

Students' Perception about Management Education in B-School's: Delhi & NCR

Sunil Kumar Yadav¹, Alok Singh² and Suman Yadav³

¹Assistant Professor, DSEC, Lodi Road, University of Delhi.

²Assistant Professor, Alabbar School of Management, Raffles University, Neemrana, Rajasthan.

³Assistant Professor, Head MBA Department, BIET, Jhansi

Abstract

The purpose of this research is to find out the effective factors which are more important to change the perception of students at the time of Admission in B-Schools for Management education especially the Masters of Business Administration (MBA)/ PGDM programmed. An academic survey conducted in 20 business schools of Delhi & NCR (10 respondents from each B-schools in Gr. Noida, Ghaziabad, Delhi & Gurgaon) by researchers with 44 attributes. Out of 44 attributes, 8 factors extracted by factor analysis PCA method which are (98.88 %) affective to change the perception of students.

Keywords: B-schools, Management Education, Perception, Students

1. Introduction

The changes in the worldwide business scenario are exceptional and will remain so in the coming decades, with the beginning and the influence of new technologies for the information and awareness. In a knowledge based economy, as knowledge becomes more important, so does higher education (World Bank/OECD, 2006). The higher education sector too, has undergone major changes throughout the world which led to increased competition for institutions in this sector (Maringe and Gibbs, 2009). Due to the intensification of globalization, competition and professionalism in the corporate world, management education, no doubt, has earned a central role in the success of students career. As Palacio et al. (2002) clarifies that for management institution to stay progressive and effective, students expectations, academic preferences and quality perception about the educational environment should be kept by the higher authorities of the institute. A few decades ago this was an achievable task, when expectations were realistic and opportunities were ample. But within a context where students are becoming increasingly concerned about the quality of management education; the challenges of business schools multiplies. The global, integrated and open market system further poses threats to management schools in developing Asian countries. As developing countries, higher education, especially university education is recognized as a key force for modernization and development.

Researcher conducted survey among 200 respondents, where ratio was 1: 1 Male and Female. Mostly respondents was 20-23 years age group, which data showed that India have a huge young youth population for the management education. (Table 1, 2 & 3).

2. Review of Literature

The literature review section traverses through various research studies intended towards Understanding students perception about quality in management education. It has been suggested in literature that service quality in higher education should be assessed according to the perceptions of students¹. The construct of quality as conceptualized in the service literature is based on the perceived quality¹⁰. Perceived quality is defined as the consumer's judgment about an entity's overall experience or superiority (Wilkins et al., 2012). Considering the urgent need to deliver quality education in higher education institutes a research was carried out among young management students between the ages of 21 to 25 years of India. The study measured the quality perception of students on five dimensions namely, responsiveness, learning outcomes, physical facilities, academics and personality development. The results pointed out negative quality gaps in all the five dimensions with the highest negative gap in the physical facilities and negative score in academic dimension.

Significant differences between perceptions and expectations of students with respect to all the five dimensions were observed (Narang, 2012). Yet another study aimed at investigating relationships among quality dimensions in higher education in Indonesian state universities, revealed that students' satisfaction was completely influenced by the commitment of college management, the standard after all deliveries, and therefore the easy giving feedback for quality improvement². The quality of the lecturer and student support systems were found to be the most influential factors in the provision of quality education according to a range of higher education students quality perceptions and experience in the UK¹¹. A study by Bhatia and Dash⁴ was undertaken to compare India's higher education with six different countries taken from different continents of the world US, UK, Australia, China, Brazil and South-Africa. India had higher competitive benefits over China and Brazil with regard to the standard of the tutorial system, quality of management facilities, native accessibility of analysis and coaching services and extent of workers coaching. A comparative study of quality practices in higher education institutions in the US and Malaysia, revealed US institutions were more customer oriented and committed towards developing and incorporating quality improvement culture than Malaysian institutes.

Students perceptions relating to their expertise of study in a global branch field was assessed against seven dimensions i.e. learning resources, quality of lecturers and teaching, student learning, program effectiveness, use of technology, assessment and feedback, facilities and quality of social life, during a UAE study. The results showed that these international branch campuses of US, UK and Australia were performing well and largely the students were satisfied (Wilkins et al., 2012). Among the various factors, academic instruction was the most critical aspect of quality of education⁸. On the whole, various studies confirm that higher education provided in developed countries is perceived to be comparatively of better quality of students.

3. Objective

This study aims at understanding Indian students perception for Management education in B-schools. With this purpose, the specific research questions that the study seeks to answer were:

1. What factors lead to students preference for a Management education program in B-Schools?
2. To identify and understand quality parameters of B-schools and output of management education from the students perspective.
3. To suggest areas of improvement based on the findings of the study.

4. Research Methodology

A total sample of 200 students was collected from 20 business schools of Delhi & NCR (10 respondents from each B-schools in Gr. Noida, Ghaziabad, Delhi & Gurgaon) by researchers with 44 attributes. Out of 44 attributes, 8 factors extracted by factor analysis & PCA method which are (98.88 %) affective to change the perception of students.

As this paper aims at studying students perspective about the quality of management education, only those, constructs were defined and considered, that were important from the students viewpoint.

1. **Input:** On the input construct, students were asked about their opinion on curriculum, Faculty members, facilities provided and the infrastructure. Students are the customers for the service provided by the business schools. Their expectations from the faculty members has important implications for improving the quality of education in the business schools and also for providing better services to other stakeholders like industry, parents and society (Rita and Lakshmi, 2009).
2. **Process:** this construct measured students view about institutional processes relevant to them like, quality of teaching methods, examination system and career planning and guidance.
3. **Output:** the output constructs aimed at determining students perception about actual Gaining of knowledge, placement services for students and course's job value. Business schools or management institutes can no longer justify their performance to students and society, only in terms of inputs or investments made; that is, in terms of monetary investments, or provision of new courses, or the recruitment of additional faculty, or the new facilities installed. The bottom line for students at the end of the course is their employability. Input and processes become irrelevant for students if outputs generated are not satisfactory.

5. Results and Discussion

Total sample of the 200 completed questionnaires received, 66.6 percent response rate was received from pursuing MBA students from Indian B-schools 3 % from PGDM. The mean values of the respondents perception regarding quality of input, process and output parameters are shown in Table 1. Respondents, overall 50% male and 50% female, who have participated in this survey. All respondents for the 44 factors all in Table 1 as a mean value. Researcher has also used reliability test for the data adequacy which Cronbach's Alpha (.857) show more reliability (Table 6). By factor analysis 8 factors Extraction Method: Principal

Component Analysis from 44 attributes which are dominated by (98.88 %). (Table 8).

6. References

1. Aldridge S, Rowley J. Measuring Customer Satisfaction in Higher Education. *Quality Assurance in Education*. 1998; 6(4):197–204.
2. Ardi R, Akhmad H, Zagloel, Teuku YM. Investigating relationships among quality dimensions in higher education. *Quality Assurance in Education*. 2012; 20(4):408–28.
3. Baruch Y, Lemming A. Programming the MBA - the quest for curriculum. *Journal of Management Development*. 1996; 15(7):27–36.
4. Bhatia, Dash. A Comparative Analysis of Higher Education System of India with Other Countries. *American Journal of Scientific Research*. 2010.
5. Chua C. Perception of quality in higher education. *Proceedings of the Australian universities quality forum 2004*. 2004.
6. Datar SM, Garvin DA, Cullen PG. Rethinking the MBA: business education at a crossroads. *Journal of Management Development*. 2010; 30(5):451–62.
7. Faisal MA, Syed AAT. Emerging trends in management education in international business schools. *Educational Research and Review*. 2007; 2(12):325–31.
8. Gatfield T, Barker M, Graham P. Measuring Student Quality Variables and the Implications for Management Practices in Higher Education Institutions: an Australian and international student perspective. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*. 1999; 21(2):239–52.
9. Harvey L, Green D. Defining quality. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*. 1993; 18(1):9–34
10. Hasan H, Ilias A, Rehman R, Razak M. Service Quality and Student Satisfaction: A Case Study at Private Higher Education Institutions. *International Business Research*. 2008; 1(3):163–75.
11. Hill Y, Lomas L, MacGregor J. Students perceptions of quality in higher education. *Quality Assurance in Education*. 2003; 11(1):15–20.

Annexure

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics

| | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|------------------------------|-----|---------|---------|--------|----------------|
| Gender | 200 | 1.00 | 2.00 | 1.5000 | .50125 |
| Age Group | 200 | 1.00 | 3.00 | 1.9750 | .29120 |
| Courses | 200 | 1.00 | 3.00 | 1.6500 | .92291 |
| Size of family | 200 | 1.00 | 3.00 | 2.0450 | .32170 |
| 1. B-School's Website | 200 | 1.00 | 4.00 | 3.6550 | .63084 |
| 2. Other Website | 200 | 2.00 | 4.00 | 2.8250 | .45321 |
| 3. Friends and/or relatives | 200 | 2.00 | 5.00 | 2.7050 | 1.05047 |
| 4. Coaching institutes | 200 | 1.00 | 5.00 | 3.8550 | 1.74908 |
| 5. College prospectus | 200 | 2.00 | 5.00 | 2.9850 | .44244 |
| 6. Personal visit to College | 200 | 1.00 | 5.00 | 4.1300 | .64434 |
| 7. Magazines/newspapers | 200 | 1.00 | 4.00 | 2.9550 | .50423 |
| 8. Male Faculty | 200 | 2.00 | 5.00 | 3.5400 | .92882 |
| 9. Female faculty | 200 | 2.00 | 5.00 | 3.4000 | .69456 |
| 10. Admin members/counselor | 200 | 2.00 | 5.00 | 2.7150 | 1.04366 |
| 11. Current students | 200 | 1.00 | 5.00 | 4.0700 | .84181 |
| 12. Ex-students | 200 | 1.00 | 5.00 | 3.0000 | .59309 |
| 13. Industrial visit | 200 | 1.00 | 5.00 | 3.4650 | .90158 |
| 14. Guest lecturers | 200 | 2.00 | 5.00 | 3.9550 | .39210 |
| 15. Experienced faculty | 200 | 3.00 | 5.00 | 4.8150 | .50203 |
| 16. Placement record | 200 | 1.00 | 5.00 | 4.1350 | .75473 |
| 17. Package | 200 | 2.00 | 5.00 | 4.8750 | .51057 |
| 18. corporate participating | 200 | 3.00 | 5.00 | 3.2850 | .50503 |
| 19. Fee structure | 200 | 2.00 | 5.00 | 3.8250 | .59679 |
| 20. Infrastructure | 200 | 3.00 | 5.00 | 3.1500 | .47817 |
| 21. Comfortable lodging | 200 | 2.00 | 4.00 | 3.6650 | .53310 |
| 22. Resourceful library | 200 | 2.00 | 5.00 | 4.1600 | .66074 |
| 23. Canteen | 200 | 2.00 | 5.00 | 3.2750 | .53929 |
| 24. transport | 200 | 2.00 | 5.00 | 3.4650 | .89598 |
| 25. rating of the College | 200 | 2.00 | 4.00 | 2.6250 | .90469 |
| 26. Distance | 200 | 1.00 | 5.00 | 4.1400 | 1.22388 |
| 27. Location | 200 | 3.00 | 5.00 | 3.6700 | .91942 |
| 28. Ambience | 200 | 1.00 | 5.00 | 4.5250 | .74306 |
| 29. Extracurricular | 200 | 2.00 | 5.00 | 4.0450 | .40471 |
| 30. Large computer lab | 200 | 4.00 | 5.00 | 4.0500 | .21849 |
| 31. Wi-Fi campus | 200 | 1.00 | 5.00 | 3.4850 | .99232 |

Continued ...

| | | | | | | |
|-----|--------------------------|-----|------|-------|--------|---------|
| 32. | Batch size (intake) | 200 | 1.00 | 5.00 | 3.2250 | .66073 |
| 33. | sport/gym | 200 | 1.00 | 5.00 | 4.4750 | .86784 |
| 34. | Affiliated University | 200 | 3.00 | 5.00 | 4.5650 | .81183 |
| 35. | Recognition by AICTE/UGC | 200 | 1.00 | 5.00 | 4.7050 | .85536 |
| 36. | Types of degree | 200 | 2.00 | 5.00 | 4.7300 | .72784 |
| 37. | how old | 200 | 2.00 | 5.00 | 3.9400 | .50763 |
| 38. | Mode of admission | 200 | 4.00 | 24.00 | 4.4800 | 2.80874 |
| 39. | Appearance | 200 | 1.00 | 5.00 | 3.0850 | .63228 |
| 40. | Ratio of boys and girls | 200 | 2.00 | 5.00 | 3.4500 | .87827 |
| 38. | Mode of admission | 200 | 4.00 | 24.00 | 4.4800 | 2.80874 |
| 39. | Appearance | 200 | 1.00 | 5.00 | 3.0850 | .63228 |
| 40. | Ratio of boys and girls | 200 | 2.00 | 5.00 | 3.4500 | .87827 |
| 41. | specialization course | 200 | 2.00 | 4.00 | 3.6150 | .53686 |
| 42. | reputation | 200 | 1.00 | 5.00 | 3.7150 | .86459 |
| 43. | International tours | 200 | 1.00 | 5.00 | 3.4550 | .97092 |
| 44. | reputation | 200 | 2.00 | 5.00 | 4.2000 | .62607 |
| | Valid N (listwise) | 200 | | | | |

Table 2. Gender

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| ValidMale | 100 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 50.0 |
| Female | 100 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 100.0 |
| Total | 200 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Table 3. Age

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid>20 | 11 | 5.5 | 5.5 | 5.5 |
| 20-23 | 183 | 91.5 | 91.5 | 97.0 |
| 23-26 | 6 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 100.0 |
| Total | 200 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Table 4. Courses

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| ValidMBA | 132 | 66.0 | 66.0 | 66.0 |
| PGDBM | 6 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 69.0 |
| UG | 62 | 31.0 | 31.0 | 100.0 |
| Total | 200 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Table 5. Size of Family

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid1-3 | 6 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| 3-6 | 179 | 89.5 | 89.5 | 92.5 |
| 6< | 15 | 7.5 | 7.5 | 100.0 |
| Total | 200 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Table 6. Reliability Statistics

| Cronbach's Alpha | Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items | N of Items |
|------------------|--|------------|
| .857 | .750 | 48 |

Table 7. Summary Item Statistics

| | Mean | Minimum | Maximum | Range | Maximum / Minimum |
|----------------|-------|---------|---------|-------|-------------------|
| Item Means | 3.568 | 1.500 | 4.875 | 3.375 | 3.250 |
| Item Variances | .726 | .048 | 7.889 | 7.841 | 165.255 |

Table 8. Total Variance Explained

| Component | Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings | | | Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings | | |
|-----------|-------------------------------------|---------------|--------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|--------------|
| | Total | % of Variance | Cumulative % | Total | % of Variance | Cumulative % |
| 1 | 16.267 | 36.971 | 36.971 | 13.950 | 31.705 | 31.705 |
| 2 | 8.854 | 20.123 | 57.094 | 8.171 | 18.571 | 50.277 |
| 3 | 5.294 | 12.033 | 69.127 | 6.474 | 14.713 | 64.990 |
| 4 | 3.899 | 8.862 | 77.990 | 4.122 | 9.369 | 74.359 |
| 5 | 3.363 | 7.642 | 85.632 | 3.080 | 7.000 | 81.359 |
| 6 | 2.463 | 5.599 | 91.231 | 2.811 | 6.389 | 87.747 |
| 7 | 1.870 | 4.250 | 95.481 | 2.708 | 6.155 | 93.902 |
| 8 | 1.497 | 3.401 | 98.882 | 2.191 | 4.980 | 98.882 |

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Table 9. Rotated Component Matrix^a

| | Component | | | | | | | |
|--------------|-----------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| WIFI | .903 | | | | | | | |
| INTERNATONAL | .886 | | | | | | | |
| RATIO | .871 | | | | | | | |
| AT | .852 | | | | | | | |
| RATING | .790 | | | | | | | |
| IV | .789 | | | | | | | |
| RC | .746 | | | | | | | |
| REPUTATION | .697 | | | | | | | |
| LODG | .643 | .560 | | | | | | |
| DIST | .574 | .538 | | | | | | |
| CANT | .553 | .527 | | | | | | |
| FF | .542 | .525 | | | | | | |
| AU | | .924 | | | | | | |
| INFRA | | .903 | | | | | | |
| AMB | | .844 | | | | | | |
| TD | | .792 | | | | | | |
| SPORTS | | .768 | | | | | | |
| MA | | .726 | | | | | .596 | |
| BSW | | .608 | | | | | | |
| GL | | | .966 | | | | | |
| PA | | | .898 | | | | | |
| PR | | | .867 | | | | | |
| PV | .521 | | .711 | | | | | |
| MN | | | | .947 | | | | |
| PROS | | | | .837 | | | | |
| CS | | | | .802 | | | | |
| INTAKE | | | | | .817 | | | |
| RL | | | | | .630 | | | |
| EFM | | | .550 | | .598 | | | |
| APPERANCE | | | | | | .807 | | |
| COURT | | | | | | .612 | | |
| EA | | | | | | | .974 | |
| AGEBSCHOOL | | | .570 | | | | .592 | |
| ES | | | | | | | | .771 |

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
 Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.
 a. Rotation converged in 13 iterations.