

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/324006690>

A Study On Identification of Factors for Quality Education in Indian Business School

Article in International Journal of Applied Business and Economic Research · March 2018

CITATION

1

READS

278

2 authors, including:



[Anwer Mohammed Faisal](#)

Rajalakshmi School of Business

13 PUBLICATIONS 53 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE



International Journal of Applied Business and Economic Research

ISSN : 0972-7302

available at <http://www.serialsjournals.com>

© Serials Publications Pvt. Ltd.

Volume 15 • Number 21 (Part 2) • 2017

A Study On Identification of Factors for Quality Education in Indian Business School

L. Karthigeyan¹ and A. Mohammed Faisal¹

¹School of Management Studies, Vels University Chennai. Email: karthi.sms@velsuniv.ac.in, a.mohd.faisal@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

India needs to achieve a higher level of quality in education. A student who learns a management course from a quality business school alone can be an employable and industry ready, competitive candidates to uplift the business, industries, commerce and international trade at the macro level. Therefore the need for an institute with only focus on the management course is a must. The objective is to identify the factors for quality education in business school in India. Survey method is used to identify the factors for quality education of business school. A sample sizes of 216 alumnus were selected. In this study, the statistical methods like mean and correlation were used for analysis. Based on the analysis, the important factors such as fee, course, pedagogy, job and customer satisfaction are identified for quality education of business school in India. The factors identified in this paper can be successfully implemented in the higher business institutions to improve the quality of education and customer satisfaction. The future work is to develop the sustainable framework based on the identified factors. This study is conducted in higher management education from the passed-out students' perspective only.

Keywords: Business school, customer satisfaction, India.

1. INTRODUCTION

The management courses are a mantra for many to climb up the career ladder interns of promotion, going abroad, increasing their pay incentives, simply to get a good job in a sophisticated multinational corporation India or abroad. Since 1963, we have management courses in India imported from USA. India had profound a course in the management courses. Educational institutions are realizing the significance of customer-centered philosophies of total quality management to improve their businesses (Sahney et. al., 2004). Quality in higher education can serve as the ideal to address the service, education and implementation aspects synergistically (Srikanthan and Dalrymple, 2003). Quality in education can be determined by the

extent to which students' needs and expectations can be satisfied (Tan and Kek, 2004). India needs to attain a higher level of quality in education (Sakthivel et. al., 2005). A student who learns a management course from a quality business school can be an employable and industries ready, competitive candidates to uplift the business, industries, commerce and international trade at the macro level in India. Therefore the need for a quality institute with only focus on the management courses is a must in India. The objective is to identify the factors for quality education of business school in India.

Tam (2001) attempted to analyse ways of thinking about higher education and quality. Srikanthan and Dalrymple (2003) proposed the guidelines for a new approach to a quality system in higher education. Hill et. al. (2003) founded that the quality of the lecturer and the student support systems were the most influential factors in the provision of quality education. Tan and Kek (2004) presented an enhanced approach to using SERVQUAL for measuring student satisfaction in Singapore. Sahney et. al. (2004) conducted the study on students within selected educational institutions in India to obtain a student perspective of the quality of those institutions. Sakthivel et. al. (2005) develop a TQM model of academic excellence and empirically establish a relationship between TQM implementation and students' satisfaction of academic performance from ISO and non-ISO engineering institutions in India. Petruzzellis et. al. (2006) assessed university performance by testing student satisfaction in Italian universities. Brochado (2009) examined the performance of five alternative measures of service quality in Portugal. Ree et. al. (2014) introduced the cases in which education quality improved by applying the Taguchi method to education in Korea. Mok (2014) examined the major approaches and strategies that the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (HKSAR) has adopted in enhancing quality in teaching, learning, and research in higher education. Ashraf et. al. (2016) identified the determinants that potentially influence quality education in private universities in Bangladesh. Teeroovengadum et. al. (2016) developed the model that consisted of five primary dimensions, which were administrative quality, physical environment quality, core educational quality, support facilities quality and transformative quality. Wiśniewska and Grudowski (2016) identified the most preferred characteristics of a teacher working at a business school in Poland. Lim and Shah (2017) attempted to analyse the sustainability of Australian transnational education. Manatos et. al. (2017) analysed the content of the European Higher Education taking into account three levels of analysis: the process level, the organisational level and the quality management principles level. There is a paucity of literatures that have been conducted to identify the factors for quality education of business school in India. The objective is to identify the factors for quality education of business school in India.

2. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Survey method is used to identify the factors for quality education of business school. The primary data were collected through observation method and interview method from questionnaires. A sample sizes of 216 alumnum were selected. In this study, the statistical methods like mean and correlation were used for analysis.

3. RESULTS AND FINDINGS

There were 142 (65.7%) male and 74 (34.3%) female respondents in this study (Table 18.1). Out of this group of respondents, 56.5% were aged less than 27, 56.5% were between 28-37 years old and 9.3% were between 38-47 years old. Out of this group of respondents, 26.4% were working less than 18 years, 45.8% were between 19-24 years and the remaining 27.8% were over 25 years. Out of all the respondents, 20.8% preferred PGDM / PGDBA, 67.1% MBA (FT) and the rest of them a Exe MBA / MBA (PT).

Table 18.1
Findings of Demographic characteristics of sample

<i>S.No</i>	<i>Demographic Variable</i>	<i>Sample Composition</i>	
1.	Gender	Male	65.7%
		Female	34.3%
2.	Age	Less than 27	56.5%
		28-37	34.3%
		38-47	9.3%
3.	Years of Study	Less than 18	26.4%
		19-24	45.8%
		More than 25	27.8%
4.	Course	PGDM / PGDBA	20.8%
		MBA (FT)	67.1%
		Exe MBA / MBA (PT)	12.0%

Table 18.2
Descriptive Statistics of each factor based on the Customer Satisfaction

<i>Fee</i>	<i>Course</i>	<i>Pedagogy</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std. Deviation</i>	<i>N</i>
Highly Satisfied	MBA (FT)	2	2	1.026	20
Highly Satisfied	Exe MBA / MBA (PT)	4	2.05	1.468	20
Satisfied	PGDM / PGDBA	3	2	0	5
Satisfied	PGDM / PGDBA	4	2	0	6
Satisfied	MBA (FT)	1	2.44	1.446	25
Satisfied	MBA (FT)	2	3.08	1.288	25
Satisfied	MBA (FT)	4	1.6	0.516	10
Satisfied	MBA (FT)	5	2.13	0.915	15
Satisfied	MBA (FT)	6	2	0	12
Satisfied	Exe MBA / MBA (PT)	4	1.5	0.548	6
Neither Satisfied nor dissatisfied	PGDM / PGDBA	6	1	0	10
Neither Satisfied nor dissatisfied	MBA (FT)	2	2	0	3
Dissatisfied	PGDM / PGDBA	1	3	0	3
Dissatisfied	PGDM / PGDBA	4	3.29	1.309	21
Dissatisfied	MBA (FT)	3	2.58	0.654	24
Dissatisfied	MBA (FT)	4	2	0	3
Dissatisfied	MBA (FT)	5	2	.	1
Dissatisfied	MBA (FT)	6	3.43	0.787	7

Table 18.3
Importance of each factor based on the Customer Satisfaction

<i>Fee</i>	<i>Course</i>	<i>Pedagogy</i>	<i>Importance</i>
Dissatisfied	MBA (FT)	6	1
Dissatisfied	PGDM / PGDBA	4	2
Satisfied	MBA (FT)	2	3
Dissatisfied	PGDM / PGDBA	1	4
Dissatisfied	MBA (FT)	3	5
Satisfied	MBA (FT)	1	6
Satisfied	MBA (FT)	5	7
Highly Satisfied	Exe MBA / MBA (PT)	4	8
Highly Satisfied	MBA (FT)	2	9
Satisfied	PGDM / PGDBA	3	10
Satisfied	PGDM / PGDBA	4	11
Satisfied	MBA (FT)	6	12
Neither Satisfied nor dissatisfied	MBA (FT)	2	13
Dissatisfied	MBA (FT)	4	14
Dissatisfied	MBA (FT)	5	15
Satisfied	MBA (FT)	4	16
Satisfied	Exe MBA / MBA (PT)	4	17
Neither Satisfied nor dissatisfied	PGDM / PGDBA	6	18

Table 18.2 and 18.3 indicate that student dissatisfied with the fee based on the MBA (FT) course along with the sixth type of pedagogy is to be the most dominant factor. It is followed by PGDM / PGDBA with the fourth type of pedagogy. However, the student satisfied with the fee based on the MBA (FT) course along with the second type of pedagogy.

Table 18.4
Correlations between the factors

<i>Factors</i>	<i>Fee</i>	<i>Course</i>	<i>Pedagogy</i>	<i>Job</i>
Fee	1	**	**	**
Course		1	-	**
Pedagogy			1	**
Job				1

(**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level; *. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level; - No Correlation)

Table 18.5
Correlation between factors and customer satisfaction

<i>Factors (Independent Variable)</i>	<i>Customer Satisfaction (Dependent Variable)</i>
Fee	**
Course	–
Pedagogy	*
Job	–

(**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level; *. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level; - No Correlation)

There is a highly correlated between the fee and course, pedagogy, job at the 0.01 level. There is a highly correlated between the job and course, pedagogy at the 0.01 level. However, there is no correlation between the course and pedagogy (Table 18.4). There is a highly correlated between the fee and customer satisfaction at the 0.01 level. There is a correlation between the pedagogy and customer satisfaction at the 0.05 level. However, there is no correlation between the course and customer satisfaction (Table 18.5). Also, there is no correlation between the job and customer satisfaction. Based on the analysis (Table 18.4 and 18.5), the identified factors for quality education of business school in India are fee, course, pedagogy, job and customer satisfaction. These factors are empirically analysed. So it helps to develop the sustainable framework for quality education of business school in India.

4. CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis, the important factors such as fee, course, pedagogy, job and customer satisfaction are identified for quality education of business school in India. The factors identified in this paper can be successfully implemented in the higher business institutions to improve the quality of education and customer satisfaction. However, this is the first phase of the study conducted. In the next phase, the study has to be conducted for the development of the sustainable framework. The future work is to develop the sustainable framework based on the identified factors. This study is conducted in higher management education from the passed-out students' perspective only.

Reference

- Yvonne Hill, Laurie Lomas, Janet MacGregor, (2003). Students' perceptions of quality in higher education. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 11 (1), 15 – 20.
- S. Sahney, D.K. Banwet and S. Karunes, (2004). A SERVQUAL and QFD approach to total quality education: A student perspective. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 53 (2), 143 – 166.
- Teeroovengadam, V., Kamalanabhan, T.J. and Seebaluck, A. K. (2016). Measuring service quality in higher education: Development of a hierarchical model (HESQUAL). *Quality Assurance in Education*, 24 (2), 244 – 258.
- Lim, F. C. B. and Shah, M. (2017). An examination on the growth and sustainability of Australian transnational education. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 31(3).
- Manatos, M. J., Sarrico, C. S. and Rosa, M. J. (2017). The European standards and guidelines for internal quality assurance: an integrative approach to quality management in higher education? *The TQM Journal*, 29 (2), 342 – 356

- Ree, S., Park, Y. H. and Yoo, H. (2014) A study on education quality using the Taguchi method. *Total Quality Management and Business Excellence*, 25(7-8), 935-943
- Ashraf, M. A., Osman, A. Z. R. and S. R. A. Ratan, (2016). Determinants of quality education in private universities from student perspectives. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 24(1) 123 – 138
- Srikanthan, G. and Dalrymple, J. (2003) Developing alternative perspectives for quality in higher education. *The International Journal of Educational Management*, 17(3), 126 – 136.
- Srikanthan, G. and Dalrymple, J. (2002) Developing a Holistic Model for Quality in Higher Education. *Quality in Higher Education*, 8(3), 215-224.
- Mok, K. H. (2014). Enhancing Quality of Higher Education for World-Class Status Approaches, Strategies, and Challenges for Hong Kong. *Chinese Education and Society*, 47(1), 44–64.
- Tan, K. C. and Kek, S. W. (2004). Service Quality in Higher Education Using an Enhanced SERVQUAL Approach. *Quality in Higher Education*, 10(1), 17-24.
- Petruzzellis, L., D’Uggento, A. M. and Romanazzi, S. (2006). Student satisfaction and quality of service in Italian universities. *Managing Service Quality*, 16 (4), 349-364.
- M. Wiśniewska and Grudowski, P. (2016). High-quality academic teachers in business school. The case of The University of Gdańsk, Poland. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, 27(9-10) 1-13.
- Brochado, A. (2009). Comparing alternative instruments to measure service quality in higher education. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 17 (2), 174-190.
- Tam, M. (2001). Measuring Quality and Performance in Higher Education. *Quality in Higher Education*, 7 (1), 47-54.
- Sakthivel, P.B., Rajendran, G., and Raju, R. (2005). TQM implementation and students’ satisfaction of academic performance. *The TQM Magazine*, 17(6), 573-589.