

# "A study on the factors influencing Myanmar students' choice of University courses"

By Yar Zar Aye Cho 6117190010

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Master of Business Administration Degree (International Program) At Siam University December 2018



Title of research:	A study on the factors influencing Myanmar students' choice of
	University courses
Researcher:	Yar Zar Aye Cho
ID:	6117190010
Major:	Information Technology
Degree:	Master of Business Administration
Academic:	2018

This is Independent study has been approved to be a partial fulfillment of the requirement for Degree of Master in Business Administration in Information

Technology

in Have

(Dr. Om Huvanand)

Advisor

(Assoc. Prof. Dr. Jomphong Mongkolvanich)

Dean, Graduate School of Business

Siam University, Bangkok, Thailand

#### Abstract

Title of research:	A study on the factors influencing Myanmar students' choice of
	University courses
Researcher:	Yar Zar Aye Cho
ID:	6117190010
Major:	Information Technology
Degree:	Master of Business Administration
Advisor:	

On Hiw a

(Dr. Om Huvanand)

The objective of the research is to study on the factors influencing Myanmar students' choice of University courses regarding their demographic backgrounds. The students' demographic backgrounds include gender, age, and income. There are social factors which influence on students when they choose courses. There are product factors of the courses which also influence on students. However, the degree of influences is vary based on the differences of demographic backgrounds. This research study on the relationships between social factors, product factors, and students' demographic backgrounds.

The secondary data are included in this study which states the theories and concepts of decisionmaking processes, consumer buying behaviours and social factors affecting consumer behaviours. For the primary data, the questionaries' survey is conducted. The sample size is 200 approximately, and it was collected from the internet, social networks and public places such as malls and offices. As this research is to study the Myanmar students' buying behaviour, the survey data were collected only from Myanmar students.

For data analysis, SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) program is used to analyse the data. Both descriptive statistics and inferential statistics are presented in this study. Under descriptive statistics analysis, the data are processed and shown in the way of frequency, percentage, mean, minimum, maximum and standard deviation. For inferential statistics analysis, the data are processed by Independent Sample T-test and ANOVA so that the hypothesis can be tested.

According to the results from the study, regarding to descriptive analysis, it can be concluded that most of the respondents are female and age range with the most significant respondent number is between 25 to 34. Students with monthly income from \$101 to \$500 are the majority in this survey. Regarding social factor influences, most of the students selected the option that they have no influences from social factors. For the Universities' product factor influences, most respondents picked the brand of Universities, Institutes, and Colleges.

Regarding the inferential analysis, it can be assumed that there are relationships between social factor influences, product factor influences, and students' demographic backgrounds while choosing University courses. The analysis states that male students or students with less than \$100 monthly income are influenced by senior family members when they choose the courses. However, the students with above \$2000 income have no social influences. Moreover, the students whose ages between 25 to 34 are influenced by friends. For product factor influences, male students consider on better future career path than female students. Female students more consider the curriculum of the course than male students. Again, age group between 35 to 44 or any students whose income is from \$1001 to \$2000 also consider the curriculum of the courses before enrolling.



## Acknowledgments

This research becomes a reality with the kind support and help of many individuals. I would like to extend my sincere thanks to all of them.

Foremost, I would like to express my gratitude towards my mother, **Dr. Tin Tin Myaing**, who encouragement which helped me in the completion of this research.

Also, I would like to express my special gratitude and thanks to my adviser, **Dr. Frank Faulkner** from imparting his knowledge and expertise in this study. I would like to say brilliant thanks to all my teachers from both of **MCC Training Institutes** and **Siam University**.

I am thankful to my colleagues who helped me to collect enough samples for research.

My thanks and appreciations also go to any people who have willingly helped me out with their abilities.

Yar Zar Aye Cho

## **Table of Contents**

СНАРТ	TER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY	1
1.2	RESEARCH PROBLEM	2
1.3	RESEARCH QUESTIONS	2
1.4	THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY	2
1.5	THE OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY	3
1.6	CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS	3
1.7	RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS	3
1.8	SCOPES OF THE STUDY	4
1.9	LIMITATION OF THE STUDY	4
1.10	BENEFITS OF THE STUDY	4
1.11	OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS	5
СНАРТ	TER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	6
2.1	Consumer behaviour	6
2.2	SOCIAL FACTOR INFLUENCES	6
2.2.	2.1 Small groups	6
2.2.	2.2 Family	6
2.2.	2.3 Roles and status	7
2.3	CONSUMER DECISION-MAKING PROCESS	7
2.4	DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS AFFECTING CONSUMER BEHAVIOR	8
2.4.	.1 Occupation	8
2.4.	2.2 Age	8
2.4.	2.3 Economic Condition	8
2.4.	.4 Lifestyle	9
2.4.	5 Personality	9

2.5	SOCIAL FACTORS AFFECTING CONSUMER BEHAVIOUR	9
2.6	CONSUMER BEHAVIOUR FOR HIGHER EDUCATION	9
СНАРТ	TER 3: METHODOLOGY	10
3.1	RESEARCH METHOD	10
3.2	POPULATION AND SAMPLE GROUPS	10
3.3	DATA COLLECTION	10
3.4	DATA ANALYSIS	11
СНАРТ	TER 4: DATA ANALYSIS	12
4.1	DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS	12
4.1	.1 Data analysis of respondents' demographic background regarding gender, ag	ge and
inc	ome	12
4.1	.2 Data analysis of social factors influencing on respondents	13
4.1	.3 Data analysis of Product factors influencing on respondents	14
4.2	INFERENTIAL ANALYSIS	14
4.2	2.1 Hypothesis H1	15
4.2	2.2 Hypothesis H2	21
СНАРТ	TER 5: CONCLUSION	
5.1	THE RESULT OF THE DATA ANALYSIS	
5.1	.1 Results of the descriptive analysis	
5.1	.2 Results of the inferential analysis	31
5.2	CONCLUSION	
5.3	RECOMMENDATION	
REFER	RENCES	
APPEN	DIX A	
QUES	TIONNAIRE	

# List of Figures

Figure 1. Conceptual framework	3
--------------------------------	---



## List of Tables

Table 1 The frequency distribution of the respondents by gender
Table 2 The frequency distribution of respondents by age 12
Table 3 The frequency distribution of respondents by monthly income
Table 4 The frequency distribution of responses on social factors 13
Table 5 The frequency table of responses on product factors
Table 6 Descriptive statistics regarding to the social factors influence on genders
Table 7 Independent Samples T-Test of social factors influence on genders    16
Table 8 Mean values of the relationship between age groups and social influence factors
Table 9 ANOVA analysis for variances among age groups for social influence factors
Table 10 Mean values of the relationship between different monthly income groups and social
influence factors
Table 11 ANOVA analysis for variances among different monthly income groups for social influence
factors
Table 12 Descriptive statistics regarding to the product factors influence on genders
Table 13 Independent Samples T-Test of social factors influence on age groups 23
Table 14 Mean values of the relationship between age groups and product influence factors
Table 15 ANOVA analysis for variances among age groups for product influence factors25
Table 16 Mean values of the relationship between different income groups and product influence
factors
Table 17 ANOVA analysis for variances among different income groups for product influence factors

## **Chapter 1: Introduction**

#### **1.1 Background of the study**

The throwback to the old days, the very first college of Myanmar, Rangoon College was established with the affiliated to Calcutta University in 1884. Myanmar Legislative Council approved the University of Yangon Act in 1920. But there were no bachelor programs till 1952. After independence, 1952, four years education plan were invented, and faculties such as Forestry, Medicine, Law, Arts & Science, Social Science, Engineer, Education, and Agriculture were established. And time after time, these faculties were transformed into separate universities. At these days, the matriculation exam pass rate is very low, and all of the universities were located on two major cities, Yangon and Mandalay. So, the people did not get many alternatives when they choose the universities and courses.

In 1988, there was a big uprising in the whole country of Myanmar, and the military government had to close the schools and universities for two years. While Universities were being closed for two years, people were trying to attend other professional courses, diplomas, and advanced diplomas. Before 1988, there were only public universities within the country and no private institutions. After that 88 uprising, people were demanding private institutions in the higher education sector. After shifting of power form Military government to the democratic government, in 2011, people are demanding a better quality of higher education and a lot of private institutions emerged. The country is more open to foreign investments, and education sector has become one of the vast markets for investors. Form the side of the government, public universities were also trying to reform their outdated systems. After the historic trip of US President Obama in November 2012, the Institute of International Education (IIE) was launched successfully. IIE includes 10 U.S higher education institutions, and it is intended to assist in reforming higher education in Myanmar by means of strategic planning among Myanmar Universities and US Universities. Nowadays, there are many options for people in the higher education sector. They can choose either public universities or private institutions by means of short-term professional courses or degree courses.

According to the Asian Development Bank's Technical Assistance Consultant's Report, 2013, there are 164 National Universities in Myanmar which are awarding courses from diploma to doctorate level. On the other sides, there are 50 private Institutes and Colleges which are running as franchises for international universities from Europe, America, and Scandinavian.

#### **1.2** Research Problem

The research problem in this study is the influence factors of Myanmar students when they choose courses or degree from Universities. As there are the vast amount of Universities and Institutes, Internationally or Domestically, and different carrier paths, students need to overthink before enrolling for course. Unlike the Western countries, there may be more influences from social factors, especially from senior family members, to young students. Young students follow the senior family members decisions against their actual interest. But if the student is old and mature enough in stable incomes, they decide themselves when enrolling the courses. So, there may be some relationship between course selection consideration factors and personals' demographic background such as gender, age, and income.

#### **1.3 Research Questions**

- What factor mostly influencing to Myanmar students when they select University courses?
- How much social factors influence on students while choosing the courses?
- What is the relationship between students' demographic backgrounds and social influence factors?
- What is the relationship between students' demographic backgrounds and influences of the product factors of Universities?

## 1.4 The significance of the Study

Based on this study, either national universities, international universities, private institutions or educational agencies can make strategy what kind of courses should be provided and how to position the courses. They can also utilise this study to implement better marketing strategies.

## **1.5** The objective of the Study

The study aims to analyse how social factors and product factors influence on the students by means of the students' demographic backgrounds such as gender, age, and income.

## 1.6 Conceptual Framework and Research Hypothesis

The conceptual framework can be seen as followed.



Figure 1. Conceptual framework

The above conceptual framework presents social factors such as senior family member, friends, and role model are influencing on the students, and the effects may differ based on the variance of the demographic background of the students. Product factors such as the brand of institutions, geographical locations, future opportunities, course duration, lecturer, curriculum and timetable flexibility also influence on students by means of gender, age and income.

## 1.7 Research Hypothesis

Based on the framework, the following are the research hypothesis.

H1: There are relationships between students' demographic backgrounds and social influence factors.

**H2**: There are the relationships between students' demographic backgrounds and influences of the product factors of Universities.

#### **1.8** Scopes of the Study

This research will focus on the influencing factors on Myanmar students' by means of demographic backgrounds when Universities' courses are chosen. As mentioned in the titles, this research will only emphasize the relationships between social factors and product factors influence on Myanmar students by mean of gender, age, and income level. The sample will include both male and female students with age of 15 (who passes the matriculation exam) and over. The sample size is approximately 200 people who compromised of students who would attend or choose a course organized by Universities, Institutes or Colleges.

## 1.9 Limitation of the Study

This study only emphasizes on Myanmar students who are attending or going to participate in a course soon. So, the survey will be only eligible for Myanmar people who is attending or has a plan to attend a university course. Moreover, there is the limitation of time to conduct the research, and it is not adequate time to conduct the survey on large sample size. And the survey will be collected from the internet and public area such as shopping mall and universities around downtown due to time limitation. The survey can be reached to neither the students who do not use the internet nor the students who are in rural areas.

#### **1.10** Benefits of the Study

As this study is focused on influencing factors on Myanmar students when university courses are selected, it will benefit not only national universities, international universities, private institutions and also benefit to educational agencies. They can implement effective business strategies and marketing strategies based on this study.

## 1.11 Operational Definitions

*Students* refer to any Myanmar people who passed the matriculation exam in minimum and attending courses or planning to attend courses which are provided by either National, International or Private Universities, Institutes, and Colleges.

*Universities* refer to any academic awarding bodies, including universities, institutes, and colleges, which offers degrees and higher education level courses.

*Courses* refer to any courses provided by universities as a form of certification, diploma, advanced diploma, bachelor degree, master degree or doctorate.

Demographic factors refer to students' demographic status such as gender, age, and income.

*Social factors* refer to the factors which come in as social form and influences on students' decision making.

*Product factors* refer to the product or services of the Universities which are considered by the students while choosing a course.

## **Chapter 2: Literature Review**

In this chapter, concept, and theories which are related to the consumer behaviours, the customer buying decision-making process, demographic factor influencing, social factor influencing and product factor influencing.

#### 2.1 Consumer behaviour

Consumers around the world vary tremendously in age, income, education level, and tastes. They also buy an incredible variety of goods and services (Kotler & Armstrong, Principles of Marketing, 2011). According to Kotler and Armstrong, there is an environment factors which are entering to consumers' 'black box' and generate certain responses. In an environment, there are two categories: marketing stimuli and others major factors. The marketing stimuli includes 4Ps: Product, Price, Place, and Promotion. The other major factors are economic, technological, social, and cultural. Buyers' characteristics and buyers' decision process are included in 'black box'. Based on how the environment effects on buyers' characteristics and buying decision processes, buyer responses change.

#### 2.2 Social factor influences

A consumer's behaviour also is influenced by social factors, such as the consumer's small groups, family, and social roles and status (Kotler & Armstrong, Principles of Marketing, 2011).

#### 2.2.1 Small groups

Person's attitude or behaviour can be changed by the influences of the small groups. Influences may be the form of worth of mouth influence, opinion leaders influence, and online social networks influence.

#### 2.2.2 Family

Family plays an important role in our most buying decisions (Pratap, 2017). Kotler and Armstrong also state that family is the most important consumer buying organization in society. Type of buying

product and role of person within family has connected each other. Members within a family can be categorised in three roles; initiator, influencer, decider, and user. Initiator starts buying decision making process when he/she notice a service or product is needed to purchase. Influencer feed the information for buying decision making process. Decider make the decision finally. User is the person who most directly consume the purchased product or service.

#### 2.2.3 Roles and status

Persons are living with their social environments such as family, clubs and, online associations. Within these social environments, people are defined in terms of their status and role. People are expected to act and present to flexible with their social environments. They try to fulfill their esteem need according to their environments. So, they select the products and services which can reflect their status and roles.

## 2.3 Consumer decision-making process

Before buying services or products from the consumer, the decision-making process happens. According to Engel, Blackwell & Miniard's model of the consumer decision-making process, there are five stages when a consumer buys a product or services.

The first stage is *needed recognition*. Need recognition stage happens when the consumer notices that he needs a service or product. (Kotler, Marketing Management: An Asian Perspective, 2009). The needs emerge on individual consumer based on the level of his motivation. This can be seen clearly in Abraham Maslow's hierarchy of needs as followed.

The second stage is *information searching and processing*. (Kotler, Marketing Management: An Asian Perspective, 2009) states that the consumer initiates to search for information related to the product or service after deciding that he require to buy a product or service. The source of information may come in various forms such as print media, web pages, Internet, yellow pages directory or even from peer recommendation from friends, communities or groups.

Once information is gathered, *the identification and evaluation of alternatives stage* become. The consumer will start to concentrate on the choice of alternative products or services based on their point of views. (Solomon, Bamossy, Askegaard, & Hogg, 2010) states that individual consumer has their weighting factors when he selects a product or service.

At *the purchase decision stage*, the product or service has been selected by the consumer. If the consumer has a pleasant experience with a product or service, he may skip stage 2 and stage 3 next time.

The final stage is *post-purchase behaviour*, and it happens after the product or services has been purchased.

## 2.4 Demographic factors affecting consumer behavior

"consumer behaviour..... is the study of the processes involved when individuals or groups select, purchase, use or dispose of products, services, ideas or experiences to satisfy needs and desires." (Solomon, Bamossy, Askegaard, & Hogg, 2010). There are five factors which affect consumer behavior.

#### 2.4.1 Occupation

Buying decision of consumer may differ between different occupation of each consumer. It means consumer with different occupation may affect buying decision on product or service.

#### 2.4.2 Age

The buying behaviours of consumers may be changed because of the age difference between each consumer.

## 2.4.3 Economic Condition

It is obvious that the economic condition of consumers effects on deciding to buy a product or service.

#### 2.4.4 Lifestyle

Based on personal lifestyle, believes, attitude, social relation and his perception may affect on making the decision to buy a product or service.

#### 2.4.5 Personality

Every each of consumer has their attributes and that effects on buying behaviours.

#### 2.5 Social factors affecting consumer behaviour

Social factors play an essential role in influencing the buying decisions of consumers.

As like the demographic factors effect on consumer buying behaviour, social factors also affect consumer behaviours. Individual people have been influenced more or less from social factors such as reference groups, immediate family members, relatives, role in the society and status in the society.

#### 2.6 Consumer behaviour for higher education

College is now the second most expensive purchase in people's lives — students now seek out all of the increasingly available information about their decisions and even try to negotiate for a better deal (Collis, 2013). Choice of higher education institution is a major and significant decision for future students. Indeed, it is likely to be one of the first, if not the first decision, to be made without dominant parental involvement (Krezel & Krezel, 2017). There are three phases which are conducted when a student selects a higher education institution: predisposition, search, and choice (Hossler & Gallagher, 1987). According to Hossler and Gallagher's three-phase model of college choice, the first phase focus on growth of academic goals by means of socioeconomic situation, background attributes of student, peer-to-peer networks and environmental features. The second phase concentrate with collection information about universities, institutes and colleges. In this phase, there may be some social influences on selection of student. (Krezel & Krezel, 2017) states that the social factors can be categorised into three groups: institutional communication, student related factors, and influences of the greater social environment that comprise of family, peers and other reference groups. The third phase is setting the choice of university, institute or college.

## **Chapter 3: Methodology**

Methods and processes which are applied in the study will be explained in this Methodology chapter. Research methods, population selection and collection method of data will be stated in this chapter.

#### **3.1** Research method

Quantitative research methodology will be applied for this study which includes the analysis of demographic factors, social factors, and product factors. Moreover, this study is constructed as descriptive and based on the survey. In the survey, factors which influence on Myanmar students' choice of University courses will be emphasized.

Quantitative research is an organized way of gathering and investigating data collected from various sources. It consists of the utilization of statistical, mathematical and computational functions to arise results.

## 3.2 Population and sample groups

The population of this research will be only the Myanmar people who are attending or going to attend a course opened by Universities. And population can include both males and females who are older than 15 years and passed the matriculation exam or equivalent level or eligible to attend higher education courses. Sample size will be approximately 200 students for this study. For the sample selection, convenience sampling of non-probability sampling method will be used.

#### **3.3 Data collection**

In this study, both primary and secondary data will be used as the sources of data. The result from the questionnaire survey will be used as primary data. And the information from printed media, books, internet, and similar study will be used as secondary data.

The questionnaire will include three sections – demographic background of students, social factors influence on them and product factors which are being considered. In the demographic factor, gender, age, and income will be asked in the questionnaire. Then the social factor section will measure how

senior family members, friends and role model influence to the students by means of their demographic backroads. For the third section, Product factor, the study will measure how the students choose the courses based on the universities' brand (reputation), Geographical Location, future opportunities, course duration, course lecturer quality, curriculum quality and flexibility of timetable.

#### **3.4** Data analysis

As this research is based on the quantitative method, data gathered from the questionnaire will be used to analyse. Once the feedback from the questionnaire is gathered, all of them are required to examine for the completeness and integrity. After cleansing the questionnaires, they will be implied into the predefined codes which are analyzed and stored as nominal or ordinal variables so that the data can be processed with statistical software. To analyse the data, SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) application will be used in both descriptive statistics way and inferential statistics way. Data will be presented as percentage and frequency form for descriptive analysis.

On the other hand, mean data will be also presented as the minimum, maximum and standard deviation form for descriptive statistics. For inferential statistics, the data will be processed with Independent T-Test, Levene's Test and ANOVA. This analysis will use 0.05 as significance level as the standard for the above data processing.

## **Chapter 4: Data Analysis**

As the name implies, "A Study on the Factors Influencing Myanmar Students' Choice of University Courses", this research is focused on how the factors influence on Myanmar students, based on their demographic background, when they choose the courses from Universities, Institutes and Colleges. In this chapter, data analysis will be presented in two ways, descriptive way and inferential way.

## 4.1 Descriptive analysis

Descriptive analysis is an analysis method which summarizes based on the gathered data. In this analysis, there are three parts which describe the demographic factors of respondents. They are gender, age and income and they will be presented in frequency and percentage.

## 4.1.1 Data analysis of respondents' demographic background regarding gender, age and income

Table 1

The	frequency	distribution	of the	respondents	bv	gend	er
					~ )	0	

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Female	112	56	56	56
	Male	88	44	44	100
	Total	200	100	100	

The above table represents the respondents' demographic data related to age. According to this table, the frequency of female respondent is 112 (56%), and the male respondent is 88 (44%). Based on the data, female respondents' amount is larger than the male respondents' amount.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	15 - 24	41	20.5	20.5	20.5
	25 - 34	110	55.0	55.0	75.5
	35 - 44	31	15.5	15.5	91.0
	45 and above	18	9.0	9.0	100
	Total	200	100	100	

Table 2	
The frequency distribution of respondents by	age

The second table represents the demographic background data related to the age of respondents. The most significant amount of contributed person in this survey is the age range between 25 and 34 which has 110 (55 %) in total. The second biggest contribution group is age range between 15 and 24

which has 41 (20.5%). Age between 35 and 44 are third with the frequency of 31 (15.5%), and the least is 45 and above group, 18 frequency (9%). So, the majority age group is 25-34, which is more than half the amount of total respondents.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2000\$ and above	21	10.5	10.5	68.5
	1001\$ - 2000\$	28	14	14	14
	501\$ - 1000\$	32	16	16	84.5
	101\$ - 500\$	88	44	44	58
	Below 100\$	7	3.5	3.5	88
	No income	24	12	12	100
	Total	200	100	100	

#### Table 3

The frequency distribution of respondents by monthly income

According to Table 3, the majority group is the respondents whose incomes are between 101\$ and 500\$ with the frequency 88 (44%). The respondents whose incomes from 501\$ to 1000\$ is the second largest group with frequency 32 (16%). The group which has monthly income 1001\$ to 2000\$ is third majority groups with frequency 28 (14%). The respondent group who has no income is frequency 24 (12%), and the group with monthly income 2001\$ and above is 21 (10.5%). The respondent group whose income below 100\$ is the fewest frequency with 7 (3.5%).

## 4.1.2 Data analysis of social factors influencing on respondents

#### Table 4

The frequency distribution of responses on social factors

		Responses		Percent of	
		Ν	Percent	Cases	
Social Factors Influences <sup>a</sup>	Senior family members' influence	46	19.7%	23.0%	
	Friends influences	36	15.5%	18.0%	
	Role model influences	40	17.2%	20.0%	
	No influence	111	47.6%	55.5%	
Total		233	100.0%	116.5%	

a. Dichotomy group tabulated at value 1.

Table 4 represents the statistic about social factors influencing on respondents when they choose the University course. The respondents who make their own decision with influencing is the majority group with 111 (47.6%) responses. However, 46 (19.7%) of responses shows that senior family

members influence the respondents. 40 (17.2%) of responses are selected as role model influences. It means the respondents choose the course because the person they respect or admire attends the course. The smallest group of respondents is friends influences with 36 (15.5%) responses. They choose the course because their friends choose the course.

## 4.1.3 Data analysis of Product factors influencing on respondents

#### Table 5

The frequency table of responses on product factors

		Res	sponses	Percent
		N	Percent	of Cases
Product factors influences <sup>a</sup>	Brand of University, Institute, College	145	24.2%	72.5%
	Geographical location	57	9.5%	28.5%
	Future career path	158	26.3%	79.0%
	Course duration	53	8.8%	26.5%
	Lecturer quality	71	11.8%	35.5%
	Curriculum	61	10.2%	30.5%
	Flexibility of timetable	55	9.2%	27.5%
Total		600	100.0%	300.0%

a. Dichotomy group tabulated at value 1.

The above table represents the product factors influencing on the respondents when they choose the university course. Future career path is the most influenced product factors within the respondents with the selection of 158 (26.3%). Moreover, respondents also consider the Brand of University which option was selected by145 (24.2%). The third influencing factor is lecturer quality with 71 (11.8%) responses. 61 (10.2%) of reactions have selected the Curriculum as the influencing factor when they choose the course. Geographical location and timetable flexibility are almost the same amounts of influence on the respondents by means of 57 (9.5%) and 55(9.2%). Course duration factor is the smallest influencing factor on the respondents as a result show that 53 (8.8%) only.

#### 4.2 Inferential analysis

According to the conceptual framework presented in Chapter 1, the hypotheses of the study are as followed.

H1: There are relationships between students' demographic backgrounds and social influences factors.

**H2**: There are relationships between students' demographic backgrounds and product influences factors.

For both above hypotheses, Independent Simple T-Test and ANOVA are used to test for equality of variances. Moreover, alpha level 0.05 is used as standard significance value.

## 4.2.1 Hypothesis H1

H1: There are relationships between students' demographic backgrounds and social influence factors.

In this hypothesis H1, the study will focus on the relationship between demographic background and social influence factors. Gender, Age and Monthly income from the demographic background will be testified to the relationship with social influence factors.

4.2.1.1 H1.1

The hypothesis for the relationship between gender groups and social influence factors will be defined as H1.1.

H<sub>0</sub>: The differences in gender does not affect the students' decision from social influences.

H<sub>1</sub>: The differences in gender affects the students' decision from social influences.

#### Table 6

Descriptive statistics regarding to the social factors influence on genders

				Std.	Std. Error
	Gender	N	Mean	Deviation	Mean
Senior family members' influence	Female	88	0.17	0.38	0.04
	Male	112	0.28	0.45	0.04
Friends influences	Female	88	0.19	0.40	0.04
	Male	112	0.17	0.38	0.04
Role model influences	Female	88	0.21	0.41	0.04
	Male	112	0.20	0.40	0.04
No influence	Female	88	0.59	0.49	0.05
	Male	112	0.53	0.50	0.05

		Levene	e's Test							
		for Equ	ality of							
		Varia	inces			t-tes	t for Equalit	y of Means		
								95% Con Interva	nfidence l of the	
						Sig. (2-	Mean	Std. Error	Diffe	rence
		F	Sig.	t	df	tailed)	Difference	Difference	Lower	Upper
Senior family	Equal variances	13.66	0.000	-1.78	198	0.08	-0.11	0.06	-0.22	0.01
members'	assumed									
influence	Equal varian assumed	ices not		-1.82	197.04	0.07	-0.11	0.06	-0.22	0.01
Friends influences	Equal variances assumed	0.73	0.394	0.43	198	0.67	0.02	0.06	-0.09	0.13
	Equal varian assumed	ices not	00	0.43	182.24	0.67	0.02	0.06	-0.09	0.13
Role model influences	Equal variances assumed	0.08	0.777	0.14	198	0.89	0.01	0.06	-0.11	0.12
	Equal varian assumed	ices not		0.14	185.53	0.89	0.01	0.06	-0.11	0.12
No influence	Equal variances assumed	2.84	0.094	0.90	198	0.37	0.06	0.07	-0.08	0.20
	Equal varian assumed	ices not		0.91	188.14	0.37	0.06	0.07	-0.08	0.20

Table 7Independent Samples T-Test of social factors influence on genders

As presented in Table 6 and Table 7, an independent samples t-test was applied to data to compare social factors influences on different gender groups.

For senior family members' influences social factor, results indicated a significant preference for Male group (M = 0.28, SD = 0.45) over Female group (M = 0.17, SD = 0.38), t (197.04) = -1.82, p < 0.001.

For friends influences factor, the analysis shows a non-significant trending in the predicted direction indicating a preference for Female group (M = 0.19, SD = 0.40) over Male group (M = 0.17, SD = 0.38), t (198) = 0.43, p = 0.394.

For role influences factor, results state a non-significant preference for Female group (M = 0.21, SD = 0.41) over Male group (M = 0.20, SD = 0.40), t (198) = 0.14, p = 0.777.

For no influence factor, results indicated a non-significant preference for Female group (M = 0.59, SD = 0.49) over Male group (M = 0.53, SD = 0.53), t (198) = 0.90, p = 0.094.

According to above analysis, the hypothesis " $H_1$ : The differences in gender affects the students" decision from social influences." is accepted.

4.2.1.2 H1.2

The hypothesis for the relationship between different age group and social influence factors will be defined as H1.2.

H<sub>0</sub>: The differences in age does not affect the students' decision from social influence factors.

H<sub>1</sub>: The differences in age affects the students' decision from social influence factors.

Table 8Mean values of the relationship between age groups and social influence factors

	Age	Senior family members' influence	Friends influences	Role model influences	No influence
15-24	Mean	0.29	0.05	0.20	0.61
	N	41.00	41.00	41.00	41.00
	Std. Deviation	0.46	0.22	0.40	0.49
25-34	Mean	0.19	0.25	0.22	0.52
	N	11.00	110.00	110.00	110.00
	Std. Deviation	0.40	0.43	0.42	0.50
35-44	Mean	0.23	0.13	0.13	0.65
	Ν	31.00	31.00	31.00	31.00
	Std. Deviation	0.43	0.34	0.34	0.49
45 and	Mean	0.33	0.17	0.22	0.5
above	Ν	18.00	18.00	18.00	18.00
	Std. Deviation	0.49	0.38	0.43	0.51
Total	Mean	0.23	0.18	0.2	0.56
	Ν	200.00	200.00	200.00	200.00
	Std. Deviation	0.42	0.39	0.40	0.50

Table 9			
ANOVA analysis for variance	es among age	groups for social	l influence factors

		Sum of		Mean		
		Squares	df	Square	F	Sig.
Senior family	Between Groups	0.52	3	0.17	0.99	0.405
members' influence	Within Groups	34.90	196	0.18		
	Total	35.42	199			
	Between Groups	1.26	3	0.42	2.91	0.035
Friends influences	Within Groups	28.26	196	0.14		
	Total	29.52	199			
Role model	Between Groups	0.20	3	0.07	0.42	0.742
influences	Within Groups	31.80	196	0.16		
	Total	32	199			
No influence	Between Groups	0.58	3	0.19	0.77	0.510
	Within Groups	48.81	196	0.25		
	Total	49.40	199			

Table 8 and Table 9 presents the result of one-way ANOVA calculated on participants' responses on social influence factors by means of their age groups.

For senior family members' influence factor, the analysis was not significant, F(3, 196) = 0.99, p = 0.405 (r = 0.071).

For friends influences factor, the analysis was significant with 25-34 age group (M = 0.25, SD = 0.43) is the biggest group over 45 and above group (M = 0.17, SD = 0.38), 35-44 age group (M = 0.13, SD = 0.34), and 15-24 age group (M = 0.05, SD = 0.22), F(3,196) = 2.91, p = 0.035.

For role model influences factor, the analysis was not significant, F(3, 196) = 0.42, p = 0.742 (r = 0.046).

For no influence factor, the analysis was not significant also, F(3, 196) = 0.77, p = 0.510 (r = 0.063).

There is a certain relationship between age groups and social influences factors through Friends influence factor. Therefore, the hypothesis " $H_1$ : The differences in age affect the students' decision from social influence factors." is accepted.

## 4.2.1.3 H1.3

The hypothesis for the relationship between different income groups and social influence factors will be defined as H1.3.

H<sub>0</sub>: The difference in different income group does not affect the students' decision from social influences.

H<sub>1</sub>: The difference in the income group affects the students' decision from social influences.

## Table 10

Mean values of the relationship between different monthly income groups and social influence factors

		Senior family			
		members'	Friends	Role model	
Month	ly income	influence	influences	influences	No influence
	Mean	0.29	0.13	0.29	0.54
No income	Ν	24.00	24.00	24.00	24.00
	Std. Deviation	0.46	0.34	0.46	0.51
	Mean	0.57	0.00	0.00	0.43
Below 100\$	Ν	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00
	Std. Deviation	0.54	0.00	0.00	0.54
101\$ - 500\$	Mean	0.27	0.19	0.27	0.46
	N	88.00	88.00	88.00	88.00
	Std. Deviation	0.45	0.40	0.45	0.50
501¢	Mean	0.22	0.28	0.12	0.56
3015 - 1000\$	Ν	32.00	32.00	32.00	32.00
1000\$	Std. Deviation	0.42	0.46	0.34	0.50
1001\$	Mean	0.11	0.14	0.11	0.71
2000\$	N	28.00	28.00	28.00	28.00
2000\$	Std. Deviation	0.32	0.36	0.32	0.46
2001\$ and	Mean	0.05	0.14	0.10	0.81
2001\$ and above	N	21.00	21.00	21.00	21.00
a00ve	Std. Deviation	0.22	0.36	0.30	0.40
	Mean	0.23	0.18	0.20	0.56
Total	N	200.00	200.00	200.00	200.00
	Std. Deviation	0.42	0.39	0.40	0.50

		Sum of		Mean		
		Squares	df	Square	F	Sig.
Soniar family	Between Groups	2.19	5	0.44	2.56	0.029
members' influence	Within Groups	33.23	194	0.17		
	Total	35.42	199			
Friends influences	Between Groups	0.71	5	0.14	0.96	0.446
	Within Groups	28.81	194	0.15		
	Total	29.52	199			
Dala madal	Between Groups	1.60	5	0.32	2.04	0.075
influences	Within Groups	30.40	194	0.16		
mnuences	Total	32.00	199			
	Between Groups	3.08	5	0.62	2.58	0.028
No influence	Within Groups	46.32	194	0.24		
	Total	49.40	199			

*Table 11* ANOVA analysis for variances among different monthly income groups for social influence factors

The one-way ANOVA method was applied to calculate on participants' responses on social influence factors by means of their monthly income and the outcome are presented in Table 10 and Table 11.

For senior family members' influence factor, the result was significant, and the majority group is income below 100\$ (M = 0.57, SD = 0.54) over no income group (M = 0.29, SD = 0.46), 101\$-500\$ group (M = 0.27, SD = 0.45), 501\$-1000\$ group (M = 0.22, SD = 0.42), 1001\$-2000\$ group (M = 0.11, SD = 0.32), and 2001\$ and above group (M = 0.05, SD = 0.22), F (5, 194) = 2.56, p = 0.029.

For friends influences factors, the analysis was not significant, F(5, 194) = 0.96, p = 0.446 (r = 0.070).

For role model influences factors, the analysis was marginally significant. The group which belongs students with no income (M = 0.29, SD = 0.46) is the biggest over 101\$-500\$ group (M = 0.27, SD = 0.45), 501\$-1000\$ group (M = 0.12, SD = 0.34), 1001\$-2000\$ group (M = 0.11, SD = 0.32), 2001\$ and above group (M = 0.10, SD = 0.30), and below 100\$ (M = 0, SD = 0), F (5,194) = 2.04, p = 0.075.

For no influence factor, the analysis was significant in which the group which belongs the students with 2001\$ and above income (M = 0.81, SD = 0.40) is the majority over 1001\$-2000\$ group (M = 0.71, SD = 0.46), 501\$-1000\$ group (M = 0.56, SD = 0.50), No income group (M = 0.54, SD = 0.51),

101\$-500\$ (M = 0.46, SD = 0.50), and below 100\$ group (M = 0.43, SD = 0.54), F(5, 194) = 2.58, p = 0.028.

There is a relationship between different monthly income groups and social influences factors. Hypothesis " $H_1$ : The difference in the income group affects the students' decision from social influences." is accepted.

Therefore, according to the analysis results of H1.1, H1.2, and H1.3, there is a relationship between students' demographic backgrounds and social influence factors.

#### 4.2.2 Hypothesis H2

**H2**: There are the relationships between students' demographic backgrounds and influences of the product factors of Universities.

## 4.2.2.1 H2.1

The hypothesis for the relationship between gender groups and Universities' product factors will be defined as H2.1.

 $H_0$ : The difference in gender does not affect the students' consideration of product factors of University courses.

H<sub>1</sub>: The differences in gender affects the students' consideration of product factors of Universities' courses.

				Std.	Std. Error
	Gender	N	Mean	Deviation	Mean
Brand of University	Female	88	0.71	0.46	0.05
	Male	112	0.74	0.44	0.04
Location	Female	88	0.28	0.45	0.05
	Male	112	0.29	0.45	0.04
Future Career Path	Female	88	0.73	0.45	0.05
	Male	112	0.84	0.37	0.04
Course duration	Female	88	0.27	0.45	0.05
	Male	112	0.26	0.44	0.04
Lecturer quality	Female	88	0.33	0.47	0.05
	Male	112	0.38	0.49	0.05
Curriculum	Female	88	0.39	0.49	0.05
	Male	112	0.24	0.43	0.04
Flexibility of timetable	Female	88	0.30	0.46	0.05
	Male	112	0.26	0.44	0.04

*Table 12* Descriptive statistics regarding to the product factors influence on genders



	]	Levene	's Test							
	f	or Equ Varia	ality of			t_test	for Equality	of Means		
									95% Con Interva Diffe	nfidence l of the rence
		F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig. (2- tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Brand of	Equal variances assumed	1.28	0.258	-0.57	198	0.57	-0.04	0.06	-0.16	0.09
Oniversity	Equal variance assumed	es not		-0.57	183.18	0.57	-0.04	0.06	-0.16	0.09
Location	Equal variances assumed	0.00	0.960	-0.03	198	0.98	-0.00	0.07	-0.13	0.13
	Equal variance assumed	es not		-0.03	187	0.98	-0.00	0.07	-0.13	0.13
Future Career Path	Equal variances assumed	14.88	0.000	-1.94	198	0.05	-0.11	0.06	-0.23	0.00
	Equal variance assumed	es not		-1.90	167.22	0.06	-0.11	0.06	-0.23	0.00
Course	Equal variances assumed	0.19	0.664	0.22	198	0.83	0.01	0.06	-0.11	0.14
duration	Equal variance assumed	es not		0.22	185.41	0.83	0.01	0.06	-0.11	0.14
Lecturer	Equal variances assumed	1.81	0.181	-0.66	198	0.51	-0.05	0.07	-0.18	0.09
quality	Equal variance assumed	es not		-0.67	189.26	0.51	-0.05	0.07	-0.18	0.09
Curriculum	Equal variances assumed	17.40	0.000	2.23	198	0.03	0.15	0.07	0.02	0.27
	Equal variance assumed	es not		2.20	174.14	0.03	0.15	0.07	0.01	0.28
Flexibility of timetable	Equal variances assumed	1.28	0.259	0.57	198	0.57	0.04	0.06	-0.09	0.16
	Equal variance assumed	es not		0.57	183.18	0.57	0.04	0.06	-0.09	0.16

*Table 13* Independent Samples T-Test of social factors influence on age groups

As the results shown in Table 12 and 12, an independent samples t-test was applied to data to compare product factors influences on different gender groups.

For brand of university factor, results indicated a non-significant relationship with Male group (M = 0.74, SD = 0.44) over Female group (M = 0.71, SD = 0.46), t (198) = -0.57, p = 0.258.

For location factor, results indicated a non-significant preference for Male group (M = 0.29, SD = 0.45) over Female group (M = 0.28, SD = 0.45), t (198) = -0.03, p = 0.960.

For future career path factor, results state a significant preference for Male group (M = 0.84, SD = 0.37) over Female group (M = 0.73, SD = 0.45), t (167.22) = -1.90, p < 0.001.

For the factor of course duration, it was non-significant preference where female group (M = 0.27, SD = 0.45) over male group (M = 0.26, SD = 0.44), t (198) = 0.22, p = 0.664.

For lecturer quality, it was non-significant preference for male group (M = 0.38, SD = 0.49) over female group (M = 0.33, SD = 0.47), t (198) = -0.66, p = 0.181.

For curriculum factor, it was a significant preference for female group (M = 0.39, SD = 0.49) over male group (M = 0.24, SD = 0.43), t (174.14) = 2.20, p < 0.001.

For timetable flexibility factor, it was a non-significant relationship where female group (M = 0.30, SD = 0.26) is influenced than male group (M = 0.26, SD = 0.44), t (198) = 0.57, p = 0.259

According to the above analysis, " $H_1$ : The differences in gender affect the students' consideration of product factors of Universities' courses." is accepted.

4.2.2.2 H2.2

The hypothesis for the relationship between different age group and Universities product factors will be defined as H2.2.

H<sub>0</sub>: The difference in age does not affect the students' consideration of product factors of University courses.

H<sub>1</sub>: The difference in age affects the students' consideration of product factors of University courses.

				Future	~			Flexibility
Age		Brand of	<b>T</b>	Career	Course	Lecturer	G · 1	of
		University	Location	Path	duration	quality	Curriculum	timetable
15-24	Mean	0.63	0.29	0.76	0.34	0.44	0.22	0.32
	N	41.00	41.00	41.00	41.00	41.00	41.00	41.00
	Std. Deviation	0.49	0.46	0.44	0.48	0.50	0.42	0.47
25-34	Mean	0.76	0.31	0.84	0.23	0.36	0.27	0.24
	Ν	110.00	110.00	110.00	110.00	110.00	110.00	110.00
	Std. Deviation	0.43	0.46	0.37	0.42	0.48	0.45	0.43
35-44	Mean	0.71	0.19	0.68	0.32	0.29	0.55	0.26
	N	31.00	31.00	31.00	31.00	31.00	31.00	31.00
	Std. Deviation	0.46	0.40	0.48	0.48	0.46	0.51	0.45
45 and	Mean	0.78	0.28	0.78	0.22	0.22	0.28	0.44
above	Ν	18.00	18.00	18.00	18.00	18.00	18.00	18.00
	Std. Deviation	0.43	0.46	0.43	0.43	0.43	0.46	0.51
Total	Mean	0.73	0.29	0.79	0.27	0.36	0.31	0.28
	N	200.00	200.00	200.00	200.00	200.00	200.00	200.00
	Std. Deviation	0.45	0.45	0.41	0.44	0.48	0.46	0.45

*Table 14* Mean values of the relationship between age groups and product influence factors

## Table 15

ANOVA analysis for variances among age groups for product influence factors

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
D 1 C	Between Groups	0.49	3	0.16	0.82	0.486
University	Within Groups	39.38	196	0.20		
	Total	39.88	199			
	Between Groups	0.33	3	0.11	0.53	0.664
Location	Within Groups	40.43	196	0.21		
	Total	40.76	199			
Future Career Path	Between Groups	0.68	3	0.23	1.37	0.255
	Within Groups	32.50	196	0.17		
	Total	33.18	199			
0	Between Groups	0.53	3	0.18	0.91	0.440
duration	Within Groups	38.42	196	0.20		
duration	Total	38.96	199			
T (	Between Groups	0.75	3	0.25	1.08	0.359
Lecturer	Within Groups	45.05	196	0.23		
quanty	Total	45.80	199			
	Between Groups	2.26	3	0.76	3.69	0.013
Curriculum	Within Groups	40.13	196	0.21		
	Total	42.40	199			
E1 '1'1', C	Between Groups	0.76	3	0.25	1.27	0.285
r lexibility of	Within Groups	39.11	196	0.20		
timetable	Total	39.88	199			

Table 14 and Table 15 presents the result of one-way ANOVA calculation on participants' responses on product influence factors by means of the different age groups.

For brand of university factor, the analysis was no significant, F(3, 196) = 0.82, p = 0.486 (r = 0.065).

For geographical location of universities factor, the analysis was also no significant, F(3, 196) = 0.53, p = 0.664 (r = 0.052).

For future career path, the result of analysis was no significant, F(3, 196) = 1.37, p = 0.255 (r = 0.083).

Again, for course duration factor, the analysis was no significant, F(93, 196) = 0.91, p = 0.44 (r = 0.068)

For lecturer quality factor, there is non-significant preference, F(3, 196) = 1.08, p = 0.359 (r = 0.074). For curriculum factor, the analysis was a significant with 35-44 age group (M = 0.55, SD = 0.51) is the biggest which is on top of 45 and above group (M = 0.28, SD = 0.46), 25-34 age group (M = 0.27, SD = 0.45), and 15-24 age group (M = 0.22, SD = 0.42), F(3, 196) = 3.69, p = 0.013.

For timetable flexibility of universities, the analysis was no significant, F(3, 196) = 1.27, p = 0.285 (r = 0.080)

According to above analysis, hypothesis " $H_1$ : The difference in age affects the students' consideration on product factors of University courses." is acceptable.

4.2.2.3 H2.3

The hypothesis for the relationship between the income of the students and Universities' product factors will be defined as H2.3.

 $H_0$ : The difference in monthly income does not affect the students' decision on Universities' product factors.

H<sub>1</sub>: The differences in monthly income affects the students' decision on Universities' product factor.

Monthly	income	Brand of University	Location	Future Career Path	Course duration	Lecturer quality	Curriculum	Flexibility of timetable
<b>N</b> T	Mean	0.67	0.33	0.79	0.29	0.42	0.29	0.21
N0 income	Ν	24.00	24.00	24.00	24.00	24.00	24.00	24.00
meome	Std. Deviation	0.48	0.48	0.42	0.46	0.50	0.46	0.42
D - 1	Mean	0.57	0.57	0.71	0.57	0.00	0.29	0.29
Below 100\$	Ν	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00
100\$	Std. Deviation	0.54	0.54	0.49	0.54	0.00	0.49	0.49
1010	Mean	0.80	0.23	0.82	0.23	0.39	0.30	0.25
1015 - 5005	Ν	88.00	88.00	88.00	88.00	88.00	88.00	88.00
500\$	Std. Deviation	0.41	0.42	0.39	0.42	0.49	0.46	0.44
<b>501</b> 0	Mean	0.59	0.38	0.75	0.22	0.41	0.28	0.38
501\$ -	Ν	32.00	32.00	32.00	32.00	32.00	32.00	32.00
1000\$	Std. Deviation	0.50	0.49	0.44	0.42	0.50	0.46	0.49
10010	Mean	0.714	0.18	0.75	0.5	0.29	0.36	0.21
2000\$	Ν	28.00	28.00	28.00	28.00	28.00	28.00	28.00
2000\$	Std. Deviation	0.46	0.39	0.44	0.51	0.46	0.49	0.42
2001\$	Mean	0.76	0.38	0.81	0.05	0.29	0.33	0.38
and	Ν	21.00	21.00	21.00	21.00	21.00	21.00	21.00
above	Std. Deviation	0.44	0.50	0.40	0.22	0.46	0.48	0.50
	Mean	0.73	0.29	0.79	0.27	0.36	0.31	0.28
Total	Ν	200.00	200.00	200.00	200.00	200.00	200.00	200.00
	Std. Deviation	0.45	0.45	0.41	0.44	0.48	0.46	0.45

Table 16

Mean values of the relationship between different income groups and product influence factors

		Sum of		Mean		
		Squares	df	Square	F	Sig.
Brand of	Between Groups	1.27	5	0.25	1.27	0.277
University	Within Groups	38.61	194	0.20		
	Total	39.88	199			
Location	Between Groups	1.69	5	0.34	1.68	0.141
	Within Groups	39.06	194	0.20		
	Total	40.76	199			
Future	Between Groups	0.21	5	0.04	0.25	0.938
Career Path	Within Groups	32.97	194	0.17		
	Total	33.18	199			
Course	Between Groups	3.41	5	0.68	3.72	0.003
duration	Within Groups	35.55	194	0.18		
	Total	38.96	199			
Lecturer	Between Groups	1.38	5	0.28	1.21	0.308
quality	Within Groups	44.47	194	0.23		
	Total	45.80	199			
Curriculum	Between Groups	0.13	5	0.03	0.12	0.989
	Within Groups	42.27	194	0.22		
	Total	42.40	199			
Flexibility of	Between Groups	0.82	5	0.16	0.82	0.539
timetable	Within Groups	39.05	194	0.20		
	Total	39.88	199			

Table 17										
ANOVA	analysis for	variances	among	different	income	groups	for	product	influence	factors

The one-way ANOVA was applied to calculate on participants' responses on product influence factors by means of their monthly income.

For brand of university factor, the analysis was no significant, F(5, 194) = 1.27, p = 0.277 (r = 0.081).

For location of university factor, the analysis was no significant, F(5, 194) = 1.68, p = 0.141 (r = 0.093).

For future career path consideration, the analysis was also no significant, F(5, 194) = 0.25, p = 0.938 (r = 0.036).

The analysis was significant in course duration factor. The group which has students with less than 100\$ income (M = 0.57, SD = 0.54) is the largest group which sits over no income group (M = 29, SD 0.46), 101\$-500\$ group (M = 0.23, SD = 0.42), 501\$-1000\$ group (M = 0.22, SD = 0.42), 1001\$-

2000\$ group (*M* = 0.5, *SD* = 0.51), and, 2001\$ and above group (*M* = 0.05, *SD* = 0.22), *F* (5, 194) = 3.72, *p* = 0.003.

For lecturer quality factor, the analysis was no significant, F(5, 194) = 1.21, p = 0.308 (r = 0.079). For curriculum factor, the analysis states that there is no significant, F(5, 194) = 0.12, p = 0.989 (r = 0.025).

For flexibility of timetable factors, the result shows that there is no significant, F(5, 194) = 0.82, p = 0.539 (r = 0.065).

Based on above analysis, it can be assumed that there are unequal variances among different income level of student groups and it is accepted for hypothesis " $H_1$ : The differences in monthly income affects the students' decision on Universities' product factor."

Therefore, according to the analysis results of H2.1, H2.2, and H2.3, there are the relationships between students' demographic backgrounds and influences of the product factors of universities.



## **Chapter 5: Conclusion**

The objective of this research is to study how social factors and product factors influence on the students by means of the students' demographic background such as gender, age, and income. There are three major parts in this study, students demographic background, social factor influences, and product factor influences. Social factors and Universities' product factors have the relationship and influence on the demographic background of the students. Social factors and product factors differently influence on the students based on their different demographic backgrounds. This study can be used as guidelines for universities to make strategic business plans and marketing plans.

#### 5.1 The result of the data analysis

After collecting the data, descriptive analysis and referential analysis were applied to the received data as presented in Chapter 4. There are some useful findings after analysing the data. And the summary of the outcome is presented as followed.

#### 5.1.1 Results of the descriptive analysis

In the demographic background part, most of the respondents are female with 112 frequencies (56 percent of total respondents) according to the study of the survey responses. With frequency value 110 (55 percent of total respondents), most of the respondents have the age between 25 to 34. In term of monthly income, 88 respondents (44 percent of the total) selected the group \$101-\$500 which has the most significant number of respondents.

There is a question in the survey to analyse the social factor influences. The question has four options to answer, and the respondent can choose more than one question if applicable. 111 responses (47.6 percent) selected No influences options.

For the Universities' product factor influences, there is one question and seven options to answer in the survey. Respondent must select exactly three factors which are considered most. Brand of Universities, Institutes and College option is the most chosen with 58 responses (26.2 percent).

#### 5.1.2 Results of the inferential analysis

As mentioned in Chapter 1, there are two hypotheses in this study "H1: There are relationships between students' demographic backgrounds and social influence factors." Moreover, "H2: There are the relationships between students' demographic backgrounds and influences of the product factors of Universities.". To testify these hypotheses, social factors and product factors are applied to respondents' demographic backgrounds. Independent T-Test and ANOVA methods are used to calculate mean values and significance values.

#### 5.1.2.1 Hypothesis H1

H1: There are relationships between students' demographic backgrounds and social influence factors.

Assumption 1.1: The differences in gender affects the students' decision from social influences.

According to the analysis on the relationship between gender and social influences factors, it can be found that the differences in genders affect the students' decision from social influences by means of senior family members' influences factor. Based on the analysis, it can be assumed that male students are influenced by senior family members while they are choosing courses.

Assumption 1.2: The differences in age affects the students' decision from social influence factors.

After testing the relationship between the age groups and social influence factors, it can be found that the differences in age affect the students' decision from social influence factors through influences from friends. It means that friends influence the students with age between 25 to 34 and they choose the courses because of their friends' suggestions or their friends are going to attend that courses.

Assumption 1.3: The differences in the income group affects the students' decision from social influences.

According to the analysis of the relationship between different income groups and social influence factors, it can be assumed that the difference in monthly income level effects the students' decision from social influences. The students with income of less than \$100 are influenced by senior family

members when they choose the courses. And the students whose incomes are more than \$2001 choose the course on their own decision without social influences

#### 5.1.2.2 Hypothesis H2

**H2**: There are the relationships between students' demographic backgrounds and influences of the product factors of Universities.

Assumption 2.1: The differences in gender affects the students' consideration of product factors of Universities' courses.

After running ANOVA testing on data, it can be assumed that there are relationships between the different gender groups and Universities' product factors through future career path and curriculum. The male students more consider on future opportunities than female students. However, on the other side, female students more consider on course content (curriculum) than male students.

Assumption 2.2: The differences in age affects the students' consideration of product factors of University courses.

According to the analysis, it can be assumed that the differences in age effects the students' consideration on courses' product factors. There is a relationship between students' age and curriculum factor. The students' ages between 35 to 44 are the primary group who consider the curriculum and course contents when they choose the courses.

Assumption 2.3: The differences in monthly income affects the students' decision on Universities' product factor.

Based on the results of the analysis, there is the relationship between the different monthly income level and the course product factors by means of the curriculum. The students with monthly income from \$1001to \$2000 consider the curriculum before enrolling the courses.

#### 5.2 Conclusion

According to the analysis results, it can be concluded that both of social influence factors and university courses' product factors influence on students by means of their demographic backgrounds such as gender, age, and income level.

It can be assumed that senior family members influence male students. For the course selection, more male students consider on future career path than female students. However, female students consider the curriculum of the course rather than male students.

The students whose ages between 25 to 34 willing to listen to their friends' suggestions or they do what their friends do. The students' ages between 35 to 44 are the dominant group who consider the curriculum and course contents when they choose the courses.

The students with less than \$100 income are influenced by senior family members such as parents. They take suggestions from their elder relatives. On the other hand, the students whose monthly incomes higher than \$2000 are not influenced by other peoples. They decide themselves when choosing the courses. For the product influence factors, the students with monthly income from \$1001to \$2000 consider the curriculum before enrolling the courses.

### 5.3 Recommendation

According to the finding from this study, the universities can consider the statistics and the above conclusions. Universities can understand that not only product factors are the importance, and social factors and students' demographic backgrounds are also important.

Based on the finding, if a University wants to launch a new course which is targeted to male students, or low-income students, it is recommended considering their senior family members also for marketing. The Universities are recommended to focus more on course contents and curriculum if the course is intended for female students or for students whose ages between 25 to 34.

For further study, it is recommended to increase the sample size and area of research for better and accurate data quality.

## References

- Asian Development Bank. (2013). Technical Assistance Consultant's Report. Asian Development Bank.
- Blackwell, R. D., Miniard, P. W., & Engel, J. F. (2001). Consumer Behavior. Harcourt College.
- Collis, D. (2013, 8 23). *The Student as a Consumer* | *The EvoLLLution*. Retrieved from The EvoLLLution: https://evolllution.com/opinions/student-as-consumer/
- Hays, J. (2014). *EDUCATION IN MYANMAR* | *Facts and Details*. Retrieved 11 18, 2018, from http://factsanddetails.com/southeast-asia/Myanmar/sub5\_5f/entry-3117.html#chapter-0
- Hossler, D., & Gallagher, K. (1987). Studying Student College Choice: A Three-Phase Model and the Implications for Policymakers. *College and University*, 207-222.
- Howard, D. J., Kirmani, A., & Rajagopal, P. (2014). Social Influence and Consumer Behavior. Taylor& Francis Group.
- Institute of International Education. (2013). *Investing in the Future: Rebuilding Higher Education in Myanmar*. New York: Institute of International Education.
- Juneja, P. (n.d.). Social Media Impact on Consumer Behavior. Retrieved 11 18, 2018, from https://www.managementstudyguide.com/consumer-decision-making-process.htm
- Kotler, P. (2009). Marketing Management: An Asian Perspective (5 ed.). Prentice Hall.
- Kotler, P., & Armstrong, G. (2011). Principles of Marketing (14th ed.). Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Krezel, J., & Krezel, Z. A. (2017). Social influence and student choice of higher education institution. *Journal of Education Culture and Society*, 116-130.
- Perna, L. W., & Titus, M. A. (2004). Understanding Differences in the Choice of College Attended: The Role of State Public Policies. *The Review of Higher Education*, 501–525.

- Pratap, A. (2017). How does family affect consumer behavior and decision making? Retrieved 12 1, 2018, from https://www.cheshnotes.com/2017/03/what-role-does-family-play-in-consumerbehavior/
- Rodrigo. (2016). Factors influence an individual's self-concept The WritePass Journal : The WritePass Journal. Retrieved 12 2018, 2, from https://writepass.com/journal/2016/11/factorsinfluence-an-individuals-self-concept%EF%BB%BF/
- Solomon, M., Bamossy, G., Askegaard, S., & Hogg, M. K. (2010). *Consumer Behaviour: A European Perspective* (4th ed.). London: Prentice Hall.

Win, P. T. (2015). An Overview of Higher Education Reform In Myanmar. Bangkok.

Wisdom Jobs. (n.d.). Family Buying Influences in Consumer Behaviour - Family Buying Influences in Consumer Behaviour (10516) | Wisdom Jobs. Retrieved 12 1, 2018, from https://www.wisdomjobs.com/e-university/consumer-behaviour-tutorial-94/family-buyinginfluences-10516.html



## **Appendix A**

## Questionnaire

## The Factors You Would Consider if You Are Choosing a University Degree or Course

Questionnaire survey for "A STUDY ON THE FACTORS INFLUENCING MYANMAR STUDENTS' CHOICE OF UNIVERSITY COURSES"

Please answer the following questions as if you are attending or planning to attend a course/degree provided by National, Private or International University/ Institute/College.

PART 1: DEMOGR Tell us about yourself	APHIC FACTORS		
Gender			
□ Male	□ Female		
Age			
15 - 24	□ 25 - 34	□35 - 44	□ 45 and above
Monthly income			
□ No income			
□ Below 100\$ (	below 150,000 Ks)		
□ 101\$ - 500\$ (	150,001 Ks - 750,000 Ks	s)	
□ 501\$ - 1000\$	(750,001 Ks - 1,500,000	Ks)	
□ 1001\$ - 2000\$	\$ (1,500,000 Ks - 3,000,0	000 Ks)	
□ 2001\$ and ab	ove (3,000,000 Ks and a	bove)	

#### PART 2: SOCIAL FACTORS

Why would you choose a particular course? (Please select more than one if applicable except "Non influence" option.)

□ Senior family members' influence [e.g; Parents recommend to choose the course, family member is attending/going to attend the course, etc.,]

Friends influences [e.g; Your friends are attending/going to attend the course, etc.,]

□ Role model influences [e.g: The person you like is attending/going to attend the course, etc.,]

□ No influence [e.g. Self choice]

#### PART 3: PRODUCT FACTORS

Which THREE of the following factors are most influencing on you when you make a decision to choose a course?

Brand of University, Institute, College [e.g: Reputation of awarding University, Institute, College]

Geographical location [e.g: Ease of access, Located in downtown, etc.,]

□ Future career path [e.g: Better career path, potential for higher salary/income/position, etc.,]

Course duration [e.g: Get a bachelor degree in 3 years, get a diploma in 6 moths, etc., ]

Lecturer quality [e.g: The university which has lecturers with good reputation.]

Curriculum [e.g: Course contents, subjects, etc.,]

Flexibility of timetable [e.g: weekend section availability, evening section availability, etc.,]