



“Critical analysis of quality management in secondary schools of Hyderabad Karnataka region”

Sushma N Jogan

Assistant Professor School of Education, Central University of Karnataka Kadaganchi

Email: snjogan.jogan@gmail.com

Abstract:

Quality in education is an evaluation of the process of educating which enhances the need to achieve and develop the talents of the customers of the process, and at the same time meets the accountability standards set by the clients who pay for the process or the outputs from the process of educating. The present paper emphasis on the application areas of specific key contents of Quality Management tools in managing, leadership, vision & plan statement, evaluation, process control & improvement, Quality system improvement, employee participation, recognition and reward, Education and training. This paper also identifies and uses quality management principles to focus on the needs, expectations, experiences and problems of teachers and students. Survey through Questionnaire and semi-structured interviews has been applied to achieve the aim of this paper. The finding of this research revealed the factors that the secondary school has applied quality management and to a very great extent and also has ensured that the

quality management policy is appropriate to its purpose. Critically tried to determine how quality management can contribute for the institutional performance and customer (Parents, learners) satisfaction.

Key words: Quality management, Secondary schools and Continuous improvement

Introduction:

QM is generally described as a collective, interlinked system of quality management practices that is associated with organizational performance. Education has always been facing the challenge in ensuring that the quality of teaching and learning takes place effectively. One possible path for improving the quality of education lies in the application of a Quality management approach as has been used in industries, to the teaching and learning process. Quality authorities like Joseph Juran (1950's); Edward Deming (1950's) and Philip Crosby (1980's) have put forth several approaches to improve company performance. These

approaches are embodied in a set of quality management practices, known as Total Quality Management (TQM). On account of these policies, different approaches have been adopted for the introduction of quality management in education, such as self assessment and external assessment of the institutions, accreditation and certification systems, and different models of TQM (Wiklund et al., 2003). Quality Management (QM) presents a strategic option and an integrated management philosophy for organizations, which allows them to reach their objectives effectively and efficiently, and to achieve sustainable competitive advantage.

Need and significance of the study: Defining quality in education has proved to be a challenging task. Cheng and Tam (1997, p. 23) suggest that “education quality is a rather vague and controversial concept” and Pounder (1999, p. 156) argues that quality is a “notoriously ambiguous term”. As a result of the difficulty in defining quality, the measurement of quality has also proved to be contentious.

Throughout the world, organizations are now facing a common challenge resulting from rapid changes in the school environment. Organizations of schools need to improve their performance in order to gain sustainable

competitive advantages to survive in today’s competitive environment. This serves as the driving force for a number of innovative strategic changes in many organizations. To cope with the changing expectations of the organization, there is a need for continuous improvement of the institutional performance. Different innovations can be integrated to keep the performance above the competitors of all time. In enhancing the performance of any organization, in doing this effectively, the factors that drive such performance have to be well understood.

Literature Review:

1. K. Sreejakumar & S.Santoshkumar (2015): “Quality education through continuous improvement: Evidences for application of TQM in Higher Secondary Education in Kerala, India” IJCISS Vol.2 Issue-05 May 2015.
2. Diogo Almeida (UNESP) (2014): “Critical factors to quality management system implementation: relevant literature review 1992-2012” The Quality Management System supports stable processes and their better management. Sustainable implementation and maintenance are influenced by some

factors. This paper presents critical factors to Quality Management System implementation.

3. Iftikhaar Ahmad Wani , Hakim Khalid Mehraj(2014): “Total quality management in education: An analysis” , IJHISSI Vol.3 Issue 6 June 2014.
4. Norhayati Zakuan: (2012): “Critical Success Factors of Total Quality Management Implementation In Higher Education Institution: A Review” This paper determines the research area of critical success factors of total quality management (TQM) implementation in higher education institutions which has potential to be explored and generate new knowledge, to improve the total quality management practices and outcome especially in higher education institutions
5. Rui Sousa a,*, Christopher A. Voss “Quality management re-visited: a reflective review and agenda for future research” This article reflects on the mass of literature in the field, synthesizing, organizing and structuring knowledge and offering suggestions for future research. It reviews QM research organized along five main themes: the definition of QM, the definition of

product quality, the impact of QM on firm performance, QM in the context of management theory and the implementation of QM.

6. K. N. jha! & K. C. iyer (2006): “Critical Factors Affecting Quality Performance in Construction Projects” The critical success factors obtained were: project manager’s competence; top management’s support; monitoring and feedback by project participants; interaction among project participants; and owners’ competence. The factors that adversely affected the quality performances of projects were: conflict among project participants; hostile socio-economic environment; harsh climatic condition; PM’s ignorance & lack of knowledge; faulty project conceptualization; and aggressive competition during tendering.

Objectives of the study:

1. To find out the quality maintaining in management among different schools in Kalaburagi.
2. To identify the quality management in different private and govt. schools.
3. To develop the quality management through proper vision and plan.
4. To evaluate the current system of quality management.

5. To bring quality system improvement in quality management.

Hypothesis of the study:

1. There will be a significant difference in the quality management of institutions.
2. There will be a significant difference in quality management in gender.
3. There will be a significant difference in quality management of private schools.
4. There will be a significant difference in quality management of Govt. schools.

Research Methodology:

Sample size and technique: For collecting the requisite data, 120 samples have been taken. Simple random technique is used for collecting data.

Tools: The questionnaire was administered to the Principal, Vice principal and HODs of various disciplines of Secondary schools.

Analysis and interpretation of data:

Table 1:

Variable	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-value	Level of significance
QM1	120	2.4000	.58554	2200.095	0.000*

Note*: Significant at 0.05 level

The one sample t-test table 1 shows that the Quality Management (N=120), Mean value 2.400 and Standard Deviation is 0.58554 and

Method: The researcher has followed Survey method for the study.

Procedure: For the present study the researcher visited 6 different Schools from Govt. and private in Kalaburagi and collected information from the Principal, vice principal, HODs of various subjects and office staff (most senior in the institution). Standard questionnaire on quality school management covering 10 areas like, leadership, supplier quality management, vision and plan statement, evaluation, process control and improvement, product design, quality system improvement, employee participation, recognition and reward, education and training. After their response, analysis was carried by using SPSS 20 by applying one sample t-test.

calculated t-value 2200.095 and obtained significant value is 0.000 is significant at 0.05 level. Hence the stated hypothesis is accepted.

Table 2:

Variable	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-value	Level of significance
QM1	120	2.4000	.58554	2200.095	0.000*
Gender		1.5000	.50210	2585.365	

Note*: Significant at 0.05 level

The one sample t-test table 2 shows that the Quality Management (N=120), Mean value 2.4000 & 1.5000 in quality management and Gender, Standard Deviation is 0.58554, 0.50210

and calculated t-value 2200.095, 2585.365 and obtained significant value is 0.000 is significant at 0.05 level. Hence the stated hypothesis is accepted.

Table 3:

Variable	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-value	Level of significance
QM1	120	2.4000	.58554	2200.095	0.000*
Institution		1.2500	.43483	2991.620	

Note*: Significant at 0.05 level

The one sample t-test table 3 shows that the Quality Management (N=120), Mean value 2.4000 & 1.2500 in quality management and institution, Standard Deviation is 0.58554,

0.43483 and calculated t-value 2200.095, 2991.620 and obtained significant value is 0.000 is significant at 0.05 level. Hence the stated hypothesis is accepted.

Table 4:

Variable	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-value	Level of significance
QM1		2.4000	.58554	2200.095	0.000*
Institution	120	1.2500	.43483	2991.620	
Gender		1.5000	.50210	2585.365	

Note*: Significant at 0.05 level

The one sample t-test table 4 shows that the Quality Management (N=120), Mean value 2.4000, 1.2500 & 1.5000 in quality management

institution and Gender, Standard Deviation is 0.58554, 0.43483, 0.50210 and calculated t-value 2200.095, 2991.620, 2585.365 and

obtained significant value is 0.000 is significant at 0.05 level.

Table 5:

Variable	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-value	Level of significance
Quality Management	Male	60	2.5000	.676481	1.891	0.061*
	Female	60	2.3000	.46212		

Note*: Significant at 0.05 level

The Independent sample t-test shows that the Quality Management in Male (N=60), Mean value 2.5000, Standard deviation is 0.676481 and Female (N=60) Mean value is 2.3000,

Standard deviation is 0.46212 and obtained t-value is 1.891 and significant value is 0.061 which is partially not significant at 0.05 level. Therefore, the stated hypothesis is rejected.

Table 6:

Variable	Institution	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-value	Level of significance
Quality Management	Private	90	2.4667	.50168	2.195	0.030*
	Government	30	2.2000	.76112		

The Independent sample t-test shows that the Quality Management in Private (N=90), Mean value 2.4667, Standard deviation is 0.50168 and Government (N=30) Mean value is 2.2000, Standard deviation is 0.76112 and obtained t-value is 1.891 and significant value is 0.030 which is significant at 0.05 level. Therefore, the stated hypothesis is accepted.

4. There is a significant difference in quality management of Govt. schools

Discussion of results:

1. There is a significant difference in the quality management of institutions.
2. There is a significant difference in quality management in gender.
3. There is a significant difference in quality management of private schools.

Suggestion and Conclusion:

School management can be developed through Quality Management. It can also suggest that there should be autonomous bodies for all the levels primary, secondary and university which can inspect the educational institutions after every one and two years, so that implementation of QM can be ensured. The concept should be applied wholly and solely to change education system which would be according to the changing times. QM should be applied in other organizations for better performance. To conclude we can say that the Quality Management tool proved to be useful tool in the

development of Management in different secondary schools.

Acknowledgement:

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to all Principals and staff of secondary schools which provided the necessary resources for the present study to conduct research on Quality Management in educational institutions. I like to thank Shri. Chakor Mehta, principal of SRN Mehta School, Kalaburagi who gave his valuable suggestions for research. I also like to thank Shri. Kalkeri Head master for his support in collecting data from Kendriya vidyalaya, Kalaburagi. Sister Lydia Head mistress of St. Mary School Kalaburagi. Principal and Vice Principal of KenBridge school, Kalaburagi.

References:

- [1] Ahire, S. L., Golhar, D. Y., & Waller, M. A. (1996). Development and validation of TQM implementation constructs. *Decision Sciences*, 27(1), 23-56.
- [2] Al-Khalifa, K. N., & Aspinwall, E. M. (2000). The development of total quality management in Qatar. *The TQM Magazine*, 12(3), 194-204.
- [3] Aldridge, S., Rowley, J. (1998), "Measuring customer satisfaction in higher education", *Quality Assurance in Education*, Vol. 6 No.1/4, pp.197-204.
- [4] Bank, J. (1992), *The Essence of Total Quality Management*, Prentice-Hall, Hemel Hempstead.
- [5] Barnard, J. (1999), "Using total quality principles in business courses: the effect on student evaluations", *Business Communication Quarterly*, Vol. 62 No. June, pp.61-73
- [6] Behara, R., & Gunderson, D. E. (2001). Analysis of quality management practices in services. *International Journal of Quality and Reliability Management*, 18, 584-604
- [7] Corrigan, J. (1995). *The Art of TQM*. *Quality Progress*, 28, 61-64.
- [8] Hung, R. Y. Y., Lien, B. Y. H., Fang, S. C., & McLean, G. N. (2010). Knowledge as a facilitator for enhancing innovation performance through total quality management. *Total Quality Management*, 21(4), 425-438.
- [9] Pfeffer, N., Coote, A. (1991), *Is Quality Good For You? A Critical review of Quality Assurance in the Welfare Services*, Institute of Public Policy Research, London.
- [10] Talwar, M. S., Kumar T., Pradeep (2010). *Total Quality Management in Higher Education*. *University News*, 48(1), 12-14.
- [11] Toremén, F. (2009). *Total Quality Management practices in Turkish Primary schools*. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 17 (1), 30-44.