An empirical study of quality in higher education in relation to stakeholders perspectives

Zafrul Allam, Siraj Ahmad

Assistant Professor, College of Business Administration, Salman bin Abdulaziz University, K.S.A.
z.allam@sau.edu.sa

Abstract: In the eyes of stakeholder, the quality in higher education varies in terms of degree. The present research conducted on stakeholder to know their perception about quality in higher education. This study contemplated to ascertain the institutional factors, the curriculum content, institutional resources of quality in higher education and also focus stakeholder's perception of outcome and assessment related to quality in higher education. Sample consisted of 162 stakeholders selected randomly from Al-Kharj and Riyadh region of Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. Data were analyzed by means of descriptive statistics. Results of the present study revealed that faculty and employer perceived similar preferences with regard to admission criteria, curriculum content and outcome and assessment as the most important factor contributing to quality in higher education. Although students preferences are in all dimension is lesser than other stakeholders. However, the employer has the view that institutional factor and teaching and learning experiences considered as the highest preferences than other stakeholders that contributing to quality in higher education. Investigators incorporated certain suggestions for future research.
[Allam, Z., Ahmad S. **An empirical study of quality in higher education in relation to stakeholders perspectives.** *J Am Sci* 2013;9(12):387-401]. (ISSN: 1545-1003). http://www.jofamericanscience.org. 53

1. Introduction

In the present scenario the word 'quality' has been generally used in manufacturing and service sector and particularly in higher education. No doubt,Quality is the multi faceted concept, accepting all functions and activities of higher education, such as teaching and learning programs, research and scholarship, faculty members and staff, students, buildings, library, facilities, lab equipment, services to the community, academic culture and environment; taking into consideration national values and circumstances and international dimensions such as exchange of knowledge programme, liaison among different global institutions movement of teachers and students, and international research proposals. Whereas, Higher Education refers to all post-secondary education, comprises of universities, colleges, technical institute, training institute, polytechnics, academic staff and teacher training institutions, medical colleges, agriculture training centers, distance education centers, advance study centers and research centers and institutes. The meaning of quality in higher education is contrary to the industry where end product is clearly specified. Watty (2003) explained that quality has become the focus of attention, its meaning is neither always clear nor its usage reliable but the notion of quality in higher education has no accepted technical meaning,indeed usually involves a heavy contextual overlay of some political or educational position.

1.2. Review of Literature

In the pace of rapid change in higher education significantly engulfed the gap between universities and other service sectors perceived quality in different ways (Lomas, 2007).

Literature reviewed around the transformation in higher education; especially in relation to change consequently quality in higher education took initiatives to highlight two broad ways of thinking about quality, relating to context and the stakeholders respectively. The first gives quality a context-specific meaning where quality is attached to a context and as a consequence quality becomes meaningful (Trow, 1991; Baird, 1998; Fry 95, Nordvall and Braxton, 1996). For instance, references to the quality of assessment, student intake, academic programs, teaching and learning, the student experience and program designs are not uncommon. While reviewing the literature on quality in higher education several authors have pointed out that the quality in higher education are vaguely defined and, therefore interpreted in different ways by various investigators (Ekong, 2003, and Neave, 1994).It is partially assumed that the higher education connotes different forms in different context but is also because the concept of quality is often appropriated by different stakeholders to legitimize specific visions or interests (Martin and Stella, 2007).

Tang and Hussin (2011) observed that quality in higher education should not produce academically good graduate rather produces graduates with good moral character and fulfill the expectations of organization. They also found out that effective teaching and learning, improved communications skills and availability of information, supportive learning

environment, personal development, accuracy and accessibility were reliable indicators of invented quality in higher education. Personal and social priority asserted that present and future prospect of quality education achieved for the people and nations. As far as the individual learners is concerned as a part of the society, and the society benefits from individuals after getting quality of education. Therefore society and institution should join hand and work together to ensure the quality of education (Teshome, 2007).

Various researchers emphasized that higher education dealt with masses expectation in the growing climate/environment accompanied by increased accountability are always cited as rationale for greater emphasis on quality in higher education (Eriksen, 1995; Oldfield and Baron, 1998; Becket and Brookes, 2006). Brookes and Becket (2007) explored environmental forces that include the greater expectations and varieties of students as consumers, their demand for increased flexibility in provision and competition in the global perspectives. Earlier researches highlighted the quality in higher education might be interpreted and measured in different ways (Cheng and Tam, 1997; Pounder, 1999). But, still there is no universal agreement to describe the way to manage quality within higher education and a variety of quality management approaches have been applied in different higher education institutions set up (Martens and Prosser, 1998).

Pandi *et al.* (2009) illustrates on integrated management practices in educational institutions and institutions effectiveness in the perspectives of student's perceptions of quality. Chakka and Kulkarni (2010) put emphasis on improvement of teaching quality and learning processes through TQM and they coined a new concept of 'teacher-accreditation', which may be more important over the other accreditations with the help of methods to achieve teaching quality, evaluation of teaching quality by peer-reviewing, student feedback and evaluation of learning process.

Khan et al., (2011) studied to discuss the impact of quality of service on the satisfaction level of students and willingness to put more efforts towards their study. Results revealed that there is significant relationship between dimensions of service quality. Further it was observed that higher the level of students' satisfaction led the greater willingness to put more efforts towards their studies to accomplish the goal.

Kalayci, Watty and Hayirsever (2012) emphasized the perception of Turkey's academicians regarding quality as excellent in higher education and described that academics focused on the perspective of quality as excellent or elitist, both in their beliefs and attitudes. Other researchers Maguire and Gibbs (2013) contemplated to study with an intention of quality in higher education with particular focus on 'objectifying through articulation' the assessment of quality by professional experts. Further authors provided an overview of the differentiations of quality used in higher education.

1.3. Objectives of the Research Project

In the light of research literature reviewed in the field of Quality of Higher Education with respect to stakeholder perception. Keeping the nature and criteria of present study in mind, the investigators formulated certain objectives as follows:

- To analyze the admission criteria as one of the factors contributing to quality in higher education perceive by the stakeholders.
- To evaluate the institutional factors in establishing the quality in higher education perceive by the stakeholders.
- To analyze the curriculum content perceived by stakeholders in understanding the quality in higher education.
- To analyze stakeholders perception about institutional resources of quality in higher education.
- To determine the importance of teaching and learning experiences as one of the important factors of quality in higher education perceived by stakeholders.
- To explore stakeholders perception of outcome and assessment related to quality in higher education.

2. Methodology

2.1. Sample: The sample of present study consists of 162 respondents selected randomly from Al-kharj and Riyadh region of Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. Moreover, all 162 respondents' were male only with age variance.

2.2. Tools: Perception of Quality in Higher Education Questionnaire originally developed and standardized by Zachariah (2007) and modified according to the requirement of present research. The questionnaire has been classified into six dimensions or subscales: admission criteria, institutional factors, curriculum content, resources, teaching and learning experiences and outcome and assessment. This is a five point rating scale and each item to be rated from most important to least important with a weighted score of 5 to 1. The reliability of the scale also established.

2.3. Procedure:

The present psychometric measures were administered to 162 stakeholders in relation to quality of higher education in Al-kharj and Riyadh region of Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. The original questionnaire was in English and keeping in view about the

understanding of respondents it has been translated by expert in Arabic to get exact information from these samples. The subjects were asked to take your own time to fill the questionnaire and if feel any kind of difficulty then call to the researcher on mobile any time for further explanation of the questionnaire. All collected questionnaires were tabulated and scored for statistical analysis. The scoring was done separately for each dimension.

2.4. Ethics

The respondents were assured about the confidentiality of the responses and it will be used for academic purpose only. Furthers, they were assured that their responses would not be revealed before any authority.

2.5. Data Analysis: With the help of Mean's, SD's and rank of the order of the dimension as well as sub dimension of the questionnaires. Further, results have been shown through diagram.

3. Results

Based on findings the results have been systematically presented in different tables with respect to stakeholders such as students, faculty and employer in the light of their perception that contributed to quality in higher education.

Table-1: Showing students perception regarding admission criteria.

Sr.No.	Items	Most Imp. 5	Quite Imp. 4	Average Imp. 3	Low Imp. 2	Least Imp. 1	NR	MWS
1	High admission criteria for registering in the program	9 (10.1%)	23 (25.8%)	37 (41.7%)	8 (9.0%)	10 (11.2%)	2 (2.2%)	3.14
2	English or aptitude or ability test before entry to a program	16(18%)	16(18%)	23(25.8%)	19(21.3%)	15(16.9%)	-	2.98
3	Students commitment and interest to studies in the program	30 (33.7%)	21(23.6%)	19(21.3%)	11(12.4%)	8 (9.0%)	-	3.60
4	Varieties of courses offered in program	25(28.2%)	26(29.2%)	23(25.8%)	5(5.6%)	8 (9.0%)	2 (2.2%)	3.63
5	Overall your perception towards the above criteria in admission	17 (19.1%)	21(23.6%)	22(24.7%)	12(13.5%)	7(7.9%)	10 (11.2%)	3.32

It is evident from Table-1 that representing the perception of students regarding admission criteria. There are four admission criteria out of which varieties of courses offered in program appeared highest preference among students. The mean weightage score for varieties of courses offered in program has been found 3.63 followed by students' commitment and interest to studies in the program, high admission criteria for registration in program and English or aptitude or ability test before entry to program with least mean weightage score.

Table-2: Showing students perception regarding institutional factors.

Sr.No.	Items	Most Imp. 5	Quite Imp. 4	Average Imp. 3	Low Imp. 2	Least Imp. 1	NR	MWS
1	Status/reputation of the institute among students	25 (28.2%)	21(23.6%)	20(22.5%)	12(13.5%)	10 (11.2%)	1(1.1%)	3.44
2	Status/reputation of the institute among community and employers	29(32.6%)	22(24.7%)	23(25.8%)	7(7.9%)	7(7.9%)	1(1.1%)	3.67
3	Attendance strictness requirement for classes	27(30.3%)	25(28.2%)	19(21.3%)	13(14.6%)	4(4.5%)	1(1.1%)	3.65
4	High standard and challenging program for students to accomplish	22(24.7%)	27(30.3%)	23(25.8%)	11(12.4%)	5(5.6%)	1(1.1%)	3.56
5	Plenty of opportunities provided to students for extracurricular	25(28.2%)	13(14.6%)	22(24.7%)	10 (11.2%)	17 (19.1%)	2 (2.2%)	3.21
6	Overall your perception towards the above criteria in institutional factors	15(16.9%)	30(33.7%)	18(20.2%)	10 (11.2%)	7(7.9%)	9(10.1%)	3.45

It appears from Table -2 that the students perceived the institutional factors in the following manner. The highest mean weightage score (3.67) was found on status/reputation of the institute among community and employers among the institutional factors. The least important institutional factor as perceived buy the student is plenty of opportunities provided to students for extracurricular with mean weightage score 3.21.

Table-3: Showing student perception regarding curriculum content.

Sr. No.	Items	Most Imp. 5	Quite Imp. 4	Average Imp. 3	Low Imp. 2	Least Imp. 1	NR	MWS
1	The content of the curriculum and its relevance according to the demand of market	27 (30.3%)	25 (28.2%)	18(20.2%)	11 (12.4%)	8 (9.0%)	-	3.58
2	More theoretical information given in the curriculum to specific subject knowledge	18 (20.2%)	30 (33.8%)	25(28.1%)	10 (11.2%)	6 (6.7%)	-	3.49
3	Practical knowledge in the curriculum which is important for the organization/ industry	18 (20.2%)	25 (28.2%)	23(25.8%)	16 (18.0%)	6 (6.7%)	1 (1.1%)	3.37
4	Significance of the program related to market	15 (16.9%)	28 (31.5%)	28(31.5%)	12 (13.4%)	6 (6.7%)	-	3.38
5	More emphasis given to develop personality, synergy of work, communication and creativity	19 (21.3%)	18 (20.2%)	22(24.8%)	15 (16.9%)	14 (15.7%)	1 (1.1%)	3.14
6	Overall your perception towards the above criteria in curriculum content	15 (16.9%)	26 (29.2%)	20(22.4%)	15 (16.9%)	4 (4.5%)	9 (10.1%)	3.40

Table -3 shed the highlights of students' perception regarding curriculum content and the overall perception regarding curriculum content has been observed with the mean weightage score is 3.40.Out of all the factors of the content of the curriculum and its relevance according to the demand of market has been appeared highest preferences among the students with the weightage mean score of

3.58. The least important curriculum factor perceived by student is more emphasis given to develop personality, synergy of work, communication and creativity whereas, practical knowledge in the curriculum which is important for the organization/ industry preceded by the least important factor with mean weightage score of 3.37.

Table-4: Showing students perception regarding institutional resources.

Sr.No.	Items	Most Imp. 5	Quite Imp. 4	Average Imp. 3	Low Imp. 2	Least Imp. 1	NR	MWS
1	High standard teaching facilities such as lecture halls, labs classrooms	40 (45%)	14(15.7%)	10 (11.2%)	5(5.7%)	20(22.4%)	-	3.55
2	Plenty of library resources in terms of qualities are available	19(21.3%)	18(20.2%)	17 (19.1%)	12(13.5%)	23(25.9%)	-	2.97
3	Attractiveness of the campus and its layout	22(24.8%)	13(14.6%)	19(21.3%)	9(10.1%)	25(28.1%)	1(1.1%)	2.97
4	Sports and recreation facilities are in place	20(22.4)	10 (11.2%)	21(23.7%)	13(14.6%)	25(28.1%)	-	2.85
5	Adequate number of students in the classrooms in terms of ratio of the staff and students	27(30.4%)	20(22.5%)	18(20.2%)	5(5.6%)	19(21.3%)	-	3.34
6	Overall your perception towards the above criteria in resources of the program	26(29.2%)	20(22.4%)	17 (19.1%)	7(7.9%)	14(15.7%)	5(5.6%)	3.44

It is apparent from Table-4 that the overall institutional resources perceived by the students with mean weightage score of 3.44. Among the institutional resources high standard teaching facilities such as lecture halls, labs classrooms perceived by student with mean weightage score (3.55) followed by adequate number of students in

the classrooms in terms of ratio of the staff and students, plenty of library resources in terms of qualities are available, attractiveness of the campus and its layout and sports and recreation facilities are in place with mean weightage scores (MWS) 3.34,2.97,2.97 and 2.85 respectively.

Table-5: Showing students perception regarding teaching and learning experiences.

Sr. No.	Items	Most Imp. 5	Quite Imp. 4	Average Imp. 3	Low Imp. 2	Least Imp. 1	NR	MWS
1	Ability of faculty to judge the individual differences of the students in terms of intelligence and their needs	26(29.2%)	20(22.6%)	19(21.3%)	14(15.7%)	9(10.1%)	1(1.1%)	3.45
2	The teaching approach, methods and styles of the faculty	22 (24.7%)	28 (31.5%)	16 (18.0%)	14(15.7%)	8 (9.0%)	1(1.1%)	3.47
3	Same teaching/approach/methods used by faculty while teaching the different topics of the courses	13(14.6%)	17 (19.1%)	27(30.3%)	17 (19.1%)	12(13.5%)	3 (3.4%)	3.02
4	The Degree/qualification/Experience of faculty members	25(28.2%)	27(30.3%)	16(18.0%)	11(12.4%)	8 (9.0%)	2 (2.2%)	3.57
5	Competency of faculty to generate interest and motivate the students	32(36%)	20(22.4)	15(16.9%)	10 (11.2%)	9(10.1%)	3 (3.4%)	3.65
6	Attractive and impressive personality of faculty members	28(31.5%)	21(23.6%)	18(20.2%)	8 (9.0%)	10 (11.2%)	4(4.5%)	3.57
7	Potential of faculty members to change/shape the attitude and skills of the students	26(29.3%)	18(20.2%)	24(27%)	10 (11.2%)	10 (11.2%)	1(1.1%)	3.45
8	Student's hard work to understand the subject in and outside the class.	24(27%)	24(27%)	20(22.5%)	12(13.4%)	8 (9.0%)	1(1.1%)	3.50
9	Different students resources usage provided to students	22(24.7%)	21(23.6%)	23(25.8%)	11(12.4%)	11(12.4%)	1 (1.1%)	3.35
10	Emphasize by Faculty on practical aspects to suit the workplace requirements	18 (20.1%)	25 (28.2%)	22 (24.7%)	15 (16.9%)	8 (9.0%)	1 (1.1%)	3.34
11	Overall your perception towards the above criteria in teaching and learning experiences	21 (23.6%)	17 (19.1%)	24 (27%)	9 (10.1%)	10 (11.2%)	6 (6.7%)	3.28

On the basis of Table-5 it was found that the overall students perception in teaching and learning experiences was found with mean weightage score is 3.28.The most important factor regarding teaching and learning experiences perceived by student is competency of faculty to generate interest and motivate the students with the mean weightage score is 3.65 followed by The degree/qualification/experience of faculty members (3.57) and attractive and impressive personality of faculty members (3.57) whereas, the least important factor regarding teaching and learning experiences perceived by the students is same teaching/approach/methods used by faculty while teaching the different topics of the courses and emphasize by Faculty on practical aspects to suit the workplace requirements with mean weightage score of 3.02 and 3.34 respectively.

Table-6: Showing students perception regarding outcome and assessment.

Sr. No.	Items	Most Imp. 5	Quite Imp. 4	Average Imp. 3	Low Imp. 2	Least Imp. 1	NR	MWS
1	High grade of students	23(25.8%)	21(23.6%)	21(23.6%)	9(10.1%)	8(9%)	7(7.9%)	3.51
2	Different methods to assess the students	20(22.5%)	23(25.7%)	17 (19.1%)	15(16.9%)	7(7.9%)	7(7.9%)	3.41
3	Written Examination is the best way to assess the students	24(27%)	13(14.6%)	19(21.3%)	17 (19.1%)	9(10.1%)	7(7.9%)	3.31
4	Regular evaluation/assessment of students to engage them learning	18(20.2%)	23(25.8%)	26(29.2%)	10 (11.2%)	5(5.6%)	7(7.9%)	3.47
5	Marks shown to students after assessment	23(25.8%)	15(16.9%)	26(29.1%)	11(12.4%)	7(7.9%)	7(7.9%)	3.43
6	Overall your perception towards the above criteria in outcomes and assessment	18(20.2%)	15(16.9%)	25(28.1%)	10 (11.2%)	7(7.9%)	14(15.7%)	3.36

Table-6 represents the students' perception regarding overall outcome and assessment with mean weightage score of 3.36. High grade of students with mean weightage score of 3.51 perceived as most important factor regarding outcome and assessment followed by regular evaluation/assessment of students to engage them learning (3.47), marks shown to students after assessment (3.43), different methods to assess the students (3.41) and written Examination is the best way to assess the students (3.31).

Table-7: Presenting faculty perception regarding admission criteria.

Sr. No.	Items	Most Imp. 5	Quite Imp. 4	Average Imp. 3	Low Imp. 2	Least Imp. 1	NR	MWS
1	High admission criteria for registering in the program	13(34.2%)	14(36.9%)	10 (26.3%)	-	1(2.6%)	-	4.00
2	English or aptitude or ability test before entry to a program	19(50%)	6(15.7%)	7(18.4%)	2(5.3%)	4(10.6%)		3.89
3	Students commitment and interest to studies in the program	14(36.9%)	17(44.8%)	6(15.7%)	1(2.6%)	-		4.15
4	Varieties of courses offered in program	10 (26.3%)	17(44.8%)	10 (26.3%)	1(2.6%)	-	-	3.94
5	Overall your perception towards the above criteria in admission	10 (26.3%)	16(42.1%)	10 (26.3%)	2(5.3%)	-	-	3.89

It is observed from Table-7 that representing the perception of faculty regarding admission criteria. Out of four criteria of admission, faculty perceived a students commitment and interest to studies in the program with mean weightage score of 4.15 as one of the most important criteria for admission in the program. The least important criteria perceived by faculty was English or aptitude or ability test before entry to a program (3.89). Furthermore, 50% respondents perceived English or aptitude or ability test before entry to a program is the most important aspect for admission criteria.

Table-8: Presenting faculty perception regarding institutional factor.

Sr. No.	Items	Most Imp. 5	Quite Imp. 4	Average Imp. 3	Low Imp. 2	Least Imp. 1	NR	MWS
1	Status/reputation of the institute among students	9(23.7%)	18(47.4%)	10 (26.3%)	1(2.6%)	-	-	3.92
2	Status/reputation of the institute among community and employers	11(29%)	15(39.5%)	12(31.5%)	-	-	-	3.42
3	Attendance strictness requirement for classes	14(36.8%)	19(50%)	5(13.2%)	-	-	-	4.23
4	High standard and challenging program for students to accomplish	9(23.7%)	20(52.7%)	8 (21%)	1(2.6%)	-	-	3.97
5	Plenty of opportunities provided to students for extracurricular	9(23.7%)	18(47.3%)	6(15.8%)	4(10.6%)	1(2.6%)	-	3.78
6	Overall your perception towards the above criteria in institutional factors	7(18.4%)	19(50%)	7(18.4%)	5(13.2%)	-	-	3.73

It is explicit (ref. table -8) that the faculty observed attendance strictness requirement for classes existed as most important institutional factor with mean weightage score 4.23 followed by high standard and challenging program for students to accomplish goal (3.97) and status/reputation of the institute among students (3.92). The least institutional factor perceived by faculty status/reputation of the institute among community and employers (3.42).

Table-9: Presenting faculty perception regarding curriculum content.

Sr. No.	Items	Most Imp. 5	Quite Imp. 4	Average Imp. 3	Low Imp. 2	Least Imp. 1	NR	MWS
1	The content of the curriculum and its relevance according to the demand of market	19(50%)	16 (42.1%)	3(7.9%)	-	-	-	4.42
2	More theoretical information given in the curriculum to specific subject knowledge	11(29%)	17(44.7%)	7(18.4%)	2(5.3%)	1(2.6%)	-	3.92
3	Practical knowledge in the curriculum which is important for the organization/ industry	17(44.7%)	18(47.4%)	3(7.9%)	-	-	-	4.36
4	Significance of the program related to market	15(39.4%)	18(47.4%)	5(13.2%)	-	-	-	4.26
5	More emphasis given to develop personality, synergy of work, communication and creativity	18(47.4%)	15(39.4%)	2(5.3%)	2(5.3%)	-	1(2.6%)	4.32
6	Overall your perception towards the above criteria in curriculum content	12(31.6%)	22(57.9%)	3(7.9%)	1(2.6%)	-	-	4.18

The result revealed in Table-9 showing the perception of faculty regarding curriculum content.50% of respondents perceived the content of the curriculum and its relevance according to the demand of market as the most important curriculum content with highest mean weightage score of 4.42. The lowest mean weightage score observed 3.92 for more theoretical information given in the curriculum to specific subject knowledge.

Table-10: Presenting faculty perception regarding institutional resources.

Sr. No.	Items	Most Imp. 5	Quite Imp. 4	Average Imp. 3	Low Imp. 2	Least Imp. 1	NR	MWS
1	High standard teaching facilities such as lecture halls, labs classrooms	16(42.1%)	19(50%)	-	-	3(7.9%)	-	4.18
2	Plenty of library resources in terms of qualities are available	16(42.1%)	13(34.1%)	3(7.9%)	2(5.3%)	4(10.6%)	-	3.92
3	Attractiveness of the campus and its layout	6(15.8%)	15(39.4%)	11(29%)	1(2.6%)	5(13.2%)	-	3.42
4	Sports and recreation facilities are in place	5(13.2%)	15(39.5%)	10 (26.3%)	1(2.6%)	7(18.4%)	-	3.26
5	Adequate number of students in the classrooms in terms of ratio of the staff and students	14(36.8%)	13(34.1%)	5(13.2%)	2(5.3%)	1(2.6%)	-	3.73
6	Overall your perception towards the above criteria in resources of the program	8(21%)	19(50%)	6(15.8%)	1(2.6%)	4(10.6%)	-	3.68

The result highlighted in Table-10 showed high standard teaching facilities such as lecture halls, labs classrooms as the most important institutional resources with weightage mean score in the eyes faculty but 50 % faculty perceived to this institutional resource as quite important. Sports and recreation facilities are in place (3.26) has been observed as least important institutional resources perceived by faculty.

Table-11: Presenting faculty perception regarding teaching and learning experiences.

Sr. No.	Items	Most Imp. 5	Quite Imp. 4	Average Imp. 3	Low Imp. 2	Least Imp. 1	NR	MWS
1	Ability of faculty to judge the individual differences of the students in terms of intelligence and their needs	14(36.8%)	18(47.4%)	6(15.8%)	-	-	-	4.21
2	The teaching approach, methods and styles of the faculty	19(50%)	14(36.8%)	4(10.6%)	1(2.6%)	-	-	4.32
3	Same teaching/approach/methods used by faculty while teaching the different topics of the courses	8(21%)	11(29%)	15(39.5%)	3(7.9%)	1(2.6%)	-	3.57
4	The Degree/qualification/Experience of faculty members	14(36.7%)	18(47.4%)	4(10.6%)	2(5.3%)	-	-	4.15
5	Competency of faculty to generate interest and motivate the students	21(55.2%)	13(34.2%)	4(10.6%)	-	-	-	4.44
6	Attractive and impressive personality of faculty members	12(31.5%)	18(47.4%)	6(15.8%)	2(5.3%)	-	-	4.05
7	Potential of faculty members to change/shape the attitude and skills of the students	18(47.4%)	13(34.2%)	6(15.8%)	1(2.6%)	-	-	4.26
8	Student's hard work to understand the subject in and outside the class.	14(36.9%)	12(31.5%)	9(23.7%)	3(7.9%)	-	-	3.97
9	Different students resources usage provided to students	11(29%)	14(36.8%)	10(26.3%)	2(5.3%)	1(2.6%)	-	3.84
10	Emphasize by Faculty on practical aspects to suit the workplace requirements	11(29%)	19(50%)	7(18.4%)	1(2.6%)	-	-	4.05
11	Overall your perception towards the above criteria in teaching and learning experiences	12(31.5%)	13(34.2%)	11(29%)	2(5.3%)	-	-	3.92

Table-11 highlighted the result that 55.2% faculty perceived that competency of faculty to generate interest and motivate the students as the most important teaching and learning experiences with mean weightage score of 4.44. The least important teaching and learning experiences perceived by faculty is same teaching/approach/methods used by faculty while teaching the different topics of the courses with mean weightage score of 3.57. Whereas, 50% respondents perceived emphasize by faculty on practical aspects to suit the workplace requirements as quite important.

Table-12: Presenting faculty perception regarding outcomes and assessment.

Sr. No.	Items	Most Imp. 5	Quite Imp. 4	Average Imp. 3	Low Imp. 2	Least Imp. 1	NR	MWS
1	High grade of students	4(10.6%)	19(50%)	14(36.8%)	1(2.6%)	-	-	3.68
2	Different methods to assess the students	10 (26.3%)	24(63.1%)	4(10.6%)	-	-	-	4.15
3	Written Examination is the best way to assess the students	11(29%)	14(36.9%)	10 (26.3%)	1(2.6%)	1(2.6%)	1(2.6%)	3.89
4	Regular evaluation/assessment of students to engage them learning	19(50%)	16(42.1%)	3(7.9%)	-	-	-	4.42
5	Marks shown to students after assessment	18(47.3%)	13(34.2%)	6(15.9%)	1(2.6%)	-	-	4.26
6	Overall your perception towards the above criteria in outcomes and assessment	10(26.3%)	23(60.5%)	5(13.2%)	-	-	-	4.13

Table-12 shed the highlight of the result that 50% faculty perceived regular evaluation/assessment of students to engage them learning with mean weightage score of 4.42 as the outcomes and assessment. The least important factor of outcomes and assessment is high grade of students with mean weightage score of 3.68 in spite of 50% respondents perceived this factor as quite important.

Table-13: Indicating employer perception regarding admission criteria.

Sr. No.	Items	Most Important 5	Quite Important 4	Average Important 3	Low Imp. 2	Least Imp. 1	MWS
1	High admission criteria for registering in the program	8 (22.9%)	20 (57.1%)	7 (20%)	-	-	4.02
2	English or aptitude or ability test before entry to a program	15 (42.8%)	14 (40%)	5 (14.3%)	1 (2.9%)	1	4.22
3	Students commitment and interest to studies in the program	17(48.5%)	14 (40%)	3 (8.6%)	1 (2.9%)	-	4.34
4	Varieties of courses offered in program	9 (25.7%)	16 (45.7%)	9 (25.7%)	1 (2.9%)	-	3.94
5	Overall your perception towards the above criteria in admission	9 (25.7%)	17(48.5%)	6(17.2%)	3 (8.6%)	-	3.91

It is shown in Table-13 that students commitment and interest to studies in the program has been observed by employer as the most important admission criteria with mean weightage score of 4.34 followed by English or aptitude or ability test before entry to a program with mean weightage score of 4.22.It is important to mention here that 48.5% employer had the view that students commitment and interest to studies in the program as most important admission criteria.57.1% respondents perceived high admission criteria for registering in the program as quite important admission criteria. The lowest mean weightage score of 3.94 emerged for varieties of courses offered in program as the admission criteria.

Table-14: Indicating employer perception regarding institutional factor.

Sr. No.	Items	Most Imp. 5	Quite Imp. 4	Average Imp. 3	Low Imp. 2	Least Imp. 1	NR	MWS
1	Status/reputation of the institute among students	15(42.9%)	15(42.9%)	4 (11.4%)	1 (2.9%)	-	-	4.25
2	Status/reputation of the institute among community and employers	16(45.7%)	17(48.5%)	2 (5.8%)	-	-	-	4.4
3	Attendance strictness requirement for classes	19 (54.3%)	12 (34.3%)	3 (8.5%)	1 (2.9%)	-	-	4.4
4	High standard and challenging program for students to accomplish	14 (40%)	21 (60%)	-	-	-	-	4.4
5	Plenty of opportunities provided to students for extracurricular	13 (37.1%)	10(28.5%)	9 (25.7%)	2 (5.8%)	1 (2.9%)		3.91
6	Overall your perception towards the above criteria in institutional factors	16(45.7%)	11 (31.4%)	6 (17.1%)	1 (2.9%)	-	0	4.23

Table- 14 reflect interesting results that status/reputation of the institute among community and employers, attendance strictness requirement for classes and high standard and challenging program for students to accomplish goal perceived by employer as most important institutional factors with

equal mean weightage score 4.40.But 54.3 % respondents perceived attendance strictness requirement for classes as the most important institutional factor whereas, 60% respondents observed high standard and challenging program for

students to accomplish goal as quite important. The least important institutional factor with mean weightage score 3.91 existed to be plenty of opportunities provided to students for extracurricular activities.

Table-15: Indicating employer perception regarding curriculum content.

Sr. No.	Items	Most Imp. 5	Quite Imp. 4	Average Imp. 3	Low Imp. 2	Least Imp. 1	NR	MWS
1	The content of the curriculum and its relevance according to the demand of market	21(60%)	10(28.5%)	3 (8.6%)	1 (2.9%)	-	-	4.45
2	More theoretical information given in the curriculum to specific subject knowledge	12 (34.2%)	14 (40%)	6(17.2%)	3 (8.6%)	-	-	4.00
3	Practical knowledge in the curriculum which is important for the organization/ industry	22(62.8%)	7 (20%)	5 (14.3%)	1 (2.9%)		-	4.42
4	Significance of the program related to market	19(54.3%)	12 (34.2%)	4 (11.4%)	-	-	-	4.42
5	More emphasis given to develop personality, synergy of work, communication and creativity	16(45.7%)	13 (37.1%)	5 (14.3%)	-	1 (2.9%)	-	4.22
6	Overall your perception towards the above criteria in curriculum content	17(48.5%)	14 (40%)	2 (5.8%)	-	1 (2.9%)	1 (2.9%)	4.22

It is evident from the Table-15 that employer perceived the most important, the content of the curriculum and its relevance according to the demand of market with mean weightage score of 4.45 as 60% respondents viewed that this factor is most relevant

according to the demand of the market followed by the significance of the program related to market perceived by 54% respondents as the most important curriculum content with mean weightage score of 4.42.

Table-16: Indicating employer perception regarding institutional resources.

Sr. No.	Items	Most Imp. 5	Quite Imp. 4	Average Imp. 3	Low Imp. 2	Least Imp. 1	NR	MWS
1	High standard teaching facilities such as lecture halls, labs classrooms	17(48.5%)	13 (37.2%)	5 (14.3%)	-	-	-	4.34
2	Plenty of library resources in terms of qualities are available	17(48.5%)	13 (37.2%)	5 (14.3%)	-	-	-	4.34
3	Attractiveness of the campus and its layout	7 (20%)	16(45.6%)	9 (25.7%)	2 (5.8%)	1 (2.9%)	-	3.74
4	Sports and recreation facilities are in place	7 (20%)	10(28.5%)	11 (31.4%)	5 (14.3%)	2 (5.8%)	-	3.42
5	Adequate number of students in the classrooms in terms of ratio of the staff and students	15(42.9%)	10(28.5%)	10(28.5%)	5 (14.3%)	-	-	4.42
6	Overall your perception towards the above criteria in resources of the program	9 (25.7%)	14 (40%)	6 (17.2%)	2 (5.7%)	2 (5.7%)	2 (5.7%)	3.67

Tabe-16 highlighted that the institutional resources perceived by the employer is adequate number of students in the classrooms in terms of ratio of the staff and students as most important institutional factor that accounted for 4.42 mean weightage score followed high standard teaching facilities such as lecture halls, labs classrooms,plenty

of library resources in terms of qualities are available and attractiveness the campus and its layout with mean weightage score of 4.34,4.34 and 3.74 respectively. The least important institutional resources placed under the category sports and recreation facilities with mean weightage score of 3.42.

Table-17: Indicating employer perception regarding teaching and learning experiences.

Sr. No.	Items	Most Imp. 5	Quite Imp. 4	Average Imp. 3	Low Imp. 2	Least Imp. 1	NR	MWS
1	Ability of faculty to judge the individual differences of the students in terms of intelligence and their needs	14 (40%)	15 (42.8%)	5 (14.3%)	-	1 2.9%)	-	4.17
2	The teaching approach, methods and styles of the faculty	20 (57.1%)	9 (25.6%)	5 (14.3%)	-	-	1 (2.9%)	4.44
3	Same teaching/approach/methods used by faculty while teaching the different topics of the courses	7 (20%)	13 (37.1%)	11 (31.4%)	1 (2.9%)	2 (5.7%)	1 (2.9%)	3.64
4	The Degree/qualification/Experience of faculty members	23(65.7%)	9 (25.6%)	2 (5.8%)	-	-	1 (2.9%)	4.61
5	Competency of faculty to generate interest and motivate the students	23(65.7%)	9 (25.6%)	1 (2.9%)	-	1 (2.9%)	1 (2.9%)	4.55
6	Attractive and impressive personality of faculty members	11 (31.3%)	14 (40%)	7 (20%)	2 (5.8%)	-	1 (2.9%)	3.94
7	Potential of faculty members to change/shape the attitude and skills of the students	16(45.7%)	12 (34.3%)	4 (11.3%)	-	1 (2.9%)	2 (5.8%)	4.14
8	Student's hard work to understand the subject in and outside the class.	19(54.3%)	9 (25.6%)	5 (14.3%)	-	-	2 (5.8%)	4.42
9	Different students resources usage provided to students	9 (25.7%)	10(28.5%)	11 (31.5%)	-	1 (2.9%)	4 (11.4%)	3.83
10	Emphasize by Faculty on practical aspects to suit the workplace requirements	14 (40%)	16(45.5%)	2 (5.8%)	-	1 (2.9%)	2 (5.8%)	4.27
11	Overall your perception towards the above criteria in teaching and learning experiences	18(51.4%)	10(28.5%)	2 (5.8%)	1 (2.9%)	1 (2.9%)	3 (8.6%)	4.34

In the light of Table-17 the result described as employer perception regarding teaching and learning experiences. Numerically 65% respondents have the view that the degree/qualification/Experience of faculty members are the most important contributing factor in understanding quality in higher education with mean weightage score of 4.61.The other aspects of teaching and learning experiences perceived by employer the teaching approach, methods and styles of the faculty appeared to be next important aspect of teaching and learning experiences that accounted for quality in higher education. The least important aspect of teaching and learning experiences perceived by employer is same teaching/approach/methods used by faculty while teaching the different topics of the courses with mean weightage score of 3.64.

Table-18: Indicating employer perception regarding outcomes and assessment.

Sr. No.	Items	Most Imp. 5	Quite Imp. 4	Average Imp. 3	Low Imp. 2	Least Imp. 1	NR	MWS
1	High grade of students	8(22.8%)	19(54.3%)	4 (11.4%)	3 (8.6%)	-	1 (2.9%)	3.82
2	Different methods to assess the students	11 (31.3%)	14 (60%)	8(22.8%)	1 (2.9%)	-	1 (2.9%)	4.02
3	Written Examination is the best way to assess the students	8(22.8%)	15(42.8%)	7 (20%)	3 (8.6%)	1 (2.9%)	1 (2.9%)	3.76
4	Regular evaluation/assessment of students to engage them learning	15(42.9%)	10(28.5%)	7 (20%)	2 (5.7%)	-	1 (2.9%)	4.11
5	Marks shown to students after assessment	9 (25.6%)	17(48.5%)	5 (14.3%)	3 (8.6%)	-	1 (2.9%)	3.94
6	Overall your perception towards the above criteria in outcomes and assessment	11 (31.3%)	15(42.8%)	6 (17.3%)	-	1 (2.9%)	2 (5.7%)	4.06

It is imperative to describe the perception of employer regarding outcome and assessment referring Table-18.The employer perceived regular evaluation/assessment of students to engage them in learning aspect of outcome and assessment accounted for 42.9% contribution in quality of higher education

with mean weightage score of 4.11 followed by different methods to assess the students with mean weightage score of 4.02 as perceived by the employer accounted for quality in higher education. The least important aspect of outcome and assessment perceived by employer is written Examination is the best way to assess the students with mean weight age score of 3.76.

4. Discussions

The results of the present survey focused on the perception of students, faculty and employer as stakeholders concerned with quality in higher education. However, the literature reviewed indicates that there is not a single aspect which led to understand the quality in higher education, but the present findings forced the researchers to draw the attention of academicians, researchers and other scholastic people towards understanding of quality in higher education.

The obtained results are presenting the perception of students in relation to admission criteria. There are four admission criteria out of which varieties of courses offered in program appeared highest preference among students,varieties of courses offered in program, students' commitment and interest to studies in the program, high admission criteria for registration in program whereas, the least preferences is English or aptitude or ability test before entry to program (Ref.Table-1).The result might be attributed that students are willingly to offer many courses in the program which indicates they want to develop their skill in diversified fields. Students showed emotional attachment towards the courses offered in the program led the quality in higher education. The quality of higher education can be maintained through student commitment, motivation, involvement and standard criteria for registration in the program. The result may also be discussed with special reference to students perception as overall satisfaction with their relationship of faculty members to mange the quality in higher education (Tinto, 1993; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005; Lovitts & Nelson, 2001; Nyquist & Woodford, 2000; Campbell & Rozsnyai,2002 ; Gross & Godwin,2005 ; Golde & Dore, 2001 and ; Wulff et al.,2004). Hence students interested to obtain high grade that may fulfill the requirements of market.

On the other hand faculty perceived a students commitment and interest to studies in the program as one of the most important criteria for admission in the program (Ref.Table-7). This indicates quality can be maintained through committed, regular and motivated students. In the eyes of faculty high admission criteria appeared to be other factor to maintain the quality in higher education. The results may be interpreted in the

light of developed countries education patterns to improve the quality in higher education (Kalayci, Watty & Hayirsever,2012).

Employer viewed that student's commitment and interest to studies in the program and English or aptitude or ability test before entry to a program considered as the most important aspects of quality in higher education (Ref.Table-13). The results reflects that employer wants to hire highly committed graduates who can support the organization, Further, they stressed that English is compulsory because to achieve the objectives there is need to hire employee at global level in such circumstances English play a significant role to improve the business.The admissions criteria must be responsible to fulfill the needs of applicants in institution which has based on quality (Brookfield, 1995; Gilmore, 2003; & Smith& Pratt, 1996). Based on findings investigators discussed the results in the light literature reviewed to provide quality education.

With reference to obtained results that the stakeholders' perception regarding institutional factors in maintaining higher education. This is important consideration of the students, faculty and employer that the institution itself including infrastructure play significant role to retain and maintain quality in higher education. The students have the view that rules and regulations related to attendance must be strict and they are bound to follow the guidelines and norms of the institute to maintain the discipline that led enhancement of quality in higher education.Overall stakeholders viewed that institutional factors such as infrastructure and rules and regulation as well as compulsory attendance of students required maintaining the quality in higher education. The researchers supported the findings of Martens and Prosser (1998) that there is no universal agreement to describe the way to manage quality within higher education and a variety of quality management approaches have been applied in different higher education institutions set up.

In the light of obtained results (Ref. Table-3, 9 and 15) stakeholders perceived that curriculum is considered as a weapon to meet out requirement of changing the pattern of educational institutions and demand of the market to survive. Inadequate and meager curriculum design is a one of the source to reduce the quality of education which led to dissatisfaction of stakeholders (Msiska, 2005). The result might be interpreted in the light of Sallis (2002) finding that process of curriculum design needs to be developed by expert and specific need based curriculum for stakeholders. The content of curriculum for higher education might be based on global and international standards that focused on graduating professionals who serve contemporary society is an organized program of study for awarding degree, diploma or certificate. Further it might be attributed to

characteristics of learners, quality, environment pertaining to content of curriculum, quality process such as teacher competence, school efficiency and quality outcomes -knowledge, skills and attitudes (Bergman, 1996; Verwimp, 1999; Owlia and Aspinwall;1996; Carron and Chau, 1996; Koch & Fisher,1998 and Greaney, et al, 1999). By improving curriculum content stakeholders may drastically increase the number of registration in the course.

Results showed that high standard teaching facilities such as lecture halls, labs classrooms perceived by stakeholders as the most important institutional resources (Ref. Table-4, 10 and 16). It is stated that the facilities such as lecture room, laboratory, tutorial room and/or discussion room considered as standard institutional resource in order to maintain quality in higher education. It is indeed high tech institutional resources such as internet, audio-visual and smart board, etc., is playing vital role in shaping the present and future quality in higher education. Further, Thakkar, Deshmukh and Shastree (2006) added financial resources required for continuous improvement, cultural change and effective use of other resources to improve education at each level and mange to implement and retain the quality in higher education. The internal resources of an institution, such as number of faculty with higher degrees along with more experiences, the library resources - number of journals, reference books, citations etc. helps to get high quality inputs and producing better outputs (Koslowski, 2006).

In the light of literature reviewed the present findings interpreted to highlight the perception of stakeholders such as students, faculty and employer regarding teaching and learning experiences (Ref. Table-5, 11, and 17).It is worth noting perception of stakeholders as competency of faculty and degree / qualification and experience generate the interest and motivation among students.In fact, there is no widely accepted method for measuring teaching quality, and assessing the impact of education on students (Altbach, 2006).It is significant that institution must hire highly qualified people to manage quality in higher education because teacher can be considered as a change agent and role model in the contemporary society by providing effective pedagogy to improve formal as well informal education. Furthermore, learning which is considered as a continuous process to develop personality by interaction with friends, families, peer groups and professionals should be recognized as significant in formal processes of quality in higher education. Smith (2008) focused that teaching and learning is not just the collection of data but also a systematic interpretation and utilization those data. Quality is an not just an elusive concept but perceived by different people in different

ways which lead to make confuse to define quality might led several authors to propose a more realistic approach to the meaning of quality in higher education with the help of quality as 'fitness for purpose' as well as 'fitness of purpose'. These assumptions are based on interpretation of the quality concept finally depends on higher education's stakeholders view points (Westerheijden *et al.*, 2007).

The observation in the present research showed (Ref.Table-6, 12 and 18) perception of stakeholders regarding outcome and assessment. It was perceived that student given more importance to achieve high grade comes under the category of outcome and assessment by regular evaluation that engage them in better learning with the help of different methods such as quiz, assignment, presentation, mid term and final examination. It is necessary to discuss that knowledge-driven society; more and more people seek education as the hope for a better future. It clearly mentioned the fact that higher education will flourish to provide advance education to dealt the strategic plan to maintain the quality in higher education at colleges and universities (Duderstadt, 1999). The present discussion based on the findings of Clewes (2003) that there were three different stages appeared in the educational service experience: i) the pre-course position, which is centered on service expectations ii) the in-course experience and iii) post-course service value assessment. It is worthwhile to mention the information obtained can help stakeholders to make effective decisions about student learning and development, professional effectiveness, and program quality.

5. Summary and Conclusions

Higher Education refers to all post-secondary education, comprises of universities, colleges, technical institute, training institute, polytechnics, academic staff and teacher training institutions, medical colleges, agriculture training centres, distance education centres, advance study centres and research centres and institutes.

The results of the present survey focused on the perception of students, faculty and employer as stakeholders concerned with quality in higher education. However, the literature reviewed indicates that there is not a single aspect which led to understand the quality in higher education, but the present findings forced the researchers to draw the attention of academicians, researchers and other scholastic people towards understanding of quality in higher education. The obtained results are presenting the perception of students in relation to admission criteria. Students showed emotional attachment towards the courses offered in the program led the quality in higher education. The quality of higher education can be

maintained through student commitment, motivation, involvement and standard criteria for registration in the program. In the eyes of faculty high admission criteria appeared to be other factor to maintain the quality in higher education.

Employer viewed that student's commitment and interest to studies in the program and English or aptitude or ability test before entry to a program considered as the most important aspects of quality in higher education. With reference to obtained results that the stakeholders' perception regarding institutional factors in maintaining higher education. This is important consideration of the students, faculty and employer that the institution itself including infrastructure play significant role to retain and maintain quality in higher education.It is indeed high tech institutional resources such as internet, audio-visual and smart board, etc., is playing vital role in shaping the present and future quality in higher education. It is worthwhile to mention the information obtained can help stakeholders to make effective decisions about student learning and development, professional effectiveness, and program quality.

6. Limitation and Suggestions

Keeping in mind the objectives, the present study has been conducted by the investigator to assess the perception of stakeholders. As we know that individual differences existed in every sphere of human being led to put certain limitations in the present study. In other connotations of words that responses will vary according to individual difference. Hence, investigators highlighted certain limitation which has been found in every social science researches and similarly this research is not excluded in the forms of limitations which are followings:

- This particular study has been conducted by the investigators on two colleges students and faculty members.
- This study has been carried out only in one university and also undergraduate students.
- The research focused only male students.
- It was necessary to main the proportion of sample size hence only 162 stakeholders have been included and the results cannot be generalized.
- The instrument used in the present research was has been translated in Arabic language.
- It was very difficult to gather responses from employers because of their nature of duties and responsibilities.
- The research mainly focused only among government funded institutions of students and faculty members.

- The present research carried out on Saudi students.

7. Suggestions

In social sciences researches, it is necessary to provide some suggestions to improve the quality of future research. Gornitzka, Kyvik & Stensaker (2005) rightly suggested that the nature of higher education shifted from traditional ideology towards market based ideologies or demands. Hence investigators have given some suggestion for future researches which are as follow:

- It was noted that students of only two colleges were included in the present study, so there is dire needs to conduct such kind of study among other colleges of students.
- It is suggested that to make more authentic and reliable, it is necessary to take sample from other universities, disciplines and post graduate students.
- Indeed, it is most important suggestion is to conduct study among male and female subjects.
- There is imperative to generalize the results further researches should be conducted in other parts of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.
- It is necessary to suggest that other instruments can be used to make study more reliable and valid.
- It is essential for researchers to take prior permission to gather the responses from employers.
- There is a need to conduct comparative study of public and private institutions to know the perception of quality in higher education.
- It is also suggested to conduct study to verify cross cultural values, ethics and beliefs.

Corresponding Author: Dr. Zafrul Allam
Assistant Professor, Department of HRM,
College of Business Administration, P.O. Box: 165,
SAU, Al Kharj-11942. Saudi Arabia.
E-mail: z.allam@sau.edu.sa

References
1. Altbach, P. The dilemmas of ranking. International Higher Education, 2006; 42, 2–3.
2. Baird, J.R. Quality: what should make higher education "higher"? *Higher Education Research and Development,* 1998; 7(2), 141-152.

3. Becket, N., & Brookes, M. Evaluating quality management in university departments. Quality Assurance in Education, 2006; 14(2), 123 – 142.

4. Bergman, H. Quality of education and the demand for education: evidence from developing countries. International Review of Education, 1996; 42(6), 581-604.

5. Brookes, M. & Becket, N. Quality management in higher education: A review of a review of international issues and practice. *International Journal of Quality Standards,* 2007; 1(1), 85–. 121.

6. Brookfield, S. D. *Becoming a critically reflective teacher*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1995.

7. Campbell, C. & Rozsnyai, C.*Quality Assurance and the Development of Course Programmes*. Papers on Higher Education Regional University Network on Governance and Management of Higher Education in South East Europe Bucharest, UNESCO, 2002.

8. Carron, G. & Chau, T.N. The quality of primary schools in different development contexts. Paris: UNESCO, 1996.

9. Chakka, R. & Kulkarni,G.T.Total Quality Management in Pedagogy (TQM_P): An Update. Indian Journal of Pharmaceutical Education and Research, 2010; 44(4), 386-390.

10. Cheng, Y., & Tam, W. Multi-models of quality in education. *Quality Assurance in Education,* 1997; 5(1), 22-31.

11. Clewes, D.A Student-centered Conceptual Model of Service Quality in Higher Education. *Quality in Higher Education,*2003; 9(1), 69-85.

12. Duderstadt, J.J. Can Colleges and Universities Survive in the Information Age?" Ed. Richard N. Katz and Associates. *Dancing with the Devil: Information Technology and the New Competition in Higher Education* (pp. 1-25). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1999.

13. Ekong, D.Quality: Trends from the UNESCO regional consultations on higher education. Paper presented at the Commission II - Quality of Higher Education, 2003.

14. Eriksen, S. D.TQM and the transformation from an elite to a mass system of higher education in the UK. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 1995; 3(1), 14-29.

15. Fry, H. Quality judgments and quality improvement, *Higher Education Quarterly,* 1995; 49 (1), 59-77.

16. Gilmore, A. Services Marketing and Management, Sage Publications, London, 2003.

17. Golde, C.M. & Dore, and T.M. At crosses purposes: What the experiences of today's doctoral students reveal about doctoral education. Philadelphia: Pew Charitable Trusts, 2001.

18. Gornitzka,A.; Kyvik,S. & Stensaker,B. *Analysis in Higher Education. In: A.. Gornitzka, M. Kogan and A. Amaral (eds.): Reform and Change in Higher Education - Analysing Policy Implementation,*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer, 2005; 8, 35-56.

19. Greaney, V.; Khandker, S.R. & Alam, M.Bangladesh: Assessing basic learning skills The world bank, Bangladesh, 1999.

20. Gross, K., & Godwin, P. *Education's many stakeholders,* 2005.

21. Kalayci,N.; Watty,K., & Hayirsever,F.Perceptions of quality in higher education: a comparative study of Turkish and Australian business academics. Quality in Higher Education, 2012; 18(2), 149-167.

22. Khan,M.M.; Ahmed,I., & Nawaz, M.M.Student's Perspective of Service Quality in Higher Learning Institutions; An evidence Based Approach. *International Journal of Business and Social Science,2011;* 2 (11), 159-164.

23. Koch, J. V. & Fisher, J. L. Higher education and total quality management. *Total Quality Management*, 1998; *9*(8), 659–668.

24. Koslowski, F. Promoting student success through student housing. *The Community College Times,* 2006; *18*(21), 9.

25. Koslowski, F. A. Quality and assessment in context: A brief review. *Journal of Quality Assurance in Education*, 2006; 14(3), 277-288.

26. Lomas, L. Are Students Customers? Perceptions of Academic Staff. *Quality in Higher Education*, 2007; 13(1), 31-44.

27. Lovitts, B. & Nelson, C. The Hidden Crisis in Graduate Education: Attrition from Ph.D. Programs. *Academe*, 2001; 86 (6), 44-50.

28. Maguire, K. & Gibbs, P. Exploring the notion of quality in quality higher education assessment in a collaborative future. Quality in Higher Education, 2013; 19(1), 41-55.

29. Martens, E., & Prosser, M.What constitutes high quality teaching and learning and how to assure it? *Quality Assurance in Education*, 1998; 6(1), 28-36.

30. Martin, M. & Stella, A. *External quality assurance in higher education: making choices* (85). Paris: UNESCO: International Institute for Educational Planning, 2007.

31. Msiska, F. G. W.(2005).Challenges and prospects of quality higher education in the University of Malawi: The case of Chancellor College, in Amini, S. Fremerey, M. Wesseler, M. (Eds) (2005) Towards a Shared Vision for Higher Education: Cross-Cultural Insights and Projects

Vol. 1V, Institute of Socio-cultural Studies, University of Kassel (Germany) pp. 227 – 238.

32. Nordvall, R. C., & Braxton, J. M. An alternative definition of quality of undergraduate college education. *Journal of Higher Education*, 1996; 67(5), 483-497.

33. Nyquist, J. D. & Woodford, B. J. *Renvisioning the PhD- what concerns do we have?* Washington: University of Washington, 2000.

34. Oldfield. B. & Baron, S. Student perceptions of service quality in a UK University business and management faculty. *Quality Assurance in Education, 2000;* 8(2), 85-95.

35. Owlia, M. & Aspinwall, E. A framework for the dimensions of quality in higher education. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 1996; 4(2), 12-20.

36. Pandi, A.P.; Rao, U.S. & Jeyathilagar, D. A study on integrated total quality management practices in technical institutions-students' perspective. *International Journal of Educational Administration*, 2009; 1(1), 17-30.

37. Pascarella, E., & Terenzini, P. *How college affects students (Vol. 2): A third decade of research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2005.

38. Pounder, J. Institutional performance in higher education: is quality a relevant concept?, Quality Assurance in Education, 1999; 7(3), 156-165.

39. Sallis, E. Total quality management in education. Kogan Page Publishers, 3rd edition: 2002; 4-139.

40. Smith, C. D.Design Focused Evaluation. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education,* 2008; 33(6), 631-645.

41. Smith, H. A. & Pratt, D. The use of biodata in admissions to teacher education. Journal *of Teacher Education, 1996; 47*, 43-52.

42. Tang, S.F., &Hussin,S. Quality in Higher Education: A Variety of Stakeholder Perspectives. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity*, 2011; 1(2), 126-131.

43. Teshome,Y.(2007).The Ethiopian higher education: Creating space for reform.Addis Ababa: St Mary's University College Printing Press New

44. Thakkar,J.; Deshmukh, S.G. & Shastree, A.Total quality management (TQM) in self-financed technical institutions: A quality function deployment (QFD) and force field analysis approach. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 2006; 14(1), 54 – 74.

45. Tinto, V. (1993). Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition (2nd Ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

46. Trow M. (1991). The exceptionalism of American Higher Education. In (Ed.) Trow M & Nybom T. University and society. Jessica Kingsley: London.

47. Verwimp, P. Measuring the quality of education at two levels: A case study of primary schools in rural Ethiopia. *International Review of Education*, 1999; 45(2), 167-196.

48. Watty, K. When will Academics Learn about Quality? *Quality in Higher Education,* 2003; 9 (3), 213-221.

49. Westerheijden, D.F.; Stensaker, B.,& Rosa, M.J. Quality Assurance in Higher Education: Trends in Regulation, Translation and Transformation. Dordrecht: Springer, 2007.

50. Wulff, D.H.; Austin, A.E.; Nyquist, J.D. & Sprague, J. The development of graduate scholars as teaching scholars: a four-year longitudinal study. In: Wulff DH and Austin AE (Eds). Paths to theprofessoriate: strategies for enriching the preparation, 2004.

51. Zachariah,S. Managing quality in higher education: a stakeholder perspective. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Leicester, U.K., 2007.

11/24/2013