



## **The Effect of Job Based and Environmental Factors in Enrollment of Higher Learning Institutions in Indonesia**

**Siti Ma'rifah**

Sekolah Tinggi Agama Islam Shalahuddin Al-Ayyubi  
[sitimarifahma@staisa.ac.id](mailto:sitimarifahma@staisa.ac.id),

**Obsatar Sinaga**

Padjadjaran University  
[obsatar.sinaga@unpad.ac.id](mailto:obsatar.sinaga@unpad.ac.id)

Received: December 11, 2022; reviews: 2; accepted: January 16, 2023

### **Abstract**

University level education become an important human right that could help to fulfill their basic needs. When it comes to higher education, numerous studies have pinpointed the desires of jobs security and environmental factors in the changing dynamic situation as the most important motivators for enrolling in universities (HLIs). Taking this consideration, the current study objective is to investigate the effect of job based factors and environmental factors on the career decision of university level students. A descriptive research strategy was used for this study. Primary data came from a self-administered questionnaire and a representative sample of 500 people. Both descriptive and inferential statistics were used in the analysis. The findings shown that environmental and job based factor considered to be important factors for the student's decisions in higher level education. The research contributed a body of knowledge in the extant literature that could become a new research are in future. This study also recommended that higher learning institutions are required to develop and review existing academic programs in a way that the person registered to them are able to grasp desirable and useful knowledge, skills and job attitude.

### **Keywords**

Job based factors, environmental factors, education, Indonesia

### **Introduction**

Education is a human right and it is a tool for individuals to acquire knowledge, skills and attitudes that are necessary for them to cope with their ever-

changing environment (Dewey, 1986). For that reason, the characteristics of people enrolled in education institutions have changed remarkably and motivation for schooling varies from people to people, country to country (Bailey et al., 2009). Similarly, to other decisions people take in everyday life, the decision to join a University level education follows a series of calculations on possible benefits and costs, opportunities and threats associated with it. Conferring to Maslow's hierarchy of needs theory, the motivation to decide on joining University level education may come from an experienced gap in satisfying a specific need or a requirement (Acosta Castellanos & Queiruga-Dios, 2022). Thus, unsatisfied need or requirement which may come from internal or external environment and job based factors becomes a motivating factor for people to join education or not behind the decision to enroll in higher education or whether those factors are associated with individual characteristics such as gender, age, marital status and program of study (Mukanziza & Singirankabo, 2022).

Empirical studies on the determinants which effects to enroll in University level education institutions indicate common and different individual motivations. The recent study findings by Piseth (2014) have validated by Teowkul et al. (2009) and Walker (2012) that people's decision to join a graduate program include, personal development factors such as self-improvement and achievement; career enhancement factors including promotion, high income, competitiveness; career switching factors such as need to change the current employment, take new career path; environmental factors such as peer influence, status in society, family expectations; and university factors including for instance easy access, time for studying etc. Same study findings have proved no statistical association between the decision to join university based on age and both career enhancement and switching factors. However, the personal development, environmental and university based factors were found statistically associated with the decision to join higher education based on age. The study by McDaniel (2012) provides evidence that expectation to be paid high earnings; expansion of employment opportunities and the possibility to get a higher level position are among the factors that push people to join higher education. However, the author proves significant difference between male and female expectations.

Eidimtas and Juceviciene (2014) further indicate the consideration of studies as an investment to yield returns in the future, especially by increasing chances to change career and earning higher incomes as a motivating factor for pursuing University level education. Besides, environmental conditions such as family and social status, economic development, education policies that expand access and accessibility to higher learning institutions are among the factors influencing the decision to participate in higher education. The findings are in agreement with that of Galotti et al. (2006) and Ceja (2006) that educated parents are likely to encourage their children to pursue University level education. They provide space for creating in children the need to study university by sharing information, saving for education and monitoring every step in children's education. Fitria, Pudjiati, and

Wulandari (2022) justify the source of information and the message itself as a motive for people to join higher education. For example, the information contained in advertisements on technical and vocation education with possibility to get a scholarship; speeches of government high officials on the role of education, higher education in particular, in turning developing countries into middle income countries are among the information that attract people to think about admission to University level education (Kaberuka, 2000). The study findings by Sojkin, Bartkowiak, and Skuza (2012) indicate family opinions and expectation, and students-like type of life as influential factors in deciding whether to pursue university education in Poland. Contrarily to other studies as mentioned above, the findings revealed better chance to find employment and possibility to get professional advancement not the main determinants of decision to enroll in University level education in Indonesia. This may be due to perception that rate of employability among university graduates is low besides that, a university education does not guarantee that one would have more work prospects or self-employment (Ashfahani et al.; Sojkin et al., 2012). Fernandez (2010) explored the motivations behind higher education; the informational resources which helped students choose a University level institution, as well as the barriers to enrolling in universities. The results show that enhancing chances of getting a job and gaining experience and skills among students' main factors for pursuing higher education. Due to university's positive reputation, excellent infrastructure, and accessibility of programs and courses which suit their purposes, students pick it.

C. Sikubwabo, A. M. Muhirwa, and P. Ntawiha (2020) investigated factors influencing the decrease of student's enrolments in six selected private higher learning institutions in Rwanda. The results show that institutional factors have a significant influence on the decrease of student's enrolments (C. Sikubwabo, A. Muhirwa, & P. Ntawiha, 2020). These factors are namely: high costs, inflexible and unmarketable programs, terrible living standards for students, slow internet connectivity, a problematic location for the school, and rigid educational norms and restrictions are some of the issues. The research advised that decision-makers be conscious about the variables that contribute towards the decline in student enrollment. The author suggested further study regarding students' satisfaction. Adejimi and Nzabalirwa (2021) argued that a wide gap noted in enrolment trend based on gender across departments while conducting students' enrolment trend in the education. Soares (2021) further conducted research on the variables affecting Angola's decision about higher education institutions. The findings show that the main issues are related to scientific activities where there is a discrepancy in gender. Sedahmed and Noureldien (2019) looked at Factors Influencing Students Decisions to Enrollment in Sudanese Higher Education Institutions. The findings show that about 50% are educational Institution related factors and 40% are admission related factors while influence strongly students' enrolment decision while only 10% is employment related factors and 0% for student and society related factors have weak influence.

After seeking the significance of job based factors and environmental factor for the University level enrolment. Along with this significance, previous studies still have some gaps, firstly previous studies have mainly focused on western countries (Cai, Wen, Lombaerts, Jaime, & Cai, 2022; McCall, Western, & Petrakis, 2020; Mukanziza & Singirankabo, 2022) but have little attention on developing nations. As, Indonesia is a also a developing nations and in Indonesia education sector is considered a big industry which contributed a lot from both of social and economic perspective. Moreover, the previous studies have individual effect of job based factors and environmental on the University level students while have little attention on combine effect of job based factors and environmental factors on the University level student enrolment (Mukanziza & Singirankabo, 2022). Moreover, previous studies also ignored the gender and age association with environmental factors, job based factors and University level enrolment (Kirkham, Chapman, & Wildy, 2020). Because is previous studies it is argued that these gender and age directly and indirectly effect to the University level enrolment (Corbin, 2017; Fatokun, Hamid, Norman, & Fatokun, 2019). Therefore, these factors could not be ignored. Keeping in attention previous gaps, the current study objective is to check the impact of environmental and job based factors on the University level student's enrolment with the presence of age and gender. The research was divided into five sections, introduction, literature review, research methodology, analysis and discussion, contributions and limitations.

### **Literature Review**

The term "student University level choice," as defined by Hossler, Braxton, and Coopersmith (1989), refers to the cumulative and longitudinal decision-making process that occurs when a person is enrolled in higher education. Therefore, Chapman (1981) published an article proposing a model of students' University-level choice decisions, which not only identified and analyzed factors that influence students' University-level choice decisions but also provided a guideline for University-level stakeholders to develop pertinent recruiting policies. The importance of higher education was first recognized by society as a whole, as noted by Jalalian, Latiff, Hassan, Hanachi, and Othman (2010). People have started to realize that "a good University level choice could influence one's future," but the research shows that back then, the biggest worry was over not knowing what to look for when deciding on the best University level to pursue. The internal and external influences were identified using Chapman's model of university level choice in order to have a clearer picture at each stage of the decision making process (Chapman, 1981).

The government of Malaysia plans to continuously develop Malaysia through various exchange programs in terms of culture, transfer of knowledge, and international trade in order to achieve its 2020 goal, but Haron et al. (2017) and Naidu and Derani (2016) both agree that today's college students are very different from those of previous generations. Given the complexities inherent in making a

decision about a higher education institution, the public is likely to place a greater emphasis on security than on the other factors. Among the many factors that parents take into account when deciding which university is best for their children is the country's economic and political stability, as noted by Sigle-Rushton and McLanahan (2004). This perspective is bolstered by the fact that universities shoulder more of the load when it comes to ensuring the safety of their students on campus. Each year, universities must publish a report detailing the security measures they have put in place to protect their students, faculty, and staff. Several researchers (Chekwa, Thomas Jr, & Jones, 2013).

The majority of the millennial generation around the world are struggling to afford the increased cost of higher education compared to previous generations (Chung & Fitzsimons, 2013). First-year students have a greater financial stake in the issue of college costs because they must rely on their families for assistance. Graduate students, on the other hand, are less financially vulnerable to tuition hikes because most of them already have jobs. Tuition, payment deadlines, and payment method options are all reported to be more important to graduate students than they are to undergraduates (Dao & Thorpe, 2015). However, Moogan (2011) marketing mix study on education argued that marketing should be prioritized. One of the most significant factors considered by high school students when deciding which college to attend was tuition cost, according to the study. This finding lends credence to the argument that the cost of tuition at a given university can have a significant impact on the value and quality that students perceive of their education. Meanwhile, the study found that while local students have greater access towards education loan via government supported initiatives, international students can only rely on scholarships offered through the institution itself (Alfattal, 2017), attesting the importance of pricing as a key influential factor.

Thus, based on previous discussion, this study follows with a consideration of personal characteristics as input variables, factors behind the decision as process variables. In addition decision to join University level education as output variable. It provides space for considering personal characteristics in terms of gender, age, marital status, employment status, and availability of scholarship to be independent of the decision to join University level education. On the top of that, in the process of weighing decision options, individuals consider and are shaped by a number of factors including environment factors, job security actors and job development factors. For this study, environmental factors refer to external conditions from the societal trend and aspiration. These include but not limited to family conditions, social condition, economic conditions and political aspiration on education. Job security factors are operationalized as conditions emerging in employment sphere and if individuals are not able to cope with them may be disqualified for the job. They are therefore motives for seeking or sustaining employment safety. This may largely include all forms of requirements to get new or/and to remain on current employment. Job development factors refer to the dynamics attracting individuals to move forward in their career and developments.

These may include but not limited to need for high earnings, future investment, career development, higher position, and enlargement of job opportunities. Thus, based on previous discussion, the following hypothesis are formulated below,

**H1:** *environmental factors significantly effect to the student's decisions in higher level education with consideration of age, employment status, marital status, and studentship status.*

**H2:** *job security factors significantly effect to the student's decisions in higher level education with consideration of age, employment status, marital status, and studentship status.*

**H3:** *job security factors significantly effect to the student's decisions in higher level education with consideration of age, employment status, marital status, and studentship status.*

### **Methodology**

The research objective is to investigate the effect of environmental factors, job security, and job development factors on University level enrolment students. For this purpose, descriptive survey design used and applied quantitative research approach. The items of the survey questionnaire were developed based on a review of previous studies on factors influencing people's decision to join higher learning institutions (Suleiman, Adeniyi, Kamal, Oluwaseun, & Abiodun, 2022). The primary data were gathered from a proportional sample of 300 out of 1000 students enrolled in three faculties at the "Protestant Institute of Arts and Social Sciences" during the academic year 2018/19. We used questionnaire tested with an alpha value equals to 0.812. Data were analyzed by use of descriptive statistics and t-testing. The questionnaire included 20 statements measures with five point Likert scale ranging from 1 for strongly disagree to 5 for strongly agree. Out of 20 statements, 7 items measured environment factors, 9 measured job based development factors and 4 measured job security factors associated with decision to enroll in higher learning institutions. The target population was 1000 students registered in the institution of Indonesia. The questionnaire was randomly distributed to the students from all departments of Indonesia educational state. The sample was selected via quota sampling. Using the following factors, we segmented the population among subgroups: gender, age, as well as enrollment programs (Weekend, holiday and day program). These subgroups were identified in the whole population. This method helped in well representation of chosen subgroups while studying. A number of respondents of 93.12% were achieved out of a total of 500 surveys issued. The questionnaire was first piloted to ensure the internal reliability of scales. The test was confirmed with 0.872 alpha and all factors had exceeded Cronbach's alpha 0.7.

## **Data Dialysis and Discussion**

The analysis of factors influencing a decision to enroll in higher learning institution was done by use of mean range, whilst the association of factors influencing decision and characteristics of students in terms of gender, age, marital status, employment status, scholarship status and program of study is examined through t-test. Therefore, this section presents the findings as follow: 1) respondents' central tendency on environment factors, variables affecting students' decisions to enroll in higher education institutions also include related to career progression and job stability, and 2) level of association between factors and personal characteristics in terms of gender, age, marital status, employment status, scholarship status and program of study. These analysis was done using SPSS software.

### **Descriptive Statistics**

The findings in [Table 1](#) show respondents' environment based factors that have influenced their decision to enroll University level education. The need to rise up the social status was given much value compared to other factors in the same category with a mean of 3.67, standard deviation (STD) of 1.62. The effect of economic conditions was indicated among influential factors in taking decisions to join higher education with a mean and STD of (3.63, 1.64) compared to the value given to social conditions with a mean and STD of (3.27, STD1.68) and political atmosphere (mean = 3.09, STD1.67) which attracts people to study. The influence of open access to university education was recognized among other environmental factors that influence the decision to pursue University level education but with a low rate, mean of (2.79, STD1.78). Equally, the respondents however recognized university education as a fashion with low effect on the decision to enroll in a given academic program. Although all above mentioned factors were indicated as influential determinants for individual decision to pursue university education, on the other hand social conditions especially social status, economic conditions and attractive legal and policy frameworks to education are the main environment factor contributing to the decision to enroll in higher learning institution. The motivation based on parents and/or other people's recommendation was qualified with a mean of (2.0, STD1.53) which is a low influence.

Further predicted results in Table.1 indicates that job security factors having high influence on the decision to pursue university education. The latter is considered by a quite number of people as a solution or/and response to the condition imposed by employment market. These employment conditions were rated with a mean and STD of (4.23, 1.43) which is high. The respondents affirmed the decision to join higher education to be dependent of the need for fulfilling required competencies for the job mean and STD (3.76,1.58), fulfilling required education qualification for employment (mean 3.37, STD1.70) and securing current job mean and STD of (3.34,1.84). Generally, respondents rated job security factors to have high influence

on individual decision to enroll in university education. The need to overcome the conditions imposed by employment market is among the main influential factor Contribution to the decision to pursue University level education.

In addition, the further predicted findings in Table.1 expressed the influence of job development factors on the decision to register in University level education. Much weight mean score and STD (4.31, 1.36) were given to the consideration of education as an investment to pay off in the future, education as a tool to build up future career with a mean score and STD (4.09, 1.47) and education as means to change employment position to a better one (job promotion) with a mean score and STD (3.98, 1.52). The respondents rated the need for increasing income through salary with a mean score and STD (3.78,1.61), the need for changing from one job to another (new job) with mean score of 3.75, STD1.58 to effect the decision to pursue higher education. Besides credits to influence decision to register with higher education was to the programs which are likely to expand job opportunities mean score and STD of (3.64,1.60), to open the space for promotion (score mean of 3.55, STD1.62) and programs which fit with previous studies (mean score and STD of (3.44,1.62).

Table.1: Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	SD
Environmental Factors		
Need for rising social status	3.67	1.62
Economic living conditions	3.63	1.64
Social living conditions	3.27	1.68
Political environment on education	3.09	1.67
Public call and easy access to higher education	2.79	1.78
University education on fashion	2.57	1.68
Recommendation from parents and/or other nearest people	2.01	1.53
Job Security Factors		
Conditions imposed by employment market	4.23	1.43
Fulfilling required competency for the job	3.76	1.58
Having required qualification for employment	3.37	1.70
Securing current job	3.34	1.84
Job development factors		
Making an investment to yield in future	4.31	1.355
Program which fits the current job or future career	4.09	1.465
A way to change current position to a better one	3.98	1.523
A way to increase income through increased salary	3.78	1.605
Program which help change from one job to another	3.75	1.580
Program which is likely to give work	3.64	1.603
Program which is likely to open door for promotion	3.55	1.624
Program which is in line previous studies	3.44	1.641
Program which is likely to yield highly paying job	3.27	1.725



### Inferential Statistics

The findings on whether there is or not significant difference between the factors behind the decision to pursue University level education and personal characteristic in terms of gender, age group, marital status, employment status, studentship. The results presented in Table.2 indicates that environment factor behind the decision to pursue higher education are not significantly different between below and 30 years old and above 30 years old ( $t = 0.172, 0.0.716 > p\text{-value } 0.05$ ); 2) Job based development factors behind the decision to pursue higher education are not significantly different between below and 30 years old and above 30 years old ( $t = 1.321, 0.104 > p\text{-value } 0.05$ ); 3) job security factors behind the decision to pursue higher education are not significantly different between below and 30 years old and above 30 years old ( $t = 0.612, 0.421 > p\text{-value } 0.05$ ). The results presented in Table.2 indicate the following: 1) the mean environment factor behind the decision to pursue higher education are not significantly different between single and married students ( $t = -0.021, 0.983 > p\text{-value } 0.05$ ); 2) the mean job based development factors behind the decision to pursue higher education are not significantly different between male and female ( $t = 1.24$ ). The findings presented in Tabl3.2 indicate the mean environment factor behind the decision to pursue higher education are not significantly different between employed and non-employed students ( $t = 0.331, 0.741 > p\text{-value } 0.05$ ); 2) the mean Job based development factors behind the decision to pursue higher education are not significantly different between employed and non- employed students ( $t = 0.087, 0.931 > p\text{-value } 0.05$ ); 3) the mean job security factors behind the decision to pursue higher education are not significantly different between employed and non-employed students ( $t = -0.009, 0.993 > p\text{-value } 0.05$ ). In addition, the results presented in [Table.2](#) indicate that the mean environment factor behind the decision to pursue higher education are significantly different between self-sponsored and scholarship holders ( $t = 2.147, 0.033 < p\text{-value } 0.05$ ); 2). Job based development factors behind the decision to pursue higher education are not significantly different between self-sponsored and scholarship holders ( $t = 1.461, 0.146 > p\text{-value } 0.05$ ); 3), job security factors behind the decision to pursue higher education are not significantly different between self-sponsored and scholarship holders ( $t = 1.437, 0.153 > p\text{-value } 0.05$ ). All of the above results are supported with previous findings (Mukanziza & Singirankabo, 2022)

Table.2: Inferential Statistics

	<b>T</b>	<b>Degree of</b>	<b>Sig. (2-</b>
	<b>Statistics</b>	<b>Freedom</b>	<b>tailed)</b>
Age			
Environmental Equivalent variances anticipated	0.172	212	0.716
Equivalent variances not anticipated	0.162	129.883	0.856

Job based Equivalent variances anticipated	1.321	213	0.104
Equivalent variances not anticipated	1.231	121.620	0.225
Job security Equivalent variances anticipated	0.612	212	0.421
Equivalent variances not anticipated	0.716	139.147	0.475
Marital Status			
Environmental Equivalent variances anticipated	-0.021	224	0.983
Equivalent variances not anticipated	-0.021	208.320	0.983
Job based Equivalent variances anticipated	1.240	225	0.216
Equivalent variances not anticipated	1.230	209.313	0.220
Job security Equivalent variances anticipated	-0.083	223	0.934
Equivalent variances not anticipated	-0.083	214.359	0.934
Employment Status			
Environmental Equivalent variances anticipated	2.147	162	0.033
Equivalent variances not anticipated	2.279	29.204	0.030
Job based Equivalent variances anticipated	1.461	162	0.146
Equivalent variances not anticipated	1.237	25.289	0.228
Job security Equivalent variances anticipated	1.437	160	0.153
Equivalent variances not anticipated	1.347	25.261	0.190
studentship status			
Environmental Equivalent variances anticipated	2.147	162	0.033
Equivalent variances not anticipated	2.279	29.204	0.030
Job based Equivalent variances anticipated	1.461	162	0.146
Equivalent variances not anticipated	1.237	25.289	0.228
Job Security Equivalent variances anticipated	1.437	160	0.153
Equivalent variances not anticipated	1.347	25.261	0.190
Equivalent variances anticipated	2.147	162	0.033

0.216 > p-value 0.05); 3) the mean job security factors behind the decision to pursue higher education are not significantly different between male and female ( $t = 0.083, 0.934 > p\text{-value } 0.05$ ).

### **ANNOVA Test Results**

The analysis of variance (ANNOVA) revealed the following as presented in Table.3 indicates that the mean environment factor behind the decision to pursue higher education are not significantly different among the programs of study ( $F_{2,218} = 0.249; 0.780 > p\text{-value } 0.05$ ); 2) Job based development factors behind

the decision to pursue higher education are not significantly different among the programs of study ( $F_{2,219} = 1.185$ ;  $0.308 > p\text{-value } 0.05$ ); 3) job security factors behind the decision to pursue higher education are not significantly different among the programs of study ( $F_{2,217} = 0.123$ ;  $0.884 > p\text{-value } 0.05$ ). The above discussed results are predicted in the following table.3.

Table.3: ANNOVA Test Results

		<b>Sum of Squares</b>	<b>Mean Squares</b>	<b>F Squares</b>	<b>Sign</b>
Environmental	Between groups	0.407	0.203	0.249	0.780
	Within Groups	177.871	0.816		
Job based development	Between Groups	2.365	1.183	1.185	0.308
	Within Groups	218.482	0.998		
Job security	Between Groups	0.316	0.158	0.123	0.884
	Within Groups	279.454	1.288		

### **Conclusion and Recommendation**

Upon the findings it is concluded that students who are enrolled in higher education were motivated by almost same factors. Job development factors are the dominant factors to influence the decision to pursue University level education compared to job security factors and environment factors. Although the findings revealed the mean factors contributing to the decision to join higher education are not significantly different from the personal characteristics; there are exceptions at the level of job security factors between male and female and environment factors between self-sponsored and scholarship holders. The findings suggest the universities consider the students' differences about motivations to register to university education and align the program development and re- view of existing one accordingly. Universities should also ensure a quality teaching-learning-assessment process that address growth needs and required knowledge, skills and job attitudes by involving mainly employing institutions and other industries in curriculum development. In this study, we used descriptive statistics to analyze the data; hence, the future study may focus on the determinants of higher learning education choices and students' satisfaction with regard to academic performance.

### **Contributions**

The above findings imply that people are driven by different motivation in the pursuit of higher education. Job development factors lead the decision to enroll to higher learning institution. This means that people are looking for education which enables them to respond to their growth needs, especially through programs which promise to pay off in the future and those ones respond to the changing terms and condition of today's employment market. Consequently, higher learning institutions are required to develop and review existing academic programs in a

way that the person registered to them are able to grasp desirable and useful knowledge, skills and job attitude. The influence of dynamics in social, economic and political sphere attracts attention of higher learning in situation not only to provide a flexible mode of attendance, also to organize teaching, learning and assessment in way that needed competences are developed and opportunities for career development and better employment positions are made available to the students. Industrial attachment and involvement of employing institutions in curriculum or program development could help in the process.

The findings bring to wonder about current responses from higher learning institutions vis-à-vis job security factors which are behind the decision to pursue higher education. Universities are known to be bureaucratic institutions where- by a set of rules and regulations is used to either qualify or not its students. On another hand, due to the pressure from employer, students may decide to join a university with a belief to get an award earlier or any other academic document before the normal program duration as a way to secure his/her current employment. Do the universities have a way-out to respond to this matter with no violation of regulations, at the same time ensure the safety of its clients? Does the existing qualification framework provide flexible way for universities to respond to this challenge without disgracing the quality of education? In addition, the findings claim the lack of required competence for the job as a motive to pursue higher education. The composition of university students provides evidence on the existence of both employed and no employed students in the same programs and classroom. Thus, how do the universities consider and integrate the experience of employed students and promote non-experience students in the same classroom? If each student is focusing on fulfilling required competence for the job, how do universities individualized its teaching, learning and assessment to ensure that everyone has got his/her package according to his/her specific needs?

The findings therefore call higher learning institutions to mind about the students' differences based on motivation to join university as the quality of program and teaching-learning-assessment process are concerned. For today and future sustainability of universities, it seems imperative to align the academic programs and organization of instructions to the different needs of people who demand for education. Generally, the findings revealed that the means factors influencing decision to enroll to higher education are no significant different vis-à-vis personal characteristics in terms of gender, age group, marital status, employment status, studentship status and program of study. The exception was found on the mean job security factors behind the decision to pursue higher education which is significantly different between male and female and the mean environment factors behind the decision to pursue higher education which significantly different between self-sponsored and scholarship holders.

Along with these contributions, the studies still have some limitations that could become new research area. There was little attention on moderating or mediating effect therefore, future research could be conduct on moderating or

mediating variable to increase research generalizability. Also, study has been conducted on Indonesia educational institutions that could not be generalized on other developed economies, therefore, future research could be conducted on other developing nations to increase the research scope. The study was also limited on cross sectional research design where data was collected at one time, a future research could be conduct on other longitudinal research design to increase the researcher room. The research also ignores the structural equation modeling technique, therefore, future research could be conduct on structural equation modeling technique to increase the more reliability of the findings.

## **References**

- Acosta Castellanos, P. M., & Queiruga-Dios, A. (2022). From environmental education to education for sustainable development in higher education: a systematic review. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, 23(3), 622-644.
- Adejimi, S., & Nzabwirwa, W. (2021). Students' enrolment trend in the School of Education, College of Education, University of Rwanda. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 9(1), 17-27.
- Alfattal, E. (2017). International students' college choice is different! *International Journal of Educational Management*.
- Ashfahani, R. N. G., Sugandha, A., Tripena, A., Prabowo, A., Rokhman, A. F., & Bon, A. T. Double Linear Regression Method to Analyze Factors Affecting the Employment Level in West Java Province.
- Bailey, R., Armour, K., Kirk, D., Jess, M., Pickup, I., Sandford, R., & Education, B. P. (2009). The educational benefits claimed for physical education and school sport: an academic review. *Research papers in education*, 24(1), 1-27.
- Cai, J., Wen, Q., Lombaerts, K., Jaime, I., & Cai, L. (2022). Assessing students' perceptions about classroom learning environments: the New What Is Happening In this Class (NWIHIC) instrument. *Learning Environments Research*, 25(2), 601-618.
- Ceja, M. (2006). Understanding the role of parents and siblings as information sources in the college choice process of Chicana students. *Journal of College Student Development*, 47(1), 87-104.
- Chapman, D. W. (1981). A model of student college choice. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 52(5), 490-505.
- Chekwa, C., Thomas Jr, E., & Jones, V. J. (2013). What Are College Students' Perceptions about Campus Safety? *Contemporary Issues in Education Research*, 6(3), 325-332.
- Chung, S. M., & Fitzsimons, V. (2013). Knowing Generation Y: a new generation of nurses in practice. *British Journal of Nursing*, 22(20), 1173-1179.
- Corbin, A. (2017). Assessing differences in learning styles: age, gender and academic performance at the tertiary level in the Caribbean. *The Caribbean Teaching Scholar*, 7(1).

- Dao, M. T. N., & Thorpe, A. (2015). What factors influence Vietnamese students' choice of university? *International Journal of Educational Management*, 29(5), 666-681.
- Dewey, J. (1986). Experience and education. Paper presented at the The educational forum.
- Eidimtas, A., & Juceviciene, P. (2014). Factors influencing school-leavers decision to enrol in higher education. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 116, 3983-3988.
- Fatokun, F., Hamid, S., Norman, A., & Fatokun, J. (2019). The impact of age, gender, and educational level on the cybersecurity behaviors of tertiary institution students: an empirical investigation on Malaysian universities. Paper presented at the *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*.
- Fernandez, J. L. (2010). AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF FACTORS INFLUENCING THE DECISION OF STUDENTS TO STUDY AT UNIVERSITI SAINS MALAYSIA. *Kajian Malaysia: Journal of Malaysian Studies*, 28(2).
- Fitria, T. N., Pudjiati, D., & Wulandari, F. (2022). Selecting English Study Programs in Higher Educations: Students' Perspectives. *Ahmad Dahlan Journal of English Studies*, 9(1), 1-13.
- Galotti, K. M., Ciner, E., Altenbaumer, H. E., Geerts, H. J., Rupp, A., & Woulfe, J. (2006). Decision-making styles in a real-life decision: Choosing a college major. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 41(4), 629-639.
- Haron, N. A., Devi, P., Hassim, S., Alias, A., Tahir, M. M., & Harun, A. (2017). Project management practice and its effects on project success in Malaysian construction industry. Paper presented at the *IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering*.
- Hossler, D., Braxton, J., & Coopersmith, G. (1989). Understanding student college choice. *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research*, 5, 231-288.
- Jalalian, M., Latiff, L., Hassan, S. T. S., Hanachi, P., & Othman, M. (2010). Development of a questionnaire for assessing factors predicting blood donation among university students: a pilot study. *Southeast Asian journal of tropical medicine and public health*, 41(3), 660.
- Kaberuka, D. (2000). *Rwanda Vision 2020*.
- Kirkham, J., Chapman, E., & Wildy, H. (2020). Factors considered by Western Australian Year 10 students in choosing Year 11 mathematics courses. *Mathematics Education Research Journal*, 32, 719-741.
- McCall, D., Western, D., & Petrakis, M. (2020). Opportunities for change: What factors influence non-traditional students to enrol in higher education? *Australian Journal of Adult Learning*, 60(1), 89-112.
- McDaniel, A. (2012). Women's advantage in higher education: towards understanding a global phenomenon. *Sociology Compass*, 6(7), 581-595.
- Moogan, Y. J. (2011). Can a higher education institution's marketing strategy improve the student-institution match? *International Journal of Educational Management*, 25(6), 570-589.

- Mukanziza, J., & Singirankabo, E. (2022). Factors Influencing Students' Decision to Enrol in Higher Learning Institutions: Case of Bachelor Students from the Protestant Institute of Arts and Social Sciences—Rwanda. *Open Access Library Journal*, 9(8), 1-14.
- Naidu, P., & Derani, N. E. S. (2016). A comparative study on quality of education received by students of private universities versus public universities. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 35, 659-666.
- Piseth, T. (2014). Factors Influencing Students' Decision to Pursue Higher Education: A Perspective from Master's Degree Students. Royal University of Phnom Penh.
- Sedahmed, Z. M., & Noureldien, N. A. (2019). Factors influencing students decisions to enrollment in sudanese higher education institutions. *Intelligent Information Management*, 11(4), 61-76.
- Sigle-Rushton, W., & McLanahan, S. (2004). Father absence and child well-being: A critical review. *The future of the family*, 116, 120-122.
- Sikubwabo, C., Muhirwa, A., & Ntawiha, P. (2020). An Investigation of Institutional Factors Influencing the Decrease of Student Enrollments in Selected Private Higher Learning Institutions in Rwanda. *European Journal of Education Studies*, 7(9).
- Sikubwabo, C., Muhirwa, A. M., & Ntawiha, P. (2020). Exploring effective strategies to revamp the student enrolments in private tertiary institutions: A case of Rwanda. *Inkanyiso: Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 12(2), 129-145.
- Soares, J. M. A. C. (2021). Factors Influencing the Choice of Higher Education Institutions in Angola. *International Journal of Educational Administration and Policy Studies*, 13(1), 23-39.
- Sojkin, B., Bartkowiak, P., & Skuza, A. (2012). Determinants of higher education choices and student satisfaction: the case of Poland. *Higher education*, 63, 565-581.
- Suleiman, Y., Adeniyi, S. T., Kamal, O., Oluwaseun, L. S., & Abiodun, O. M. (2022). An Assessment of Students' Enrolment Rate In University Of Ilorin, Nigeria from 2019-2021: Implications for Management. *Journal of Educational Leadership in Action*, 8(2), 4.
- Teowkul, K., Seributra, N. J., Sangkaworn, C., Jivasantikarn, C., Denvilai, S., & Mujtaba, B. G. (2009). Motivational factors of graduate Thai students pursuing master and doctoral degrees in business. *RU international Journal*, 3(1), 25-56.
- Walker, G. (2012). *Environmental justice: concepts, evidence and politics*: Routledge.