# Quality of Management Education in Nagarjuna University Area

## Dr. R. Karunakara Rao

**Associate Professor, Wollega University**
**Nekemte, Ethiopia**

**Abstract:** Present study aims to present perceptions of M.B.A students regarding the quality of management education they receiving with reference to Learning and Teaching resources. Data were collected from the 300 3rd semester M.B.A students from 15 colleges in the Nagarjuna University and its affiliated colleges through a pre-designed questionnaire. The major finding of the study is the quality of Management education in the Nagarjuna University area is low due to inadequate learning and teaching resources.

**Keywords***:* Management education, Quality, Learning resources, Teaching resources.

## Introduction

With the advent of Globalization, developments in the science and technology, business organizations are become more complex and comprehensive in its size, management structure and operating practices. In response to the developments the importance of high quality business management education and training is increasing day by day. To meet the required quality most of the management institutes in India adopts western methodologies and pedagogies in its curriculums'. India turns 1.5 lakh management graduates from its more than 2000 management institutes across the country annually , Andhra Pradesh is a fast developing state in India and there are quite a good number of more than 162 MBA Colleges in Andhra Pradesh turns more than 10000 M.B.A s' annually. Nagarjuna University is located in Guntur district is a well-known district for higher education. It has more than 50 higher educational institutions, and in those 31 colleges' offers M.B.A program, but still demand for superior quality of management education is outstripping.

## Quality of Management Education

Management education is more sensitive than so many courses due to changing business environment and its significance in the present society. In general Quality refers to the degree to which a service satisfies customers' organizations and society by meeting their needs and wants and expectations; Quality of education refers all functions, and activities that are, teaching, academic programmes, research and scholarship, staffing, students, infrastructure, and academic environment. Quality of Management education is the abilities and skill building of assimilating the knowledge in the area of business management needs and the implementation of this knowledge to creating mechanisms to fulfill expectations of stake holders. The most important determinants of the quality of management education are the comprehensiveness and the contemporariness of curriculum, and the rigour with which the students are sensitized to the curriculum (V. S. M. Nair) includes Quality of students including the admission process, Pedagogy, Placement, Faculty development and Infrastructure (Vipin Gupta et.al).

**Purpose of Study and its Objectives**

Management education in India, every one speaks about few Indian premier institutes and not about hundreds of institutes located in rural India. The purpose of present research is to determine the quality of management education in the Nagarjuna University area by considering learning and teaching resources.

The following are the specific objectives of the study

- To determine the received quality of management education in the Nagarjuna university and its affiliated colleges and
- To offer suggestive measures to improve the quality of management education in the Nagarjuna university area.

**Brief Review of literature**

Previous research on management education in India is mainly focused on IIMs and Indian premier Business schools and limitations of regulatory authority like AICTE (All India Counsel for Technical Education). V. S. M. Nair criticized AICTE working as archaic, irrelevant, ineffective, and an artefact of the License Raj. He suggested AICTE should leave business education in the country alone and participation of industry associations and the market. C.S.V.Ratnam and Shobha Misra reviewed quality issues with costs and over intervention of AICTE, they advised self-regulation system through setting up of an Internal Quality Assurance Cell (IQAC) with in institutions and Government should support institutes by providing grants and resources on the basis of Performance. Prof. B.V.K discussed absence of leadership concept in current management education, missing of code of ethics of the managers and stressed on agency theory concept

and information technology in teaching to achieve sustainable growth and inclusive growth. Dr. Ashutosh Priya studied Total Quality Management by faculty, teaching material & case studies, institute industry linkages, government role, placement, pedagogy, values, and governance made suggestions accordingly. Prof. Sameer S. Pingle Dayal Ishwar analyzed importance of management education in India by considering various paradigm shifts in Indian economy. Bala V Balachandranis stressed on importance of ethical leadership, transparency, investor protection, corporate governance and experiential learning in management education in India. Indranil Bose considered changes in curriculum development, intellectual capital requirement, value systems imbibed in management practice, functional priorities in Indian economy advised active self-regulatory and autonomous monitoring body, inviting only the brightest minds in management education by lucrative offerings, exploration of new horizons while designing course curriculum, initiating broader industry-academic interface and regular academic exchange programmes, in-house promotion of talent by the institutes etc. S K Chadha, P P Arya  advised change in the character and structure of management education with corporate sector, up gradation of curriculum and course content, designing of different programs for executives, maintenance of an efficient and effective regulatory system to check mushrooming, and emphasis on research. Vipin Gupta et.al analysed management education by Quality of students including the admission process, Pedagogy, Placement, Faculty development and Infrastructure. Deepti Bhatnagar and Subhash Bhatnagar reviewed conditions in IIMs in India further suggestions are made for better performance. B Bowonder &S L Rao suggested a mechanism for monitoring the content and delivery

of business schools to achieve student centric learning. J. Philip analyzed the shortage of management faculty in Indian context.

**Procedure**

**Sample**

Simple random sampling technique is used to get responses from M.B.A third semester students in the Nagarjuna University campus and its 14 affiliated colleges. From each college randomly 20 students are taken as sample, total 300 responses are collected.

**Survey instrument**

The survey questionnaire has following 3 parts.

Part 1: In this section respondents are asked to give information regarding Gender, Age, Basic Degree, previous work experience and Medium of instruction up to Degree.

Part 2: In this section respondents are asked to give their response on  Learning resource on five point Likert scale ranges from 1(Excellent) to 5 (Very Poor). Learning resources includes teaching tools and equipment, syllabus along with project work, specializations, application of knowledge, learning value, library facility, computer lab and electronic access, training in communication and personality development, guest lectures, seminars and symposiums, workshops and case studies, industrial visits, internal and university assessment procedure, placement activity, industry and institute linkage, physical facilities and infrastructure, communication with college top management, and government support.

Part 3: In this section respondents are asked to give their responses on teaching resource on five point Likert scale ranges from 1 (excellent) to 5 (very poor). Teaching resource includes knowledge base, communication skills, sincerity and commitment level, ability of integrating course with environment and other issues, accessibility to the teacher, motivation and feedback.

**Statistical tools used:**

Primary data is analysed by using SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences). Reliability analysis is made to know the consistency. Multiple regression analysis is used to interpret the Quality of Management Education.

**Statistical Analysis and Result discussion**

From the Reliability analysis obtained final Cronbach's Alpha score for all listed items is 0.667, which shows that data has satisfactory internal consistency.

Table 1 presents the demographic characteristics of the respondents. 63.7 percent are male and 36.3 percent are female. 94.3 percent are in the age group 20-24 years, 5.3 percent are 25-28 years, and 0.3 percent is above 28 years. 73.7 percent are B.Com graduates, 7.0 percent are B.A graduates, 7.7 percent are B.Sc graduates, and 11.7 percent are B.Tech graduates. 70.7 percent had Telugu as their medium of instruction up to graduation, 28.7 percent had English medium and 0.7 percent had other (Oriya and Hindi) medium of instruction up to their graduation. 9.3 percent had previous work experience and 90.7 percent had no work experience.

Table 2 and 3 presents opinions of the respondents' on learning resources and Teaching resources. Means and standard deviations are also presented. Majority of the respondents opined quality of learning and teaching resources as Poor in Nagarjuna University area.

**Results for Multiple Regression Analysis**

Table 4 presents R value is 0.846 is the values of the multiple correlation coefficient between the predictors (Learning resource and Teaching resource) and the Management education quality. R2 value is 0.717 which means that Learning resources and Teaching resource accounts for 71.7% of the variation in Quality of Management education. F value is 23.532 shows high significance to predict the dependent variable.

Table 5 presents Beta values and T values for learning resources and teaching resources. The beta variable is a measure of how strongly the independent variable influences the dependent variable.

Beta value for up to date teaching tools and equipment is 0.043 at significance level 0.242, indicates less performance of the variable. Majority of the students opined that colleges are following obsolete teaching tools. There are no LCD class rooms in the colleges. Beta value for syllabus along with project work is -0.033 at significance level 0.362, shows inadequacy of the variable, majority of the respondents revealed that they are not having standardized procedure to do their projects. Beta value for specializations offered by the college is -0.136 at significance level 0.003 indicates inadequacy of the variable and most of the students are dissatisfied with specializations offered by the colleges, most of the colleges due to lack of teachers offering limited specializations, no colleges offering specializations like systems, international business. Beta value for applicability and relevance to the real life situations is -0.010 at significance level 0.897, shows inadequacy of the variable. Only well experienced and dedicated professionals can teach applicability and relevance to the real life situations, majority of the colleges

had fresh M.B.A graduates as teachers, they are facing difficulty to construct the bridge between theory and application of the knowledge. Beta value for Learning value is -0.011 at significance level 0.772, indicates inadequacy of the variable, majority of the respondents opined that the learning value in terms of knowledge, concepts, manual skills, analytical abilities and broadening perspectives is very poor. Beta value for Library is -0.069 at significance level 0.657 indicates inadequacy of the variable. Majority of the colleges are affiliated to both Jawaharlal Nehru Technological University and Acharya Nagarjuna University, colleges maintains more number of colleges within one campus, for each college it has to maintain separate libraries but colleges maintains one library for all colleges. Beta value for Computer lab and electronic access to information is 0.58 at significance level 0.279 indicates less performance of the variable. In this connection colleges affiliated to both ANU and JNTU had computer and internet labs for engineering students, M.B.A people are lucky to have access to those labs. Beta value for Training in communication skills and personality development is 0.215 at significance level 0.111 shows adequacy of the variable. Beta value for Guest lectures by industry people and academicians is -0.034 at significance level 0.554 indicates less performance of the variable. Beta value for Seminars and symposiums is 0.392 at significance level 0.004 indicates better performance of the variable. Beta value for 'Workshops and case studies' is -0.060 at significance level 0.292, indicates inadequacy of the variable. Beta value for Industrial visits is -0.014 at significance level 0.879, indicates inadequacy of the variable. Beta value for Internal and university assessment procedure is 0.330 at significance 0.000 indicates adequacy of the variable. Beta value for Cultural events and sports

in the college is -0.409 at significance level 0.030 shows inadequacy of the variable. Beta value for Placement activity in the college is 0.295 at significance level 0.001 indicates adequacy of the variable. Beta value for Industry – Institute linkage is -0.147 at significance level 0.077 indicates inadequacy of the variable. Beta value for Physical facilities and infrastructure is 0.286 at significance level 0.000 indicates adequacy of the variable. Beta value for Government support is 0.068 at significance level 0.318 inadequacy of the variable. Beta value for Communication with top management is -0.010 at significance level 0.922 indicates inadequacy of the variable.

Beta value for Knowledge base of the teacher is -0.190 at significance level 0.113 shows inadequacy of the variable, this is due to majority of the faculty in the colleges are fresh M.B.A graduates and old students of the colleges. Beta value for Communication skills of the teacher is 0.093 at significance level 0.076 shows adequacy of the variable. Beta value for Sincerity and commitment levels of the teacher is 0.078 at significance level 0.124 indicates positive adequacy but not up to extent. Beta value for Interest and involvement generated by the teacher is -0.182 at significance level 0.016 shows inadequacy of the variable. Beta value for Ability to integrate content with environment and other issues is 0.263 at significance level 0.000 indicates adequacy of the variable. Beta value for Ability to integrate content with other courses is -0.101 at significance level 0.264 indicates inadequacy of the variable. Beta

value for Accessibility to the teacher is -0.355 at significance level 0.000 shows adequacy of the variable. Beta value for Ability to design quizzes, assignments, examinations and projects is -0.026 at significance level 0.746 indicates inadequacy of the variable. Beta value for Motivation from the teacher is 0.037 at significance level 0.639 indicates positive correlation but inadequacy. Beta value for Provision of sufficient time for feedback is 0.353 at significance level 0.000 shows adequacy of the variable.

**Conclusion**

Quality of management education is a multidimensional concept includes so many aspects, can classify in to two broad resources i.e. Learning resources and Teaching resources. Quality of management education in the Nagarjuna University and its affiliated colleges is very poor due to lack of adequate teaching resources and learning resources. In the beginning Management graduates after their graduation they started their own enterprises, after some time they got good managerial positions but now most of the management graduates are getting office assistant positions due to less quality of education they received, to overcome this situation management education quality has to be enhanced through making proper regulations and sincere regulatory authority, by minimizing number of institutes, owners of the college has to give more priority to quality rather than their profits to get long run survival by providing more facilities to the faculty members  for the sustainable society.

| Table 1 Demographic characteristics (n=300) | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Frequency | Percent | Mean | Standard deviation |
| Gender | Male | 191 | 63.7 | 1.3633 | .48176 |
| | Female | 109 | 36.3 | | |

| Age | 20-24 | 283 | 94.3 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 25-28 | 16 | 5.3 | 1.0600 | .25155 |
| | 29-31 | 1 | .3 | | |
| Basic degree | B.Com | 221 | 73.7 | | |
| | B.A | 21 | 7.0 | 1.5733 | 1.04958 |
| | B.Sc. | 23 | 7.7 | | |
| | B.Tech | 35 | 11.7 | | |
| Medium of instruction up to graduation | Telugu | 212 | 70.7 | | |
| | English | 86 | 28.7 | 1.3067 | .50346 |
| | Other | 2 | .7 | | |
| Previous work experience | Yes | 28 | 9.3 | 1.9067 | .29139 |
| | No | 272 | 90.7 | | |

**Table 2**
**Responses for Learning resources (n=300)**

| | Response | Frequency | Percent | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Up to date teaching tools and equipment | Excellent | 12 | 4.0 | | |
| | Good | 64 | 21.3 | | |
| | Average | 151 | 50.3 | 2.9467 | .79114 |
| | Poor | 72 | 24.0 | | |
| | Very Poor | 1 | .3 | | |
| Syllabus along with project work | Average | 50 | 16.7 | | |
| | Poor | 86 | 28.7 | 4.3800 | .75554 |
| | Very Poor | 164 | 54.7 | | |
| Specializations offered by the college | Excellent | 10 | 3.3 | | |
| | Good | 58 | 19.3 | | |
| | Average | 131 | 43.7 | 3.200 | .9983 |
| | Poor | 64 | 21.3 | | |
| | Very Poor | 37 | 12.3 | | |
| Applicability and relevance to the real life situations | Excellent | 20 | 6.7 | | |
| | Good | 60 | 20.0 | | |
| | Average | 68 | 22.7 | 3.4667 | 1.28103 |
| | Poor | 64 | 21.3 | | |
| | Very Poor | 88 | 29.3 | | |
| Learning value | Excellent | 11 | 3.7 | | |
| | Good | 51 | 17.0 | | |
| | Average | 111 | 37.0 | 3.2833 | .98639 |
| | Poor | 96 | 32.0 | | |
| | Very Poor | 31 | 10.3 | | |
| Library | Excellent | 20 | 6.7 | | |
| | Good | 52 | 17.3 | | |
| | Average | 124 | 41.3 | 3.2267 | 1.14001 |
| | Poor | 48 | 16.0 | | |
| | Very Poor | 56 | 18.7 | | |
| Computer lab and access to electronic information | Excellent | 54 | 18.0 | | |
| | Good | 62 | 20.7 | 2.8667 | 1.26262 |
| | Average | 91 | 30.3 | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Poor | 56 | 18.7 | | |
| | Very Poor | 37 | 12.3 | | |
| Training in communication skills and personality development | Good | 24 | 8.0 | 3.7733 | .93356 |
| | Average | 100 | 33.3 | | |
| | Poor | 96 | 32.0 | | |
| | Very Poor | 80 | 26.7 | | |
| Guest lectures | Excellent | 84 | 28.0 | 2.7400 | 1.36330 |
| | Good | 49 | 16.3 | | |
| | Average | 54 | 18.0 | | |
| | Poor | 87 | 29.0 | | |
| | Very Poor | 26 | 8.7 | | |
| Seminars and symposiums | Excellent | 56 | 18.7 | 2.6000 | 1.08501 |
| | Good | 76 | 25.3 | | |
| | Average | 116 | 38.7 | | |
| | Poor | 36 | 12.0 | | |
| | Very Poor | 16 | 5.3 | | |
| Workshops and case studies | Excellent | 6 | 2.0 | 4.0867 | 1.12697 |
| | Good | 38 | 12.7 | | |
| | Average | 28 | 9.3 | | |
| | Poor | 80 | 26.7 | | |
| | Very Poor | 148 | 49.3 | | |
| Industrial visits | Excellent | 36 | 12.0 | 3.0133 | 1.15075 |
| | Good | 48 | 16.0 | | |
| | Average | 132 | 44.0 | | |
| | Poor | 44 | 14.7 | | |
| | Very Poor | 40 | 13.3 | | |
| Internal and university assessment procedure | Excellent | 48 | 16.0 | 2.7200 | 1.23017 |
| | Good | 100 | 33.3 | | |
| | Average | 76 | 25.3 | | |
| | Poor | 40 | 13.3 | | |
| | Very Poor | 36 | 12.0 | | |
| Cultural events and sports | Excellent | 24 | 8.0 | 3.373 | 1.2433 |
| | Good | 44 | 14.7 | | |
| | Average | 108 | 36.0 | | |
| | Poor | 44 | 14.7 | | |
| | Very Poor | 80 | 26.7 | | |
| Placement activity in the college | Excellent | 28 | 9.3 | 3.1733 | 1.26039 |
| | Good | 76 | 25.3 | | |
| | Average | 68 | 22.7 | | |
| | Poor | 72 | 24.0 | | |
| | Very Poor | 56 | 18.7 | | |
| Industry - institute linkage | Average | 84 | 28.0 | 3.9067 | .67785 |
| | Poor | 160 | 53.3 | | |
| | Very Poor | 56 | 18.7 | | |
| Physical facilities and infrastructure | Excellent | 47 | 15.7 | 2.3300 | .89654 |
| | Good | 147 | 49.0 | | |
| | Average | 66 | 22.0 | | |
| | Poor | 40 | 13.3 | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Communication with top management | Excellent | 20 | 6.7 | 3.3733 | .97834 |
| | Good | 32 | 10.7 | | |
| | Average | 80 | 26.7 | | |
| | Poor | 152 | 50.7 | | |
| | Very Poor | 16 | 5.3 | | |
| Government support | Excellent | 252 | 84.0 | 1.1600 | .36722 |
| | Good | 48 | 16.0 | | |

**Table 3**
**Responses on Teaching resource**

| | Response | Frequency | Percent | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Knowledge base of the teachers | Excellent | 28 | 9.3 | 3.2533 | 1.09841 |
| | Good | 32 | 10.7 | | |
| | Average | 112 | 37.3 | | |
| | Poor | 92 | 30.7 | | |
| | Very Poor | 36 | 12.0 | | |
| Communication skills of teachers | Excellent | 12 | 4.0 | 3.4533 | .92954 |
| | Good | 20 | 6.7 | | |
| | Average | 124 | 41.3 | | |
| | Poor | 108 | 36.0 | | |
| | Very Poor | 36 | 12.0 | | |
| Sincerity and Commitment levels of the faculty | Excellent | 16 | 5.3 | 3.3200 | 1.02360 |
| | Good | 32 | 10.7 | | |
| | Average | 136 | 45.3 | | |
| | Poor | 72 | 24.0 | | |
| | Very Poor | 44 | 14.7 | | |
| Interest and involvement generated by the faculty | Excellent | 28 | 9.3 | 2.9067 | .92781 |
| | Good | 60 | 20.0 | | |
| | Average | 124 | 41.3 | | |
| | Poor | 88 | 29.3 | | |
| Ability to integrate content with environment and other issues | Excellent | 28 | 9.3 | 3.2567 | 1.02353 |
| | Good | 24 | 8.0 | | |
| | Average | 111 | 37.0 | | |
| | Poor | 117 | 39.0 | | |
| | Very Poor | 20 | 6.7 | | |
| Ability to integrate content with other courses | Good | 56 | 18.7 | 3.2933 | .78059 |
| | Average | 104 | 34.7 | | |
| | Poor | 136 | 45.3 | | |
| | Very Poor | 4 | 1.3 | | |
| Accessibility to the teacher | Excellent | 36 | 12.0 | 2.2933 | .89253 |
| | Good | 184 | 61.3 | | |
| | Average | 44 | 14.7 | | |
| | Poor | 28 | 9.3 | | |
| | Very Poor | 8 | 2.7 | | |
| Ability to design quizzes, assignments, examinations and projects | Excellent | 20 | 6.7 | 2.5200 | .90128 |
| | Good | 152 | 50.7 | | |
| | Average | 96 | 32.0 | | |

|  | Poor | 16 | 5.3 |  |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | Very Poor | 16 | 5.3 |  |  |
| Motivation from the Teacher | Excellent | 40 | 13.3 | 2.4933 | 1.08961 |
|  | Good | 152 | 50.7 |  |  |
|  | Average | 48 | 16.0 |  |  |
|  | Poor | 40 | 13.3 |  |  |
|  | Very Poor | 20 | 6.7 |  |  |
| Provision of sufficient time for feed back | Excellent | 20 | 6.7 | 3.1733 | 1.07726 |
|  | Good | 48 | 16.0 |  |  |
|  | Average | 136 | 45.3 |  |  |
|  | Poor | 52 | 17.3 |  |  |
|  | Very Poor | 44 | 14.7 |  |  |

**Table 4**
**Model Summary**

| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | F |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | .846[a] | .717 | .686 | .57508 | 23.532 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Provision of sufficient time for feedback, Cultural events and Sports in the College, Syllabus along with Project work, Sincerity and Commitment levels of the faculty, Up-to-date teaching tools and equipment, Communication skills of the faculty, Computer lab and electronic access to information, Learning Value, Ability to design quizzes, Assignments, examinations and projects, Accessibility to the teacher, Government Support, Specializations offered by the college, Ability to integrate content with environment and other issues, Workshops and Case studies, Motivation from the Teacher, Internal and University assessment procedure, Guest lectures by industry people and academicians, Applicability and relevance to the real life situations, Physical facilities and infrastructure, Interest and involvement generated by the faculty, Industry - Institute linkage, Ability to integrate content with other courses, Industrial visits, Placement activity in the campus, Communication with Top management, Knowledge base of the faculty, Seminars and Symposiums, Training in communication skills and personality development, Library

**Table 5**
**Coefficients[a]**

| Model | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | T | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | B | Std. Error | Beta |  |  |
| 1 (Constant) | 1.793 | 1.176 |  | 1.524 | .129 |
| Up-to-date teaching tools and equipment | .056 | .048 | .043 | 1.172 | .242 |
| Syllabus along with Project work | -.045 | .049 | -.033 | -.913 | .362 |
| Specializations offered by the college | -.140 | .047 | -.136 | -2.953 | .003 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Applicability and relevance to the real life situations | -.008 | .062 | -.010 | -.130 | .897 |
| Learning Value | -.012 | .041 | -.011 | -.291 | .772 |
| Library | -.062 | .140 | -.069 | -.444 | .657 |
| Computer lab and electronic access to information | .047 | .043 | .058 | 1.084 | .279 |
| Training in communication skills and personality development | .236 | .147 | .215 | 1.600 | .111 |
| Guest lectures by industry people and academicians | -.026 | .044 | -.034 | -.593 | .554 |
| Seminars and Symposiums | .371 | .129 | .392 | 2.869 | .004 |
| Workshops and Case studies | -.055 | .052 | -.060 | -1.056 | .292 |
| Industrial visits | -.013 | .085 | -.014 | -.152 | .879 |
| Internal and University assessment procedure | .276 | .062 | .330 | 4.459 | .000 |
| Cultural events and Sports in the College | -.338 | .155 | -.409 | -2.182 | .030 |
| Placement activity in the campus | .240 | .074 | .295 | 3.247 | .001 |
| Industry - Institute linkage | -.223 | .125 | -.147 | -1.776 | .077 |
| Physical facilities and infrastructure | .327 | .074 | .286 | 4.402 | .000 |
| Government Support | .190 | .190 | .068 | 1.001 | .318 |
| Communication with Top management | -.010 | .106 | -.010 | -.098 | .922 |
| Knowledge base of the faculty | -.177 | .111 | -.190 | -1.591 | .113 |
| Communication skills of the faculty | .103 | .058 | .093 | 1.782 | .076 |
| Sincerity and Commitment levels of the faculty | .079 | .051 | .078 | 1.541 | .124 |
| Interest and involvement generated by the faculty | -.202 | .084 | -.182 | -2.414 | .016 |
| Ability to integrate content with environment and other issues | .264 | .066 | .263 | 4.013 | .000 |
| Ability to integrate content with other courses | -.133 | .119 | -.101 | -1.119 | .264 |
| Accessibility to the teacher | -.408 | .053 | -.355 | -7.757 | .000 |
| Ability to design quizzes, assignments, examinations and projects | -.029 | .090 | -.026 | -.324 | .746 |
| Motivation from the Teacher | .035 | .075 | .037 | .470 | .639 |

| Provision of sufficient time for feed back | .337 | .089 | .353 | 3.777 | .000 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. Dependent Variable: overall quality of management education | | | | | |

**References**

B Bowonder & S L Rao, (2010) Management Education in India, its evolution and some contemporary issues, All India Management Association journal of Management.

Dayal Ishwar (2002), Developing management education in India, Journal of Management Research, Year: 2002, Volume: 2, Issue: 2, Print ISSN: 0972-5814. pp. 101.

Deepti Bhatnagar and Subhash Bhatnagar (2007), Management Education in India: Trends and Challenges.     Retrieved     from www.indianmba.com/faculty_column/fc631/fc631. html

Dr. Ashutosh Priya (2007), Global World & Quality of Management Education in India. Retrieved                     from www.indianmba.com/faculty_column/fc631/fc631. html

Indranil Bose (2007), Intellectual Capital & Quality Management Education in India, Retrieved from WWW.INDIANMBA.COM

J. Philip (2008), Management Education in India, Paper presented at the XIII International Study and Practical Conference "Competitiveness in Information Society: BRICS-countries Experience" held at State University of Management, Moscow, Russia, During October 22 - 24, 2008

Prof. B.V.K, Business Education at the Crossroads (2010), Retrieved from www.bizcovering.com

Prof. C S Venkataratnam MS Shobha Mishra (2003), The Changing Scenario of Management Education     in     India.     Retrieved     from www.aspirationsindia.com

Prof. Sameer S. Pingle (2007), Importance of Management Education in India, Retrieved from http://www.indianmba.com/Faculty_Column/FC574/fc574.html

S  K  Chadha, P.P.Arya (2005), Quality of Management     Education, Deep     &     Deep Publications, ISBN 8176297003

V. S. M. Nair (ND) AICTE A Dragon to be Slayed, if Business Education in India is to be saved. Retrieved from www.coolavenues.com

Vipin  Gupta, Kamala  Gollakota,     Ancheri Sreekumar, (2003) "Quality in Business Education: A Study of the Indian Context", Paper Prepared for and Presented at the Business Education and Emerging  Market  Economies:  Trends  and Prospects Conference.