"A Pragmatic Study on impact of Privatization on Quality Education" - A Study of Gujarat state

Mr Prashant Ravindrakumar Pandya
Dr Kerav Pandya

Research Scholar, Gujarat Technological University, Ahmedabad.
Associate Professor, C K Shah Vijapurwala Institute of Management, Vadodara.

In the 21st century, the Privatization of education has become more perceptible and they use more marketing tool compare to before. This study aspires to make out the demographic and surroundings information of persons that differentiate their perception about quality of higher education. A sample of 122 persons was taken from six top Cities of Gujarat State to evaluate their perception toward dimensions of higher education. Factor analysis was conducted to identify the characteristics of persons which make their observation about quality of higher education different. The results demonstrate that more options can be available due to privatization with the students, Failure in giving quality education due to non-providing proper salary to teachers and Fees are very high significant influence on perception about quality of higher education. Lack of equality and inadequate observation on institutes by higher authority has moderate influence on the person's perception. This research carries worth to education policy-makers and university authorities. They can use these findings to prepare systems, and target specific groups of students to ensure favorable academic environment and increase the brand representation of their institutions.

Keywords: Privatization, Quality Education

Introduction:

'Education is one of the necessary requirements for person improvement and to come out from poverty', it is essential for country wide growth and a flourishing society. Rahmanand Uddin (2009) say that education is the responsibility of the government and should be managed through national resources. In addition, higher education is important for economic and social impacts in society (Brennan & Teichler, 2008). Therefore, governments and society have a vested interest in ensuring a constant flow of students in higher education. Every year most of students from different developing countries going a foreign country for 'quality' higher education. The effect is that lots of money is used up outside the country, resulting in missed economic opportunity. We can attract foreign students by providing "Quality Education" in local Universities and preserved our local students it will be allowing better economic activity this sector. For that higher educational institutional authorities need to understand the importance of generating a noticeable representation of quality education for regulate their faithful customers. According to Wilkinson and Yussof (2005) the tendency of private universities is to get their specialization in profitable areas only. Quality assurance for higher education systems has become an important issue worldwide, instigating collaboration among quality assurance agencies at international and regional levels. Furthermore, a standard quality of service need have to maintain by higher education institutions to sustain in the current market scenario. Thus, this research will make out and calculate the extent to which persons' distinctiveness impact the awareness quality of higher education. These results will help strategy makers as well as authorities of various universities to divide the person group on the basis of their distinctiveness and target the actual group of people for various institutions.

Quality of Higher Education

There are several means of Quality of higher education. According to Longanecker and Blanco (2003), Quality of higher education's by who and how students are taught rather than by what students learn. The perspectives of academic staff and administrators

highlighted from their definition. According to Akareem & Hossain, 2012; Ashrafetal, (2009), Dimensions of higher education quality are expressed by quality of students, faculty credentials, academic features, and administrative supports. According to Akareem and Hossain (2012), students' qualification and their background, contribute significantly to defining the quality of education. Individual characteristics like age, research interests previous results, perception pattern, family background, and income are important contributors to the perception of education quality. Environmental factors such as social, economic, and cultural influences can also play vital roles. According to Rahman and Uddin (2009), parents' education, their income, attitude, and present examination system affect the education of children. In India, generally private universities charge a high rate of tuition fees compared to public universities. According to Sarpkaya (2010) students put more emphasison factors like employment potential and individual satisfaction, and are less influenced by marketing factors like media coverage and publicity. Educational quality is mostly affected by the Educational Qualification of teaching staff. According to Arnon and Reichel (2007), students make out two types of images of teachers: the imageofan ideal teacher and own character as a teacher. Their study revealed that students perceive personal qualities and professional knowledge to be the most significant qualities needed to be an ideal teacher. The personal qualities include general personal qualities, kindness, leadership, and attitude toward profession; and professional qualities include knowledge of the subject matter and moralizing knowledge. They also stated that other qualities like general knowledge, teacher as a socializing agent and a person with different social missioners perceived to be less important. Teachers must have lot of special features of efficient programmes for teachers' education. Some of are like: chance to gain knowledge during the pre-service course, capability to evaluate student learning, capability to plan syllabus, and capability to get opinion from the students. In India, teaching staff do not always get effective training to ensure effective teaching and they mostly rely on job experience.

Third, an important aspect of education quality is identified by academic factors within the universities. Lizzioetal. (2002) explored that perception about university learning environment contributes to academic outcome, where a sit is not influenced by prior academic achievements. According to Walker (2008), students' expectation can be measured by explaining three broad categories: course contents, academic staff, and grades. The study showed that students' responses had a wide range of deviations among the three categories: academic content that is studied in the university; career skills that are needed either in or outside the college and life skills that are useful in all aspects of post-higher-education life. The author found that students sometimes suggest that learning is not correlated with the course design and instructor, what students actually learn does not always reflect in their grades, but recognized that student evaluation of teaching is treated as one of the widest research literature in applied psychology (Ginnsetal., 2007). Contradicting this Buchanan (2011) declared that students' evaluation is not the only method to judge teachers' performance, and this can be used for internal uses but it is not suitable for disclosing to broader audiences.

All of these three dimensions determine the quality of higher education (Akareem & Hossain, 2012; Ashrafet al.,2009). However, extant literature does not clearly identify which characteristics make the persons perceive these dimensions differently. Therefore, this study takes a quantitative research approach to identify this scope of the research.

Objective:

The most important objective of the study is to understand persons' behavior on privatization and also to study of various factors which affects quality education due to privatization of the education with reference to age, gender, educational qualification, occupation.

Research Methodology:

Survey approach was used for gathering primary data and research questionnaire was used for the research. The questionnaire was designed using Likert Scale. Total 145 respondents of major six cities of Gujarat State Ahmedabad, Surat, Rajkot, Mehsana, Gandhinagar and Vadodara city, Out of those 122 valid responses are used for analysis purpose.

Data Analysis and Discussion

Factor Analysis

One of the most widely used interdependency techniques for data reduction is factor analysis. Factor analysis seeks to identify a set of dimensions that is not readily observed in a large set of variables.

Factor analysis is multivariate statistical technique which is used to summarize the information contained in a large number of variables into a smaller number of subsets of factors (Hair et al., 2003). Also there are several reasons for using factors analysis as follows: (i) to identify a new, smaller set of uncorrelated variables to replace the original set of correlated variables, (ii) to identify a smaller set of salient variables from a larger set, and (iii) to identify underlying dimensions or factors, that explain the correlations among a set of variables (Malhotra, 2003)

Table: 1 KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.724
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	210.278
	df	55
	Sig.	.000

Looking at the Table1, the KMO measure is 0.724 hence it is inferred that the sample size is adequate for the factor analysis. Bartlett's test shows the p-value as 0.000 for the chi square statistic (210.278) at 55 degrees of freedom and hence the factor analysis could be further proceeds for the reduction of the factors and identify the key factors influencing quality of education by the privatization. Therefore, it is established from the

Table: 2 Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigen values			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	2.824	25.676	25.676	2.824	25.676	25.676	2.069	18.807	18.807
2	1.474	13.402	39.078	1.474	13.402	39.078	1.615	14.679	33.486
3	1.256	11.415	50.493	1.256	11.415	50.493	1.507	13.697	47.184
4	1.073	9.752	60.245	1.073	9.752	60.245	1.437	13.061	60.245
5	.848	7.708	67.952						
6	.798	7.252	75.204						
7	.692	6.294	81.499						
8	.639	5.811	87.309						
9	.553	5.025	92.334						
10	.444	4.035	96.369						
11	.399	3.631	100.000						
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.									

statistical measures that the variables have some correlation and factor analysis is appropriate.

Further analysis of factors shows that there are three factors can be extracted based on the Eigen values as the mentioned following table shows the same and conferred that three factors should be extracted and having an influence on the quality education and which also influenced by the effect of privatization.

First factor extracted above having the highest Eigen value which is 2.824 which depicts the highest loaded factor in the factor analysis. Further, more the component 2 and 3 also bearing the Eigen value more than 1 so these factor could be extracted and studied further to check the quality of education by the privatization.

Table: 3 Rotated Component Matrix[a]				
	Component			
	1	2	3	4
Fees are very high compared to government schools	.694	-.184	.044	.303
Increase number of jobs due to privatization	.122	.372	.750	-.123
Perceptions of parents are increased due to privatization in terms of high fees payment school	.127	-.195	.824	.197
Lack of equality and inadequate observation on institutes by higher authority	.021	.274	-.033	.724
Increase number of schools and colleges	.044	.116	-.022	.036
More options can be available due to privatization with the students	.754	.551	.446	.102
Failure in giving quality education due to non providing proper salary to teachers	.749	.651	-.008	.292
Transparent system can be possible in terms of quality education	.140	.148	.132	-.159
More facilities are increased for the students due to privatization	.071	.735	.009	.037
Raise Demand for higher education	.136	.049	.138	.789
Possibility of Local development	.617	.156	.160	.147
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.[a]				
a. Rotation converged in 5 iterations.				

From the Rotated Component matrix it can be identified that, Fees More options can be available due to privatization with the students due to privatization bearing the highest loading on the factor plot which is 0.754 and has been placed on component 1 so it contains the highest impact on the Quality of education. Next factor, Quality of education influenced by Failure in giving quality education due to non providing proper salary to teachers bearing the factor loading 0.749 and placed on the component one. And finally third factor, Quality of education affected by Fees are very high compared to government schools with a factor loading of 0.617 could be extracted and studied further to assess the impact of Privatization on Quality Education.

Conclusion:

From the result, it is concluded that with the affect of privatization, more options can be available due to privatization with the students, Failure in giving quality education due to non providing proper salary to teachers and Fees are very high compared to government schools are highly affecting with the comparison of other factors like Lack of equality and inadequate observation on institutes by higher authority, Increase number of schools and colleges and Raise Demand for higher education. Further, due to

privatization local area can also developed and standard of living can be increased. Perceptions of parents are increased due to privatization in terms of high fees payment schools are less affecting with implementing privatization.

References:

1. Akareem, H.S., & Hossain,S.S.(2012).Perception of education quality in private universities of Bangladesh: Astudy from students' perspective. Journal of Marketing for Higher Education, 22 (1), 11–33.

2. Arnon,S., & Reichel, N.(2007). Whois the ideal teacher? Am I? Similarity and difference in perception of students of education regarding the qualities of a good teacher and of their own qualities as teachers. Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 13(5), 441–464.

3. Ashraf, M.A., Ibrahim,Y.,& Joarder, M.H.(2009). Quality education management at private universities in Bangladesh: An exploratory study. Jurnal Pendidikdan Pendidikan, 24, 17–32.

4. Brennan, J., & Teichler, U.(2008).The future of higher education and of higher education research.HigherEducation,56(3),259–264.

5. Buchanan,J.(2011).Qualityteaching:Meansforitsenhancement?AustralianUniversities' Review,53 (1), 66–72.

6. Ginns, P., Prosser, M.,&Barrie,S.(2007).Students'perceptionsofteaching quality in higher edu- cation: The perspective of currently enrolled students. Studies in Higher Education, 32 (5), 603–615.

7. Hair, Anderson, Tatham and Black (2006). "Multivariate Data Analysis", Pearson education, Fifth edition

8. Ingvarson,L.,Beavis, A.,&Kleinhenz,E.(2007). Factors affecting the impact of teacher education pro- grammes on teacher preparedness: Implications for a ccreditation policy1. European Journal of TeacherEducation,30(4),351–381.

9. Lizzio, A.,Wilson,K., & Simons,R.(2002). University students' perceptions of the learning environ- ment and academic outcomes: Implications for theory and practice. Studies in Higher Education, 27(1), 27–52.

10. Longanecker,D.A.,&Blanco, C.D.(2003). Public policy implications of changing student attendance patterns. New Directions for HigherEducation, 2003(121), 51–68.

11. Koslow skiIII,F. A. (2006).Quality and assessment in context: A brief review. Quality Assurance in Education, 14(3), 277–288.

12. Rahman, A.U., & Uddin,S.(2009).Statistical analysis of different socioeconomic factors affecting education ofNW.FP(Pakistan).JournalofAppliedQuantitativeMethods,4(1),88–94.

13. Sarpkaya,R.(2010). Factors affecting individual education demand at the entrancetouniversity: Adnanmenderes university sample. Educational Sciences: Theory andPractice, 10(1), 475–488.

14. Walker, P. (2008). What do students think they (should) learn at college? Student perceptions of essential learning outcomes. Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 8(1), 45–60.

15. Wilkinson, R.,&Yussof, I.(2005). Public and private provision of higher education in Malaysia: Acom- parativeanalysis.HigherEducation, 50(3), 361–386.