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Abstract

Purpose - The study aim to evaluate the impact of quality of management education on student satisfaction.

Design/methodology/approach – The study area comprised of five management institutes of Uttarpradesh. A total 250 BBA and MBA students were randomly chosen from these institutes. The data collected was analyzed by applying regression and T-test.

Findings – It was found that the quality of management education had a significant impact on student satisfaction. Gender made a significant difference in the satisfaction of students.

Originality and value – The study suggests educational system that would guide to quality education in management and thus lead to student satisfaction.
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INTRODUCTION

In the past two decades management education in India has a quantitative development, now for endurance, success and growth, quality and customer satisfaction is a tactical issue for management institutes. The evaluation, execution and conceptualization need to be addressed of quality in education by educational planners, policy makers, stakeholders and administrators of the educational system. Quality management has been addressed from various approaches, frameworks and models have been planned and developed (Cheng and Tam, 1997), “satisfaction models” confirm to be useful in giving at a quality direction especially in educational services. Cheng and Tam, (1997) proposed a satisfaction model; quality as the satisfaction of the assortment of stakeholders, be there inside or outside. Whereas the process model entails recognition of design characteristics that make up the renovation process and act as drivers towards customer satisfaction, the satisfaction orientation entails recognition of customer requirements (Sahney, S. 2011).

LITERATURE REVIEW

A customer is someone being served up. Customers can be both external and internal, depending on they are served up inside or outside the institution, and the regularity of communications the institution has with customers. For education, the administrative staff and the faculty are considered as internal customers, and the society, parents, industry and the students as external customers (Sahney et al., 2004). So many researchers have defined quality with various perspectives; like as a property of services or products, or else processes producing these services or products. In the service sector the definition has been elusive; it is extremely customer oriented as it is based on services experienced from customer’s perception. As alleged by customers, quality service involves a judgment of what they expected the service should be (expectation) and the service they actually received (perceptions), (Zeithaml et al., 1985; Parasuraman et al., 1985; Gronroos, 1984).

Sahney, S. (2011), conducted an empirical study on delighting customers of management education as a student perspective in her study she wants to identify customer necessities of students as the prime customer of an educational system and to evaluate service quality through SERVQUAL by taking undergraduates and post graduates management students, after applying SERVQUAL, Kano Model and QFD she found that accreditation, rankings and ratings are gaining great attention. There is enormous pressure upon the educational system to turn into more customers centric by giving quality services. Singhal, R. (2012), evaluated student’s perspective of TQM in professional education in his study he found that as evaluate to government institute students and private institute students think that
management attitude is usual towards TQM in the institute. Joseph, M. (1997), examined service quality in education a student’s perspective by applying factor analysis he found that students were not satisfied with the service quality of the institutes. Musise, T., etal, (2012), studied effect of gender on college student’s satisfaction and achievement by taking independent variable as gender and dependent variable: ACT scores, satisfaction with major curriculum and college GPA after applying t-test and Cohen’s d effect size they found that gender had a significant impact on Act scores, satisfaction with major curriculum and college GPA. Suarman, (2014), examined gender differences on student’s satisfaction by taking 177 males and 273 females using cross-sectional model on five point Likert scale he found that there was no significant differentiation between students’ observations of the quality and students’ satisfaction.

Issues associated with the conceptualization and judgment of quality in education has been a subject of discussion, due to the numerous expectations of stakeholders and customers. It is essential to identify the customers with the customer expectations and necessities, hence to give a customer-oriented service, provide service quality and customer satisfaction (Abdulla, F. 2006; Babakus and Boller, 1992; Parasuraman et al., 1988; Zeithaml et al., 1990;). The management institutes want to focus on such requirements, thus as to be able to make, communicate and deliver value. There are six items of student’s satisfaction which comprise, learning implementation, curriculum quality and quality of teaching, quality of service, quality of learning process and quality of facilities. Guolla, M., (1999), on the other hand, literature evidences shows that there is less research on the relationship between the qualities of teaching and student’s satisfaction (Spilt, J.L., H.M. Koomen and J.T. Thijs, 2011; Hair, F.J, W.C Black, B.J Babin, R.E Anderson and R.L. Tatham, 2006; Roebken, H., 2007). In addition, students’ emotional satisfaction, assurance, cognitive trust and commitment contain an influence on the students’ loyalty (Hennig, T., M.F. Langer and U. Hansen, 2001). Gigliotti & Secrest (1988), given evidence that gender did not matter when the persons were provided clear directions to complete a defined task. (Meit, Borges, Cubic, & Seibel 2007), provided that female students are more obedient and persevering in their studies, self-disciplined but more likely to be unsure. These attitudes are favorable and usually more positive than males; though, females require face-to-face contact to fully develop both student -teacher relationships and student-student relationships that enhance knowledge (Chen & Tsai, 2007). (Fry, Greenop, Turnbull, & Bowman 2010), confirm this belief in a more recent study judgment that no gender differences were apparent. In the past, they did find that the gender differences could be accredited to lack of inspiration and differences in risk-taking.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY
1. To study the quality of management education.
2. To examine the satisfaction of students.
3. To assess the impact of quality of management education on student satisfaction.

METHODOLOGY
The sample includes 250 BBA and MBA students of five private management institutes of Uttarpradesh by using a simple random sampling technique for selecting respondents. Primary data has been collected from the respondents using a self- designed scale on five point Likert Scale (strongly agree=5 and strongly disagree=1). 150 questionnaires were found to be usable for the study. T-test and regression has been applied for the data analysis.

HYPOTHESIS
Ho₁: There is no significant impact of quality of management education on the student satisfaction.

Ho₂: Gender makes no significant difference of the satisfaction of students.

STATISTICAL METHODS
Mean, standard deviation, t-test and regression analysis has been performed for analyzing the data.

**ANALYSIS & INTERPRETATION**
Regression analysis was performed on the data. Table 1-3 presents the results of regression analysis.

### Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.854&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.730</td>
<td>.728</td>
<td>6.097</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a. Predictors: (Constant), Quality of Management Education
b. Dependent Variable: Student Satisfaction*

Table 1 shows the adjusted $R^2$ which indicates the percentage of the variance in the Student Satisfaction explained by Quality of Management Education. Adjusted R square value is 0.728 which indicates that independent variable quality of management education accounts for 72.8% of the variance in the student satisfaction.

### ANOVA<sup>a</sup>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14858.517</td>
<td>402.386</td>
<td>.000&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>5502.077</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>20360.593</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a. Dependent Variable: Student Satisfaction
b. Predictors: (Constant), Quality of Management Education*

Table 2 Indicate the value of F-test which finds out whether the model is a good fit for the data. In other words, ANOVA assess the total significance of the regression model. Table 2 shows the value of F-test (402.386, p< 0.05). Hence, the model is significant and shows that the quality of management education is statistically significant in relation to student’s satisfaction.

### Coefficients<sup>a</sup>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>7.301</td>
<td>1.620</td>
<td>4.506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>QOE</td>
<td>1.678</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>19.992</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a. Dependent Variable: Student Satisfaction*

Table 3 shows the contribution of the quality of management education on student satisfaction in the selected private management institutes. The unstandardized regression coefficient $b$ in a regression model indicates the strength of the impact of the independent variable on the dependent variable, when the other variables are held constant.

A linear regression equation between a dependent variable (student satisfaction) and independent variable (quality of management education) as follows:-

The regression equation has the following form:-

$$SS = a + b \text{QOE}$$

The resulting regression equation is:

$$SS = 7.301 + 1.678 \text{QOE}$$

Where, QOE = Quality of management education

SS = Student Satisfaction

The equation (2) indicates that if quality of management education changes by one unit, there will be a 1.678 unit increase in the student satisfaction. The coefficient is positive for quality of management education; hence it indicates the positive relationship between dependent and independent variables.
The t-value indicates for individual regression coefficient in the model indicates whether the independent variable (quality of management education) is a significant predictor of the student satisfaction. The results of the t-value confirm that SS (t = 19.992; P = .000 < .005) is significant at 0.05 level.

The outcome of the Standardized Beta value (β) illustrates that the impact of quality of management education on student satisfaction. Since, p = .000 < .005, F= 402.386, p < .05, Adjusted R square = .728, it can be concluded that quality of management education has a significant and positive impact on student satisfaction as the Standardized Beta value (β) is 0.854.

**H02:** Gender makes no significant difference in the satisfaction of students.

T test was carried out on the data of student satisfaction to evaluate the significant difference in student satisfaction of management education for gender.

**Table 4:** Demonstrate independent sample t test statistics for student satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>7.974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4:** Presents the results of t test, assuming equal variance (p=0.005<.05) for the Levene’s test. Thus F = 7.974, p= 0.000 < 0.05 for t-test (equality of means). The null hypothesis is rejected. Hence it can be inferred that there is a significant difference in student satisfaction of male students and female students.

**Table 5** Presents Group statistics for student satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>29.24</td>
<td>7.036</td>
<td>.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>46.78</td>
<td>8.344</td>
<td>.957</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SS: Student Satisfaction

The mean score of the student satisfaction on table 5 indicates that female student is more satisfied than male students.

**Discussion & Conclusion**

The results denote that there is a statistically significant impact of quality of management education on the student satisfaction. This study also successfully demonstrated that quality of management education is an influential mediator to determine students’ satisfaction based on gender. Further studies with consideration of other related variables such as environment, cost of education, subject interest, class atmosphere, etc. are recommended to be conducted. Such studies will be useful to identify the level of quality teaching and student satisfaction allowing the university to determine the areas that need to be worked on to enhance teaching quality and accordingly to improve students’ satisfaction.

**Limitation of the study**

The study is limited to the students of management institutions. The variables and the objectives for the study were conceptualized based on the literature review.
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