

A Study on Implementation of Quality Education Based on Student Satisfaction in Indian Business School

L. Karthigeyan¹, Dr. A. Mohammed Faisal², and Dr. S. Duraisamy³

¹(Research Scholar, School of Management Studies, VISTAS, Chennai, India)

²(Assistant Professor, School of Management Studies, VISTAS, Chennai, India)

³(Professor, School of Management Studies, VISTAS, Chennai, India)

Abstract

Indian HE needs to achieve a higher level of quality. A management student who learns a course from a quality business school alone should be industry ready and competitive students to elevate the business and industries. Therefore, the need for an organization with only focus on the management course is an essential. The objective is to study the implementation of quality education based on the student satisfaction in Indian business school. Survey method is used to describe the implementation of quality education of business school. 216 sample sizes were selected for the implementation of quality education in Indian business school. The descriptive statistical method is used for analysis. Based on the analysis, the critical factors such as fee, course, pedagogy and job are found to be important based on the student satisfaction for the implementation of quality education in Indian business school.

Keywords: Business school, Higher education, India, Student Satisfaction.

Introduction

The higher education (HE) in management courses is a mantra for many to rise up the career ladder interns of promotion, increasing their pay incentives, simply to get a good placement in a sophisticated multinational corporation India or abroad. India had profound a course in HE in 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 HE can serve as the ideal to address the service, education and implementation aspects synergistically (Srikanthan and Dalrymple, 2003). Quality in HE can be determined based on student satisfaction through the needs and expectations (Tan and Kek, 2004). India needs to attain a higher level of quality in education (Sakthivel et. al.,

2005). A student who learns a HE in management course from a quality business school should be some industry ready, competitive candidates to uplift the business, industries, commerce and international trade at the macro level in India (Karthigeyan and Faisal, 2017). Therefore, the need for an organization with only focus on the management course is an essential. The objective is to study the implementation of quality education based on the student satisfaction in Indian business school.

Tam (2001) attempted to analyse ways of thinking about HE and quality. Srikanthan and Dalrymple (2003) proposed a new method for the quality management system in HE. Hill et. al. (2003) explained that the quality lecturer and the students' support systems were found to be the most important factors in quality HE. 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' perspective for quality in Indian HE institutions. Sakthivel et. al. (2005) develop a TQM model that was empirically tested a relationship the TQM implementation and its students' satisfaction in both ISO and non-ISO of engineering in Indian HE. 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) applied the Taguchi method to Korean HE for quality improvement. 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 HE. Ashraf et. al. (2016) identified the factors that potentially effect on quality education in Bangladesh for private HE universities. Teeroovengadam 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 process level, the organisational level and the quality management principles level in European HE. There is a paucity of literatures that have been conducted to study the implementation of quality education based on the student satisfaction in Indian business school. The objective is to study the implementation of quality education based on the student satisfaction in Indian business school.

Research methodology

The survey method is used to study the implementation of quality education in Indian business school. The observation method and interview method from questionnaires were used for data collection. A sample sizes of 216 were selected to study the implementation of quality education in Indian business school. In this study, the descriptive statistical method is used for analysis.

Results and Findings

In this study, there were 142 males (65.7%) and 74 females (34.3%) respondents (Table 1). Out of this group of respondents, 56.5% were aged less than 27, 34.3% 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 1 Findings of Demographic characteristics of sample

S NO	DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLE	SAMPLE COMPOSITION	
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 2 Descriptive Statistics of each factor based on the Customer Satisfaction

Fee	Course	Pedagogy	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
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

Fee	Course	Pedagogy	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
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 3 Importance of each factor based on the Student Satisfaction

Fee	Course	Pedagogy	Importance
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

Fee	Course	Pedagogy	Importance
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 2 and 3 showed that student dissatisfied with the sixth type of pedagogy and the fee based on the MBA (FT) course is to be the most important factor based on the student satisfaction. It is followed by PGDM / PGDBA course 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.

Conclusion

Based on the analysis, the critical factors such as fee, course, pedagogy and job are found to be important based on the student satisfaction for the implementation of quality education in Indian business school. So it helps to develop the viable framework for quality education in Indian business school. However, the first phase of the study was 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 critical factors.

Reference

- 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*

- Brochado, A. (2009). *Comparing alternative instruments to measure service quality in HE. Quality Assurance in Education, 17 (2), 174-190.*
- Karthigeyan, L. and Faisal, A. M. (2017). *A Study on Identification of Factors for Quality Education in Indian Business School. International Journal of Applied Business and Economic Research, 15 (21), 183 – 188.*
- 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).*
- 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.*
- 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 HE? The TQM Journal, 29 (2), 342 – 356*
- Mok, K. H. (2014). *Enhancing Quality of HE for World-Class Status Approaches, Strategies, and Challenges for Hong Kong. Chinese Education and Society, 47(1), 44–64.*
- 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.*
- Ree, S., Park, Y. H. and Yoo, H. (2014) *A study on education quality using the Taguchi method. Total Quality Management & Business Excellence, 25(7-8), 935-943*
- 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.*
- Sakthivel, P.B., Rajendran, G., and Raju, R. (2005). *TQM implementation and students’ satisfaction of academic performance. The TQM Magazine, 17(6), 573-589.*
- Srikanthan, G. and Dalrymple, J. (2002) *Developing a Holistic Model for Quality in HE. Quality in HE, 8(3), 215-224.*
- Srikanthan, G. and Dalrymple, J. (2003) *Developing alteranative perspectives for quality in HE. The International Journal of Educational Management, 17(3), 126 – 136.*

- *Tam, M. (2001). Measuring Quality and Performance in HE. Quality in HE, 7 (1), 47-54.*
- *Tan, K. C. and Kek, S. W. (2004). Service Quality in HE Using an Enhanced SERVQUAL Approach. Quality in HE, 10(1), 17-24.*
- *Teeroovengadum, V., Kamalanabhan, T.J. and Seebaluck, A. K. (2016). Measuring service quality in HE: Development of a hierarchical model (HESQUAL). Quality Assurance in Education, 24 (2), 244 – 258.*
- *Yvonne Hill, Laurie Lomas, Janet MacGregor, (2003). Students' perceptions of quality in HE. Quality Assurance in Education, 11 (1), 15 – 20.*