
STUDENTS' VIEWS OF QUALITY OF EDUCATION: A QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY

Dr. Nasir Uddin

Associate Professor, Bangladesh University of Capital Market,
Dhaka-1000, Bangladesh
E-Mail: dr-nasir@bicm.ac.bd

ABSTRACT

This Study has summarized students' views of quality of education of a university to aid the administration to improve the quality of the education. For the purpose, primary data are collected using stratified random sampling by considering its one-degree program as one stratum and secondary data are collected from different websites. The data are analyzed using descriptive statistics: mean, standard deviation, unbiased estimates of the population mean and standard deviation and inferential statistics: hypothesis testing, ANOVA, factor analysis, and regression analysis. The study reveals that students of International Development Program have very positive attitude about the quality of the university education while the students of Master of Business Administration program maintain a bleak attitude about the quality of the university education. As a school, the students of Graduate School of International Relations are more satisfied than the students of Graduate of School of International Management. The study also shows that there are no significant differences in options between the International Development Program and International Relations Program students, when have combined the four programs-have found differences in the same cases. The authority should emphasis on teachers' performance, support services and global alternative appearance in order to improve its quality of education. The students recommended teaching more concepts by the teachers, increasing the numbers of elective courses, arranging more range of overseas exchange programs, increasing the numbers of reference books in the library, employing more teaching staff with good English language proficiency and teaching skills, teaching uniformly in the whole semester, extending the semester duration, and minimizing teachers' turnover ratio should be implemented.

Key words: Students, Views, Quality, Education, Questionnaire, Survey.

Cite this Article: Dr. Nasir Uddin, Students' Views of Quality of Education: A Questionnaire Survey, *International Journal of Management*, 11(7), 2020, pp. 962-974.

<http://www.iaeme.com/IJM/issues.asp?JType=IJM&VType=11&IType=7>

1. INTRODUCTION

In the competitive market and in the present world, the development of human resources has become very critical to meet the challenges of the twenty-first century. As a result, the education and training centers are mushrooming to cater the demand for knowledge by the societies. In terms of their academic attainments, public and private universities are competing among each other to provide better facilities, study environment and good teaching methods in order to maintain higher standard and academic reputation.

The University of this Study, with 262 enrolments during this study, was established in 1981 with the aim to provide theoretical and practical knowledge and experiences needed for the global businesses and the people who want to pursue careers in International Relations Program and International Development Program. Later, the university has introduced Master of Business Administration and E-biz Program. The International Relations Program and International Development Program are managed under the Graduate School of International Relations (GSIR) and the Master of Business Administration and E-biz Program are managed under the Graduate School of International Management (GSIM). This study collected data on these four programs.

To achieve the objectives of the University, the university provides the information about the courses and other benefits it offers to the students who are seeking study at masters' level. Since the students have a lot of choices on which institutions they would choose, thus, apart from providing the information about the university, the university has to ensure that the standard and the quality of the courses it offer will meet the expectations of the students.

However, the success or the failure in providing quality education is not only depending on the design of the programs, but also largely depends on how well the authority of the university is able to reconcile with the expectation of the students towards their program. Students who entered at the university also have their own expectations, in which, some of them may coincide with that of the university or may be just at par. Analysis on the quality of the university's education will allow the authority to understand the needs and the tools that they have to provide in order to become one of the leading academic providers in the world.

1.1. Objectives of the Study

The main objectives of this study is to seek students' views on the quality of the education of the university. The Specific objectives are as follows:

- to review the views of the respondents on the quality of the university programs as compare to peer universities of the respondents' countries in terms of their standard norms.
- to test whether there is any significant difference between the opinion of respondents of International Development Program (IDP) and the opinion of respondents of International Relations Program (IRP).
- to test whether there is any significant difference among the opinion of respondents of International Development Program (IDP), the opinion of respondents of International Relations Program (IRP), Masters of Business Administration (MBA) and E-biz program.
- to conduct factor analysis in order to determine the number of factors underline the set of variables we have, to find out degree of dependence of each original variable on each common factor, to interpret the factors we will obtain, to figure out the amount of each common factor possessed by each observation: the factor loadings.

- to conduct regression analysis in order to determine whether there is any significant difference among the respondents in their views in terms of teachers' performance (Factor 1), supporting services to the students (Factor 2) and international appeal (Factor 3).
- to make recommendation to the university authority in order to provide better education and environment including range of elective course, facilities, and teaching methods. Furthermore, to uphold the standard and quality of its overall education.

1.2. Motivation for the Study

The University differs significantly from many universities in terms of their objectives. Whereas many universities offering courses in order that human resources can be developed to fulfill local and national demand, The University is offering courses in order that human capital can be accumulated to fulfill local, national, and international needs. Therefore, the university is drawing students from all over the world. At present, many graduated students from the university are working in many reputed organizations. The rational of the study is mainly to know whether students of the university, who will be future leaders in their work places, are satisfied with the quality of the university education and to know their degree of satisfaction. It is expected that the university policy makers will be highly benefited by this study. In addition, this study may be a good guideline to researchers in this field in future.

1.3. Methodology of the Study

Source of Data: Both primary data and secondary data are used in this study.

1.3.1. Source of Primary Data

Primary data is collected by a pre-determined questionnaire, direct interview method and Likert 5 points scale (5 very good-----1 very bad). We followed here stratified probability random sampling. Total number in population is 262 students. Because of time and financial limitation, we decided that our sample size is 52, of which 20 questionnaires are distributed to IDP, 7 questionnaires are distributed to IRP, 20 questionnaires are distributed to MBA, and 5 questionnaires are distributed to E-biz students. Sample size for each stratum is determined according to their proportion in the total population. Sample from each stratum are determined according to random number, which are generated by using excel formula.

1.3.2. Source of Secondary Data

Secondary data is collected from the university web site and Economist Intelligence Unit (EIU) web site. The EIU web site has helped us in determining the criterion (variables) for designing the questionnaire on the quality of the education.

1.3.3. Software's & Data Analysis Tools

With regard to the data analysis, software's such as EViews, Excel, SAS, and Statistics are used. In order to make data informative and draw inferences, both descriptive statistics: mean, standard deviation, unbiased estimates of the population mean and standard deviation and inferential statistics: hypothesis testing, ANOVA, factor analysis, and regression analysis are used extensively.

2. DATA ANALYSES AND FINDINGS

2.1. Summary of the Background Information of the Respondents

In the survey, 65 per cent of the respondents are male and the remaining 35 per cent of the respondents are female. In terms of region classification, large proportions are from Asia, constitutes about 90 per cent while non-Asia respondents constitute only about 10 per cent of the total sample. Prior coming to the university, most of the students (77 per cent) know about the university either from their sponsors or from the internet, whereas only 24 per cent of the students know about the university from other sources. In terms of financing their study at the university, 99 per cent of the students are fully sponsored, of which 87 per cent are from scholarship and 12 per cent are from companies. Only about 2 per cent of the students are self-financing (Table-1).

Table-1 Respondents' Background Information

Gender	Male	Female					
%	0.65	0.35					
Region	Asia	Non-Asia					
%	0.90	0.10					
Education	Bachelor	Master					
%	0.87	0.13					
Graduate Program	IDP	IRP	MBA	E-BIZ			
%	0.38	0.13	0.38	0.10			
Student status	1 st Year	2 nd Year	Exchange				
%	0.62	0.37	0.02				
Edu. Background	Econ	Business	IT	Engineering	Politic	Law	Others
%	0.37	0.15	0.02	0.21	0.06	0.06	0.13
Job Status	Govt. Job	Private	Student	Teaching	Business	Other	
%	0.33	0.50	0.06	0.06	0.00	0.06	
Hear about uni	Internet	JICA	Sponsor	Student	Other		
%	0.35	0.27	0.15	0.12	0.12		
Finance	Scholarship	Company	Self				
%	0.87	0.12	0.02				

Source: Field Survey

2.2. Comparison between the Program and the best Program of the Respondent's Country

With respect to my question to the respondent about the position of quality of the university education compare to best university of his/her country, 50 per cent of the IDP respondents mentioned that the university is much better than their country's best school. The percentages are 29 per cent, 10 per cent and 0 per cent for the IRP, MBA and E-biz respectively. One striking feature is that 90 per cent of the IDP students mentioned the university is better or much better compare to the best school of their country (Table-2).

Table 2 The Program and the best Program of the Respondent's Country

Programs	Much Better	Better	The Same	A Bit Lower	Much Lower	Total
IDP	50	40	10	0	0	100%
IRP	29	29	43	0	0	100%
MBA	10	35	30	25	0	100%
E-biz	0	40	0	40	20	100%

Source: Field Survey

2.3. Students' Views of Quality of Education

To know about the students' views of quality of education, we have computed mean scores for each stratum, using its sample. Moreover, we have estimated unbiased estimates of the population mean and the standard deviation of the population mean. The objective of computing unbiased estimates of the population standard deviation is to see whether we have become successful to reduce the standard deviation considerably using stratified random sampling.

Table-3 indicates that among the students of four stratum, IDP students are found to be most satisfied with the quality of the university education. Most of the mean scores of the variables for the IDP stratum are about 4.0 except for the range of the overseas exchange programs (3.3). On the other hand, MBA students have most bleak attitude about the quality of the university education. The table also shows that all unbiased estimate of the population mean scores are below 4.0 except for quality and availability of IT (4.0). In view of this result, the management of the university should take necessary steps to increase the quality of the university education. In this regard, this paper provides the recommendations based on the respondent views on how the quality of the university education can be improved. The recommendations are placed in the recommendations paragraph.

Table-3 shows that unbiased estimate for the population standard deviation is considerable smaller than that of each sample stratum, which proves that we have improved our accuracy significantly by using the stratified random sampling.

Table 3 Sample Mean and Standard Deviation & Unbiased Estimates of the Population Mean and the Standard Deviation of the Population Mean

Q #	Particulars	IDP Stratum		IRP Stratum		MBA Stratum		E-biz Stratum		Unbiased Estimates of Population	
		Mean	STD	Mean	STD	Mean	STD	Mean	STD	Mean	STD
11	Teachers' quality	4.2	0.62	4.0	0.58	3.4	0.60	3.6	1.14	3.8	0.37
12	Relevance of course content	4.3	0.64	3.9	0.90	3.7	0.49	3.6	1.14	3.9	0.35
13	Range of elective course	3.8	1.11	3.6	0.98	3.3	1.02	3.2	0.84	3.5	0.63
14	Library facilities	4.2	0.93	3.9	1.35	3.7	0.99	3.8	1.79	3.9	0.59
15	Overseas exchange program range	3.3	0.92	3.0	1.29	3.7	0.88	4.0	0.71	3.5	0.54
16	Support to student by professors	3.9	0.81	3.9	1.07	3.6	0.69	4.2	0.84	3.8	0.45
17	Quality and availability of IT	4.3	0.66	4.1	1.21	3.6	0.75	4.0	1.73	4.0	0.45
18	Teaching methodology	4.0	0.69	3.7	0.76	3.5	0.76	3.6	1.52	3.7	0.44
19	International appeal	3.8	0.79	4.0	0.82	3.3	0.86	3.8	1.64	3.6	0.50
20	Grade output	3.8	0.77	4.1	0.38	3.5	0.60	3.2	0.84	3.6	0.40
21	Meeting expectation and needs	3.9	0.72	3.7	0.76	3.3	0.64	3.6	0.55	3.6	0.40
22	Prestige with global community	3.7	0.75	3.7	0.95	3.2	0.89	3.8	1.10	3.5	0.49
23	Administration	3.9	0.88	4.0	0.82	3.1	0.91	3.8	1.30	3.6	0.53

Source: Field Survey

2.4. Determining whether there is any Significant Difference between the Opinion of Respondents of IDP and the Opinion of Respondents of IRP

One-way ANOVA is used to test whether there is any significant difference between the opinion of respondents of International Development Program (IDP) and the opinion of respondents of International relations Program (IRP). The related questions for this analysis are from number 11 to number 23 from the questionnaire.

2.4.1. The Hypotheses

Table-4 shows the relevant hypotheses constructed to test whether there is any significant difference between the views of IDP respondents and IRP respondents. All hypotheses are tested at 5% level of significance.

Table 4 Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1	H ₀	No significant difference in the views of IDP and IRP students in terms of teacher's quality
	H ₁	Significant difference in the views of IDP and IRP students in terms of teachers' quality
Hypothesis 2	H ₀	No significant difference in the views of IDP and IRP students in terms of relevance of course content
	H ₁	Significant difference in the views of IDP and IRP students in terms of relevance of course content
Hypothesis 3	H ₀	No significant difference in the views of IDP and IRP students in terms of range of elective courses
	H ₁	Significant difference in the views of IDP and IRP students in terms of range of elective courses
Hypothesis 4	H ₀	No significant difference in the views of IDP and IRP students in terms of library facilities
	H ₁	Significant difference in the views of IDP and IRP students in terms of library facilities
Hypothesis 5	H ₀	No significant difference in the views of IDP and IRP students in terms of range of exchange program
	H ₁	Significant difference in the views of IDP and IRP students in terms of range of exchange program
Hypothesis 6	H ₀	No significant difference in the views of IDP and IRP students in terms of students support by professors
	H ₁	Significant difference in the views of IDP and IRP students in terms of students support by professors
Hypothesis 7	H ₀	No significant difference in the views of IDP and IRP students in terms of quality and availability of IT
	H ₁	Significant difference in the views of IDP and IRP students in terms of quality and availability of IT
Hypothesis 8	H ₀	No significant difference in the views of IDP and IRP students in terms of teaching methodology
	H ₁	Significant difference in the views of IDP and IRP students in terms of teaching methodology
Hypothesis 9	H ₀	No significant difference in the views of IDP and IRP students in terms of international appeal
	H ₁	Significant difference in the views of IDP and IRP students in terms of international appeal
Hypothesis 10	H ₀	No significant difference in the views of IDP and IRP students in terms of grade output
	H ₁	Significant difference in the views of IDP and IRP students in terms of grade output
Hypothesis 11	H ₀	No significant difference in the views of IDP and IRP students in terms of meeting expectation
	H ₁	Significant difference in the views of IDP and IRP students in terms of meeting expectation
Hypothesis 12	H ₀	No significant difference in the views of IDP and IRP students in terms of prestige with global community
	H ₁	Significant difference in the views of IDP and IRP students in terms of prestige with global community
Hypothesis 13	H ₀	No significant difference in the views of IDP and IRP students in terms of administration
	H ₁	Significant difference in the views of IDP and IRP students in terms of administration

2.4.2. The Hypotheses Test Results and the Decisions

Table 5 shows the hypotheses test results and express that there is no significant difference between the views of IDP respondents and the views of IRP respondents. This is expected because both programs are under the same administration and the same school. Here, it is proved that the administration of GSIR is giving equal efforts for both programs.

Table 5 Hypotheses Test Result

Hypotheses	Test Results	Hypotheses	Test Results
Hypothesis 1	H ₀ we failed to reject	Hypothesis 8	H ₀ we failed to reject
Hypothesis 2	H ₀ we failed to reject	Hypothesis 9	H ₀ we failed to reject
Hypothesis 3	H ₀ we failed to reject	Hypothesis 10	H ₀ we failed to reject
Hypothesis 4	H ₀ we failed to reject	Hypothesis 11	H ₀ we failed to reject
Hypothesis 5	H ₀ we failed to reject	Hypothesis 12	H ₀ we failed to reject
Hypothesis 6	H ₀ we failed to reject	Hypothesis 13	H ₀ we failed to reject
Hypothesis 7	H ₀ we failed to reject	Level of significance = 5%	

2.5. Determining whether there is any Significant Difference among the opinion of Respondents of IDP, IRP, MBA and E-biz Program

Apart from testing the significant difference between the opinion of the respondents of IDP and IRP, the same test is also conducted to test whether there is any significant difference among the opinion of respondents in all stratum. We are interested in these because all the above programs have different mean scores for different variables.

2.5.1. The Hypotheses

The relevant hypotheses are constructed as table-6. Again, all hypotheses are tested at 5% level of significance.

Table 6 Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1	H ₀	No significant difference in the views of IDP, IRP, MBA and E-Biz students in terms of teachers' quality
	H ₁	Significant difference in the views of IDP, IRP, MBA and E-Biz students in terms of teachers' quality
Hypothesis 2	H ₀	No significant difference in the views of IDP, IRP, MBA and E-Biz students in terms of relevance of course content
	H ₁	Significant difference in the views of IDP, IRP, MBA and E-Biz students in terms of relevance of course content
Hypothesis 3	H ₀	No significant difference in the views of IDP, IRP, MBA and E-Biz students in terms of range of elective courses
	H ₁	Significant difference in the views of IDP, IRP, MBA and E-Biz students in terms of range of elective courses
Hypothesis 4	H ₀	No significant difference in the views of IDP, IRP, MBA and E-Biz students in terms of library facilities
	H ₁	Significant difference in the views of IDP, IRP, MBA and E-Biz students in terms of library facilities
Hypothesis 5	H ₀	No significant difference in the views of IDP, IRP, MBA and E-Biz students in terms of range of exchange program
	H ₁	Significant difference in the views of IDP, IRP, MBA and E-Biz students in terms of range of exchange program
Hypothesis 6	H ₀	No significant difference in the views of IDP, IRP, MBA and E-Biz students in terms of students support by professors
	H ₁	Significant difference in the views of IDP, IRP, MBA and E-Biz students in terms of students support by professors
Hypothesis 7	H ₀	No significant difference in the views of IDP, IRP, MBA and E-Biz students in terms of quality and availability of IT
	H ₁	Significant difference in the views of IDP, IRP, MBA and E-Biz students in terms of quality and availability of IT
Hypothesis 8	H ₀	No significant difference in the views of IDP, IRP, MBA and E-Biz students in terms of teaching methodology
	H ₁	Significant difference in the views of IDP, IRP, MBA and E-Biz students in terms of teaching methodology
Hypothesis 9	H ₀	No significant difference in the views of IDP, IRP, MBA and E-Biz students in terms of international appeal
	H ₁	Significant difference in the views of IDP, IRP, MBA and E-Biz students in terms of international appeal
Hypothesis 10	H ₀	No significant difference in the views of IDP, IRP, MBA and E-Biz students in terms of grade output
	H ₁	Significant difference in the views of IDP, IRP, MBA and E-Biz students in terms of grade output
Hypothesis 11	H ₀	No significant difference in the views of IDP, IRP, MBA and E-Biz students in terms of meeting expectation
	H ₁	Significant difference in the views of IDP, IRP, MBA and E-Biz students in terms of meeting expectation
Hypothesis 12	H ₀	No significant difference in the views of IDP, IRP, MBA and E-Biz students in terms of prestige with global community
	H ₁	Significant difference in the views of IDP, IRP, MBA and E-Biz students in terms of prestige with global community
Hypothesis 13	H ₀	No significant difference in the views of IDP, IRP, MBA and E-Biz students in terms of administration
	H ₁	Significant difference in the views of IDP, IRP, MBA and E-Biz students in terms of administration

2.5.2. The Hypotheses Test Results and the Decisions

Table-7 shows that H₀ of hypothesis 1, Hypothesis 2, Hypothesis 10, Hypothesis 11 and hypothesis 13 are rejected at 5% level of significance. Therefore, there are significant differences in their views among the respondents of IDP, IRP, MBA, and E-biz program in

terms of teachers' quality, relevance of course contents, grader output, meeting respondent's expectations and needs, and administration. The managements, specially, the management of GSIM, should consider these criterions one by one and look for reasons behind the difference in the opinions.

Table 7 Hypotheses Test Results

Hypotheses	Test Results	Hypotheses	Test Results
Hypothesis 1	H ₀ rejected	Hypothesis 8	H ₀ failed to reject
Hypothesis 2	H ₀ rejected	Hypothesis 9	H ₀ failed to reject
Hypothesis 3	H ₀ failed to reject	Hypothesis 10	H ₀ rejected
Hypothesis 4	H ₀ failed to reject	Hypothesis 11	H ₀ rejected
Hypothesis 5	H ₀ failed to reject	Hypothesis 12	H ₀ failed to reject
Hypothesis 6	H ₀ failed to reject	Hypothesis 13	H ₀ rejected
Hypothesis 7	H ₀ failed to reject	Level of significance = 5%	

However, Null hypothesis (H_0) of Hypothesis 3, Hypothesis 4, Hypothesis 5, Hypothesis 6, Hypothesis 7, Hypothesis 8, Hypothesis 9, and Hypothesis 12 are failed to reject at 5% level of significance. Therefore, there are no significant differences in their views among the respondents of IDP, IRP, MBA, and E-biz in terms of range of elective courses, library facilities, range of oversea exchange programs, support to students by professors, quality and availability of IT, teaching methodology, international appeal, and prestige with the global community. This is very significant finding and this should be the case. Because the above criterions except range of oversea exchange programs i.e., range of elective courses, library facilities, support to students by professors, quality and availability of IT, teaching methodology, international appeal, and prestige with the global community are the same for all the stratum.

2.6. Determining Principal Component Factors

2.6.1. The Original Variables

In order to summarize our 13 variables by a small number of factors so that we can explain original variables easily, we have conducted principal component factor analysis. Our original 13 variables are presented in table-8.

Table 8 Name of the Original Variables

Sl. #	Original Variables	Sl. #	Original Variables
1.	Teachers' quality	8.	Teaching methodology
2.	Relevance of courses content	9.	International appeal
3.	Range of elective courses	10.	Grade output
4.	Library facilities	11.	Meeting expectation and needs
5.	Rang of overseas exchange program	12.	Prestige with the global community
6.	Support to student by professors	13.	Administration
7.	Quality and availability of IT		

2.6.2. Maximum Possible Factors

As first step of factor analysis, we have computed maximum possible factors. The maximum number of the extracted factors is equal to the number of the original variables. So, we have 13 extracted factors as in the table-9. However, to be candidate as a significant factor, a factor must have Eigen value-greater or equal to one. From table-9, we keep 3 main principal components as factors because those three factors' Eigen values are greater than one. These three factors explain about 70 percent of total variation contained in the original 13 variables (Table-10).

Table 9 Maximum Possible Factors

S.L #	Eigen Value	% Total Variance	Cumulative Eigen Value	Cumulative %
1	6.22715	47.90116	6.22715	47.9012
2	1.692336	13.01797	7.91949	60.9191
3	1.147208	8.82468	9.06669	69.7438
4	0.960114	7.38549	10.02681	77.1293
5	0.674529	5.18869	10.70134	82.3180
6	0.580010	4.46161	11.28135	86.7796
7	0.466004	3.58464	11.74735	90.3642
8	0.342705	2.63619	12.09006	93.0004
9	0.283622	2.18171	12.37368	95.1821
10	0.249304	1.91772	12.62298	97.0999
11	0.152448	1.17268	12.77543	98.2725
12	0.123271	0.94824	12.89870	99.2208
13	0.101299	0.77922	13.00000	100.0000

2.6.3. Extracted Factors

Since there are only three factors having Eigen value greater or equal one, the significant number of the extracted factors is three. These three factors explain about 70 percent of total variation contained in the original 13 variables (Table-10).

Table 10 Factors with Eigen Value Greater Than One

S.L #	Eigen Value	% Total Variance	Cumulative Eigen Value	Cumulative %
1	6.227150	47.90116	6.22715	47.9012
2	1.692336	13.01797	7.91949	60.9191
3	1.147204	8.82468	9.06669	69.7438

2.6.4. Interpretation of the Factors

The three factors are converted by the varimax normalized factor rotation method to find new factors that are easier to explain. Table-11 shows that Factor 1 has a strong positive correlation with the variables: support to student by professors (= variable 6), teaching methodology (= variable 8), grade output (= variable 10), and meeting expectation and needs (= variable 11). This factor is interpreted as teachers' performance. Factor 2 has a strong positive correlation with the variables: range of elective course (= variable 3), library facilities (= variable 4), and administration (= variable 13). This factor is interpreted as support services/support to students. Factor 3 has a high positive correlation with the variable International appeal (= variable 9). This factor is interpreted as global attractive appearance.

Table 11 Factor Loadings

Variables	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
1	0.5918	0.4713	0.3617
2	0.6908	0.4175	0.0179
3	0.1944	0.8070	0.1181
4	0.0562	0.8869	0.0350
5	0.2791	0.5056	0.0141
6	0.7978	0.1456	-0.0654
7	0.3700	0.6071	0.1163
8	0.8621	0.1830	0.2760
9	0.2059	0.0277	0.9244
10	0.7264	0.0721	0.4233
11	0.7637	0.2691	0.3956
12	0.1641	0.4872	0.6607
13	0.1485	0.7659	0.3445
Expl. Var	3.6653	3.4154	1.9860
Prp. Totl	0.2819	0.2627	0.1528

2.7. Determining whether there is any Significant Difference among the Respondents in their Views in Terms of the Factors

Using the Varimax normalized factor rotation method, we have calculated Factors Scores, i.e., the values of new factors for each of the observations. Using factor scores for each factor as dependent variable and taking into considerations dummy variables as independent variables; we have run the following regressions in order to test whether there are any significant differences among the respondents of IDP, IRP, MBA, and E-biz stratum regarding Factor 1 (teachers' performance), Factor 2 (supporting services to the students) and Factor 3 (international appeal).

2.7.1. Determining whether there is any Significant Difference among the Respondents in their Views in Terms of Teachers' Performance (Factor 1)

$$\text{Factor Scores for Factor 1 } i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 D_2 + \beta_2 D_3 + \beta_3 D_4 + e_i \quad (1)$$

Where $D_2 = 1$ if a respondent is IRP student, 0 otherwise. $D_3 = 1$ if a respondent is MBA student, 0 otherwise. $D_4 = 1$ if a respondent is E-Biz student, 0 otherwise. e_i = error term/disturbance.

$$\text{Factor scores for Factor 1 } i = 0.295 - 0.217 D_2 - 0.575 D_3 - 0.465 D_4$$

$$(0.222) \quad (0.437) \quad (0.315) \quad (0.497)$$

$$n = 52 \quad \text{SSR} = 47.510 \quad R^2 = 0.068$$

Hypothesis Test: $H_0 = \beta_1 = \beta_2 = \beta_3 = 0$ F-statistic
1.175

$H_a =$ at least one of the above β is not equal to zero. Prob (F-statistic) 0.329

Hypothesis Test Result and the Decision

At 5% level of significance, we fail to reject H_0 because P value is 33%. Therefore, $\beta_1 = \beta_2 = \beta_3 = 0$, this means that there is no significant difference among the respondents in terms of factor 1 (teachers' performance).

2.7.2. Determining whether there is any Significant Difference among the Respondents in their Views in Terms of Supporting Services to the Students (Factor 2).

$$\text{Factor Scores for Factor 2 } i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 D_2 + \beta_2 D_3 + \beta_3 D_4 + e_i \quad (2)$$

Where $D_2 = 1$ if a respondent is IRP student, 0 otherwise. $D_3 = 1$ if a respondent is MBA student, 0 otherwise. $D_4 = 1$ if a respondent is E-Biz student, 0 otherwise. e_i = error term/disturbance.

$$\text{Factor Scores for Factor 2 } i = 0.241 - 0.313 D_2 - 0.475 D_3 - 0.164 D_4$$

$$(0.225) \quad (0.442) \quad (0.318) \quad (0.504)$$

$$n = 52 \quad \text{SSR} = 48.678 \quad R^2 = 0.046$$

Hypothesis Test: $H_0 = \beta_1 = \beta_2 = \beta_3 = 0$ F-statistic
0.763

$H_a =$ at least one of the above β is not equal to zero. Prob (F-statistic) 0.520

Hypothesis Test Result

At 5% level of significance, we fail to reject H_0 because P value is 52%. Therefore, $\beta_1 = \beta_2 = \beta_3 = 0$, this means that there is no significant difference among the respondents in terms of factor 2 (supporting services to the students).

but they think that opportunities are not enough to join the exchange program. The respondents mentioned that the authority should increase the number of exchange school as soon as possible.

3.4. Course Reserve

With respect to library services, in overall, respondents are satisfied with the facilities provided in the library. However, it is recommended that more reference books should be made available for the students especially those in the reserve area. In some cases, there are only one course reserve book in the library, which is very inconvenient for the students because if the students do not purchase the book because of any reason prior to beginning of the semester they cannot purchase that book later.

3.5. English Language Proficiency and Teaching Skills of Teachers

In terms of teaching quality, students in MBA and IDP program find that a few lectures cannot deliver their lectures efficiently due to limitation of time or poorly conduct in English language. Even good lectures are found failed in delivering their lectures efficiently because they lack of teaching skills and teaching methodology. It is recommended for each faculty to ensure every lecturer have certain level of teaching skills so that the course content can be easily acquire and understand by the students.

3.6. Miscellaneous

In addition, the course subjects should be clearly explained in the classroom rather than rushing through the term. Furthermore, more qualified teachers from different countries should be recruited to upgrade the quality of teaching staff. Learning materials such as slides, project cases and handout are highly demanded to be utilized to supplement the lectures. It is also highly recommended that the term duration to be extended, so that the administration can include study weeks. With one study week before the exam will allow the students to concentrate and focus on each course before the final examination.

3.7. Special Suggestions for GSIM

The teachers' turnover ratio in GSIM is very high. For that reason, the administration should ensure that good teachers are not leaving GSIM. They should try to recruit well-known professors to increase students' confidence about the quality of the university education. With respect to course contents, the administration should check the course contents of the best schools of the world and revise, if necessary, the course contents of courses of GSIM. Moreover, the administration should conduct a survey to collect opinions from GSIM students to improve the quality of GSIM education.

4. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In summing up, in aggregate, the students' views about the quality of the university education is not satisfactory. In terms of students' views, IDP is the best program in the university followed by IRP, E-biz and MBA. The majority of the respondents of IDP and IRP students' mentioned that the quality of the programs are much better or better than the quality of the best programs in their countries whereas the majority of the respondents of E-biz and MBA students mentioned that the quality of the programs are a bit lower or much lower than the quality of the best programs in their countries

In terms of quality of the university education, we found that there is no significant difference between IDP and IRP respondents. However, in comparing between the stratum of IDP, IRP, MBA and E-biz, we found that there are significant differences among four

stratums in terms of teachers' quality, relevance of course content, grade output, meeting respondents' exception and needs, and administration. On the other hand, there are no significant differences in their views among the respondents in terms of range of elective courses, library facilities, range of overseas exchange program, support to students by professors, quality and availability of IT, teaching methodology, international appeal, and prestige with the global community.

Three factors can summarize the quality of the education of the University: teachers' performance, support to students, and global attractive appearance. With respect to the teachers' performance (Factor 1), support to students (Factor 2) and global attractive appearance (Factor 3), it is found that there are no significant differences among the respondents about the factors. In other words, this means that all of the respondents are supporting all of the factors (three) extracted by the factor analysis.

Finally, in order to improve the quality of the university education, the university authority should take into consideration the recommendations given by the students, such as teaching more concepts by the teachers, increasing the numbers of elective courses, providing more range of overseas exchange programs, increasing the numbers of reference books in the library, employing more teaching staff with good English language proficiency and teaching skills, teaching uniformly in the whole semester, and extending the semester duration.

REFERENCES

- [1] Boniface, D. R. (1995). *Experiment Design and Statistical Methods for Behavioral and Social Research* (London: Chapman & Hall).
- [2] College Ranking: Business School (2005). <http://www.library.uiuc.edu/edx/rankbus.htm>.
- [3] Green, P. E. and D. S. Tull, (1978). *Research for Marketing Decisions*, 4th ed. (Prentice-Hall Inc.)
- [4] Harman, H. H. (1976). *Modern Factor Analysis*, 3rd edition (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press).
- [5] Hong Kong Stock Exchange (1997). *Survey of Retail Investor in Hong Kong Stock Exchange* (Hong Kong Stock Exchange: Research and Planning Division).
- [6] Jackson, B. B. (1983). *Multivariate Data Analysis: An Introduction* (Illinois: Richard D. Irwin).
- [7] Johnson, R. A (1992). *Applied Multivariate Statistical Analysis*, 3rd edition (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall).
- [8] Lehman, D. R. (1985). *Marketing Research and Analysis*, 2nd ed. (Richard D: Irwin, Inc.).
- [9] Manly. B. F. J. (1986). *Multivariate Statistical Methods: A primer*, (London: Chapman and Hall).
- [10] MBA Ranking (2005). website: <http://www.mbainfo.com/rankings.html>
- [11] Mendenhall, W.; Ott, L. and Scheaffer, R. L. (1996). *Elementary Survey Sampling*, 5th ed. (PWS-KENT Publishing Company).
- [12] Which MBA? Economist Intelligence Unit (EIU) (2005).<http://mba.eiu.com/site-info.asp?info-naus=wmba-rank-usthod>.
- [13] Wooldridge, J. M. (2003). *Introduction of Econometrics: A Modern Approach*, 2ed.(Mason, Ohio: South-Western).