https://doi.org/10.3311/PPso.12145

Periodica Polytechnica Social and Management Sciences, 27(1), pp. 87–97, 2019

Business and Management Higher Education Quality: A Case Study of a Czech Private University

Lucie Vnoučková[1], Hana Urbancová[1], Helena Smolová[2]

[1] Department of Management, University of Economics and Management, Nárožní 2600/9a, 158 00 Prague 5, Czech Republic
[2] Czech Academy of Agricultural Sciences, Slezská 100/7, 120 00 Prague 2, Czech Republic
* Corresponding author, e-mail: lucie.vnouckova@vsem.cz

Received: 23 February 2018, Accepted: 17 May 2018, Published online: 28 January 2019

Abstract

Assessment of the business higher education quality is a multifaceted and multidimensional concept. Quality as a factor of performance of universities is currently an often-discussed topic. The aim of this article is to identify and evaluate factors of quality of business economics education by university students at a private Czech university. The results are based on a quantitative survey by questionnaire data collection from university students. The factor analysis was conducted to find significant groups of students regarding their perception of the educational process divided into three main areas. The quality perception was analyzed in this paper specifically by using focus on areas of subjects, lessons, and teachers. The analysis found groups of variables with significant appearance within the groups of students to reveal their main orientation and preferences. It is quality orientation (specified learning outcomes and its applicability), business orientation (tailoring to business needs) and expert orientation (skills and knowledge of teacher, his/her orientation on study group and tailoring lessons to their needs). Furthermore, identification of homogenous groups of students and their expectations helps with a design of subjects and lessons in the way of focusing on practice, addressing the needs and preferred teaching techniques. This is especially true when the students are already experienced in the taught subject. A limitation of the study is a narrow focus on one private university. It may be taken as a case study.

Keywords

quality, assessment, higher education, business economics, management

1 Introduction

Quality assessment in higher education has stimulated the development of systematic investigations of student-learning outcomes and student feedback on courses has started to play an important role in improving student learning outcomes. Students' evaluation works with student opinions about the courses and teaching delivery of each subject they have been enrolled in. The evaluation of education quality by students is directly related to the processes of measuring teaching performance (Kifle and Alauddin, 2016).

This paper presents the procedure of internal quality audits at the University of Economics and Management performed in the academic year 2015-2016 and introduces the process management as the key element of quality assurance in higher education. Recently, private higher education institutions have been focusing on the quality management as a tool establishing and sustaining a competitive advantage and improving the economic performance (Lee and Olson, 2016). However, it is not easy to determine appropriate standard level of quantity and the range of information that would provide sufficient data for the process of the internal quality assessment. Therefore, the aim of the paper is to set the overall criteria on student survey based on identification of factors which matter to students, in terms of education quality resulting from student preferences. Additionally, the results present the main factors which need to be addressed in terms of planning and implementation of quality management using student surveys.

2 Literature Review

High quality education is currently recognized as the key element for economic prosperity and sustainability. Assessment of higher education is focused on collecting and measuring information and on increasing the need for academic quality which contributes to liability among institutional and external authorities and affects universities performance.

Cite this article as: Vnoučková, L., Urbancová, H., Smolová, H. (2019) "Business and Management Higher Education Quality: A Case Study of a Czech Private University", Periodica Polytechnica Social and Management Sciences, 27(1), pp. 87–97. https://doi.org/10.3311/PPso.12145

At higher educational institutions, the main purpose of education is the largest possible development of each learner, producing a learning society and improving quality of the university system as a whole. The objective of quality evaluation is not only focused on improving the weaknesses or reinforcing the strengths of the institution, but it also leads to developing or increasing the basis for majority of educational decisions and academic programs (Neyazi et al., 2016).

The area mentioned above is linked to the term "teaching quality", defined by Darling-Hammond (2013) simply as strong instruction which allows students to learn. On the other hand, Acosta (2000) perceives this term in more detail as the goal which should be fulfilled in three main steps: the first step is course planning, the second is adoption of a methodological approach, and the final, very important step is the evaluation of results. The current trend seems to slowly change from the enhancement-led quality assurance focused on meeting of all management obligations responsibly, to increasing recognition that knowledge and experiences lead to improvement of teaching and research outcomes (Shah and Sid Nair, 2012). Continuous application of the Bologna process (European declaration standardizing the standards of higher education, see ESG (2015); further described below in the theoretical part) in the European area is providing a comprehensive view of education as a priority sector of the economy. Improvements are evident particularly in the field of management process of higher education institutions that are nowadays more efficient and effective from the point of view of socio-economic aspects. Accreditation systems are in line with the goal to ensure quality at HEIs (higher education institutions), and universities are forming strategies aiming at continuous quality improvements. The Bologna process standardizes the rules for higher education regarding the credit system and international mobility of students and academicians with the focus on improving the quality of universities (Qefalia and Totoni, 2012). In accordance with the above literature, the concept of academic quality can be described as the capability of students to achieve some specific outcome (Braithwaite and Corr, 2016). In this relation, it is necessary to mention the fact that teaching-learning efficiency and its outcomes are mostly dependent on innate abilities of each student (Santos, 2007). The role of student has changed over time, and students are engaging more broadly in changes in learning and teaching, having a commitment to their university or discipline. Generally, it helps students to engage in many aspects of their university life and empowers them to take real responsibility for a change in academic programs and in the teaching-process (Dunne, 2012). On the other hand, participation of students in the development of university teaching can be delimited by the class period, while dedication to the study and understanding of the knowledge is to be obtained during the specific exam period. This student participation calls for an extension of classroom time. Therefore, the role of students changes because contemporary educational theory (i.e. Santos, 2007; Dunne, 2012; Qefalia and Totoni, 2012) gives students considerable responsibility for managing their own learning. The principle of the active participation of students in managing their own learning inside a supporting environment is common, as business education becomes an effective feedback between teachers and students due to a quality assessment (Martinez-Canas et al., 2012).

Student-centered focus on university learning represents a form of study in which students have the responsibility and capacity to evaluate their own learning experiences, rather than being merely passive recipients. The practice of the student-oriented teaching is recently offering alternative assessment strategies such as the way of evaluating the student learning process and learning outcomes (Kim and Davies, 2014). For this purpose, it is possible to use a variety of teaching techniques, as for example various types of media, homework, or group projects (Peck et al., 2006; Hackathorn et al., 2010). This relates to the necessity to demonstrate proficiency in the taught subject, understanding the ways of teaching and the processes of student development (Sadker and Sadker, 2005). In the research of Gokcekus (2000), on the contrary, elements such as the overall lecture organization, knowledge, ways of presentation, perception, or teacher enthusiasm were assessed. Assessment by students therefore represents the most common technique used for measuring competencies and effectiveness of teachers (Ochave and Abulon, 2006; Sulong, 2014).

The issue of assessing teaching and related elements could be concluded by an idea presented by Cornish et al. (2009). The authors claim that, as to the feedback from students, it is important to evaluate and assess the results adequately and take consequent measures. It is necessary to show that needs and wishes of students are really implemented into the educational process. Implementation must take place after comparing student wishes and feedback with strategy and management of the university and evaluation of relevance of comments and recommendations.

For the purposes of this study, it should be noted that Stimac and Katic (2015), in their research, point out that not all states apply all elements of quality assurance. It is

therefore necessary to put more emphasis on assessing not just the content of particular subjects, but also the quality of the actual teaching and the competence of individual teachers. Unfortunately, according to Starý and Chvál (2009), the teaching quality assessment in terms of scientific enterprise, around which it would be possible to develop relevant research in the Czech Republic, is not elaborated in greater detail. This finding can be contrasted to universities abroad, where for many years much attention is paid to the sphere of teaching quality, educational process quality, and staffing (e.g. Prenzel and Allolio-Näcke, 2006; Helmke, 2006; Neuhaus and Sandmann, 2006). However, we can still say that we lack a systematic research of teaching quality factors that would take into consideration differences resulting from specific nature of each subject and each field of study at universities. Stimac and Katic (2015); Starý and Chvál (2009); Nogová and Huttová (2006) and Helmke (2006) mentioned proper staffing including active practitioners, connection with practical experience, transfer of practical experience and knowledge, using the latest technologies, and providing efficient study materials as the main factors of teaching quality. The factors affecting teaching-learning process are thoroughly analyzed in this article.

This study motivated by the recognition that evaluation of education quality and thus success of the whole economy always hinges on students and their learning outcomes, focuses on the analysis of the key factors of student perception of the educational process in lessons, subjects, and teacher quality. Current concepts of evaluating the education quality management may be considered with a lack of specific activities focused on student perception and its efficiency. Therefore, an investigation into the evaluation of education quality by students is necessary. The survey presented in this paper is focused on key variables of the educational and learning process evaluated by students. The identified specific factors of student perception of the educational process can lead to adapting existing questionnaires and procedures at higher education institutions for higher quality assurance.

3 Materials and Methods

The paper analyses and evaluates the results of a primary research on quality management of selected university. The data for the evaluation of current level of education and learning at a Czech private university were collected in a primary quantitative survey by means of a questionnaire investigation. The survey was carried out among students; a total of 2,265 students in academic year 2015/2016. The subjects evaluated included the areas of Business Economics, Management, Marketing, and Human Resource Management. The data were collected using CAPI (computer assisted paper interviewing) and CAWI (computer assisted web interviewing) and subsequently processed using a statistical software. The final data source was firstly sorted according to identification questions; for the purpose of basic data classification, descriptive statistics were used. The questionnaire was developed using accreditation standards and TQM in higher education area in Europe and USA, such as ESG, EQAR, ACBSP, AACBS, IACBE, and others. Other evaluation surveys of universities were also used, such as eVALUate (Curtin University, n.d.) and student surveys and their discussions presented in scholarly papers by Marsh (1987); Remedios and Lieberman (2008); Ahmad and Aziz (2009); Tang et al. (2012); Alauddin and Kifle (2014), and other authors listed in literature review.

The data were collected and analyzed in the three trimesters (September 2015 to June 2016) of the academic year 2015/2016. In the first trimester (September 2015 to December 2015), 793 students participated in the questionnaire survey, in the second trimester (January 2016 to March 2016), 814 students participated, and in the third trimester (April 2016 to June 2016), 658 students participated. Only the students who regularly attended classes took part in the survey (participation in classes is voluntary for students, not all students attended classes or participated in the research). The results are thus not based on evaluation of students who did not have overall knowledge of and experience with the entire process of education and tuition. Only students who attended all lessons, seminars and lectures were part of the sample. Students who did not attend lesson either chose to study from paper, video, and online study materials, or had individual study plans, or preferred to cut out the lessons for work, or had other personal issues.

3.1 Research Design

The research was designed to map the factors of quality of education in three addressed areas: lessons and their contents; the course, subject and structure; and usefulness and teacher quality, as measured by multiple questions based on quality reports and evaluation criteria (the criteria were completed based on study of literature on quality in higher education and quality standards applied by accreditation institutions mentioned above) using a five-point scale. The data collection instruments included questions to

measure education activities at the university. The questions were designed on the basis of theories (see the theoretical background) and similar research studies.

Each student filled a questionnaire for each subject (s)he was enrolled in. Students evaluated all the compulsory subjects and all optional subjects they had attended. Optional subjects are part of the studies only for full-time students. Part-time students attended and evaluated only compulsory subjects. Students always filled the questionnaire during the last lecture of each subject. They evaluated pre-defined criteria on scales, and they could also include a comment on the subject, lessons, study, or teacher. The written comments were evaluated separately and those which were usable, reasonable, and feasible formed basis for recommendations for reset of study plans incorporating for example now voluntary subjects, etc.

The questionnaire addressed three main areas (other than identification questions): lessons and their organization; technical and technological support and its content; the course / subject and its structure, usefulness and the teacher quality, i.e. expertise, education skills, technical skills, ability to attract, ability to motivate for learning, etc. Besides quality of education, the questionnaires also measured student views on study materials, texts and presentations, the personality and abilities of the teacher, the technology used in the education process, connection with practice, technical and organizational facilities and equipment, student learning outcomes, expectations, and overall perceived usefulness of the study (i.e., at their job position, use of learned knowledge, skills, and abilities).

Respondent reactions to target statements and their attitudes to the given matter were restricted by offering a set of several statements. The statements were designed on the basis of literature research and drawn from accreditation quality standards (as mentioned above) and in some cases modified according to the specificities of the university to fit the conditions. The main advantage is that the results will be broadly comparable and also usable for accreditation process and reporting. The main disadvantage is the fact that the expression is limited by statements and scales used. On the other hand, students could write their comments freely and the parts which they perceived as missing or overregulated could be commented afterwards. The statements were firstly designed and tested on a few testing groups to make sure all statements are understandable and measure the exact core of matter. The testing groups were given a specific "after pre-test" questionnaire emphasizing the ability to understand, focus, and coherence of statements in the questionnaire. Partial changes and rephrasing were made after the pilot survey.

Part of the querying process was also qualitative research using the tool of focus groups. A total of 5 focus groups were created. 3 groups were bachelor students, 1 group was master students and 1 focus group was teachers. All focus groups were designed to fill the responses of the paper questionnaires. The focus areas were also the level of quality of lessons, subjects and teachers and also the overall evaluation of the education process. All focus groups lasted 120 minutes and had 4 to 9 attendants (students or teachers). One moderator of discussion was always present to make sure all the focus groups would be comparable. Other two observers were present on each focus group. Observers took notes and also recorded the process on an audio recorder. Also, a psychologist was present and supervised all five focus groups. Notes and recorded interviews were finally rewritten and analyzed and used as support for explanation of quantitative data and results.

3.2 Operationalization of Variables

The paper focuses on a more indepth discussion of the higher education quality evaluation, and on investigating the main factors influencing perception of lessons, subjects, and teachers by students. All the primary data were evaluated using descriptive statistics. In addition, dependence among qualitative characteristics was tested to see whether there are relations between searched attributes, to verify the data obtained and their further analyses (Hendl, 2006). Multivariate statistical methods and analyses were used to lower the number of possible single approaches and practices. Factor analysis was used to analyze the data.

The process of calculation and interpretation of results was used according to Hebák et al. (2006). The basic conditions of attributes to enter the analysis were fulfilled according to Hendl (2006). The analysis is often used in social sciences (Palát, 2012). In the area of learning and development research the method is also used quite often and favored by researchers (Anderson, 2009). The level of correlation coefficients was sufficient according to Anderson (2009) and Hendl (2006). Moreover, 88 % of correlations in the correlation table were statistically significant. The KMO (Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin test) value amounted to over 0.8 which is considered meritorious and thus adequate for factor analysis.

The number of monitored variables (factors) was reduced using the Varimax method. For the selection of substantial factors, the Kaiser-Guttman rule was applied

(i.e. substantial factors having a value within the range higher than 1) and subsequently Sutin test was applied. The correlation coefficients are in the interval of <-1;1>. If the correlation coefficient is positive, there is a direct proportion (negative – indirect proportion). For the purpose of evaluation, values of variables correlation higher than 0.3 (moderate correlation) according to Anderson (2009) were used. Statistically significant results were presented at the significance level of 0.05. To evaluate the results, IBM SPSS statistics was used.

Factor analysis was conducted to find groups of responses of students regarding their perception of the educational process. The goal was to find groups of variables with significant appearance and consistent content and at the same time to reveal main orientation of coherent groups of students. The results may help in setting up a personalized study program focused on the key expectations of students and stakeholders and, at the same time, also to maintain actual student learning outcomes. The results of analyses and formed factors may help to reveal the current desired areas by stakeholders, orientation of labor market and employers, and perception and learning abilities and preferences of students. Of course, only constructive feedback from students was implemented. Demands for lowering the quality were rejected. The higher level of generalization of results by factor analysis helps to focus on the most important and highly recommended areas with filtering out inconsistencies (which may be studied separately as outstanding values, which in turn may also be inspiring for development). Accordingly, all areas were further discussed with other stakeholders before implementation to make sure the new / upgraded direction is acceptable for interest groups (i.e. employers, organizations, state, accreditation institutions, labor market, and others).

4 Results

The objective of this chapter is to evaluate the results obtained from the primary survey. The respondents were structured as follows: gender – 841 (37.13 %) men, 1414 (62.43 %) women (10 students did not answer); professional experience – 1067 (47.11 %) work in the area of study, 1177 (51.96 %) do not work (21 did not answer); future intention to work in the area of study – 1213 (53.77 %) plan to work in the area of studied subjects, 338 (14.98 %) do not plan to work in the area of studied subjects, and the remaining ones (31.13 %) do not know.

As the paper focuses on the quality evaluation of three areas (subjects, courses, and teachers), the chapter presents results gained in these areas. Firstly, student evaluation of subjects is presented. The factor analysis was chosen as the method of analysis. Similar approaches of students towards evaluation of subjects were sought during the monitored education, describing subsequent responses regarding variables of a subject evaluation that depend on the preferences of an individual, goals and personal approaches. The analysis revealed three major categories of student attitudes to subjects, explaining 49 % of the total sample. Analysis grouped variables into factors in the composition shown in the Table 1.

Factor 1 (22 % of the sample) may be described as follows:

- The group of students who are completely satisfied with the subject and they are also oriented on its practical use is connected and described by Factor 1. This factor consists of 22 % of students who perceive the subject, study plan, and program design highly positively and are focused on its quality. The rest of the sample also positively evaluates lessons, courses, and teachers, but this group formed by Factor 1 is specific in that it is focused on the connection of the subject content with practice and its future application in job positions; students see subjects logically placed in the study plan and evaluate accessibility of study materials as appropriate. The subject fulfilled their expectations as to the study program and future orientation on use of the obtained knowledge and skills in a future job position in business. Accordingly, students in focus groups continuously mentioned that focus on practice and practically oriented subjects are the most valuable for them. The factor is therefore

Table 1 The factor analysis of variables related to subject

	Varimax – Subject		
	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
Sex (women = 1)	0.089	-0.198	-0.678
Work in the area studied	0.094	0.859	0.050
Plan to work in the area studied	0.126	0.841	-0.046
Exam requirements	0.166	-0.089	0.413
Filled expectations	0.744	0.027	0.108
Subject is difficult	-0.013	-0.054	0.631
Subject is useful	0.741	0.124	-0.015
Relates to practice	0.639	0.235	-0.064
Study materials	0.450	-0.114	0.104
Place in study plan	0.654	0.119	-0.022
% of variance	21.997	15.940	10.603
Factor name	Usefulness	Business	Demands

Source: Data processed by the authors

named "Orientation on usefulness of the subject". The results may be used to set the subject for the practical future use of taught knowledge and skills and support students with study materials, because this leads to their fulfilled expectations.

Factor 2 (16 % of the sample) groups together the following students:

- The factor consists of students who already work or plan to work in the studied subject area (they are both business-oriented). The factor shows that those students are a similar and specific group with a specific but coherent behavior, as the results of the analysis revealed and validated similarities between those groups. Deeper analysis of the data shows the group (defined by Factor 2) is divided into two solid parts of almost equal size. The first part of the factor (approx. 180 "one-direction" students) are students who are mainly focused on their own business practices, and they find it difficult to be able to adapt themselves to the new theories or different knowledge and skills presented by teaching-learning process. Sometimes they even have issues with teacher authority, perceiving themselves as experts. The other part (approx. 180 "open-minded" students) is opposite to the first part. These practitioners enjoy deepening their practical knowledge and support their own theories, closely cooperate with the lecturer and share their ideas, and deeply appreciate new teaching techniques and possibilities. Similarly, focus groups shown that the ability of the teacher to respond during the lessons to practical questions from students who already work is evaluated as the best.
- The second factor may be named "Business workers". Attention of university management must be paid to both outlined parts of Factor 2. Attention should be paid to the identification of focus of business-oriented students, both "open-minded" and "one-direction", in order to address their preferred teaching techniques and reach expected synergy, and to sharing ideas between the teacher and students; this is confirmed also by results of focus group, where students mentioned the necessity to attract the specific study group, adapt to its needs, and attract its interest.

Factor 3 (10.6 % of the sample) groups together the following students:

- This factor shows connection with male students. According to the results of the analysis, approx. 250 male students in the sample have special demands on studies. They look for a perceived or actual difficulty of the subject and for learning skills necessary for passing an exam successfully and a link between the content of a subject and its fitness to their expectations regarding the exam requirements. For this group of respondents, a subject is evaluated as adequate when it has defined and unified exam requirements and the requirements seem to be reachable and in line with the content of theory and methods taught at lessons and seminars and written in study texts. The same result was found in focus groups. These are students who care specifically for clear definition of demands on exam and content of knowledge and skills they have to obtain. When they are not sure about required learning outcomes, they are dissatisfied and complain. The sample contained 37 % of men, and that means a significant part – almost one third – of male respondents behave in this manner.

The second evaluated area is closely connected to the lessons. The analysis revealed two major groups of student attitudes to lessons, which explains 54.4 % of the total sample. Detailed results are presented in Table 2.

Factor 1 describes a coherent group of students who are completely satisfied with lessons. They appreciate their organization and handling, style, tempo, and the manner of explanation. The lessons are understandable for them. Almost 37 % of the studied sample of students are satisfied

Table 2 The factor analysis of variables related to lessons

	Varimax – Lessons	
	Factor 1	Factor 2
Work in the area studied	0.036	0.871
Plan to work in the area studied	0.036	0.861
Teaching of lessons is adequate	0.835	0.010
Style of explanation is adequate	0.852	0.019
Explanation is understandable	0.816	0.103
Tempo is suitable	0.718	0.115
Manner of explanation is suitable	0.835	0.039
% of variance	36.920	17.457
Factor name	Style	Business

Source: Data processed by the authors

with lectures without exceptions. It is a rather homogenous group which evaluates lessons as completely suitable. Equally, all the focus groups expressed overall satisfaction with lessons and their contents, appreciating teamwork, additional and non-conform information, openness, constructive criticism, authority, and feedback.

The resultant Factor 2 in the area of lessons points at the specific group of students who already work in the area they study (as in the area of lectures). Already employed students need to express their current values and only then can they perceive new ways of thinking and working. According to the focus group members, they expect interaction at the lessons. On the other hand, they are not willing to step out of their current practices, even in trying new uncommon education technologies.

The third area studied, related to the internal evaluation of educational quality, is focused on variables regarding the perception of teachers by students. The factors found are shown in the Table 3.

The analysis found three main factors: satisfied students (Factor 1) and business workers (Factor 3) which were already described above. Other than that, only one other new factor (Factor 2) was found in the description of variables related to teachers.

Factor 2 refers to students who perceive teacher skills and knowledge as being on a high level. Contrary, it is possible to find no connection between experiences of a teacher and impact on student attention, connection with theory and practice, or motivation. The results show that perception of the teacher has no other consequences on learning outcomes and participation on teaching-learning process. A total of 11.2 % of respondents do not link teacher expertise to improvement of their learning process or motivation to learn. It is the exact opposite of the group of students formed by Factor 1. Students grouped in Factor 1 (27 % of the sample) do not care about expert skills of the teacher, but they focus on his/her skills to motivate them, improve their learning skills, attract their attention, and adequately explain and present theory in exercises. Results of focus groups also show that the students appreciate the ability to attract attention and tailor to specificities of the study group.

Table 3 The factor analysis of variables related to teachers

	Varimax – Teacher		
	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
Work in the area studied	0.061	0.000	0.863
Plan to work in the area studied	0.071	0.002	0.852
Is an expert	0.086	0.768	0.021
Uses modern techniques	0.051	0.780	-0.002
Uses modern technologies	0.368	0.267	0.044
Motivates to learn	0.744	-0.050	0.128
Is able to attract attention	0.744	0.069	0.111
Adequately explains	0.765	0.218	0.014
Connects theory and practice	0.687	-0.072	0.093
Focus on practicing	0.698	-0.130	0.082
Cares about students	0.657	0.221	-0.029
% of variance	26.593	11.245	10.426
Factor name	Student focus	Expert teacher	Business

Source: Data processed by the authors

5 Discussion

Based on the results, we can summarize that, when assessing the teaching quality, surveyed students primarily put emphasis on the cooperation with practice, high quality of teachers, and usefulness of the acquired knowledge. Therefore, the student surveys should put emphasis also on this area. In the sphere of assessing the subject, 3 areas students find important were identified: orientation on usefulness of the subject, business workers, and orientation on subject demands. Identification of these areas can help the university to modify the contents of each subject so that it suits both the requirements of students and the requirements of practice. In the sphere of assessing lessons, we can clearly identify two primary areas for students when providing feedback on teaching quality. First and foremost, these are adequate lecturers including professional teaching-learning process, and second, business workers with industry experience among the staff. Students put heavy emphasis on teaching carried out by competent teachers who are also practitioners working in the area they teach or related area, so that there is more likely to be a transfer of knowledge from practice that would help students to succeed at the labor market.

An interesting finding is that 10 % of male students are not oriented on future application of their skills and knowledge in job, but rather on meeting the exam criteria. This group of students is not oriented on future application of their skills and knowledge to be performed at work / job position, but rather on meeting the exam criteria. On the other hand, the women were found to behave just the opposite way. Women more often search for practical application of their knowledge, which is also discussed for example by Enarson et al. (2007) and Kabeer (2005).

Analyses made in the study found two factors significant for all three analyzed areas. These are according to the

findings: completely satisfied students with all variables related to the searched area (approx. one third of students), and specific group of business workers (approx. 15 %). As the resultant factors show, attention should be paid to the subject demands and learning outcomes. Those are the main areas of student perception of the educational process.

It is important to mention that that all variables evaluated by the analysis in the area of lessons are interconnected. It is therefore necessary to pay attention to all variables in the area of lessons (organization of lesson, style, tempo, and understanding), because they are positively related and deviation from one affect all others. That means it is possible, for example, to increase positive perception of all variables by upgrading only one of them. This result is very encouraging. An upgrade in one part leads to positive rise of the others. This result may be used to reach the best learning outcomes.

6 Conclusion

The results of this article showed main factors which need to be addressed within planning and implementation of quality management using student survey as a tool at a higher education institution. These factors include quality orientation (specified learning outcomes and their applicability), business orientation (tailoring to business needs), and expert orientation (skills and knowledge of teacher, his/her orientation on study group, and tailoring lessons to student needs). Furthermore, identification of homogenous groups of students and their expectations helps with designing subjects and lessons in such a way as to focus on practice, addressing the needs and preferred teaching techniques. This is especially true when the students are already experienced in the taught subject. Equally important is to clearly state the exam expectations for students who still miss the link between taught subject and its practical implications.

A limitation of the study is a narrow focus on one private university. However, the results are presented as a case study, findings of which may help other universities when implementing the process of evaluating quality of teaching, which is an increasingly discussed area. Promising avenues for further research are areas measuring the impact of student preferences on student performance and learning outcomes. Additionally, revealed groups may be surveyed separately to validate their differences in approaches to learning process and its results.

References

Acosta, F. M. A. (2000) "Hints for the Improvement of Quality Teaching in Introductory Engineering Statistics Courses", European Journal of Engineering Education, 25(3), pp. 263–280. https://doi.org/10.1080/030437900438694

Ahmad, F., Aziz, J. (2009) "Students' perception of the teachers' teaching of literature communicating and understanding through the eyes of the audience", European Journal of Social Sciences, 7(3), pp. 17–26.

Alauddin, M., Kifle, T. (2014) "Does the student evaluation of teaching instrument really measure instructors' teaching effectiveness? An econometric analysis of students' perceptions in economics courses", Economic Analysis and Policy, 44(2), pp. 156–168. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eap.2014.05.009

Anderson, V. (2009) "Research Methods in Human Resource Management", 2nd ed., Chartered Institute of Personnel Development, London, United Kingdom.

Braithwaite, R., Corr, P. J. (2016) "Hans Eysenck, education and the experimental approach: A meta-analysis of academic capabilities in university students", Personality and Individual Differences, 103, pp. 163–171. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2016.03.040

Cornish, S., Reed, R., Wilkinson, S. (2009) "Incorporating New Technology into the Delivery of Property Education", Pacific Rim Property Research Journal, 15(3), pp. 303–320. https://doi.org/10.1080/14445921.2009.11104283

Curtin University (n.d.) "Unit Survey", [online] Available at: http://evaluate.curtin.edu.au/info/unit_survey.cfm [Accessed: 11 December 2017]

Darling-Hammond, L. (2013) "Getting Teacher Evaluation Right: What Really Matters for Effectiveness and Improvement", 1st ed., Teachers College Press, New York, USA.

Dunne, L. (2012) "Do the students have a role in development of their college curriculum?", University of Winchester. [online] Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/post/Do_the_students_have_a_role_in_development_of_their_college_curriculum [Accessed: 13 December 2017]

Enarson, E., Fothergill, A., Peek, L. (2007) "Gender and Disaster: Foundations and Directions", In: Rodriguez, H., Quarantelli, E., Dynes, R. (eds.) Handbook of Disaster Research, Handbooks of Sociology and Social Research, 1st ed., Springer, New York, USA, pp. 130–146. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-32353-4_8

ESG (2015) "Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area", 1st ed., The Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area. Brussels, Belgium.

Gokcekus, O. (2000) "How do university students value economics courses? A hedonic approach", Applied Economics Letters, 7(8), pp. 493–496. https://doi.org/10.1080/13504850050033238

Hackathorn, J., Solomon, E. D., Tennial, R. E., Garczynski, A. M., Blankmeyer, K., Gebhardt, K., Anthony, J. N. (2010) "You get out what you put in: Student engagement affects assessment", presented at Poster presentation: Best Practices in Assessment Conference, Atlanta, GA, Oct. 25-27, 2010.

Hebák, P., Malá, I., Hustopecký, J. (2006) "Vícerozměrné statistické metody" (Multidimensional Statistical Methods), 3rd ed., Informatorium, Prague, Czech Republic. (in Czech)

Helmke, A. (2006) "Was wissen wir über guten Unterricht? Über die Notwendigkeit einer Rückbesinnung auf den Unterricht als dem "Kerngeschäft" der Schule" (What do we know about good education? About the necessity of a reconsideration of education as the core business of school), Pädagogik, 58(2), pp. 42–45. (in German)

Hendl, J. (2006) "Přehled statistických metod zpracování dat: analýza a metaanalýza dat" (Overview of Statistical Methods and Data Analysis), 1st ed., Portál, Prague, Czech Republic. (in Czech)

Kabeer, N. (2005) "Gender equality and women's empowerment: A critical analysis of the third millennium development goal 1", Gender & Development, 13(1), pp. 13–24. https://doi.org/10.1080/13552070512331332273

Kang, Z. (2008) "Advanced models for assessing perceived instructional quality of university faculty", PhD Dissertation, The University of Toledo.

Kifle, T., Alauddin, M. (2016) "What determines students' perceptions in course evaluation rating in higher education? An econometric exploration", Economic Analysis and Policy, 52, pp. 123–130. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eap.2016.09.004

Kim, A. K. J., Davies, J. (2014) "A teacher's perspective on student centred learning: Towards the development of best practice in an undergraduate tourism course", Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport & Tourism Education, 14, pp. 6–14. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhlste.2013.12.001

Kolitch, E., Dean, A. V. (1999) "Student ratings of instruction in the USA: Hidden assumptions and missing conceptions about 'good°s teaching", Studies in Higher Education, 24(1), pp. 27–42. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079912331380128

Lee, S. M., Olson, D. L. (2016) "Convergenomics: strategic innovation in the convergence era", 2nd ed., Routledge, London, UK.

Lingard, R. L., Ladwig, J., Mills, M. D., Hayes, D., Luke, A., Gore, J., Christie, P. H. (2001) "The Queensland School Reform Longitudinal Study: A Strategy for Shared Curriculum Leadership. Teachers' Manual", 1st ed., State of Queensland (Department of Education), Brisbane, Australia.

Lucas, U., Milford, P. (2003) "Key aspects of teaching and learning in accounting, business and management", In: Fry, H., Ketteridge, S., Marshall, S. (eds.) A Handbook for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education: Enhancing Academic Practice, 3rd ed., Routledge, London, United Kingdom, pp. 391–412. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203891414

Marsh, H. W. (1987) "Students' evaluations of University teaching: Research findings, methodological issues, and directions for future research", International Journal of Educational Research, 11(3), pp. 253–388. https://doi.org/10.1016/0883-0355(87)90001-2

Martinez-Canas, R., del Pozo-Rubio, R., Mondejar-Jimenez, J., Ruiz-Palomino, P. (2012) "Multidisciplinary Case Study On Higher Education: An Innovative Experience In The Business Management Degree", Contemporary Issues in Education Research, 5(5), pp. 349–354. https://doi.org/10.19030/cier.v5i5.7467

McDowell, L. (ed.) (1991) "Course evaluation: Using students' experiences of learning and teaching", 1st ed., Educational Development Service, Newcastle Polytechnic, Newcastle, UK.

Mehdizadeh, M. (1990) "Loglinear Models and Student Course Evaluations", The Journal of Economic Education, 21(1), pp. 7–21. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220485.1990.10844649

Neuhaus, B., Sandmann, A. (2006) "Sachlogische Strukturen im Biologieunterricht und ihr Zusammenhang zur Unterrichtsqualität und Lernleistung" (Logical structures in biology lessons and their relation to the quality of teaching and learning performance), 1st ed., Forschergruppe Naturwissenschaftlicher Unterricht, Essen, Germany. (in German)

Neyazi, N., Arab, M., Farzianpour, F., Majdabadi, M. M. (2016) "Evaluation of selected faculties at Tehran University of Medical Sciences using CIPP model in students and graduates point of view", Evaluation and Program Planning, 59, pp. 88–93. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2016.06.013

Nogová, M., Huttová, J. (2006) "Process of development and testing of textbook evaluation criteria in Slovakia", In: Bruillard, É., Aamotsbakken, B., Horsley, M. (eds.) Caught in the Web or Lost in the Textbook? IARTEM, Paris, France, pp. 333–340.

Ochave, J. A., Abulon, E. (2006) "Students' ratings of professors' competence: An application of the G-Theory", PNU Research Series, 88.

Palát, M. (2012) "Statistické zpracování dat" (Statistical Data Evaluation) [online] Available at: http://www.vuchs.cz/OPVpK/dokumenty/Palat-Statistika-2.pdf [Accessed: 3 March 2016] (in Czech)

Panasuk, R. M., Todd, J. (2005) "Effectiveness of Lesson Planning: Factor Analysis", Journal of Instructional Psychology, 32(3), pp. 215–232.

Peck, A. C., Ali, R. S., Levine, M. E., Matchock, R. L. (2006) "Introductory Psychology Topics and Student Performance: Where's the Challenge?", Teaching of Psychology, 33(3), pp. 167–170. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15328023top3303_2

Prenzel, M., Allolio-Näcke, L. (2006) "Untersuchungen zur Bildungsqualität von Schule: Abschlussbericht des DFG-Schwerpunktprogramms" (Research on educational quality of schools: Final report of the DFG priority program), 1st ed., Waxmann, Münster, Germany. (in German)

Qefalia, A., Totoni, A. (2012) "The Correlations Accreditation - Bologna Process - Continuous Quality Improvement Based in Professors' Perceptions in Albanian Public Universities", Annales Universitatis Apulensis Series Oeconomica, 14(1), pp. 260–268.

Remedios, R., Lieberman, D. A. (2008) "I liked your course because you taught me well: The influence of grades, workload, expectations and goals on students' evaluations of teaching", British Educational Research Journal, 34(1), pp. 91–115. https://doi.org/10.1080/01411920701492043

Sadker, M. P., Sadker, D. M. (2005) "Teachers, schools, and society", 7th ed., McGraw-Hill, Boston, USA.

Santos, M. E. (2007) "Quality of Education in Argentina: Determinants and Distribution using PISA 2000 test scores", Universidad Nacional del Sur-CONICET, [online] Available at: https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/9038/f0435a482dde130be4d64b325961b522557d.pdf [Accessed: 12 December 2017]

Shah, M., Sid Nair, C. (2012) "The changing nature of teaching and unit evaluations in Australian universities", Quality Assurance in Education, 20(3), pp. 274–288. https://doi.org/10.1108/09684881211240321

Stankevičienė, J., Tamošiūnas, T., Tubutienė, V., Valuckienė, J. (2007) "The Quality of Teaching as the Factor of Evaluation the Quality of Studies", Social Research / Socialiniai tyrimai, 2(10), pp. 147–154.

Stark-Wroblewski, K., Ahlering, R. F., Brill, F. M. (2007) "Toward a more comprehensive approach to evaluating teaching effectiveness: supplementing student evaluations of teaching with pre–post learning measures", Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 32(4), pp. 403–415. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930600898536

Starý, K., Chvál, M. (2009) "Kvalita a efektivita výuky: metodologické přístupy" (Quality and Efficiency of Education: Methodological Approaches), In: Janíková, M., Vlčková, K. (eds.) Výzkum výuky: tématické oblasti, výzkumné přístupy a metody, (Research on Education: Thematic Areas, Research Approaches and Methods) 1st ed., Paido, Brno, Czech Republic. (in Czech)

Stimac, H., Katic, S. (2015) "Quality Assurance in Higher Education", Interdisciplinary Management Research, 11, pp. 581–591.

Sulong, M. S. (2014) "Lecturers' Perception On Teaching Evaluation: Selection Of Research Instruments", The Online Journal of Quality in Higher Education, 1(2), pp. 36–44.

Tang, W., Bai, J., Liu, J., Wang, H., Chen, Q. (2012) "Students' evaluation indicators of the curriculum", International Journal of Medical Education, 3(2), pp. 103–106. https://doi.org/10.5116/ijme.4fcc.d2a6

Tigelaar, D. E. H., Dolmans, D. H. J. M., Wolfhagen, I. H. A. P., van der Vleuten, C. P. M. (2004) "The development and validation of a framework for teaching competencies in higher education", Higher education, 48(2), pp. 253–268. https://doi.org/10.1023/B:HIGH.0000034318.74275.e4

Appendix

The questionnaire used for student evaluation.

Student survey

Dear students,

We would like to ask you to fill this survey to report on aspects of teaching-learning performance. Your feedback will be used to upgrade lessons and quality of teachers.

Thank you very much for your answers and comments!

Subject: _____

Name of teacher: _____

Date: _____

Sex: ☐ man ☐ woman

Do you work in the area studied: ☐ yes ☐ no

Do you plan to work in the area studied: ☐ yes ☐ no ☐ not sure

1. Subject (please check one answer per row)

	Totally agree	Partly agree	Neutral	Partly disagree	Totally disagree
filled expectations					
is difficult					
is useful and valuable					
is connected with practice					
study materials are adequate					
requirements for exam are adequate					
is adequately placed in study plan					

2. Lesson (please check one answer per row)

	Totally agree	Partly agree	Neutral	Partly disagree	Totally disagree
lectures are adequate					
style of explanation is adequate					
explanation is understandable					
tempo suits me					
the manner of explanation suits me					

3. Teacher (please check one answer per row)

	Totally agree	Partly agree	Neutral	Partly disagree	Totally disagree
is an expert					
uses modern teaching techniques					
uses modern technologies					
motivates to learn					
is able to attract attention					
creates positive atmosphere					
adequately explains					
connects theory and practice					
focuses on practicing					
cares about students understanding					
gives opportunity to express opinion					

Your comments: