CHAPTER-IV

DATA ANALYSIS & INTERPRETATION

- Service quality dimensions in higher management education.
- Differentiate the expected and delivered quality factors of Private and Public Universities.
- Extent of satisfaction level of students and parents with regard to institutional quality factors.
- Perception of teachers regarding the service quality and the constraints and challenges in providing quality services.
CHAPTER- 4
DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

4. Data Analysis and Interpretation

In this chapter, detailed data analysis and interpretation of study has undertaken to reach out the results of four objectives of the study. The study mainly focused to find out the gap between expectation and perception of stakeholders apropos service quality in higher management education in public and private universities. The researcher has formulated four specific objectives. First objective is to “explore the important service quality dimensions in higher management education”. Second objective is “to differentiate the expected and delivered quality factors of Private and Public Universities”. Third objective is “to study the extent of satisfaction level of students and parents with regard to institutional quality factors”. Fourth objective is “to analyze the perception of teachers regarding the service quality and the constraints and challenges in providing quality services”. Students (n-400), Parents (n-200), and Faculty members (n-100) were the main stakeholders. Three separate questionnaires formulated and distributed among respondents to collect data. Further data analyzed in SPSS version.20 using Independent T-Test. Data analysis and interpretation is given below.

4.1 Demographic profile of the respondents

The demographic profile of the respondents is divided into three parts (students, parents, and faculty).

The sample size of the respondents for the study is 700. The total sample size in comprises of 400 students, 200 parents, and 100 teachers. Out of 400 students, 200 students are selected from public universities (100 from GNDU and 100 from P.U.), and 200 students are selected from private universities (100 from LPU and 100 from Chd. Uni.). Out of 200 parents, 100 parents are selected from public universities (50 from GNDU and 50 from P.U.) and 100 parents are selected from private universities (50 from LPU and 50 from Chd Uni.). Out of 100 teachers, 50 teachers are selected from public universities (25 from GNDU and 25 from P.U.) and 50 parents are selected from private universities (25 from LPU and 25 from Chandigarh University).
4.2 Normality and Homoscedasticity of the data
Normality and homoscedasticity of data is a basic assumption of parametric test. Especially when researcher is using an ANOVA or t-test, he has to follow the assumptions. If the assumptions are violated then the results are false positive. So it is best to use non-parametric tests, where the assumption of normality and homoscedasticity is not applicable, or they can be called assumption free test. However, we are fortunate enough to have t- test, Anova that are so robust. However, many researchers in their researches studies suggest that non-normal data does not produce false positive results if your sample size is large Blanca, et al 2013, Erceg-Hurn, et al 2008, Glass, et al 1972, Harwell, et al 1992, Leech, et al 2002, Lix, et al 1996, Maas, et al 2004, Nimon, et al 2012, Olejnik, et al 1983).

4.3 Reliability of Data (Cronbach’s Alpha (α))
The reliability of the data is checked using Cronbach Alpha. The reliability of data is checked separately for every stakeholder (students, parents, and faculty). Cronbach alpha value is checked to find out the relationship or correlation among the statements within any factor. Many researchers has different opinion of that, (Nunnally, 1978, George and Mallery 2016) suggested that anything above .7 is sufficient. The overall reliability of items related to students' questionnaire/ schedule is .951 and for parents it is .910 and for faculty it is .931, which far ahead of the suggested value. The reliability coefficient of students, parents and faculty is given below according to different dimensions and factors.

4.3.1 Reliability of Data (Cronbach’s) Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha (α) (Expectation)</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha (α) (Perception)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tangibility(4-Items)</td>
<td>.855</td>
<td>.854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability(5-Items)</td>
<td>.822</td>
<td>.783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness(4-Items)</td>
<td>.870</td>
<td>.775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance(4-Items)</td>
<td>.804</td>
<td>.854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy(5-Items)</td>
<td>.880</td>
<td>.898</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table no-4.1 it can be interpreatre that most of the dimensions, whether belongs to expectation section or perception, has more than 0.8 Cronbach Alpha
value. For tangibility it is .855 and .854, for, for reliability it is .822 and .783, for resonsiveness it is .870 and .775, for assurance it is .880 and .898

Table No- 4.2
Reliability Coefficient of student satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Factors</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha (α)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access and Approachable</td>
<td>.816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure</td>
<td>.828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Reputation</td>
<td>.775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety &amp; Security</td>
<td>.881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>.825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placements</td>
<td>.767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee</td>
<td>.884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship</td>
<td>.879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra Curriculum Activities</td>
<td>.839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functioning</td>
<td>.759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feed Back</td>
<td>.847</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For satisfaction section it is more than .7 for all the factors. For access and approachable it is .816, for exposure it is .828, for academic reputation and quality it is.775, for safety and security it is .881, for infrastructure, placements, fee, scholarships, extra curriculum activities, functioning and feed back it is .825, .767, .884, .879, .839, .759, and 847 respectively.

4.3.2 Reliability of Data (Cronbach’s)Parents

Table No- 4.3
Reliability Coefficient of expectation and perception of Parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha (α) (Expectation)</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha (α) (Perception)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tangibility(4-Items)</td>
<td>0.871</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability(5-Items)</td>
<td>0.848</td>
<td>0.886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness(4-Items)</td>
<td>0.804</td>
<td>0.869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance(4-Items)</td>
<td>0.827</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy(5-Items)</td>
<td>0.845</td>
<td>0.863</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the table no-4.3 it can be interpreted that most of the dimensions, whether belongs to expectation section or perception, has more than 0.8 Cronbach Alpha value. For tangibility it is .871 and .840, for, for reliability it is .848 and .886, for resonsiveness it is .804 and .869, for assurance it is .827 and .850. for empathy it is .845 and .863.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Factors</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha (α)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access and Approachable</td>
<td>.885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure</td>
<td>.816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Reputation</td>
<td>.879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety &amp; Security</td>
<td>.886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>.847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placements</td>
<td>.877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee</td>
<td>.868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship</td>
<td>.829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra Curriculum Activities</td>
<td>.887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functioning</td>
<td>.834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feed Back</td>
<td>.824</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For satisfaction section it is more than .7 for all the factors. For access and approachable it is .885, for exposure it is .816, for academic reputation and quality it is .879, for safety and security it is .886, for infrastructure, placements, fee, scholarships, extra curriculum activities, functioning and feed back it is .847, .877, .868, .829, .887, .834, and .824 respectively.

### 4.3.3 Reliability of Data (Cronbach’s) Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha (α)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic Amenities</td>
<td>0.703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>0.815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Resources</td>
<td>0.796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion and Remuneration Policies</td>
<td>0.756</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the table no-4.5 it can be interpreted that most of the factors has above .7 alpha value. For basic amenities it is .703, for infrastructure it is .815, for teaching resources it is .796, for promotion and remuneration it is .756, for administration it is .812, for teaching and research motivation it is .933, for extra curriculum activities it is .926, for grievance handling it is .706.

**Table No- 4.6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constraints and Challenges</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha (α)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selection and Remuneration Constraint</td>
<td>0.716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in Decision Making</td>
<td>0.789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution of work</td>
<td>0.779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Teacher Ratio and Quality</td>
<td>0.788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Constraints</td>
<td>0.797</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table no-4.6 it can be interpreted that most of the factors has above .7 alpha value. For selection and remuneration constraint is .716, for involvement in decision making it is .789, for distribution of work it is .779, for student-teacher ratio and quality it is .788, for institutional constraints it is .797.

4.4 To explore the important service quality dimensions in higher management education.

Under the First objective, expectation of stakeholders (students, parents) regarding service quality in public sector universities and private sector universities is compared with each other. After that, perception of the stakeholders is also compared in the same manner. Firstly, students’ analysis is done and later on, the analysis of parents is done. To find out the difference between both sectors an independent t- is used.
Hypothesis 1

H01: There is no significant variance in the service quality dimensions in Higher Management Education in public and private universities with respect to students.

Table No-4.7
Comparison of Expected Services of Students from Public & Private Universities
& Comparison of Perceived Services of Students from Public & Private Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Statistics</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expected Tangibility</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>4.3238</td>
<td>.48000</td>
<td>.03394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>4.2638</td>
<td>.47961</td>
<td>.03391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Reliability</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>4.2760</td>
<td>.56907</td>
<td>.04024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>4.3530</td>
<td>.51353</td>
<td>.03631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Responsiveness</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>4.1588</td>
<td>.55940</td>
<td>.03956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>4.2925</td>
<td>.46357</td>
<td>.03278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Assurance</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>4.3025</td>
<td>.50837</td>
<td>.03595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>4.3350</td>
<td>.52038</td>
<td>.03680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Empathy</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>4.0660</td>
<td>.55857</td>
<td>.03950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>4.2190</td>
<td>.52038</td>
<td>.03680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Tangibility</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3.8675</td>
<td>.61794</td>
<td>.04370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>4.0188</td>
<td>.67574</td>
<td>.04778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Reliability</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3.6920</td>
<td>.73419</td>
<td>.05191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3.8720</td>
<td>.67132</td>
<td>.04747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Responsiveness</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3.7913</td>
<td>.64814</td>
<td>.04583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3.8675</td>
<td>.64820</td>
<td>.04583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Assurance</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3.8600</td>
<td>.72493</td>
<td>.05126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3.9450</td>
<td>.63065</td>
<td>.04459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Empathy</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3.6700</td>
<td>.73059</td>
<td>.05166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3.9250</td>
<td>.68125</td>
<td>.04817</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table no 4.7 shows the descriptive statistics, regarding expected and perceived quality service in all quality dimensions in public and private universities. Total 200 students from public universities and 200 students from private universities are compared on all five-quality dimension of service quality. The descriptive statistics comprises of mean, standard deviation and standard error mean.
### Independent Samples Test of Comparison of Service Quality dimensions in Public and Private Universities of Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Tangibility</th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>0.359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Reliability</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>1.526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Responsiveness</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>3.518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Assurance</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>0.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Empathy</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>0.542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Tangibility</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Reliability</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>0.624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Responsiveness</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>0.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Assurance</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>4.763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Empathy</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>0.767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the above table no~4.8 it can be examined that five quality dimensions of expectation and perception are analyzed separately for public and private universities from students points of view. The results showed that when expected services on all quality dimensions is compared between public and private universities, only two dimensions produced significant results. At the same time when perceived services on all quality dimensions are compared between public and private universities, three dimensions produced significant results. Where the assumption of Levene test is not met the unequal variance is observed. The mean score of expected tangibility in public (M=4.3238, SD=0.48) and private universities (M=4.2638, SD=0.47961), t(398) =1.251, p>.05 is not significant at 5 percent of significance level. This indicates that students’ expectation regarding tangibility factors (like projectors, smart classes, infrastructures and other learning materials) is not very much different because both the sectors are not provoking the high expectation in the students. Both sectors are putting their best efforts to enhance the tangibility factors so what sought of expectations students have from public sector is meeting by the public sector and same in the case with private sector. So the null hypothesis is accepted. The dissimilarity in the mean score of expected reliability of public (M=4.276, SD=0.56907) and private universities (M=4.353, SD=0.51353), t(398)=-1.42, p>.05 is also not significant at 5 percent of significance level. The reliability dimension (promises, grievance handling, perform right service at right time, placements and error free documentation) is also not able to distinguish the public and private sectors. On expected responsiveness (willingness to help customers immediately, quick transport, career guidance) public universities (M=4.1588, SD=0.5594) are falling behind from private universities (M=4.2925, SD=0.46357), t(398)=-2.6. That is why there is significant p<.05 results are found at 5 percent of significance level. The public sector is always reluctant to quick response, so that is why people have less expectation from public sector. The expectation of students regarding assurance dimension (Courtesy, money worth, ability to instill confidence among students) is little low in public universities (M=4.3025, SD=0.52964) as compare to private universities (M=4.335, SD=0.50837), t(398)=-0.63, that is why insignificant results are found p>.05 significance level. But when expectation of students regarding empathy dimension (individual and personal needs, appropriate convenient operating hours, good understanding of students’ needs) is compare between public and private universities, private universities (M=4.219, SD=0.52038), has a better score then
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public universities (M=4.066, SD=0.55857), t(398)=-2.83, which indicates significant results p<.05. The outcome of independent sample T-test is significant only for two expected quality dimensions (responsiveness and empathy) in contrast for public and private universities.

On the other hand, when students’ perception (actually received services) is compare between public and private universities on all five-quality dimensions only three produce significant results. The variance in the mean score of perceived tangibility dimension (like projectors, smart classes, infrastructures and other learning materials) in public (M=3.8675, SD=0.61794) and private universities (M=4.0188, SD=0.67574), t(398)=-2.34, p<.05 is significant. It is clear from the results that private universities are delivering better services than private universities. The private sector always has better tangibility facilities and because of these factors, they managed to attract the students. The other dimension, which also has a significant result, is reliability. The reliability dimension (promises, grievance handling, perform right service at right time, placements and error free documentation), where private universities (M=3.872, SD=0.67132), outperforms the public universities (M=3.692, SD=0.73419), t(398)=2.56, and produce significant result p<.05. The private universities do bother about students and always keen to help the students and want to build long-term relationship them. The perceived responsiveness (willingness to help customers immediately, quick transport, career guidance) by the students public universities (M=3.7913, SD=0.64814) and from private universities (M=3.8675, SD=0.6482), t(398)=-1.18, p>.05 does not deliver significant results. But between both sectors it is the private sector that scores more on this dimension, but still the difference is insignificant. Again the public universities are (M=3.86, SD=0.72493) performing less in comparison with private universities (M=3.945, SD=0.63065), t(390.515)=1.25, for perceived assurance but difference between the both is not statistically significant p>.05. However, the difference between public and private universities on empathy dimension is found statistically significant p<.05. The mean score of public universities (M=3.67, SD=0.73059) for empathy dimension (individual and personal needs, appropriate convenient operating hours, good understanding of students’ needs) is matched with the mean score of private universities (M=3.925, SD=0.68125), t (398)=-3.61, and produced significant difference in the both sectors. Which indicates that public universities are still not
performing as well as they should have to be, whereas universities despite charging high fee and disadvantage of location of the campus, putting their best efforts to retain the students as long as they can. It means that result of independent sample T-test for perceived quality dimensions is significant for three quality dimensions and insignificant for two-quality dimension

**Hypothesis 2**

H$_{02}$. There is no significant difference in the dimensions of service quality in Higher Management Education in public and private universities with respect to parents.

**Table No- 4.9**

Comparison of Expected Services of Parents from Public & Private Universities, & Comparison of Perceived Services of Parents from Public & Private universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangibility</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.2675</td>
<td>.48883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.4550</td>
<td>.42844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.2320</td>
<td>.55902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.5420</td>
<td>.40829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.1900</td>
<td>.51262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.6225</td>
<td>.44593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.2925</td>
<td>.53661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.5675</td>
<td>.41720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.1800</td>
<td>.46406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.5340</td>
<td>.34472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangibility</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.8225</td>
<td>.62391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.9350</td>
<td>.44893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.7040</td>
<td>.63084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.7440</td>
<td>.60974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.8150</td>
<td>.71741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.7375</td>
<td>.64586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.9550</td>
<td>.74990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.7275</td>
<td>.68266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.8380</td>
<td>.66161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.7460</td>
<td>.62530</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table no 4.9 shows the descriptive statistics, regarding expected and perceived quality service in all quality dimensions in public and private universities. Total 100 parents from public universities and 100 parents from private universities are compared on all five-quality dimension of service quality. The descriptive statistics comprises of mean, standard deviation and standard error mean.
### Independent Samples Test of Comparison of Service Quality Dimensions in Public & Private Universities of Parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Tangibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>3.003</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>-2.885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-2.885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Reliability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>17.224</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-4.478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-4.478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Responsiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>-6.366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-6.366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Assurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>3.964</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>-4.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-4.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Empathy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>12.723</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-6.124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-6.124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Tangibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>12.524</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>-1.464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Reliability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td>0.587</td>
<td>-0.456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Responsiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>0.935</td>
<td>0.335</td>
<td>0.803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Assurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>0.713</td>
<td>2.243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Empathy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>0.686</td>
<td>0.408</td>
<td>1.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the above table no-4.10It is observed that five quality dimensions of service quality are analyzed separately on expectation and perception section for public and private universities on parent’s points of view. The results showed that there is a significant variance in public and private universities on all expected quality dimensions whereas perceived quality dimensions had one significant result. Where the assumption of Levene test is not met the unequal variance is observed. The parents are main stakeholder of the education, whereas students are the real beneficiary but that are the parents, who do all the investment for the education of the students. Therefore, they have to take a decision in which institute/college/university they should enroll their child. The expectation of parents is always different from student perspective because they know hard realities of the world better than their wards. The mean score of expected services of parents from public universities is (M=4.268, SD=0.4888) below from private universities (M=4.455, SD=0.4284), t(198)=-2.89. It means parents have more expectation regarding tangibility dimension (like projectors, smart classes, infrastructures and other learning materials) from private sector as compare to public sector that is why it produced p<.05 significant result. They believe that not all such amenities are available in good condition in public universities. The same kind of results also found in reliability dimension. The mean score of public universities (M=4.232, SD=0.559) and private universities (M=4.542, SD=0.4083), t(181.224)=-4.478, p<.05 for expected reliability (promises, grievance handling, perform right service at right time, placements and error free documentation) is significant. On responsiveness dimension too, parents expected services are more from private universities than public universities. The parents expected responsiveness (willingness to help customers immediately, quick transport, career guidance) from public university is (M=4.19, SD=0.5126) significantly different from private universities (M=4.623, SD=0.4459), t(194.275)=-6.366, p<.05. There is always more fear in private sector to lose the student, because of this; they are more focused on students’ needs and wants. However, these things are missing in public sector. The public sector is least bother about students. Therefore, this is the cause, that parents have a more expectations from private sector. The difference in the mean score of public (M=4.293, SD=0.5366) and private universities (M=4.568, SD=0.4172), t(186.657)=-4.046, p<.05 for expected assurance (Courtesy, money worth, ability to instill confidence among students) is significant. Once again, parents’ expectation regarding assurance (Courtesy, money worth, ability to instill confidence
among students) like all other dimensions is more from private sector rather than public sector. Because they feel that private sector is charging, a high amount of fee from parents for the courses which are their wards are doing and that is why they are supposed to do such kind of services. At last the expected empathy (individual and personal needs, appropriate convenient operating hours, good understanding of students’ needs) is also highlighting the significant difference $p<.05$ between public universities ($M=4.18$, $SD=0.4641$) and private universities ($M=4.534$, $SD=0.3447$), $t(182.755)=-6.124$. Therefore, it is very much clear from the results that parents have a more expectation private universities in comparative to public universities. Because the image of public entities is good in the mind the people, but there is always a doubt in the functioning of the public sector. That is why result of independent sample T-test is significant for all the expected quality dimensions in comparison for public and private universities. On the expectation section private sector is far ahead from public sector, but is it true for the perceived section too. Whether, the parents are getting the same kind of results in terms of perception section too in public and private sector. Let us see, which sector is above in which dimension in the other part.

When parents perceived (actually received services) service is compared with public and private universities, almost on all the dimensions results are insignificant. There is only one dimension, which is assurance where parents perceived services are different. The expectation of parents was more from private sector regarding tangibility dimension but in reality public sector is also trying to compete with it. The mean score of perceived tangibility from public universities ($M=3.823$, $SD=0.6239$) is little below from private universities ($M=3.935$, $SD=0.4489$), $t(179.843)=-1.464$, which indicate that private universities have a upper hand in area. However, the difference is so little that it cannot be called significant. The reliability dimension also does not able to produce significant results. The private universities ($M=3.744$, $SD=0.7174$), $t(198)=-0.46$, are little more aggressive in their approach in comparison of their counterpart public universities ($M=3.704$, $SD=0.6308$). However, the parents think that, once the student is enrolled with university they are fail to keep their promises right. The difference in mean the score of perceived responsiveness (willingness to help customers immediately, quick transport, career guidance) for public universities ($M=3.815$, $SD=0.7174$) and private universities ($M=3.738$, $SD=0.6459$), $t(198)=0.803$, $p>.05$ is also insignificant. Whereas on assurance
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dimension (Courtesy, money worth, ability to instill confidence among students) parents got a more value in return from public sector (M=3.955, SD=0.7499) than private universities (M=3.738, SD=0.6827), t(198)=2.243. At last on empathy dimension (individual and personal needs, appropriate convenient operating hours, good understanding of students’ needs) there is an insignificant difference is found, same can be seen in the mean score of the public universities (M=3.838, SD=0.6616) and private universities (M=3.746, SD=0.6253), t(198)=1.011, p>.05. It means result of independent sample T-test for Delivered quality dimensions is an in significant for majority of the dimensions.

4.5 To differentiate the expected and delivered quality factors of Private and Public Universities.

The second objective aims at to find out the difference between the expected and delivered services quality factors of private universities as well as public universities from parents and students point of view.

4.5.1 Gap Analysis for Students

The gap analysis is done to find out the difference between the expected and delivered services by the private universities as well as public universities from students point of view.

4.5.1.1 Gap Analysis (Public Universities)

Firstly, the gap analysis is done to find out the difference between the expected services and delivered services by public universities to the students from students 'point of view.

Hypothesis 3

H03: There is a no significant difference in the expectation and perception of students regarding service quality in Higher Management Education with respect to five quality dimensions, Tangibility, Reliability, Responsiveness, Assurance, and Empathy for Public Universities.
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#### Table No- 4.11
**Gap Analysis Dimensions wise (Public Universities)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Statistics</th>
<th>SQ</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tangibility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>4.3238</td>
<td>.48000</td>
<td></td>
<td>.03394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivered</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3.8675</td>
<td>.61794</td>
<td></td>
<td>.04370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reliability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>4.2760</td>
<td>.56907</td>
<td></td>
<td>.04024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivered</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3.6920</td>
<td>.73419</td>
<td></td>
<td>.05191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsiveness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>4.1588</td>
<td>.55940</td>
<td></td>
<td>.03956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivered</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3.7913</td>
<td>.64814</td>
<td></td>
<td>.04583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assurance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>4.3025</td>
<td>.52964</td>
<td></td>
<td>.03745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivered</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3.8600</td>
<td>.72493</td>
<td></td>
<td>.05126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Empathy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>4.0660</td>
<td>.55857</td>
<td></td>
<td>.03950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivered</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3.6700</td>
<td>.73059</td>
<td></td>
<td>.05166</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Table no 4.11, showing the descriptive statistics of the public universities (GNDU and PU). The students of both the universities expressed their expectation from the universities and after that, they were asked to reveal the actually received services. The descriptive table shows the mean, standard deviation, and standard error.

#### Table No- 4.12
**Gap Analysis Dimensions wise (Public Universities)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Samples Test</th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tangibility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>6.558</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>8.246</td>
<td>375.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reliability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>6.035</td>
<td>0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>8.891</td>
<td>374.697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsiveness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>3.385</td>
<td>0.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>389.672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assurance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>9.322</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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From the table no-4.12 it can be evaluated that there is a significant difference in all the service quality dimensions, which indicated that expected services were not met with the actually received or delivered services. Where the assumption of Levene test is not met the unequal variance is observed. The first dimension tangibility (projectors, smart classes, infrastructure, learning material) produced a significant difference \( p<.05 \) in the mean score of expected services (\( M=4.3238, SD=0.48 \)) and delivered services (\( M=3.8675, SD=0.61794 \)), \( t(375.05)=8.246 \), which mean null hypothesis is rejected. Same consequences found in rest of the dimensions too, where student’s expectation of services does not meet with actually delivered services in public universities. On the second dimension of service quality i.e. reliability (promises, grievance handling, perform right service at right time, placements and error free documentation) students’ expectation are far ahead (\( M=4.276, SD=0.56907 \)) from actually delivered services (\( M=3.692, SD=0.73419 \)), \( t(374.697)=8.891 \) by the public universities, that is why null hypothesis is rejected \( p<.05 \). It suggests us that ability to perform promised services by the public universities is not equal to the expectation of the students. The public universities are also lagging behind on responsiveness dimension also (willingness to help customers immediately, quick transport, and career guidance), which is statistically proved from the mean score of expected services (\( M=4.1588, SD=0.5594 \)) and delivered services (\( M=3.7913, SD=0.64814 \)), \( t(398)=6.07 \), to the students, hence null hypothesis is rejected \( p<.05 \). It means public universities are not quick enough to and willing to help students. The fourth dimension of service quality is assurance (courtesy, money worth, ability to instill confidence among students), same results are found this dimension too. Therefore there is a significant difference in the mean score of expected services (\( M=4.3025, SD=0.52964 \)) and delivered services (\( M=3.86, SD=0.072493 \)), \( t(364.338)=6.97 \), and null hypothesis is rejected \( p<.05 \). The expectation of students regarding (individual and personal needs, appropriate convenient operating hours, good understanding of students’ needs) empathy is high but received services are low. The expected score of students regarding empathy is (\( M=4.066, SD=0.55857 \)) and delivered service score is
null hypothesis is rejected for each dimension in public universities, which indicate that expectation of students from public universities is not match with the received quality services.

4.5.1.2 Gap Analysis (Private Universities)

The gap analysis is done to find out the difference between the expected services and delivered services by private universities from students’ point of view.

Hypothesis 4

$H_{04}$: There is a no significant difference in the expectation and perception of students regarding service quality in Higher Management Education with respect to five quality dimensions, Tangibility, Reliability, Responsiveness, Assurance, and Empathy for Private Universities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table No- 4.13</th>
<th>Gap Analysis Dimensions wise (Private Universities)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group Statistics</td>
<td>SQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangibility</td>
<td>Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness</td>
<td>Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance</td>
<td>Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delivered</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Table no 4.13, showing the descriptive statistics of the private universities (Chd. Univ. and LPU). The group statistics table shows the expected mean and delivered mean of the students with standard deviation, and standard error. The total 200 students were approached for this analysis.
Table No- 4.14
Gap Analysis Dimensions wise (Private Universities)
Independent Samples Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>8.352</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>4.181</td>
<td>358.913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>8.348</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>8.048</td>
<td>372.488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>12.239</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>7.542</td>
<td>360.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>0.241</td>
<td>0.624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>6.809</td>
<td>380.842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>8.567</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>372.245</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table no-4.14 it can be assessed that there is a significant difference in the mean score of expected services and delivered services. Where the assumption of Levene test is not met the unequal variance is observed. The null hypothesis is rejected on all the five dimensions namely (tangibility, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, empathy). The expectation of the students who are studying in the private universities (Chd. Univ., L.P.U.) is not met with the delivered services to the students. So the expectation of students regarding tangibility dimension (projectors, smart classes, infrastructure, learning material) is \( (M=4.2638, SD=0.47961) \) not fulfilled in terms of delivered services \( (M=4.0188, SD=0.67574) \), \( t(358.913)=4.181 \), so the null hypothesis is rejected \( p<0.05 \). Whereas, reliability dimension (promises, grievance handling, perform right service at right time, placements and error free documentation) is concern, the mean score of expected services \( (M=4.353, SD=0.51353) \) and delivered services \( (M=3.872, SD=0.67132) \), \( t(372.488)=8.048 \).
p<.05, is significantly different. The promises done by universities at the time of admission, grievance handling, and to perform the right services at the right time by the universities, etc. are not matching with the expectation of the students. The same type of results is found on remainder of the service quality dimensions too. The mean score of expected services of responsiveness, assurance and empathy is (M=4.2925, SD=0.46357), (M=4.335, SD=0.50837) and (M=4.219, SD=0.52038) respectively. The mean score of delivered services of responsiveness, assurance and empathy is (M=3.8675, SD=0.6482), t(360.35)=7.542, (M=3.945, SD=0.63065), t(398)=6.809, and (M=3.925, SD=0.68125), t(372.245)=4.85 respectively. On all the dimensions there is a statistically difference and that is why the null hypothesis is rejected.

4.5.1.3 Gap Analysis (Overall Both sectors included)
The overall gap analysis includes both sectors public and private. This is done to find out the difference between the expected services and delivered services to the students by the universities from students’ point of view. Total 400 students from all universities are considered for this analysis.

**Hypothesis 5**
H_{05}. There is a no significant difference in the expectation and perception of students regarding service quality in Higher Management Education with respect to five quality dimensions, Tangibility, Reliability, Responsiveness, Assurance, and Empathy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table No-4.15</th>
<th>Gap Analysis (Overall)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group Statistics</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivered</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivered</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivered</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivered</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivered</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table no 4.15 is representing group statistics of gap analysis dimension wise (overall). The table showing the mean score of expected services and delivered services by the students, standard deviation, and standard error.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table No-4.16</th>
<th>Gap Analysis (Overall)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Samples Test</strong></td>
<td><strong>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tangibility</strong></td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reliability</strong></td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsiveness</strong></td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assurance</strong></td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Empathy</strong></td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table no-4.16 it can be analyzed that there is a significant difference in the expected services and delivered services on all the service quality dimensions. Where the assumption of Levene test is not met the unequal variance is observed. The first dimension tangibility (projectors, smart classes, infrastructure, learning material) has a mean score of expected services (M=4.294, SD=0.48014) and mean score of delivered services (M=3.943, SD=0.65109), t(733.921)=8.668, with significant difference p<.05. This indicates that null hypothesis is rejected, because students expect more and getting less in terms of tangibility dimension (projectors, smart classes, infrastructure, learning material). It means that both sectors whether private or
public not fully satisfy the students in terms of tangibility dimension. Same results are found in rest of the dimensions too, where student’s expectation does not meet with delivered services by the service providers. On the second dimension reliability (promises, grievance handling, perform right service at right time, placements and error free documentation) mean score of expected services of students from universities is (M=4.315, SD=0.5427) whereas what universities delivered to them is (M=3.782, SD=0.70833), much less t(739.39)=11.935, produced significant difference p<.05. The third dimension is responsiveness, where there is a significant difference in the mean score of expected services (M=4.266, SD=0.51743) and delivered services (M=3.829, SD=0.64848), t(760.516)=9.553, p<.05. It also suggest us that (willingness to help customers immediately, quick transport, and career guidance) is not done accurately in the both sectors, because in both type of universities willingness to help customers and quick transport and career guidance is not as good as it should has to be. The private universities are little better on this issue as compare to their counterpart. The mean score of expected services (M=4.319, SD=0.51872) is significantly p<.05 different from the mean score of delivered services (M=3.903, SD=0.67991), t(745.942)=9.735, for assurance dimension. The null hypothesis is also rejected for the last dimension empathy where the mean score of expected services (M=4.143, SD=0.54455) and delivered services (M=3.798, SD=0.71692), t(744.421)=7.664, p<.05, is different. On the last two dimensions whether it is assurance or empathy, expectation of students is high and delivered services are less.

4.5.1.4 Gap Analysis (Overall perception regarding delivered services –Overall expectation)

In this section overall perception regarding delivered services and overall expectation of students is compared with each other. The overall perception and expectation of students is combined from both sectors public and private.

Hypothesis 6

$H_06$: There is a no significant difference in the overall expectation and perception of students regarding service quality in Higher Management Education.
Table No-4.17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Expectation</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>93.6375</td>
<td>8.76946</td>
<td>0.43847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Perception</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>84.5975</td>
<td>12.64497</td>
<td>0.63225</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The descriptive table no 4.17. shows mean, standard deviation and standard error of the overall expectation and perception of delivered services to students by both sectors. The mean of the overall expectation is 93.6375 and for overall perception is 84.5975.

Table No-4.18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>35.639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>11.749</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table no-4.18 it can be judged that there is a significant variance in the mean of score of overall expectation (M=93.6375, SD=8.76946) and overall perception regarding delivered services (M=84.5975, SD=12.64497), t(710.703)= 11.749, p<.05. That mean students have higher expectations from Higher Management Education and in response not getting the same kind of services. So, null hypothesis is rejected with respect to overall expectation and perception regarding delivered services to the students.

4.5.1.5 Gap Analysis (Public v/s Private) (Dimension Wise)

To analyze this gap, firstly, the gap between expected services and delivered services (dimension wise) of public universities is calculated, and then the gap between expected services and delivered services (dimension wise) of private universities is calculated. Then the gap to both universities is analyzed from students’ point of view.
**Hypothesis 7**

H\(_{07}\): There is no significant difference in the mean gap score of service quality in Higher Management Education for students of Public and Private Universities with respect to quality dimensions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Gap score</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tangibility</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-1.8250</td>
<td>2.83984</td>
<td>.20081</td>
<td>-2.928</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-.9800</td>
<td>2.93131</td>
<td>.20727</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-2.9200</td>
<td>3.76089</td>
<td>.26594</td>
<td>-1.401</td>
<td>.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-2.4050</td>
<td>3.58962</td>
<td>.25382</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-1.4700</td>
<td>2.92607</td>
<td>.20690</td>
<td>.827</td>
<td>.409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-1.7000</td>
<td>2.62765</td>
<td>.18580</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-1.7700</td>
<td>3.11700</td>
<td>.22041</td>
<td>-.726</td>
<td>.468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-1.5600</td>
<td>2.64602</td>
<td>.18710</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-1.9800</td>
<td>3.80288</td>
<td>.26890</td>
<td>-1.432</td>
<td>.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-1.4700</td>
<td>3.30206</td>
<td>.23349</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table no-4.19 it can be measured that out of five quality dimensions only tangibility has significant variance, so there is a significant difference in the mean gap score of public (M=-1.8250, SD=2.83984) and private (M=-.9800, SD=2.93131), t(398)= -2.928, p<.05, for tangibility, which mean null hypothesis is rejected. On the other hand, an insignificant variance is found in all the remaining dimensions. So we can compose there is an insignificant variance in the mean gap score of public (M=-2.9200, SD=3.76089) and private (M=-2.4050, SD=3.58962), t(398)= -1.401, p>.05, for reliability. It is evident from the above mentioned table that, the mean score of public universities is more as compare to private universities, which suggest us that the gap between expectation and delivered services is more in public universities rather than private universities. That mean private universities are better on tangibility dimension whereas public universities are not. The result of all remaining dimension is an insignificant. There is a gap existed in all the dimensions but that is statistically not significant between public and private universities. On the third dimension there is an insignificant variance in the mean gap score of public (M=-1.4700, SD=2.92607)
and private (M=1.7000, SD=2.62765), t(398)=.827, p>.05, for responsiveness. The gap between expected services and delivered services is more in private universities rather than public universities. However, the gap between the gaps is not significantly different with each other. There is also an insignificant difference is found in the mean gap score of public (M=1.7700, SD=3.11700) and private (M=1.5600, SD=2.64602), t(398)= -1.726, p>.05, for assurance. The last dimension is also mentioning the same results, where the difference between the mean gap score of public (M=1.9800, SD=3.80288) and private (M=1.4700, SD=3.30206), t(398)= -1.432, p>.05, for empathy is an significant.

### 4.5.1.6 Gap Analysis (Public v/s Private) (Overall)

To analyze this gap, overall gap between expected services and delivered services of public universities and private universities is calculated than the gap is analyzed on overall basis between public and private universities.

**Hypothesis 8**

Hₐ₈: There is a no significant difference in the overall mean gap score of service quality in Higher Management Education for students of Public and Private Universities.

### Table No- 4.20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Overall Gap</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>9.965</td>
<td>12.5251</td>
<td>0.88566</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>8.115</td>
<td>11.0931</td>
<td>0.7844</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The group statistics table no 4.20. Shows mean of the both sectors, standard deviation and standard error of the overall mean gap score between the public and private universities. The mean gap score of public university is 9.965 whereas private university has 8.115. There is a gap between the both sectors but it is statistically significant or not, we have to calculate the t value. That is done in the next table.
From the table no-4.21 it can be refereed that there is an insignificant variance in the overall mean gap score public (M=9.97, SD=12.5251) and private (M=8.12, SD=11.09311), t(398)= 1.56, p>.05, so null hypothesis is accepted with respect to overall mean gap score of public and private universities. It suggests us that there is a gap between expected services and delivered services in both sectors but that gap statistically is not significant. The gap can be seen in dimension wise but as overall, it is an insignificant.

4.5.2 Parents Gap Analysis
After analyzing the students’ gap analysis, now the gap analysis of parents is done. For this purpose total 200 parents approached, 100 from public universities and 100 from private universities. The gap analysis is done to find out the difference between the expected and delivered services of private and public universities from parents point of view. First of all, gap analysis is done for public universities and after that for private universities and last overall gap is also done. After that gap analysis for overall expectation and overall perception about delivered services is done to distinguish both sectors public and private.

4.5.2.1 Gap Analysis (Public Universities)
The gap analysis is done to find out the difference between the expected services and perception of delivered services by public universities to parents of the students.

Hypothesis 9
H09. There is a no significant difference in the expectation and perception of parents regarding service quality in Higher Management Education with respect to five
The table no 4.22 is for group statistics showing the mean score of expected services and delivered services to parents, standard deviation and standard error.

Table No-4.23
Gap Analysis Dimensions wise (Public Universities)
Independent Samples Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SQ</th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangibility</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>3.503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>5.614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>0.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>6.264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>4.281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>4.253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>2.654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the table no-4.23 it can be evaluated that there is a significant variance in the mean score of expected services (M=4.2675, SD=0.48883) and delivered services (M=3.8225, SD=0.62391), t(198)=5.614, p<.05, for tangibility. Which indicate that parents expectation regarding tangible attribute is more and actually received services are far less. Same kind of response is measured on reliability dimension. For reliability there is also a significant variance in the mean score of expected services (M=4.232, SD=0.55902) and delivered services (M=3.704, SD=0.63084), t(198)=6.264, p<.05, so the null hypothesis is rejected. When it comes to responsiveness dimension, the expectation of parents (M=4.19, SD=0.51262) is also significantly different from the delivered services (M=3.815, SD=0.07174) to them t(179.189)=4.253, p<.05. The next dimensions is assurance, same kind of results are also visible there, where expected services (M=4.2925, SD=0.53661) are high from delivered services (M=3.955, SD=0.7499), t(198)=3.66, with a significant margin p<.05. At last parents expected mean score from the universities (M=4.18, SD=0.46406) is significantly different from delivered services (M=3.838, SD=0.66161), to them t(198)=4.232, p<.05. Hence, null hypothesis is rejected for each dimension because on each dimension expected services are not matched with the delivered services.

4.5.2.2 Gap Analysis (Private Universities)

After doing the gap analysis for public universities, the same is done for the private universities also. The difference between the expected services and delivered services by private universities from parents point of view is done with the help of independent test.

Hypothesis 10

H_{010}: There is a no significant difference in the expectation and perception of parents regarding service quality in Higher Management Education with respect to five dimensions, Tangibility, Reliability, Responsiveness, Assurance, and Empathy for Private Universities.
Table No-4.24
Gap Analysis Dimensions wise (Private Universities)
Group Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SQ</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tangibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.4550</td>
<td>.42844</td>
<td>.04284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivered</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.5420</td>
<td>.40829</td>
<td>.04083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.9350</td>
<td>.44893</td>
<td>.04489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivered</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.7440</td>
<td>.60974</td>
<td>.06097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.6225</td>
<td>.44593</td>
<td>.04459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivered</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.7375</td>
<td>.64586</td>
<td>.06459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.5675</td>
<td>.41720</td>
<td>.04172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivered</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.7275</td>
<td>.68266</td>
<td>.06827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.5340</td>
<td>.34472</td>
<td>.03447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivered</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.7460</td>
<td>.62530</td>
<td>.06253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table no 4.24 showing the group statistics of the gap analysis of private universities. The table comprises of mean score of expected services and delivered services to the parents by the private universities.

Table No-4.25
Gap Analysis Dimensions wise (Private Universities)
Independent Samples Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality ofMeans</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>0.409</td>
<td>0.523</td>
<td>8.379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>8.379</td>
<td>197.569</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>8.453</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>10.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>10.875</td>
<td>172.919</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>7.705</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>11.276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>11.276</td>
<td>175.911</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>8.758</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>10.499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>10.499</td>
<td>163.899</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the table no-4.25 it can be evaluated that there is a significant difference in all the service quality dimensions of private universities. The parents expected services from private universities is always more, because they pay more in terms of fee and other expenses for the education of their wards? However, the reality is very different because private universities do not fulfill the promises, which they made at the time of admission of student. So for the first dimension of the service quality which is tangibility a significant difference is found in the mean score of expected services $(M=4.455, \text{SD}=0.42844)$ and delivered services $(M=3.935, \text{SD}=0.44893)$, $t(198)=8.379$, $p<.05$, to them. The mean score of expected services $(M=4.542, \text{SD}=0.40829)$ and delivered services $(M=3.744, \text{SD}=0.60974)$, $t(198)=10.875$, $p<.05$, for reliability (Promises, grievance handling, perform right service at right time, placements and error free documentation) is produce a significant results. The mean score of delivered services $(M=3.7375, \text{SD}=0.64586)$ is much less than the mean score of expected services $(M=4.6225, \text{SD}=0.44593), t(198)=11.276$, $p<.05$, by the parents from the universities for responsiveness (Willingness to help customers immediately, quick transport, career guidance). The remaining two dimensions is also not different from the previous three dimensions. The null hypothesis is rejected for each the dimension. The expected services are more in terms of assurance (Courtesy, money worth, ability to instill confidence among students) $(M=4.5675, \text{SD}=0.4172)$ and delivered services $(M=3.7275, \text{SD}=0.68266)$, are far below that number $(198)=10.499$, which results in producing the significant difference $p<.05$. The last dimension is also producing the significant difference between the expected services and delivered services. The empathy dimension (Individual and personal needs, appropriate convenient operating hours, good understanding of students’ needs) manufactures the significant variance in the mean score of expected services $(M=4.534, \text{SD}=0.34472)$ and delivered services $(M=3.746, \text{SD}=0.6253)$, $t(194.088)=11.036$, $p<.05$. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Empathy</th>
<th>Equal variances assumed</th>
<th>17.904</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>11.036</th>
<th>198</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.036</td>
<td>154.088</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


4.5.2.3 Gap Analysis (Overall both sectors included)

The overall gap analysis is done to find out the difference between the expected services and delivered services from parents point of view.

Hypothesis 11

H_{011}: There is no significant difference in the expectation and perception of parents regarding service quality in Higher Management Education with respect to five dimensions, Tangibility, Reliability, Responsiveness, Assurance, and Empathy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Group Statistics</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tangibility</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>4.3613</td>
<td>0.46801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delivered</td>
<td>3.8788</td>
<td>0.54507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>4.387</td>
<td>0.51239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delivered</td>
<td>3.724</td>
<td>0.61915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>4.4063</td>
<td>0.52598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delivered</td>
<td>3.7763</td>
<td>0.68196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>0.49884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delivered</td>
<td>3.8413</td>
<td>0.7243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>4.357</td>
<td>0.44468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delivered</td>
<td>3.792</td>
<td>0.64375</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table no 4.26 is representing group statistics of gap analysis dimension wise (overall). The table showing the mean score of expected services and delivered services by the students, standard deviation, and standard error.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangibility</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>0.523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>9.498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>1.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances</td>
<td>11.667</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the table no-4.27 it can be analyzed that when the expectation and perception regarding delivered services of all the parents (included public and private sector) is checked it comes up with significant results on all the dimensions. The first dimension tangibility (Like projectors, smart classes, infrastructures and other learning materials) is produced a significant difference where the mean score of expected services (M=4.631, SD=0.46806) is large than the mean score of delivered services (M=3.879, SD=0.54507), t(389.099)=9.498, p<.05. There is significant difference in the mean score of expected services (M=4.387, SD=0.51239) and delivered services (M=3.724, SD=0.61915), t(384.549)=11.667, p<.05, for reliability (Promises, grievance handling, perform right service at right time, placements and error free documentation) too. Their ability to keep the promises and handling the objections and grievance accurately is not good at the both sectors. On responsiveness (Willingness to help customers immediately, quick transport, career guidance) the mean score of expected services (M=4.406, SD=0.52598) and the mean score of delivered services (M=3.776, SD=0.68196), is not matched hence null hypothesis is rejected t(398)=10.35, p<.05,. The parents of the both universities are also not satisfied with the assurance dimension (Courtesy, money worth, ability to instill confidence among students). The results are also indicating the same thing where the mean score of expected services (M=4.43, SD=0.49884) and delivered services (M=3.841, SD=0.7243), t(353.113)=9.467, p<.05, is significantly different. At last on empathy dimension (Individual and personal needs, appropriate convenient operating hours, good understanding of students’ needs) a statistically significant variance is found in the mean score of expected services (M=4.357, SD=0.44468) and delivered services (M=3.792, SD=0.64375), t(398)=10.21, p<.05.
4.5.2.4 Gap Analysis (Overall perception regarding delivered services- overall expectation)

Under this section, overall perception regarding delivered services and overall expectation of parents is compared with each other. The overall perception and expectation of parents is combined from both sectors public and private.

**Hypothesis 12**

H012: There is a nonsignificant difference in the overall expectation and perception of parents regarding delivered service quality in Higher Management Education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table No-4.28</th>
<th>Variance between overall Expectation and Perception of Parents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Expectation</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Perception</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The descriptive table no 4.28 shows mean, standard deviation and standard error of the overall expectation and perception of delivered services to parents by both sectors. The mean of the overall expectation is 96.51 and for overall perception is 83.565.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table No-4.29</th>
<th>Variance between overall Expectation and Perception of Parents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</strong></td>
<td><strong>t-test for Equality of Means</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sig.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.756</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.612</td>
<td>356.828</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table no-4.29 it can be judged that there is a significant variance in the mean score of expected services (M=96.51, SD=8.34073) and delivered services (M=83.565, SD=11.8803), t(356.828)= 12.612, p<.05. which mean parents have high expectation and in response not getting the same kind of services, so null hypothesis is rejected with respect to overall expectation and overall perception of the parents regarding service quality in Higher Management Education.
4.5.2.5 Gap Analysis (Public v/s Private) (Dimension Wise)

To analyze this gap, firstly, the gap between expected services and delivered services (dimension wise) of public universities is calculated, and then gap between expected services and delivered services (dimension wise) of private universities is calculated. Then the gap to both universities is analyzed from parents point of view.

**Hypothesis 13**

H$_{013}$: There is a nosignificant difference in the mean gap score of service quality in Higher Management Education for parents of Public and Private Universities with respect to quality dimensions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SQ</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tangibility</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-1.7800</td>
<td>2.42704</td>
<td>.24270</td>
<td>.878</td>
<td>.381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-2.0800</td>
<td>2.40236</td>
<td>.24024</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-2.6400</td>
<td>3.70236</td>
<td>.37024</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-3.9900</td>
<td>3.80986</td>
<td>.38099</td>
<td>2.541</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-1.5000</td>
<td>3.52910</td>
<td>.35291</td>
<td>4.297</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-3.5400</td>
<td>3.17636</td>
<td>.31764</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-1.3500</td>
<td>2.95548</td>
<td>.29555</td>
<td>4.665</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-3.3600</td>
<td>3.13507</td>
<td>.31351</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-1.7100</td>
<td>3.77738</td>
<td>.37774</td>
<td>4.275</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-3.9400</td>
<td>3.59804</td>
<td>.35980</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table no-4.30 it can be measured that out of five quality dimensions only tangibility has an in significant variance, which can be understand because parents never give too much emphasis to big building and so on they always believe in good education that can secure the future of the student. The first dimension tangibility which includes (Like projectors, smart classes, infrastructures and other learning materials) an insignificant variance in the mean gap score of public (M=-1.7800, SD=2.42704) and private (M=-2.0800, SD=2.40236), t(198)=.878, p>.05, which mean null hypothesis is accepted. It also suggest us that gap in private universities is more, whereas in public universities it is less. It means private universities are showing or highlighting the infrastructure more and providing less. On the other hand, a significant variance is found in all the remaining dimensions. The second dimension
reliability (Promises, grievance handling, perform right service at right time, placements and error free documentation) has a significant variance in the mean gap score of public (M= -2.6400, SD=3.70236) and private (M= -3.9900, SD=3.80986), t(198)= 2.541, p<.05. Again, the gap between expected and delivered services is more in private universities, which indicate that private universities are not fulfilling the expectation of the parents. The third dimension is responsiveness (Willingness to help customers immediately, quick transport, career guidance) also has a significant difference in the mean gap score of public (M= -2.6400, SD=3.70236) and private (M= -3.9900, SD=3.80986), t(198)=4.297, p<.05. On this dimension, too, the private universities are not performing well according to parents’ point of view. The fourth dimension is assurance (Courtesy, money worth, ability to instill confidence among students) where a significant variance is found in the mean gap score of public (M= -1.3500, SD=2.95548) and private (M= -3.6000, SD=3.13507), t(198)= 4.665, p<.05. The last dimension is empathy (Individual and personal needs, appropriate convenient operating hours, good understanding of students’ needs) there is a significant variance is also found in the mean gap score of public (M= -1.7100, SD=3.77738) and private (M= -3.9400, SD=3.59804), t(198)= 4.275, P<.05. The results of the gap analysis is shows that private universities are not doing what they has to be, they make lots of fake promises, whereas the expectation of parents from public universities is always low that is why there is lesser gap between expected services and delivered services.

4.5.2.6 Gap Analysis (Public v/s Private)

To analyze this gap, overall gap between expected services and delivered services of public universities and private universities is calculated than the gap is analyzed on overall basis between public and private universities.

**Hypothesis 14**

H_{014}: There is a no significant difference in the overall mean gap score of service quality in Higher Management Education for parents of Public and Private Universities.
Table No-4.31
Overall Variance between Mean Gap score of Parents of Public and Private Universities
Group Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Gap Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-8.98</td>
<td>13.4907</td>
<td>1.34907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-16.91</td>
<td>12.9139</td>
<td>1.29139</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The group statistics table no 4.31 Shows mean of the both sectors, standard deviation and standard error of the overall mean gap score between the public and private universities. The mean gap score of public university is -8.98 whereas private university has -16.91. There is a gap between the both sectors but it is statistically significant or not, we have to calculate the t value. That is done in the next table.

Table No-4.32
Overall Variance between Mean Gap score of Parents of Public and Private Universities
Independent Samples Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Gap Score</th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>0.787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>4.246</td>
<td>197.623</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table no-4.32 it can be refereed that there is a significant variance in the overall mean gap score public (M=-8.98, SD=13.49072) and private (M=-16.91, SD=12.91393), t(198)= 4.246, p<.05, so null hypothesis is rejected with respect to overall mean gap score of public and private universities. Which indicate the public universities are performing well in comparison with private universities according to parents point of view.
4.6 To study the extent of satisfaction level of students and parents with regard to institutional quality factors.

Under the third objective of the study, firstly satisfaction level of students is compared between public and private universities and then satisfaction level of parents is also compared between public and private universities. After that, overall satisfaction of parents and student is compared between each other.

4.6.1 Comparison of Student satisfaction (Public v/s Private)

Firstly, the students' satisfaction level is compared between public and private universities and then overall satisfaction of students is compared between the both sectors. For this purpose, total 400 students are taken from both the sectors public and private.

**Hypothesis 15**

$H_{015}$: There is no significant difference in the satisfaction level of students regarding service quality of Public and Private Universities with respect to quality factors.

**Table No-4.33**  
Comparison of Student Satisfaction of Service Quality of Public & Private Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QF</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access &amp; Approachable</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3.9867</td>
<td>0.61513</td>
<td>0.0435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3.7117</td>
<td>0.8465</td>
<td>0.05986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3.4688</td>
<td>0.87538</td>
<td>0.0619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3.6788</td>
<td>0.83289</td>
<td>0.05889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic reputation &amp; Quality</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>0.53567</td>
<td>0.03788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3.9883</td>
<td>0.83233</td>
<td>0.05885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety &amp; Security</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>4.2817</td>
<td>0.53058</td>
<td>0.03752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td><strong>Public</strong></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>4.2625</td>
<td>0.59718</td>
<td>0.04223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Private</strong></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0.85719</td>
<td>0.06061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Placements</strong></td>
<td><strong>Public</strong></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>0.98995</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Private</strong></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3.625</td>
<td>1.02328</td>
<td>0.07236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fee</strong></td>
<td><strong>Public</strong></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3.315</td>
<td>0.82106</td>
<td>0.05806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Private</strong></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3.115</td>
<td>0.7413</td>
<td>0.05242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scholarship</strong></td>
<td><strong>Public</strong></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3.925</td>
<td>0.78098</td>
<td>0.05522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Private</strong></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>0.91366</td>
<td>0.06461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extra Curriculum Activities</strong></td>
<td><strong>Public</strong></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>0.78159</td>
<td>0.05527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Private</strong></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>0.67337</td>
<td>0.04761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Functioning</strong></td>
<td><strong>Public</strong></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>4.0121</td>
<td>0.55648</td>
<td>0.03935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Private</strong></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3.9771</td>
<td>0.4828</td>
<td>0.03414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feed back</strong></td>
<td><strong>Public</strong></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3.9338</td>
<td>0.70376</td>
<td>0.04976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Private</strong></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>0.89104</td>
<td>0.06301</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table no 4.33 is for group statistics, which represent the total 11 quality factors with their mean, standard deviation, and standard error. The 200 students from public universities and 200 from private universities are taken. Whether the results are showing significant results or not that can be interpreted with the help of next table.
### Table No-4.34
Comparison of Student Satisfaction of Service Quality of Public & Private Universities

Independent Samples Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QF</th>
<th>Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access &amp; Approachable</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>6.323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>3.717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>-2.458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic reputation &amp; Quality</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>29.287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>2.453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety &amp; Security</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>3.589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>-1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>16.595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>1.252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placements</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>-0.546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>5.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>2.557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>0.636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>-2.294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra Curriculum Activities</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>3.221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>-3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functioning</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>9.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the table no-4.34 it can be restrained that out of eleven quality factors seven factors has significant difference, where it can be say that which sector is ahead of other sector, or in other words it can be say that there is a difference between public sector and private sector. Where the assumption of Levene test is not met the unequal variance is observed. The first quality factor is access and approachability, there is a significant variance in the mean score of satisfaction of public (M=3.9867, SD=0.61513) and private (M=3.7117, SD=0.8465) universities, t(363.34)= 3.717, p<.05. It is clear from the result that for this factor public universities are ahead and private universities are behind, because public universities are easily approachable and location of the universities are close to the residential area. The second quality factor is exposure, a significant difference is found in the mean score of satisfaction of public (M=3.4688, SD=0.87538) and private (M=3.6788, SD=0.83289) universities, t(398)= -2.458, p<.05. On this factor private universities outplay the public universities, because private universities tries their best to attract more and more corporate clients on their campuses to hire the students, whereas these type of activities are less in public sectors. The third quality factor is academic reputation and quality, a significant difference is found in the mean score of satisfaction of public (M=4.16, SD=0.53567) and private (M=3.9883, SD=0.83233) universities, t(339.711)= 2.453, p<0.5, where public universities has a upper hand because of their long lasting existence and academic reputation and quality. The private universities will take some more time to gain the academic reputation and quality. The fourth quality factor is safety and security, on this factor an insignificant difference is found in the mean score of satisfaction of public (M=4.2817, SD=0.53.58) and private (M=4.3817, SD=0.67283) universities, t(398)= -1.65, p>.05. This happen because both the sectors put their best effort for the security and safety of the students so it is hard to distinguish the both. The fifth quality factor is infrastructure, an insignificant difference is found in the mean score of satisfaction of public (M=4.2625, SD=0.59718) and private (M=4.17, SD=0.85719), t(355.342)=1.252, p>.05. From this result, it is very much clear that both the sectors are keen to provide state of the art
facilities to the students. That is why there is not a big gap is existed. The sixth quality factor is placements, an insignificant difference is found in the mean score of satisfaction of public (M=3.57, SD=0.98995) and private (M=3.625, SD=1.02328) universities, t(398)=-0.546, p>.05. This is the hard reality of the Higher Management Education in Punjab, because none of the both sectors is able to place their students regularly and effectively in the corporate sector. The seventh quality factor is fee, a significant difference is found in the mean score of fee of public (M=3.315, SD=0.82106) and private (M=3.115, SD=0.7413) universities, t(393.914)= 2.557, p<.05. It is always a very crucial factor for the education. The fee of the public universities is low comparatively to private universities, so satisfaction level of students is higher in public universities. The eight quality factor is scholarships, a significant difference is found in the mean score of scholarships of public (M=3.925, SD=0.78098) and private (M=4.12, SD=0.91366) universities, t(398)= -2.294, p<.05. The public universities are providing various kind of scholarships to the needy students, but it is the private universities who offer the installments facilities to the students for the submission of the fees. The ninth quality factor is extra curriculum activities, a significant difference is found in the mean score of extra curriculum activities of public (M=3.88, SD=0.78159) and private (M=4.12, SD=0.67337) universities, t(398)= -3.29, p<.05, because private universities organizes more extra curriculum activities like (industrial trips and cultural fest etc.) to engage and motivate the students. The tenth quality factor is functioning, an insignificant difference is found in the mean score of functioning of public (M=4.0121, SD=0.55648) and private (M=3.9771, SD=0.4828) universities, t(390.233)=0.672, p>.05. The results are highlighting the fact despite of all the malfunctioning in the public sector students still has a faith in the public sector. The last quality factor is feedback, a significant difference is also found in the mean score of feedback of public (M=3.9338, SD=0.70376) and private (M=3.63, SD=0.89104) universities, t(377.727)= 3.783, p<.05. The students feedback indicate that students who are studying in the public universities are more likely to get admission in the same university whereas less numbers of students are interested in enroll in the same private university.
4.6.1.1 Comparison of Overall Satisfaction (Public v/s Private Universities)

After comparing the satisfaction level of students (factors wise) in public and private universities. Now the overall satisfaction is students is done between the public and private sector.

**Hypothesis 16**

$H_{016}$: There is a nosignificant difference in the overall mean score of satisfaction level of students of service quality in Public and Private Universities.

**Table No- 4.35**  
Comparison of Overall Satisfaction of Students of Service Quality in Public and Private Universities (Group Statistics)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Satisfaction</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>136.765</td>
<td>16.4384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>135.74</td>
<td>17.3409</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table no 4.35 is for a group statistics of comparison of overall satisfaction of students in public and private universities, highlighting the mean score of overall satisfaction of sectors, standard error and standard deviation.

**Table No- 4.36**  
Comparison of Overall Satisfaction of Students of Service Quality in Public and Private Universities  
Independent Samples Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Satisfaction</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>0.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>0.607</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table no-4.36 it can be judged that there is nosignificant variance in the overall satisfaction score of public ($M=136.765$, $SD=16.4384$) and private ($M=135.74$, $SD=17.34087$), $t(398)=0.607$, $p>0.05$. So null hypothesis is accepted with respect to comparison of overall satisfaction score of students in public and private universities.
4.6.1.2 Effect of demographic variables on overall satisfaction of Students

Does the demographic varibale effects the satisfaction of the students. To analyze this aspect further anlsis is done.

**Effect of Gender on the overall satisfaction of the students**

First of all the effect of gender on overall satisfaction is done.

| Table no 4.37  
<p>| Group statistics of effect of gender |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Satisfaction</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>132.847</td>
<td>17.896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>139.333</td>
<td>15.3106</td>
<td>1.05653</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table no 4.37 is for a group statistics of effect of gender on overall satisfaction of students in public and private universities.

| Table no 4.38  
| Results of Independent t-test of effect of gender |
| Independent Samples Test |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | t-test for Equality of Means |
| F | Sig. | T | df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
| Overall Satisfaction | Equal variances assumed | 4.444 | 0.036 | -3.905 | 398 | 0 |
| Equal variances not assumed | -3.875 | 373.918 | 0 |

The table no 4.38 is indicating that there is a significant difference in the satisfaction level between girls and boys. It represent that satisfaction level students does vary according to gender.

**Effect of Age on the overall satisfaction of the students**

Under this action the effect of age group on overall satisfaction of students is measured. To know the results one way ANOVA is used and later on Tukey Post Hoc and mean plot is also used.
Data Analysis & Interpretation

Table no 4.39
Results of ANOVA for the effect of age on overall satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Levene Statistic</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Welch Sig.</th>
<th>Brown-Forsythe Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to 20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-22</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>136.7991</td>
<td>15.22174</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-24</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>136.0142</td>
<td>17.82253</td>
<td>3.608</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>2.287</td>
<td>0.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 24</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>132.9767</td>
<td>20.53509</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table no 4.39 is indicating the results of the ANOVA to measure the effects of age on overall satisfaction. The result shows that assumption of Levene test is not met, so Welch and Brown-Forsythe is considered, which in significant. This reveal that age does effect the overall satisfaction of the students.

Table no. 4.40
Results of Tukey Post Hoc Test for the effect of age on overall satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) Age</th>
<th>(J) Age</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UP TO 20</td>
<td>21-22</td>
<td>28.20093</td>
<td>11.92229</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>-2.5582</td>
<td>58.9601</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-24</td>
<td>-28.98582</td>
<td>11.95083</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>-1.8470</td>
<td>59.8186</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABOVE 24</td>
<td>32.02326*</td>
<td>12.13981</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.7029</td>
<td>63.3436</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UP TO 20</td>
<td>21-22</td>
<td>-28.98582</td>
<td>11.95083</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>-58.9601</td>
<td>2.5582</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-24</td>
<td>.78488</td>
<td>1.82034</td>
<td>.973</td>
<td>-3.9115</td>
<td>5.4813</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABOVE 24</td>
<td>3.82232</td>
<td>2.80466</td>
<td>.523</td>
<td>-3.4136</td>
<td>11.0583</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UP TO 20</td>
<td>21-22</td>
<td>-28.98582</td>
<td>11.95083</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>-59.8186</td>
<td>1.8470</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-24</td>
<td>-.78488</td>
<td>1.82034</td>
<td>.973</td>
<td>-5.4813</td>
<td>3.9115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABOVE 24</td>
<td>3.03744</td>
<td>2.92361</td>
<td>.727</td>
<td>-4.5054</td>
<td>10.5803</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UP TO 20</td>
<td>21-22</td>
<td>-32.02326*</td>
<td>12.13981</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>-63.3436</td>
<td>-.7029</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-24</td>
<td>-3.03744</td>
<td>2.92361</td>
<td>.727</td>
<td>-10.5803</td>
<td>4.5054</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.
The table no 4.40 and figure no 4.1 is showing that overall satisfaction of students does vary from up to 20 to above 24, it means that the satisfaction of above 24 age group students is low. The results Tukey Post Hoc and mean plot is also indicating the same thing.

**Effect of Universities on the overall satisfaction of the students**

To check the effect of universities on the overall satisfaction of the students one way ANOVA, Tukey Post Hoc and Mean plot is used.

**Table no 4.41**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Levene Statistic</th>
<th>Sig. Welch</th>
<th>Sig. Brown-Forsythe</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GNDU</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>135.74</td>
<td>17.8074</td>
<td>13.811</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30.118</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUP</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>137.79</td>
<td>14.9648</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPU</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>144.95</td>
<td>8.70664</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>126.53</td>
<td>18.9019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table no 4.41 is indicating the results of the ANOVA to measure the effects of universities on overall satisfaction of students. The results shows that assumption of
levene test is not met, so Welch and Brown-Forsythe is considered, which in highly significant. This reveals that overall satisfaction of the students does vary according to the universities.

The table no 4.42 and figure no 4.2 is showing that overall satisfaction of students does vary from university to university. The satisfaction level GNDU students are different from Chd. Uni & LPU students, PUP students vary from Chd. Uni.to LPU. The same results are also found where satisfaction of Ch.d Uni. and LPU students are different from all the other universities. The results Tukey Post Hoc and mean plot is also indicating the same thing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) Universities</th>
<th>(J) Universities</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GNDU</td>
<td>PUP</td>
<td>-2.05000</td>
<td>2.20696</td>
<td>.789</td>
<td>-7.7439</td>
<td>-3.6439</td>
<td>3.6439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>9.21000</td>
<td>2.20696</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>3.5161</td>
<td>14.9039</td>
<td>-3.5161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GNDU</td>
<td>2.05000</td>
<td>2.20696</td>
<td>.789</td>
<td>-3.6439</td>
<td>7.7439</td>
<td>-3.6439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUP</td>
<td>LPU</td>
<td>-7.16000</td>
<td>2.20696</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>-12.8539</td>
<td>-12.8539</td>
<td>-1.4661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>11.26000</td>
<td>2.20696</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>5.5661</td>
<td>16.9539</td>
<td>-1.4661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GNDU</td>
<td>9.21000</td>
<td>2.20696</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>3.5161</td>
<td>14.9039</td>
<td>-3.5161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPU</td>
<td>PUP</td>
<td>7.16000</td>
<td>2.20696</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>1.4661</td>
<td>12.8539</td>
<td>-1.4661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>18.42000</td>
<td>2.20696</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>12.7261</td>
<td>24.1139</td>
<td>-1.4661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LPU</td>
<td>-11.26000</td>
<td>2.20696</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-16.9539</td>
<td>-16.9539</td>
<td>-5.5661</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.
4.6.2 Comparison of Parents satisfaction (Public v/s Private universities)

Under this section, the parents’ satisfaction is compared between public and private universities on all the quality factors and then overall satisfaction of parents is compared between the both sectors.

**Hypothesis 17**

H_{017}: There is a no significant difference in the satisfaction level of parents regarding service quality of Public and Private Universities with respect to quality factors.

**Table No-4.43**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QF</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access &amp; Approachable</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>1.20367</td>
<td>0.12037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.3633</td>
<td>0.72023</td>
<td>0.07202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>0.64854</td>
<td>0.06485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.8025</td>
<td>0.65645</td>
<td>0.06565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic reputation &amp; Quality</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.2133</td>
<td>0.6241</td>
<td>0.06241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>0.79059</td>
<td>0.07906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety &amp; Security</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.3733</td>
<td>0.45512</td>
<td>0.04551</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table no 4.43 is for group statistics, which represent the total 11 quality factors with their mean, standard deviation, and standard error. The 100 parents from public universities and 100 from private universities are taken. Whether the results are showing significant results or not that can be interpreted with the help of next table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QF</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Public</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>4.2567</td>
<td>4.025</td>
<td>4.095</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.44154</td>
<td>0.5192</td>
<td>0.52076</td>
<td>0.86579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.04415</td>
<td>0.05192</td>
<td>0.05208</td>
<td>0.08658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement</td>
<td>3.475</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.82687</td>
<td>0.86579</td>
<td>0.76038</td>
<td>0.74472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.08269</td>
<td>0.08658</td>
<td>0.07604</td>
<td>0.07447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees</td>
<td>2.925</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.82074</td>
<td>0.74026</td>
<td>0.74472</td>
<td>0.74472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.08207</td>
<td>0.07403</td>
<td>0.07604</td>
<td>0.07447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship</td>
<td>3.455</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>4.1233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.94574</td>
<td>0.76038</td>
<td>0.76038</td>
<td>0.4585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.09457</td>
<td>0.07604</td>
<td>0.07604</td>
<td>0.04585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra Curriculum</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>4.1233</td>
<td>3.9057</td>
<td>3.7143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>0.74472</td>
<td>0.4585</td>
<td>0.52212</td>
<td>0.52006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.07447</td>
<td>0.04585</td>
<td>0.05221</td>
<td>0.05201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functioning</td>
<td>3.3567</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.3567</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.77017</td>
<td>0.73474</td>
<td>0.77017</td>
<td>0.73474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.07702</td>
<td>0.07347</td>
<td>0.07702</td>
<td>0.07347</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table no 4.44 is for group statistics, which represent the total 11 quality factors with their mean, standard deviation, and standard error. The 100 parents from public universities and 100 from private universities are taken. Whether the results are showing significant results or not that can be interpreted with the help of next table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QF</th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access &amp; Approachable</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>0.299</td>
<td>0.585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>4.468</td>
<td>161.836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>1.532</td>
<td>0.217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>-8.046</td>
<td>197.971</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the table no-4.44 it can be restrained that, out of eleven quality factors eight factors has significant difference. The satisfaction level of parents is quite different from students. The first quality factor is access and approachability; the parents think that public universities are more easily accessible and approachable. The results of the independent t-test also indicating the same thing, a significant difference is observed in the mean score of access and approachable of parents in public (M=3.99, SD=1.20367) and private (M=3.3633, SD=0.72023) universities, t(198)=4.468, p<.05. An exposure is the next quality factor, where parents also give the more weightage to
private universities, the mean score of exposure factor of parents in public (M=3.06, SD=0.64854) and private (M=3.8025, SD=0.65645) universities, t(198)= -8.046, is highlighting the significant difference p<.05. The parents are aware that private universities has a great potential for global exposure of the students like Chandigarh university and lovely professional university are doing. However, on the third quality factor (academic reputation and quality) the public universities have a great image in the market. The results of the independent t-test showing that mean score of academic reputation and quality factor of parents from public (M=4.2133, SD=0.6241) and private (M=3.49, SD=0.79059) universities, t(187.873)= 7.181, has a significant difference p<.05. The fourth quality factor is safety and security, here the difference in the public and private university regarding safety and security is an insignificant. The mean score of safety and security factor of parents in public (M=4.3733, SD=0.45512) and private (M=4.2567, SD=0.44154), t(198)=1.84, p>.05 is an insignificant. It means all universities are giving full attention to the safety and security of the students. The next quality factor (infrastructure) is also providing the same results, where both sectors has no significant difference, which mean infrastructure facilities are good in the both type of universities. There is no significant variance in the mean score of infrastructure factor of parents in public (M=4.025, SD=0.5192) and private (M=4.095, SD=0.52076) universities, t(198)=0.952, p>.05. The sixth quality factor is placement, here is an insignificant difference is found in the mean score of placement factor of parents in public (M=3.27, SD=0.86579) and private (M=3.475, SD=0.82687), t(198)=1.712, p>.05, because placement of student is a major concern for the institutions. The lack of placement opportunities for the students is a cause for fewer enrolments in the universities. The other major factor for the difference in the public and private universities is Fee. The mean score of fee factor of parents in public (M=2.925, SD=0.82074) is more as compare to private (M=2.45, SD=0.74026) universities, t(198)= 4.298, and has a significant difference p<.05. The eight quality factor is scholarships, a significant difference is found in the mean score of scholarships of parents in public (M=3.455, SD=0.94574) and private (M=3.74, SD=0.76038) universities, t(198)= -2.349, p<.05. On scholarships private sector is booming because they provide more scholarships offering to the students. On the ninth quality factor asignificant difference is found in the mean score of extra curriculum activities of parents of public (M=3.76, SD=0.74472) and private (M=4.1233, SD=0.4585) universities, t(164.623)= -4.155,
The private universities are again above from the public universities on this factor too. Regarding functioning public universities are (M=3.9057, SD=0.52212) above from private universities (M=3.7143, SD=0.52006), t(198)=2.598, and has a significance difference p<.05. At last for feedback factor a significant difference is found in the mean score of parents in public (M=3.3567, SD=0.77017) and private (M=2.9, SD=0.73474), t(198)= 4.29, p<.05.

4.6.2.1 Comparison of Overall Satisfaction (Public v/s Private Universities)
The overall satisfaction of parents between public and private universities is compare under this section. The 100 parents from public universities and 100 parents from private universities are considered.

Hypothesis 18
H_{018}: There is a nosignificant difference in the overall mean score of satisfaction of parents in Public and Private Universities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Satisfaction</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>126.01</td>
<td>13.11988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>123.13</td>
<td>12.82332</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table no 4.45 is for group statistics showing mean score, standard deviation, and standard error. The mean score of public universities is 126.01 and for private universities it is 123.13. To find the out the difference between public and private universities an independent t-test is used.
From the table no-4.46 it can be judged that there is no significant variance in the overall sum of mean satisfaction score parents in public (M=126.01, SD=13.1199) and private (M=123.13, SD=12.8233), t(198)= 1.57, p>0.05, so null hypothesis is accepted with respect to overall sum of mean satisfaction score of public and private universities.

**Effects of demographic variables on overall satisfaction of the parents**
After analyzing the effects of demographic variable of students and parents analysis is also done. Only those variables are taken for the analysis that is relevant to the study.

**Effect of Gender on the overall satisfaction of the parents**
First of all the effect of gender on overall satisfaction of the parents is analyzed with the help of independent t-test.

The table no4.47 is showing the group statistics of effect of overall satisfaction of the parents.
Table no 4.48
Result of independent t-test of effect of gender on overall satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall satisfaction</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>5.621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>-0.638</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table no 4.48 is indicating that there is an insignificant difference in the satisfaction level parents according to gender. It represents that satisfaction level parents does not vary according to gender.

Effect of Age on the overall satisfaction of the parents

Under this section, the effect of age group on overall satisfaction of parents is analyzed. To know the results one way ANOVA is used and later on Tukey Post Hoc and mean plot is also used.

Table no 4.49
Result of ANOVA for the effect of age on overall satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Levene Statistic</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 40 Years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>135.6</td>
<td>7.0214</td>
<td>1.022</td>
<td>0.397</td>
<td>5.169</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45 Years</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>128.138</td>
<td>11.1859</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50 Years</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>127.097</td>
<td>11.4787</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-55 Years</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>124.787</td>
<td>12.8722</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 55 Years</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>118.86</td>
<td>14.1048</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table no 4.49 is indicating the results of the ANOVA to measure the effects of age on overall satisfaction. The result shows that assumption of levene test is fulfilled, which indicate that there is a significant difference in the overall satisfaction of parents due to difference in the age in the age group.
Table no 4.50
Results of Tukey Post Hoc Test for the effect of age on overall satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) Age</th>
<th>(J) Age</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under 40 Years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45 Years</td>
<td>41-45 Years</td>
<td>7.46207</td>
<td>6.05611</td>
<td>.733</td>
<td>-9.2133 24.1374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45 Years</td>
<td>46-50 Years</td>
<td>8.50323</td>
<td>5.81427</td>
<td>.588</td>
<td>-7.5062 24.5126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45 Years</td>
<td>51-55 Years</td>
<td>10.81277</td>
<td>5.88310</td>
<td>.355</td>
<td>-5.3862 27.0117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45 Years</td>
<td>Above 55 Years</td>
<td>16.74035*</td>
<td>5.83327</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.6786 32.8021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45 Years</td>
<td>46-50 Years</td>
<td>1.04116</td>
<td>2.81361</td>
<td>.996</td>
<td>-6.7060 8.7884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45 Years</td>
<td>51-55 Years</td>
<td>3.35070</td>
<td>2.95323</td>
<td>.788</td>
<td>-4.7809 11.4823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45 Years</td>
<td>Above 55 Years</td>
<td>9.27828*</td>
<td>2.85267</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>1.4235 17.1330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under 40 Years</td>
<td>-8.50323</td>
<td>5.81427</td>
<td>.588</td>
<td>-24.5126 7.5062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50 Years</td>
<td>41-45 Years</td>
<td>-1.04116</td>
<td>2.81361</td>
<td>.996</td>
<td>-8.7884 6.7060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50 Years</td>
<td>51-55 Years</td>
<td>2.30954</td>
<td>2.41884</td>
<td>.875</td>
<td>-4.3507 8.9697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50 Years</td>
<td>Above 55 Years</td>
<td>8.23713*</td>
<td>2.29498</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>1.9180 14.5563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under 40 Years</td>
<td>-10.81277</td>
<td>5.88310</td>
<td>.355</td>
<td>-27.0117 5.3862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-55 Years</td>
<td>41-45 Years</td>
<td>-3.35070</td>
<td>2.95323</td>
<td>.788</td>
<td>-11.4823 4.7809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-55 Years</td>
<td>46-50 Years</td>
<td>-2.30954</td>
<td>2.41884</td>
<td>.875</td>
<td>-8.9697 4.3507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-55 Years</td>
<td>Above 55 Years</td>
<td>5.92758</td>
<td>2.46416</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>-.8574 12.7126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under 40 Years</td>
<td>-16.74035*</td>
<td>5.83327</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>-32.8021 -.6786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 55 Years</td>
<td>41-45 Years</td>
<td>-9.27828*</td>
<td>2.85267</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>-17.1330 -1.4235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 55 Years</td>
<td>46-50 Years</td>
<td>-8.23713*</td>
<td>2.29498</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>-14.5563 -1.9180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 55 Years</td>
<td>51-55 Years</td>
<td>-5.92758</td>
<td>2.46416</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>-12.7126 .8574</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.
The table no 4.50 and figure no 4.3 is showing that overall satisfaction of parents does vary from up to under 40 years to above 55 years, it means that the satisfaction of above 55 age group students is low. The results Tukey Post Hoc and mean plot is also indicating the same thing.

**Effect of University on overall satisfaction of the parents**

To check the effect of universities on the overall satisfaction of the parents one way ANOVA, Tukey Post Hoc and Mean plot is used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Levene Statistic</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GNDU</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>123.38</td>
<td>12.5501</td>
<td>1.77486</td>
<td>1.228</td>
<td>0.301</td>
<td>6.057</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUP</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>128.64</td>
<td>13.2723</td>
<td>1.87698</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPU</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>127.32</td>
<td>10.8561</td>
<td>1.53528</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>118.94</td>
<td>13.3622</td>
<td>1.88969</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table no4.52
Result of Tukey Post Hoc of effect of universities on overall satisfaction of the parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiple Comparisons</th>
<th>University (I)</th>
<th>University (J)</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PUP</td>
<td>GNDU</td>
<td>-5.26000</td>
<td>2.51010</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td></td>
<td>-11.7642</td>
<td>1.2442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GNDU</td>
<td>LPU</td>
<td>-3.94000</td>
<td>2.51010</td>
<td>.398</td>
<td></td>
<td>-10.4442</td>
<td>2.5642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GNDU</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>4.44000</td>
<td>2.51010</td>
<td>.291</td>
<td></td>
<td>-2.0642</td>
<td>10.9442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PUP</td>
<td>LPU</td>
<td>1.32000</td>
<td>2.51010</td>
<td>.953</td>
<td></td>
<td>-5.1842</td>
<td>7.8242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LPU</td>
<td>GNDU</td>
<td>3.94000</td>
<td>2.51010</td>
<td>.398</td>
<td></td>
<td>-2.5642</td>
<td>10.4442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LPU</td>
<td>PUP</td>
<td>-1.32000</td>
<td>2.51010</td>
<td>.953</td>
<td></td>
<td>-7.8242</td>
<td>5.1842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LPU</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>8.38000*</td>
<td>2.51010</td>
<td>.953</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.8758</td>
<td>14.8842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>GNDU</td>
<td>-4.44000</td>
<td>2.51010</td>
<td>.291</td>
<td></td>
<td>-10.9442</td>
<td>2.0642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LPU</td>
<td>PUP</td>
<td>-8.38000*</td>
<td>2.51010</td>
<td>.953</td>
<td></td>
<td>-14.8842</td>
<td>-1.8758</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Figure no. 4.4 Mean Plot of Effect of University on overall satisfaction of Parents
The table no 4.52 and figure no 4.4 is showing that overall satisfaction of parents does vary from university to university. The satisfaction level PUP parents is different from Chd. Uni, and the satisfaction level of LPU parents is different from CU. The satisfaction level of CU parents is different from PLU and PUP. The results Tukey Post Hoc and mean plot is also indicating the same thing.

4.6.3 Comparative Satisfaction Analysis (Parents v/s Students)

The satisfaction level of parents is compared with students using independent t-test. Here all the parents (200) and students (400) are taken irrespect of sectors.

Hypothesis 19

H\textsubscript{019}: There is a no significant variance in the mean score of satisfaction of parents and students of service quality for Higher Management Education of Public and Private Universities with respect to quality factors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table No-4.53</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comparison of Satisfaction of Parents and Students of Service Quality of Public and Private Universities</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QF</th>
<th>Group Statistics</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access &amp; Approachable</td>
<td>Parents 200</td>
<td>3.6767</td>
<td>1.03803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students 400</td>
<td>3.8492</td>
<td>0.7517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure</td>
<td>Parents 200</td>
<td>3.4313</td>
<td>0.74976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students 400</td>
<td>3.5738</td>
<td>0.85978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic reputation &amp; Quality</td>
<td>Parents 200</td>
<td>3.8517</td>
<td>0.79761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students 400</td>
<td>4.0742</td>
<td>0.70428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety &amp; Security</td>
<td>Parents 200</td>
<td>4.315</td>
<td>0.45106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students 400</td>
<td>4.3317</td>
<td>0.6072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Parents 200</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>0.51986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students 400</td>
<td>4.2163</td>
<td>0.73924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement</td>
<td>Parents 200</td>
<td>3.3725</td>
<td>0.85065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students 400</td>
<td>3.5975</td>
<td>1.00587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee</td>
<td>Parents 200</td>
<td>2.6875</td>
<td>0.81512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students 400</td>
<td>3.215</td>
<td>0.78761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship</td>
<td>Parents 200</td>
<td>3.5975</td>
<td>0.86776</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table no 4.53 is for group statistics, which represent the total 11 quality factors with their mean, standard deviation, and standard error. The 200 parents and 400 students are taken. Whether the results are showing significant results or not that can be interpret with the help of next table.

### Table No-4.54
Comparison of Satisfaction of Parents and Students of Service Quality of Public and Private Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QF</th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access &amp; Approachable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>0.504</td>
<td>0.478</td>
<td>-2.322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>-2.092</td>
<td>306.527</td>
<td>0.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>1.192</td>
<td>0.275</td>
<td>-1.995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>-2.088</td>
<td>449.744</td>
<td>0.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic reputation &amp; Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>9.477</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>-3.488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>-3.346</td>
<td>357.316</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety &amp; Security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>10.413</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>-0.344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>-0.378</td>
<td>512.957</td>
<td>0.705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>31.96</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2.676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>-2.997</td>
<td>533.054</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the table no-4.54 it can be examined that out of eleven quality factors nine factors has significant difference. Where the Levene’s test of equal variance assumption has not met at that situation equal variance not assumed value has taken.

The first quality factor is access and approachable, a significant variance occurred in mean score of access and approachableness of parents (M=3.6767, SD=1.03803) and students (M=3.8492, SD=0.7517), t(598)= -2.322, p<.05. The students are more satisfied from the access and approachability of the universities as compare to parents.

The exposure quality factor earns less satisfaction from students, whereas parents are more worried about the exposure factor, a significant variance in the mean score of satisfaction of parents (M=3.4313, SD=0.74976) and students (M=3.5738, SD=0.85978), t(598)= -1.995, p<.05, is found. The third quality factor is academic reputation and quality, a significant difference is found in the mean score of academic reputation and quality factor of parents (M=3.8515, SD=0.79761) and students (M=4.0742, SD=0.70428), t(357.16)= -3.346, p<.05. The assumption of levene test has not met so variance not equally assumed has taken. The fourth quality factor is safety and security of the students, assumption of levene test of equality is not met so equal variance is not assume. There is an insignificant variance in the mean score of
safety and security factor of parents (M=4.315, SD=0.45106) and students (M=4.3317, SD=0.6072), t(512.957)=-0.378, p>.05 for safety and security. The results clear us that both parents and students are satisfied from safety and security of the students, so difference is not existed. The next quality is infrastructure, the assumption of equality of variance is not assumed, the mean score of infrastructure factor of parents (M=4.06, SD=0.51986) is much lesser than students (M=4.2163, SD=0.73924), t(533.054)=-2.997, and produced a significant results p<.05. Now days placements is the key element for every educational institute to survive, but from last five years and so placements of management students is go down drastically The students are seems to be little satisfied over parents. The results of independent test is also indicating the same thing that there is a significant difference in the mean score of placement factor of parents (M=3.3725, SD=0.85065) and students (M=3.5975, SD=1.00587), t(461.911)=-2.87, p<.05.The most important factor is fee of the course, where parents are less satisfied (M=2.6875, SD=0.81512) as compare to students (M=3.215, SD=0.78761), t(598)= -7.644, p<.05. The next factor is scholarship, the assumption of equality is not met, the satisfaction level of parents is again lesser (M=3.5975, SD=0.86776) than students (M=4.0225, SD=0.85444), t(392.679)= -5.684, p<.05. The next factor (extra curriculum activities) is not having the significant difference. So the null hypothesis is accepted. The levene test assumption is not met that is why equal variance is not assumed. There is an insignificant variance in the mean score of satisfaction of parents (M=3.9414, SD=0.64317) and students (M=4., SD=0.73841), t(450.208)= -0.996, p>.05 for extra curriculum activities. The second last factor is functioning of the university there is also significant variance is found in the mean score of functioning factor of parents (M=3.81, SD=0.52856) and students (M=3.9946, SD=0.52058), t(598)=-4.075, p<.05for functioning. At the last factor feedback a significant variance is found in the mean score of feedback factor of parents (M=3.1283, SD=0.78489) and students (M=3.7819, SD=0.81616), t(598)= -3.364p<.05.

4.6.3.1 Comparative Overall Satisfaction (Parents v/s Students)
After comparing the satisfaction level of parents with students on individual factors, now the overall satisfaction level of parents is compared with students.
Hypothesis 20

H_{020}: There is no significant difference in the overall satisfaction of parents and students of service quality for Higher Management Education of Public and Private Universities.

Table No-4.55
Comparison of overall Satisfaction of Parents and Students of Service Quality of Public and Private Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Statistics</th>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Satisfaction</td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>124.57</td>
<td>13.0201</td>
<td>0.92066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>136.253</td>
<td>16.8823</td>
<td>0.84411</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table no 4.55 is for group statistics showing mean score, standard deviation, and standard error. The mean score of parents is 124.57 and for students it is 136.253. To find the out the difference between parents and students satisfaction an independent t-test is used.

Table No-4.56
Comparison of overall Satisfaction of Parents and Students of Service Quality of Public and Private Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Samples Test</th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Satisfaction</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>10.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>-9.353</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table no-4.56 it can be judged that there is a significant variance in the overall sum of mean satisfaction score parents (M=124.5700, SD=13.02009) and students (M=136.2525, SD=16.88228), t(498.502)= -9.353, p<.05, so null hypothesis is rejected with respect to overall sum of mean satisfaction score of parents and students.
4.7 To analyze the perception of teachers regarding the service quality and the constraints and challenges in providing quality services.

Under this objective teachers perception is compared in public and private universities and contraints and challenges faced by the faculty while doing service is also compared.

**Hypothesis 21**

H₀₂₁: There is no significant difference in the perception of Faculty members of service quality for Higher Management Education in Public and Private Universities with respect to quality factors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QF</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic Amenities</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>17.26</td>
<td>2.27506</td>
<td>0.32174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15.42</td>
<td>2.65799</td>
<td>0.3759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>3.3335</td>
<td>0.47143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>2.37547</td>
<td>0.33594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Resources</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14.56</td>
<td>3.85005</td>
<td>0.54448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>16.46</td>
<td>2.54919</td>
<td>0.36051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion and Remuneration</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>16.94</td>
<td>4.19139</td>
<td>0.59275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>17.76</td>
<td>4.25973</td>
<td>0.60242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>3.72663</td>
<td>0.52702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15.14</td>
<td>2.90678</td>
<td>0.41108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and Research Motivation</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7.64</td>
<td>2.00774</td>
<td>0.28394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>2.20426</td>
<td>0.31173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra-Curricular Activities</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>11.36</td>
<td>2.26563</td>
<td>0.32041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10.48</td>
<td>3.47727</td>
<td>0.49176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievance Handling</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>1.95553</td>
<td>0.27655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>2.36609</td>
<td>0.33462</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table no 4.57 is for group statistics showing mean score, standard deviation, and standard error of eight factors across public and private sector.
From the table no-4.58 it can be study that out of eight quality factors only two factors has significant variance. So it is hard to tell that which sector is out performing other. Where the assumption of levene test is not met, the equal variance is not assumed is considered. On the first factor, the perception of public teachers regarding basic...
amenities is significantly different (M=17.26, SD=2.27506) from the perception of private teachers (M=15.42, SD=2.65799), t(98)= 3.719. The teaching resources shown a significant difference in the mean score of perception of public universities teachers (M=14.56, SD=3.85005) and private universities teachers (M=16.46, SD=2.54919), t(85.037)= -2.91, p<.05. It is clear that private universities teachers have a more teaching resources than public universities. In six quality factors there is no significant variance is found. The infrastructure is not the difference between the both sectors according to the universities, so an in significant difference in the mean score of perception of public universities teachers (M=20.5, SD=3.3335) and private universities teachers (M=21.5, SD=2.37547), t(98)= -1.727, p>.05. An in significant variance also found regarding in the mean score of perception of public universities teachers (M=16.94, SD=4.19139) and private universities (M=17.76, SD=4.25973), t(98)= -0.97, p>.05, for promotion and remuneration policies. The promotion and remuneration policies are not effective in private universities but they are afraid to disclose the reality. The administration of the universities does not produce significant difference in the mean score of perception of public universities teachers (M=14.5, SD=3.72663) and private universities teachers (M=15.74, SD=2.90678), t(98)= -0.958, p>.05, but the result showed that private universities are performing better than public universities. The teaching and research motivation is also produce produced an in significant difference in the mean score of perception of public (M=7.64, SD=2.00774) and private (M=7.28, SD=2.26563), t(98)= 0.854p>.05. Regarding extracurricular activities and grievance handling same kind of results are also found. There is an insignificant variance in the mean score of perception of public (M=11.36, SD=2.26563) and private (M=10.48, SD=3.47727), t(84.25)= 1.499, p>.05, for extracurricular activities. There is no significant variance in the mean score of perception of public (M=6.82, SD=1.95553) and private (M=6.44, SD=2.36609), t(94.644)=0.875, p>.05, for grievance handling too.

4.7.1 Analysis of Overall Perception of Teachers (Public v/s Private Universities)

After comparing the perception of teachers on individual factors, now the overall perception teachers is compared on both sectors.
Hypothesis 22

H\textsubscript{022}: There is no significant difference in the overall perception of Faculty members of service quality for Higher Management Education in Public and Private Universities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table No-4.59</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comparison of overall perception of Faculty members of Service Quality of Public &amp; Private Universities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group Statistics</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Perception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table no 4.59 is for group statistics showing mean score, standard deviation, and standard error. The mean score of overall perception of public universities is 109.58 and for private universities are 110.48. To find out the difference between the overall perception of public universities and private universities, an independent t-test is used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table No-4.60</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comparison of overall perception of Faculty members of Service Quality of Public &amp; Private Universities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Samples Test</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Perception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table no-4.60 it can be judged that there is no significant variance in the overall mean score of perception public (M=109.6, SD=18.7987) and private (M=110.5, SD=18.0986), t(98) = -0.24, p>.05, so null hypothesis is accepted with respect to overall mean score of perception of public and private universities.
4.7.2 Comparison of Constraint and Challenges Analysis (Public and Private Universities)

Under this objective constraints and challenges faced by the teachers is compared in public and private universities.

Hypothesis 23

$H_{023}$: There is no significant difference in the constraint and Challenges of Faculty members of service quality for Higher Management Education in Public and Private Universities with respect to different factors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table No-4.61</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comparison of constraint and Challenges of Faculty members of Service Quality of Public &amp; Private Universities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group Statistics</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C&amp;C</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection and Remuneration Constraint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in Decision Making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution of work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Teacher Ratio and Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Constraint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table no 4.61 is for group statistics showing mean score, standard deviation, and standard error for comparison of constraint and challenges. A five constraint and challenges are compare between public and private sector.
From the table no-4.62, it can be restrained that out of five constraint factors four factors has significant difference. Hence, it can be interpret that there is a difference in the constraints and challenges faced by the faculty in both sectors. There is a significant variance in the mean score of constraints of public (M=19.36, SD=3.87962) and private (M=17.34, SD=3.53761), t(98)=2.72, p<.05 for selection and remuneration constraint. The selection and remuneration constraint is more in public universities in comparison of private universities. The other constraint is the unfair distribution of work among the teachers. A significant difference is found in the mean score of constraints of public (M=15.52, SD=3.03207) and private (M=19.16, SD=3.1646), t(98)=-5.873, p<.05 for unfair distribution of work. The most of the private universities are practices this thing. On students teacher ratio, a significant result is also found in the mean score of constraint of public universities (M=13.56,
SD=2.40034) and private (M=12.2, SD=2.64189), t(98)= 2.694, p<.05. The second last constraint is institutional constraint, the result justify that private universities provides more institutional barrier as compare to public universities. A significant difference is found in mean score of perception of public (M=12.86, SD=3.14941) and private (M=14.96, SD=2.63385), t(98)= -3.617, p<.05, for institutional constraints too. But in one factor there is not significant variance is found. There is no significant variance in the mean score of perception of public (M=6.24, SD=2.08552) and private (M=6.4, SD=1.93781), t(98)=-0.397, p>.05 for involvement in decision making.

4.7.2.1 Analysis of overall Constraint and Challenges (Public v/s Private Universities)

The overall constraint and challenges faced by the teachers is compared in the following analysis.

Hypothesis 24

H_{024}: There is a no significant difference in the overall constraint and Challenges of Faculty members of service quality for Higher Management Education in Public and Private Universities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table No-4.63</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comparison of Overall constraint and Challenges of Faculty members of Service Quality of Public &amp; Private Universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall constraint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table no 4.63 is for group statistics showing mean score, standard deviation, and standard error. The mean score of overall constraint of public universities is 67.54 and for private universities are 70.06. To find the out the difference between the overall constraint of public universities and private universities an independent t-test is used.
### Table No-4.64
**Comparison of Overall constraint and Challenges of Faculty members of Service Quality of Public &Private Universities**

**Independent Samples Test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Constraint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>0.607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table no-4.64 it can be judged that there is no significant variance in the overall comparison of constraint and challenges score public (M=67.54, SD=10.882) and private (M=70.06, SD=10.2169), t(98) = -1.194, p>.05, so null hypothesis is accepted with respect to overall comparison of constraint and challenges score of public and private universities.