2.1 REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Institutions / college culture has been defined in many ways by various authors and researchers. However, many agree that institutions/college culture can be referred to as a set of values, beliefs and behavior patterns that form the core identity of institutions and helps in shaping the faculty, students and stack holders behavior (Kotter & Heskett 1992; Pheysey 1993; Deshpande & Farley 1999), institutions / college culture also act as a cognitive map that influence the way in which the context is defined. It provides the selection mechanisms or norms and values which people enact events. It is also a pattern of beliefs, symbols, rituals, myths and practices that evolved over a time in Institutions/ Colleges culture is the dominant value espoused by an organization or a set values and assumptions that underline the statement, “this is how we do things around here.’(Quinn 1998).

Deal & Kennedy. (1982), emphasis that ‘institutions values and philosophy guide faculty, students and stack holders’ behavior in the institutions towards success and the role ‘culture’ plays in performance seems obvious since all businesses are people business...Not only their hands, but their heads and hearts are engaged in the institutions or college mission’.

Gordon & DiTomaso (1992) also found that “a strong institutions/college culture as measured by the consistency of perceptions of company
values is predictive of short-term future company performance”. He argues that, institutions/ college culture will contribute to firm performance if it adapts to the changing environments. Some theorists recommend that cultural strength is an advantage in highly competitive environments where such conditions are recognized by firms in advance. Some argue that the compatibility between individual values and institutions / college culture values that is the value congruency enhances the faculty commitment (Nazir 2005), reduces labor turnover and fosters job satisfaction.

Schein (1992) defined institutions / college culture as a pattern of basic assumptions invented, discovered or developed by a given group as it leans to cope with its problem of external adaption and internal integration. These values are then taught to new members in the organization as the correct way to think and feel in relation to those problems. According to him ‘culture’ is the sum of all the shared, ‘taken for granted assumptions’ that a group has learnt throughout organizations or institutions history. Also, institutions / college culture is determined to be the residue of success. Institutions / college culture is also the structure and control system to generate behavior standards.

According to Sadri & Lees (2001), positive college culture could provide immense benefits to the organization and thereby leading a competitive edge over other firms in the industry. However, institutions / college culture without this could have a negative impact on the institutions performance as it could deter institution from adopting the required strategic or tactical changes. Such type of institution / college culture would inhabit future changes in an organization.

According to Van de Post et al (1998), institutions / college culture is, to the organization, what personality is to the individual. It is hidden, but
unifying force that provides meaning and direction. It is also a system of shared meanings or systems of beliefs and values that ultimately shapes employee behaviour. Thus, institution / college culture has received much attention in the last two decades due to its effects and potential impact on success (Rashid Sambasivan & Johari 2002).

A more formal definition of institutions / college culture that the researcher identifies with is that “institutions / college culture is with its problems new members as the correct way to perceive, think and feel in relation to those problems” (Schein 2004).

2.2 WORK VALUES

2.2.1 Value Perceptions

Values are measures of worth given to events in life. Basically, for an individual, values represent preferable modes of conduct based on strong convictions and they significantly influence the behavioral patterns in different ways (George Edgin 1978).

There are different views on the dimensions of ‘values’ and its classification. One approach which is relevant to the present study is ERG theory (Existence, relatedness and Growth).

2.2.2 ERG-Theory

Clayton Alderfer of Yale University has reworked Maslow’s hierarchy model to align it more suitably to facilitate empirical research. His revised hierarchy is labelled as ERG theory. Alderfer argues that there are three groups of core needs i.e., existence, relatedness and growth.
The existence group of needs are concerned with fulfillment of basic material and existence requirements. Maslow’s physiological and safety needs are brought together in this group. The relatedness group of needs incorporates the desire to maintain important interpersonal relationships. These social and status desires require interaction with others and if they are to be satisfied, they align with Maslow’s love need and external component of his esteem classification.

Finally, Alderfer isolates growth needs as an intrinsic desire for personal development. This includes Maslow’s intrinsic component of esteem needs, like self-actualization, enrichment of himself. Further, ERG theory demonstrates in contrast to Maslow that (1) More than one need may operate at the same time. (2) If the gratification of higher level need is stifled or difficult, the desire to satisfy a lower level need increases.

ERG, theory, unlike Maslow does not assume rigid hierarchy and assume that individuals need structure is primarily based on the inherent values of individuals. Therefore need satisfaction is instrumental to value satisfaction. Thus, by focusing upon persons’ values we would be dealing with a concept that is more central, more dynamic and more economical, from the organisations’ as well as individual’s perspectives.

Thus, Clayton Alderfer’s modified need hierarchy, collapses Maslow’s five hierarchical needs into three i.e., Existence, relatedness and Growth (ERG). They are,

2.2.3  **Physiological Needs/Existence Needs**

Needs are required to preserve human life. They include all of what Maslow termed as physiological needs relating to material safety.
2.2.4 Social Needs/Relatedness Needs

They refer to all socially intended needs i.e., how people relate to their surrounding social environment. These include the need for meaningful social and interpersonal needs.

2.2.5 Esteem-Self Actualisation/Growth Needs

They reflect the individual’s desire to be self confident, productive and creative. The desire to engage in tasks requires the full utilisation of abilities and to develop additional capabilities and skills. This ERG model is born out of reality that all needs are prescribed by values and values in turn operate as boundary for the needs Maslow’s five basic needs and McClelland’s three motives (need for affiliation, need for power and need for achievement) have been incorporated into this three level classification.

In this study, the three major categories of needs have been treated as work values for the purpose of this study. As suggested by Rokeach (1968), values are be seen as the cognitive representation of inherent faith and induce transformation of needs into satisfaction. But, it is also realised that the relationship between values and needs are not isomorphic.

2.3 DEFINITION OF QUALITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Harvey & Green (1993) suggest that stakeholder’s views on quality could be categorized according to five definitions: 1.Exceptional, 2.Perfection, 3.Fitness for purpose, 4.Value for money, 5.Transformation (a continuing process of empowerment and enhancement of students). While the authors suggest that quality as transformation includes the other definitions of quality, they are likely to be prioritised by different stakeholders in accordance with their motivations and interest. Hence, the best can be
achieved by identifying the criteria for quality set by stakeholders such as students, faculties, alumni and industries.

2.3.1 Quality of Teaching

As the number of those participating in the higher education increases, and as that increase is inevitably unmatched by an equal increase in unit funding, the quality and versatility of teaching will become even more important. Stories have reverberated for decades about poor teaching by academics who were distinguished in their research, but only failures when it came to communication of their knowledge to students. Such stories were treated with gentle tolerance when the students were part of gifted elite and could compensate by their own efforts for the mediocre teaching they sometimes received (Naisbitt & Aburdene 1989). As the gates widen, the nature of the student body varied, although more in relation to the educational backgrounds they have experienced than to the inborn talent they possess. Consequently, teaching will have to be highly skilled and appropriate to the diverse needs of the student population. Nor the Industries of the future continue to tolerate the graduate who has a well rounded and trained mind but whose knowledge and skills are unrelated to the needs of the economy. Many Industries are beginning to ask why the higher education system has not used its own resources more effectively to develop appropriate knowledge and skill in its graduates. The nature of teaching will need to become not only more varied and versatile, but will also have to be of a very high quality. The ultimate guarantee of quality in the interaction process must be in the attitude, knowledge and skills of the individual teachers themselves. Teachers, who feel enthusiastic for their job and who are well qualified and experts in what they teach, are the only essential ingredients in teaching quality. It is for those who lead the academic teachers to provide the ethos and a real sense of autonomy for each individual, in order to release their creative talents in
teaching. Nevertheless, it is also the responsibility of management to know what the quality of student experience is in the department, faculty or institution for which they are responsible. Reaching to a judgment about the skill of each individual teacher must therefore be part of management responsibility, and senior academic leaders must develop ways of collecting evidence about teaching quality. It is possible to formulate a judgement of an individual’s teaching competence with sufficient accuracy to include it in the teacher appraisal process that is now being instituted in universities. Evidence from far too many sources indicates that the higher education system still contains, and tolerates, too large a minority of teachers who are not delivering an acceptable service to their students. At the present time, there are enormous anxieties amongst lecturers about the measures of teaching competence, and the possibility that disciplinary action might be taken against teachers who fall below a minimum standard of competence. The performance of the individual teacher is only one ingredient in the teaching quality measure of any department or institution. It can not be said too often that the real quality of higher education must be measured in terms of what the students know, understand and can do at the end of their higher education experience. These are unquestionably the criteria used by industries and by society at large (Baroness Pauline Perry 1991).

2.3.2 Quality in Higher Education: An International Perspective

During the last decade, many countries have experienced a growing concern for quality in higher education. The manifestations of this concern and the reasons for it vary from country to country (Malcolm Frazer 1994). The concern for quality in higher education comes from several quarters.

1. Government, which in most countries is the paymaster

2. Citizens, who pay taxes to Government
3. Industries and graduates

4. Students and their parents

5. Teachers, Professors and Managers in Higher Education

‘More does not mean worse’, but those who pay and those who study, want evidence to support this assertion, and those who teach and administrate in Higher Education have a responsibility to provide the evidence. The first reason for the concern is ‘Value for money’. The second reason is about effectiveness. In many countries the expansion of higher education has not brought the prosperity as promised. There are some developing countries that undertook massive expansion of higher education only to discover that there were many unemployed, underemployed, or misemployed graduates who were disillusioned. In other countries, industries complain about the inability of graduates to contribute to their enterprises. This leads to the third reason -- the concern for quality in higher education has been seen by many as ‘secret garden’. Better communications, nationally and internationally, and more openness in many other fields of activity have meant that universities can no longer hide behind the defence of academic freedom. Higher education institutions need to expose and explain to society at large what they are about and how well they are doing it. The fourth and final reason is due to the lowering of national barriers by political change, by massive increase in travel and by the revolution in electronic communications.

Each of these have had an effect on higher education. Government wants students to learn in, from and about other countries. Students themselves want to be more mobile. This has produced a need to understand the equivalences of qualifications, the standards reached and the values to be attached to credit for something learnt in one country to be transferred to another. It is strange that, although there is clearly an international consensus
that quality in higher education is important, there is no agreement either between, or within. Much confusion would have been avoided, if there could be agreement internationally on the meaning of terms such as ‘level’, ‘standards’, ‘effectiveness’ and ‘efficiency’ (De weert 1990).

1. **Level**

   A doctorate programme is at a higher level than one leading to a baccalaureate. This does not mean that doctoral programs are of higher quality than baccalaureate programs.

2. **Standards**

   These are statements defining the threshold that must be reached before programs can be offered or qualifications can be awarded.

3. **Effectiveness**

   It is a measure between standard goals and their achievements. Quality in Higher education must involve judgements about the goals.

4. **Efficiency**

   This is a measure of resources used (costs) to achieve stated goals. It is unfortunate that governments frequently confuse quality in higher education with efficiency.

2.3.3 **Quality Inspection**

   Another concept of importance is ‘quality inspection’ which is described in ISO 8402 as measuring, examining and testing one or more quality characteristics. Inspection could thus be interpreted as comparing an
entity with some standard, where this term then should be understood in the sense “required, expected or accepted level of quality”

2.4 INSTITUTIONS OR COLLEGE QUALITY ASSURANCE IN INDIA

India’s standards of higher education compare unfavourably with the average standards in educationally advanced countries. In 1980s, serious concerns were raised about continued deterioration in quality of higher education. It was found that the built-in controls were not able to ensure quality. Various options were examined. In line with global practices, external quality assurance was conceived in India as a solution (Antony 2002). Presently, there are three agencies that evaluate the quality of institutions and/or programmes through an external quality assurance in the country. These are: the National Assessment and Accreditation Council (NAAC) set up by the UGC in 1994 to accredit institutions of higher educations; the National Board of Accreditation (NBA) established by the All India Council of Technical Education (AICTE) in 1994 to accredit programmes in engineering and related areas and the Accreditation Board (AB) established by the Indian Council of Agriculture Research (ICAR) in 1996 to accredit agricultural institutions.

2.5 NATIONAL ASSESSMENT AND ACCREDITATION COUNCIL

Though the National Policy for Education (NPE) in 1986 recommended to put in place a quality assurance mechanism, the National Assessment and Accreditation Council (NAAC) could only be established in 1994. Even after that, it took almost a few years for NAAC to accredit the first institution in January 1998. Initially, there was a debate on whether the accreditation in India could be made compulsory and linked to funding
(Antony 2002). Finally, keeping in mind that built-in controls in the form of regulatory bodies and a strong affiliating system already existed, it was decided that assessment and accreditation would be used as an enabling mechanism towards self-improvement. The NAAC adopted core elements common to most external quality assurance systems, namely, assessment based on a pre-determined criteria that combines self-study and peer review that is valid for a specific period of time. Based on this, NAAC evolved its unique assessment model that combined three basic approaches to quality assurance, namely Accreditation, Assessment, and Academic Audit. Accreditation is an evaluation of whether an institution or program qualifies for a certain status. Accreditation provides the outcome in a binary scale – yes/no or accredited/not-accredited. Assessment gives an idea of the quality of the outputs. Typical outcome of assessment results in a multi-point grade – numeric or literal or descriptive. Academic audits are focused on those processes by which an institution monitors its own academic standards and acts to assure and enhance the quality of its offerings. The objectives of the institution or programme are taken as the starting point for the audit. The audit is usually done by a small group of generalists and it results in an audit report together.

NAAC accredits institutions and certifies for educational quality of the institution based on seven criteria. It goes beyond certification and provides an assessment that classifies an institution on a nine-point scale indicating where the institution stands in the quality-scale. External peer review report other than its confidential part is made public. So far, NAAC has taken up accreditation of universities and colleges only, though it could take up accreditation of departments or programmes as well. The universities recognised by the UGC or colleges affiliated to them are eligible to volunteer for accreditation. Accreditation by NAAC is voluntary and is valid for five years. By June 2005, NAAC had accredited 105 universities and 2311...
colleges. Overall, around 13 per cent institutions of higher education have been accredited by NAAC in India. Though accreditation in India is voluntary, many state governments. Have decided to make accreditation compulsory for the institutions within their states. The government of Tamilnadu has decided to submit the government colleges for assessment in a phased manner. Karnataka has made accreditation mandatory for all its professional colleges. Similar moves are on in states like Bihar, Kerala, Goa, Andhra Pradesh and Maharashtra. The UGC is meeting the cost of accreditation of universities and colleges recognised by it.

2.6 NATIONAL BOARD OF ACCREDITATION

The National Board of Accreditation (NBA) under the AICTE, accredits programmes that come under engineering and related areas. NBA follows the same process of external peer review as that of NAAC. Programmes with more than 650 marks out of a maximum of 1000 points are “Accredited” and those that score less than 650 are “Not Accredited”. Programmes getting a score more than 750 are accredited for a period five-years, where between 650 and 750 are accredited for a period of three years. The outcome of NBA process is not linked to funding. Though AICTE has made accreditation by NBA mandatory for all technical institutions, the progress so far is poor. By May 2003, NBA had accredited merely 895 programs from 202 institutions as against a total of 14000 programmes in 3589 approved UG and PG and 1608 diploma level institutions. A large number of institutions are yet to complete two years after graduating of their first batch and, therefore, are not yet eligible for accreditation.

2.6.1 Criteria for Accreditation

The NBA evaluation processes are so designed as to facilitate identification of the strengths and weaknesses of the programmes under
accreditation. The evaluation process is based on a set of eight broad criterions developed through a lengthy participatory process involving more than 1000 participants concerned with Technical Education all over India. These criteria are listed here.

Criterion I : Organization and Governance
Criterion II : Financial Resources, Allocation and Utilization
Criterion III : Physical Resources (Central Facilities)
Criterion IV : Human Resources: Faculty and Staff
Criterion V : Human Resources: Students
Criterion VI : Teaching-Learning Processes
Criterion VII : Supplementary Processes
Criterion VIII : Research and Development and Interaction Effort

Three of the criteria described above have been broken down into smaller parameters, and weightages have been assigned to these parameters by the NBA. The parameters and the weightages assigned to them, which are different for diploma, undergraduate (UG) degree and postgraduate (PG) degree programmes are given below:

2.6.2 Parameters Human Resources

Faculty

A: Number of Student faculty: Ratio, Cadre ratio, Average experience, faculty retention, turnover

B: Qualifications

C: Participation of faculty in Institutional development/ Departmental development/ Academic matters/ Student development/ Self growth
D: Implementation and Impact of Faculty Development initiatives

E: Analysis and Follow-up of Performance appraisal

F: Service rules, pay package, incentives

Support Staff (Technical/Administration)

A: Number

B: Qualification/ skills (Laboratory, Office, Computer centre etc.)

C: Skill Upgradation

2.6.3 Human Resources-Students

A: Student admissions

B: Academic results

C: Performance in competitive examinations

D: Placement

2.6.4 Teaching – Learning Processes

A: Delivery of syllabus contents

B: Contents beyond the syllabus

C: Academic calendar

D: Continuous evaluation procedure

E: Utilization of Laboratories/ Equipment

F: Information access facilities

G: Student - centric learning initiatives

H: Student feedback
2.6.5 Accreditation Board

Accreditation Board (AB) under the ICAR enforces and monitors compliance with norms and standards for agricultural education in India. AB follows the same process as that of NAAC and NBA. The result of AB accreditation process is “accreditation status”, “provisional accreditation status” or “no accreditation status”. In each case, the outcome is substantiated with reasons. The accreditation status is valid for a period of five to ten years. Accreditation outcome is linked to funding. The AB charges no accreditation fees.

2.6.6 Institutional Professional Bodies

Some of the other Institutional Professional Bodies are attempting to establish their own accreditation mechanism. The Distance Education Council (DEC) and the National Council of Teacher Education (NCTE) are working with NAAC to develop their own accreditation procedures. Overall, the response of the higher education institutions’ quality assurance movement is lukewarm, though there are significant regional variations with universities and colleges in the southern and western parts of the country generally more enthusiastic towards accreditation. There have also been initiatives to rope in private professional rating agencies for accreditation in certain segments of higher education.

2.6.7 Institutions or College Quality Assessment

The term ‘institutions or college quality assessment’, which is frequently used within higher education, is in ISO 8402 held as synonymous to ‘quality evaluation’, which is defined as “systematic examination of the extent to which an entity is capable of fulfilling specified requirements”. It is further stated that the results of an evaluation or assessment may be used for
qualification, approval, registration, certification or accreditation purposes. Institutions are terrifically amplified over the past decade (Brennan et al 1999).

The institutions or college quality assessment units would be expected to provide information about the actual and relative quality of institutions and the courses they offer (DES 1991).

Institutions or college quality assessment is seen as separate from Academic Audit from the perspectives of purpose, methodology and institutional responsibility. While the audit focuses on the robustness of Quality Assurance and Quality Management Systems, the responsibility of providing quality education rests with the institution. Institutions or college quality assessment is possible only when the criteria for quality and the quality itself are defined. Indicators of student quality have been used frequently as measures in the assessment to the criteria of quality. The public wishes students to graduate with general abilities and emphasize criteria on communications skills (Cave & Hanney 1992).

The criteria for quality in Astin's approach are grounded on an institution's ability to affect its students and faculty positively; for example, by enhancing the knowledge, personal development of students, scholarly, pedagogical ability and efficiency of faculty members. An essential component of this approach is simultaneously considering inputs, environments, and outcomes (Astin 1993).

The effective institution is one that adapts programs and policies to improve students' educational experience. Programs consistent with this approach frequently focus on the assessment of student progress. Another widely recognized assessment program uses a series of tests of student competencies (Banta 1989). In these programs, students' performance at entry
level, during and exit from college is compared to establish the extent to which student competencies increase.

In the measurement of academic progress, indicators of the nature and extent of interactions between the student and the educational environment are important intervening variables. One measure of interaction, involvement, the extent to which students invest physical and psychological energy in their educational experience, has emerged as a major construct in ensuring positive outcomes (Terenzini 1989).

Students are a central focus in assessments of educational quality. It is seldom acknowledged that they are also major stakeholders in higher education. Till date, quality criteria has reflected administrators’ or faculty priorities. As both the subjects of assessment and stakeholders, it is argued that students and their perceptions of quality criteria need to be incorporated into the assessment process. For example, students have different perception of grades, a central component of assessment, than do professors (Goulden & Griffin 1995). Whereas faculty focused on the role of grades as feedback, students see grading as including a gate-keeping function. They are thus likely to assign a different value to grades than faculty do. In spite of differences between students' and other stakeholders' views, students' perceptions are rarely examined and so cannot be taken into account in the assessment process.

Higher education institutions with the most educational impact are those with consistent and obvious educational objectives that are shared by faculty and students (Chickering et al 1993). The significance that students accord to particular objective shape the activities in which they engage and the degree of effort they expend in those activities (Cantor & Langston 1989). However, there is evidence of increasing discrepancy in the educational objectives of faculty and students. For example, faculty's teaching objectives
have remained relatively stable over the past two decades, with highest priority given to facilitating students' intellectual development (Trice & Dey 1997). In contrast, students are increasingly interested in obtaining practical training for employment (Dey et al 1991). The existence of opposing objectives between faculty and students is likely to lead to bigger levels of frustration and dissatisfaction.

Faculty express dissatisfaction, when they perceive that students are not committed to intellectual pursuits. Students manifest disappointment with the academic advising they receive, because it does not respond to their needs (Alexitch 1997).

Educational institutions quality to identify two dominant traditions within quality discourse, which have grown up together and are to an extent interdependent. The “economist” view of education uses quantitative measurable outputs as a measure of quality, for example enrollment ratios and retention rates, rates of return on investment in education in terms of earnings and cognitive achievement as measured in national or international tests. The progressive/humanist tradition tends to place more emphasis on educational processes. The word “indicators” in itself implies a positivist approach to measuring quality and so, tends not to be used within this tradition. Judgements of quality are based on what happens in colleges and in the classroom. Learning of basic cognitive skills, literacy and numeracy, as well as general knowledge are considered vital to quality. However, colleges are also recognised as places where learners acquire attitudes and cultural values. Hence, characteristics such as learner centred pedagogies (e.g. Prophet 2012; Ackers & Hardman, 2013), democratic college governance (e.g. Harber 2013; Karlsson 2012; Suzuki 2012) (e.g. UNESCO 2005) are included in notions of quality education. Each of these contrasting approaches is associated with a
large international organisation in the field of development. The “economist” view tends to dominate World Bank thinking on education.

The World Bank, as Jones (2012) reminds us, is first and foremost a bank and as such justifies its loans for education development in terms of public financial returns. Since its inception, UNESCO has viewed education as essential although not sufficient for human development and as having cultural, even spiritual, benefits (UNESCO 2005; Delors 2009).

At the current time this emphasis is realised through its “themes” of cultural and linguistic diversity in education, inclusive of education, peace and human rights education and education for sustainable development. The United Nations has highlighted the first and last of these themes through the institution of an International Mother Tongue day and declaration of 2005-2014 as the “Decade of Education for Sustainable Development”.