

A STUDY ABOUT STUDENTS' PERSPECTIVE FOR IMPROVING QUALITY OF MANAGEMENT EDUCATION SYSTEM IN PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS

* Parmod Kumar

Astt Prof, USB, Chandigarh University, Gharuan

** Ms. Ritu Sharma

Astt Prof, USB, Chandigarh University, Gharuan

Abstract : Quality is an indefinable and unclear concept (Parasuraman, Zeithami and Berry, 1985). Quality is defined as the 'fitness for purpose' and quality assurance is defined as 'the methods, techniques, practices and activities intended to lead to the attainment, maintenance, monitoring and improvement of quality' (Woodhouse, 1998, p. 258). Quality assurance for higher education systems has become a key issue globally encouraging alliance among quality assurance organizations at regional and international levels. The term "QUALITY" is derived from the Latin word "QUALITAS" which means the degree of excellence of a thing (Oxford Dictionary, 2003). The quality in the field of education connotes present and future needs of particular learners in question, given their particular situations and forecasts. It also denotes significant variations in the educational procedures, in the nature of its inputs, its purposes, programs and educational technologies; and its socio-economic, cultural and political environment (Coombs 1985: 105).

Key words : political environment, situations and forecasts

Introduction

As far as quality in education is concerned, the World Bank (1995) has come up with following concept: Quality in education is hard to express and measure. A suitable definition must include student outcomes. Most educators would also include in the definition the nature of the educational proficiencies that help to produce thus outcomes—the learning environment.

The unexpected growth of management institutions (1400 plus B-schools in India) has increased the concern about the quality of management education imparted by them. These B-Schools are confronted by various challenges in the way of improving quality, these are: shortage of quality faculty, infrastructure, funding, research and development, level of students, global competition and so on. Ensuring quality of an educational service is very complex because of

the various stakeholders' involved into it like: students, faculty, corporate, parents, society and above all whole country.

As far as measurement of quality of education is concerned, various researchers have come out with favorable and unfavorable arguments like: some authors believe that because of the complex, dynamic and intangible outcomes of education, an objective measurement of quality is very difficult or impossible (Tofte 1993, Sayed, 1993), on the other hand, some say that it is essential if quality improvement is to be monitored (Seymour, 1992; Morris and Haigh, 1993, Burkhalter, 1993). Moreover, the terms customer and market have also subjected to resistance from some educationalists who argue that they are applicable only to commercial environment not education (Sallis 1993; Cortis, 1992)

In the context of countries like India and other developing countries in the world, the quality measurement and improvement in private institutions is generally of special interest and focus. There are so many reports and theoretical works on quality, with respect to quality assurance and quality improvement. In many of them, research scholars have recognized different views on the issue related to quality education and its responsible factors. There are seven issues crucial for effective development of higher education in Bangladesh, namely, teaching quality, method, content, peer quality, direct facilities, indirect facilities and political climate (Andaleeb, 2003).

Furthermore, higher education institutions need to assure a particular standard quality of services to sustain in the market in which they operate. Nowadays these institutions are considered as service centers like other profitable and non-profitable organizations that segment and target markets based on the various dimensions of higher education quality. By using segmentation, the total student market can be classified into subgroups and various universities can analyze the attractiveness of each group to decide which segment(s) and they should focus on for promotional efforts for each sub groups (Kotler & Armstrong, 2010).

The modern universities are experiencing 'buyers' market' and students are buying higher education from universities by various resources like: curriculum, faculties, libraries and many more. That's why, selecting the suitable segment is a serious issue for universities, because these students will ultimately become the target market and represent loyalty (Ehrman, 2006).

Review Literature

Spanbauer (1995) raises a very important question that students are primary customers but customer relationship is somewhat different from a customer in a hotel or bank. In

University or college, customers are not well defined as Madu and Kuei (1993) suggest the definition of customer is quite broad as besides student as primary customers, there are other potential customers like parents, employers, government and society who should be considered (Sallis,1993; Corts,1993; Hittman, 1993).

Another complexity arises from the dynamic and interactive nature of higher education is "while students are prime customers of colleges and universities, they are also their raw material, suppliers, co-processors and products (Harris, 1992).

Faculty will be the final decision maker, by virtue of acquired knowledge and meaningful real world experience (Shahaida, Rajashekar and Nargundkar, 2006)

Purpose of Education:

The various parties involve in Quality Education like Government, Students and Industry consider different individualities as a purpose of education. As per industry's point of view about purpose of education is to create graduates who can communicate, cooperate, solve problems and work in a team effectively. However, the Student's viewpoint towards purpose of education is that, to improve earnings and further career prospects. Last but not the least the Government purpose of education may be to boost students' performance and achievement in aggregate (Montimore and Stone). Other objectives of education like acquisition of knowledge and inculcation of values in individuals (Wicks).

Three quality measures are qualities of design, conformance and performance in higher education. They have established a set of measurement parameters in evaluating the quality of research and curriculum development (Widrick, Mergen and Grant, 2000). The attributes for measuring performance of quality education are as follows: uniform national tests, certificate of educational institutions, student satisfaction measure, industry feedback,

international texts and quantitative measures and national indices such as patents, government of independent audits to set standards student evaluations and so on (Scarbec, 2000).

In Indian context, some other researchers have suggested five parameters to measure quality of management education quality of students that includes: the admission process, pedagogy, placement, faculty development and infrastructure (Gupta, Gollakota and Sreekumar, 2003). As compared private and public educations on the basis of quality assurance the matter of discussion is that there are several points of examination rather than prescribing any solutions to complications regarding the quality of education associated with the two different platforms (Sabur, 2004). Another scholar discussed the need for educational institutions to establish quality policies (Spanbauer, 1992). The techniques related to student assessment measures are classified as either formative or summative (Dhali, 1999).

In the context related to study held in Bangladesh, highlighted three different aspects involved in measuring quality education in private universities: the quality of teaching and research, receptiveness to the demands of the labor market, and equity (Lamanga, 2002). In Lamanga's (2006), he recommended several initiatives that can ultimately ensure quality education system for the higher learning institutions in Bangladesh.

According to Aminuzzaman (2007); Many departments of universities (Public & Private) do not have a long-term national vision, but that such a vision is critical to quality education He also describe that quality education in universities will be accomplished through changing the method of teaching and learning as well as assessment methods, reintroducing the curriculum continually, updating and upgrading professional knowledge and skills

and improving the broader educational, administrative and resource environments.

In reality, the student and lecturer interface is important to determine quality, and it is suitable to monitor this quality through appropriate quality assurance procedures. Though this is a superficial approach, the real challenge is the enhancement of quality. Different institutions have started to investigate approaches to quality enhancement (Rowley, 1996).

For instance, the study held at Wolver Hampton University as looking for registration under BS 5750 as well as the number of other universities which are taking the Total Quality Management path especially for quality education, including Aston, South Bank, Robert Gordons and Wolver Hampton (Hart and Shoolbred, 1993). Some other scholar's contributes by describing initiatives in this area include (Marchese, Ewell and Cornesky, 1991).

In 1991, a paper for Further Education Unit suggest six criteria for a quality model: (1) it seeks to improve the quality of teaching and learning strategies, (2) it is flexible, (3) it harnesses the commitment of all staff, (4) the learner should be involved, (5) there must be enhanced working relationships associated with all functions of the organization, and (6) requirements can be measured and progress can be demonstrated.

Relating to the cost of education in private university, there is right to mention particular the cost that will be foregoing measure or give-and-take price or sacrifice made to secure a benefit. Hence, in the simple words 'cost of education', that means the sacrifice made or price paid by the beneficiaries (students) so that they can achieve the specific objective of learning (Kotler, 2003).

Objectives Of The Study

By keeping the need of the study in mind, the present study aims at the following objectives:

1. To find out all various factors responsible for improving quality of Education in private institutions.
2. To analyze all the factors for improvement of quality of education and putting forward the major components for the improvement.

1. Research Methodology

1.1. Research Design: Descriptive Research Design is used for this study

1.2. Sampling Design: A sample size of respondents has been collected from 96 was collected from various Private

colleges/Universities in and around Chandigarh. **Research Instrument:** Primary Data has been used for this study which is collected in the form of a questionnaire consisting of 40 questions.

2. Data Analysis And Interpretation

Reliability: Internal Reliability was assessed using Cronbach’s alpha. As per the result obtained from Reliability Test using SPSS, the Cronbach alph coefficient comes out to be 0.777 with is quite satisfactory. So we can use Factor analysis for examining the role of various factors in determining consumer’s preference for shopping at shopping malls.

Case Processing Summary

	N	%
Valid	89	92.7
Cases Excluded ^a	7	7.3
Total	96	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.918	.919	38

3. Factor Analysis: The Measure of overall Adequacy (MSA) i.e. 0.707 falls in the acceptable range of (above 0.45). Most of the variables obtain and exceeds minimum acceptable MSA level and thus all fifteen

variables are statistically significant and collectively meet the the necessary threshold of sampling adequacy with an MSA value of 0.707. as represent by the following diagram.

KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.707
Approx. Chi-Square		1758.315
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Df	703
	Sig.	.000

The total variance is explained in the following Diagram

Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	10.101	26.582	26.582	10.101	26.582	26.582	5.464	14.379	14.379
2	2.677	7.045	33.628	2.677	7.045	33.628	2.812	7.401	21.780
3	2.218	5.837	39.465	2.218	5.837	39.465	2.610	6.868	28.647
4	1.935	5.092	44.556	1.935	5.092	44.556	2.478	6.521	35.168
5	1.850	4.867	49.423	1.850	4.867	49.423	2.450	6.446	41.615
6	1.605	4.222	53.646	1.605	4.222	53.646	2.068	5.442	47.057
7	1.521	4.002	57.648	1.521	4.002	57.648	1.991	5.240	52.297
8	1.408	3.705	61.353	1.408	3.705	61.353	1.846	4.858	57.155
9	1.297	3.412	64.765	1.297	3.412	64.765	1.664	4.379	61.534
10	1.188	3.127	67.893	1.188	3.127	67.893	1.601	4.214	65.747
11	1.135	2.988	70.881	1.135	2.988	70.881	1.584	4.168	69.916
12	1.060	2.788	73.669	1.060	2.788	73.669	1.426	3.753	73.669
13	.927	2.439	76.108						
14	.876	2.305	78.413						
15	.801	2.108	80.521						
16	.679	1.786	82.307						
17	.635	1.670	83.977						
18	.574	1.510	85.487						
19	.537	1.414	86.901						
20	.518	1.364	88.265						
21	.457	1.201	89.466						
22	.404	1.064	90.530						
23	.393	1.035	91.565						
24	.377	.992	92.557						
25	.359	.944	93.501						
26	.303	.798	94.299						
27	.297	.781	95.080						
28	.272	.715	95.795						
29	.266	.699	96.495						
30	.233	.614	97.109						
31	.208	.547	97.655						
32	.185	.486	98.141						
33	.182	.478	98.619						
34	.156	.410	99.030						
35	.141	.372	99.402						

Paper ID: UGC 48846-878

36	.096	.254	99.656						
37	.076	.201	99.856						
38	.055	.144	100.000						

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

S.No	Factors	Factor Overloading
	Teaching, Learning and Assessment Criteria	
1	Self Assessment of Students help improving education system	.418
2	Range of Journals helps in improving Education system	.574
3	Proper support from Library staff helps in improving Education System	.420
4	Group sessions helps in improving Quality of Education system	.697
5	Proper scheduling of Classes improve quality of Education	.664
6	Practical Exposure and workshops improves Education system	.691
7	Teacher's professional competence helps in improving education system	.552
8	Case study based learning helps in improving education system	.700
9	Various placement activities improves Education system	.694
10	Career based curriculum helps in improving education system	.655
11	Co-curricular activities improves Education system	.599
	Tools and Infrastructures	
12	Proper working of institution's tools and equipment improves Education system	.591
13	Permission to get usage of equipment as and when required helps improving quality of education	.709
14	Receiving help for problems related to the information systems improves quality of Education	.454
15	Organized classrooms helps in improving quality of Education	.606
16	Respectful treatment from HOD/Principal/Director helps improving Education system	.593
17	Respectful treatment from Teachers helps improving Education system	.515
	Facilities	
18	Enough necessary tools and equipment for studies improves Education system.	.313
19	Small teaching groups improves quality of Education	.276
20	Quality of Eatable helps in improving the education system	.546
21	Canteen/Hostel services helps in improving education system	.755
22	Adequate supply of Library books helps in improving Education system	.513
23	Fair assessment of the students by the teacher improves the education system	.648
	Counseling	
24	Opportunity to get guidance for my learning difficulties improves the quality of Education	.288
25	Respectful treatment from Non-Teaching Staff helps improving Education system	.687
26	Friendly treatment at Administrative office helps in improving the quality of education	.639
27	Feeling safe and secure at the institution helps in improving Education system	.666
28	Mandatory attendance in classes improves Education system	.353
	Study Material	
29	Getting sufficient information about matters related to my studies improves the quality of Education	.788
30	Teaching aid, available as planned, helps in improving the quality of Education	.555
31	Giving teachers' feedback improves quality of Education	.602
	Cleanliness	
32	Tidiness of institution's premises helps in improving Education system	.870
33	Tidiness of institution's External areas helps in improving Education system	.828
34	Tidiness of canteen's/Hostel premises helps in improving quality of Education	.672
	Feedback	
35	Sufficient feedback on my studies helps in improving quality of Education	.340
36	Opportunities to participate in various national/international events improves quality of Education	.634
37	Proper knowledge of Assessment criteria of students helps in improving quality of Education	.689
38	Getting assessment result within a stipulated time help improve the education system	.345

Conclusion

The Factor Analysis used as dimension reduction tool, which means it highlight that Variables (factors) which are more important or highly effected for the quality of research. Here,

By using Principal Component diagonal method the total factors used for analysis was 38. Out of 38 factors 7 factors are extracted highly effected the quality education and

explained by the principle component methods. These factors are as follows: Teaching, Learning and Assessment Criteria, Tools and infrastructures, Facilities, Counseling, Study material, Cleanliness and Feedback. By improving these factors may help improving the quality of whole education system in any sector (Public or Private) of Education.

References

1. A. Pal Pandi, U. Surya Rao, D. Jeyathailagar, *A Study on Integrated Total Quality Management Practices in Technical Institutions – Students’ Perspective*, *International Journal of Educational Administration*, Vol. 1, No. 1, 2009, pp. 17 – 30.
2. *Annual Status of Higher Education of States and UTs in India (ASHE 2013)*, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Confederation of Indian Industry & Deloitte, November, 2013.
3. Archana Krishnan, *Quality in Higher Education: Road to competitiveness for Indian Business Schools*, *Opinion-Volume 1*, No. 1, December 2011, pp. 9 -15.
4. Devesh Kapur and Pratap Bhanu Mehta, *Indian Higher Education Reform: From Half-Baked Socialism to Half-Baked Capitalism*, Center for International Development (CID), Harvard University, Working Paper No. 108, September 2004.
5. H.J. Dejager & F.J. Nieuwenhuis, *Linkages between Total Quality Management and the Outcomes based Approach in an Education Environment*, *Routledge Journal of Quality in Higher Education*, Vol. 10, No.3, November, 2005, pp. 251 – 260.
6. H.P. Misra, *Higher Education: New Challenges and Emerging Roles*, *Odisha Review*, July, 2012, pp.39 – 43.
7. Hans N. Weiler, *Higher Education in India: Reflections on Some Critical Issues*, Stanford University.
8. Ms. Rajani Bhalla, *Study on Indian Higher Education: A TQM Perspective*, *Journal of Arts, Sciences and Commerce*, Vol. III, Issue 4 (2), October, 2012, pp. 24 – 29.
9. Murad Ali and Rajesh Kumar Shastri, *Implementation of Total Quality Management in Higher Education*, *Asian Journal of Business Management*, 2(1), 2010, pp. 9 – 16.
