STUDENTS & 0.0305 & 0.4113 & 0.2418 & -0.3676 & -0.2122 & 0.0954 \\
\hline CAMPUS VISIT & -0.2486 & -0.0739 & -0.1657 & -0.0706 & 0.0769 & -0.0361 \\
\hline OLD & 0.3019 & 0.3703 & 0.1091 & 0.0024 & -0.3568 & -0.2297 \\
\hline NEW & -0.2873 & -0.1644 & -0.2120 & 0.2226 & 0.4118 & -0.0383 \\
\hline AIDED & -0.0238 & 0.2275 & 0.1169 & -0.0137 & -0.1209 & 0.3656 \\
\hline UNAIDED & 0.0121 & -0.3043 & 0.2739 & -0.0167 & -0.0557 & -0.0583 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { SCHOOL } \\
& \text { AFFILIATED }
\end{aligned}
\] & 0.0910 & -0.1989 & 0.3912 & 0.1461 & 0.1603 & 0.2616 \\
\hline SR. COLLEGE AFFILIATED & -0.2108 & -0.0436 & -0.2802 & 0.2624 & 0.2550 & 0.2482 \\
\hline LOCATION & 0.2279 & 0.2182 & 0.2008 & -0.2402 & -0.1280 & 0.0832 \\
\hline CONVEYANCE AVAILABLE & 0.2911 & 0.2881 & 0.1467 & 0.0437 & 0.0250 & 0.0517 \\
\hline FAMILY TRADITION & -0.1644 & -0.2421 & 0.0886 & 0.3643 & 0.3558 & 0.1744 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { REPUTATION } \\
& \text { OF } \\
& \text { INSTITUTION }
\end{aligned}
\] & 0.0495 & 0.0323 & 0.2960 & 0.2381 & 0.0519 & 0.3213 \\
\hline COURSES OFFERED & 0.2602 & 0.2496 & 0.3190 & 0.0654 & 0.0025 & 0.2495 \\
\hline TUTION FEES & -0.2553 & 0.0000 & 0.0739 & -0.1165 & 0.0493 & 0.2716 \\
\hline LIBRARY & 0.4432 & 0.1653 & 0.3838 & 0.0303 & -0.0062 & -0.0285 \\
\hline SPORTS FACILITIES & 0.3089 & -0.1698 & 0.1185 & 0.2191 & 0.0474 & -0.3790 \\
\hline AUDITORIUM & 0.1799 & -0.1300 & 0.1484 & 0.1449 & -0.0198 & -0.3755 \\
\hline CANTEEN & -0.1007 & -0.0510 & -0.1098 & 0.0771 & -0.0949 & 0.2671 \\
\hline IT LAB & 0.0901 & 0.0304 & -0.0640 & 0.1384 & 0.0525 & 0.3588 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { GUIDANCE } \\
& \text { AND } \\
& \text { COUNSELLING }
\end{aligned}
\] & 0.2222 & 0.1177 & 0.3862 & 0.0190 & 0.1647 & 0.4612 \\
\hline QUALIFIED STAFF & 1.0000 & & & & & \\
\hline CHOICE OF SUBJECTS & 0.5098 & 1.0000 & & & & \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { SCHOLORSHIP } \\
& \text { S AVAILABLE }
\end{aligned}
\] & 0.3028 & 0.1782 & 1.0000 & & & \\
\hline UNIFORM & -0.0152 & -0.1551 & 0.0595 & 1.0000 & & \\
\hline ATTENDANCE & -0.0330 & -0.2440 & -0.0549 & 0.5034 & 1.0000 & \\
\hline COLLEGE TIMINGS & 0.0413 & 0.1901 & 0.0736 & 0.1189 & 0.3673 & 1.0000 \\
\hline STUDENT COMPOSITION & 0.2759 & 0.2401 & 0.2267 & 0.1203 & -0.1074 & -0.0170 \\
\hline EXTRA CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES & 0.2100 & -0.1600 & 0.1004 & 0.2106 & 0.0814 & -0.1501 \\
\hline USE OF MOBILE PHONES & -0.2975 & -0.1007 & 0.0189 & 0.1233 & -0.1506 & 0.1914 \\
\hline NCC & -0.1835 & -0.3214 & 0.0572 & 0.4580 & 0.1992 & -0.0068 \\
\hline SAFETY AND SECURITY & -0.0665 & -0.1197 & -0.0963 & 0.0664 & 0.2361 & 0.4819 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Note: Correlation Coefficients values more than 0.50 are highlighted.

Here the following parameters within this Group F are showing good correlation
- Qualified Staff and Choice of Subjects

Part G: Social Life on Campus
\begin{tabular}{|l|r|r|r|r|r|}
\hline & \begin{tabular}{c} 
STUDENT \\
COMPOSITION
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
EXTRA \\
CURRICULAR \\
ACTIVITIES
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
USE OF \\
MOBILE \\
PHONES
\end{tabular} & NCC & \begin{tabular}{c} 
SAFETY AND \\
SECURITY
\end{tabular} \\
\hline MOTHER & 0.4903 & 0.0682 & 0.0835 & 0.0708 & 0.0445 \\
\hline FATHER & 0.2832 & 0.0661 & 0.3066 & 0.1462 & 0.4189 \\
\hline FRIENDS & 0.3531 & 0.2780 & 0.1230 & 0.2870 & 0.3193 \\
\hline RELATIVES & 0.2364 & 0.3992 & 0.0085 & 0.4568 & 0.2485 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
FORMER \\
STUDENTS
\end{tabular} & 0.1325 & 0.0199 & -0.1950 & 0.1302 & -0.2316
\end{tabular}

Note: Correlation Coefficients values more than 0.50 are highlighted.

Here the following parameters within this Group G are showing good correlation:
- Student Composition and Reputation of the Institution
- Student Composition and Extracurricular Activities
- Extracurricular Activities and Sports Facilities
- Extracurricular Activities and Auditorium
- Extracurricular Activities and NCC
- Use of Mobile Phones and Canteen
- NCC and Family Tradition
- Safety and Security and Senior College Affiliated
- Safety and Security and Reputation of the Institution
- Safety and Security and Canteen
- Safety and Security and IT Lab

\subsection*{4.11.3Correlation Matrices: Management Representatives}

Correlation matrices based on the management representative responses and their interpretation is provided subsequently.

Correlation Matrix for all parameters for Management Representatives
Part D: Significant Factors
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & LOCATION & \begin{tabular}{l}
CONVEYANCE \\
AVAILABLE
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
FAMILY \\
TRADITION
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { REPUTATION } \\
\text { OF } \\
\text { INSTITUTION }
\end{gathered}
\] & COURSES OFFERED & \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { TUITI } \\
\text { ON } \\
\text { FEES }
\end{gathered}
\] \\
\hline LOCATION \({ }^{\text {- }}\) & 1.0000 & & & & & \\
\hline CONVEYANCE AVAILABLE & 0.9096 & 1.0000 & & & & \\
\hline FAMILY TRADITION & 0.3497 & 0.2106 & 1.0000 & & & \\
\hline REPUTATION OF
INSTITUTION & 0.0164 & -0.0513 & -0.4240 & 1.0000 & & \\
\hline COURSES OFFERED & 0.2441 & 0.0944 & -0.0225 & 0.4331 & 1.0000 & \\
\hline TUTION FEES & 0.2352 & 0.0852 & 0.2131 & 0.3121 & 0.2803 & 1.0000 \\
\hline LIBRARY & 0.4215 & 0.2723 & 0.3749 & 0.3521 & 0.5364 & 0.4146 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
SPORTS \\
FACILITIES
\end{tabular} & 0.3639 & 0.3241 & 0.2459 & 0.3180 & 0.1929 & 0.6695 \\
\hline AUDITORIUM & 0.1105 & 0.0989 & 0.0985 & 0.3227 & 0.5376 & 0.0504 \\
\hline CANTEEN & 0.0464 & -0.0352 & 0.2778 & -0.0411 & 0.0871 & 0.2144 \\
\hline IT LAB & 0.4109 & 0.3653 & -0.0269 & 0.2045 & 0.6048 & 0.3380 \\
\hline GUIDANCE AND COUNSELLING & 0.0806 & 0.0238 & 0.1065 & 0.1665 & 0.3238 & 0.1966 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { QUALIFIED } \\
& \text { STAFF } \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] & 1.0000 & 0.9096 & 0.3497 & 0.0164 & 0.2441 & 0.2352 \\
\hline CHOICE OF SUBJECTS & 0.9096 & 1.0000 & 0.2106 & -0.0513 & 0.0944 & 0.0852 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
SCHOLORSHIPS \\
AVAILABLE
\end{tabular} & 0.0677 & 0.0289 & 0.3310 & -0.1002 & -0.2204 & 0.0045 \\
\hline UNIFORM & 0.4331 & 0.3864 & 0.4984 & 0.1459 & 0.1909 & 0.2985 \\
\hline ATTENDANCE & 0.1145 & 0.0067 & 0.1782 & 0.1782 & 0.4615 & 0.0958 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { COLLEGE } \\
& \text { TIMINGS }
\end{aligned}
\] & 0.0794 & -0.1426 & 0.2231 & -0.0922 & 0.0320 & 0.1806 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { STUDENT } \\
& \text { COMPOSITION }
\end{aligned}
\] & -0.0429 & -0.0805 & -0.0428 & 0.1751 & 0.3751 & 0.1597 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { EXTRA } \\
& \text { CURRICULAR } \\
& \text { ACTIVITIES } \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] & 0.3320 & 0.2951 & 0.3047 & 0.3534 & 0.2971 & 0.4126 \\
\hline USE OF MOBILE PHONES & -0.1516 & -0.0178 & -0.3989 & -0.0427 & -0.1458 & 0.2627 \\
\hline NCC & 0.1911 & 0.1651 & 0.1115 & 0.0366 & 0.4150 & 0.0743 \\
\hline SAFETY AND SECURITY & 0.2152 & 0.1732 & -0.1849 & 0.3007 & 0.0946 & 0.3331 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Here the following parameters within this Group D are showing good correlation:
- Location and Conveyance Available
- Location and Qualified Staff
- Location and Choice of Subjects
- Conveyance Available and Qualified Staff
- Conveyance Available and Choice of Subjects

Note: Higher Correlation Coefficients values are highlighted.

Part E: Infrastructure
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & LIBRARY & SPORTS FACILITIES & AUDITORIUM & CANTEEN & IT LAB & \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { GUIDANCE } \\
\text { AND } \\
\text { COUNSELLING }
\end{gathered}
\] \\
\hline LOCATION & 0.4215 & 0.3639 & 0.1105 & 0.0464 & 0.4109 & 0.0806 \\
\hline CONVEYANCE AVAILABLE & 0.2723 & 0.3241 & 0.0989 & -0.0352 & 0.3653 & 0.0238 \\
\hline FAMILY TRADITION & 0.3749 & 0.2459 & 0.0985 & 0.2778 & -0.0269 & 0.1065 \\
\hline REPUTATION OF INSTITUTION & 0.3521 & 0.3180 & 0.3227 & -0.0411 & 0.2045 & 0.1665 \\
\hline COURSES OFFERED & 0.5364 & 0.1929 & 0.5376 & 0.0871 & 0.6048 & 0.3238 \\
\hline TUTION FEES & 0.4146 & 0.6695 & 0.0504 & -0.2144 & 0.3380 & -0.1966 \\
\hline LIBRARY & 1.0000 & & & & & \\
\hline SPORTS FACILITIES & 0.5107 & 1.0000 & & & & \\
\hline AUDITORIUM & 0.3263 & 0.0822 & 1.0000 & & & \\
\hline CANTEEN & 0.2261 & -0.2985 & 0.3492 & 1.0000 & & \\
\hline IT LAB & 0.4329 & 0.4514 & 0.0641 & -0.2232 & 1.0000 & \\
\hline GUIDANCE AND COUNSELLING & 0.1913 & 0.1159 & 0.2420 & 0.1098 & 0.2485 & 1.0000 \\
\hline QUALIFIED STAFF & 0.4215 & 0.3639 & 0.1105 & 0.0464 & 0.4109 & 0.0806 \\
\hline CHOICE OF SUBJECTS & 0.2723 & 0.3241 & 0.0989 & -0.0352 & 0.3653 & 0.0238 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
SCHOLORSHIPS \\
AVAILABLE
\end{tabular} & 0.1931 & -0.0925 & 0.0603 & 0.1784 & -0.3141 & 0.1209 \\
\hline UNIFORM & 0.5409 & 0.3928 & 0.3136 & 0.2880 & 0.2924 & 0.1218 \\
\hline ATTENDANCE & 0.3396 & 0.1861 & 0.3934 & -0.0176 & 0.1424 & 0.2561 \\
\hline COLLEGE TIMINGS & 0.0335 & -0.0036 & -0.1398 & -0.0747 & 0.1033 & -0.0336 \\
\hline STUDENT
COMPOSITION & 0.2332 & 0.1130 & 0.2351 & -0.0585 & 0.3307 & 0.3139 \\
\hline EXTRA CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES & 0.5154 & 0.6052 & 0.3536 & 0.0376 & 0.1951 & 0.1289 \\
\hline USE OF MOBILE PHONES & -0.3071 & -0.1817 & 0.0082 & -0.2121 & -0.0274 & 0.1739 \\
\hline NCC & 0.2205 & 0.1070 & 0.5109 & 0.0205 & 0.0850 & -0.0485 \\
\hline SAFETY AND SECURITY & 0.2354 & 0.4879 & -0.0324 & -0.1377 & 0.3238 & -0.0842 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Here none of the parameters within this Group E are showing good correlation.

Note: Higher Correlation Coefficients values are highlighted.

Part F: Student Specific Factors
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { QUALIFIED } \\
\text { STAFF } \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { CHOICE OF } \\
\text { SUBJECTS } \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] & SCHOLORSHIP S AVAILABLE & UNIFORM & ATTENDANCE & \begin{tabular}{l}
COLLEGE \\
TIMINGS
\end{tabular} \\
\hline LOCATION & 1.0000 & 0.9096 & 0.0677 & 0.4331 & 0.1145 & 0.0794 \\
\hline CONVEYANCE AVAILABLE & 0.9096 & 1.0000 & 0.0289 & 0.3864 & 0.0067 & -0.1426 \\
\hline FAMILY TRADITION & 0.3497 & 0.2106 & 0.3310 & 0.4984 & 0.1782 & 0.2231 \\
\hline REPUTATION OF INSTITUTION & 0.0164 & -0.0513 & -0.1002 & 0.1459 & 0.1782 & -0.0922 \\
\hline COURSES OFFERED & 0.2441 & 0.0944 & -0.2204 & 0.1909 & 0.4615 & 0.0320 \\
\hline TUTION FEES & 0.2352 & 0.0852 & 0.0045 & 0.2985 & 0.0958 & 0.1806 \\
\hline LIBRARY & 0.4215 & 0.2723 & 0.1931 & 0.5409 & 0.3396 & 0.0335 \\
\hline SPORTS FACILITIES & 0.3639 & 0.3241 & -0.0925 & 0.3928 & 0.1861 & -0.0036 \\
\hline AUDITORIUM & 0.1105 & 0.0989 & 0.0603 & 0.3136 & 0.3934 & -0.1398 \\
\hline CANTEEN & 0.0464 & -0.0352 & 0.1784 & 0.2880 & -0.0176 & -0.0747 \\
\hline IT LAB & 0.4109 & 0.3653 & -0.3141 & 0.2924 & 0.1424 & 0.1033 \\
\hline GUIDANCE AND COUNSELLING & 0.0806 & 0.0238 & 0.1209 & 0.1218 & 0.2561 & -0.0336 \\
\hline QUALIFIED STAFF & 1.0000 & & & & & \\
\hline CHOICE OF SUBJECTS & 0.9096 & 1.0000 & & & & \\
\hline SCHOLORSHIPS AVAILABLE & 0.0677 & 0.0289 & 1.0000 & & & \\
\hline UNIFORM & 0.4331 & 0.3864 & 0.1009 & 1.0000 & & \\
\hline ATTENDANCE & 0.1145 & 0.0067 & -0.0272 & 0.1649 & 1.0000 & \\
\hline COLLEGE TIMINGS & 0.0794 & -0.1426 & 0.2209 & -0.0903 & 0.3610 & 1.0000 \\
\hline STUDENT
COMPOSITION & -0.0429 & -0.0805 & 0.1871 & 0.0812 & 0.0671 & -0.0780 \\
\hline EXTRA CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES & 0.3320 & 0.2951 & -0.0131 & 0.4296 & 0.4708 & -0.0023 \\
\hline USE OF MOBILE PHONES & -0.1516 & -0.0178 & 0.0063 & -0.3972 & -0.1729 & -0.2731 \\
\hline NCC & 0.1911 & 0.1651 & -0.2259 & 0.0623 & 0.3949 & -0.0690 \\
\hline SAFETY AND SECURITY & 0.2152 & 0.1732 & -0.3505 & 0.1404 & -0.2470 & -0.1528 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Here the following parameters within this Group F are showing good correlation:
- Qualified Staff and Location
- Qualified Staff and Conveyance Available
- Choice of Subjects and Location
- Choice of Subjects and Conveyance Available

Note: Higher Correlation Coefficients values are highlighted.

Part G: Social Life on Campus
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { STUDENT } \\
\text { COMPOSITION }
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { EXTRA } \\
\text { CURRICULAR } \\
\text { ACTIVITIES } \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] & USE OF MOBILE
PHONES & NCC & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { SAFETY } \\
\text { AND } \\
\text { SECURITY } \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] \\
\hline LOCATION & -0.0429 & 0.3320 & -0.1516 & 0.1911 & 0.2152 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
CONVEYANCE \\
AVAILABLE
\end{tabular} & -0.0805 & 0.2951 & -0.0178 & 0.1651 & 0.1732 \\
\hline FAMILY TRADITION & -0.0428 & 0.3047 & -0.3989 & 0.1115 & -0.1849 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { REPUTATION OF } \\
& \text { INSTITUTION }
\end{aligned}
\] & 0.1751 & 0.3534 & -0.0427 & 0.0366 & 0.3007 \\
\hline COURSES OFFERED & 0.3751 & 0.2971 & -0.1458 & 0.4150 & 0.0946 \\
\hline TUTION FEES & 0.1597 & 0.4126 & -0.2627 & 0.0743 & 0.3331 \\
\hline LIBRARY & 0.2332 & 0.5154 & -0.3071 & 0.2205 & 0.2354 \\
\hline SPORTS FACILITIES & 0.1130 & 0.6052 & -0.1817 & 0.1070 & 0.4879 \\
\hline AUDITORIUM & 0.2351 & 0.3536 & 0.0082 & 0.5109 & -0.0324 \\
\hline CANTEEN & -0.0585 & 0.0376 & -0.2121 & 0.0205 & -0.1377 \\
\hline IT LAB & 0.3307 & 0.1951 & -0.0274 & 0.0850 & 0.3238 \\
\hline GUIDANCE AND COUNSELLING & 0.3139 & 0.1289 & 0.1739 & -0.0485 & -0.0842 \\
\hline QUALIFIED STAFF & -0.0429 & 0.3320 & -0.1516 & 0.1911 & 0.2152 \\
\hline CHOICE OF SUBJECTS & -0.0805 & 0.2951 & -0.0178 & 0.1651 & 0.1732 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
SCHOLORSHIPS \\
AVAILABLE
\end{tabular} & 0.1871 & -0.0131 & 0.0063 & -0.2259 & -0.3505 \\
\hline UNIFORM & 0.0812 & 0.4296 & -0.3972 & 0.0623 & 0.1404 \\
\hline ATTENDANCE & 0.0671 & 0.4708 & -0.1729 & 0.3949 & -0.2470 \\
\hline COLLEGE TIMINGS & -0.0780 & -0.0023 & -0.2731 & -0.0690 & -0.1528 \\
\hline STUDENT COMPOSITION & 1.0000 & & & & \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { EXTRA } \\
& \text { CURRICULAR } \\
& \text { ACTIVITIES } \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] & -0.2498 & 1.0000 & & & \\
\hline USE OF MOBILE PHONES & 0.1409 & -0.2539 & 1.0000 & & \\
\hline NCC & -0.0400 & 0.4508 & -0.2161 & 1.0000 & \\
\hline SAFETY AND SECURITY & -0.1026 & 0.2775 & -0.0941 & 0.0925 & 1.0000 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Here none of the parameters within this Group \(G\) are showing good correlation.

Note: Higher Correlation Coefficients values are highlighted.

\subsection*{4.12 Hypotheses Testing}

Hypotheses for the said study are prepared for each section of the respondents' viz. the students, the parents and the management representatives. Details are as given below.

Hypothesis Testing based on statistical tests is presented here.

\section*{Hypotheses for the Study}
- \(\mathrm{H}_{01}\) - There is significant correlation between Location of the college and Conveyance available.
- \(\mathrm{H}_{02}\) - There is significant correlation between Reputation of the Institute and course offered.
- \(\mathrm{H}_{03}\) - There is significant correlation between Reputation of the Institute and Qualified Staff.
- \(\mathrm{H}_{04}\) - The perceptions of parents with respect to significant factors have an impact on management strategies.
- \(\mathrm{H}_{05}\) - The perceptions of students with respect to significant factors have an impact on management strategies.
- \(\mathrm{H}_{01}\) - There is significant correlation between Location of the college and Conveyance available.

We have considered two different data sets viz. Location of the College (LOC) and Conveyance Available (CON).

\section*{Parents}

Statistical details for the same are as below:
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|}
\hline Description & Parent LOC & Parent CON \\
\hline Mean (Average) & 4.30 & 4.20 \\
\hline Median & 4.00 & 4.00 \\
\hline Standard Deviation & 0.46 & 0.40 \\
\hline Standard Error & 0.03 & 0.02 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

We have applied F-Test, T-test and Mann-Whitney Test. The test results are as displayed below.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{F-Test - Variance} \\
\hline \(\mathrm{H}_{01}\) : is True & Parent LOC variance > Parent CON variance \\
\hline p-value: & 0.706\% \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Reject equality of variances - Use Heteroscedastic T-Test} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{T-Student Test (Homoscedastic)} \\
\hline \(\mathrm{H}_{01}\) : is True & Parent LOC average > Parent CON average \\
\hline p-value: & 0.167\% \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Reject equality of means} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{T-Student Test (Heteroscedastic)} \\
\hline \(\mathrm{H}_{01}\) : is True & Parent LOC average > Parent CON average \\
\hline p-value: & 0.168\% \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Reject equality of means} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Mann-Whitney Test} \\
\hline \(\mathrm{H}_{01}\) : is False & Parent LOC median < Parent CON median \\
\hline p-value: & 41.117\% \\
\hline Cannot reject equality of & edians \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Inference - The said hypothesis \(\mathbf{H}_{01}\) stands accepted.

\section*{Students}

Statistical details for the same are as below:
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|}
\hline Description & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Student \\
LOC
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Student \\
CON
\end{tabular} \\
\hline Mean (Average) & 4.33 & 4.07 \\
\hline Median & 4.00 & 4.00 \\
\hline Standard Deviation & 0.76 & 0.77 \\
\hline Standard Error & 0.04 & 0.04 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

We have applied F-Test, T-test and Mann-Whitney Test. The test results are as displayed below.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{F-Test - Variance} \\
\hline \(\mathrm{H}_{01}\) : is False & Student LOC variance > Student CON variance \\
\hline p-value: & 46.959\% \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Cannot reject equality of variances - Use Heteroscedastic T-Test} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{T-Student Test (Homoscedastic)} \\
\hline \(\mathrm{H}_{01}\) : is True & Student LOC average > Student CON average \\
\hline p-value: & 0.002\% \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Reject equality of means} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{T-Student Test (Heteroscedastic)} \\
\hline \(\mathrm{H}_{01}\) : is True & Student LOC average > Student CON average \\
\hline p-value: & 0.002\% \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Reject equality of means} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Mann-Whitney Test} \\
\hline \(\mathrm{H}_{01}\) : is True & Student LOC median >= Student CON median \\
\hline p-value: & 49.177\% \\
\hline Cannot reject equality of & dians \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Inference - The said hypothesis \(\mathbf{H}_{01}\) stands accepted.

\section*{Management Representatives}

Statistical details for the same are as below:
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|}
\hline Description & Mg LOC & Mg CON \\
\hline Mean (Average) & 3.96 & 3.86 \\
\hline Median & 4.00 & 4.00 \\
\hline Standard Deviation & 0.73 & 0.64 \\
\hline Standard Error & 0.10 & 0.09 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

We have applied F-Test, T-test and Mann-Whitney Test. The test results are as displayed below.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{F-Test - Variance} \\
\hline \(\mathrm{H}_{01}\) : is True & Mg LOC variance > Mg CON variance \\
\hline p-value: & 18.455\% \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Cannot reject equality of variances - Use Heteroscedastic T-Test} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{T-Student Test (Homoscedastic)} \\
\hline \(\mathrm{H}_{01}\) : is True & Mg LOC average > Mg CON average \\
\hline p-value: & 23.348\% \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Reject equality of means} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{T-Student Test (Heteroscedastic)} \\
\hline \(\mathrm{H}_{01}\) : is True & Mg LOC average > Mg CON average \\
\hline p-value: & 23.350\% \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Reject equality of means} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Mann-Whitney Test} \\
\hline \(\mathrm{H}_{01}\) : is True & Mg LOC median >= Mg CON median \\
\hline p-value: & 41.197\% \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Inference - The said hypothesis \(\mathrm{H}_{01}\) stands accepted.
- \(\mathrm{H}_{02}\) - There is significant correlation between Reputation of the Institute and course offered.

We have considered two different data sets viz. Reputation of Institution (RI) and Courses Offered (CO).

\section*{Parents}

Statistical details for the same are as below:
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|}
\hline Description & Parent RI & Parent CO \\
\hline Mean (Average) & 4.13 & 3.95 \\
\hline Median & 4.00 & 4.00 \\
\hline Standard Deviation & 0.50 & 0.81 \\
\hline Standard Error & 0.03 & 0.05 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

We have applied F-Test, T-test and Mann-Whitney Test. The test results are as displayed below.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{F-Test - Variance} \\
\hline \(\mathrm{H}_{02}\) : is False & Parent RI variance > Parent CO variance \\
\hline p-value: & 0.000\% \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Reject equality of variances - Use Heteroscedastic T-Test} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{T-Student Test (Homoscedastic)} \\
\hline \(\mathrm{H}_{02}\) : is True & Parent RI average > Parent CO average \\
\hline p-value: & 0.055\% \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Reject equality of means} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{T-Student Test (Heteroscedastic)} \\
\hline \(\mathrm{H}_{02}\) : is True & Parent RI average > Parent CO average \\
\hline p-value: & 0.056\% \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Reject equality of means} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Mann-Whitney Test} \\
\hline \(\mathrm{H}_{02}\) : is True & Parent RI median <= Parent CO median \\
\hline p-value: & 22.211\% \\
\hline Cannot reject equality of & edians \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Inference - The said hypothesis \(\mathbf{H}_{02}\) stands accepted.

\section*{Students}

Statistical details for the same are as below:
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|}
\hline Description & Student RI & Student CO \\
\hline Mean (Average) & 4.29 & 4.24 \\
\hline Median & 4.00 & 4.00 \\
\hline Standard Deviation & 0.80 & 0.68 \\
\hline Standard Error & 0.05 & 0.04 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

We have applied F-Test, T-test and Mann-Whitney Test. The test results are as displayed below.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{F-Test - Variance} \\
\hline \(\mathrm{H}_{02}\) : is True & Student RI variance > Student CO variance \\
\hline p-value: & 0.211\% \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Reject equality of variances - Use Heteroscedastic T-Test} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{T-Student Test (Homoscedastic)} \\
\hline \(\mathrm{H}_{02}\) : is True & Student RI average > Student CO average \\
\hline p-value: & 22.169\% \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Cannot reject equality of means} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{T-Student Test (Heteroscedastic)} \\
\hline \(\mathrm{H}_{02}\) : is True & Student RI average > Student CO average \\
\hline p-value: & 22.170\% \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Cannot reject equality of means} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Mann-Whitney Test} \\
\hline \(\mathrm{H}_{02}\) : is True & Student RI median <= Student CO median \\
\hline p-value: & 29.239\% \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Cannot reject equality of medians} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Inference - The said hypothesis \(\mathrm{H}_{02}\) stands accepted.

\section*{Management Representatives}

Statistical details for the same are as below:
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|}
\hline Description & Mg RI & Mg CO \\
\hline Mean (Average) & 4.16 & 4.06 \\
\hline Median & 4.00 & 4.00 \\
\hline Standard Deviation & 0.55 & 0.82 \\
\hline Standard Error & 0.08 & 0.12 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

We have applied F-Test, T-test and Mann-Whitney Test. The test results are as displayed below.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{F-Test - Variance} \\
\hline \(\mathrm{H}_{02}\) : is False & Mg RI variance > Mg CO variance \\
\hline p-value: & 0.292\% \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Reject equality of variances - Use Heteroscedastic T-Test} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{T-Student Test (Homoscedastic)} \\
\hline \(\mathrm{H}_{02}\) : is True & Mg RI average > Mg CO average \\
\hline p-value: & 23.727\% \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Cannot reject equality of means} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{T-Student Test (Heteroscedastic)} \\
\hline \(\mathrm{H}_{02}\) : is True & Mg RI average > Mg CO average \\
\hline p-value: & 23.739\% \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Cannot reject equality of means} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Mann-Whitney Test} \\
\hline \(\mathrm{H}_{02}\) : is True & Mg RI median < \(=\mathrm{Mg}\) CO median \\
\hline p-value: & 22.233\% \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Inference - The said hypothesis \(\mathbf{H}_{02}\) stands accepted.
- \(\mathrm{H}_{03}\) - There is significant correlation between Reputation of the Institute and Qualified Staff.

We have considered two different data sets viz. Reputation of Institution (RI) and Qualified Staff (QS).

\section*{Parents}

Statistical details for the same are as below:
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|}
\hline Description & Parent RI & Parent QS \\
\hline Mean (Average) & 4.13 & 4.60 \\
\hline Median & 4.00 & 5.00 \\
\hline Standard Deviation & 0.50 & 0.49 \\
\hline Standard Error & 0.03 & 0.03 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

We have applied F-Test, T-test and Mann-Whitney Test. The test results are as displayed below.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{F-Test - Variance} \\
\hline \(\mathrm{H}_{03}\) : is False & Parent RI variance < Parent QS variance \\
\hline p-value: & 32.309\% \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Reject equality of variances - Use Heteroscedastic T-Test} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{T-Student Test (Homoscedastic)} \\
\hline \(\mathrm{H}_{03}\) : is True & Parent RI average < Parent QS average \\
\hline p-value: & 0.000\% \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Cannot reject equality of means} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{T-Student Test (Heteroscedastic)} \\
\hline \(\mathrm{H}_{03}\) : is True & Parent RI average < Parent QS average \\
\hline p-value: & 0.000\% \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Cannot reject equality of means} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Mann-Whitney Test} \\
\hline \(\mathrm{H}_{03}\) : is True & Parent RI median < Parent QS median \\
\hline p-value: & 11.131\% \\
\hline Cannot reject equality of & dians \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Inference - The said hypothesis \(\mathbf{H}_{03}\) stands accepted.

\section*{Students}

Statistical details for the same are as below:
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|}
\hline Description & Student RI & Student QS \\
\hline Mean (Average) & 4.29 & 4.41 \\
\hline Median & 4.00 & 4.50 \\
\hline Standard Deviation & 0.80 & 0.65 \\
\hline Standard Error & 0.05 & 0.04 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

We have applied F-Test, T-test and Mann-Whitney Test. The test results are as displayed below.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{F-Test - Variance} \\
\hline \(\mathrm{H}_{03}\) : is False & Student RI variance < Student QS variance \\
\hline p-value: & 0.211\% \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Reject equality of variances - Use Heteroscedastic T-Test} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{T-Student Test (Homoscedastic)} \\
\hline \(\mathrm{H}_{03}\) : is True & Student RI average < Student QS average \\
\hline p-value: & 1.967\% \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Cannot reject equality of means} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{T-Student Test (Heteroscedastic)} \\
\hline \(\mathrm{H}_{03}\) : is True & Student RI average < Student QS average \\
\hline p-value: & 1.968\% \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Cannot reject equality of means} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Mann-Whitney Test} \\
\hline \(\mathrm{H}_{03}\) : is True & Student RI median <= Student QS median \\
\hline p-value: & 12.411\% \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Inference - The said hypothesis \(\mathrm{H}_{03}\) stands accepted.

\section*{Management Representatives}

Statistical details for the same are as below:
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|}
\hline Description & Mg RI & Mg QS \\
\hline Mean (Average) & 4.16 & 4.05 \\
\hline Median & 4.00 & 4.00 \\
\hline Standard Deviation & 0.55 & 0.76 \\
\hline Standard Error & 0.08 & 0.10 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

We have applied F-Test, T-test and Mann-Whitney Test. The test results are as displayed below.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{F-Test - Variance} \\
\hline \(\mathrm{H}_{03}\) : is False & Mg RI variance > Mg QS variance \\
\hline p-value: & 2.515\% \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Reject equality of variances - Use Heteroscedastic T-Test} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{T-Student Test (Homoscedastic)} \\
\hline \(\mathrm{H}_{03}\) : is True & Mg RI average > Mg QS average \\
\hline p-value: & 6.184\% \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Cannot reject equality of means} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{T-Student Test (Heteroscedastic)} \\
\hline \(\mathrm{H}_{03}\) : is True & Mg RI average > Mg QS average \\
\hline p-value: & 6.184\% \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Cannot reject equality of means} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Mann-Whitney Test} \\
\hline \(\mathrm{H}_{03}\) : is True & Mg RI median > = Mg CO median \\
\hline p-value: & 12.411\% \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Inference - The said hypothesis \(\mathbf{H}_{03}\) stands accepted.
- \(\mathrm{H}_{04}\) - The perceptions of parents with respect to significant factors have an impact on management strategies.
- \(\mathrm{H}_{05}\) - The perceptions of students with respect to significant factors have an impact on management strategies.

For the above stated hypothesis \(\mathrm{H}_{04}\) and \(\mathrm{H}_{05}\), we have considered dataset for Part \(\mathrm{H}(\mathrm{H} 1)\) in the management representative questionnaire.

We have applied one parameter t-test and z-test. The test results are as displayed below.
\begin{tabular}{|l|r|}
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{ One sample t test } \\
\hline Count & 55 \\
\hline Mean & 3.181818 \\
\hline std dev & 0.580259 \\
\hline std err & 0.078242 \\
\hline hypothetical mean & 0 \\
\hline A & 0.05 \\
\hline Tails & 1 \\
\hline Df & 54 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{t}\) stat & \(1.7322 \mathrm{E}-42\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{p}\) value & 0.062999 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{t}\) critical & yes \\
\hline Sig & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|l|r|}
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{ One sample z test } \\
\hline count & 55 \\
\hline mean & 3.181818 \\
\hline std dev & 0.580259 \\
\hline std err & 0.078242 \\
\hline hypothetical mean & 0 \\
\hline \(\boldsymbol{\alpha}\) & 0.05 \\
\hline tails & 1 \\
\hline df & 54 \\
\hline \(\boldsymbol{t}\) stat & 40.666325 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{p}\) value & \(6.6501 \mathrm{E}-10\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{t}\) critical & 0.062999 \\
\hline sig & yes \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Inference - The said hypotheses \(\mathrm{H}_{04}\) and \(\mathrm{H}_{05}\) stands accepted.

\section*{Summary of Hypotheses Testing}

Summary of Hypothesis Testing is presented below:
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|l|l|c|c|}
\hline Sr. & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Hypothesis \\
No.
\end{tabular} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{ Hypothesis Description } & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{ Inference } \\
\cline { 3 - 6 } & & & Parents & Students & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Management \\
Representatives
\end{tabular} \\
\hline 1 & \(\mathrm{H}_{01}\) & \begin{tabular}{l} 
There is significant correlation \\
between Location of the college and \\
Conveyance available.
\end{tabular} & Accepted & Accepted & Accepted \\
\hline 2 & \(\mathrm{H}_{02}\) & \begin{tabular}{l} 
There is significant correlation \\
between Reputation of the Institute \\
and course offered.
\end{tabular} & Accepted & Accepted & Accepted \\
\hline 3 & \(\mathrm{H}_{03}\) & \begin{tabular}{l} 
There is significant correlation \\
between Reputation of the Institute \\
and Qualified Staff.
\end{tabular} & Accepted & Accepted & Accepted \\
\hline 4 & \(\mathrm{H}_{04}\) & \begin{tabular}{l} 
The perceptions of parents with \\
respect to significant factors have an \\
impact on management strategies.
\end{tabular} & --- & --- & Accepted \\
\hline 5 & \(\mathrm{H}_{05}\) & \begin{tabular}{l} 
The perceptions of students with \\
respect to significant factors have an \\
impact on management strategies.
\end{tabular} & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\title{
Chapter 5: Conclusions, Suggestions / Recommendations and Scope of Study
}

Chapter 5 presents 'Conclusions' is based on the analysis of data. This chapter is titled as, 'Conclusions / Recommendations and Scope of Study.'

Field survey findings were analyzed based upon the data collected though the questionnaires.

\section*{Following conclusions were derived from the survey findings -}

\subsection*{5.1 Objective 1}

\section*{Objective 1}

To identify and analyze the factors that determines the Perceptions of Parents about the choice of junior college.

Table 1: Factors that determines the Perceptions of Parents about the choice of junior college
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{1}{|c|}{\begin{tabular}{c} 
FACTOR THAT DETERMINES \\
PERCEPTION OF PARENTS
\end{tabular}} & RANK \\
\hline Part D: Significant Factors & 1 \\
\hline Part F: Student Specific Factors & 2 \\
\hline Part G: Social Life on Campus & 3 \\
\hline Part B: Sources of Information and Influences & 4 \\
\hline Part C: College Basics & 5 \\
\hline Part E: Infrastructure & 6 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Note: These ranking are based on the total scores obtained by that particular sub-parameter.

\subsection*{5.1.1 Observations}
a. Of the six factors tested for perceptions of parents the top ranked factor was Significant factors; of which the top three factors in descending order of importance were found to be:
i. Reputation of the Institution
ii. Location
iii. Conveyance Available
b. The second ranked factor was Student Specific Factors, of which the top three factors in descending order of importance were found to be:
i. Qualified Staff
ii. Choice of Subjects
iii. College Timings
c. The third ranked factor was Social life on campus of which the top three factors in descending order of importance were found to be:
i. Safety and Security
ii. Student Composition
iii. Extra Curricular Activities

\subsection*{5.1.2 Conclusions}
a. It is clearly evident that older institutes are preferred as they have good reputation for years. Also these institutes are centrally located which facilitates ease in commuting.
b. The parents are aware of increasing scope of education and hence have given importance to choice of subject and qualified staff which can make a difference in teaching / learning to their wards.
c. Since the students of junior college are just out for school, the parents seem to be aware of their peer group, their personality development and are concerned about their safety and security.

Figure 1: Factors that determines the Perceptions of Parents about the choice of junior college


\subsection*{5.2 Objective 2}

\section*{Objective 2}

To identify and analyze the factors that determines the Perceptions of Students about the choice of junior college.

Table 2: Factors that determines the Perceptions of Students about the choice of junior college
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{1}{|c|}{\begin{tabular}{c} 
FACTOR THAT DETERMINES \\
PERCEPTION OF STUDENTS
\end{tabular}} & RANK \\
\hline Part D: Significant Factors & 1 \\
\hline Part G: Social Life on Campus & 2 \\
\hline Part E: Infrastructure & 3 \\
\hline Part F: Student Specific Factors & 4 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
Part B: Sources of Information and \\
Influences
\end{tabular} & 5 \\
\hline Part C: College Basics & 6 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Note: These ranking are based on the total scores obtained by that particular sub-parameter.

\subsection*{5.2.1 Observations}
a. Of the six factors tested for perceptions of students the top ranked factor was Significant factors; of which the top three factors in descending order of importance were found to be:
i. Location
ii. Reputation of the Institution
iii. Courses Offered
b. The second ranked factor was Social life on campus of which the top three factors in descending order of importance were found to be:
i. Safety and Security
ii. Student Composition
iii. Extra Curricular Activities
c. The third ranked factor was Infrastructure, of which the top three factors in descending order of importance were found to be:
i. Canteen
ii. Library
iii. IT Lab

\subsection*{5.2.2 Conclusions}
a. The students have also shown an inclination towards reputed institutes; however they prioritize between reputation and location as per their convenience.
b. Junior college gives scope for overall development with choice of subjects and extracurricular activities. This is what students who are just out of school wish for. The interaction with new peers is also an attraction for students in junior college.
c. The students give a lot of importance to physical facilities which can be actually experienced by them. Canteen is a hub which they like and reserved for social interaction.

Figure 2; Factors that determines the Perceptions of Students about the choice of junior college
\begin{tabular}{lll} 
& Location \\
Reputation \\
the Institution
\end{tabular}

\subsection*{5.3 Objective 3}

\section*{Objective 3}

To compare the perceptions of parents and students regarding selection of junior colleges.

Table 3: Factors that determines the Perceptions - Comparison of Ranks by Parents and Students
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{1}{|c|}{\begin{tabular}{l} 
FACTOR THAT DETERMINES \\
PERCEPTION - COMAPRISON
\end{tabular}} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
RANK BY \\
PARENTS
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
RANK BY \\
STUDENTS
\end{tabular} \\
\hline Part D: Significant Factors & 1 & 1 \\
\hline Part F: Student Specific Factors & 2 & 4 \\
\hline Part G: Social Life on Campus & 3 & 2 \\
\hline Part E: Infrastructure & 6 & 3 \\
\hline Part B: Sources of Information and Influences & 4 & 5 \\
\hline Part C: College Basics & 5 & 6 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

It was found that both parents and students have ranked SIGNIFICANT FACTORS as top ranked aspect.

\subsection*{5.3.1 Observations}
a. Both the parents and students agreed that SIGNIFICANT FACTORS as top ranked aspect.
b. Both the parents and students have demonstrated a similar perception for qualified staff, choice of subjects and safety and security.
c. Students have given more importance to infrastructure aspect as compared to the parents.

\subsection*{5.4 Objective 4}

\section*{Objective 4}

To study the impact of the perceptions on strategies adopted by the management of select junior colleges.

Table 4: Important Factors considered by Management Representatives to create Positive Perception
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|}
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
FACTORS THAT ARE IMPORTNT TO \\
MANAGEMENT REPRESENTATIVES
\end{tabular} & \\
\hline Part G: Social Life on Campus & RANK \\
\hline Part D: Significant Factors & 1 \\
\hline Part F: Student Specific Factors & 2 \\
\hline Part E: Infrastructure & 3 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Note: These ranking are based on the total scores obtained by that particular sub-parameter.

\section*{All combined taken together}

The summary of rankings is as given below:
Table 5: Summary of Rankings
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{1}{|c|}{\begin{tabular}{c} 
FACTOR THAT DETERMINES \\
PERCEPTION
\end{tabular}} & \begin{tabular}{l} 
RANK BY \\
PARENTS
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l} 
RANK BY \\
STUDENTS
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l} 
RANK BY \\
MANAGEMENT \\
REPRESENTATIVES
\end{tabular} \\
\hline Part D: Significant Factors & 1 & 1 & 2 \\
\hline Part F: Student Specific Factors & 2 & 4 & 3 \\
\hline Part G: Social Life on Campus & 3 & 2 & 1 \\
\hline Part E: Infrastructure & 6 & 3 & 4 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
Part B: Sources of Information and \\
Influences
\end{tabular} & 4 & 5 & NOT APPLICABLE \\
\hline Part C: College Basics & 5 & 6 & NOT APPLICABLE \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Note: These ranking are based on the total scores obtained by that particular sub-parameter.

\subsection*{5.4.1 Observations}
a. Of the six factors tested for perceptions of management representatives the top ranked factor was Social life on campus of which the top three factors in descending order of importance were found to be:
i. Safety and Security
ii. Student Composition
iii. Extra Curricular Activities
b. The second ranked factor was Significant factors; of which the top three factors in descending order of importance were found to be:
i. Reputation of the Institution
ii. Courses offered
iii. Location
c. The third ranked factor was Student Specific Factors, of which the top three factors in descending order of importance were found to be:
i. College Timings
ii. Qualified Staff
iii. Choice of Subjects

\subsection*{5.4.2 Conclusions}
a. Study of responses of management representatives has shown a definite impact of perceptions of parents and students on management strategies. This can be seen from the fact that Significant Factors which is the top ranked factor by parents and students is the second ranked factor for management.
b. The management representatives are more inclined to student perceptions than parent perceptions. This can be seen from the fact that second ranked factor by students is top ranked factor for management - Social Life on the Campus. This factor is also ranked third by the parents.

Figure 3: Important Factors considered by Management Representatives to create Positive Perception


\subsection*{5.5 Other Observations}
a. It is clearly evident that the reputation of the institute matters a lot in the decision making process of parents and students. A convenient location with availability of transport facilities eases the burden of their wards in commuting. Hence is preferred by parents.
b. It can be concluded that even today the quality of staff is a matter of prime importance. This has been so since the advent of education. As students in junior colleges are just out of schools this factor becomes even more important.
c. In schools there are hardly any choices as most subjects are compulsory. Parents wish that for subject choice in college in the academic interest of their wards. Students also wish to explore more subjects of their choice.
d. Parents usually prefer timings which coincide with their work timings. Also timing preferences seem to be governed by the timings of the coaching classes preferred by parents and students.
e. Social life on campus is very important for the personality development of students. Hence parents wish for institutes which have a student composition suited to their liking. Most important aspect for the parents is the safety and security of their wards. Parents look forward to a safe environment as children who are just out of school tend to take liberties once in college. A junior college gives exposure to a lot of extracurricular activities at intercollegiate level which helps students venture into various avenues of their interests.

\subsection*{5.6 Recommendations}

These recommendations are based on above discussion, observations and conclusions. (Please refer section 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4 and 5.5 above).

\section*{Study Objectives}
i. To identify and analyze the factors that determines the Perceptions of Parents about the choice of junior college.
ii. To identify and analyze the factors that determines the Perceptions of Students about the choice of junior college.
iii. To compare the Perceptions of Parents and Students.
iv. To study the impact of the perceptions on strategies adopted by the management of various junior colleges both established and new.

\subsection*{5.6.1 General Advice}

Looking at the inferences drawn from the statistics the researcher recommends the following:
a. A central location is advisable for any new college as it would facilitate commuting for the students. If the location is not so then the colleges should try and arrange for transport facilities for the convenience of students. However students compromise on location only if the college has a good reputation. So it is essential that colleges take every effort to ensure for a positive perception.
b. Junior colleges should have a proper selection and interview process for staff appointments. This will ensure to have qualified staff. Induction Training programmes for faculty development and on the job training should be done twice in the year (once in each term). The programme must focus on goal setting and its success thereby facilitating / enhancing the teaching learning process. A proper system of appraisal also needs to be followed by the management to ensure sustained quality.
c. A good teacher is always appreciated by students. The use of internet has also made a major impact on the lives of students. As such the faculty needs to keep themselves updated continuously. The positive correlation between qualified teachers and attendance makes this even more important especially when the decrease in attendance of students has become a cause for concern, especially in junior colleges. The state govt. has also taken steps to curb this by introducing biometric attendance and strict action against affiliated class- college pattern. Colleges too have to be active respond to such steps.
d. In today's world the scope of education has increased extensively. The use of internet has become commonplace among students. They are well acquainted with the educational environment, more so in a place like Pune which is the seat of education. Students are aware of various courses, where they are offered, what is eligibility etc. As such it is becoming difficult to restrain the students to compulsory subjects. A rising trend is seen towards students opting for liberal art which offers them a wide choice. Traditional courses should also have such applications where they could add more subjects to the existing curriculum which would help put their students on the global dais.
e. Parents are seen to be most influential about the academic decisions of their wards. As such parents also should keep themselves updated about the educational scenario. It was observed that parents with a good educational background had an advantage in this regard.
f. Managements should seek a dialogue to ensure that all necessary information reaches the parents. App-based communication can be a solution as almost everyone is a mobile user these days.
g. Financial constraints seem to be the reason behind most respondents showing a preference for aided colleges. Also securing admission has become a crucial factor in the life of a student. Parents and students have therefore shown an inclination to junior colleges affiliated with senior colleges to attain ease in this respect.
h. For effective interaction a mobile application would be ideal as students are parents all are mobile users. As such there would be no need for training for app use. Apps should be user friendly, consuming mini space of phone memory and most imp free. Colleges can invest in development of custom apps based on their requirements.
i. A quarterly meeting of teachers and class representatives would also be beneficial in communication of vital points and compliances.
j. Management should conduct separate meetings for junior colleges to address their queries.
k. Like aided colleges even unaided colleges may implement the inservice training programme. It could be conducted after every 5 years.
1. Periodic assessment of employment selection system may be necessary. Appraisal feedback will be appreciated.
m . Institutions should take necessary measures to see that they create a positive perception in the minds of parents. This will help to get a good student number and also achieve parent satisfaction.
n. Institutions should attempt at offering a wide choice of subjects for maximum exposure to current subjects which are more in demand. At the same time students who wish to pursue some traditionally popular subjects should also be catered to. Subjects should not be discontinued depending on decrease in number of students. Instead senior faculties could be trained to handle these subjects' along with new additional subjects.
o. A good and qualified staff enhances the teaching-learning process. Quality of teachers also helps to build a positive perception of the institute among parents and students. It is therefore extremely essential for institutes to be particular about appointment of staff.
p. Training induction programme for new teachers, faculty development programme for existing staff and mentorship programme for suitable staff and student may be initiated.
q. An induction programme should be arranged for new teachers to acclimatize them to the institutional environment.
r. A faculty development programme should be conducted yearly by the institutes to help teachers interact with each other and understand the changing needs of the industry.
s. A mentorship programme is also an effective way where junior teachers are mentored by the senior teachers. This type of programme has been very successful in the corporate world and can be effective even in educational field.

\subsection*{5.6.2 Model for Management to create positive perception}

\section*{Objective 5}

To suggest an indicative model for management for building positive perception among parents and students.

Figure 4: Suggestive Model for management to create positive perception among Parents and Students


Note: The above schematic is for newly opened colleges to build positive perception. Indicative timeframe suggested in initial 5 years. This is based on the rankings given by the students, parents and management given above.

\subsection*{5.6.3 Management Strategy}

\section*{Objective 6}

\section*{To suggest a framework of management strategies.}

Liberalization, privatization and globalization have changed the organizational environment/ needs- both internal and external. Interests of stake-holders have undergone significant changes. Needs and expectations have also changed. Strategy is about what you do-what you want to become-and how you plan to achieve it. Thus management strategy schematic is as shown in diagram below which also takes into account the basic principles of management.

Figure 5: Management Strategy Schematic


\subsection*{5.6.4 Management Strategy Implementation Framework}

Figure 6: Management Strategy Implementation Framework


Indicative framework for management strategy implementation is as shown above which takes into account various steps such as formulation, implementation and evaluation.

\subsection*{5.7 Scope for Further Research}

Similar study may be conducted for junior colleges in other cities in Maharashtra State.

Similar study may be conducted for other boards such as CBSE, IGCSE and IB curriculum institutes.

Similar research may be conducted to understand the perceptions of meritorious students.

Similar research may be conducted to understand the perceptions of parents who have completed education till graduation levels.

Similar research may be conducted to understand the perceptions of parents of varied economic levels.

The research may be extended to understanding perceptions in institutions of higher learning.

Similar research may be undertaken at university level so as to help building Institutes of Eminence all over the country.

Similar research may be undertaken to understand and identify growing importance of strategic management in education sector.
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University Grants Commission (UGC).
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In the context of Sample Size, web links used are as listed below:
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Sample Size formula. https://www.surveysystem.com/sample-sizeformula.htm.

Z Value Table. http://users.stat.ufl.edu/~athienit/Tables/Ztable.pdf.

Z Value Tables. http://chemeng.iisc.ac.in/venu/tables.pdf.

\section*{Appendix A: Research Questionnaires}

Sample Questionnaires are included here.

\section*{Parents}

\section*{Questionnaire for the Parents}

Dear Respondents,
The research study entitled "A Study of the Perceptions of Parents and Students and Its Impact on Management Strategies of Junior Colleges with Reference to Pune City" is being carried out under the doctoral program of Tilak Maharashtra Vidyapeeth, Pune.

It would be very much appreciated if you could please spare your valuable time and share your OPINIONS and FEEDBACK as frankly as possible and complete the questionnaire. Your response to the questionnaire, in all respect will be treated strictly as confidential and assure that it will be used only for academic purposes only. I assure you to share the outcome of the study as soon as the study is completed.

I also request you to select only one choice as an answer to the question wherever multiple choices have been provided.

\section*{Part A1: PARENT DETAILS}
1. Name of Parent: \(\qquad\)
2. Contact Details: Phone No.: _Email: \(\qquad\)
3. Residing Area / Location in Pune City:

City / Peth \(\square\) Kothrud / Karvenagar \(\square\) Parvati / Dhankawadi / Swargate \(\square\)

Sinhagad Road \(\square\) Camp / Yerwada \(\square\) Hadapsar \(\square\) \(\square\) Shivajinagar / Aundh / Bashan \(\square\)
4. Please indicate the highest level of education achieved by you. Put a check mark on the space next to the appropriate description for each parent. (Please Tick).

\section*{Academic}
\begin{tabular}{|c|l|l|c|}
\hline Sr. No. & Level of Education & Father & Mother \\
\hline A1 & Less than High School & & \\
\hline A2 & High School & & \\
\hline A3 & Diploma & & \\
\hline A4 & Graduate & & \\
\hline A5 & Post-Graduate & & \\
\hline A6 & Others (please specify) & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Work Related
\begin{tabular}{|c|l|l|c|}
\hline Sr. No. & Level of Education & Father & Mother \\
\hline A7 & Home Maker & & \\
\hline A8 & Teacher & & \\
\hline A9 & Banker & & \\
\hline A10 & Service & & \\
\hline A11 & Business & & \\
\hline A12 & Others (please specify) & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
5. Annual Income Level (Please Tick)

Upto Rs. 1 Lakh \(\square\)
\(\square\) Rs. 1 to 3 Lakh \(\qquad\) Rs. 3 to 5 Lakh
More than Rs. 5 Lakh \(\square\)
\(\square\)
Part A2: STUDENT DETAILS
1. Name of Student: \(\qquad\)
2. Name of current college: \(\qquad\)
3. Stream:

ArtsCommerce \(\square\) Science
4. Standard studying in:

XI \(\square\) XII
Rate the Importance Level about the Influencing Factors

The following is a list of persons or factors which may have influenced you in making a choice. Please indicate the importance levels for the following factors. (Please rate the following parameters on the scale of 1 to 5, where 1 Not at all Important and 5 being Very Important.)

Part B: SOURCES OFINFORMATION AND INFLUENCES
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{c} 
Sr. \\
No.
\end{tabular}} & \multirow{6}{|c|}{\begin{tabular}{c} 
Influencing \\
Factor
\end{tabular}} & \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{ Level of Importance (Please Tick) } \\
\cline { 3 - 7 } & & \multicolumn{1}{|c|}{\begin{tabular}{c}
\(\mathbf{1}\) \\
No \\
Importance
\end{tabular}} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Less \\
Important
\end{tabular} & Neutral & Important & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Most \\
Important
\end{tabular} \\
\hline B1 & \begin{tabular}{l} 
Ward (Own \\
Child)
\end{tabular} & & & & & \\
\hline B2 & Spouse & & & & & \\
\hline B3 & Friends & & & & & \\
\hline B4 & Relatives & & & & & \\
\hline B5 & Former Students & & & & & \\
\hline B6 & Campus Visit & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Part C: COLLEGE BASICS}
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l} 
Sr. \\
No.
\end{tabular}} & \multirow{6}{|c|}{ Basic Aspects } & \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{ Level of Importance (Please Tick) } \\
\cline { 3 - 7 } & & \(\mathbf{1}\) & \(\mathbf{2}\) & \(\mathbf{3}\) & \(\mathbf{4}\) & \(\mathbf{5}\) \\
\cline { 3 - 7 } & & \begin{tabular}{c} 
No \\
Importance
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Less \\
Important
\end{tabular} & Neutral & Important & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Most \\
Important
\end{tabular} \\
\hline C1 & Old & & & & & \\
\hline C2 & New & & & & & \\
\hline C3 & Aided & & & & & \\
\hline C4 & Unaided & & & & & \\
\hline C5 & School-Affiliated & & & & & \\
\hline C6 & \begin{tabular}{l} 
Senior College \\
Affiliated
\end{tabular} & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Part D: SIGNIFICANT FACORS}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Sr. No.} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Significant Factors} & \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{Level of Importance (Please Tick)} \\
\hline & & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 \\
\hline & & No Importance & Less Important & Neutral & Important & Most Important \\
\hline D1 & Location & & & & & \\
\hline D2 & Conveyance Available & & & & & \\
\hline D3 & Family Tradition & & & & & \\
\hline D4 & Reputation of Institution & & & & & \\
\hline D5 & Courses Offered & & & & & \\
\hline D6 & Tuition Fees & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Part E: INFRASTRUCTURE}
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{c} 
Sr. \\
No.
\end{tabular}} & \multirow{6}{|c|}{ Infrastructure } & \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{ Level of Importance (Please Tick) } \\
\cline { 3 - 7 } & & \(\mathbf{1}\) & \(\mathbf{2}\) & \(\mathbf{3}\) & \(\mathbf{4}\) & \(\mathbf{5}\) \\
\cline { 3 - 7 } & & \begin{tabular}{c} 
No \\
Importance
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Less \\
Important
\end{tabular} & Neutral & Important & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Most \\
Important
\end{tabular} \\
\hline E1 & Library & & & & & \\
\hline E2 & Sport Facilities & & & & & \\
\hline E3 & Auditorium & & & & & \\
\hline E4 & Canteen & & & & & \\
\hline E5 & IT Lab & & & & & \\
\hline E6 & \begin{tabular}{l} 
Guidance and \\
Counselling
\end{tabular} & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Part F: STUDENT SPECIFIC FACTORS}
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l} 
Sr. \\
No.
\end{tabular}} & \multirow{3}{|c|}{\begin{tabular}{c} 
Student Specific \\
Factors
\end{tabular}} & \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{ Level of Importance (Please Tick) } \\
\cline { 3 - 7 } & & \(\mathbf{1}\) & \(\mathbf{2}\) & \(\mathbf{3}\) & \(\mathbf{4}\) & \(\mathbf{5}\) \\
\cline { 3 - 7 } & & \begin{tabular}{c} 
No \\
Importance
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Less \\
Important
\end{tabular} & Neutral & Important & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Most \\
Important
\end{tabular} \\
\hline F1 & Qualified Staff & & & & & \\
\hline F2 & Choice of Subjects & & & & & \\
\hline F3 & \begin{tabular}{l} 
Scholarships \\
Available
\end{tabular} & & & & & \\
\hline F4 & Uniform & & & & & \\
\hline F5 & Attendance & & & & & \\
\hline F6 & College Timings & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Part G: SOCIAL LIFE ON CAMPUS}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Sr. } \\
& \text { No. }
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Social Life Factors} & \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{Level of Importance (Please Tick)} \\
\hline & & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 \\
\hline & & No Importance & Less
Important & Neutral & Important & Most Important \\
\hline G1 & \begin{tabular}{l}
Student \\
Composition
\end{tabular} & & & & & \\
\hline G2 & Extra Curricular Activities & & & & & \\
\hline G3 & Use of Mobile Phones & & & & & \\
\hline G4 & NCC & & & & & \\
\hline G5 & Safety and Security & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Students}

\section*{Questionnaire for the Students}

Dear Respondents,
The research study entitled "A Study of the Perceptions of Parents and Students and Its Impact on Management Strategies of Junior Colleges with Reference to Pune City" is being carried out under the doctoral program of Tilak Maharashtra Vidyapeeth, Pune.

It would be very much appreciated if you could please spare your valuable time and share your OPINIONS and FEEDBACK as frankly as possible and complete the questionnaire. Your response to the questionnaire, in all respect will be treated strictly as confidential and assure that it will be used only for academic purposes only. I assure you to share the outcome of the study as soon as the study is completed.

I also request you to select only one choice as an answer to the question wherever multiple choices have been provided.

\section*{Part A1: STUDENT DETAILS}
1. Name of Student: \(\qquad\)
2. Name of last school attended: \(\qquad\)
3. Name of current college:
4. Stream: Arts \(\quad \square\)

Commerce \(\square\) Science \(\square\)
5. Standard studying in:


XII \(\square\)
6. Contact Details: Phone No.: \(\qquad\) Email: \(\qquad\)
7. Residing Area / Location in Pune City: City / Peth \(\square\) Kothrud / KarvenagarParvati / Dhankawadi / Swargate \(\qquad\)
Sinhagad Road \(\square\)
Camp / Yerwada \(\square\) Hadapsar

Shivajinagar / Aundh / Pashan


\section*{Part A2: PARENT DETAILS}

Please indicate the highest level of education achieved by your parents. Put a check mark on the space next to the appropriate description for each parent. (Please Tick). Academic
\begin{tabular}{|c|l|l|c|}
\hline Sr. No. & Level of Education & Father & Mother \\
\hline A1 & Less than High School & & \\
\hline A2 & High School & & \\
\hline A3 & Diploma & & \\
\hline A4 & Graduate & & \\
\hline A5 & Post-Graduate & & \\
\hline A6 & Others (please specify) & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Rate the Importance Level about the Influencing Factors
The following is a list of persons or factors which may have influenced you in making a choice. Please indicate the importance levels for the following factors. (Please rate the following parameters on the scale of 1 to 5, where 1 Not at all Important and 5 being Very Important.)

Part B: SOURCES OFINFORMATION AND INFLUENCES
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Sr. No.} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Influencing Factor} & \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{Level of Importance (Please Tick)} \\
\hline & & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 \\
\hline & & No
Importance & Less Important & Neutral & Important & Most Important \\
\hline B1 & Mother & & & & & \\
\hline B2 & Father & & & & & \\
\hline B3 & Friends & & & & & \\
\hline B4 & Relatives & & & & & \\
\hline B5 & Former Students & & & & & \\
\hline B6 & Campus Visit & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Part C: COLLEGE BASICS}
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l} 
Sr. \\
No.
\end{tabular}} & \multirow{6}{|c|}{ Basic Aspects } & \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{ Level of Importance (Please Tick) } \\
\cline { 3 - 7 } & & \(\mathbf{1}\) & \(\mathbf{2}\) & \(\mathbf{3}\) & \(\mathbf{4}\) & \(\mathbf{5}\) \\
\cline { 3 - 7 } & & \begin{tabular}{c} 
No \\
Importance
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Less \\
Important
\end{tabular} & Neutral & Important & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Most \\
Important
\end{tabular} \\
\hline C1 & Old & & & & & \\
\hline C2 & New & & & & & \\
\hline C3 & Aided & & & & & \\
\hline C4 & Unaided & & & & & \\
\hline C5 & School-Affiliated & & & & & \\
\hline C6 & \begin{tabular}{l} 
Senior College \\
Affiliated
\end{tabular} & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Part D: SIGNIFICANT FACTORS
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l} 
Sr. \\
No.
\end{tabular}} & \multirow{3}{|c|}{\begin{tabular}{c} 
Significant \\
Factors
\end{tabular}} & \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{ Level of Importance (Please Tick) } \\
\cline { 3 - 7 } & & \(\mathbf{1}\) & \(\mathbf{2}\) & \(\mathbf{3}\) & \(\mathbf{4}\) & \(\mathbf{5}\) \\
\cline { 3 - 7 } & \begin{tabular}{c} 
No \\
Importance
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Less \\
Important
\end{tabular} & Neutral & Important & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Most \\
Important
\end{tabular} \\
\hline D1 & Location & & & & & \\
\hline D2 & \begin{tabular}{l} 
Conveyance \\
Available
\end{tabular} & & & & & \\
\hline D3 & Family Tradition & & & & & \\
\hline D4 & \begin{tabular}{l} 
Reputation of \\
Institution
\end{tabular} & & & & & \\
\hline D5 & Courses Offered & & & & & \\
\hline D6 & Tuition Fees & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Part E: INFRASTRUCTURE}
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l} 
Sr. \\
No.
\end{tabular}} & \multirow{6}{|c|}{ Infrastructure } & \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{ Level of Importance (Please Tick) } \\
\cline { 3 - 7 } & & \(\mathbf{1}\) & \(\mathbf{2}\) & \(\mathbf{3}\) & \(\mathbf{4}\) \\
no \\
& & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Noss \\
Importance
\end{tabular} & Neutral & Important & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Most \\
Important
\end{tabular} \\
\hline E1 & Library & & & & & \\
\hline E2 & Sport Facilities & & & & & \\
\hline E3 & Auditorium & & & & & \\
\hline E4 & Canteen & & & & & \\
\hline E5 & IT Lab & & & & & \\
\hline E6 & \begin{tabular}{l} 
Guidance and \\
Counselling
\end{tabular} & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Part F: STUDENT SPECIFIC FACTORS}
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{c} 
Sr. \\
No.
\end{tabular}} & \multirow{6}{|c|}{\begin{tabular}{c} 
Student Specific \\
Factors
\end{tabular}} & \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{ Level of Importance (Please Tick) } \\
\cline { 3 - 7 } & & \(\mathbf{1}\) & \(\mathbf{2}\) & \(\mathbf{3}\) & \(\mathbf{4}\) & \(\mathbf{5}\) \\
\cline { 3 - 7 } & & \begin{tabular}{c} 
No \\
Importance
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Less \\
Important
\end{tabular} & Neutral & Important & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Most \\
Important
\end{tabular} \\
\hline F1 & Qualified Staff & & & & & \\
\hline F2 & Choice of Subjects & & & & & \\
\hline F3 & \begin{tabular}{l} 
Scholarships \\
Available
\end{tabular} & & & & & \\
\hline F4 & Uniform & & & & & \\
\hline F5 & Attendance & & & & & \\
\hline F6 & College Timings & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Part G: SOCIAL LIFE ON CAMPUS
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Sr. \\
No.
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Social Life Factors} & \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{Level of Importance (Please Tick)} \\
\hline & & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 \\
\hline & & No Importance & Less
Important & Neutral & Important & Most Important \\
\hline G1 & \begin{tabular}{l}
Student \\
Composition
\end{tabular} & & & & & \\
\hline G2 & Extra Curricular Activities & & & & & \\
\hline G3 & Use of Mobile Phones & & & & & \\
\hline G4 & NCC & & & & & \\
\hline G5 & Safety and Security & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Management Representatives}

\section*{Questionnaire \\ for \\ College Management Representatives}

Dear Respondents,
The research study entitled "A Study of the Perceptions of Parents and Students and Its Impact on Management Strategies of Junior Colleges with Reference to Pune City" is being carried out under the doctoral program of Tilak Maharashtra Vidyapeeth, Pune.

It would be very much appreciated if you could please spare your valuable time and share your OPINIONS and FEEDBACK as frankly as possible and complete the questionnaire. Your response to the questionnaire, in all respect will be treated strictly as confidential and assure that it will be used only for academic purposes only. I assure you to share the outcome of the study as soon as the study is completed.

I also request you to select only one choice as an answer to the question wherever multiple choices have been provided.

\section*{Part A: INSTITUTION DETAILS}
1. Name of Institution: \(\qquad\)
2. Name of the Respondent: \(\qquad\)
3. Type: \(\quad\) Aided \(\quad \square \quad\) Unaided \(\quad \square\)
4. Facilities provided: School Affiliated \(\quad \square \quad\) Senior College Affiliated
5. Area / Location of the Institution in Pune City:

City / Peth \(\square\) Kothrud / Karvenagar \(\square\) Parvati / Dhankawadi / Swargate
Sinhagad Road \(\square\) Camp / Yerwada \(\square\) Hadapsar \(\square\)
Shivajinagar / Aundh / Pashan \(\qquad\)

\section*{Part B: INSTITUTION FEATURE DETAILS}

Please indicate the top 10 features that your institution promotes to the students and their parents and its rankings. (Please do not repeat the rank.)
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|}
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
Sr. \\
No.
\end{tabular} & Institution Feature & Rank \\
\hline 1 & & \\
\hline 2 & & \\
\hline 3 & & \\
\hline 4 & & \\
\hline 5 & & \\
\hline 6 & & \\
\hline 7 & & \\
\hline 8 & & \\
\hline 9 & & \\
\hline 10 & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Part C: IMPORTNACE OF INFLEUNCING FACTORS}

Note: Influential factors for perception are the factors on which the management has some control or these influential factors are in their functional areas.
- College Basics include Aided, Unaided, School-Affiliated, and Senior College Affiliated.
- Significant Factors includes Location, Conveyance Available, Family Tradition, Reputation of Institution, Courses Offered, and Tuition Fees.
- Infrastructure includes Library, Sport Facilities, Auditorium, Canteen, IT Lab, Guidance and Counselling.
- Student Specific Factors include Qualified Staff, Choice of Subjects, Scholarships Available, Uniform, Attendance, and College Timings.
- Social Life on the Campus includes Student Composition, Extra Curricular Activities, Use of Mobile Phones, NCC, Safety and Security.

For the factors in the table below rank that factor according to its importance on the scale of 1 to 5 , where 1 is of top most importance and 5 being of least importance.
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|}
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
Sr. \\
No.
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l} 
Influential Factors for \\
Perception
\end{tabular} & Rank \\
\hline A & College Basics & \\
\hline B & Significant Factors & \\
\hline C & Infrastructure & \\
\hline D & Student Specific Factors & \\
\hline E & Social Life on the Campus & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Rate the Importance Level about the Influencing Factors}

The following is a list of persons or factors which may have influenced you in making a choice. Please indicate the importance levels for the following factors. (Please rate the following parameters on the scale of 1 to 5, where 1 Not at all Important and 5 being Very Important.)

\section*{Part D: SIGNIFICANT FACTORS}
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l} 
Sr. \\
No.
\end{tabular}} & \multirow{6}{|c|}{\begin{tabular}{c} 
Significant \\
Factors
\end{tabular}} & \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{ Level of Importance (Please Tick) } \\
\cline { 3 - 7 } & & \(\mathbf{1}\) & \(\mathbf{2}\) & \(\mathbf{3}\) & \(\mathbf{4}\) & \(\mathbf{5}\) \\
\cline { 3 - 7 } & & \begin{tabular}{c} 
No \\
Importance
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Less \\
Important
\end{tabular} & Neutral & Important & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Most \\
Important
\end{tabular} \\
\hline D1 & Location & & & & & \\
\hline D2 & \begin{tabular}{l} 
Conveyance \\
Available
\end{tabular} & & & & & \\
\hline D3 & Family Tradition & & & & & \\
\hline D4 & \begin{tabular}{l} 
Reputation of \\
Institution
\end{tabular} & & & & & \\
\hline D5 & Courses Offered & & & & & \\
\hline D6 & Tuition Fees & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Part E: INFRASTRUCTURE}
\begin{tabular}{|c|l|l|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{c} 
Sr. \\
No.
\end{tabular}} & \multirow{6}{*}{ Infrastructure } & \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{ Level of Importance (Please Tick) } \\
\cline { 3 - 7 } & & \(\mathbf{1}\) & \(\mathbf{2}\) & \(\mathbf{3}\) & \(\mathbf{4}\) & \(\mathbf{5}\) \\
\cline { 3 - 7 } & & \begin{tabular}{c} 
No \\
Importance
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Less \\
Important
\end{tabular} & Neutral & Important & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Most \\
Important
\end{tabular} \\
\hline E1 & Library & & & & & \\
\hline E2 & Sport Facilities & & & & & \\
\hline E3 & Auditorium & & & & & \\
\hline E4 & Canteen & & & & & \\
\hline E5 & IT Lab & & & & & \\
\hline E6 & \begin{tabular}{l} 
Guidance and \\
Counselling
\end{tabular} & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Part F: STUDENT SPECIFIC FACTORS
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Sr. \\
No.
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Student Specific Factors} & \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{Level of Importance (Please Tick)} \\
\hline & & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 \\
\hline & & No Importance & Less
Important & Neutral & Important & Most Important \\
\hline F1 & Qualified Staff & & & & & \\
\hline F2 & Choice of Subjects & & & & & \\
\hline F3 & Scholarships Available & & & & & \\
\hline F4 & Uniform & & & & & \\
\hline F5 & Attendance & & & & & \\
\hline F6 & College Timings & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Part G: SOCIAL LIFE ON CAMPUS}
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{c} 
Sr. \\
No.
\end{tabular}} & \multirow{3}{|c|}{\begin{tabular}{c} 
Social Life \\
Factors
\end{tabular}} & \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{ Level of Importance (Please Tick) } \\
\cline { 3 - 7 } & & \(\mathbf{1}\) & \(\mathbf{2}\) & \(\mathbf{3}\) & \(\mathbf{4}\) & \(\mathbf{5}\) \\
\cline { 3 - 7 } & \begin{tabular}{c} 
No \\
Importance
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Less \\
Important
\end{tabular} & Neutral & Important & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Most \\
Important
\end{tabular} \\
\hline G1 & \begin{tabular}{l} 
Student \\
Composition
\end{tabular} & & & & & \\
\hline G2 & \begin{tabular}{l} 
Extra Curricular \\
Activities
\end{tabular} & & & & & \\
\hline G3 & \begin{tabular}{l} 
Use of Mobile \\
Phones
\end{tabular} & & & & & \\
\hline G4 & NCC & & & & & \\
\hline G5 & \begin{tabular}{l} 
Safety and \\
Security
\end{tabular} & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Your opinion about impact of perceptions of students and their parents on the management strategy:
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|l|l|l|c|}
\hline \multirow{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l} 
Sr. \\
No.
\end{tabular}} & \multirow{2}{*}{ Opinion / Statement } & \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{ Rating (Please Tick) } \\
\cline { 3 - 7 } & & \(\mathbf{1}\) & \(\mathbf{2}\) & \(\mathbf{3}\) & \(\mathbf{4}\) & \(\mathbf{5}\) \\
\cline { 3 - 7 } & \begin{tabular}{l} 
Strongly \\
Disagree
\end{tabular} & Disagree & Neutral & Agree & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Strongly \\
Agree
\end{tabular} \\
\hline H1 & \begin{tabular}{l} 
The perceptions of \\
Parents and Students \\
impact \\
institution's strategic \\
plan and management \\
policies.
\end{tabular} & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Appendix B: List of Institutions Visited
\begin{tabular}{|c|l|l|}
\hline \begin{tabular}{c} 
SR. \\
NO.
\end{tabular} & \multicolumn{1}{|c|}{ NAME OF THE COLLEGE } & \multicolumn{1}{c|}{ LOCATION } \\
\hline 1 & ABASAHEB GARWARE COLLEGE & KOTHRUD / KARVENAGAR \\
\hline 2 & ABHINAV JR COLLEGE & SINHAGAD ROAD \\
\hline 3 & AHURA COLLEGE & HADAPSAR \\
\hline 4 & \begin{tabular}{l} 
AKUTAI KALYANI SADHANA \\
COLLEGE
\end{tabular} & HADAPSAR \\
\hline 5 & ALEGAONKAR COLLEGE & \begin{tabular}{l} 
SHIVAJINAGAR / AUNDH / \\
PASHAN
\end{tabular} \\
\hline 6 & ANGLO URDU COLLEGE & CAMP / YERWADA \\
\hline 7 & ANNASAHEB MAGAR COLLEGE & HADAPSAR \\
\hline 8 & B R GHOLAP VIDYALAYA & \begin{tabular}{l} 
SHIVAJINAGAR / AUNDH / \\
PASHAN
\end{tabular} \\
\hline 9 & BHARAT ENGLISH SCHOOL & \begin{tabular}{l} 
SHIVAJINAGAR / AUNDH / \\
PASHAN
\end{tabular} \\
\hline 10 & BKC COLLEGE & SINHAGAD ROAD \\
\hline 11 & BMCC & \begin{tabular}{l} 
SHIVAJINAGAR / AUNDH / \\
PASHAN
\end{tabular} \\
\hline 12 & CHAITYNA JUNIOR COLLEGE & CITY / PETH \\
\hline 13 & DON BOSCO COLLEGE & CAMP / YERWADA \\
\hline 14 & \begin{tabular}{l} 
DR. KALMADI SHAMRAO SHOOL \\
AND COLLEGE
\end{tabular} & KOTHRUD / KARVENAGAR \\
\hline 15 & DYANGAGA & SINHAGAD ROAD \\
\hline 16 & FERGUSSON COLLEGE & \begin{tabular}{l} 
SHIVAJINAGAR / AUNDH / \\
PASHAN
\end{tabular} \\
\hline 17 & H V DESAI COLLEGE & CITY / PETH \\
\hline 18 & HHCP JR. COLLEGE & CITY / PETH \\
\hline 19 & JIJAMATA GIRLS HIGH SCHOOL & CITY / PETH \\
\hline 20 & KBP JR. COLLEGE & \begin{tabular}{l} 
PARVATI / DHANKAWADI / \\
SWARGATE
\end{tabular} \\
\hline 21 & MAHARASHTRA VIDYALAYA & CITY / PETH \\
\hline 22 & MAHAVIR JR. COLLEGE & \begin{tabular}{l} 
PARVATI / DHANKAWADI / \\
SWARGATE
\end{tabular} \\
\hline 23 & MAHILASHRAM JR. COLLEGE & KOTHRUD / KARVENAGAR \\
\hline 24 & MIT JR. COLLEGE & KOTHRUD / KARVENAGAR \\
\hline 25 & MITRAMANDAL & \begin{tabular}{l} 
SHIVAJINAGAR / AUNDH / \\
PASHAN
\end{tabular} \\
\hline 26 & MODERN COLLEGE & \begin{tabular}{l} 
SHIVAJINAGAR / AUNDH / \\
PASHAN
\end{tabular} \\
\hline 27 & MOHITE COLLEGE & KOTHRUD / KARVENAGAR \\
\hline 28 & MOHOL COLLEGE & KOTHRUD / KARVENAGAR \\
\hline 2
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|l|l|}
\hline 29 & \begin{tabular}{l} 
MOLEDINA HIGH SCHOOL AND JR. \\
COLLEGE
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l} 
PARVATI / DHANKAWADI / \\
SWARGATE
\end{tabular} \\
\hline 30 & \begin{tabular}{l} 
MUKTANGAN ENG. SCHOOL AND \\
JR. COLLEGE
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l} 
PARVATI / DHANKAWADI / \\
SWARGATE
\end{tabular} \\
\hline 31 & \begin{tabular}{l} 
N M V GIRLS HIGH SCHOOL AND \\
JR. COLLEGE
\end{tabular} & CITY / PETH
\end{tabular}

\section*{Appendix C: Letters}

NAAC accredited 'A+' Grade
Affiliated to University of Pune
(ID No. PU/PN/ASC/003/1916)
Office : 24331978
40 Drin. Res. : 24332479
Fax No. : 020-24332479
E-mail : principalspcollege@vsnl.net Index No: J11.11.006

Date : 15/01/2019

\section*{Certificate}

This is to certify that Mrs. Sangeeta. R. Bide who is a Research Scholar from Tilak Maharashtra Vidyapeeth, has visited S.P. College for her data collection with reference to her thesis works in the months of August-September.
She has collected data by distributing questionnaires among students. She has personally interacted with me as a management representative of Junior College for the same.

This letter is issued as per her request.


Vice Principal
(Mrs. Shende Kanchan)
Vice - Principal
Junior College,
S. P. College, Pune-30

\section*{CERTIFICATE}
(To whomsoever it may concern)

This is to certify that Mrs. Sangeeta Bide (TMV Research Scholar) has collected data from our institute - Muktangan English School \& Jr. College in the month of August 2018 for her Ph.D. Research.

This letter has been issued on her request.

Place: Pune
Date : 1.2.2019

(Mrs.Hemangini Inamdar) PRINCIPAL
MUKTANGAN ENGLISH SHOOL, \& JR. COLLEGE PUNE -411009.

Maharashtriya Mandal, Pune.
Physical Culture Society,
D. R. Damle

1539 Sadashiv Peth, Tilak Road

Gen. Secretary
Pune-30. Ph. : 020-24477043, 2447624 (Recognized by Government)

\section*{Certificate}

This is to certify that Mrs Sangeeta Ravindra Bhide(TMV Research scolar) has collected data from our Institution Maharashtriya Mandal's Junior College of Commerce. This letter is issued on her request.


Dhananjay Damle General Secreytary```

