



An Evaluative Study on Challenges in Quality Assurance in Fashion Design Courses in India

Arul Kumaravelu^{1*}, ESM Suresh²

^{1*}Associate Professor, Department of Knitwear Design, National Institute of Fashion Technology, Chennai, India, karul500@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8886-8215>

²Professor & Head, Extension Centre, Kalamassery, National Institute of Technical Teachers Training and Research, Cochin, Kerala, India, esmsuresh@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9439-4316>.

***Corresponding Author:** Arul Kumaravelu

*Associate Professor, Department of Knitwear Design, National Institute of Fashion Technology, Chennai, India, karul500@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8886-8215>

Citation: Arul Kumaravelu, ESM Suresh (2024), An Evaluative Study on Challenges in Quality Assurance in Fashion Design Courses in India, *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 30(4), 8859 - 8867

Doi 10.53555/kuev.v30i4.2867

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

Presently, leaders of higher educational institutions in India are confronting a monumental task of ensuring the exceptional quality in the current educational system. The competition from graduates across the emerging economies has attained an all-time high. It is crucial that the institutions involved in higher education in high potential courses like fashion design and technology needs genuine introspection to ensure that an efficient quality assurance system is in place to offer quality services to their key stakeholders. In order to keep up with industry and market changes, Fashion Technology courses in India have undergone significant transformations in recent years. This study aims to evaluate the significance of different factors that are influencing the quality of higher education in India. Specifically, the study has identified and refined the challenging factors in ensuring quality in fashion design and technology courses. As an outcome of an extensive review of literature and insights obtained from industry experts and academic professionals, nine quality assurance factors were identified that are theorized to affect the quality assurance in fashion education programs. The factors identified and included for final analysis included "Quality of Faculty Members", "Policies and Frameworks" for growth and promotion, "Infrastructural Resources" for development of fashion design education, "Funding and Support" for sustained development, "Leadership Support", "Facilities" for learning and research, "Accreditation System" for continuous assessment and evaluation, "Employability of Graduates" and "Innovation" in curricular offering and teaching and learning system on a continual basis. Data were collected from six hundred professionals (both industry and academia) representing fashion design and technology industry. Statistical measures like descriptive statistics, relative importance index (RII), Independent Sample t-test and One way ANOVA were performed. The study highlights the role of different challenging factors impacting the quality of fashion design and technology programs. The findings have significant implications for educational leaders and different stakeholders to enhance quality assurance in higher education in general and fashion technology courses in particular.

Keywords: Quality, Quality Assurance, Challenges, Fashion Design, Technology Education

1. Introduction

Globally, higher education has been acknowledged as a crucial instrument for the establishment of a knowledge economy and the growth of human capital (World Bank, 1999). Higher education, according to Peretomode (2008), is the facilitator, the central pillar, the dominant force, and the key driver for the robust socio-economic, political, cultural, and industrial development of a nation. Often higher education institutions are increasingly considered as the potential wealth and human capital producing industries. Human capital alone

can maintain and enhance growth potential of a nation (Kors, 2008). According to a report of World Bank (2004), it is indispensable that all developing nations must invest in higher education if they want to prosper in global economy where information has become a crucial source of competitive advantage. The competitiveness of an emerging economy like India heavily on the calibre of the knowledge produced by institutions of higher education. Only great education can refine and polish the brains of individuals and bring about transformation in economic, social, and political spheres of society. Countries can attain sustained growth by enhancing their human capitals' capabilities by providing quality higher education. From a worldwide viewpoint, advanced education in human resources has been acknowledged as a fundamental instrument for national development. This high degree of education helps individuals to gain skills and procedures that are invested in human productivity, creativity, competence, initiative, invention, and ingenuity (Ehiametalor, 1988).

2. Quality and Quality Assurance in Higher Education

Numerous scholars have offered numerous definitions of the notion of quality. According to Kalusi (2001), quality is a difficult term and complex to define on which there is little unanimity. According to DuBrin (1997), quality is a distinguishing characteristic of a product or service that is desirable to the person seeking the characteristic. According to this definition, quality possesses the characteristics of value and acceptability. Nonetheless, according to DuBrin (1977), quality should possess the following characteristics: conformity to expectation, compliance to requirement, excellence and value, and avoidance of loss. Asiyai and Oghuvbu (2009) defined quality as a measurement of how well or poorly the products of higher education institutions perform academically and satisfy predetermined criteria. World Organization for Standardization (1994) defined quality as the sum of a product's or service's traits and qualities that contribute to its capacity to meet specified demands. Article 11 of the 2003 World Declaration on Education characterises quality as a multidimensional concept that should encompass all school functions and activities. Teaching, research and scholarship, community service, personnel, students, infrastructures and educational facilities, equipment, and the academic atmosphere have been cited as activities of higher education institutions (World conference on higher education, 1998). High quality delivery is a precondition for successful production in the education business, and thus, quality education is a tool for national development. Quality, according to Ekong (2006), increases knowledge, practical skills, views, attitudes, and values. When excellent education is provided at a level sufficient to fulfil established requirements, the products of education should be able to function successfully in the actual world of employment. When quality is inadequate, performance falls short of expectations (Suresh & Arul, 2017). Consequently, one might assert that the quality of education has fallen below the benchmark.

Quality assurance is the systematic procedure of maintaining a defined level of standards in the product and service through sustained sampling inspection and testing (Asiyai, 2013). According to Okebukola (2010:3), quality assurance is an umbrella term for a variety of actions meant to enhance the inputs, processes, and outputs of the higher education system. In accordance with this, Ayodele (2007) asserts that quality assurance encompasses the quality of available instructional resources for teaching, equipment, instrument, facilities, environment, students, curriculum, instructional delivery quality, and instructor quality. Quality assurance is intended to demonstrate and enhance the quality of an institution's educational methods, products, and outcomes (Oyebode, Oladipo and Adetome; 2008). Everyone is responsible for guaranteeing the quality of education. One of the fundamental pillars of quality assurance in education is the development of minimum standards for the qualification of teachers, the quality of instruction in institutions, the expected educational achievement of students, and the implementation of a more stringent management process for education, so that the entire sector develops stronger operating policies and procedures that are well documented and adhered to.

In higher education, the word quality assurance is commonly used to refer to procedures that preserve and enhance academic standards, i.e. the level of academic accomplishment obtained by graduates. This definition of academic quality as equivalent to academic standards is consistent with the emerging emphasis in higher education policies on student learning outcomes — the specific levels of knowledge, skill sets, and abilities that students attain as a result of their participation in a specific education programme (Brennan and Shah, 2000).

Internal academic quality assurance is distinguished from external academic quality assurance. External quality assurance refers to supra-institutional policies and practises that ensure the quality of institutions of higher learning and programmes. Internal quality assurance refers to the policies and practises by which academic institutions monitor and improve the quality of their education provision. Universities have long had rules and procedures aimed to ensure the quality of education, but academic institutions have also always worked within a national policy framework created by the state to ensure academic standards.

Unfortunately, the higher education system of India has lost its competitiveness over the period of time on global scale. This is demonstrated by the fact that only very few Indian higher education institutions appear in

annual world university rankings such as the Times Higher Education World University Rankings and the QS World University Rankings. Although some Indian higher education institutions are recognised for sending some of the world's most talented students overseas, they are unable to recruit students from other developing nations (Kumar, 2018).

3. Background

Idialu (2013) identified the factors affecting quality assurance in higher education which included "Inadequate Funding and Support of Vocational Education," "Staff Quality and Quantity," "Lack of Facilities," "Retraining the Trainers," "Poor Societal Attitude," "Poor Remuneration for Teachers," "Poor Administration and Regular Supervision of Education Program," "Examination Malpractice," "Poor Assessment Methods," and "Absenteeism of Teachers and Students", "Skill Acquisition and Competency," "Adequate Funding and Support," "Accreditation System," "Adequate Staffing/Staff Development," "Provision of Adequate Facilities," and "Better Motivations/Remunerations of Teachers/Lecturers." Sukdee et al. (2017) have identified and analysed the factors impacting the bachelor's degree program. They finally included four factors in their analysis that included "Learning management and student assessment components", "Student potential improvement components", "Quality of lecturer components", "System and mechanism of curriculum administration". Stander and Herman (2017) have identified that "physical and financial resources", "capacity development which includes staff roles and responsibilities", "academic leadership and development and research", and "program design (curriculum design)" were the important barriers and challenges in the management of quality assurance in private higher education institutions. Kumar (2012) discussed the difficulties and potential solutions for ensuring the quality of higher education in India. Bora (2012) addressed the most significant challenges facing professional education in India, as well as potential solutions. According to industry players and recruitment agencies, the majority of graduates in the majority of sectors are unemployed, according to his statement. According to Komow et al. (2012), India's higher education system lacks technological innovation, infrastructural facilities, and human resources, especially trained teachers. Singh and Singh (2013) have complained about the inefficiencies of the governing bodies and QA agencies in establishing and maintaining a standard quality assessment system in India. According to Chadha (2013), India's education has lost its competitive edge because of a lack of innovation, relevance, and a poorly designed regulatory system. Gambhir et al. (2016) have modelled the aspects determining the quality of a technical institution and applied the relevant evaluation, assessment, and ranking techniques.

4. Statement of the Problem

The higher education system in India is one of the world's largest next to China and the United States in terms of the number of students. Since independence, the government's priority in higher education has been improving "access and equality" rather than "quality and relevance". However, in the recent decades, higher education sector in India has witnessed a tremendous increase in the number of Universities/University level Institutions and Colleges since independence. The majority of higher education institutions were found to be plagued by inferior quality, inadequate infrastructure, lack of pleasant learning environment for students, a large gap between demand and supply, poorly trained and insufficient faculty, obsolete teaching methods based on rote learning, a greater emphasis on final exams than actual learning, a lack of autonomy, research facilities, excessive bureaucratisation, partisanship, etc. (Gupta, 2021). Several educators and key stakeholders have been complaining about the poor quality of higher education offered to students in India.

In the past, quality was frequently associated with the status of an institution, and it was nearly difficult to quantify quality in the absence of well-defined characteristics. But currently, with the rise of globalisation and market economy, there is a great deal of pressure on higher education institutions to demonstrate their value in terms of quality and 'value for money/time invested' in pursuing higher education and/or professional training from a variety of stakeholders, including students, faculty, administrative personnel, government agencies, Funding and Support bodies, future employers, accrediting bodies, media, lawmakers, state and provincial government, multinational corporations, and transportation companies. In the field of higher education in India and worldwide, seeking legitimacy through quality validation has become a current trend or fashion (Stensaker, 2007; Gupta 2021). It is important to identify and determine the challenges encountered by higher education institutions in ensuring quality and sustainability in the long run. It is vitally pertinent that challenges in quality assurance in fashion design courses in India.

5. Scope of the study

The study is limited to identifying and analysing the challenges faced by fashion design courses in India in ensuring quality education to all the stakeholders.

6. Research Objectives

The key objectives of the study are highlighted below:

- To identify the problems and challenges faced by institutions in ensuring quality in fashion design and technology education programs.
- To analyse the relative importance of different challenging factors impacting quality assurance in fashion design and technology programs
- To analyse the impact of different challenging factors on quality assurance in fashion design and technology programs.
- To compare and contrast the perceptions of education and industry professionals in their assessment of different challenging factors in quality assurance in fashion design and technology programs.

7. Research Design and Methodology

From the review of extensive quantum of studies on quality assurance in higher education and insights gathered from industry professionals in fashion design, the key challenges faced by educational institutions in providing quality fashion design education was identified and analysed. From the initial analysis 25 factors were identified. A sample of 25 faculty members of fashion design and technology courses and 25 fashion design industry professionals were approached for the pilot study to refine and identify the most important challenges facing the higher fashion design and technology education in the country. As an outcome of the pilot study, nine key challenges were identified impacting the quality assurance in fashion design and technology courses. The key challenges are “Policies and Frameworks”, “Innovation”, “Employability of Graduates”, “Leadership Support”, “Infrastructural Resources”, “Funding and Support for development”, “Facilities”, “Accreditation System”, and “Quality of Faculty Members”.

In this work, descriptive research approach was adopted. The sample for the study included Faculty Members of different institutions offering "Fashion Technology and Design Courses" and Industry Professionals from Fashion Design Industry. In accordance with the sample size determination for research projects as formulated by Krejcie and Morgan (1970), the sample size was determined as 600. The questionnaire was administered with 730 respondents. However, the final sample size was limited to 600 with a response rate of 82.2%. The study respondents were selected based on a combination of convenient and snowball sampling procedure.

The respondents were asked to rate the extent of influence of different factor as a challenge in insurance quality in fashion design and technology education in India. The study adopted five point Likert scale system with scale options as “Very Small Extent” “Small Extent”, “Neutral”, “Large Extent” and “Very Large Extent”.

8. Results and Discussion

8.1 Demographic Profile

The demographic profile of the respondents of the study is shown in Table 1. A total of 600 respondents were included in the study. Based on the gender, 49.5% (N=297) were male and 50.50% (N=303) were female members. With respect to the age profile, majority of the respondents were aged between 31 and 40 years (57.7%, N=346), followed by respondents with age over 50 years (26.00%, N=156). Similarly, 13.7% (N=82) of respondents were from the age group of 41 - 50 years and 2.7% (N=16) of respondents were from the age group of below 30 years.

With regard to education, 61.173% (N=367) of the respondents hold PG degrees and 20.83% (N=125) of the respondents were holding Undergraduate degrees. Interestingly, 18.00% (N=108) of respondents were PhD degree holders. Regarding the experience level, 40.67% (N=244) of respondents have experience below 10 years, followed by 34.00% (N=204) of respondents with experience of between 11 - 20 years. Only 25.33% (N=152) of respondents have work experience of over 20 years. The study included 50% (N=300) of respondents from industry (fashion design and technology) and another 50% (N=300) from education.

Table 1: Demographic Profile

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percent
Gender	Male	297	49.50
	Female	303	50.50
Age (Years)	Upto 30	16	2.7
	31-40	346	57.7
	41-50	82	13.7
	Above 50	156	26.0
Education	UG	108	18.00
	PG	125	20.83
	PhD	367	61.17

Experience (years)	Below 10	244	40.67
	11 - 20	204	34.00
	Above 20	152	25.33
Nature of Employment	Industry	300	50.00
	Education	300	50.00

8.2 Descriptive Statistics and Reliability Analysis

The descriptive statistics and reliability analysis of the factors impeding the quality assurance in fashion design and technology courses in India is presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics and Reliability Analysis (N=600)

Factors	Mean (M)	Std. Deviation (SD)	Cronbach's Alpha
Quality of Faculty Members	3.91	0.57	0.85
Policies and Frameworks	4.56	0.52	0.85
Infrastructural Resources	4.20	0.58	0.92
Funding and Support	4.15	0.45	0.88
Leadership Support	4.25	0.63	0.87
Facilities	4.07	0.48	0.81
Accreditation System	4.05	0.51	0.83
Employability of Graduates	4.29	0.48	0.87
Innovation	4.37	0.37	0.87

Based on the mean rating, it is observed that top-rated factor impacting the quality assurance in higher education included "Policies and Frameworks" (M=4.56, SD=0.52), "Innovation" (M=4.37, SD=0.37) and "Employability" (M=4.29, SD=0.48). On the other hand, respondents have deemed that the factors like "Quality of Faculty Members" (M=3.91, SD=0.57), "Accreditation System" (M=4.05, SD=0.51) and "Facilities" (M=4.07, SD=0.48) were moderately impacting the quality assurance in fashion design and technology courses. The coefficient of reliability (Cronbach Alpha) value for all the factors affecting quality assurance is presented in the table. In general, the value of Cronbach's Alpha above 0.7 is considered reliable (Brown, 2002). A reliable scale accurately measures what it is supposed designed to measure. All of the impacting factors in quality assurance have Cronbach's Alpha value of above 0.6, indicating that the scale is reliable.

8.3 Relative Importance Index (RII)

The statistical measure Relative Importance Index (RII) is used to compute the relative extent of the impact of different challenging factors in quality assurance based on the perception of respondents (Table 3)

Table 3: Relative Importance Index (RII)

Challenge to Quality Assurance	Very Small Extent	Small Extent	Neutral	Large Extent	Very Large Extent	Weighted Total	RII
Policies and Frameworks	0	0	16	198	386	2770	0.92
Innovation	0	0	90	104	406	2716	0.91
Employability of Graduates	0	0	12	316	272	2660	0.89
Leadership Support	0	0	36	296	268	2632	0.88
Infrastructural Resources	0	0	0	406	194	2594	0.86
Funding and Support	0	0	44	364	192	2548	0.85
Facilities	0	0	60	454	86	2426	0.81
Accreditation System	0	0	86	484	30	2344	0.78
Quality of Faculty Members	0	24	78	448	50	2324	0.77

From the table 3, it is evident that the respondents have given higher weightage to Policies and Frameworks (RII=0.92) as an important challenge in the quality assurance in fashion education programs, followed by Innovation (RII=0.91), Employability of Graduates (RII=0.89), Leadership Support (RII=0.88), Infrastructural Resources (RII=0.86), Funding and Support (RII=0.85), Facilities (RII=0.81), Accreditation System (RII=0.78) and Quality of Faculty Members (RII=0.77).

8.4 Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis 1: No significant difference between respondents with different type on the perception toward different challenging factors in quality assurance in fashion education programs

The hypothesis was tested by conducting Independent sample t-test with respondents type consisting of Education Professionals (N=300), Industry Professionals (N=300) as independent variable and different challenging factors as dependent variable and results are discussed (Table 4)

Table 4: Independent Sample t-test between Education and Industry Professionals on different Challenging Factors in Quality Assurance

Challenges in QA	Respondent	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-value	p-value
Quality of Faculty Members	Education Professional	3.94	0.55	1.19	0.23(ns)
	Industry Professional	3.88	0.58		
Employability of Graduates	Education Professional	4.24	0.50	-2.35	0.02*
	Industry Professional	4.33	0.45		
Policies and Frameworks	Education Professional	4.55	0.56	-0.57	0.57(ns)
	Industry Professional	4.57	0.48		
Funding and Support	Education Professional	4.13	0.45	-0.99	0.32(ns)
	Industry Professional	4.17	0.45		
Innovation	Industry Professional	4.31	0.34	3.69	0.00**
	Education Professional	4.42	0.38		
Facilities	Education Professional	4.13	0.52	2.81	0.01*
	Industry Professional	4.02	0.42		
Accreditation System	Education Professional	4.10	0.55	2.25	0.02*
	Industry Professional	4.00	0.46		
Infrastructural Resources	Education Professional	4.12	0.58	-3.74	0.00**
	Industry Professional	4.29	0.56		
Leadership Support	Education Professional	4.20	0.64	-2.15	0.03*
	Industry Professional	4.31	0.62		

* - Significant at 0.05 level

** - Significant at 0.01 level

NS – No Significance

From the Table 4, it is concluded that industry and educational professional has differed significantly on the different factors affecting quality assurance in fashion education programs like Employability of Graduates (t=2.35, p=0.02), Innovation (t=3.69, p=0.00), Facilities (t=2.81, p=0.01), Accreditation System (t=2.25, p=0.02), Infrastructural Resources (t=3.74, p=0.00) and Leadership Support (t=2.15, p=0.03). On the other hand, there was no significant differences in the perception of respondents on the factors like Quality of Faculty Members, Policies and Frameworks, and Funding and Support. Thus, the hypothesis was rejected for the factors like Employability of Graduates (5% level), Innovation (1% level), Facilities (1% level), Accreditation System (5% level), Infrastructural Resources (5% level) and Leadership Support (1% level). The hypothesis was accepted for Quality of Faculty Members, Policies and Frameworks, and Funding and Support as the p-value was greater than 0.05.

Industry professionals have given higher importance to Policies and Frameworks (M=4.57, SD=0.48), Employability of Graduates (M=4.33, SD=0.45), and Infrastructural Resources (M=4.29, SD=0.56) as the prominent factors affecting quality assurance in fashion design and technology programs. Similarly, education professionals have also given higher importance to Policies and Frameworks (M=4.55, SD=0.56), Innovation (M=4.42, SD=0.38), and Employability of Graduates (M=4.24, SD=0.5) as the prominent factors affecting quality assurance in fashion design and technology programs.

Hypothesis 2: No significant difference between respondents with different gender on the perception toward different challenging factors in quality assurance in fashion education programs

The hypothesis was tested by conducting the Independent sample t-test with respondents Gender as the independent variable and different challenging factors as dependent variable and results are discussed (Table 5)

Table 5: Independent Sample t-test between Gender and different Challenging Factors in Quality Assurance

Factors	Gender	N	Mean (M)	Std. Deviation (SD)	t-value	p-value
Quality of Faculty Members	Male	297	4.00	0.46	5.90	0.00**
	Female	303	3.72	0.70		
Employability of Graduates	Male	297	4.41	0.34	9.75	0.00**
	Female	303	4.04	0.60		
Policies and Frameworks	Male	297	4.78	0.29	17.78	0.00**
	Female	303	4.13	0.60		
Funding and Support	Male	297	4.26	0.34	8.33	0.00**
	Female	303	3.95	0.57		
Innovation	Male	297	4.38	0.39	1.44	0.15 (ns)
	Female	303	4.34	0.32		
Facilities	Male	297	4.14	0.43	4.62	0.00**
	Female	303	3.95	0.54		
Accreditation System	Male	297	4.11	0.53	3.77	0.00**
	Female	303	3.94	0.46		
Infrastructural Resources	Male	297	4.26	0.44	3.13	0.00**
	Female	303	4.10	0.78		
Leadership Support	Male	297	4.37	0.56	6.79	0.00
	Female	303	4.01	0.70		

From the Table 5, it is inferred that the male and female respondents have differed significantly on all the factors affecting quality assurance in fashion education programs except Innovation. Thus, the hypothesis was rejected for the all the factors (excluding Innovation) at 1% level.

Hypothesis 3: No significant difference between respondents of different age on the perception toward different challenging factors in quality assurance in fashion education programs

The hypothesis was tested by conducting the One way ANOVA with Age as the independent variable and different challenging factors as dependent variable and results are discussed (Table 6).

Table 6: One way ANOVA between Age and different Challenging Factors in Quality Assurance

Variable		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F-value	p-value
Quality of Faculty Members	Between Groups	36.36	3.00	12.12	46.42	0.00**
	Within Groups	155.62	596.00	0.26		
	Total	191.98	599.00			
Employability of Graduates	Between Groups	26.23	3.00	8.74	47.50	0.00**
	Within Groups	109.69	596.00	0.18		
	Total	135.92	599.00			
Policies and Frameworks	Between Groups	30.30	3.00	10.10	45.38	0.00**
	Within Groups	132.64	596.00	0.22		
	Total	162.93	599.00			
Funding and Support	Between Groups	14.73	3.00	4.91	27.52	0.00**
	Within Groups	106.31	596.00	0.18		
	Total	121.04	599.00			
Innovation	Between Groups	9.67	3.00	3.22	26.75	0.00**
	Within Groups	71.81	596.00	0.12		
	Total	81.48	599.00			
Facilities	Between Groups	16.69	3.00	5.56	27.75	0.00**
	Within Groups	119.51	596.00	0.20		
	Total	136.20	599.00			
Accreditation System	Between Groups	27.48	3.00	9.16	42.47	0.00**
	Within Groups	128.54	596.00	0.22		
	Total	156.02	599.00			
Infrastructural Resources	Between Groups	30.74	3.00	10.25	35.96	0.00**
	Within Groups	169.82	596.00	0.28		
	Total	200.56	599.00			
Leadership Support	Between Groups	45.69	3.00	15.23	46.63	0.00**
	Within Groups	194.69	596.00	0.33		
	Total	240.38	599.00			

From the Table 6, it is inferred that the respondents with different Age have differed significantly on all the factors affecting quality assurance in fashion education programs except Innovation. Thus, the hypothesis was rejected for the all the factors at 1% level.

9. Conclusions

The findings of this work have revealed important insights into the contemporary difficulties surrounding quality assurance in higher education institutions in general and fashion design and technology courses in particular in India. First, this study has demonstrated that implementing quality assurance procedures and standards is not a guarantee for resolving quality challenges in higher fashion design and technology education. It depends on several factors including how effectively the said policies, frameworks and procedures are followed diligently. Given the steep increase in the demand for fashion design and technology courses in higher education arena, it is strongly believed that the rapid growth is unavoidable. However, the preliminary concern here is how institutions and governing bodies might address accessibility without sacrificing quality.

In addition, nurturing innovation and creativity in fashion education courses on a sustainable manner has become the urgent need of the hour. Without incremental growth in the modernization and novelty in the curriculum, it will be difficult to withstand competition for student community to compete in the global market.

The administration and management of higher education institutions involved in fashion design and technology programs might think of undergoing dramatic adjustments and reorientations to focus more on modernization of curricular requirements in line with the trending needs to enable students' community to keep abreast with latest developments. In a nutshell, fashion education in India need a paradigm shift in its approach to face challenges in equipping students with latest skills and competencies, utilizing opportunities by effectively utilizing the available Funding and Support and alleviating threats in terms of competition from other emerging markets.

10. Implications, Suggestions and Future Scope

This study has successfully identified and ranked the extent of impact of different factors that can detrimentally impact the quality of fashion design and technology education in India. Respondents of the study have strongly believed that the existing "Policies and Frameworks" pose serious challenges in providing quality education to student's community. The educators as well industry professional view that the existing systems, policies, frameworks and procedures in governing higher education in general and fashion design education in particular needs a serious revival in order to compete at global level. Industry professionals are unhappy with the pace at which changes are introduced in curricular design as well as methods of teaching and learning. Similarly, Innovation in the program offering and assessment needs to be seriously rejuvenated so that students can excel in the global level and face challenges with ease. Ensuring appropriate employability, growth and entrepreneurial opportunity has to be primary concern of educational leaders and administrators that could instil confidence in the graduates. In addition, Leadership Support, Infrastructural Resources and Funding and Support are inevitable and proved as critical challenge in guaranteeing quality education to students.

Educational leaders and management teams that strive to provide a quality teaching and learning environment in higher education institutions should examine the significance of a number of the findings highlighted in this study for ensuring the quality of fashion design and technology courses.

This study was conducted as a cross sectional study in which responses were collected simultaneously from the respondents of the study. Thus, future studies may focus on conducting longitudinal studies, in which the change in response attitude of the stakeholders could be appropriately studied. The study recommends that a comparative study can be conducted by collecting data from different higher education streams like engineering, medicine, arts and science.

References

1. Asiyai RI and Oghuvbu EP (2009) An empirical analysis of the causes and possible solutions to decline in quality of tertiary education in Delta state, Nigeria. *Journal of Sociology and Education in Africa* 8(2):1-13.
2. Asiyai, R. I. (2013). Challenges of quality in higher education in Nigeria in the 21st century. *International Journal of Educational Planning & Administration*, 3(2), 159-172.
3. Bora, A. (2012). Professional Education: Overcoming Major Challenges. *University News*, 49(52), 9-17.
4. Borah, B. (2020). Financing of higher education in India: Issues and mitigation measures. *International Journal of Management (IJM)*, 11(4).
5. Chadha, S. K. (2013). Time to Focus on Employability: Education Sector Must be Deregulated. *The Tribune*, Chandigarh.
6. E.S.M. Suresh & Arul Kumaravelu (2017). The Quality of Education and its Challenges in Developing Countries, *2017 ASEE International Forum, Columbus, Ohio*, <https://peer.asee.org/29306>.
7. DuBrin AJ (1979) *Fundamental of organization behaviour: An applied approach*. Cincinnati: south west college publishing.

8. Ehiamentalor ET (1988) Perspectives on National development: A book of readings. Benin: University of Benin press
9. Ekong JE, (2006) Standard in education and quality delivery as imperatives for national productivity. *Nigerian Journal of Educational Philosophy*, 2 (2), 16- 24.
10. Gambhir, V., Wadhwa, N. C., & Grover, S. (2016). Quality concerns in technical education in India: A quantifiable quality enabled model. *Quality assurance in education*.
11. Gupta, A. (2021). Focus on Quality in Higher Education in India. *Indian Journal of Public Administration*, 67(1), 54-70.
12. Idialu, E. E. (2013). Ensuring quality assurance in vocational education. *Contemporary Issues in Education Research (CIER)*, 6(4), 431-438.
13. Kalusi JI, (2001) Teacher quality for quality education *Nigerian Journal of Educational Philosophy* 8 (2): 62-72
14. Komow, B., Khanna, R. & Sharma R.K. (2012). Journey of Higher Education in India: An Analysis of Post-Independence Era. *Asian Journal of Post Multidimensional Research*, 1(1), 96-115.
15. Kors LA, (2008) On the sadness of higher education. *The Wall Street Journal*, Tuesday may 27: 1-7.
16. Krejcie, Robert V., and Daryle W. Morgan. "Determining sample size for research activities." *Educational and psychological measurement*, vol. 30, no. 3, pp. 607-610, 1970.
17. Kumar, C. R. (Ed.). (2018). *The future of Indian universities: Comparative and international perspectives*. Oxford University Press.
18. Kumar, S. (2012). Quality in Indian Higher Education: Problems and Possible Solution. *University News*, 50(43), 52-55.
19. Okebukola PA, (2010) Five years of higher education in Nigeria: Trends in quality assurance. Available at: www.unilorin.edu.ng (accessed 5 March 2012).
20. Oyebade SA, Oladipo SA. and Adetoro JA (2007) Determinants and strategies for quality assurance in Nigerian university education system. *East African Journal of Educational Research and Policy* 2, pp. 63-81.
21. Peretomode VF (2008) What is higher in higher education. Benin-City: Justice Jecko press and publishers Ltd.
22. Reddy, G. C. (2014). Current Realities and Emerging Trends of Fashion Education in India-A Comprehensive Study on Undergraduate Programmes at NIFT, Hyderabad. *BS Publications*, 534.
23. Singh, K. & Singh, K. (2013). Effectiveness of the Quality Assurance Mechanism: Views and Perceptions of Teachers. In Kumar, K. et al. (Eds.) *Resurgence of Education: An Effort towards Quality Culture in Education*. 131- 136. Ludhiana: Nirvaan Publication.
24. Stander, E., & Herman, C. (2017). Barriers and challenges private higher education institutions face in the management of quality assurance in South Africa. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 31(5), 206-224.
25. Stensaker, B. (2007). Quality as fashion: Exploring the translation of a management idea into higher education. In *Quality assurance in higher education* (pp. 99-118). Springer, Dordrecht.
26. Sukdee, T., Tornee, S., & Kraipetch, C. (2017). Factor Analysis of Key Success Indicators in Curriculum Quality Assurance Operation for Bachelor's Degree in Physical Education. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 6(3), 109-115.
27. World Bank (1999) World development report, knowledge for development. Washington D. C: World Bank [53]
28. World Bank (2004) Improving Tertiary education in Sub-Sahara Africa: Things that work. Report of a regional training conference, Accra, Ghana.