

## REVIEW OF THE MANAGEMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION ESTABLISHMENT, INNOVATION AND LEGALITY IN THE STATE OF ARUNACHAL PRADESH

**Mr Taba Tadhe Goyang<sup>1</sup>, Dr M M Singh<sup>2</sup>**

PhD Scholar, Department of Humanities & Management, NIT Arunachal Pradesh, Itanagar,  
Arunachal Pradesh, India-791112, tabatadheresearch@gmail.com<sup>1\*</sup>

Associate Professor, Department of Humanities & Management, NIT Arunachal Pradesh,  
Itanagar, Arunachal Pradesh, India-791112<sup>2</sup>

**\*Corresponding Author Email-id : tabatadheresearch@gmail.com**

### ABSTRACT

The purpose of this paper is to examine the quality dimensions associated with the higher education institutions their innovations and legality in the state of Arunachal Pradesh. Higher education institutions are allocating more resources in order to improve their stakeholders' impressions of them. The researcher handles a review of the literature on higher education setup, innovations, and legality in this article in order to identify the key knowledge gaps and develop the research that will value more examination in the future. The identified gaps highlight the need to improve knowledge about how perceptions of higher education (innovations and legality) are formed, identifying the critical factors that influence their formation and determining whether their degree of influence differs when considering the perspectives of different authors from different regions. Theoretical propositions about the discovered gaps have been presented.

**Keywords:** *Higher education, Innovations, Legality, Quality, Reputation*

### INTRODUCTION

Significant changes in the higher education (HE) environment have occurred in recent decades, resulting in increased rivalry among higher education institutions (HEIs). The growth in supply in terms of reach and diversity that occurred during the second half of the twentieth century was aided by the impacts of other phenomena such as globalisation and the reduction in governmental finance (Maringe & Gibbs, 2009). Globalization has favoured a growing internationalisation of higher education, significantly boosting the number of international students and university interest in attracting them (Altbach, Reisberg, & Rumbley, 2009). Reduced public funding has increased competition for resources, contributing to the privatisation of higher education and the expansion of private institutions. All of this has increased international competition and rivalry among HEIs to attract domestic and international students, resources, and prestigious teaching staff, leading many universities to perceive a need to build a solid favourable image and reputation among their stakeholders, these being differentiating factors that influence their affective responses and behaviour vis-à-vis the institution (Alves & Raposo, 2007).

As a result, institutions have begun to devote more resources to improving their image (Curtis, Abratt, & Minor, 2009). Image and reputation management is a critical topic that is not without

challenges. Indeed, there is still a lack of understanding of important factors of successfully and efficiently maintaining institution image.

## **METHODOLOGY**

This overview of the literature is based on important sources of relevant research on educational quality approaches, quality literacy, and the multidimensional idea of quality. To achieve the aforementioned goals, the scholarly literature on HE innovations and legality in the Indian state of Arunachal Pradesh was evaluated. The literature was examined using logical principles, with care given to include all information published in respectable scientific publications.

To deepen the study, forward and backward searches were performed. To review the published literature, the usual methods of content analysis were used. Section 1 provides an introduction; Section 2 describes the research method; Section 3 presents the scope of review; Section 4 presents the literature review findings on innovations and legality in education from various perspectives. Section 5 provides conclusion and suggestion for future work.

## **DEFINING THE SCOPE OF REVIEW**

Because of important developments in the external environment in terms of consumer awareness and expectation, technology, and competition, educational institutions have now recognised the necessity for quality focus. Higher education institutions' operational environments have changed as a result of increased demand for higher education, technological innovation, a growing knowledge economy, and pressure to meet the requirements and aspirations of its stakeholders (Blackmore, 2009). These developments have created significant problems, and educational institutions' long-term viability is dependent on their quality education delivery system.

Students are considered as passive consumers of teaching in the conventional education model, absorbing knowledge uncritically; this is being replaced by a new education model that fosters deep processing of information through active and autonomous learning. Quality is becoming increasingly crucial for higher education institutions (Gallifa and Batale, 2010). A narrative review is conducted in accordance with Bearman et al. (2012)'s classification of literature reviews. 'What are the primary topics investigated and the significant knowledge gaps in the published literature related HEI innovations and legality?' asks the review question.

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

Arpan, Raney, and Zivnuska (2003) defined it as "different views about a university that contribute to an overall appraisal of the university," a notion that Ressler and Abratt (2009) believe is congruent with the definition of reputation. According to these authors, image is concerned with how an organisation wishes to be perceived by its stakeholders and how it believes it is perceived by them (construed image), whereas reputation, according to Delgado-Márquez, Escudero-Torres, and Hurtado-Torres (2013), is concerned with the question "what do stakeholders actually think of an organisation?"

In terms of conceptualization, evaluation, and measurement, the idea of educational quality is

diverse and multidimensional, making it challenging to examine from a single perspective (Sahney et al., 2008). It is critical to understand and measure present levels of educational quality in order to enhance it. To solve quality concerns and increase performance, higher education institutions require more effective delivery methods. Higher education, on the other hand, is a professional organisation rather than a corporation, and its operations are more complicated (Vroeijenstijn, 2003). In education, the term of quality takes on many connotations depending on the circumstance (Abukari and Corner, 2010).

Sakthivel et al. (2005) presented a quality model for educational institutions based on TQM ideas, including the following quality dimensions:

- Top management commitment - Process improvement is preceded by leadership. It comprises the dedication and backing of senior management.
- Course delivery entails teacher quality, educational content, and course organisation. Infrastructure and learning facilities are included in campus facilities.
- Courtesy is characterised as a warm and kind approach toward pupils.
- Stakeholder input and improvement

By monitoring and analysing the primary outcomes, higher education institutions should design alternative assessment techniques to assess and sustain quality while also increasing responsibility. It necessitates identifying the anticipated outputs or consequences of a certain instructional/educational activity. Outcome-based evaluation has now become a widespread practise (Mollis and Marginson, 2002). The majority of accrediting agencies have agreed that outcome-based evaluation is the best technique for assessing institutional effectiveness. According to Clewes (2003), scholars see educational quality as result quality.

Assessment of institution quality based on entire student experience and satisfaction is an intriguing technique that may be effective in bridging the gap between traditional and academic viewpoints on how to enhance higher education with marketoriented attitudes (Gaell, 2000). (Wiers-Jensen et al., 2002).

Narang (2012) performed an examination of management students' perceptions of the quality of education in public institutions, which indicated five quality characteristics: physical facilities, academics, learning outcomes, responsiveness, and personality development:

- Physical facilities: This category includes elements such as modern technology training, well-equipped communication classrooms with effective classroom management, adequate facilities and infrastructure to provide service, computer laboratories with cutting-edge technology, comprehensive learning resources, residential and recreational facilities, and an aesthetic view of the facilities.
- Academics: It is about the academic timetable, the competence of topic instructors, the availability of faculty for student consultation, the supervision of students' work, faculty expertise, well-organized lectures, and faculty communication skills.

- Learning goals include practical orientation in education, adaptation to current techniques, course structure design based on employment requirements, problem-solving abilities, a feeling of social duty, campus training and placement chances, and extracurricular activities.
- Responsiveness: Elements of responsiveness include quick service from various support departments, courteousness, a helpful attitude, cleanliness, a systematic and methodical approach, openness of official process, and standards and rules.
- Personal development involves encouragement for sports and cultural activities, knowledge growth, and student appreciation.

According to Yusoff et al. (2015), the following dimensions influence business student satisfaction in higher education. Professional and friendly surroundings, Student evaluations and learning experiences, the classroom setting, goods are facilitated by lectures and tutorials. Textbooks and tuition charges Student assistance services, Procedures in business, Faculty relationships, Faculty who are knowledgeable and receptive Staff assistance and feedback

Sohail and Shaik (2004) investigated student perceptions of service quality in the context of business education and established six service quality dimensions: contact staff, physical evidence, reputation, responsiveness, access to facility, and curriculum. Tsinidou et al. (2010) also did empirical research to assess the elements that influence higher education quality. These 27 characteristics have been classified into seven groups: academic personnel, administrative services, library services, curriculum framework, location, infrastructure, and career opportunities. Ndirangu and Udoto (2011) clearly classified the quality of learning facilities and library services into three categories: quality of books and online resources, quality of support services, and quality of learning environment.

Education for Sustainable Development is becoming a prominent topic of conversation in Arunachal Pradesh, emphasising the critical role of education in attaining sustainable development. Al-Husseini and Elbeltagi (2018) advance this approach by identifying and describing two categories of innovation in the context of higher education. 1) Product innovation refers to the acceptance, development, and implementation of new products like as research projects, courses, new teaching tools and materials, and curricula. Development 2) Process innovation is described as the development and use of new technologies, excellent financial management, and continual skill enhancement. The desire to alter intellectually in order to improve innovation is referred to as innovative behaviour. It is necessary to invest not only in the human resources required for this task, but also in the infrastructure that will support the efforts. Furthermore, because of the high population in universities caused by oversupply and undersupply of higher education institution services, it is critical that these institutions focus on providing what is ready and friendly for the market (Blom et al., 2016). Web-based technologies on education are facilitating wide adoption of electronic learning (e-learning) on practises in education and training, and e-learning is becoming more and more popular. Simply supplying learners with a Web-based learning system does not ensure e-learning success. E-learning innovation has become a significant focus for education in Arunachal Pradesh.

The evaluation of quality of creative ideas has become an essential criterion for e-learning acceptability. Tseng et al. (2011) assessed the success of an e-learning system and classified quality attributes into five categories: effectiveness, learner attractiveness, instructor attitudes, service quality, and supportive issues.

Cheng (2012) investigated the influence of quality antecedents on e-learning adoption and classified them into twelve categories: Quality of course material, Course design, Support service quality, Support functionality, System interactivity, System responsiveness, Userinterface design, Instructor attitude toward e-learners Perceived utility, ease of use, enjoyment, and intention to use.

Roffeei, Yusop, and Kamarulzaman (2018) conducted research on the Determinants of Innovation Culture in Higher Education. Students based their research on the concept that numerous studies on innovation may be found in the management sphere, but seldom in higher education. Innovative teaching methods would challenge established learning and teaching methods, potentially determining the innovation culture among pupils. Future study may be required to discover acceptable communication mechanisms that aid in the development of an innovation culture.

Sevillano-Garca and Vázquez-Cano 2015) studied the acceptability and use of digital mobile devices among students. They argue that digital gadgets (tablets and smart phones) have the potential to improve university education.

However, debates over the use of digital mobile devices are intermittent and uneven. Furthermore, a lack of quality professional development, staff who are sceptical of the use of digital devices in course creation, and generally unsupportive cultures of mobile devices as a learning technology make it difficult to integrate them into the University learning process.

Yuan et al. (2018) performed a study based on the premise that research findings from current evaluation methods cannot be directly or effectively applied to the quality assessment of innovation and entrepreneurship education at colleges and universities. According to the findings of this study, while there has been research on the quality of innovation and entrepreneurship in universities and colleges, it is still in its development and focuses on the environment, educational, inputs, and outputs. They also discovered that universities do not pay enough attention to the creation of the curriculum system for innovation and entrepreneurship education, nor do they adequately boost teacher training/professional development in this subject.

## CONCLUSION

This paper benefits both practitioners and researchers in a variety of ways. The assessment of the academic literature on HE innovations and legality allowed for the identification of the key issues investigated and important discoveries in this field, as well as knowledge gaps that might be filled with additional research. A great variety of previous research made significant contributions to the aspects that form HE image and reputation, as well as their causes and repercussions. However, a greater knowledge of how they develop is needed.

While world-class schools, worldwide rankings, and certification have become prominent subjects

in the educational profession.

Responding to the study question "What are the key characteristics of innovation and legality in higher education?" The author has created a framework for considering educational innovation from several angles. This framework is based on an assessment of the literature, which includes important sources of journal and conference publications. The literature review provides qualitative insights on studies on educational institution establishment innovation. Finally, several of the research examined use specific educational systems such as e-learning.

Higher education has a significant role to play in assisting students to achieve success in the construction of higher education in an innovative manner. Higher education in Arunachal Pradesh can foster graduate creativity and, as a result, reduce unemployment among Arunachal Pradesh graduates.

## REFERENCES

- [1]. Abukari, A., & Corner, T. (2010). Delivering higher education to meet local needs in a developing context: the quality dilemmas? *Quality Assurance in Education*, 18(3), 191-208.
- [2]. Al-Husseini, S., & Elbeltagi, I. (2018). The role of knowledge sharing in enhancing innovation: A comparative study of public and private higher education institutions in Iraq. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 55(1), 23–33.
- [3]. Altbach, P. G., Reisberg, L., & Rumbley, L. E. (2009). *Trends in global higher education: Tracking an academic revolution*. Paris: UNESCO.
- [4]. Alves, H., & Raposo, M. (2007). Conceptual model of student satisfaction in higher education. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, 18(5), 571–588.
- [5]. Arpan, L. M., Raney, A. A., & Zivnuska, S. (2003). A cognitive approach to understanding university image. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, 8(2), 97–113.
- [6]. Bearman, M., Smith, C. D., Carbone, A., Slade, S., Baik, C., Hughes-Warrington, M., et al. (2012). Systematic review methodology in higher education. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 31(5), 625–640.
- [7]. Blackmore, J. (2009). Academic pedagogies, quality logics and performative universities: evaluating teaching and what students want. *Studies in Higher Education*, 34(8), 857-872.
- [8]. Blom, A., Raza, R., Kiamba, C., Bayusuf, H., & Adil, M. (2016). *Expanding Tertiary Education for Well-Paid Jobs: Competitiveness and Shared Prosperity in Kenya*. The World Bank
- [9]. Cheng, Y. (2012). Effects of quality antecedents on e-learning acceptance. *Internet Research*, 22(3), 361-390.
- [10]. Clewes, D. (2003). A student-centered conceptual model of service quality in higher education. *Quality in Higher Education*, 9(1), 69-85.
- [11]. Curtis, T., Abratt, R., & Minor, W. (2009). Corporate brand management in higher education: The case of ERAU. *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, 18(6), 404–413.

- [12]. Delgado-Márquez, B. L., Escudero-Torres, M. Á., & Hurtado-Torres, N. E. (2013). Being highly internationalised strengthens your reputation: An empirical investigation of top higher education institutions. *Higher Education*, 66(5), 619–633.
- [13]. Gaell, V. (2000). The expectations and experience of first-year students at City University of Hong Kong. *Quality in Higher Education*, 6(1), 77-89.
- [14]. Gallifa, J., & Batale, P. (2010). Student perceptions of service quality in a multi-campus higher education system in Spain. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 18(2), 156-170.
- [15]. Maringe, F., & Gibbs, P. (2009). *Marketing higher education: Theory and practice*. UK: McGraw-Hill.
- [16]. Mollis, M., & Marginson, S. (2002). The assessment of universities in Argentina and Australia: between autonomy and heteronomy. *Higher Education*, 43(3), 311-330.
- [17]. Narang, R. (2012). How do management students perceive the quality of education in public institutions? *Quality Assurance in Education*, 20(4), 357-371.
- [18]. Ndirangu, M., & Udoto, M. (2011). Quality of learning facilities and learning environment. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 19(3), 208-223.
- [19]. Ressler, J., & Abratt, R. (2009). Assessing the impact of university reputation on stakeholder intentions. *Journal of General Management*, 35(1), 35–45.
- [20]. Roffeei, S. H. M., Yusop, F. D., & Kamarulzaman, Y. (2018). Determinants of Innovation Culture amongst Higher Education Students. *The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology*, 17(1), 14.
- [21]. Sahney. S., Banwet, D., & Karunes, S. (2008). An integrated framework of indices for quality management in education: a faculty perspective. *The TQM Journal*, 20(5), 502-519.
- [22]. Sakthivel, P. B., Rajendran, G., & Raju, R. (2005). TQM implementation and students' satisfaction of academic performance. *The TQM Magazine*, 17(6), 573-589.
- [23]. Sevillano-García, M. a L., & Vázquez-Cano, E. (2015). The Impact of Digital Mobile Devices in Higher Education. *Educational Technology & Society*, 18(1), 106–118.
- [24]. Sohail, M. S., & Shaikh, N. M. (2004). Quest for excellence in business education: a study of student impressions of service quality. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 18(1), 58-65.
- [25]. Stefanovic, M., Matijevic, M., & Cvijekovic, V. (2009). Web-based laboratories for distance learning. *International Journal of Engineering Education*, 25(5), 1005-1012.
- [26]. Tseng, M., Lin, R., & Chen, H. (2011). Evaluating the effectiveness of e-learning system in uncertainty. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, 111(6), 869-889.
- [27]. Tsinidou, M., Gerogiannis, V., & Fitsilis, P. (2010). Evaluation of the factors that determine quality in higher education: an empirical study. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 18(3), 227-244.
- [28]. Vroeijenstijn, A. I. (2003). Towards a quality model for higher education. *Journal of Philippine Higher Education Quality Assurance*, 1(1), 78-94.
- [29]. Wiers-Jenssen, J., Stensaker, B., & Groggaard, J. (2002). Student satisfaction: towards an empirical deconstruction of the concept. *Quality in Higher Education*, 8(2), 183-195.

- [30]. Yuan, Y., Zhang, H., Wang, J., & Li, X. (2018). A Research on the Quality Evaluation of the Innovation and Entrepreneurship Education at Chinese Universities Based on Linguistic Operators. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 18(5).
- [31]. Yusoff, M., McLeay, F., & Woodruffe-Burton, H. (2015). Dimensions driving business student satisfaction in higher education. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 23(1), 86-104.