

FACTORS OF QUALITY ASSESSMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION AND ITS IMPACT ON BUSINESS STUDENTS' DEVELOPMENT AND INTEREST IN UNIVERSITY EDUCATION

Lucie Depoo¹✉
Hana Urbancová¹
Helena Smolová¹

¹University of Economics and Management, Czech Republic

✉ lucie.depoo@vsem.cz

ABSTRACT

Human resource development at universities is one of the crucial aspects that forms an innovative and growing society. Therefore, it is crucial to continuously manage and develop factors of quality evaluation process in all universities to develop also human resources for labor market. Therefore, the aim of this paper is to identify factors of education quality which impact students' interest in attending lessons and courses. Data were collected by students' questionnaire at case business university. Two dimensional statistical methods were used to evaluate the results. Totally, 1,607 students were questioned. The outputs show link towards students' interest in lessons and courses based on the quality of human resource development. There were four factors determining quality of human development found: practically oriented lessons; open and discussing teachers; subject extent and difficulty; and newcomers. The limitations of this study may be seen in the collection of data based on self-reports of students only and may therefore be subject to common-method bias. To minimize this limitation, the survey was assuring students that there was no right or wrong answer and their contribution towards higher quality was highly appreciated.

KEYWORDS

Assurance, education, quality evaluation, interest in university studies, teaching quality, university

HOW TO CITE

Depoo L., Urbancová H., Smolová H. (2022) 'Factors of quality assessment in higher education and its impact on business students' development and interest in university education', *Journal on Efficiency and Responsibility in Education and Science*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 63-71. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7160/eriesj.2022.150201>

Article history

Received

December 26, 2020

Received in revised form

October 27, 2021

Accepted

January 25, 2022

Available on-line

June 30, 2022

Highlights

- The result of this study is that the quality of education process does affect students' interest in lessons and courses.
- Students attend mostly subjects which were evaluated as the best and were connected to practice.
- Significant dependencies formed factors affecting students' interest in lessons and courses and attendance in courses.
- The article formulates the impact of the quality of lectures, teachers and lessons on students' interest and attendance.

INTRODUCTION

The importance of improving the quality level of higher education is stressed by Deveci (2015), Leonard (2021), Šnýdrová et al. (2021) and many others, which state that assessment of lectures and seminars by students is nowadays crucial for the management of universities. Surveys by He and Hutson (2016) state that the first function which is most important in the teaching process at this time is students' initiation and the initiation of academic staff to interconnect seminars and lectures with practice. Heffernan et al. (2016)

stress that students also want to succeed in competition in the labor market, and similarly, universities want to perform best in the global competition in high education.

The increased need for social accountability requires leaders of universities to constantly improve quality and promote transparency in order to safeguard public interest and confidence in quality assurance standards and factors (Garwe, 2014). Standards provide a theoretical framework ensuring academic quality as a complex, mission-driven relationship of systems and processes effectively linked to provide constant

improvement and positive results. Measurement, analysis, and knowledge management form a composite of results from student outcomes, customer outcomes, and faculty outcomes. Results serve as information for continuous improvement to advance academic quality (ACBSP, 2020). Similarly, IACBE (2019) determines academic quality with adequate quantitative and qualitative levels of human, financial, and physical resources as important factors. The overall quality of education also depends on the education processes used by the academic business unit to convert those resources to outcomes. These include processes such as teaching and other faculty interactions with students, faculty development and scholarly activities, curricular innovation and strategic planning.

The urgency of a quality-ensuring process in higher education is increasing with the number of persons involved in the process of education at universities with regards to demographic trends, and, especially now facing the COVID-19 closures, crisis and necessity to move to online or distance form together with the same or higher level of quality. Therefore, it is clear that universities are currently located in a highly competitive environment. In order to attract the interest of customers (university students, university graduates, employers, contracting research and development projects, representatives of practice), these services have to be of an outstanding quality. Therefore, the presented article deals with the evaluation of education quality provided by students and teachers at the selected university and its impact on students' interest in lessons and courses. The main research questions examined may be expressed as follows:

- Is it possible to define factors affecting student interest in lessons and courses?
- Does student interest in lessons and courses relate with the quality of teaching-learning process?

Theoretical Background

The assessment of the quality of educational services is according to Mazais, Lapiņa and Liepiņa (2012) essential for providing feedback on the effectiveness of educational plans and for motivation to make changes in individual processes of universities and colleges. One of the topical issues that significantly complicates maintaining a certain consistency in the quality of educational services is the rapidly changing environment. Educational institutions should respond adequately to those changes by adapting their teaching-learning processes and their activities as a whole. Therefore, universities should put in place mechanisms to enable their study programs to be evaluated on an ongoing basis (Dufour, 2015).

There are several aspects to be observed in the assessment of the content of the study. For example, Simic, Stimac and Barilovic (2019) used in their study aspects such as organization of the study, the quality of the study program, usefulness of the information obtained, study program as a source of personal development, and quality of services provided by both academic and non-academic staff, competencies of staff and faculty, accessibility of sources etc.

A somewhat different view of the subject is seen by Hossain, Hossain and Chowdhury (2018), who in their research conducted at a private college found that perceived value is mostly affected

by factors such as curriculum quality, teaching competence, service facility and also service delivery. But students' perceived satisfaction depends mostly on service facility.

Evaluation of quality assurance by students was also conducted by Ashraf, Ibrahim and Joarder (2009). Authors were measuring numerous of areas. In the area of faculty credentials, the following factors were found as crucial: (1) faculty's academic background, (2) teaching experience, (3) updated course content, (4) communication skills and least but not last (5) fair treatments to students. Moreover, the authors focused on areas such as classroom facilities, academic calendar, campus facility, research facility, cost of education and quality education in general.

Overall, the teacher is usually perceived as one of the key factors in student quality assessment, as he or she is the one who has the greatest impact on educational performance and the likelihood of successful completion of studies (Wachtel, 1998; Tram and Williamson, 2009; Flegl and Andrade Rosas, 2019).

The results of the research by Feldman (1996) showed that the most important concrete aspects are the preparation of the teacher and his/her organization of the course, the clarity and comprehensibility of the interpretation and course delivery, fulfillment of the course objectives and the outcome or impact of the course. Zeithaml (1988) argues that student satisfaction and motivation to graduate increase when the educational institution provides an environment that generally facilitates and simplifies learning.

The students' attitude towards school is, however, formed by the number of factors. These include, for example, peer opinions (Ryan, 2001), teachers' motivation influencing indirectly students' performance (Sammons et al., 2011), and academic responsibility (Merchant et al., 2012). One should also mention the implementation of practical examples and situations into the classroom, which increases students' professional competences (Colombo and Gómez Pradas, 2014), and is therefore often required and highly valued by them. Similarly, it is the case of interactivity of tuition and engagement of students in their education processes (Gámiz Sánchez, Montes Soldado and Pérez López, 2014; Kramarski and Michalsky, 2009). The key factor is also the efforts made by students themselves, which are often influenced by the above-mentioned classmates, attitudes of teachers and teaching materials or the learning environment (Hopland and Nyhus, 2016), which—due to the current considerable development of technologies—also includes e-learning, which provides students (and hence also teachers) with some flexibility in time and place (Alepis and Virvou, 2014).

Bryk and Schneider (2002) consider interpersonal relationships among students, teachers other school staff and, where applicable, other interest groups an essential part of the social school environment. One of the conditions for the existence of this link is, of course, also the participation of students in teaching. Studies investigating the relationship between students' interest and their study results have therefore been carried out for many years (see, for example, Devadoss and Foltz, 1996; Dolton, Marcenaro and Navarro, 2003, etc.). The conclusions of these research studies are unambiguous — attendance of lectures, seminars, etc., clearly provides the students with a number of

benefits (Stanca, 2006). Lindstadt (2005), McCluskey, Bynum and Patchin (2004) agree that the critical factors deciding on students' interest/attendance/non-attendance of classes include, in addition to those individual, family, or societal ones, factors related to the educational institution itself—its structure, rules, environment or employees. The former influences can hardly be affected by universities, and therefore emphasis must be put on the latter factor and monitoring student satisfaction in this area. Research shows that students with a different general performance focus are coming to all levels of education (Trajkovik et al., 2018; Voronchenko, Vinogradova and Zhrebtsova, 2014; Savva et al., 2017). In a college or university chosen by a student, each individual encounter new tasks, experiences and is exposed to regular evaluation of success in subjects. Students are always exposed to a comparison to others by teachers and fellow students. According to the study results, behavior, approach to study, everyone gets into the role of a successful, average or unsuccessful student at a college or university and this affects his/her inner motivation. However, according to research, students will not graduate successfully without motivation. It is necessary to realize that in order to achieve optimal performance of students, their level of internal motivation have to reach appropriate level corresponding to their competencies and individual personal characteristics (Zhdanko, 2018; Trajkovik et al., 2018). The motivation and results of the study are also related to the promotion of one's own self and how the student perceives himself/herself and how he/she feels in performance situations during lectures, exercises and other study duties. Based on the research results of Limanond et al. (2011); Khabibullina, Fakhrutdinova and Diuanova (2017); Ji, Tian and Dong (2015) state that the experience of success is an emotional experience, which is the essence of the motivation for further study performance and its effectiveness is weakened by the fear of failure.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The article brings results of primary survey of students in selected case business university. The data were collected to evaluate today's trend in education, teaching and obtaining skills and knowledge by students in a Czech private university. A quantitative primary survey was used, investigating assessment of education, teaching and its quality by students. The number of students who participated at the survey was 1,607. All students were affiliated with one business case university from Czech Republic. Students were both at undergraduate and graduate level (bachelor and master students in business programs). Characteristics of students is shown in Sample subchapter. The data were collected from students who successfully passed their subject. All types of subjects were used for the analysis – compulsory and voluntary.

The questionnaires were collected using computer-assisted paper interviewing - CAPI and computer-assisted web interviewing – CAWI. Data were sorted, evaluated, and tested by statistical software SPSS. The data matrix was evaluated based on identification questions and secondly, statistical tests based on prepositions mentioned below were used. The structure and content of the survey was designed based on quality standards in higher education. The standards were used from European

area (ESG, ENQA, EQAR) and American standards (AACSB, ACBSP). Also, quality-oriented questionnaire from other universities were used, i.e., eVALUate (Curtin University, 2015) and surveys presented by Remedios and Lieberman (2008), Ahmad and Aziz (2009), Tang et al. (2012), and Kifle and Alauddin (2016), and quality approaches mentioned in the literature review.

Sample

Students were questioned when they attended classes and evaluated each course they had attended. The structure of respondents was as follows:

- Gender of students: 629 (39.4%) male, 971 (60.6%) female; 7 answers were missing;
- Professional employment of students: 762 (47.9%) work in business, 829 (52.1%) do not work yet;
- Future orientation of students: 864 (55.4%) plan to work in business, 240 (15.4%) do not plan to work in business and the remaining ones do not have clear plan yet;
- Study grades: 951 (59.2%) undergraduate students and 656 (40.8%) graduate students;
- Forms of study: 743 (46.2%) full-time and 864 (53.8%) part-time;
- In total, the university had 1,864 students at the case study period.

Survey design

The survey was designed to complexly evaluate quality of teaching-learning process in studied university. There were the following areas investigated: teachers, subjects and lessons. This paper focuses on impact of quality on the attendance of students at lessons and courses. Multiple questions measured each area (lesson, subject and teacher). Students' expressions of offered statements in the survey were designed to offer several possible answers. The questions and answers were designed either as multiple-choice, or scales. Five-point sales were used, where 1 means strongly agree and 5 means strongly disagree. It was possible to use median value (value 3) to express neither agreement/satisfaction with a statement, nor disagreement/dissatisfaction. Use of scale could measure not only satisfaction or agreement, but also its level. Questionnaires contained scales, and also had open questions, where each student could fill his/her comments, recommendations or suggestions on the studied areas (courses, subjects and teachers). All comments collected from open questions were evaluated based on content analysis and constructive and reasonable comments were used to implementation in the education process improvements. For example, improvements in teachers' skills, innovation in subjects, etc. Areas that were redesigned based on collected suggestions were firstly discussed with stakeholders (academic council, university management, employers, and quality assurance institutions) before they were implemented to ensure applicability and usefulness of the new direction. The higher number of collected responses and suggestions make available to orient on the most often mentioned suggestions and to filter out inconsistent notes. On the other hand, ale comments were evaluated and interpreted

separately, as those may contain important message or inspiration for further development.

As the design of the survey follows the international quality standards and main suggestions in the current theory, the results should be highly comparable and create the base for quality assurance and accreditation processes. The main limit of these questionnaires is that the statements are mostly limited by statements by the used scales. This may be compensated by open questions and the possibility to write any comment by students. Students were filling survey per each course they attended. Each student completed the survey at the last lesson of each course he/she was enrolled at. The survey was firstly used on several students as a pilot survey. Passed to all concerns and questions of students who were selected as pilot testers were addressed the survey was finalized. The pilot survey also made sure that the questions are understandable and measure the core of the research question.

To test the reliability of the survey Cronbach Alpha was used. The alpha coefficient for questionnaire items was 0.783. The result is considered satisfactory, showing that questions have relatively high internal consistency as coefficient of 0.70 or higher is considered “acceptable” in social sciences.

Operationalization of results

The collected data were processed and analyzed firstly by descriptive statistics. Furthermore, two-dimensional statistics using Pearson’s correlation coefficient was used. The results of the tests are presented at the significance level 0.05. All statistical tests and procedures were conducted based on

Hebák, Malá and Hustopecký (2006). Interpretation of results followed the suggestions of the same author. The overall entry conditions of data to perform an analysis were evaluated based on procedures described by Hendl (2006). The main hypothesis in this paper is H0: The quality of education does not affect students’ attendance at lessons.

RESULTS

Hypotheses related to the variables of each analyzed area (subject, lesson and teacher) were tested. Table 1 shows statistically significant results. The variables were chosen for the analysis, which may affect students’ final perception of education quality level. One may see that students perceive subjects as beneficial when the subjects are oriented or focused on practice and practicing. The analysis revealed a very strong relation between these variables. Students appreciate practically oriented education and the possibility to obtain information and case studies from practice. Highly evaluated are also guests and teachers who also work in company management and give lectures and seminars. Students also evaluated best the possibility to be part of the education process using presentation of their project work or other possibilities to discuss with the teacher and other students and colleagues. The revealed correlation is very strong ($p < 0.001$).

Another important result of the correlation analysis is proven relation between filled students’ expectations when the subject is adequately positioned in the study plan and program. Students expect the subjects to be in accordance with their study plans and their programs. This is important for their satisfaction with the education process.

Hypothesis	Correlation coefficient
Subject is beneficial and valuable - relates to practice	0.895
Subject is adequately placed in study program - filled expectations	0.527
Explanation is understandable – the pace is suitable	0.712
Explanation is understandable - style of explanation is adequate	0.799
Lectures are adequate - style of explanation is adequate	0.547
Teacher cares about students understanding - opportunity to express opinion	0.564
Teacher cares about students understanding - adequately explains	0.669
Teacher pays attention on practicing - able to attract	0.555
Teacher pays attention on practicing - motivates to learn	0.620
Teacher pays attention on practicing - uses modern teaching techniques	0.016

Table 1: Hypotheses related to subjects (Source: Own processing)

Students perceive lessons as understandable when the pace and style of explanation are adequate. Those two aspects have a significant impact on students’ understanding. Based on the results presented above, it is necessary that teacher focuses on the student and study group to reach study goals and learning outcomes. This is also confirmed with the third significant correlation, which shows relation between appropriate explanation and perception of lectures as adequate.

The analysis revealed mediumstrong correlations between carefulness of teacher of students understanding and opportunity to express opinion and with teachers’ explanation. The focus is placed on the student-oriented education. Teachers receive the best evaluation when they care about students’ understanding and discuss with the

students. Students appreciate being part of the discussion and being able to express and discuss their opinions to unite their thoughts.

Similarly, important is also orientation on practice. The analysis revealed three strong correlations in this area. Focus on practicing correlates with the teacher’s ability to attract students and ability to motivate them. Practicing statistically significantly attracts students and motivates them in the education process. Teachers should place emphasis on this. On the other hand, the usage of modern teaching techniques is not dependent on practicing; the analysis shows there is no relation. The attention of students can be attracted by any teaching techniques, but students are attracted by discussion and practical application of studied theory.

The results of correlation analyses show the main focus areas of students. They are oriented on practice and practical orientation and explanation of studied subjects. The practically oriented education attracts and motivates students. Additionally, the students prefer student-centred education and obtains the best results in student attention and participation in the education process. These focus areas mainly impact students' perception of education quality.

Impact of the quality evaluation level on students' interest in lessons and courses

The results showing student interest in lessons and courses are summarized in Table 2. The subjects evaluated by students were

divided into the main study areas. Table 2 shows the number of subjects evaluated, the number of respondent students per each area and in total, and average values of student interest in lessons and courses and their average evaluation values of subjects, lessons and teachers in the studied area. On average, each subject was attended by 23 students, but standard deviation is almost 25 students. That means that in some cases only one or two students attended the course.

Most of the students studied the area of Human Resources evaluate the courses as the best. On the other hand, the lowest number of students attended Marketing courses. There are fewer courses, yet the average number of students per class is the lowest.

	students	subjects		attendance	subject	lesson	teacher
Economics	244	7	AVG	34.86	2.17	1.73	1.84
			STD	46.30	0.28	0.48	0.26
Business Economics	275	13	AVG	21.15	1.73	1.35	1.50
			STD	20.07	0.15	0.19	0.24
Human Resources	452	17	AVG	26.59	1.74	1.27	1.42
			STD	30.28	0.22	0.18	0.27
Management	336	15	AVG	22.27	1.72	1.46	1.60
			STD	19.95	0.22	0.33	0.30
Marketing	145	12	AVG	12.08	1.78	1.44	1.59
			STD	7.61	0.26	0.33	0.27
Total	1607	72	AVG	22.61	1.81	1.44	1.57
			STD	24.86	0.29	0.33	0.30

Table 2: Evaluation and interest of study areas (Source: Own processing)

The largest number of students per lesson is in the area of Economics. Students have to pass the main microeconomics and macroeconomic courses in the first year of their study and this impacts on high interest in lessons and courses. One may notice that students evaluate the subjects as the worst. But the lessons and teachers in the area of Economics are not evaluated as bad as the subjects. That indicates the way of teaching these unpopular subjects is acceptable by students, although they do not like the contents of these subjects.

The area of Business Economics shows average values in all studied criteria. Based on the results of focus group, Business Economics subjects are, compare to Economics, perceived as valuable and closely connected with practice. That is why students evaluate most of the studied areas positively, except for Economics. They perceive it as only theoretical.

The area of Management obtained quite satisfactory results. Students evaluated the subjects, teachers and lessons in this area as one of the best ones. It is also the second most studied area, with a total of 334 respondents – attending students – and 15 subjects per research period.

The impact of interest in lessons and courses on the evaluation of education process was also studied and tested by correlation analysis. In total, a subject and its content do not relate to student interest in lessons and courses. Correlations were found in areas of Human Resources, Marketing and medium-strong in Management. In these areas, students are attracted by the content of subjects and the content of the tuition has impact on their interest in lessons and courses.

On the other hand, lessons are almost always connected to

attendance. The strongest correlation can be seen in Economics. Lessons in this area are very important for students, as they perceive the subjects quite demanding, and they need to attend the lessons and seminars. Also, other study areas correlate (usually medium correlations) with the lectures. An exception is the area of Business Economics, where no relations were found. Lessons in this area were evaluated as almost the best ones and practical.

Similar results are found in the relation between impacts of teacher on student's interest in lessons and courses (Table 3). One may state that the evaluation of teachers has impact on students' interest in lessons and courses mainly in Economics. On the other hand, again, interest in lessons and courses in Business Economics does not depend on teacher.

In summary, lessons (practically oriented with practicing – factor 1) and teachers (open and discussing – factor 2) have impact on student interest in lessons and courses in the education process (lectures, seminars). The results also show that the more difficult the studied subject is, the more students attend (subject difficulty and broad content – factor 3; where students need help with understanding and self-study is not sufficient). Students appreciate the help of the teacher and the possibility to discuss, ask questions and communicate about problematic areas.

However, student interest in lessons and courses also depends on the year of study (beginners – factor 4). Students in the first year of their studies attend more often the studied subjects and lessons than in the following years. It is natural and is also caused by study success and promotion to higher grade. This

consequence is not valid in the area of Human Resources. These subjects are often attended by students in higher grades

too. Students appreciated the focus on practice, and they are also interested in the content of those subjects.

Interest & Attendance	Subject	Lesson	Teacher
Total	0.193	0.376	0.272
Economics	0.156	0.902	0.648
Business Economics	0.172	0.082	0.051
Human Resources	0.270	0.397	0.354
Management	0.406	0.481	0.436
Marketing	0.247	0.535	0.270

Table 3: Impact of evaluation level on students’ interest in lessons and courses (Source: Own processing)

DISCUSSION

The results of Noroozi, Biemans and Mulder (2016) show that the students’ feedback is important for the quality of the teaching process, and Jones et al. (2016) add that the teachers’ feedback from the students (after seminars, lectures, from case studies etc.) is important too. In view of the achieved results, it is possible to agree with the research by Deveci (2015) that assessment of lectures and seminars by students is nowadays crucial for the management of universities. The results showed that practical orientation of the subjects is important for all students, as confirmed by the researchers He and Hutson (2016). Darwin (2016) says that student feedback-based evaluation plays a significant social role in framing perceptions of the quality of teaching in higher education. Yet its emergence is a relatively recent topic nowadays, having only been in widespread application since the mid-1980s. Feedback must always be provided straight after the lesson in the semester or trimester. Feedback is crucial tool for developing student understanding and awareness of learning outcomes and students’ autonomy. Darwin (2016) adds that the early manifestations of student feedback-based evaluation came with newly emerging academic development units with a motive to enhance the quality of local teaching and to afford student retention, however, new motives for assailing student feedback evolved with the rapid growth in student numbers, the introduction of student fees and heightened levels of inter-institutional competition for students. According to Darwin (2016) we can state that the complex social origins of these competing motives for student feedback-based evaluation in higher education are very important for high education quality nowadays.

If we connect theory and practice and we state with Aminbeidokhti, Jamshidi and Mohammadi Hoseini (2014) that as the total quality management (TQM) is important in practice, it is equally important in higher education. TQM positively and meaningfully affects the organizational learning primarily and that organizational learning has a significant effect on the organizational innovation. All the universities are it the market with learning they should create a competitive advantage. This topic is discussed in high education field too. It is possible to agree with the conclusions of Garwe (2014) and Ferro and D’Elia (2020) that universities now operate in a global and competitive environment and that quality education is the result of the quality of processes implementation and the quality of implementation processes is largely determined by the quality of management. Chui et al. (2016) and Khosravi et

al. (2013) report that higher education institutions are currently facing significant changes due to the massive increase in the number and diversity of educational service providers, which deepens the competitive environment in the education market. Klein et al. (2019) adds that the organizational context and commitment, including structures, policies, processes, and leadership, influence individual trust decisions and the students’ acceptance of analytical learning tools in the educational process at the university. Furthermore, their results have shown the importance of a comprehensive, inclusive, and well-communicated plan for implementing learning analytics tools for maximal student acceptance.

As ENQA (2005) defines, higher education institutions are responsible for the quality of their education and programs. This study investigates more from analysis of the basic standards; it is possible to compare it to the actual students’ interests (which also means focus on stakeholders and current market demands). The students’ interest in specific areas, subjects and courses affect their interest in lessons and courses and attendance. The paper found four factors affecting students’ interest in lessons and courses: practically oriented lessons; open and discussing teachers; subject extent and difficulty; and newcomers. Development of a culture of quality and demonstration of its accountability are the most important areas (ENQA, 2005; AACSB, 2016) and it is also linked to first three factors affecting students’ attendance in courses and lessons. Higher education institutions should be able to demonstrate their quality, diversity and innovation by focusing on areas described in the presented study.

Guilbault (2018), in the context of the increasing competitive environment in higher education, emphasizes the need for higher education institutions to develop and implement marketing concepts, basically in the same manner as in other sectors. Taking into account the results achieved in this article, it is possible to summarize that only universities that focus on identifying their students’ preferences and needs and trying to understand what students expect from the university itself have the chance to succeed in today’s highly competitive environment and maintain a high standard of quality, which is confirmed by researchers Fajčiková and Urbancová (2019). The practical contribution of the article is the presentation of the results of a case study from a selected private business university. Although this is a case study, the results are obtained from a relatively large sample of respondents, and therefore this study can help to steer similarly oriented private universities. The evaluation process described above takes

place regularly at the presented private school and is in line with quality standards of ACBSP (2020).

The theoretical contribution of this article is the systemic formulation of the impact of quality of lectures, teachers and lessons on students' interest and attendance. The quality, therefore, influences the course of study and study results, completing education and later also employability in the labour market.

The practical contribution of this article is the application of the theoretical knowledge within the students at the surveyed university while research found the impact of quality on attendance and results of lessons and courses. The main reason and shift can be seen in the fact that the market with higher education is highly competitive because all schools are trying their best to attract as many students and candidates as possible. On the other hand, the current demography in most European countries is declining, which leads to even higher concurrence. Furthermore, all surveyed students evaluate focus on quality positively.

A limitation of the study is a narrow focus on one private university. However, the results are presented as a case study, and these findings may help other universities when implementing the process of evaluating quality of teaching, which is an increasingly discussed area. Furthermore, this article provides an insight into the importance of quality assurance, its monitoring and implementation of continuous improvement based on feedback loop.

Promising avenues for further research are areas measuring the impact of student preferences in quality on performance and learning outcomes together with quality of graduates and fulfillment of curricula. Additionally, revealed factors may be surveyed separately to validate their impact on the quality of

teaching-learning process in higher educational institutions and further differences in approaches to learning process, development of human resources and its results.

CONCLUSIONS

It is possible to summarize that the quality of education process does affect students' interest in lessons and courses. The main hypothesis in this paper *H0: The quality of education does not affect students' attendance at lessons* was rejected. Students attended mostly subjects which were evaluated as the best and were connected to practice. Research outcomes confirmed statistically significant dependencies which formed the main factors affecting students' interest in lessons and courses and attendance in courses. These factors are practically oriented lessons; open and discussing teachers; subject extent and difficulty, and newcomers. The first factor is lesson focus on practicing and practical case studies, connected with practical application. The second factor is a teacher's personality, openness and attention to students, discussions and opinion sharing have impact on student interest in lessons and courses. Third factor shows that the more difficult the studied subject is, the more the students attend. Fourth factor is the year of study. Students in the first year of their studies attend more often the studied subjects and lessons than in the following years. Contrary, the fourth factor is not applicable for practically oriented subjects. Such subjects are often attended by students in higher grades, where students appreciate focus on practice, and they are interested in the content of those subjects.

Based on the continuous research on the case university we may generalize the results, as they prove to replicate the same results for past years. The need for practical education is rising and students reply to this trend.

REFERENCES

- AACSB (2016) *Eligibility Procedures and Accreditation Standards for Business Accreditation*, Aacsb.edu, [Online], Available: <http://www.aacsb.edu/~media/AACSB/Docs/Accreditation/Standards/2013-business-standards-update.ashx> [9 Jul 2020].
- ACBSP (2020) *ACBSP standards and criteria for demonstrating excellence in baccalaureate/graduate degree business programs*, [Online], Available: https://cdn.ymaws.com/www.acbsp.org/resource/collection/EB5F486D-441E-4156-9991-00D6C3A44ED1/ACBSP_Unified_Standards_and_Criteria_for_Accreditation.pdf [9 Jul 2020].
- Ahmad, F. and 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*, Vol. 7, No. 3, pp. 17–26.
- Alepis, E. and Virvou, M. (2014) *Object-oriented user interfaces for personalized mobile learning*, Berlin: Springer.
- Aminbeidokhti, A., Jamshidi, L. and Mohammadi Hoseini, A. (2014) 'The effect of the total quality management on organizational innovation in higher education mediated by organizational learning', *Studies in Higher Education*, Vol. 41, No. 7, pp. 1153–1166. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2014.966667>
- Ashraf, M. A., Ibrahim, Y. and Joarder, M. (2009) 'Quality education management at private universities in Bangladesh: An exploratory study', *Journal of Educators & Education/Jurnal Pendidik dan Pendidikan*, Vol. 24, pp. 17–32.
- Bryk, A. and Schneider, B. (2002) *Trust in schools*, New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Chui, T. B., bin Ahmad, M. S., binti Ahmad Bassim, F. and binti Ahmad Zaimi, N. (2016) 'Evaluation of service quality of private higher education using service improvement matrix', *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Vol. 224, pp. 132–140. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.05.417>
- Colombo, A. and Gómez Pradas, M. (2014) 'SIMULACRE: A proposal for practical training in e learning environments', *RUSC. Universities and Knowledge Society Journal*, Vol. 11, No. 3, pp. 4. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7238/rusc.v11i3.1781>
- Curtin University (2015) *Unit Survey*, [Online], Available: http://evaluate.curtin.edu.au/info/unit_survey.cfm [9 Jul 2020].
- Darwin, S. (2016) 'The emergence of contesting motives for student feedback-based evaluation in Australian higher education', *Higher Education Research & Development*, Vol. 35, No. 3, pp. 419–432. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2015.1107879>
- Devadoss, S. and Foltz, J. (1996) 'Evaluation of Factors Influencing Student Class Attendance and Performance', *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, Vol. 78, No. 3, pp. 499–507. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1243268>
- Deveci, H. (2015) 'Value Education Through Distance Learning: Opinions of Students who already Completed Value Education', *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education*, Vol. 16, No. 1, pp. 112–126. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17718/tojde.89079>

- Dolton, P., Marcenaro, O. D. and Navarro, L. (2003) 'The effective use of student time: a stochastic frontier production function case study', *Economics of Education Review*, Vol. 22, No. 6, pp. 547–560. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0272-7757\(03\)00027-X](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0272-7757(03)00027-X)
- Dufour, C. (2015) 'The Tools and Methods Used for the Continuous Evaluation of Education Programmes', *Documentation et Bibliothèques*, Vol. 61, No. 2-3, pp. 90–103. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1032814ar>
- ENQA (2005) *Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area*, drafted by ENQA in cooperation with EUA, EURASHE and ESIB and endorsed by the ministers of education of the Bologna signatory states at the Bergen meeting of May 2005, [Online], Available: http://www.enqa.eu/wp-content/uploads/2013/06/ESG_3edition-2.pdf [9 Jul 2020].
- Fajčíková A. and Urbancová H. (2019) 'Can higher education institutions adapt to students' preferences? A case study at the Czech state university', *International Journal for Quality Research*, Vol. 13, No. 3, pp. 721–734. <http://dx.doi.org/10.24874/IJQR13.03-14>
- Feldman, K. A. (1996) 'Identifying exemplary teaching: Using data from course and teacher evaluations', *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, Vol. 65, pp. 41–50. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/tl.37219966509>
- Ferro, G. and D'Elia, V. (2020) 'Higher Education Efficiency Frontier Analysis: A Review of Variables to Consider', *Journal on Efficiency and Responsibility in Education and Science*, Vol. 13, No. 3, pp. 140–153. <https://doi.org/10.7160/eriesj.2020.130304>
- Flegl, M. and Andrade Rosas, L. A. (2019) 'Do professor's age and gender matter or do students give higher value to professors' experience?', *Quality Assurance in Education*, Vol. 27, No. 4, pp. 511–532. <https://doi.org/10.1108/QAE-12-2018-0127>
- Gámiz Sánchez, V., Montes Soldado, R. and Pérez López, M. C. (2014) 'Self-assessment via a blended-learning strategy to improve performance in an accounting subject', *RUSC. Universities and Knowledge Society Journal*, Vol. 11, No. 2, pp. 43. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7238/rusc.v11i2.2055>
- Garwe, E. C. (2014) 'Quality assurance in higher education in Zimbabwe', *Research in Higher Education Journal*, Vol. 23, No. 1, pp. 1–10.
- Guilbault, M. (2018) 'Students as customers in higher education: The (controversial) debate needs to end', *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, Vol. 40, pp. 295–298. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2017.03.006>
- He, Y. and Hutson, B. (2016) 'Appreciative Assessment in Academic Advising', *The Review of Higher Education*, Vol. 39, No. 2, pp. 213–240. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2016.0003>
- Hebák, P., Malá, I. and Hustopecký, J. (2006) *Vícerozměrné statistické metody*. [Multidimensional Statistical Methods], Prague: Informatorium.
- Heffernan, N. T., Ostrow, K. S., Kelly, K., Selent, D., Van Inwegen, E. G, Xiong, X. and Williams, J. J. (2016) 'The Future of Adaptive Learning: Does the Crowd Hold the Key?', *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*, Vol. 26, No. 2, pp. 615–644. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s40593-016-0094-z>
- Hendl, J. (2006) *Přehled statistických metod zpracování dat: analýza a metaanalýza dat* [Overview of Statistical Methods and Data Analysis: Analysis and metaanalysis of data], Prague: Portál.
- Hopland, A. O. and Nyhus, O. H. (2016) 'Learning environment and student effort', *International Journal of Educational Management*, Vol. 30, No. 2, pp. 271–286. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-05-2014-0070>
- Hossain, M. A., Hossain, M. M. and Chowdhury, T. H. (2018) 'Understanding the success of private universities: An empirical investigation from graduates' perspective', *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, Vol. 35, No. 1, pp. 145–162. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/IJQRM-02-2015-0031>
- IACBE (2019) *Accreditation process manual*, [Online], Available: <https://iacbe.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/Accred-Process-Manual-Approved-April-2019-1.pdf> [25 Jan 2022].
- Ji, H., Tian, H., Dong, T. (2015) 'The Effect of the Formative Evaluation on the Medical Student's Career Emotion, Practicing Skills and Social Adaptation', *International Conference on Social Science, Management and Economics (SSME 2015)*, Lancaster, pp. 313–317.
- Jones, L., Allen, B., Dunn, P. and Brooker, L. (2016) 'Demystifying the rubric: a five-step pedagogy to improve student understanding and utilisation of marking criteria', *Higher Education Research & Development*, Vol. 36, No. 1, pp. 1–14. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0294360.2016.1177000>
- Khosravi, A. A., Poushaneh, K., Roozegar, A. and Sohrabifard, N. (2013) 'Determination of Factors Affecting Student Satisfaction of Islamic Azad University', *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Vol. 84, pp. 579–583. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.06.607>
- Khabibullina, D. A., Fakhrutdinova, R.A. and Diuanova, R.K. (2017) 'The logic of realization of the student's personality formation model through the means of the subjects of the language cycle', *Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods*, Vol. 7, No. 9, pp. 535–539.
- Kifle, T., and Alauddin, M. (2016) 'What Determines Students' Perceptions in Course Evaluation Rating in Higher Education? An Econometric Exploration', *Economic Analysis and Policy*, Vol. 52, pp. 123–130. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.eap.2016.09.004>
- Klein, C., Lester, J., Rangwala, H. and Johri, A. (2019) 'Learning Analytics Tools in Higher Education: Adoption at the Intersection of Institutional Commitment and Individual Action', *Review of Higher Education*, Vol. 42, No. 2, pp. 565–593. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2019.0007>
- Kramarski, B. and Michalsky, T. (2009) 'Investigating preservice teachers' professional growth in self-regulated learning environments', *Journal of Educational Psychology*, Vol. 101, No. 1, pp. 161–175. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0013101>
- Leonnard (2021) 'Antecedents of private university students' satisfaction: The effects of traditional and electronic service quality', *Journal on Efficiency and Responsibility in Education and Science*, Vol. 14, No. 3, pp. 154–166. <https://doi.org/10.7160/eriesj.2021.140303>
- Limanond, T., Jomnonkwao, S., Watthanaklang, D., Ratanavaraha, V. and Sirdhara, S. (2011) 'How vehicle ownership affect time utilization on study, leisure, social activities, and academic performance of university students? A case study of engineering freshmen in a rural university in Thailand', *Transport Policy*, Vol. 18, No. 5, pp. 719 – 726. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tranpol.2011.01.007>
- Lindstadt, M. A. (2005) 'Employing mediation to approach truants', *Family Court Review*, Vol. 43, No. 2, pp. 303–322. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-1617.2005.00031.x>
- Mazais, J., Lapiņa, I. and Liepiņa, R. (2012) 'Process Management for Quality Assurance: Case of Universities', *Proceedings of the 8th European Conference on Management, Leadership and Governance*, Pafos, pp. 8–9.
- McCluskey, C. P., Bynum, T. S. and Patchin, J. W. (2004) 'Reducing Chronic Absenteeism: an Assessment of an Early Truancy Initiative', *Crime & Delinquency*, Vol. 50, No. 2, pp. 214–234. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0011128703258942>

- Merchant, B., Årlestig, H., Garza, E., Johansson, O., Murakami-Ramalho, E. and Törnsen, M. (2012) 'Successful school leadership in Sweden and the US. Contexts of social responsibility and individualism', *International Journal of Educational Management*, Vol. 26, No. 5, pp. 428–441. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09513541211240228>
- Noroozi, O., Biemans, H. and Mulder, M. (2016) 'Relations between scripted online peer feedback processes and quality of written argumentative essay', *The Internet and Higher Education*, Vol. 31, pp. 20–31. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2016.05.002>
- Remedios, R., and 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*, Vol. 34, No. 1, pp. 91–115. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01411920701492043>
- Ryan, A. M. (2001) 'The peer group as a context for the development of young adolescent motivation and achievement', *Child Development*, Vol. 72, No. 4, pp. 1135–1150. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.00338>
- Savva, L. I., Saigushev, N. Y., Vedeneeva, O.A., Pavlova, L. V. and Rabin, E. I. (2017) 'Student's time-awareness formation: Self-organized personality as promoting factor for mental health', *European Proceedings of Social and Behavioural Sciences*, Vol. 26, pp. 858–864. <https://dx.doi.org/10.15405/epsbs.2017.07.02.111>
- Sammons, P., Gu, Q., Day, C. and Ko, J. (2011) 'Exploring the impact of school leadership on pupil outcomes. Results from a study of academically improved and effective schools in England', *International Journal of Educational Management*, Vol. 25, No. 1, pp. 83–101. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09513541111100134>
- Simic, M. L., Stimac, H. and Barilovic, Z. (2019) 'Education service quality—Private vs. public business education in Croatia', *Economic and Social Development: Book of Proceedings*, pp. 75–84.
- Stanca, L. (2006) 'The Effects of Attendance on Academic Performance: Panel Data Evidence for Introductory Microeconomics', *The Journal of Economic Education*, Vol. 37, No. 3, pp. 251–266. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3200/JECE.37.3.251-266>
- Šnýdrová, M., Depoo, L. and Šnýdrová, I. (2021) 'How University Graduation Shapes Attitudes Toward Employment in Different Generations Operating at Job Market?', *Journal on Efficiency and Responsibility in Education and Science*, Vol. 14, No. 3, pp. 143–153. <https://doi.org/10.7160/eriesj.2021.140302>
- Tang, W., Bai, J., Liu, J., Wang, H. and Chen, Q. (2012) 'Students' evaluation indicators of the curriculum', *International Journal of Medical Education*, Vol. 3, No. 2, pp. 103–106. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5116/ijme.4fcc.d2a6>
- Trajkovic, V., Malinovski, T., Vasileva-Stojanovska, T. and Vasileva, M. (2018) 'Traditional games in elementary school: Relationships of student's personality traits, motivation and experience with learning outcomes', *Plos One*, Vol. 13, No. 8, e0202172. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0202172>
- Tram, D. N. and Williamson, J. (2009) 'Evaluation of teaching: hidden assumptions about conception of teaching', *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference of Teaching and Learning*, Rotterdam.
- Voronchenko, T., Vinogradova, N. and Zhrebtsova, E. (2014) 'Teacher's Professional Health as a Factor of the Development of a Student's Harmonic Personality', *5th World Conference on Psychology, Counseling and Guidance*, Dubrovnik, pp. 235–238. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.12.364>
- Wachtel, H. K. (1998) 'Student evaluation of college teaching effectiveness: A brief review', *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, Vol. 23, No. 2, pp. 191–212. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0260293980230207>
- Zeithaml, V. A. (1988) 'Consumer perceptions of price, quality, and value: a means-end model and synthesis of evidence', *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 52, No. 3, pp. 2–22. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1251446>
- Zhdanko, T. A. (2018) 'Competitiveness of student's personality – Modern imperative', *European Proceedings of Social and Behavioural Sciences*, Vol. 50, pp. 1254–1261. <https://dx.doi.org/10.15405/epsbs.2018.12.154>