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5. INTRODUCTION:

Every research project entails a lot of hard work and whole hearted dedication to explore and solve its underlying intricacies. The researcher put insight to make objectives more fruitful and significant so layman as well as technical person’s associated with the work of teaching as well as learning at various levels can understand easily. Everything is combined together during writing of the findings. It is a matter of communication what has done, what has occurred and what the results mean, in a concise, understandable, accurate and logical manner. The final process of summarizing the findings, arrival at conclusions making recommendations and formulating generalization for population to which they will be applicable is an important component of any research. It serves as a refresher of the person involved in the research project to focus on the investigation perspective of the problem. It has dissemination function because it is crucial to future practical application of the study findings. It aids the future workers to understand the general purpose and the findings of the study. On the basis of analysis and interpretation of the data discussed in the previous chapter certain findings have been obtained and conclusions are drawn. The findings are presented here in accordance with the objectives of the study. Thus the present chapter has been organized under the following headings:

5.1 Findings of the study
5.2 Conclusion of the study
5.3 Limitations of the study
5.4 Educational implications of the study
5.5 Suggestions for the further researches
5.1 FINDINGS OF THE STUDY:

PHASE- I : Development of Endogenous Quality Indicators for Teacher Education Institutions (Factor Analysis).

In the preliminary stage of the factor analysis, two tests were performed by investigator to ensure that the data is suitable for factor analysis in which the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measured the sample adequacy and the Bartlett’s test of sphericity measured the appropriateness of data. KMO value was found high (0.777) which indicates that the data set is highly desirable for factor analysis. The Bartlett’s test of sphericity was used to test the multivariate normality of the set of distributions and found significant value at 0.01 level of confidence.

Investigator also analyzed the communality index for each item in this phase. Communality in Factor Analysis is same thing like $R^2$(R square) in the regression analysis and it shows the extent to which the derived factors explain the particular item. Communality index values for each quality items (N=35) were found relatively large (greater than 0.5).

The investigator found in pre-requisite phase of factor analysis that the sample and data is appropriate and adequate and also the items have large proportion of its variance accounted by the factors which are suitable pre-requisites for factor analysis. The investigator is presented the findings of the study in accordance with the objective of the study.

5.1.1 To explore the Endogenous Indicators for Performance of Teacher Education Institutions through Factor Analysis.

(i) In relation to explore the endogenous indicators for performance of the teacher education institutions, there were explored six quality endogenous indicators
through factor analysis such as Knowledge assimilation, Student support and progression, Infrastructure with innovative resources, Team effort and healthy coordination, Governance and Faculty quality and development were explored by the investigator and these quality indicators accounted 75.128 percent of the variance among the quality items.

(ii) Factor ‘Governance’ has accounted 17.925 percentage of total variance and has linear relationship with the items such as Mixed policy of centralized and decentralized management (MPCDM), Recruitment and salary as per norms (RSPN), Curriculum Updated Frequently (CUF), Students Involvement in the Administration (SIA), Accountability of Staff (AS), Transparent Admission Policy and Fee Structure (TAPFS), Academic calendar (AC), Periodic Investigation and Supervision by Administrative Authority (PISAA), and comprehensive and continuous assessment (CCA).

(iii) Factor ‘Students Support and Progression’ has accounted 15.636 percentage of total variance which has linear relationship with the items such as Guidance and counseling facility (GCF), Placement cell (PC), Physical activity programme (PAP), Attendance involvement in scholastic achievement (AISA), Student motivation for self learning (SMLS), High-tech teaching and learning environment (HTLA) and Clear vision and mission in the mind of students (CVMMS).

(iv) Factor ‘Team effort and healthy coordination’ has accounted 12.390 percentage of total variance and encapsulated the items such as Subject-wise teaching staff (SWTS), Healthy staff student interaction (HSSI), Balanced workload among staff (BWL), Staff student ratio (SSR) and Internal coordination and management (ICAM).
(v) Factor ‘Knowledge Assimilation’ has accounted 11.131 percentage of total variance has linear relationship with the items such Guest lecture by educational expert (GLEX), Focus on teaching practice (FTP), Organizing seminar, conferences and workshops (OSCW), Enforcement on research development (ERD), Enriching social, cultural and leisure activities (ESCLA) and Remedial coaching (RC).

(vi) Factor ‘Faculty quality and development’ has accounted 9.913 percentage of total variance and found linear relationship with the items- Highly motivated faculty with high job satisfaction (HMFHJ), well qualified and experienced teaching faculty (WQETF), Staff setting goal for teaching Development (STGTD) and Reward and recognition for outstanding progress (RROP).

(vii) Factor ‘Infrastructure with innovative resources’ has accounted 8.133 percentage of total variance and encapsulated the items- Financial assets as per norms (FAPN), Library with innovative resources (LIR), Electronic multimedia and laboratories (EMAL) and Students support facilities (SSF).

5.1.2 To assess the Perception of Students towards Determined Endogenous Indicators affecting the Quality of Teacher Education Institutions.

In relation to perception of students towards these quality endogenous indicators, the key indicator ‘Knowledge Assimilation’ with 3.99 perceived by Students as most important indicator for performance of teacher education institutions. The key indicator ‘Team Effort and Healthy Coordination’ with weighted mean 3.81 is perceived as second important indicator for performance of teacher education institutions. The indicator ‘infrastructure with innovative resources (3.80)’ considered as third important factor, Student Support and Progression (3.52) as fourth, Governance (3.41) as fifth and Faculty
Quality and Development (2.93) perceived by the students as comparative less important indicator for performance of teacher education institutions.

5.1.3 To assess the Perception of Staff towards Determined Endogenous Indicators affecting the Quality of Teacher Education Institutions.

In relation to perception of staff towards these quality endogenous indicators, the key indicator ‘Knowledge Assimilation’ with weighted mean 4.24 perceived by the staff as most important indicator for performance of teacher education institutions. Whereas the key indicator ‘Infrastructure with Innovative Resources’ with weighted 3.96 is perceived as second important indicator for performance of teacher education institutions. The indicator ‘Team Effort and Healthy Coordination (3.74)’ considered as third important factor, Governance (3.69) as fourth, Student Support and Progression (3.62) as fifth and Faculty Quality and Development (3.49) perceived as comparative less important indicator for performance of teacher education institutions.

5.1.4 To assess the Perception of Administrators towards Determined Endogenous Indicators affecting the Quality of Teacher Education Institutions.

In relation to perception of Administrators towards these quality endogenous indicators, the key indicator ‘Knowledge Assimilation’ with weighted mean 4.23 perceived by Administrators as most important indicator for performance of teacher education institutions. And the weighted mean for key indicator ‘Team effort and healthy coordination’ is found 4.20 and assigned second rank by the administrators. It means that administrators perceived the key indicator ‘Team effort and healthy coordination’ is second most important indicator for performance of teacher education institutions. The indicator ‘governance (4.09)’ considered as third important factor, Infrastructure with Innovative Resources (3.90) as fourth, Faculty Quality and Development (3.88) as fifth
and student support and progression (3.42) perceived by the administrators as comparative less important indicator for performance of teacher education institutions.

5.1.5 **To compare the Perception of Students, Staff and Administrators towards Determined Endogenous Indicators affecting the Quality of Teacher Education Institutions.**

F-value for perception difference among responders towards quality indicator ‘knowledge Assimilation’ is found 2.165 which is insignificant at 0.05 level of confidence. It means all responders assigned nearly equally weightage to the indicator ‘knowledge assimilation and F-values for key indicators “Infrastructure with Innovative Resource” and “Team effort and Healthy Coordination” are found 1.120 and 1.805 respectively which are also insignificant at 0.05 level of confidence which indicates that there exists no significant difference found among the responders with reference to indicators Knowledge Assimilation, Infrastructure with Innovative Resource and Team effort and Healthy Coordination whereas in relation to quality indicators such as Governance, Student Support and Progression and Faculty Quality and Development F-values are found 3.479, 3.003 and 14.397 respectively which are significant at 0.05 and 0.01 level of confidence, hence it can say that there is found some contradiction in the perception of the students, staff and administrators with reference to these key indicators. Thus related null hypotheses “There exists no significant difference in perception of students, staff and administrators with reference to endogenous indicators affecting the quality of teacher education institutions” is partially accepted in relation to quality indicators knowledge assimilation, Infrastructure with Innovative Resource and Team effort and Healthy Coordination and partially rejected in relation Governance, Student Support and Progression and Faculty Quality and Development.
PHASE-II: QUALITY PERFORMANCE OF GOVERNMENT AND SELF-FINANCED TEACHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS (SWOT ANALYSIS).

The investigator has analyzed the data in relation to following objectives to study the quality status of government and self financed teacher education institutions through SWOT analysis in following heads-

5.1.6 To Assess the Quality Performance of Government-Financed Teacher Education Institutions:

In relation to study the quality performance of government financed teacher education institutions regarding determined endogenous indicators; investigator obtained weighted mean for each quality indicators and items under the determined endogenous indicators. The weighted mean for indicator ‘Knowledge assimilation’ was found 2.66 which considered as marginal strength of government financed teacher education institutions. In the same manner the weighted mean values for indicators ‘team effort and healthy coordination’, students support and progression and governance were obtained 2.68, 2.60, and 2.61 respectively which considered as marginal strengths whereas the weighted mean for indicator ‘faculty quality and development’ was found 3.05 which is considered as strong strength of the government financed institutions. With reference to key indicator ‘Infrastructure with innovative resources’, the weighted mean was obtained 2.40 which is considered as weakness of these institutions. These finding related to quality performance of government financed institutions has been summarized in qualitative manner in the table 5.1 as below-
Table 5.1: Quality performance of government financed institutions with reference to endogenous indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Endogenous indicators</th>
<th>Quality Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Assimilation</td>
<td>Marginal Strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Effort and Healthy Coordination</td>
<td>Marginal Strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure with Innovative Resources</td>
<td>Weakness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Support and Progression</td>
<td>Marginal Strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>Marginal Strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Quality and Development</td>
<td>Strength</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1.7 To Assess The Quality Performance Of Self-Financed Teacher Education Institutions:

In relation to study the quality performance of self financed teacher education institutions regarding determined endogenous indicators. The weighted mean for key indicator ‘Knowledge assimilation’ was found 2.22 which considered as weakness of self financed teacher education institutions. In the same manner the weighted mean values for indicators ‘team effort and healthy coordination’, student’s support and progression governance and faculty quality and development were obtained 2.44, 2.32, 2.51 and 2.17 respectively which considered also as weaknesses of the self financed institutions whereas in relation to key indicator ‘Infrastructure with innovative resources’, the weighted mean was obtained 2.64 which is considered as marginal strength of the self financed teacher education institutions. These finding related to quality performance of self financed institutions has been summarized in qualitative manner in the table 5.2 as below-
### Table 5.2: Quality performance of self financed institutions with reference to endogenous indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Endogenous indicators</th>
<th>Quality Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Assimilation</td>
<td>Weakness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Effort and Healthy Coordination</td>
<td>Weakness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure with Innovative Resources</td>
<td>Marginal Strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Support and Progression</td>
<td>Weakness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>Weakness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Quality and Development</td>
<td>Weakness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1.8 To compare the Quality Performance of Government and Self Financed Teacher Education Institutions regarding determined Endogenous Indicators in terms of Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats:

In relation to compare the quality performance of government and self financed teacher education institutions regarding determined endogenous indicators in terms of Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats with qualitative manner. The strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of the government and self financed teacher education institutions has been listed and given in summarized form as under—

**Strengths:**

The strengths of the government and self financed teacher education with reference to endogenous indicators has been summarized in qualitative manner in the table 5.3 as below-
Table 5.3: the strengths of government and self financed institutions with reference to endogenous indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Endogenous indicators</th>
<th>Government financed Institutions</th>
<th>Self financed Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge assimilation</td>
<td>√/ *</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Effort and Healthy Coordination</td>
<td>√/ *</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure with Innovative Resources</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>√/ *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Support and Progression</td>
<td>√/ *</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>√/ *</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Quality and Development</td>
<td>√/ **</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

√ Indicated the strength and * indicates marginal and **indicates the good strength.

In relation to key indicators knowledge assimilation, team effort and healthy coordination, governance, student support and progression and faculty quality and development, the government financed teacher education institution found in better condition than self financed institutions and these key indicators are considered as strengths of the government financed institutions. There are the some qualities aspects considered as strengths and pointed out by the investigator during the investigation and analyzed the fruitful data. The effective and frequently organization of guest lectures by experts, research development, focus on teaching practice, cultural activities, balance work load among staff, healthy staff-students interaction, effective internal coordination and management, students motivational mechanism, centric policy of centralized and decentralized management, recruitment and salary as per norms, accountability of staff, periodic investigation by higher authority and highly motivated and experienced faculty.
pointed out as strengths of the government financed teacher education institutions. Whereas accountability of the staff, effective internal coordination and management, organization of cultural activities and infrastructure, mechanism for students motivation and mixed policy of management were pointed out and considered as strengths of the self financed teacher education institutions.

Weaknesses:

The weaknesses of the government and self financed teacher education with reference to endogenous indicators has been summarized in qualitative manner in the table 5.4 as below-

**Table 5.4 : the weaknesses of government and self financed institutions with reference to endogenous indicators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Endogenous Indicators</th>
<th>Government financed Institutions</th>
<th>Self financed Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge assimilation</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Effort and Healthy Coordination</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure with Innovative Resources</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Support and Progression</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Quality and Development</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

✓ Indicates the weaknesses

In relation to key indicator ‘infrastructure with innovative resources’, the government financed teacher education institution found in poor condition than self...
financed institutions. Further there are several weaknesses of the government institutions and pointed out by the investigator. Remedial classes for weaker students, poor staff-student ratio, lack of subject wise teaching faculty, infrastructure, lack of placement facilities, poor attendance of the students in the class and lack of comprehensive assessment considered and pointed out as weakness of the government teacher education institutions.

Further, In relation to key indicators knowledge assimilation, student support and progression, team effort and healthy coordination, governance and faculty quality and development, the self financed teacher education institution found in poor condition than government financed institutions and these key indicators are considered as weaknesses of the self financed institutions. The key aspects such as the organization of guest lectures by experts, research development, focus on teaching practice, balance workload among staff, recruitment and salary as per norms, remedial classes for weaker students, poor staff-student ratio, lack of placement facilities, lack of subject wise teaching faculty, poor attendance of the students in the class, biased fee structure, lack of comprehensive assessment and lack of highly motivated and experienced faculty pointed out and considered as weaknesses of the self financed teacher education institutions.

**Opportunities:**

The government financed teacher education institutions have opportunities to develop the quality performance with standard parameters having their strengths with reference to key indicators knowledge assimilation, team effort and healthy coordination, governance, student support and progression and faculty quality and development and these institutions may develop the action plan for faculty development and set the goal of achievement for next coming years. The qualified and experienced faculty can be effectively moulded the pedagogical aspect of the teaching and may educate the students
with future vision whereas the self financed teacher education institutions have poor quality aspects relation to these strength quality indicators but infrastructure in these institutions are found well maintained and updated with standards. These institutions should be focused to develop the quality indicators such as knowledge assimilation, good governance and management, students support and progression and faculty quality and its development. The strength of infrastructure in these institutions may play important role for effective and efficient conduct of the educational programmes.

**Threats:**

In the government institutions, the insufficient and poor infrastructure facilities may be the major threats before these institutions. Lack of remedial classes for weaker students, poor staff-student ratio, lack of subject wise teaching faculty, infrastructure, lack of placement facilities, poor attendance of the students in the class and lack of comprehensive assessment in these institutions may create obstacles in getting achievement of the students and performance of these institutions. Teacher education institution is a place where teachers are moulded for the nation but with lack of these quality aspects, it is not possible to get these objectives of the teacher education by these institutions, whereas compare to government institutions, self financed institutions are running with lack of quality indicators such as knowledge assimilation, team effort and healthy coordination, governance and students support and progression. Most of the self financed institutions are opened mostly with commercial motives. It is the major threats not only before these institutions but also for students and nation. The teacher with efficiency cannot be produced by such institutions those have only commercial motives.
5.2 CONCLUSION OF THE STUDY:

It is conclude that the determined six endogenous indicators accounted 75.128 percentage of total variance among the observe quality aspects of teacher education institutions and high value of communality for each item is indicated that observed quality items play important role for overall development of teacher education institutions. The endogenous indicators such as knowledge assimilation, governance and student support and progression accounted more observed quality items. It means these aspects of teacher education are most important determinant for performance of teacher education institutions.

Further it is concluded that all responders (students, staff and administration) have assigned as prior and same rank to the endogenous indication ‘knowledge assimilation’, it may be cause that the key indicator ‘Knowledge assimilation’ encapsulated the quality aspects such as guest lecture by experts, teaching practice, research development and cultural activities which are essential for faculty achievement and also considered as valuable and important key aspects by higher inspection authority whereas it was found major differences in perception of responders in relation to governance, team effort and healthy coordination and faculty quality and development. The students have assigned low rank to these indicators as compared to staff and administrators it may be due to different level of maturity and experience.

The key indicator infrastructure with innovative resources perceived by the students as third important quality aspect of the teacher education institutions, whereas staff perceived it as second and administrators perceived as fourth important quality aspects for performance of the institutions. The staff perceived the infrastructure facilities as comparative more important for the quality performance; it may be because that
without sufficient availability of infrastructure, educational activities cannot be performed in the institutions.

The endogenous indicator ‘team effort and healthy coordination’ is perceived by students and administrators as the second most important quality aspect of the teacher education institutions. The reason may be behind it that indicator ‘team effort and healthy coordination’ encapsulated the key aspects such as balanced work load among staff, staff-students ratio, healthy staff-students interaction, subject-wise teaching staff and internal coordination and management, therefore it can say that any institution cannot be performed with efficiency in lack of manpower and also human resources with coordination is backbone of the institutions.

In relation to quality performance of government and self financed teacher education institutions, the quality indicators knowledge assimilation, team effort and healthy coordination, students support and progression, governance and faculty quality and development considered as marginal strengths of the government financed institutions whereas these indicators are found as weaknesses of the self financed teacher education institutions. It may be because that the self financed institutions are opened mostly with commercial motives and parochial feelings with inadequate physical facilities, insufficient teachers, unskilled trainees, poor practice teaching and high tuition fee paid by students. The infrastructure found satisfactory in the self financed teacher education institutions as compare to government institutions. It may be due to the infrastructure in the self financed institutions are the private property of the management and also well maintained due to the frequently inspections by the administrative authority. It reflects their strengths and has opportunities with availability of adequate infrastructure because infrastructure availabilities are key essential for effective and efficient functioning of the educational programmes. The government financed teacher
education institutions have opportunities to develop the quality performance with standard parameters having their strengths these institutions may develop the action plan for faculty development and set the goal of achievement for next coming years whereas as compare to government institutions, self financed institutions are running with lack of quality indicators such as knowledge assimilation, team effort and healthy coordination, governance and students support and progression. Teacher education institution is a place where teachers are moulded for the nation but with lack of these quality aspects, it is not possible to get the objectives of the teacher education by these institutions and it can treat as major threats of these institutions.

5.3 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY :

The study is delimited in the following manner-

1. The present study is delimited with number of observed quality items. There are encapsulated 35 items to explore endogenous indicators for performance of teacher education institutions.

2. The present study is delimited with number of teacher education institutions (sample units). Only ten teacher education institutions are selected in the phase-1(factor analysis) which consisted with a central university, a deemed university and eight institutions have been taken from the Dr. B.R.A. University, Agra and In the phase-2 (SWOT analysis) only 20 teacher education institutions (10 government and 10 self financed teacher education institutions) were selected from the Dr. B.R.A. University, Agra for the study.

3. The present study is delimited with the number of the responders (sample units). In the phase-1, only 330 sample units selected for the development of quality indicators whereas in the phase-2, only 560 sample units selected from the 20
teacher education institutions for the SWOT analysis of the government and self-financed teacher education institutions.

4. The present study is delimited with its scope. The results can be generalized on only the teacher education institutions.

5. The present study is delimited with the nature of quality items. All these quality items are belongs to endogenous (internal) aspects of the teacher education institutions.

6. The present study is delimited with nature of the study. The present study is exploratory in nature and carried with the exploratory factor analysis and SWOT analysis.

5.4 EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY:

Educationist and policy maker all over the world have emphasized on the quality of teacher education. In the present perspective observations and findings of the present study, there are found six key indicators such as knowledge assimilation, governance, student support and progression, infrastructure with innovative resources, team effort and healthy coordination and faculty quality and development. These are highly correlated aspects of the performance of the teacher education institutions. Thus the investigator suggested some valuable suggestions for governing authority, policy makers managers, administrators and teachers keeping in mind the present findings of the study in the following manner.

The decision-makers may also know that teacher educators of self financed teacher education institutions are not satisfied and engaged in goal-oriented activities with high motivation and also not secure with the job. This clearly indicates that the
management and higher authorities may devote more attention on teacher educators working in self financed institution for enhancing motivation towards their profession.

In the present study, it was found that there are six key dimensions for performance of the teacher education institutions; therefore it may be valuable and fruitful for the policy maker and governing authority to determination of quality of the teacher education institutions. The finding of the study will be significant for framework of policy of the teacher education at national and international level.

The management authority should be made effort to enrich the key quality aspects with the international standards in their institutions. It is found as compare to government institutions, the self financed institutions are running with lack of quality measures, so it is the necessary that the management authority should be provide healthy environment in the institutions for educational activities.

It is found in the present study that students, staff and administrators perceived as most important and give top priority to the key indicator ‘knowledge assimilation’ and team effort and healthy coordination. So institutions should be focused and enrich these key aspect on priority because these aspects are known as heart of the institutions.

It is also found in the present study that 'governance' considered as marginal strength of the government financed institutions whereas this key aspect found as weakness of self financed institutions, so institutional authority should make effective and efficient effort for enrichment the governance because with out good governance, any institutions cannot achieve their quality goal. The management of the self financed institutions should be recruited qualified faculty and also it should me observed by the governing body.

**5.5 SUGGESTIONS FOR THE FURTHER RESEARCHES :**

- In the present study, government and self financed teacher education institutions of Agra region are considered to study the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities
and threats with quality indicator, the same study may conduct on central universities, deemed universities and state universities with SWOT approach.

- In the present study, only endogenous quality aspect were considered, same study may be carried also with external factors of quality aspects.
- Exploratory factor analysis was performed for development of the quality indicators, now confirmatory factor analysis may be performed with these results or findings of the study.
- Factor and SWOT approaches may be performed in the same manner for the other dimensions of teacher education.
- The action plan of TQM may be developed for determination of quality of teacher education through SWOT analysis.
- The same research may be carried to explore the quality indicators for performance of the medical educational institutions, law institutions, engineering institutions and management institutions.
- The same research may be carried with the large sample and on the other institutions.
- The quality performance of state universities, deemed universities and central universities may be compared with reference to these endogenous indicators.

* * * * *