

Quality of Various Aspects of Higher Education in Private Sector of Pakistan as Viewed by Administrator, Teacher and Students

Abdul Majeed Khan*

Abstract

The major purpose of this paper was to examine the quality of various aspects of higher education in private sector of Pakistan. The population of the study constituted 270 administrators, 6180 teachers and 61108 students in existing 54 private universities and degree awarding institutions of Pakistan. Multi stage random sampling procedure was used to select the study sample of 840 people, which was carried out in two stages. At the first stage, 12 clusters of universities were randomly chosen. At the second stage, 60 administrators, 180 teachers and 600 students were selected through random sampling procedure with five administrators, 15 teachers and 50 students from each selected cluster. Three questionnaires developed and refined through pre-testing, were used as measuring instruments to collect data. The researcher personally visited each university to collect data. The collected data was tabulated, analyzed and interpreted by using ANOVA and t test technique. It was concluded that Male, experienced, permanent and more highly qualified administrators indicated favourable opinion about the quality of higher education, particularly quality of management and quality of curriculum. Male professors, teachers with higher qualification, experienced and permanent teachers evidenced more favourable opinion about the quality of higher education, especially the quality of institutions. Male students and those who enrolled in master degree programmes expressed more favourable opinion about the quality of higher education, especially about dimensions of quality of infrastructure, quality of faculty, quality of students, quality of curriculum and quality of institutions.

Introduction

The private sector contribution creates a visible impact on educational development. Privatization is expanded rapidly in developing countries. In all developed countries, higher education is supported by private finance. Private higher education plays a variety of roles in different situations, depending on the educational program that the private university and the political functions that it may serve. One can see around the world many institutions in which the private sector provides little support for scholarship. According to the UNESCO (1998), quality is inseparable for social relevance. The implication of the quality requirement and of policies aiming at "quality safeguard" approach is that improvements should be sought, at

*National Education Foundation, Lahore-Pakistan

at the same time, to each of the components parts of the institution and to the institution as an integral whole, functioning as a coherent system. The quality of higher education depends upon:

- Quality of staff which includes; acceptable social and financial status, a will to reduce inequalities such as those relating to gender a concern to manage staff in accordance with the merit principle and provide them with the in service training. They need in order to fulfill their role in changing society; the establishment of incentives and structures to encourage researchers to work in multidisciplinary teams on thematic projects, thus breaking with the habit of exclusively solitary scientific work.
- Quality of curricula, which calls for special care in the definition of the objectives of the training provided in relation to the requirements of the world of work and the needs of society an adaptation of teaching methods to make students more active and to develop an enterprising spirit an expansion of, and greater flexibility/ training facilities so as to make full use of the possibilities afforded by IT and to take the characteristics of the context into account the internationalization and networking of curricula, students and teachers.
- Quality of the students who constitute the raw material of higher education, which requires special attention to their problems of access in the light of criteria related to merit (abilities and motivation) proactive policies for benefit of the disadvantaged, exchanges with secondary education and with the involved in the transition from secondary to higher education, to ensure that education is an unbroken chain.
- Quality of the infrastructure and of the external environment, not for getting the infrastructure connected with the use and development of IT, without which networking, distance education facilities and the possibility of a "virtual university" could not be envisaged.
- Quality of the management of the institution as a coordinated and coherent whole, interacting with its environment, being impossible for institutions of higher education to exist as isolated enclaves.

The pursuit of "quality education" is ubiquitous in our society. Schools and programs can be assessed and ranked using measurable standards that quantify predetermined quality attributes. Although accreditation is generally considered the primary mechanism for quality assurance in higher education, disagreement often exists between accrediting agencies and the perceptions of professionals who feel the accrediting body has failed to meet its quality control function (Dill D, 1996).

Virk (1998) was of the view that higher education in Pakistan needs urgent reforms as it is not presently contributing effectively to economic growth of the country. The standard of higher education is not enviable because the universities in their present form are neither geared to create new knowledge nor do their graduate study programs measure up to

international standard. The rapid expansion of the system, limited financial input and student unrest have eroded the teaching/learning process, despite the modernization of curricula. The supply of funds to universities is limited, coupled with inefficient use of public funding. The universities are unresponsive to market trend and are essentially divorced from work of world. Higher education is more supply –oriented than demand-oriented. The research base in universities is rather weak. However, he adds Centers of Excellence, Center of Advanced Studies, Area Study Centers and mono-disciplinary institutions in the universities have made substantial advances in a number of research fields. Yet inadequately equipped libraries and laboratories and a shortage of qualified teachers continue to hinder the progress of higher education.

Prachayani (2006) states that the Pakistani government has stressed the role of private sector in promoting higher education in order to help enhance low rates of higher education enrollment and national literacy in a context of resource constraints. Research-oriented education and modern teaching methods are the prime foci of such promotion. Notwithstanding a view that private institutions have been providing laudable services and quality education, the government will continue to monitor the performance of both private and public institutions.

The low quality of teaching faculty as a whole is one of the major causes of the low standards of education. The research strength and quality of academic programs of an institution depend on the quality of the faculty. Poor quality and shortage of qualified teachers continues to hinder the progress of higher education towards achieving international standard (Isani & Virk, 2003).

Coffman (1997) states that the growth of private higher education has had some positive impacts. Private universities pay generally much higher salaries, and the best ones offer quality libraries and research facilities. They tend to respond to the public demand for modern, hands-on practical training in business and technology.

Castro and Levy (2000) describe that private institutions rarely assume or claim to assume academic elite roles complete with doctoral education, basic research, large laboratories and libraries, or mostly full-time academic staffs. This provides an opening for critics to belittle these institutions as not “true universities,” not fulfilling university roles.

Bernasconi (2004) concludes that compared to the other types of private universities, the affiliated ones possess distinctive mission statements and declarations of principles, consistent with the orientations of their sponsor institutions, tend to be smaller, and tend to have more full-time and better qualified faculty. Some receive financial support from their sponsor organizations or its members. Distinctiveness was not found in student selectivity, nor in tuition levels, program offerings, curriculum design, the weight of research and graduate programs in their functions, student socio-

economic profile and faculty involvement in governance.

Govt. of Pakistan (1988) realizes that the universities were faced with serious administrative problems, large budget deficits, outmoded curricula, defective examination system and a lack of focus on research. During the Seventh Year Plan, special attention was planned to be paid to bring about improvements in university education through a series of reforms. Emphasis was laid on improvement in quality of instruction at college level. Use of computer was to be encouraged. Private sector was encouraged with various incentives to open quality institutions.

Govt. of Pakistan (1993) focuses on the broadening of the resource base for financing education through increased allocation and encouraging private sector's participation in provision of educational facilities at all levels.

Brenda and Baron (2000) argued that there are many items related to duties carried out by non academic staff e.g. administrators and faculty support staff, over whom the academic staff may have no direct control. Academic staff should also take care of non-academic issues in order that students attain satisfaction in their studies. The students are not interested in university organizational hierarchies, and accept all university staff to work together.

Ruch (2001) states that private institutions are responsible for their own funding, along with internal governance and management, the relationship and due diligence to students, parents, government and public authorities. Lessons from other countries with established private institutions have shown that in the majority of cases, institutions are financed by tuition payments from students. For example, in the USA, nearly 95% for the profit colleges' revenues is generated from tuition and fees in contrast to 42.2% for private not-for-profit and 18.4% for public not-for-profits higher academic institutions.

Govt. of Pakistan (1989) describes that some private educational institutions earned high reputation for the academic standards they maintained and for the quality of their public instruction. However, in a vast majority, the educational conditions were less satisfactory, the service conditions were poor, the staff salaries were low, and job security was non-existent. In this situation, when the private educational institutions were pursuing a faulty educational process, and the teachers were dissatisfied

Verman (1992) states that there is a craze for management education and getting the Master in Business Administration degree. The MBA programmes are conducted by the university departments, affiliated colleges and institutes and by the private organizations. But only a few of the university-affiliated colleges and institutes are well equipped to conduct the courses for MBA. Their infrastructure, facilities, faculty resources, libraries, research and other activities are not adequate to run the management courses. Generally, an affiliated college appoints one full time director, one or two full time faculty members and the visiting faculty members are taken

from the industrial field and nearby affiliated colleges for the conduct of management courses. The faculty members who teach B.A. and B.Com courses start teaching management courses without any orientation, without exposure to decision making

Coffman (1997) states that the growth of private higher education has had some positive impacts. Private universities generally pay much higher salaries, and the best ones offer quality libraries and research facilities. They tend to respond to the public demand for modern, hands-on practical training in business and technology. The schools are free to offer innovative curricula, unconstrained by bureaucratic demands, to adhere to an outdated, set program. They usually offer more appealing learning environments that are free of political conflict and physical decay. This has caused public universities to take a closer look at their own responsiveness to the needs of students and the market.

Hamidullah (2004) conducted a study on “comparison of the quality of higher education in public and private sector institutions in Pakistan”. The objectives of the study were to compare the quality of staff, quality of student, quality of infrastructure of higher education in public and private institutions. The sample was twenty universities/degree awarding institutions, ten each from public and private sectors. The major findings of the study were that the teachers in private sector were confident and competent than the public sector; the quality of students was better in private sector than in public sector, private sector universities were far better than public sector whereas playgrounds, common rooms, cafeteria, hostels, dispensaries and transport facilities were better to a greater extent in public sector universities and lastly as far as quality of management was concerned both sectors were weak.

Recently, institutions of higher learning are characterized by student diversity, newer teaching technologies, changing public expectations, shifting emphasis towards the learner, expanding faculty work loads, and a new labor market for faculty (Austin, 2002). These characteristics indicate a major transformation in higher education (Rice, 1998; Schuster, 1999).

The Malaysian government has linked economic development with education and envisioned that the country will be a regional educational hub. To this end, the government established the National Accreditation Board to regulate activities related to all aspects of education such as infrastructure, curriculum and human resources to increase the efficiency and standardize education, particularly in the private higher institutions (LAN, 1998).

A survey of private education institutions indicate that many of these institutions offer courses in fields such as accountancy, business studies and computer studies which do not require large capital outlay (Tan, 2002). With a competitive trend for student numbers, cost-revenue calculations, limited scope for significant changes to work practices, funding for academic careers is unlikely to obtain high priority.

The issue regarding the quality of education in private institutions is the main focus of the study. It is a fact that quality of education cannot be enhanced in isolation. It has to be coordinated with quality of management, quality of teaching staff, quality of curricula, quality of infrastructure and quality of research, ultimately resulting in quality graduates

Only a few studies appear to have been conducted to investigate the quality of education in Pakistan. The present study was designed to investigate the overall views about the quality of Higher Education in Private Sector of Pakistan.

Statement of the Problem

The major purpose of the study was to examine the quality of various aspects of higher education in Private Sector of Pakistan as viewed by administrators, teachers and students.

Objective of the Study

1. To compare the views of administrators both male and female, permanent and contract based, about the quality of various aspects of higher education.
2. To compare the views of male and female teachers, permanent, contract based and visiting teaching faculty about the quality of various aspects of higher education
3. To compare the views of male and female students about the quality of various aspects of higher education.

Research Procedure

All administrators, teachers and students of privately managed universities and degree awarding institutions in Pakistan constituted the population from which samples were drawn for the study. Multi stage random sampling procedure was used in order to select the study sample of 840 people, which was carried out in two stages. At the first stage, 12 clusters of universities were randomly chosen out of the total population of existing 54 private universities. At the second stage, 60 administrators, 180 teachers and 600 students were selected through random sampling procedure with five administrators, 15 teachers and 50 students from each selected cluster. Three questionnaires - one each for administrators, teachers and students were developed based upon five point Likert scale for data collection. The questionnaires comprised of items mainly about the quality of various aspects of higher education. These quality aspects are described by UNESCO (1998).

Questionnaire for Administrators

The questionnaire consisted of total 38 items out of which 30 were based upon 5 point Likert scale. First part of the questionnaire was regarding

the personal history of administrators. Second part consisted of seven items dealing with management aspects. Third part consisting of eight items, sought information from the administrators regarding the infrastructure. Fourth part of the questionnaire contained nine items in which information was asked about the quality of teachers. Fifth part of the instrument consisting of two items asked about quality of students. One item was asked about the curriculum and three items related to check the quality of the institutions.

Questionnaire for Teachers

This questionnaire consisted of total 43 items among which 36 items were based upon five point Likert scale. The questionnaire developed for teachers asked for the information regarding their academic qualification, gender and experience. Apart from it, questions about the management system consisted of eight items. Second part of the questionnaire consisted of six items in which information was asked about quality of infrastructure. Third part of the questionnaire related to the quality of teachers which comprised 12 items. The fourth part of the questionnaire was about the curriculum which consisted of only one item. The fifth part of the questionnaire comprised of two items about quality of students. The sixth part of the questionnaire consisted of seven items about quality of the institutions.

Questionnaire for Students

This questionnaire consisted of total 29 items among which 25 were based upon five point likert scale. The questionnaire developed for students asked for information regarding their gender and degree programme. The first part of the questionnaire dealt with the infrastructure and comprised of eight items. Second part of the questionnaire about the quality of teachers consisted of ten items. Third part of the questionnaire was about quality of students which comprised two items. Fourth part of the questionnaire about the quality of institutions consisted of four items. In the last part of the questionnaire, only one item was related to the curriculum.

The questionnaires were refined through pre-testing.

Data Analysis

The responses obtained through the above-mentioned research instruments were scored before statistical analysis and interpretation. The responses ranged from strongly agree (coded as 5) to strongly disagree (coded as 1).

The frequencies of all demographic variables were taken. The statistics on the scores of the questionnaires were computed, as cited below:

The data analysis included descriptive measures to get sense of data. To determine the reliability of three questionnaires and its sub scale Cronbach

Alpha and Inter-scale correlation matrix were calculated. t-test was applied to find the mean difference on the scores of three questionnaires and its sub scales between two groups, on the variable of gender, experience and nature of job etc. One way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was computed to find the mean difference on the scores of three questionnaires and its sub scales between three groups.

Results

The responses on the quality of various aspects of higher education in private universities, were tabulated, analyzed and interpreted in this section.

Table 1

Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient of the overall questionnaire for administrators with its subscales as a measure of its internal consistency

Scales	No. of Items	Alpha Co-efficient
Overall Scale	30	.887
Quality of Management	7	.786
Quality of Infrastructure	8	.806
Quality of Faculty	9	.732
Quality of Students	2	.675
Quality of Institutions	3	.788

The above table shows the alpha reliability of the questionnaire for administrators regarding role of private sector in higher education and its sub-scales. The questionnaire appears to be statistically reliable tool for measuring the quality of various aspects of higher education in private sector of Pakistan.

Table 2

Inter-scale correlation matrix between the questionnaire for administrators and its sub-scales.

Scales	Mang	Infra	Faculty	Students	Curr	Inst	Total
Quality of Management (Mang)	1.0						
Quality of Infrastructure (Infra)	0.456**	1.0					
Quality of Faculty (Faculty)	0.223	0.434**	1.0				
Quality of Students (Students)	0.376**	0.422**	.676**	1.0			
Quality of Curriculum (Curr)	0.502**	.375**	0.313*	0.385**	1.0		
Quality of Institutions (Inst.)	0.418**	0.309*	0.547**	0.494**	0.187	1.0	
Total	0.701**	0.779**	0.768**	0.712**	0.539**	0.677**	1.0

*p < .05; **p < .01

Table 2 states the correlation between the questionnaire for administrators and its sub-scales. All the values are positively correlated to each other. There is a positive significant correlation among quality of infrastructure; quality of faculty and quality of students i.e. 0.676 reflect that quality of students increased with the increase of quality of faculty. Similarly, quality of the institutions is significantly correlated with quality of management (0.418), quality of faculty (0.547) and quality of students (0.494). The total score of the questionnaire is highly correlated with all its subscales at $p < .01$.

Table 3

Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient of the overall questionnaire for teachers with its subscales as a measure of its internal consistency.

Scales	No. of Items	Alpha Co-efficient
Overall Scale	36	.743
Quality of Management	8	.462
Quality of Infrastructure	6	.448
Quality of Faculty	12	.515
Quality of Students	2	.421
Quality of Institutions	7	.481

Table 3 shows the alpha reliability of the questionnaire for teachers regarding role of private sector in higher education and its sub-scales/areas. The internal consistency of the items within sub-scales is acceptable but not as high as expected of such scales. The relatively lower values may be because of lesser number of items in each sub-scale.

Table 4

Inter-scale correlation matrix between the questionnaire for teachers regarding role of private sector in higher education and its sub-scales

Scales	Manag	Infra	Faculty	Cur	Students	Inst	Total
Quality of Management (Mang)	1.0						
Quality of Infrastructure (Infra)	.265**	1.0					
Quality of Faculty (Faculty)	.216**	.163*	1.0				
Quality of Students (Students)	.265**	.310**	.196**	1.0			
Quality of Curriculum (Curr)	.310**	.174*	.186*	.413**	1.0		
Quality of Institutions (Inst.)	.418**	.425**	.271**	.283**	.214**	1.0	
Total	.701**	.624**	.622**	.499**	.475**	.742**	1.0

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

The above table illustrates the correlation between the questionnaire for teachers regarding the quality of various aspects of higher education in private sector of Pakistan and its sub-scales/areas. All the values are positively correlated to each other. There is a positive significant correlation among quality of institutions, quality of students and quality of curriculum. The total score of the questionnaire is highly correlated with all its subscales at $p < .01$.

Table 5

Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient of the overall questionnaire for students with its subscales as a measure of its internal consistency.

Scales	No. of Items	Alpha Co-efficient
Overall Scale	25	.629
Quality of Infrastructure	8	.477
Quality of Faculty	10	.423
Quality of Students	2	.551
Quality of Institutions	4	.501

The above table indicates the alpha reliability of the questionnaire regarding the quality of various aspects of higher education in private sector of Pakistan and its sub-scales.

Table 6

Inter-scale correlation matrix between the questionnaires for students regarding quality of various aspects of higher education

Scales	Infra	Faculty	Students	institution	curri	Total
Quality of Infrastructure (Infra)	1.0					
Quality of Faculty (Faculty)	.150**	1.0				
Quality of Students (Students)	.156**	.206**	1.0			
Quality of Institution (Inst.)	.219**	.173**	.232**	1.0		
Quality of curriculum (Curr)	.260**	.227**	.184**	.210**	1.0	
Total	.693**	.696**	.447**	.572**	.446**	1.0

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

The above table indicates the correlation between the questionnaire regarding the quality of various aspects of higher education in private sector of Pakistan and its sub-scales. All the values are positively correlated to each other. There is a positive significant correlation between the quality of infrastructure, quality of faculty, quality of institutions, quality of curriculum and quality of student. The total score of the questionnaire is highly correlated with all its subscales at $p < .01$.

Table 7

Difference between mean opinion scores of male and female administrators on the quality of various aspects of higher education.

Scale	Male(N=34)		Female(N=16)		t-value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Quality of Management (Mang.)	30.06	3.428	22.94	6.708	4.946**
Quality of Infrastructure (Infra.)	34.97	5.277	28.94	7.407	3.303**
Quality of Faculty (Faculty)	33.97	6.018	33.94	8.362	.016
Quality of Students (Students)	9.18	.936	8.63	1.996	1.338
Quality of Curriculum (Curr.)	4.79	.410	3.25	1.612	5.286**
Quality of Institutions (Inst.)	10.79	2.805	9.75	4.139	1.050
Total	123.76	11.510	107.44	24.536	3.223**

**p < .01

The above table indicates that there is statistically significant difference between mean opinion scores of male administrators and female administrators on the quality of management, quality of infrastructure, and quality of curriculum. Male administrators had more positive opinion on these dimensions. However, no significant difference in mean scores of male and female administrators existed on quality of faculty, quality of students and quality of institutions.

Significant difference was found in the mean opinion scores of male and female administrators about the overall quality of higher education, the mean opinion scores of male and female administrators was significantly higher than their female counterpart.

Table 8

Difference between mean opinion scores of permanent Administrators and contract based administrators on the quality of various aspects of higher education.

Scale	Permanent (N=20)		Contract (N=30)		t-value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Quality of Management (Mang.)	30.05	5.889	26.27	5.265	2.374*
Quality of Infrastructure (Infra.)	36.35	5.613	30.83	6.363	3.145**
Quality of Faculty (Faculty)	37.35	5.050	31.70	6.889	3.143**
Quality of Students (Students)	9.35	.933	8.77	1.569	1.493
Quality of Curriculum (Curr.)	4.75	.444	4.00	1.438	2.254*
Quality of Institutions (Inst.)	11.30	2.515	9.90	3.642	1.495
Total	129.15	15.301	111.47	16.714	3.788**

*p<.05; **p < .01

The above table states that there is statistically significant difference between mean opinion scores of permanent administrators and contract-based administrators on the quality of management, infrastructure, faculty and quality of curriculum. The values indicate that permanent administrators had more positive opinions as compared to contract-based administrators.

However, no significant difference in mean scores of permanent administrators and contract-based administrators existed on quality of students and quality of institutions.

There was significant difference in the mean opinion scores of permanent administrators and contract based administrators on the overall quality of higher education, the mean opinion scores of permanent administrators being significantly higher than contract based administrators.

Table 9

Difference between mean opinion scores of administrators on the quality of various aspects of higher education by qualification.

Scales	Education Level	N	Mean	SD	F-value
Quality of Management (Mang)	Graduate	9	21.78	4.711	7.688**
	Master	25	29.44	4.073	
	M.Phil & above	16	28.56	6.613	
Quality of Infrastructure (Infra)	Graduate	9	27.56	7.350	4.417*
	Master	25	34.60	5.066	
	M.Phil & above	16	33.69	7.078	
Quality of Faculty (Faculty)	Graduate	9	29.44	9.029	6.358**
	Master	25	32.96	5.609	
	M.Phil & above	16	38.06	4.892	
Quality of Students (students)	Graduate	9	7.67	2.236	7.133**
	Master	25	9.12	.927	
	M.Phil & above	16	9.56	.814	
Quality of Curriculum (Curr)	Graduate	9	2.33	1.323	35.585**
	Master	25	4.72	.678	
	M.Phil & above	16	4.75	.447	
Quality of Institutions (Inst.)	Graduate	9	9.78	4.353	.550
	Master	25	10.28	2.951	
	M.Phil & above	16	11.13	3.222	
Total	Graduate	9	98.56	23.522	9.217**
	Master	25	121.12	9.884	
	M.Phil & above	16	125.75	18.146	

*p < .05; **p < .01

Table 9 shows that there is statistically significant difference between mean opinion scores of administrators possessing graduates and above academic qualifications on the quality of management, infrastructure, faculty, students and quality of curriculum. The administrators with M.Phil and above level of education had more positive opinion on the sub scales. However, qualification did not cause any difference in opinion about quality of institution.

Significant difference was found in the mean opinion scores of administrators possessing graduate qualifications and those possessing above graduate academic qualification on the overall quality of higher education. The mean opinion scores of administrators possessing M.Phil and above qualification being significantly higher than administrators possessing

graduate and master academic qualification.

Table 10

Difference between mean opinion scores about quality of higher education by experience.

Scale	Upto 10 years experience (N=28)		Greater than 10 years experience (N=22)		t-value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Quality of Management (Mang)	26.00	6.538	30.05	3.539	-2.599*
Quality of Infrastructure (Infra)	31.96	7.341	34.41	5.387	-1.309
Quality of Faculty (faculty)	32.46	7.010	35.86	6.073	-1.803*
Quality of Students (students)	8.64	1.592	9.45	.858	-2.155*
Quality of Curriculum (curr)	3.93	1.464	4.77	.429	-2.613*
Quality of Institutions (Inst.)	9.32	3.507	11.91	2.238	-2.980**
Total	112.32	20.181	126.45	11.640	-2.921**

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

Table 10 shows that there is statistically significant difference between mean opinion scores of greater and lesser administrators' experience on the quality of management, quality of faculty, quality of students, quality of curriculum and quality of institutions. The figures indicate that administrators who had greater than 10 years' experience expressed positive opinion on these dimensions. However, no significant differences in mean scores having greater and lesser administrators' experience existed about quality of infrastructure.

Significant difference was found in the mean opinion scores of administrators with greater and lesser experience about the overall quality of higher education, the mean opinion scores of experienced administrators being significantly greater than administrators with less experience.

Table 11

Difference between mean opinion scores of male and female teachers on the quality of various aspect of higher education.

Scale	Male(N=113)		Female(N=67)		t-value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Quality of Management (Mang)	27.43	4.450	24.13	4.352	4.848**
Quality of Infrastructure (Infra)	17.27	4.027	15.90	3.372	2.340*
Quality of Faculty (faculty)	43.68	5.179	41.87	4.609	2.367*
Quality of Students (students)	2.61	1.312	2.28	1.433	1.561
Quality of Curriculum (curr)	6.41	1.916	5.63	1.841	2.679**
Quality of Institutions (Inst.)	21.35	4.462	17.96	3.226	5.445**
Total	118.75	13.829	107.76	10.159	5.660**

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

The above table shows that there is statistically significant difference between mean perception scores of male teachers and female teachers on the quality of management, quality of infrastructure, quality of students and quality of institutions. Male teachers had more positive opinion on these dimensions. However, no significant difference in mean scores of male

teachers and female teachers existed on such area as quality of curriculum.

Significant difference was found in the mean opinion scores of male and female teachers on the overall quality of higher education, the mean opinion scores of male and female teachers was significantly higher than their female counterpart.

Table 12 states that there is statistically significant difference between mean perception scores of permanent, contract based and visiting teachers on the quality of management, quality of faculty, quality of student, quality of curriculum and quality of institutions at .01 level. On all these scales permanent teachers have more positive opinion as compared to contract based and visiting teachers. However, on the scores of quality of infrastructure there is no mean difference.

Table 12

Difference in mean opinion scores of permanent, contract based and visiting teachers' on the quality of various aspect of higher education

Scales	Nature of job	N	Mean	SD	F-value
Quality of Management (Mang.)	Permanent	39	27.10	5.418	11.504**
	Contract	75	27.56	3.239	
	Visiting	66	24.14	4.933	
Quality of Infrastructure (Infra.)	Permanent	39	17.54	5.046	1.836
	Contract	75	16.92	2.954	
	Visiting	66	16.11	3.879	
Quality of Faculty (Faculty)	Permanent	39	46.69	6.096	18.723**
	Contract	75	42.84	3.417	
	Visiting	66	41.02	4.764	
Quality of Curriculum (Curr.)	Permanent	39	3.05	1.317	7.505**
	Contract	75	2.59	1.295	
	Visiting	66	2.05	1.341	
Students (Students)	Permanent	39	6.36	2.242	5.160**
	Contract	75	6.51	1.446	
	Visiting	66	5.53	2.070	
Quality of Institution (Inst.)	Permanent	39	22.56	4.919	16.479**
	Contract	75	20.60	2.918	
	Visiting	66	18.05	4.504	
Total	Permanent	39	123.31	17.464	24.958**
	Contract	75	117.01	3.751	
	Visiting	66	106.88	14.333	

**p<.01

Table 13 shows that there is statistically significant difference between mean opinion scores of professors and lecturers on the quality of management, infrastructure, faculty, curriculum, students and quality of institutions. However, the trend shows that professors have more positive perception as compared to lecturers on these sub scales.

Table 13

Difference between mean opinion scores of Professor and lecturers on the quality of various aspect of higher education

Scale	Prof (N=115)		Lecturer (N=65)		t-value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Quality of Management (Mang)	28.10	3.908	22.85	4.024	8.579**
Quality of Infrastructure (Infra)	17.68	3.607	15.12	3.731	4.509**
Quality of Faculty (faculty)	44.47	4.818	40.42	4.359	5.609**
Quality of Students (students)	2.81	1.330	1.92	1.241	4.393**
Quality of Curriculum (curr)	6.63	1.597	5.22	2.118	5.045**
Quality of Institutions (Inst.)	21.70	4.040	17.25	3.354	7.531**
Total	121.38	10.110	102.77	10.659	11.63**

*p < .05; **p < .01

Significant difference was found in the mean opinion scores of professors and lecturers on the overall quality of higher education, the mean opinion scores of professors is significantly higher than lecturers.

Table 14

Difference between mean opinion scores on the quality of various aspect of higher education by experience.

Scale	Greater than 5 years (N=85)		Upto 5 years (N=95)		t-value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Quality of Management (Mang)	27.12	4.368	25.39	4.825	2.508**
Quality of Infrastructure (Infra)	16.62	3.967	16.87	3.748	-.435
Quality of Faculty (faculty)	44.07	5.268	42.05	4.648	2.730**
Quality of Students (students)	2.80	1.343	2.21	1.328	2.957**
Quality of Curriculum (curr)	6.54	1.900	5.74	1.869	2.860**
Quality of Institutions (Inst.)	20.98	3.786	19.29	4.695	2.626**
Total	118.13	12.448	111.56	13.975	3.315**

*p < .05; **p < .01

Table 14 shows that there is statistically significant difference between mean opinions scores of greater and lesser teachers' experience on the quality of management, faculty, student and quality of institutions. The figures state that overall teachers who have greater than five years experience having more positive opinion on these dimensions. However, no significant differences in mean scores of greater and lesser teachers' experience existed on area as quality of infrastructure.

Table 15 indicates that there is statistically significant differences between mean perception scores of graduates, masters and above master level of education on the quality of management, infrastructure, faculty, curriculum, students and quality of institutions. On all these scales the teachers with above master level of education have more positive opinions on all these scales.

Table 15

Difference in mean opinion scores by level of education of teachers.

Scales	Education Level	N	Mean	SD	F-value
Quality of Management (Mang.)	Above Master	31	28.68	4.339	9.270**
	Master	129	26.08	4.491	
	Graduate	20	23.20	4.629	
Quality of Infrastructure (infra.)	Above Master	31	18.68	4.316	6.047**
	Master	129	16.53	3.487	
	Graduate	20	15.20	4.360	
Quality of Faculty (Faculty)	Above Master	31	47.65	4.903	19.764**
	Master	129	41.88	4.154	
	Graduate	20	43.05	6.428	
Quality of Curriculum (Curr.)	Above Master	31	3.32	1.222	9.463**
	Master	129	2.40	1.345	
	Graduate	20	1.80	1.056	
Quality of Students (Students)	Above Master	31	7.13	1.708	6.759**
	Master	129	6.00	1.879	
	Graduate	20	5.30	1.976	
Quality of Institutions (Inst.)	Above Master	31	23.61	4.326	14.918**
	Master	129	19.52	3.969	
	Graduate	20	18.30	4.194	
Total	Above Master	31	129.06	9.416	29.390**
	Master	129	112.41	11.536	
	Graduate	20	106.85	16.721	

*p < .05; **p<.01

Table 16 shows that there is statistically significant difference between mean opinion scores of male students and female students on the quality of infrastructure, faculty, students, institutions and quality of curriculum at .01 level. The trend states that male students having more positive perception as compared to female students.

Significant difference was found in the mean opinion scores of male and female students on the overall quality of higher education, the mean opinion scores of male students being significantly higher than female students.

Table 16

Difference between mean opinion scores of male and female students on the quality of various aspects of higher education

Scale	Male(N=314)		Female(N=286)		t-value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Quality of Management (Mang)	26.33	4.336	19.88	4.311	18.260**
Quality of Infrastructure (Infra)	29.55	4.982	24.79	5.061	11.595**
Quality of Faculty (faculty)	4.35	2.107	3.55	1.514	5.328**
Quality of Students (students)	11.44	3.435	8.77	2.811	10.360**
Quality of Curriculum (curr)	2.39	1.229	1.69	.908	7.831**
Quality of Institutions (Inst.)	74.06	8.572	58.68	6.734	24.281**

**p < .01

Table 17 shows that there is statistically significant mean difference between qualification and score of students on questionnaire and its sub-scale. The quality of infrastructure, quality of faculty, quality of student, quality of curriculum, quality of institutions and overall scores. On all these scales the students who enrolled in Master degree perceived more positive about the role of private sector in higher education in Pakistan as compared to others. This mean difference is statistically significant.

Table 17

Difference between mean opinion scores of level of degree of the students on the quality of various aspect of higher education

Scales	Level of degree	N	Mean	SD	F-value
Quality of Infrastructure (Infra.)	BCS/BIT	180	20.07	4.822	74.204**
	MBBS/MCS/MBA	295	25.55	4.924	
	MA&above	125	22.43	4.630	
Quality of Faculty (Faculty)	BCS/BIT	180	23.76	4.878	87.651**
	MBBS/MCS/MBA	295	29.80	5.249	
	MA&above	125	26.42	3.919	
Quality of Students (Students)	BCS/BIT	180	3.37	1.273	17.757**
	MBBS/MCS/MBA	295	4.39	2.154	
	MA&above	125	3.82	1.715	
Quality of Institutions (Inst.)	BCS/BIT	180	8.83	2.890	41.293**
	MBBS/MCS/MBA	295	11.37	3.500	
	MA&above	125	9.25	2.931	
Quality of Curriculum (Curr.)	BCS/BIT	180	1.66	.841	22.292**
	MBBS/MCS/MBA	295	2.34	1.273	
	MA & above	125	1.96	.995	
Total	BCS/BIT	180	57.69	8.029	205.109**
	MBBS/MCS/MBA	295	73.45	9.803	
	MA & above	125	63.88	4.479	

**p<.01

Discussion

It was found in the present study that male professors and teachers possessing higher qualification, longer experience and job security strongly backed up the quality aspects of higher education in their institutions. The reasons for such optimistic view may also be more personal than professional.

This was also revealed in the study that male students enrolled in master degree programs expressed more positive opinion concerning such quality components of higher education as infrastructure, standard of teaching faculty and curriculum of higher level courses. It may be due to the fact that male students feel themselves to be more adjusted to the system due to nature of Pakistani society that tends to be male dominated.

It is generally acknowledged that most of private universities were established keeping in the view financial gains whose administration has not much do with the needs and aspirations of people. The administrators running universities have their vested interests to protect instead of providing quality education.

In the present study, it was found that all administrators responded more positively as compared to teachers about the quality of higher education on all the dimensions. On the contrary, students expressed negative reactions on almost all facets of higher education. Responses of administrators and students were thus found to be conflicting. Administrators supported the system perhaps because they designed and implemented the policies of their institutions. It seems evident that they were less likely to accept failure. On the other hand, students are keen and sharp observers of the system being tested and implemented upon them who were being charged heavy fees. Therefore, their opinion may be considered as more balanced, fair, realistic and closer to the ground realities. It was revealed in the study that male administrators, holding richer experience, higher qualification and enjoying permanent job with fringe financial benefits expressed greater satisfaction with quality of management and curriculum. This finding may also be subjective because this category of administrators forms the central core of the administrative machinery who are virtually responsible for running the system.

Although the researcher made an effort to obtain views of the stake holders about actual state of functioning of private universities and identify problems and prospects of private universities, yet the results of the study may be erroneous. Ground realities debatable because the respondents did not give sufficient time for filling in the questionnaires or concealed true opinions about reality due to a variety of personal reasons. They only tended to tick the columns or rows in a questionnaire without giving much thought and attention to the statements. It would have better to interview the respondents involved in the system of private sector. Moreover, parents of the students could also be contacted about existing facilities and flaws of the private sector. Teaching system, methodology and technology being used in the classroom could be directly observed for assessment and evaluation of daily classroom teaching. Moreover, achievement test could be developed and administered to the students of the institutions of private sector for the assessment and evaluation of their actual performance.

In addition to the above, other possible flaws of the study might be the inadequate sample of the study. The present study was conducted at national level and the study population comprised all administrators, teachers and students of universities and institutions of higher learning in the private sector. The sample was delimited to only 840 comprising 60 administrators, 180 teachers and 600 students which was not representative enough because of using the cluster sampling technique. Had random sampling been used

and instead of cluster sampling more authentic results would have been obtained.

Conclusions

Following conclusions were drawn in the light of findings of study: Male, experienced, permanent and more highly qualified administrators indicated favourable opinion about the quality of higher education, particularly quality of management and quality of curriculum.

Male professors, teachers with higher levels of degree, teachers possessing greater experience and permanent teachers evidenced more favourable opinion about the quality of higher education, especially the quality of institutions.

Male students and those who enrolled in master degree programmes expressed more favourable opinion about the quality of higher education, especially about dimensions of quality of infrastructure, quality of faculty, quality of students, quality of curriculum and quality of institutions.

Male respondents exhibited more positive views about the quality of various aspects of higher education.

References

- Austin, A. E. (2002). Preparing the Next Generation of Faculty: Graduate School as Socialization to the Academic Career. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73, 941-22.
- Bernasconi (2004). *External Affiliation and Diversity: Chile's Private Universities in International Perspective*. Dean of the Law School, Universidad de Talca, Chile. www.albany.edu/dept/easps/prophe/pulication/paper.html last search
- Brenda, M. & Baron, O. (2000). Student Perceptions of Service Quality in a UK University Business and Management Faculty. *Quality Assurance in Education*. Vol. 8(2) pp. 85-95.
- Castro, Cláudio de Moura, & Levy, D. C. (2000). *Myth, Reality, and Reform: Higher Education Policy in Latin America*. Washington D. C.: Inter-American Development Bank: Distributed by The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Coffman, J. (1997). *Private Higher Education in Pakistan. The need of order* U.S. Educational Foundation, Islamabad. p. 3.

- Dill D, M. W. P & Cook, C. (1996). Accreditation and academic quality assurance. *Change*. Vol. 28 pp. 16–24.
- Govt. of Pakistan (1988). *The Seventh Five Year Plan. 1988-93*. Ministry of Education, Islamabad. pp. 192-193.
- Govt. of Pakistan (1989). *National Education Conference*. Ministry of Education, Islamabad. pp. 53-54.
- Govt. of Pakistan (1993). *The Eighth Five Year Plan. 1993-98*. Ministry of Education, Islamabad. pp. 303-320.
- Hamidullah, M. (2004). Comparison of the Quality of Higher Education in Public and Private Institutions in Pakistan (Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis). University Institute of Education And Research, University of Arid Agriculture, Rawalpindi, Pakistan.
- Isani, U. A. G. & Virk, M. L. (2003). Higher Education in Pakistan: A historic and futuristic perspective. National book Foundation, Islamabad, Pakistan. pp. 4-8, 169- 312.
- LAN (Lembaga Akreditasi Negara) (1998). Guidelines, Procedures and Criteria Standards and Course Quality Analysis for Private Tertiary Education Institutions, 2nd Edition. LAN-GP98-02.
- Prachayani, P. (2006). Private Sector Helps Promote Pakistani Higher Education. www.albany.edu/dept/easps/prophe/publication/news/summary_pakistan2.html. last updated October 29, 2006.
- Rice, R. E. (1998). Making A Place for the New American Scholar. *New Pathways Inquiry* #1. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Ruch, R. S. (2001). *The rise of the for profit university*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Schuster, J. H. (1999). Foreword. In RJ. Menges & Association, Faculty in New Jobs: A Guide to Settling In, Becoming Established and Building Institutional Support. Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Tan, A. M. (2002). *Malaysian Private Higher Education - Globalization, Privatization, Transformation and Marketplaces*, London, ASEAN Academic Press.

UNESCO, (1998). *Higher Education in Twenty First Century: Vision and Action*. Paris. pp. 5-23.

Verman (1992). *Management Education in India*. Oxford and IBH Publishing Co. Pvt. Ltd. New Delhi. p. 105-106.

Virk, M. (1998). *Universities of Pakistan: Hand Book*. University Grants Commission, Islamabad p. 6.