

## A STUDY ON INSTITUTIONAL PERCEPTION OF STUDENT TEACHERS ON THE PRINCIPLES OF TOTAL QUALITY MANAGEMENT

By

S. SUNDARESAN \*

N. MUTHAIAH \*\*

\* Research Scholar, Sri Ramakrishna Mission Vidyalyaya College of Education, Coimbatore.

\*\* Principal, Sri Ramakrishna Mission Vidyalyaya College of Education, Coimbatore.

### ABSTRACT

*Education shapes the destiny of a nation, and is the principal instrument for developing human capabilities. Educational quality is highly influenced by the learning experiences gained during the teaching-learning process. The concern for improving quality of teaching-learning process is significant, since this is a mechanism through which the content and intent of curriculum is transacted at elementary, secondary as well as higher education level. In order to impart quality education, our education system has to acquire the following qualities such as quality syllabus, quality faculty, quality teaching and evaluation, quality research and quality character. As quality education is need of hour, all the quality issues should be given top most priority with equal attention. Hence the present study was focused in such a way to study the perception of students of teacher education institution towards different quality parameters. A survey was made with the help of the Student's Institutional Perception Scale (SIPS) constructed by Subramonian and Muthaiah (2006). This survey was conducted among 150 student teachers and the results revealed that, in studying the quality management of the institution, the perception of students towards their institution varied with regard to their gender and there was no variation with regard to their educational qualification with their locality.*

*Keywords: Curricular Activities, Institutional Perception, Student Teachers, Total Quality Management.*

### INTRODUCTION

Education has been a determining factor in the progress of human civilization. Education shapes the destiny of a nation, and it is the principal instrument for developing human capabilities. Educational quality is highly influenced by the learning experiences gained during the teaching-learning process (Arvind Sharma and Venkateshwarlu, 2007). The concern for improving quality of teaching-learning process is significant since this is a mechanism through which the content and intent of curriculum is transacted at elementary, secondary as well as higher education level (Dutta, 2007).

Quality is the ability of the institution to fulfill its task and to achieve its goals. Quality impacts the content of higher education, its processes, its output or product, as it seeks to develop human resources with required skills, excellence in performance and capable of delivering the goods as a unit of the work force (Nayantara Padhi, 2006). In order to be able to impart quality education, our education system

has to acquire the following qualities such as quality syllabus, quality faculty, quality teaching and evaluation, quality research and quality character (Singh, 2008).

Improvement in the quality of higher education is certainly a thing of major concern at this moment in our country. Present day seekers of higher education look for Educational programs with specific objectives that would add value to their services in the National and International workplaces. As quality education is need of hour, all the quality issues should be given top most priority with equal attention (Pradipta and Pradipta, 2008).

Total Quality Management in higher education means improving the quality of courses, input instructional process, resource management processes and structures as well as student support service output and linkages with world of work and other organizations (Tulsi, 2001). Hence the present study is conducted in view of the institutional perception of students on the principles of Total Quality Management.

## 1. Review of Related Studies

Bonstingl (1992) states that, with regard to the principle of Total Quality, the organization must focus, first and foremost, on its suppliers and customer, the student is indeed both a customer as well as worker.

Jurate Stankeviciene (2007) reported that, the graduates have their own view on the administration and development of the educational institution where they graduate from, and their opinion can help in creating a policy of education and practice. And also, the opinion of the students towards teaching helps to take in consideration of their opinion on teaching of high quality. Similarly, to raise the teaching quality, the activation of individual work with students, listening to the needs of the students and their communicative skills development, have to be improved.

Feng Jie (2009) analysed students' general perception of TQM and its effect on attractiveness of place of study. The study sought to examine student's needs of focus, and quality of service provided by Malaysian universities, as well as the effect of the two variables on the ranking of the institutions. The findings show that, students place high importance on an institution's quality performance. Thus more effort should be taken to enhance the practice of TQM in every component of the institution, and embed it as an organizational culture.

Students are the active observers to assess the quality of education, as they are the beneficiaries of the system (Lakshmi Kumari, 2007). Students can provide feedback in the functioning of various components of the curricula as they are fully involved in the process. Role of students' is the key factor in the process of re-organisation. Students participation for quality enhancement in educational management will bring confidence among them which will further strengthen their academic potential (Bishu Charan Sahoo, 2007).

Hence involving the students and ensuring their participation in the process of quality assurance would go a long way in making our system of higher education learner centered.

## 2. Significance of the Study

The students are the destiny of a nation. They are the pillars of the society and they can be the only people who can shape up a nation. Hence they have to be properly guided in the classroom and the required things for their upliftment have to be provided sufficiently. This is the major concern facing towards the present generation. In order to provide full fledged opportunities, it is customary to study the perception of the students towards the institution in which they are studying. And also, students are the immediate customers in education whose perception towards various components in quality management helps to improve the quality of education and make education student-centered or learner-centered. So the present study was focused in such a way to study the perception of students towards the quality of their institution.

## 3. Objective of the Study

The study was carried out with the objective to study the perception of student teachers towards the quality of their institution.

### 3.1 Hypotheses of the Study

- H1: There is no significant difference in the quality indicators such as Principal as leader, teacher and quality of teaching, curricular activities and resources between the mean perception scores of students with regard to gender.
- H2: There is no significant difference in the quality indicators such as Principal as leader, teacher and quality of teaching, curricular activities and resources between the mean perception scores of students with regard to the educational qualification of student teachers.
- H3: There is no significant difference in the quality indicators such as Principal as leader, teacher and quality of teaching, curricular activities and resources between the mean perception scores of students with regard to locality of the students.

## 4. Methodology

### 4.1 Sample

For the present study, 3 Government Colleges of Education, affiliated to Tamilnadu Teacher's Education University, Tamilnadu, were chosen. 50 students from each

college were taken as sample for the study. The investigator used Random Sampling Technique.

## 4.2 Research Design

The nature of the study is Descriptive, and Survey method was followed.

## 4.3 Tool Used

The tool for the present study is the Student's Institutional Perception Scale (SIPS) adopted from the study conducted by Subramonian and Muthaiah (2006), which comprises 20 items under four quality indicators through which the investigator attempted to identify the quality of the institutions.

Some of the sample statements for the respective quality indicators are given below.

### Principal As Leader (PAL)

- Principal takes lot of interest in the College.
- Principal takes care to solve any problem of the students.

### Teacher and Quality of Teaching (TQT)

- Teachers take lot of care for students.
- Teachers teach very well.

### Curricular activities (CA)

- All students are encouraged to participate in co-curricular activities.
- The students are allowed to participate in all competitions outside the college.

### Resources (R)

- The College has good facilities.
- The College is preparing students for the future.

All the 20 items of the Student's Institutional Perception Scale are positively keyed items. This tool is a type of Five point Likert type scaling.

## 4.4 Operational definition for the quality indicators

**Principal As Leader (PAL):** It is the quality indicator that demonstrates the appropriateness in the vision, values and aims, sharing and sustaining the vision and promotion of positive attitudes to social and cultural diversity and also strategic deployment of resources along with evaluation of risk.

**Teacher and Quality of Teaching (TQT):** It is one of the quality indicator that demonstrates the extent to which the staff are motivated, confident and valued, improve their practice through training and development activities and work effectively in teams.

**Curricular Activities (CA):** It is the quality indicator that demonstrates the implementation of policies, strategies and plans for the development of students, action plans to meet the needs of students, recognizing their achievement in the community, planning for improvement and monitoring progress and reporting the progress to stakeholders.

**Resources (R):** It is the quality indicator which demonstrates the extent to which the learners are included and participating, achieving and attaining and progressing. The extent to which the learners, parents and families report that learners' educational experiences enable them to become, successful learners, confident individuals, responsible citizens and effective contributors, with the usage of available resources and efficient and effective use of resources.

## 4.5 Statistical technique used

From the scores collected, Mean, Standard Deviation and t-value were calculated.

## 5. Data Analysis

From Table 1, it is revealed that the Mean and SD value of male and female students for the quality indicators such as Principal as Leader, Teacher and Quality of Teaching, Curricular Activities and Resources are 9.28 and 3.14,

Quality Indicator		N	Mean	SD	t value	Inference
PAL	Male	100	9.28	3.14	3.41	S
	Female	50	12.23	3.88		
TQT	Male	100	13.08	2.99	4.38	S
	Female	50	15.42	3.52		
CA	Male	100	11.90	3.05	1.68	NS
	Female	50	14.79	3.63		
R	Male	100	14.44	3.12	1.44	NS
	Female	50	16.68	2.93		

S - Significant at 0.01 level; NS - No significant difference

**Table 1. Results of t test on quality indicator such as Principal as Leader (PAL), Teacher and Quality of Teaching (TQT), Curricular activities (CA), and Resources (R) in terms of gender**

12.23 and 3.88; 13.08 and 2.99, 15.42 and 3.52; 11.90 and 3.05, 14.79 and 3.63; 14.44 and 3.12, 16.68 and 2.93 respectively. The calculated t-value of those quality indicators are 3.41, 4.38, 1.68 and 1.44 respectively. This shows that, the calculated t-value is significant at 1% level of significance for the quality indicators such as Principal as Leader, and Teacher and Quality of Teaching. For the remaining quality indicators, there is no significant difference between male and female students.

From Table 2, it is revealed that the Mean and SD value of UG and PG students for the quality indicators such as Principal as Leader, Teacher and Quality of Teaching, Curricular Activities and Resources are 11.50 and 3.84, 10.77 and 4.00; 14.78 and 3.49, 14.38 and 3.59; 13.80 and 3.77, 13.88 and 3.61; 16.05 and 3.21, 15.71 and 3.10 respectively. The calculated t-value of those quality indicators are 0.14, 0.26, 0.44 and 0.27 respectively. This shows that, the calculated t-value is not significant at 5%

Quality Indicator		N	Mean	SD	t value	Inference
PAL	UG	98	11.50	3.84	0.14	NS
	PG	52	10.77	4.00		
TQT	UG	98	14.78	3.49	0.26	NS
	PG	52	14.38	3.59		
CA	UG	98	13.80	3.77	0.44	NS
	PG	52	13.88	3.61		
R	UG	98	16.05	3.21	0.27	NS
	PG	52	15.71	3.10		

NS – No significant difference

**Table 2. Results of t test on quality indicator Principal as Leader (PAL), Teacher and Quality of Teaching (TQT), Curricular activities (CA), and Resources (R) in terms of educational qualification of students**

Quality Indicator		N	Mean	SD	t value	Inference
PAL	Rural	82	10.94	3.68	0.14	NS
	Urban	68	11.62	4.14		
TQT	Rural	82	14.61	3.44	0.45	NS
	Urban	68	14.68	3.63		
CA	Rural	82	13.71	3.54	0.33	NS
	Urban	68	13.97	3.91		
R	Rural	82	15.82	3.17	0.31	NS
	Urban	68	16.07	3.18		

**Table 3. Results of t test on quality indicator Principal as Leader (PAL), Teacher and Quality of Teaching (TQT), Curricular activities (CA), and Resources (R) in terms of locality of students**

level of significance for all the quality indicators. It is revealed that there is no significant difference in the quality indicators perception scores in terms of education qualification of students.

From Table 3, it is revealed that, the Mean and SD value of rural and urban students for the quality indicators such as Principal as Leader, Teacher and Quality of Teaching, Curricular Activities and Resources are 10.94 and 3.68, 11.62 and 4.14; 14.61 and 3.44, 14.68 and 3.63; 13.71 and 3.54, 13.97 and 3.91; 15.82 and 3.17, 16.07 and 3.18 respectively. The calculated t-value of these quality indicators are 0.14, 0.45, 0.33 and 0.31 respectively. This shows that, the calculated t-value is not significant at 5% level of significance for all the quality indicators. It is revealed that, there is no significant difference in the quality indicators perception scores in terms of locality of students.

## 6. Findings and Interpretation

- There is a significant difference in the quality indicators Principal as Leader and Teacher and Quality of Teaching with respect to gender. This may be due to perception of female students being higher when compared to male students, to the staff.
- There is no significant difference between male and female students in their perception scores towards the other quality indicators.
- There is no significant difference in the quality indicators perception score in terms of educational qualification of students and their locality. This may be due to educational qualification and location of the students having no effect on the perception scores.

## 7. Educational Implications

The findings of the study have implications of focus on leadership quality of the Principal, experience of the teachers on TQM, implementation of innovation and evaluation on TQM of teacher education programmes. To ensure quality in teacher education programme,

- Teacher education institutions should be subjected to Periodical assessment and accreditation from NAAC and ISO.
- Periodical assessment by internal and external

assessment cells as per the guidelines of national agencies like NCTE, NAAC, etc., should be performed.

- Teacher education institutions should be established according to the social necessity. While establishment, quality of teacher education should be ensured.

## Conclusion

The author concluded that, gender has a significant impact on the quality indicators such as Principal as Leader and Teacher and Quality of Teaching. The study also revealed that, no difference of perception was identified between the educational qualification and locality of students.

## References

- [1]. Bishu Charan Sahoo (2007). Student Participation in Educational Management for Quality Assurance, *University News*, Vol.45(28).
- [2]. Bonstingl, J.J. (1992). *School of Quality : An introduction to Total Quality Management in education*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- [3]. Feng Jie, (2009). Education Management: Perception of TQM and Its Effect on Attractiveness of Place of Study, *E-Leader*, Kuala Lumpur.
- [4]. Jurate Stankeviciene (2007). Assessment of Teaching Quality: Survey of University Graduates – Siauliai University, Lithuania – Paper presented at the European Conference on Educational Research, University of Ghent, pp.19-21, September, 2007.
- [5]. Subramonian, G., and Muthaiah, N. (2006). *The application of the Principles of Total Quality Management (TQM) in Teacher Education Institutions*. Unpublished Ph.D Thesis, Department of Education, Sri Ramakrishna Mission Vidyalaya College of Education, Coimbatore,
- [6]. Tulsi, P. K. (2001), *Total Quality in Higher education, Reforms and Innovations in Higher Education*, AIU, New Delhi
- [7]. Dutta, P. K., (2007). Quality Maintenance in Higher Education, *University News*, Vol.45(31), pp.1-7, 16.
- [8]. Nayantara Padhi., (2006). Total Quality Management in Higher Education: A Conceptual Review, *University News*, Vol.44(24), pp. 10-16.
- [9]. Pradipta Kumar Mishra and Pradipta Kumar Pattnaik., (2008). Quality Assurance in Higher Education: Role of Action Research, *University News*, Vol.46(17), pp. 16-19.
- [10]. Lakshmi Kumari, V., (2007). The Role of Managements in Monitoring Efforts for Quality Education, *Edu Tracks*, Vol.7(1); pp.10-11.
- [11]. Arvind Sharma., and Venkateshwarlu., (2007). Quality Issues in Higher Education, *University News*, Vol.45(15), pp. 8-11.
- [12]. Singh, S. K., (2008). Quality Education and the Human Development. *University News*, Vol.45(06), pp. 8-11.

## ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Mr. S. Sundareshan is presently working as an Assistant Professor in Biological Science at TVS Teacher Training Academy, Madurai. He is also a research scholar in Education at Tamil Nadu Teachers Education University, Chennai. He has completed his Bachelor degree in Zoology from the American College, Madurai and Master degree in Zoology from Thiagarajar College, Madurai. He has also completed his Graduate degree in Education from IASE, Saidapet, Chennai, and Master degree from Sri Ramakrishna Mission Vidyalaya College of Education, Coimbatore. His areas of interest are Educational Psychology, Educational Statistics, and Educational Technology.



Dr. N. Muthaiah, is presently working as the Principal in Sri Ramakrishna Mission Vidyalaya College of Education, Coimbatore. He is also a Dean of Ramakrishna Mission Vivekananda University, Coimbatore. He has 30 years of teaching experience in the field of education. He has organized various National, International seminars and conferences and published several papers in reputed Journals.

