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Abstract The research paper makes an effort to assess the existing outlay of Indian B-schools (Business Schools imparting education on management discipline) in relation to performance appraisal system and quality Enhancement. Aim- The objectives of the study are to find dimensions of the performance appraisal system that is followed by the B-Schools in India and examine the various focus areas of how to enhance the quality of education. Methodology- The research methodology for the study is fixed to be exploratory design that determines the role of performance appraisal system in the enhancement of quality education and latter part confirms the outlay from the exploratory design. The study has involved 298 teaching faculty members of different grades to get their opinions towards the issues. The primary data were collected with the help of structured interview schedule based on which respondents were interviewed from the B-schools of five states involving Bihar, Jharkhand, West Bengal, Orissa and Madhya Pradesh in India. The data analysis is carried out with exploratory factor analysis using SPSS and confirmatory factor analysis in AMOS. Results- The study found that Dimension – I- Performance Centric and Supportive Management, Dimension – II- Performance Pay and Evolving Appraisal System and Dimension – III- Environment for Improving Performance. The focus areas of quality education are found to be Clarity of Outcome based Learning and Modern Techniques, Exposure to Real Environment and Consistent Evaluation and Assessing Individualistic Performance and Feedback which were evident from the stakeholders involved in the study.
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1. Introduction

The B-Schools have grown exponentially due to pressure of huge demand from population of the country. The yester years have seen only few reputed institutions operating in specified place with unique inculcation of knowledge for the students. The number of B-Schools (Business Schools) in the country is rapidly raising based on the disciplines and also growth of population. The B-Schools known by goodwill and specialties before this century have been commercialized and now people are looking for institutions that provide better placements. The better placement is a yardstick for the enhancement of quality of education but it alone doesn’t guarantee overall quality. The quality of education is determined by the in-takers ability to face the world with the skills that they have acquired from the education. The growth of B-Schools has paved way for large number of qualified
candidates without proper employment.

The B-Schools have the responsibility to make the students to get placed at appropriate place with unique skill-sets. The skill-sets of the students have to be developed on all dimensions from placement to personality development. The growth of demand for education has eroded the quality of education imparted by institutions. The B-Schools are becoming large in numbers throughout all corners of the country. This has led to chaos all over the country with large number of educated youths struggling to get employment for their education. The status of educated has become lower to the unskilled labor in the terms of earnings which has all been due to the exorbitant growth. The quality of education has also played a part leading to this unemployment scenario. The educated are even ready to work for lower level of job that doesn’t require the qualification the people possess. The skill level and job level of the employment has completely confounded by the supply from the educational institutions. Every academic year witness millions of educated youths coming out the educational system in search of job opportunities and their problems are left unaddressed with available job opportunities.

The development of B-Schools across the country has given new dimension to ensuring the quality of education imparted. The number of management educations in the country has attained different stature and growth. The growth reveals that the numbers that has gone to 3,000 B-Schools in the country. The growth in the numbers is certain which were below 156 recognised schools have got an explosion due to the increasing demand faced across the country. The increase has to be justified with the quality of education and appraisal of the system based on its working.

2. Review of Literature

The review of literature gives a brief about various studies that are conducted in the field of performance appraisal and quality of education all over India and abroad. The studies focus on the basics of quality education in management schools. The aim of the study was placed on the trends, issues and implications of management education in India (Sanjeev Kumar & M.K. Dash 2011). The foundations and pillars of management education is explained in majority of the studies which assess the quality of the education. The research paper revealed a conceptual model that ensures the quality education in the country (Vigna Oza & Swaty Parab 2012).

The accreditation process also has been discussed in the literature and its contribution to the excellence in the imparting of education. The paper observes that the accreditation process plays a vital role in the minds of the stakeholders (B.S. Sahay & Rajiv R. Thakur 2017). The research studies have largely focused on the quality of education given by the management institutions and enhancing the quality of education given. The conceptual measures are not tested which act as a gap in the literature. The studies have given their observations based on the previous studies and existing system which are completely theoretical (M.J. Manimala 2006). The empirical analysis part done in another study assess performance of B-schools in West Bengal have focused on appraisal alone and not the quality (J.K. Das & Satarupa Roy Chowdhury 2018). The studies also aimed at enhancing the quality using the responsibility that has to be taken by the management education system (Narendra Singh Bohra 2013). The studies also stress the need for maintaining the quality of education imparted in the top B-schools in the country with the influential analysis (G.Menon 2014) and there is also conceptual framework to examine the quality of management education on a theoretical part (P. Shahaida & et.al 2009). The impact of technology on the methods of imparting the management education is researched (Laha, J. 2009). The focus of another study is based on the marketing of the education by B-schools in India (Begde, P. 2018). The facts in the study are assessed with the empirical evidence that they are being marketed efficiently based on quality of education. The quality factors are being assessed by the studies (Nazneer, I 2015). The literature also serves the part of comparative analysis of the global institutions to that of Indian Institutions. The comparative analysis is based on the conceptual framework which warrants further studies on quantitative evidence for the justification (Thirulogasundaram, V. P.). The gap assessment of the quality of education is also researched based on the various service quality models that exist in the literature (Mishra, S). The examination of the delivery of service quality and their impact on the stakeholders as well as the management education plays a vital role for the growth of the B-schools (Agrawal, T & Shrama J 2014). The study on analytical approaches to understand the service quality is also found in the literature (Pandey, N & Shrama, M. 2011). The factor based analysis for the success of performance of the management education was categorized based on the viewpoint of faculty members (Karpagam, P. U., & Suganthi, L. 2016). The intellectual structure of the B-schools was widely researched based on the contribution of the management schools towards the growth of intellect of the students (I.C Scafuto et.al 2020). The latest studies are focusing on the adaptation of technology in teaching and their effectiveness in the output along with categorizing their approach towards the management education (S. Shaji (2019) & A. Sharma and P. Vijay 2019). The ranking of the B-schools is largely researched area in connection with the study. The methodology, criteria and other areas of ranking are playing vital role in the operation of B-schools across India. The working of the management education system is closely monitored by the research community to ensure the quality of education.
2.1. Research Gap

The review of literature has given a brief of studies that pertains only to the focus area of performance appraisal and quality of management education. The studies conducted have been done based on the conceptual framework and there needs to be empirical testing of the same. The majority of studies in the field of theoretical model create relationship between two aspects that are related to the study. The studies have to focus on the empirical testing of the models to give concrete evidence for the assessment of performance appraisal and quality of education imparted in management schools. The current study aims to assess the research gap explanatorily based on working of management schools in measuring the performance of faculty members and their direct impact on covariance among the variables of quality of education rendered by the B-schools in India.

3. Research Problem

The problems that underlie performance appraisal are numerous and few play a dominant role in the appraisal of faculty members. The faculty members’ performance has to be assessed from time to time to have significant psychological impact to keep them maintain the quality of education. The routines assessment has to be free from bias, grades and other structural positions to encourage the employees to find innovative ways for better delivering of content to the students. The B-Schools has to focus on the dimensions of the performance appraisal in the form of effectiveness performance linkages to various incentives, innovative methods in teaching, periodic awareness programme regarding evaluation techniques, measures of performance appraisal has to be disseminated to the faculty members to keep them informed and work on those areas. The problem lies with the management which keep the appraisal system under the veil which makes faculty members to be unaware of the various dimensions of appraisal system. This also directly impacts the quality of education imparted by the faculty members. The performance appraisal will give emphasis to the lacunae to the faculty members and helps them to focus on the various areas of correction to deliver quality of education. The measures and regulations adopted by the management schools have been lot fluctuating from time to time which keeps the faculty members at guess and makes them think of self-improvement rather quality education. The current study address the problems in relation with the above context which identifies the dimensions of performance appraisal which gives clarity of thought for the faculty members and make them move towards imparting quality of education along with performance appraisal.

3.1. Research Questions

a. What are the various dimensions of performance appraisal system followed in Indian B-Schools?

b. What are the focus areas of Enhancement of Quality Education in B-Schools?

4. Significance of the Study

The growing number of management schools in the country is making difficult for stakeholders to identify quality education for future generations. The number of management schools in the country is having significant raise and has been unnoticed by government which is abruptly visible in the widespread B-schools. The management schools have been spread across the country that facilitates the growth top class management employees in the country. The most important aspects of management education seem to be performance appraisal and quality of education imparted by each school. There are national and international level rankings that give various positions for management schools in the country based on their level of operation with performance appraisal of both faculty members in the organization and students are placements. The performance appraisal is the difference between the top schools and lower ranked schools in the country. The way of grooming the faculty members and students lies in the hands of management which devises strategies through performance appraisal. The management of schools is completely different from the other B-Schools in the country. The performance appraisal puts the base for goodwill of the institutions among the stakeholders. It also acts as the foundation for the assessment of education given by the concerned institutions. The quality of education is primarily dependent on the working of the performance appraisal system. The faculty members take the corrective measures from the performance appraisal where there is deviation. The study assumes significance on that note which aims to examine the impact of performance appraisal on quality of education which will safeguard the future of management education in the country.

5. Objectives of the Study

- To identify the various dimensions of performance appraisal system and categorise various focus areas of enhancement of quality education in B-schools.
- To construct exclusive model that explains the linkage that exists between the performance appraisal and its impact on enhancement of quality education.
- To suggest corrective measures that may help on improving the quality of education in B-schools.

6. Research Methodology

The research methodology helps to identify the solution for research problems of the study. The study is based on
the exploratory research design which aims to find out the dimensions of performance appraisal and focus area of quality education. The study is based on the primary data collected by personal interview method. The structured interview schedule was built using the likert five-point scale which is presented with the variables of performance appraisal and educational quality imparted by the management schools.

Sampling Design

The sample size of the study was fixed to be 298 based on the Z sample size calculator. The sample was selected based on the list of directors, professors, assistant professors and lectures of top management schools from the five states of Bihar, Jharkhand, Orissa, West Bengal and Madhya Pradesh. The proportionate sampling technique was used to ascertain the representation of the population which forms part of the sample.

| Cadres          | States | Total |
|-----------------|--------|-------|
|                 | Bihar  | Jharkhand | Orissa | West Bengal | M.P |
| Directors       | 4      | 4       | 4       | 4           | 4   | 20   |
| Professor       | 10     | 10      | 10      | 10          | 10  | 50   |
| Assistant       | 25     | 25      | 25      | 25          | 25  | 125  |
| Professor/Reader| 25     | 25      | 25      | 25          | 25  | 125  |
| Lecturer        | 25     | 25      | 25      | 25          | 25  | 125  |
| Total           | 320    |         |         |             |     | 320  |
| Rejection due to Non-Completion | 22        |         |         |             |     |      |
| Total Valid Sample | 298      |         |         |             |     |      |
| Rejection Rate  | 6.875% |         |         |             |     |      |

6.1. Statistical Tools Used

Exploratory Factor Analysis- Used for exploring the various factors that determine the performance appraisal system and quality of education

SEM modeling – Confirmatory Factor Analysis-Analyse the factors formed with the help of exploratory factor analysis and give the co-variances that exists among the factors of performance appraisal and education quality.

7. Limitations of the Study

The involvement of owners of B-schools could have given a dimension to the study and their viability of reaching them have opted to make them not included in the study.

The rejected schedules could cause minor representational issues in the sampling and have minor generalization error of 6 percent.

8. Analysis and Interpretations

The primary data collected with the help of structured interview schedule was used for analysis of data which brings quantitative evidence to act as support to the solution of research problems of the study.

8.1. Dimensions of Performance Appraisal System

The dimension of the performance appraisal system was determined by the focus of 29 variables that were selected to be part of performance appraisal system of the management schools. The core areas or dominant areas of performance appraisal have to be identified with the help of these variables which is done with the help of factor analysis. The results of the factor analysis are explained below.

| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy | 0.780 |
|-----------------------------------------------|-------|
| Barlett’s Test of Sphericity                   |       |
| Chi-Square                                    | 6,718.224 |
| df                                            | 406   |
| Sig.                                          | <0.001** |

(**- indicates significance @ 1 % level and *- indicates significance @ 5 % level)

The testing of the hypothesis of Barlett’s test reveals that the p-value is significant at oner percent level which confirms the validity and reliability of the factors formed. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin test reveals the value of 0.780 is significant and it explains the overall influence of 29 variables on the performance appraisal system in the B-schools. The tests have given the authentication of the factors formed to be reliable in generalization.
Table 3. Total Variance Explained

| Component | Initial Eigen Values | Extraction Sum of Squared Loadings | Rotation Sum of Squared Loadings |
|-----------|----------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
|           | Total                | % of Variance | Cumulative % | Total | % of Variance | Cumulative % | Total | % of Variance | Cumulative % |
| 1         | 10.2                 | 35.9          | 35.9         | 10.4  | 35.9          | 35.9         | 6.9   | 23.9          | 23.9         |
| 2         | 2.9                  | 9.9           | 45.8         | 2.9   | 9.9           | 45.8         | 5.7   | 19.7          | 43.7         |
| 3         | 2.1                  | 7.4           | 53.2         | 2.1   | 7.4           | 53.2         | 2.8   | 9.5           | 53.2         |
| 4         | 1.9                  | 6.5           | 59.7         |       |               |              |       |               |              |
| 5         | 1.6                  | 6.5           | 59.7         |       |               |              |       |               |              |
| 6         | 1.0                  | 3.6           | 68.8         |       |               |              |       |               |              |
| 7         | 1.0                  | 3.5           | 72.3         |       |               |              |       |               |              |
| 8         | 0.9                  | 3.4           | 75.8         |       |               |              |       |               |              |
| 9         | 0.8                  | 2.7           | 78.4         |       |               |              |       |               |              |
| 10        | 0.7                  | 2.5           | 80.9         |       |               |              |       |               |              |
| 11        | 0.7                  | 2.3           | 83.2         |       |               |              |       |               |              |
| 12        | 0.6                  | 2.1           | 85.3         |       |               |              |       |               |              |
| 13        | 0.6                  | 1.9           | 87.2         |       |               |              |       |               |              |
| 14        | 0.5                  | 1.7           | 88.9         |       |               |              |       |               |              |
| 15        | 0.4                  | 1.5           | 90.4         |       |               |              |       |               |              |
| 16        | 0.4                  | 1.4           | 91.8         |       |               |              |       |               |              |
| 17        | 0.4                  | 1.4           | 93.2         |       |               |              |       |               |              |
| 18        | 0.3                  | 1.1           | 94.3         |       |               |              |       |               |              |
| 19        | 0.3                  | 0.9           | 95.3         |       |               |              |       |               |              |
| 20        | 0.2                  | 0.8           | 96.1         |       |               |              |       |               |              |
| 21        | 0.2                  | 0.7           | 96.8         |       |               |              |       |               |              |
| 22        | 0.1                  | 0.7           | 97.5         |       |               |              |       |               |              |
| 23        | 0.1                  | 0.6           | 98.1         |       |               |              |       |               |              |
| 24        | 0.1                  | 0.5           | 98.6         |       |               |              |       |               |              |
| 25        | 0.1                  | 0.4           | 99.0         |       |               |              |       |               |              |
| 26        | 0.1                  | 0.3           | 99.3         |       |               |              |       |               |              |
| 27        | 0.1                  | 0.3           | 99.6         |       |               |              |       |               |              |
| 28        | 0.1                  | 0.2           | 99.8         |       |               |              |       |               |              |
| 29        | 0.1                  | 0.2           | 100          |       |               |              |       |               |              |

The variance table explains the number of factors formed with the help of eigen values. The eigen values that are greater than one is treated to be a factor and based on the seven factors were formed. The dominant factors in the factor analysis are the top three which has more than 53 percent of variance among the all variables. The table also explains the variance of each variables involved in the performance appraisal system and their contribution to the cumulative percent of variance on the total.
The rotated component matrix presents the total number of factors formed based on the instructions given and related variables responsible for the formation of the factor. The table makes it clear that there were three factors formed and number of related variables under each factor is higher. The following explains the name of factors formed which were kept based on the nature of involved variables. It also explains each variable that is relevant for the formation of respective factors which is termed to dimension of performance appraisal system.

Dimension – 1- Performance Centric and Supportive Management

The performance centric and supportive management dimension formed with the variables of Performance Pay will Encourage the Teachers to Exert more Initiative (0.809), Outcome of the Faculty Performance Appraisals are free from Bias (0.767), Linking of Evaluation of Students to Promotion (0.743), Factors affecting Performance (0.726), Periodic Awareness Programme for Improvement in Faculty Performance by Universities (0.724), Recognising and Motivating High Performance Teachers (0.708), Available Performance Evaluation system (0.700), Transparent Appraisal System (0.699), Performance Appraisal is taken sedately by Administration (0.618) and Monetary Benefits (0.618). These variables largely correlate on the measures that are performance centric. Therefore the dimension is termed to be
performance centric and supportive management.

Dimension – II- Performance Pay and Evolving Appraisal System

The factor is formed with the help of variables that are named to be Performance pay based on Students Performance Appraisal (0.776), Fairer Allocation of Pay (0.718), Performance based Payment will help in improving Efficiency of Teachers (0.713), Existing Appraisal System sufficient for Self-Appraisal (0.684), Existing System of Appraisal is Simple (0.665), Teachers Participation in Review Discussion based on encouragement (0.640) and Rating Feedback focus on Continual Improvement (0.605)

Dimension – III- Environment for Improving Performance

The third dimension of the performance appraisal system consists of variables such as Strengthens Relationship in Working Environment (0.742), Existing Appraisal System Helps in Improving Performance (0.629) and Performance based Payment Will help in Reorganising the priorities (0.603)

The factor analysis has clearly charted out the dimensions that are foundation for the performance appraisal system which constitutes of Dimension – I- Performance Centric and Supportive Management, Dimension – II- Performance Pay and Evolving Appraisal System and Dimension – III- Environment for Improving Performance.

8.2. Various Focus Areas of Enhancement of Quality Education

The various focus areas of enhancement of quality education is identified with the help of twenty variables given in a likert five-point scale to extract opinions from the faculty members. The collected data was analysed using exploratory factor analysis in SPSS for identifying the major focus areas. The results of the factor analysis are given below

| Table 5. KMO and Barlett’s Test |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Kaiser- Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy: 0.731 |
| Barlett’s Test of Sphericity:  |
| Chi-Square: 2990.00 |
| df: 190 |
| Sig.: <0.001** |

(**. indicates significance @ 1 % level and *- indicates significance @ 5 % level)

The KMO and Barlett’s test gives an overall reliability for the factors formed with the analysis which deals with the focus areas of the quality education in the management schools selected for the study.

Table 6. Total Variance Explained

| Component | Initial Eigen Values | Extraction Sum of Squared Loadings | Rotation Sum of Squared Loadings |
|-----------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
|           | Total | % of Variance | Cumulative % | Total | % of Variance | Cumulative % | Total | % of Variance | Cumulative % |
| 1         | 5.6   | 28.1         | 28.1         | 5.6   | 28.1         | 28.1         | 4.7   | 23.6         | 23.6         |
| 2         | 2.7   | 13.5         | 41.6         | 2.7   | 13.5         | 41.6         | 3.0   | 14.9         | 38.5         |
| 3         | 2.3   | 11.4         | 53.0         | 2.3   | 11.4         | 53.0         | 2.9   | 14.5         | 53.0         |
| 4         | 1.2   | 6.1          | 59.1         |       |              |              |       |              |              |
| 5         | 1.1   | 5.7          | 64.8         |       |              |              |       |              |              |
| 6         | 1.1   | 5.3          | 70.0         |       |              |              |       |              |              |
| 7         | 0.9   | 4.6          | 74.6         |       |              |              |       |              |              |
| 8         | 0.8   | 3.9          | 78.6         |       |              |              |       |              |              |
| 9         | 0.7   | 3.3          | 81.9         |       |              |              |       |              |              |
| 10        | 0.6   | 3.0          | 84.9         |       |              |              |       |              |              |
| 11        | 0.5   | 2.5          | 87.5         |       |              |              |       |              |              |
| 12        | 0.5   | 2.4          | 89.9         |       |              |              |       |              |              |
| 13        | 0.4   | 2.0          | 91.9         |       |              |              |       |              |              |
| 14        | 0.4   | 1.8          | 93.7         |       |              |              |       |              |              |
| 15        | 0.3   | 1.6          | 95.3         |       |              |              |       |              |              |
| 16        | 0.3   | 1.4          | 96.7         |       |              |              |       |              |              |
| 17        | 0.2   | 1.0          | 97.8         |       |              |              |       |              |              |
| 18        | 0.2   | 0.9          | 98.6         |       |              |              |       |              |              |
| 19        | 0.1   | 0.7          | 99.3         |       |              |              |       |              |              |
| 20        | 0.1   | 0.7          | 100          |       |              |              |       |              |              |
There are six factors formed with the help of factor analysis which is clear from the eigen values. The pre-requisite condition of extracting only major focus area has limited the number of focus areas to three. Therefore three focus areas formed were explained in the rotated component matrix.

The focus area of management to improve quality of education has to be based on the three areas identified by the factor analysis and those areas that helps in the quality of education are:

Focus Area – I- Clarity of Outcome based Learning and Modern Techniques

This focus area is formed with the help of seven variables which are One Page Visual Control (0.793), Introduction of Techniques (0.777), Improving the Relevance of syllabus (0.747), Research Work in Curriculum (0.736), Bridge gap between policies and Practices based on Practicality Lectures (0.679), Clear Assignments with Defined Learning Objectives (0.669) and Direct and Simplified Scientific Method (0.667).

Focus Area – II- Exposure to Real Environment and Consistent Evaluation

The focus area of real environment and consistent evaluation is constituted by the variables of Student Exchange Programme (0.774), Improving Thematic Consistency (0.755), More Focused Reading materials (0.713), Bi-Weekly and Weekly Assignments (0.658) and Universalisation of Curriculum (0.627).

Focus Area – III- Assessing Individualistic Performance and Feedback

The third focus area is formed with the variables of Group Projects and Activities (0.843), Per Capita Performance (0.810) and Alumina Feedback is Vital (0.749).

The focus area of quality education is systematically constituted by Clarity of Outcome based Learning and Modern Techniques, Exposure to Real Environment and Consistent Evaluation and Assessing Individualistic Performance and Feedback which is extracted from the opinions of stakeholders.

Structural Equation Modelling – Confirmatory Factor Analysis – Interaction between Performance Appraisal System and Focus Areas of Enhancement of Quality Education

The analysis of dimensions of performance appraisal system and focus areas of quality education has given the outlay of dominance areas that influences the above said conceptual background. The inter-relationship and co-variances that exist among the performance appraisal system and quality of education system can be assessed with the Structural Equation Modelling based on the Confirmatory Factor Analysis. The analysis serves dual purpose of confirming the factors formed in the factor
analysis as well give the inter-relationship that exists among the dimension and focus areas of management education. The coding is done for the variable to easily fit into pre-costumed structure of Analysis of Movement Structure Software. To improve the consistency and reliability of the model, variables that have values of 0.70 in the exploratory factor analysis were only involved.

**Dimension – I- Performance Centric and Supportive Management**

Performance Pay will Encourage the Teachers to Exert more Initiative – PCSM1

Outcome of the Faculty Performance Appraisal are free from Bias - PCSM2

Linking of Evaluation of Students to Promotion - PCSM3

Factors affecting Performance - PCSM4

Periodic Awareness Programme for Improvement in Faculty Performance by Universities - PCSM5

Recognising and Motivating High Performance Teachers - PCSM6

Available Performance Evaluation system - PCSM7

Transparent Appraisal System - PCSM8

**Dimension – II- Performance Pay and Evolving Appraisal System**

Performance pay based on Students Performance Appraisal - PPEAS1

Fairer Allocation of Pay - PPEAS2

Performance based Payment will help in improving Efficiency of Teachers - PPEAS3

**Dimension – III- Environment for Improving Performance**

Strengthens Relationship in Working Environment - EIP1

**Focus Area – I- Clarity of Outcome based Learning and Modern Techniques**

One Page Visual Control - COBL1

Introduction of Techniques - COBL2

Improving the Relevance of syllabus - COBL3

Research Work in Curriculum - COBL4

**Focus Area – II- Exposure to Real Environment and Consistent Evaluation**

Student Exchange Programme - ERE1

Improving Thematic Consistency - ERE2

More Focused Reading materials - ERE3

**Focus Area – III- Assessing Individualistic Performance and Feedback**

Group Projects and Activities - AIP1

Per Capita Performance - AIP2

Alumina Feedback is Vital - AIP3

There were 22 variables coded for the analysis in SEM model for confirmatory factor analysis. The variable summary table explains the number of dependent, independent, observed and unobserved variables involved in the model of confirmatory factor analysis. The number of variables based on the input is 35 which involves unobserved variables in the model.

| S.No | Variable Counts | Numbers |
|------|-----------------|---------|
| 1.   | Number of Variables in the Model | 35 |
| 2.   | Number of Observed Variables | 15 |
| 3.   | Number of Unobserved Variables | 20 |
| 4.   | Number of Exogenous Variables | 20 |
| 5.   | Number of Endogenous Variables | 15 |

The maximum likelihood estimates gives the cause and effect relationship among the factors and variables involved in the model. This involves combination of multiple regression effects which estimates the beta co-efficients among the model. The PCSM 3 variable has an impact of 80 percent on the factor of PCSM which is explained by the significant p-value. The regression weights explain the percentage of influence on variable on factors based on the beta estimates.

| Relationship | Estimate | S.E. | C.R. | P |
|--------------|----------|------|------|---|
| PCSM1-PCS            | 1.000    |       |      |   |
| PCSM3-PCS           | 0.883    | 0.060 | 14.682 | *** |
| PCSM4-PCS           | 0.805    | 0.060 | 13.376 | *** |
| PCSM6-PCS           | 0.622    | 0.049 | 12.688 | *** |
| PCSM7-PCS           | 0.921    | 0.063 | 14.580 | *** |
| PPEAS1-PPEAS         | 1.000    |       |      |   |
| PPEAS2-PPEAS        | 0.760    | 0.067 | 11.284 | *** |
| EIP1-PPEAS          | 0.415    | 0.073 | 5.669 | *** |
| COBL1-COBL          | 1.000    |       |      |   |
| COBL2-COBL          | 0.530    | 0.124 | 12.327 | *** |
| COBL4-COBL          | 0.917    | 0.080 | 11.460 | *** |
| ERE1-ERE            | 1.000    |       |      |   |
| ERE2-ERE            | 0.578    | 0.095 | 6.097 | *** |
| AIP2-AIP            | 1.000    |       |      |   |
| AIP3-AIP            | 0.785    | 0.139 | 5.649 | *** |

Table 8. Variable Summary

Table 9. Maximum Likelihood Estimates- Regression Weights

Table 10. Co-Variances among Performance Appraisal System and Quality of Education
The co-variances table explains the relationship that exists between the dimensions of performance appraisal system and focus areas of quality of education in the management system in the country.

The parameters table explains the model fit of the confirmatory factor analysis. The introduced variables were reduced and finally there were only fifteen observed variables in the model and seven observed variables were removed from the model. The model is significant and can be used for assessing the relationship between the performance appraisal system and its impact on the quality of management education in India. This model gives an impact assessment of performance appraisal system in management education.

**Structural Equation Modelling – Confirmatory Factor Analysis – Interaction Between Performance Appraisal System and Focus Areas of Enhancement of Quality Education**
The convergent and discriminant validity of the model is significant with all the values of CR are above 0.70 which reveals the composite reliability of the factors. The other measures of the convergent and discriminant validity are significant which reveals the overall validity of the model.

Table 12a. Convergent and Discriminant Validity

|      | CR     | AVE   | MSV   | MaxR(H) |
|------|--------|-------|-------|---------|
| PCSM | 0.862  | 0.610 | 0.571 | 0.863   |
| PPAS | 0.773  | 0.631 | 0.278 | 0.788   |
| COBL | 0.802  | 0.576 | 0.571 | 0.817   |
| ERE  | 0.712  | 0.586 | 0.278 | 0.631   |
| AIP  | 0.766  | 0.621 | 0.134 | 0.779   |

(CR- Composite Reliability, AVE- Average Variance Validity, Maximum Shared Variance)

The discussion reveals the need for adopting better teaching techniques. The new environment that is surrounding the faculty members has to be provided with scope for improving their skill sets with the changing teaching environment which keeps them the best of their ability to meet the performance standards. The feedback of the stakeholders has to be assessed with careful precision which states crucial information on existing quality of education. The quality of the education largely hinges on adoption towards technological changes and implementing an environment that is conducive for developing the skills of faculty members as well as students.

Table 12b. Convergent and Discriminant Validity

|      | PCSM | PPEAS | COBL | ERE | AIP |
|------|------|-------|------|-----|-----|
| PCSM | 0.781|       |      |     |     |
| PPAS | 0.428| 0.794 |      |     |     |
| COBL | 0.756| 0.263 | 0.759|     |     |
| ERE  | 0.286| 0.527 | 0.099| 0.679|     |
| AIP  | 0.334| 0.044 | 0.237| 0.366| 0.788|

9. Discussions and Recommendations

The study has shed light on the facts of various areas of performance appraisal system which can help to improve the working of B-schools in the country with much more focus in implementing quality education to the students who are pursuing the management studies. The stakeholders of the B-schools have to turn their attention towards promoting the teachers based on the performances and they have to be more supportive to the teaching fraternity to improve their performances. The working of the B-schools has to adopt for pay oriented to their performances and add modern technologies in evaluating the teaching techniques. The technological aspects of the involved faculty members will help to keep them updated with the changing teaching environment which keeps them at par with international standards. The faculty members have to be provided with scope for improving their skill sets with further educational opportunities, develop their technological skills and enabling them with facilities that help to adopting to better teaching techniques. The environment that is surrounding the faculty members has to be supportive which give them the motivation to work in the best of their ability to meet the performance standards. The above contextual discussions reveal the need for revamping the management policies of B-schools will improve the performance of the faculty members and increase their morale towards the job.

The focus area of quality education largely hinges on outcome-based learning along with the adaptation towards the modern techniques of the teaching practiced in the developed countries. The evaluation process of the management education has to be carried out at regular intervals to find out the lacunae in the system practicing out-dated practices and education system has to expose the students to the external environment at the places of employability which helps the students prepare for demands. This serves the dual goal of providing quality education and also enabling to feel the perquisites that are required for getting an employment at the time of education. The feedback of the stakeholders has to be assessed with careful precision which states crucial information on existing quality of education. The quality of the education largely hinges on adoption towards technological changes and implementing an environment that is conducive for developing the skills of faculty members as well as students.

10. Implications of Research

- This study adds a new dimension to the existing literature in the form of identifying the dimensions of performance evaluation system from the view point of faculty members. This will help resolve the major issues of the conflicts between the management and faculty members leading to harmonious relationship resulting in better quality of education.
- The focus area will help the management to enhance the quality of education imparted with the help of revamping the unnecessary issues that are sketched out by the study. The highlight of the study is the inter-linkage model which assesses the relationship among the performance appraisal and quality of education imparted.
- The proper understanding of the model will help the management in bringing out most effective teaching from the faculty members along with cutting down the costs on revamped focus areas.

11. Scope for Further Research

- The studies can aim to make focused approach on
Exploratory Approach on Revamping the Performance Appraisal System and Enhancement of Quality Education in B-Schools

performance appraisal system of reputed B-schools which will help to understand the dimensions of successful business schools.

- The comparative examination of focus areas of quality education among the public B-schools and private B-schools will be a useful addition to literature.
- The empirical study can aim at assessing the linkage between the management training imparted and their direct impact with the placement opportunities of pass outs.
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