

1
2 **UNIVERSITY TEACHERS' PERCEPTION OF QUALITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION IN**
3 **ETHIOPIA:**
4 **A CASE STUDY OF DIRE DAWA UNIVERSITY**

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Line spacing: single, Don't adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Don't adjust space between Asian text and numbers

5
6 **Abstract.** This article empirically assesses perception of quality in higher education in Ethiopia.
7 The data was collected from one higher educational institution where the staffs are graduates of ~~from~~ 31
8 different universities in Ethiopia. The information used in this study was obtained through administration
9 of questionnaires random sampling technique from the University staff not clear. The total number of
10 staff that participated in the research was 365. To this effect, descriptive survey method was employed not
11 clear. The data-information used in this study were-was obtained through questionnaires, focus group
12 discussions and observation. Purposive sampling technique was employed to select 365 teachers (302
13 male and 63 female) and seventeen classrooms were observed and twelve group discussions carried out
14 with participants of educational roadmap groups. Data were analyzed by both descriptive statistics of
15 percentages and inferential statistics of ~~through percentage~~, t-test, correlation and one way ANOVA.
16 Results indicated that teachers' valued input indicators of quality of education more than process and
17 output indicators. Output indicators received the lowest rating. Teachers' practice also indicated that they
18 apply process indicators in a reasonable manner. The results of relationship between practices of teaching
19 learning processes revealed that, as teachers' perception toward quality teaching learning process
20 increases their practice of elements of constructivism also increases. Finally, recommendations were
21 forwarded on the basis of the findings that teachers view the quality of education in terms of
22 impute. Recast this to distill out the meaning

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

23 Key words: teachers, perception, quality of education, input, output, processes

Formatted: Highlight

24
25 **Introduction**

26 Research -was done by different scholars show that students are one of the most important
27 customers of the universities. Every customers need quality of products. As students are
28 customers, their perception towards the university is to get quality education. So university
29 should ensure the quality of higher education. Numerous studies should have been conducted on
30 quality higher education and students' perception. For the last two decades the Ethiopian
31 government gives attention for enriching education across the region. However, this has
32 produced negative impacts on the quality of education. In the second growth and transformation
33 plan, the government gives high attention on the quality of education. This to be practical, he has
34 prepared a road map for the whole education system of the country. Higher education is one of
35 the area which gives priority on the road map.

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

36 Higher education, the important parts of education system is provided through public and private
37 universities. The significant purposes of higher education are to generate the new knowledge,
38 explore research works on different social and development issues, anticipate the needs of the
39 economy and prepare highly skilled workers. In these contexts, higher education should be
40 standard, welfare and sustainable development oriented. Not clear and no in-text citation The

Formatted: Highlight

41 | present paper intends to analyze the teachers' perception of the toward quality of education in
42 | higher education.

43 | What is Quality Education? As defined by [1], "A renewal of higher education is essential for the
44 | whole society to be able to face up to the challenges of the twenty-first century and to ensure its
45 | intellectual independence. Quality higher education needs to be restored to create and advance
46 | knowledge, educate and train responsible, enlightened citizens and qualified specialists, without
47 | whom no nation can progress economically, socially, culturally or politically." How does this
48 | translate in terms of quality of graduates produced by Ethiopian universities? As a developing
49 | nation, the country needs graduates who can think independently and are willing to strive and
50 | experiment with new ways to bring the country out of the vicious circle of poverty. This is one of
51 | the main questions raised in the road map. The road map cannot change the whole problem in
52 | one night but through change of teachers' perception towards belongingness and devote work;
53 | we can bring the quality of education at the ground.

54 | **General Objective**

55 | The main purpose of this study **will be able** to investigate Dire-Dawa University Teachers'
56 | perception **and practice toward** quality of education. **by testing the hypothesis of significant**
57 | **relationship between the variables. The general objective was to correlate quality of education**
58 | **and perceptions of teachers in terms of inputs, processes and output.**

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

59 | In order to attain this objective the following questions **will** be raised:

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

60 | 1. **How do Dire Dawa University teachers perceive quality of education, quality of teaching**
61 | **and quality of learning and the roles of teachers and students in the processes?**

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

62 | 2. **What is the relationship between teachers' perceptions of teaching learning process and**
63 | **their practice?**

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

64 | 3. **What are the major challenges affecting the quality of education, quality teaching and**
65 | **Learning?**

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

66 | 4. **What is the actual practice of teachers in terms of quality education, quality of teaching**
67 | **and quality of learning?**

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

68 | 5. **Do teachers perceive any changes in their thinking about university teaching and about**
69 | **actual teaching activities as the consequence of courses. The objectives should be stated**
70 | **smartly.**

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

71 | **Literature Review**

72 | In this work **we** adopted a more comprehensive approach to classify the quality attributes of
73 | education. The framework **we** proposed is derived from [2] viewpoint of quality in higher

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

74 education. It is called the Input–Process–Output (IPO) framework in which ‘Input’ refers to the
75 entry requirements, ‘Process’ refers to the teaching and learning processes, and ‘Output’ refers to
76 the employability and academic standings (as shown in Figure 1–below). This classification of
77 quality in higher education attributes is in accordance with the organization’s operation system
78 of converting the inputs (e.g. raw materials) into outputs (e.g. products and services) via the
79 process (e.g. procedures) [3].

80 **Quality as inputs and resources is an extremely common usage of quality.** In this sense high
81 quality is seen in high levels of provision of resources such as buildings and other facilities,
82 textbooks and instructional materials. Quality as inputs may also refer to the characteristics of
83 pupils, or those of teachers and administrators, to their number or their levels of education and
84 training. While resources are generally recognized as a necessary but insufficient condition for
85 desirable outputs such as student achievement, the tangible, visible, and quantifiable nature of
86 inputs makes this meaning of quality a common proxy for other, less easily measured aspects of
87 education such as process and outcomes. Not in-text citation.

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

88 Quality as process highlights the need to understand the use of educational inputs. Perception of
89 this need is relatively new among policy-makers, who have traditionally focused on the inputs
90 and, **when** possible, the outputs of education systems. However, research has found that Husain
91 [4] higher educations with similar levels of resources often produce quite different results.
92 Infusions of resources often fail to lead to corresponding improvements in outcomes. Recent
93 studies were done by different scholars shows that???????incomplete [5, 6].

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

94 As a result, attention turned to the processes within schools, colleges and institute.
95 Understandably, teachers and professional educators tend to focus on educational processes.
96 Indeed, to those working in education, successful process may be sufficient. A teacher may feel
97 his or her efforts are well-rewarded if students, for example, become more motivated to learn,
98 regardless of the extent of learning that takes place. Unfortunately, much of the literature **which**
99 were done by scholars [7, 8, 9, 10 and 11] on educational processes areis theoretical, prescriptive
100 and descriptive in nature, with very little evidence of relative effectiveness. Thus, the empirical
101 linkages between educational processes and educational outputs are poorly defined.

102 Quality as outputs or outcomes involves the consequences of education. “Outputs” refer to the
103 short-term consequences of schooling, **e.g.**, students’ cognitive achievement, completion rates,

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

104 certification, individual skills, attitudes, and behaviors, while “outcomes” refer to longer-term,
 105 often socially significant, consequences of education, e.g., employment, earnings, health, civic
 106 engagement, and the likes, as well as social attitudes, behaviors, and skills. The importance of
 107 understanding quality in terms of the consequences of education is better understood than the
 108 ways of doing so. The difficulty of measuring outputs/outcomes validly and reliably on a large
 109 scale has meant that virtually no education systems know empirically whether their
 110 colleges/schools are achieving their goals and objectives. citation required here.

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

111 Education has different types of customers and they perceive quality differently. Students’
 112 parents perceive quality that is related to reputation of education institutes and graduate
 113 employability. Students focus on education process and output. College/school/institute members
 114 perceive quality as relating to whole education system involving input-process-output as it is
 115 shown in Figure 1. Finally, employers perceive quality from the perspective of the output such as
 116 skills that the students bring to the workplace [12, 13].



120 Figure 1 the input- process- output frame work of quality classification Leading words should
 121 begin with capital letters

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

122 Table 1 the input-processes- output frame work for quality classification

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

| Input | Process | Output |
|--|---|--|
| 1. lecturers income levels academic qualification and teaching experience 2. student lecturer ratio 3. teachers workloads 4. availability of adequate resource 5. teaching aids form the local materials | 1. planning academic programs, developing criteria and learning materials 2. implementation programs, reviewing programs, and developing human resources 3. student learning needs students’ knowledge and experience 4. looking for better ways of teaching from theory and research 5. giving administrative position | 1.job satisfaction and career achievement 2. students have opportunities to articulate their own view and responses ,and those views are treated with respect 3.students have opportunities to assist and lead other in learning 4. share responsibility for |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | 6. uses activates learning strategic 7. motivate students and extend their aspiration to participate activities 8. understand how students learn and be creative in facilitating learning 9. innovating students in the process of setting learning goals 10. feedback is timely provided and focused on students development 11. participant in university improvement and planning by working collaboratively with teams focused on specific improvement initiative 12. participate in the decision making process in the university 13. participate on continuous professional development program | all students learning across the university and collaborative with colleagues to support every students growth 5. assessing and diagnose individual students context strength and learning needs and teaching to address these personal characteristics 6. making actions research to improve the teaching learning process |
|--|--|---|

123

124 **Method**

125 The main purpose of this study will be able to investigate the perception of university teachers
 126 regarding the teaching and learning process towards the quality of education. **We have tried to**
 127 **answer for listed number of research question in the objective.** Is this a trial????

Formatted: Highlight

128 **Sources of data**

129 **Sources of data for conducting this research primary data has been used .To collect primary and**
 130 **secondary data;** a structured questionnaire was designed in light of the objectives of the research.

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

131 Teachers from different groups **from selected from the university were asked to fill up the**
 132 **questionnaire.** Secondary data were collected from different books, publications, research

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

133 studies, journals ~~and~~ articles. In this study **ies we used Licker** scales questionnaires for case study
 134 to investigates teachers perception on the quality of education in Ethiopian higher education

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

135 systems.

136 **Sample Size**

137 The sample of the study covers teachers from five colleges and one institute of the university. A
138 sample of 365 teachers (male and female) selected purposely from the university staff.

139
140 **Data collection**

141 The information used in this study will be obtained through questionnaires, focus group
142 discussions on road map report and observation. Mixed method approaches of what will be
143 employed; purposive sampling technique will be employed to use all university teachers who
144 participate on road map discussion.

145 Discussion was carried out with all the university teachers on the basis of their willingness to
146 take time for the discussion in four groups. The groups are categorized based on colleges. The
147 first group included Dire Dawa Technology Institute, the second group is College of Natural and
148 Computational Science and Medicine and Health Science, the third group is College of Business
149 and Economics and the last group is College of Social Science and Humanities and Law.

150
151 **Data Analysis**

152
153 Data will be analyzed by both Descriptive and inferential statistics through percentages, t-test,
154 correlation and one way repeated measure ANOVA. The qualitative data were recorded and
155 analyzed using SPSS version 21. The null hypotheses were rejected or not rejected, depending on
156 whether the calculated F ratio was significant of the probability level of 0.05 (or 5%).

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

157 **Demographic Information of Respondents**

158 The demographic information of the participants is designed on the basis of three important
159 variables, college/institute, academic rank and gender.

160 Table 2 Demographic Information of Pparticipants

161

| Variables | Particulars | Frequency | Percent |
|-------------------|-----------------------------------|------------|---------------|
| College/institute | Dire Dawa Technology Institute | 199 | 54.5 |
| | Natural and Computational Science | 45 | 12.3 |
| | Medicine and Health Science | 18 | 4.9 |
| | Business and Economics | 48 | 13.2 |
| | Social Science and Humanities | 47 | 12.9 |
| | Law | 8 | 2.2 |
| Total | | 365 | 100.00 |
| Academic Rank | Technical Assistant | 32 | 8.8 |
| | Graduate Assistant (I and II) | 99 | 27.1 |

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

| | | | |
|--------|---------------------|-----|------|
| | Lecturer | 220 | 60.3 |
| | Assistant Professor | 14 | 3.8 |
| Gender | Male | 302 | 82.3 |
| | Female | 63 | 17.3 |

162 | Creata total raw for each variable

163 | The sample include 82.3% male and 17.3% are female teachers among the university staff. Out
 164 | of 365 teachers 54.5% are from technology institute, 12.3% are from natural and computational
 165 | science, 4.9% are from medicine and health science college, 13.2% are from Business and
 166 | economics college, 12.9% are from social science and humanities college and 2.2% are from
 167 | college of law. Moreover, the table shows the academic rank of the respondent's, 8.8% are
 168 | technical assistant, 27.1% are graduate assistant (I and II), 60.3% are lecturer and 3.8% of the
 169 | respondents have a rank of assistant professor.

170 | **Results and Discussions**

171 | This section focuses on the respondents' answers in terms of teachers' perception on quality of
 172 | education in Ethiopia, case of Dire Dawa University. A sum of 365 respondents from five
 173 | colleges and one institute (College of natural and computational science, Business and
 174 | Economics, Social Science and Humanities, Law, Medicine and Health Science and Technology
 175 | Institute) filled the questionnaire on perception of teachers on quality of education. Generally
 176 | two main sections are included under this section quantitative and qualitative resultmake this to
 177 | come out clearly.

178 | The (quantitative) qualitative section mainly shows an overall perception of teachers about
 179 | quality of education including descriptive and ANOVA analysis. The qualitative section
 180 | addresses the discussion part of the quality of education. Moreover, we use third person singular
 181 | analyzed the impacts of input-process- output for quality of education.

183 | Table 3 Teachers perception on student's achievement versus quality of education using Likeret
 184 | scale

| Predicator variable | Qualification | Sum of squares | df | Mean square | F | sig |
|---|---------------|----------------|----|-------------|------|------|
| Student accesses to teacher interaction may be decreased if active learning is used | | 27.82 | 3 | 9.28 | 6.29 | 0.00 |
| Quality learning requires active | | 1.02 | 3 | 0.34 | 0.47 | 0.71 |

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

| | | | | | | |
|---|------------------|-------|---|------|-------|------|
| participation of students | Academic rank | | | | | |
| Quality learning is the extent to which student's achieves good result in the final examination | | 8.06 | 3 | 2.69 | 2.13 | 0.10 |
| Quality learning is the extent to which student's achieves good result in the final examination | | 27.00 | 3 | 9.00 | 10.21 | .000 |

185
186 Teaching according to [14] is therefore a social service career and no career has more value to
187 society than teaching. It is thus, a unique profession whose quality directly influences the future
188 of any nation. Of course, teaching touches the life of virtually everyone in the society. As, as
189 such the doctor, engineer, accountant, banker, scientist and so forth were all taught by teachers
190 and in the course of their professional training [15]. the main actor who facilitates this process is
191 teacher through learning. Good teaching characteristics relate to a teacher's ability,
192 personality and relationship with students.

193
194 As a Table 3 revealed that the mean square scored value varies from 9.28 to 0.34 with significant
195 values $0.00 \leq p \leq 0.707$. A student access to teacher interaction is significant and this hypothesis
196 is accepted. No hypotheses were stated in this study Additionally, quality learning is the extent to
197 which student's achieves good result in the final examination is significant and is accepted.
198 Whereas, quality learning is the extent to which student's achieves good result in the final
199 examination is insignificant and the hypothesis is rejected. Quality learning is not only on
200 student achievements on their final examination but also testing learning of students to assessing
201 for students learning. It should be based on consistency and conformity of education in line with
202 students' satisfaction [16].

203 Table 3 Test for homogeneity of variances for quality of education leading words should begin
204 with capital letter

| Predicator variable | Levene Statistic | df 1 | df2 | Sig |
|---|---------------------|---------|-----|------|
| Student accesses to teacher interaction may be decreased if active learning is used | 1.64 | 3 | 361 | 0.18 |

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

| | | | | |
|---|------|---|-----|------|
| Quality learning requires active participation of students | 0.40 | 3 | 361 | 0.76 |
| Quality learning is the extent to which students reciting what has been said in the class | 1.34 | 3 | 361 | 0.26 |
| Quality learning is the extent to which student's achieves good result in the final examination | 3.49 | 3 | 361 | 0.02 |

205
 206 ANOVA was used to test for student accesses to teacher interaction in active learning method
 207 when it is applied by academic staff among academic rank in five colleges and one institute
 208 teachers. Student accesses to teacher in significant among the academic rank is, $F(3, 361) =$
 209 $1.64, p = .18 > 0.05$. Similarly, quality learning with active participation and students reciting
 210 what has been discuss in the class are in significant with $p > 0.05$ in both cases, whereas,
 211 students' achievement in their final examination significant and differed with academic rank,
 212 $F(3,361) = 3.49, p < 0.5$.

213 Table 4 Teachers perception on quality of teaching in class room discussion and lectures

| Predicator variable | Qualification | Sum of squares | df | Mean square | F | sig |
|--|---------------|----------------|----|-------------|-------|------|
| Quality teaching is the teaching extent to which students participate in class room discussion | | 1.35 | 3 | .45 | 0.61 | 0.61 |
| Quality teaching is the extent to which teachers delivers lecture in good manner | Academic rank | 24.03 | 3 | 8.01 | 10.59 | 0.00 |

214
 215 People perceive quality differently. Some see it as quality in teaching, the caliber of students and
 216 the students' performances on their future life [17]. One of the process of which students provide
 217 feedback at the end of teaching learning **completed**. It can be used for rating quality education
 218 and effectiveness of instructor on his types of methodology and purpose he/ provides to students.
 219 Therefore, teaching is intimately tied to notion of learning.

220
 221 The analysis of data using ANOVA revealed that the scale mean representing of **????** shown in
 222 Table 3 illustrate quality of teaching depends on the types of lectures and methodology with the
 223 significant level of $p < 0.05$ whereas, the quality of teaching extent to students participating in the
 224 class room is insignificant with $p > 0.05$ and the hypothesis **which hypothesis???** is rejected. Since,

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

225 classroom teaching will to a large extent determine the level and degree of its quality and
 226 effectiveness. In order to achieve the objective the instructors **design to keep quality and success**
 227 **of students, there should be great assist from the university administration at each level. Not**
 228 clear

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

230 Generally positive perception of students towards quality higher education in university depends
 231 on some crucial factors such as infrastructure of the university, college members, behavior of
 232 administrative staff, location of the university, library facility, laboratory facility [12, 18, 19, and
 233 20], internship assistance for students and choice of departments [21]. Those factors have both
 234 positive and negative impacts for quality of education. If all mentioned factors are fulfilled, the
 235 impact is positive if not the quality of education **fails**. The university should work on the quality
 236 of education to keep the reputation of the **institute** to attract more students in the future.

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

239 **Input variables**

241 Table 4 Average **scale-item mean, average item standard deviation and standard error results for**
 242 **processes variables in terms of academic rank overall scale scores**

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

| Processes variables | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error | 95% Confidence Interval for Mean | |
|--|-----|------|----------------|------------|----------------------------------|------|
| Quality of education is measured by planning academic programmes, developing curricula and learning materials | 365 | 1.85 | 0.95 | 0.04 | 1.75 | 1.94 |
| Quality education is measured by implementing programmes; reviewing programmes; and developing human resources | 365 | 1.69 | 0.79 | 0.04 | 1.61 | 1.77 |
| Quality education is measured by student learning needs, students' knowledge and experience | 365 | 1.58 | 0.77 | 0.04 | 1.50 | 1.66 |
| Quality education is measured by looking for better ways of teaching from theory and research | 365 | 1.88 | 0.91 | 0.04 | 1.78 | 1.97 |
| Quality of education is measured by giving administrative demands with teaching activities for instructors | 365 | 2.17 | 1.10 | 0.05 | 2.05 | 2.28 |
| Quality of education is measured by using active | 365 | 1.72 | 0.76 | 0.04 | 1.64 | 1.79 |

| | | | | | | |
|--|-----|------|------|------|------|------|
| learning strategies | | | | | | |
| Quality of education is implemented by motivate students and extend their aspiration to participate actively in teaching learning processes | 365 | 1.72 | 0.82 | 0.04 | 1.63 | 1.79 |
| Quality of education is measured by know how students' learn in your subject area and be creative and effective in facilitating learning activities | 365 | 1.84 | 0.89 | 0.04 | 1.75 | 1.93 |
| Quality education is measured by feedback and timely provides and focuses on students' development. | 365 | 1.89 | 0.86 | 0.04 | 1.80 | 1.98 |
| Quality education is measured by participate in university improvement and planning by working collaboratively with teams focused on specific improvement initiative | 365 | 2.03 | 0.86 | 0.04 | 1.94 | 2.11 |
| Quality education is measured participate in the decision making process in the university | 365 | 2.02 | 0.98 | 0.05 | 1.92 | 2.12 |
| Quality education is measured by participate on continuous professional development program | 365 | 2.06 | 0.96 | 0.05 | 1.96 | 2.16 |

243

244 As [22] state **that** assessment can enhances learning, provides feedback about student progress,
 245 builds self-confidence and self-esteem, and develops skills in evaluation. In addition, they argue
 246 that effective learning occurs when correspondence exists between teaching, evaluation, and
 247 results. Therefore, due to its close relation with instruction and learning outcomes, assessment
 248 has a key role in learning and our assumption for dependence quality of education is significant
 249 at $p < 0.5$. In order to sustain quality of education in higher education, participation of instructors
 250 and students in decision processes is crucial. In most cases, participation of instructors in
 251 decision processes **have taken in some** of the higher education whereas, the participation of
 252 students is less in assessment processes. **It was on the hand of instructors**. Therefore, the result
 253 shown in Table 5???? participation in decision processes is in significant with $p = 0.05$ and the
 254 same true participation on continuous professional development with the same p value. The
 255 perception of instructors on the participation higher education affairs is less and they do not
 256 believe this has an impact on quality of education.

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

257 **Output variables**

258 Table 5 Average **scale-item mean, average item standard deviation and standard error results for**
 259 **output variables in terms of academic rank overall scale scores**

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

260

| Output variables | N | Mean | Std. Deviat | Std. Error | 95% Confidence Interval for Mean |
|------------------|---|------|-------------|------------|----------------------------------|
|------------------|---|------|-------------|------------|----------------------------------|

| | | | on | | | |
|--|-----|------|-------|-------|------|------|
| Quality education is measured by students have opportunities to assist and lead other in learning | 365 | 1.74 | 0.78 | 0.04 | 1.66 | 1.82 |
| Quality education is measured by share a responsibility for all students' learning across the university and collaborate with colleagues to support every student's growth | 365 | 1.84 | 0.93 | 0.04 | 1.75 | 1.94 |
| Quality education is measured by assessing and diagnose individual student's context, strength and learning needs and teaching to address these personal characteristics | 365 | 1.70 | 0.83 | 0.04 | 1.61 | 1.78 |
| Quality education is measured by making action research to improve the teaching learning process. | 365 | 1.73 | 0.78 | 0.04 | 1.65 | 1.80 |
| Quality education is measured by job satisfaction and career achievement | 365 | 2.64 | 17.37 | 0.91 | 0.85 | 4.43 |
| Quality education is measured by Students have opportunities to articulate their own views and responses, and those views are treated with respect | 365 | 1.76 | 0.74 | 0.039 | 1.68 | 1.83 |

261

262 The education outputs include proxies of achievement (promotion and completion rates) as well
 263 as measures of actual achievement which include the kinds and quantity of facts and skills
 264 learned. The output characteristics of quality education is therefore the quality of student
 265 achievement and it is the amount and degree or perfection of learning according to the various
 266 levels of intellectual achievement, from recall to application and creative innovation

267

268 Education quality should give attention to students', since education as a main product that is
 269 expected from education quality system is of much greater demand in comparison to the past.

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

270 There has always been emphasis on equal attention to research and teaching quality and
 271 establishing a bond between these two before making any decision; however, different studies

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

272 show that the already given attention to research in universities does not meet the educational
 273 quality requirements. As results shown in Table 6 tell us, quality education is measured by

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

274 making action research to improve the teaching learning process is significant with $p < 0.5$
 275 academic rank whereas job satisfaction of higher education teachers' is insignificant with
 276 academic rank. Attention to this task in higher education is considered as a major one, so in their
 277 instruction, educators must pay attention to learners and learning approach; along with these two
 278 factors, the educators should move forward to attain new teaching methodology approaches.

279

280 It is evident that the most common factor that determines the quality of higher education
 281 institutions in the output is the opportunities to articulate their own views, responses and
 282 respect??? others are significant with academic rank with $p < 0.05$. This relates to the diversity of
 283 knowledge the students' gains in higher education and shows the level of quality education.
 284 Viewing student achievement as evidence of learning, and linking student learning to the
 285 "effective" [23, 24] or "successful" [25] teacher is one way of defining quality teaching.

286 **Input variables**

287 Student lecturer ratio, lecturers income level, teachers workload, availability of adequate and
 288 resources and teaching aids or laboratory materials are the input variables. Those are variables
 289 that have negative impacts on quality of education. As it was advocated by [26] class size or
 290 student lecture ratio isas one of the a-factors determining the for_ education quality in learning
 291 outcomes. Student lecturer ratio is important for instructors' and students' engagement and
 292 achievements to maintainkeep the quality of education.

293 The most dissatisfies bordered on human relation issues such as lack of housing, poor transport,
 294 insensitive leadership which is not responsive and the daily subjection of students and teachers to
 295 excessive lack of educational facilities and materials that could otherwise aid quality education
 296 provision. The other challenges in the university are qualification rank and experience of
 297 instructors. The university does not have incentive mechanism to attract well qualified staff not
 298 to leave the university. The result shown in Table ??? shows that student-lecturer ratio and the
 299 income levels are in significant with $p = 0.05$ with academic rank whereas, availability of
 300 adequate resources and teaching aids are significant with academic rank with $p < 0.05$

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

| Input variables | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error | 95% Confidence Interval for Mean | |
|---|-----|------|----------------|------------|----------------------------------|------|
| Quality education is measured by Student-Lecturer ratios | 365 | 2.35 | 1.03 | 0.05 | 2.25 | 2.46 |
| Quality education is measured by lecturers' income levels, academic qualification and teaching experience | 365 | 1.89 | 0.96 | 0.05 | 1.79 | 1.98 |
| Quality education is measured by teachers workloads | 365 | 2.76 | 1.33 | 0.07 | 2.63 | 2.90 |
| Quality of education is measured by availability of adequate | 365 | 1.70 | 0.88 | 0.046 | 1.61 | 1.79 |

| | | | | | | |
|--|-----|------|------|-------|------|------|
| Resources | | | | | | |
| Quality education is measured by making teaching aids from the local materials | 365 | 2.07 | 0.94 | 0.049 | 1.98 | 2.17 |

302

303 **Table 6 Average scale-item mean, average item standard deviation and standard error results for**
 304 **input variables in terms of academic rank overall scale score** Should be the title of the table

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

305 **Focused group discussion result**

Formatted: Highlight

306 The focus group discussion questions **were** 4 items, which were to be answered by the focus
 307 group participants accordingly for the first item stated as ‘What does quality education mean **for**
 308 you?’ ‘The participants generally defined quality of education as incomplete relevant to the
 309 society creating competent students, the broader goal of students becoming aware of their
 310 community and environment, teachers properly use input of education in the school, and
 311 sufficient resources are fulfilled, when active learning strategies or student centered strategies **are**
 312 practiced, when students actively participate in the class, and **teachers reported that quality**
 313 **education in terms of students’ knowledge, attitudes and skills.**’ not clear.

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

314 For the second item Stated as ‘**what do you think that the prior things to be fulfilled to improve**
 315 **quality education?**’ The participants pointed out that: Better teacher’s salaries and conditions of
 316 services are areas for policy attention, provide education and professional development of high
 317 quality to the teachers, sharing responsibility by increasing students, parents and community
 318 involvement in schools, sufficient resources: such as textbooks, desks, teaching materials,
 319 libraries and classroom, good interaction of students and teachers properly practice student
 320 centered approach and good governance for teachers.’

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

322 For the third item was stated as ‘How do you evaluate students achievement of quality
 323 **education?**’ full of flaws The participants pointed out that: ‘**In terms of students’ achievement and**
 324 **good behavior, students being able to express their views, demonstrate practically what they**
 325 **have learned, and exhibit an awareness of their environment, when students should be**
 326 **responsible, disciplined, punctual, respectful, and listen well.**’ not clear/lacks coherency

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

327

328 | For the fourth item stated as 'What do you think, should the role of the teacher be in the status of
329 | improvement of quality education?' the respondents reported that:

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

330 | "Participation in planning process, giving feedback mechanism that target learning needs,
331 | positive and gender Sensitive teacher/students relationships, apply student centered method
332 | properly, make action research properly with regard to the teaching learning process, and accept
333 | Innovate ideas that improve the teaching learning process, participate in the school decision
334 | making process, making teaching aid properly from local materials to be more meaningful to the
335 | teaching learning process, participate in updating and upgrading training and effective use of
336 | instructional time."

337 |
338 | Regarding the results of classroom observation, the researcher witnessed too serve grade 9
339 | section students on September6, 2015 academic year while

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

340 | The chemistry teacher taught, that he tried to give cues but he did not use materials helpful to
341 | involve the students in different class activities like pictures, graphs and model and by giving
342 | peer work, group discussion to understand the ideas presented from the topic. Again, the teacher
343 | tried to plan the instructional process in his lesson plan to use student centered in a way students
344 | involve in different class activities and provide continuous assessment but the researcher
345 | observed that the teacher did not apply his plan lacks coherency.

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

346 |
347 | The researcher deduced that the inadequacy of classroom and number of students make the
348 | teaching learning process as lecture methods. Besides, the researcher observed that there are
349 | inadequate school facilities, teaching aid sand other infrastructures.

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

350 |
351 | In addition, the teachers were tried to deliver continuous assessment and active learning method,
352 | but it seemed to be not uniform as the teachers' understanding about continuous assessment is
353 | different and sometime it might be due to some constraints of size of the class or Number of
354 | students in the classroom. Because the approach most frequently used by teachers is mixed
355 | approach, some teachers tried to using active learning but others still dominating the lecture
356 | teaching learning activities. From the above results, however, the delivery of quality education is
357 | not yet to the desired levels. This is mainly emanated from variation among teachers themselves
358 | as there are some members of teachers who have not yet promoting

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

359 Any instructional training skills as it is replied from the respondent teachers who attributed the
360 absence of practice of teaching learning process and use of active learning methods and the lack
361 of sufficient input such as syllabus, textbooks, teachers' guides class size etc

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

363 Discussion of Results

Formatted: Font: Bold

365 The main purpose of this study was to examine teachers' perception toward quality of education,
366 quality of teaching and quality of learning and relationship. Between teachers' perception of
367 teaching learning process and their practice and challenging factors for quality education, quality
368 teaching and quality learning. As the results shown, the teachers' perception of input was higher
369 than the mean test value. This shows that teachers had high perception of quality education with
370 regard to the input factors. According to Hawes and Stephens [12]the term 'quality of education'
371 is often not defined and unconfused with factors that are believed to produce quality, e.g. school
372 building, textbooks, didactics materials and well prepared teachers. Such factors are important,
373 but do not produce quality. The quality of the teacher is more important than any other factors. It
374 is the teacher who decides how to use textbook, didactic material, school facilities and teaching
375 methods. It is the teacher who defines what he/she means by participatory methods and how they
376 are applicable under the circumstance in which he/she works.

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

377
378 Similarly, teachers' perception of process was higher than mean tests value. This shows that
379 teachers have high perception of quality education with regard to the process factors. According
380 to the [1], until recently much discussion of educational quality centered on system inputs, such
381 as infrastructure and pupil teachers ratios, and on curricular contents. In recent years, however;
382 more attention has been paid to educational processes how teachers and administrators use inputs
383 to frame meaningful learning experiences for students. Their work represented a key factor in
384 ensuring quality school processes, Such as, professional learning for teacher's ongoing
385 professional development, continuing support for student centered learning, active standard
386 based participation methods, teacher feedback mechanism and teacher belief that all students can
387 learn

388

389

390 On the contrary, teachers' perception of output was lower than the mean test value. This shows
391 that teacher have low perception toward quality education (in term of student's scoring high on
392 exams and students achieving promotion to the next grade as central to education quality) with
393 regard to the output indicators. According to [1], output which signal overall quality which
394 includes, academic achievement, life skills creativity and emotional skills, values and social
395 benefits

396 **Conclusions**

398 The study was conducted in Dire –Dawa University in Ethiopia. The 381 teachers were selected
399 from teachers by using random sampling techniques. The subjects of the study were 103(87 male
400 and 16 female) teachers. To collect the data, a five point scale closed questionnaires containing
401 34 items dispatched to the teachers. In addition, focus group discussion was conducted at
402 seventeen stages assigned for road map discussion .Then, after the responses were tabulated and
403 analyzed by inferential statistical values and descriptive approaches

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

404
405 From the analyzed data the following findings were obtained

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

407 1. Teachers' overwhelmingly viewed quality education highly in terms of input indicators,
408 with a total mean value of 4.019, in term of process indicators with a total mean value of
409 3.880 and low in term of output (cognitive aspects) indicators with a total mean value of
410 2.704.

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

411 2. 78.6% (with the mean value of 4) of the teachers' perceive quality of teaching in terms of
412 involving students in the teaching learning process/ student centered approach

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

413 3. 68% (with the mean value of 3.7) of the teachers' perceive quality of learning in term of
414 active participation of students in the class.

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

415
416 4. 79.5% of the teachers' (with an aggregated mean value of 3.5) is highly practicing
417 quality activities to improve quality of education. Thus, as teachers' perception of quality
418 teaching learning process increases their practice of elements of constructivism also
419 increases. On contrary, specifically gaps in the understanding and practice of teachers

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

420 relating to quality education activities, such as making action research to improve the
421 teaching-learning process and making teaching aids from the local materials (with the
422 mean value of 2.7)

Formatted: Highlight

423
424 The overall findings of this study indicate that teachers' had high level of quality education
425 viewing with regard to input indicators. In spite of the fact that teachers have high level of
426 quality education viewing with regard to process indicators, they believe that without sufficient
427 input, teachers are unable to deliver quality of education. Similarly, teachers have somewhat
428 considerable degree of practice to improve quality of education and this indicates consistency in
429 the teachers' perception on quality of education and their practice, as teachers' perception of
430 quality teaching learning process increases their practice of elements of constructivism also
431 increases

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

432 433 434 435 Recommendation

436 1. Teachers' are key enabling factors in employing the quality of education, so that teachers
437 should be critical to any reforms designed to improve quality education.

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

438 2. In the teaching learning processes, the teachers are the 'planner and organizer' of learning
439 activities. Hence, teachers are focused on many quality teaching initiatives. Therefore,
440 much of the success of quality teaching support depends on acceptance by teachers and
441 the use of the methods at their disposal in their teaching learning processes.

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

442 3. Teachers' should understand action research is also closely related to teacher
443 empowerment and has become an important component of what is considered good
444 teacher development

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

445 4. By and large, the research findings indicated that teachers have high level of viewing of
446 quality education initiatives, in reality they failed to practice it in improving quality
447 education in the entire contexts. Therefore, it is advisable that the government should
448 give attention to teacher's job satisfaction; salary and status need to be better understood
449 to find out how these factors affect their performance.

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

450 5. Finally, hopefully, the research findings in this paper will encourage the teacher's
451 collaborative works is an essential resource to improve quality education. Therefore, this
452 study is not intended to make and generalization about the main determinant of better
453 quality in education, so any concerned and interested body can make use of this study as
454 avenue for further studies and is suggested to contribute a lot. This not a
455 recommendation

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

457 References Organize this in alphabetically

458 1. UNICEF. "Defining Quality," (Paper presented at the International Working Group on
459 Education meeting, Florence, Italy, June), 2000.

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

460 2. West, A., Noden, P., & Gosling, R. Quality in higher education: An international
461 perspective. The views of transnational corporations. Market Papers no. 17, London
462 School of Economics and Political Science, 2000.

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

463 3. Clare C., (2004). Perception of Quality in Higher Education. Proceedings of the
464 Australian Universities Quality Forum, 2004.

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

465 4. Husain Salilul Akareem & Syed Shahadat Hossain. Determinants of education quality:
466 what makes students' perception different?, Open Review of Educational Research, 2016,
467 3:1, 52-67, DOI: 10.1080/23265507.2016.1155167

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

468 5. Akareem, H. S., & Hossain, S. S. Perception of education quality in private universities
469 of Bangladesh: A study from students' perspective. Journal of Marketing for Higher
470 Education, 2012, 22 (1), 11-33.

471 6. Ashraf, M. A., Ibrahim, Y., & Joarder, M. H. Quality education management at private
472 universities in Bangladesh: An exploratory study. Jurnal Pendidik dan Pendidikan, 2009,
473 24, 17-32.

474 7. Chua, C. Perception of quality in higher education. *Proceeding of the Australian*
475 *University Forum, 2004*, Retrieved from [https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/
476 download?doi%3D10.1.1.125.3578](https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi%3D10.1.1.125.3578)

477 8. Owen, J. 'Evaluation culture: a definition and analysis of its development within
478 organisations'. *Evaluation Journal of Australasia*, 2003, 3(1).43-47.

- 479 9. Mintzberg, H. *The Rise and Fall of Strategic Planning*. UK: Prentice- Hall International,
480 1994.
- 481 10. Ramsden, P. *What makes a university effective?* Inaugural Professional Lectures, Griffith
482 University, 1998
- 483 11. Ross, J.A., Hogaboam-Gray, A., & Hannay, L. (1999). Predictors of teachers' confidence
484 I their ability to implement computer- based instruction. *Journal of educational*
485 *Computing Research*, 21 (1), 75-97.
- 486 12. Shim SH. A philosophical investigation of the role of teacher: A synthesis of Plato,
487 Confucius, blubber and frère. *Teaching and Teacher Education*. 2008; 24(3): 515-35.
- 488 13. Binod K.S. (2013) Public Perception of the Quality of Academic Education Program.
489 *Journal of Education and Research March 2013. 3(1), pp. 52-64*
- 490 14. Mandla, P. (200). *The black teacher's dilemma*. Cape town and Johannesburg:
491 Skotavicee publishers.
- 492 15. Archibong I.A., Idaka I. E, Edet A.O., (2009). Teaching as a Career: Perception of
493 University Education Students in Cross River State. *An International Multi-Disciplinary*
494 *Journal, Ethiopia, 2009, 3 (4), 482-491.*
- 495 16. Sahney, S., Banwet, D. K., & Karunes, S. Conceptualizing total quality management in
496 higher education. *The TQM Magazine*, 2004, 16(20), 145-159.
- 497 17. Ory, J. C. (2001). Faculty thoughts and concerns about student ratings. In K. G. Lewis
498 (Ed.), *Techniques and strategies for interpreting student evaluations. New Directions for*
499 *Teaching and Learning, 2001, 87, 3-15*. San Francisco, Ca: Jossey-Bass
- 500 18. Bindsardi, A., & Ekwulugo, F. International marketing of British education: Research on
501 the students' perception and the UK market penetration. *Marketing Intelligence and*
502 *Planning*, 2003, 21(5), 318-327.
- 503 19. Gatfield, T., Braker, B., & Graham, P. Measuring communication impact of university
504 advertising materials. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, 1999, 4(2),
505 73-79.
- 506 20. Ho, H., & Hung, C. An integrated analysis employing analytic hierarchy process, cluster
507 analysis and correspondence analysis. *International Journal of Educational Management*,
508 2008, 22(4), 328-340.

Formatted: Font color: Auto, Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Font color: Auto, Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, Highlight

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, Highlight

Formatted: Font color: Auto, Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Font color: Auto, Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Font color: Auto, Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

- 509 21. Baldwin, G., & James, R. The market in Australian higher education and the concept of
510 student as informed consumer. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*,
511 2000, 22(2), 139-148.
- 512 22. Goodrum, D., Hackling, M., & Rennie, L. The status and quality of teaching and learning
513 of science in Australian schools. Canberra: Department of Education, Training and Youth
514 Affairs, 2005.
- 515 23. Berliner, D.C. (1987). Simple views of effective teaching and a simple theory of
516 classroom instruction. In D.C. Berliner & B. Rosenshine (Eds.), *Talks to teachers* (pp.
517 93-110). New York: Random House, 1987.
- 518 24. Berliner, D.C. The near impossibility of testing for teacher quality. *Journal of Teacher*
519 *Education*, 2005, 56 (3), 205-213.
- 520 25. Fenstermacher, G.D., & Richardson, V. On making determinations of quality in teaching.
521 *Teachers College Record*, 2005, 107 (1), 186-213.
- 522 26. Gibbs, G. (2010). *Dimensions of Quality*, York: Higher Education Academy

Formatted: Font color: Auto, Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Font color: Auto, Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Font color: Auto, Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Font color: Auto, Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Font color: Auto, Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

523
524
525