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FINDINGS AND SUGGESTIONS

5. Findings and Suggestions

In this chapter, major findings of the study are discussed according to the objectives of the study. Further based on the outcomes of the study some suggestions are given below.

5.1 Findings of the Study

5.1.1 Objective 1 - To explore the important service quality dimensions in higher management education.

To achieve this objective, important service quality dimensions are widely explored with the help of related literature review. (N=400) students approached for this study, 200 from public universities, and 200 from private universities and (N=200) parents are approached for the study, 100 from public universities, and 100 from public universities. The expected service from public universities is compared with private universities and delivered service from public universities is compared with private universities. At the same pattern, every dimension is compared between public and private universities.

From Students’ Point of view

- The expectation of students regarding tangibility dimension does not produce significance variance in public and private universities, because their expectation regarding tangibility factors is based on the image of public and private universities.
- The result of the expected reliability variance is also an insignificant, P>7.05 for students case. Expectation of students on reliability factor in public universities (M=4.276) higher than private universities (M=4.353).
- A significant P<0.05 results are found in responsiveness dimensions. Expectation from private universities (M=4.2925) is larger than public university (M=4.1588) because public universities are always willing to help their customers immediately.
- An insignificant (P>0.05) results were found in expected assurance quality dimension between public and private universities. A mean of both universities public (M=4.3025) private (M=4.335) is close to each other.
Therefore, expectation regarding courtesy, knowledge, and employee’s ability to convey trust and confidence in students is not different in both sectors.

- For expected empathy, significant result is found, that indicates, students have a different expectation regarding empathy (personal and individual caring from service provider). Student think private universities should give more individual and personal care to them as compare to public universities. In public sector, personal and significant individual care is not as mandatory aspect as in private sector.

- In perceived tangibility quality dimension, private universities (M=4.0188) are far ahead from public universities (M=3.8675). Hence, it is proved that, private universities providing better tangibility facilities to students as compare to public universities.

- The Private universities (M=3.872) are executing well on perceived reliability aspect, whereas public universities (M=3.692) are lagging behind. Public universities is significantly (P<0.05) different from private universities. Thus, we can say that private universities are keeping their promises dependably and accurately compare to public universities.

- On perceived responsiveness a noteworthy (P>0.05) result is found, which means both universities are indifferent to respond quickly to solve the problem faced by the students.

- An insignificant (P<0.05) result is found on perceived assurance quality dimension. Which means ability, knowledge, and courtesy of employees to inbuilt trust and confidence in students is very much similar in both sectors.

- Private universities giving more individual and personal care to students as compare to public universities, a significant (p<0.05) result is also demonstrating the equivalent thing.

**From Parents’ Point of view**

- The Parents expectation is significant (P<0.05) different from private (M=4.455) and public universities (M=4.268). That mean parents have a more expectation from private universities in terms of tangibility factors as compare to public universities. So the result is stated that public universities are behind from private universities from parents’ point of view on tangibility expectation dimension.
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- The result of expected reliability dimension is significantly (P<0.05) different in public and private universities. Again private universities (M=4.542) are going well in comparison with public universities (M=4.232). It means that parents expectation from private university are more as relate to public universities on their ability to perform promised services accurately.

- On expected responsiveness dimension, result states that public universities (M=4.19) should help students instantly as match to private universities (M=4.623). Which means parents expectation on responsiveness is more from private universities as their mean score is higher than public universities mean score.

- In public (M=4.293) and private universities (M=4.568) the expected assurance dimension has significant (P<.05) variance on parents point of view. Parents has more expectation from private universities in association with public universities with respect to courtesy, knowledge of employees and their ability to build trust and confidence in students.

- The Parents has more expectation from private university (M=4.534) as compare to public universities (M=4.18) with respect to personal and individual caring to students.

- From parents points of tangibility factors are almost similar in private and public universities. Parents are not attached with big buildings and other infrastructures facilities; they are more concern intellectual services.

- On ability to perform promised services accurately, private universities (M=3.744) are ahead from their counterpart public universities (M=3.704), but they are not significantly different from each other which mean perceived reliability is not strongly different in public and private universities.

- On responsiveness dimensions, an insignificant (P>0.05) result was found too. Which means on willingness to help customer and provide promote service to students, public (M=3.815) universities and private universities (M=3.738) are not significantly different from each other. It means parents’ perceived responsiveness is not varying in public and private universities.

- A significant (P<0.05) result was found in perceived assurance dimension in public and private universities. The result stated that knowledge and courtesy
of the employees was greater in public universities as compared to private universities.

- Results of personal care, individual attention was an insignificant (P>0.05). Therefore, we can say that parents do not think that they are getting more personal and individual attention in anyone of the two sectors.

5.1.2 Objective 2- To differentiate the expected and deliver quality factors of private and public universities.

**Gap analysis for students:** To know the difference between expected and perceived quality service. Service quality gap analysis was done. All the service quality dimensions, namely assurance, tangibility, reliability, empathy were taken to serve the purpose. All five-service quality dimensions were analyzed on expectation and perception section between private and public universities. (N=400) students were approved for this purpose, 200 from public universities, and 200 from private universities. (N=200) parents were also approached for the study, 100 from public universities, and 100 from public universities. Firstly students analyzed is mention below, where public universities were analyzed first, followed by private universities, followed by overall (both universities). Something is applicable on parents’ analysis too. Independent T-test was used to analyze the data.

**Gap analysis of students (Delivered service–Expected service) (Public Universities)**

The gap analysis of public universities is covers the difference between expected and deliver service from students point of view. The result indicates the negative results, which mean expected services are not meet with delivered service Ravindran, et al., (2012).

- There is a significant (P<0.05) result found in tangibility dimension. Expectation towards tangibility dimension is not met with the perception. Therefore, we can say that students’ expectation is more and they are getting less in terms of tangibility aspect from public universities.

- The students’ expectation (M=4.276) is more whereas their perception (M=3.692) regarding reliability (ability to perform promised service dependably and accurately) is far less. Therefore, gap exists. It means
promised service are does not perform accurately and dependably by their universities.

- The Public universities are not making sincere efforts to help students and provide prompt services. The result highlighting the same, expectation (M=4.1588) and perception (M=3.7913) has gap.

- The Assurance dimension also has a significant result regarding expectation and perception of the students from public universities. Expected mean (M=4.3025) is higher than the mean (M=3.86) of perception. It means knowledge of employee courtesy and their ability to convey trust and confidence is not available as much they were looking for.

- The Personal and individual caring (empathy) also have a significant result. The expectation (M=4.066) is different from perception (M=2.67). It means expectation does not meet with actually delivered services.

**Gap analysis (Perception –Expectation, Private Universities)**

Like public universities, Private universities also have significant results on all five quality dimensions. That mean students expectation more and they are getting lesser in reality.

- The expectation and perception regarding tangibility factor has significant (P<0.05) result, which can explained that students expectation (M=4.2638) regarding tangibility factors of universities were more and actually received services (perception) (M=4.0188) was less. Thus, expectation does not meet with perception.

- The ability to perform the promised services dependably and accurately is not met with expectations of the students form private universities. So the result indicated that expectation were more as compare to perception.

- Results of responsiveness dimensions is significant (P<.05). Universities willingness to help students and provide prompt services does not match with expectations. Expectation (M=4.2925) regarding responsiveness was significantly different from perception (M=3.8675) which mean universities were not willing to help and to provide prompt services.

- The students’ expectation (M=4.335) for assurance dimension was high and does not met with perception (M=3.945), knowledge does not build trust and
confident in students. It does not mean that they are insufficient, but their performance does not meet with students’ expectation.

- Again, personal and individual caring for the students does not meet with the expectation. Expectation was more and what they were getting is far less.

Gap analysis (Perception – Expectation, Public, and Private Universities Both)

Overall gap analysis has similar results like private and public universities have (M=400) students’ expectation and perception analyzed on five quality dimensions. Independent T test was used to serve the purpose.

- The students expectation (M=4.294) regarding tangibility dimension is significantly (P<.05) different from overall perception (M=3.943). It means students expectation was not fulfilled either by public university not in private universities.
- A significant (P<.05) result is found in the students expectation (M=4.315) and perception (M=3.782) regarding reliability dimension, as overall. Universities ability, to perform promised services accurately does not meet with the expectation of the students.
- On willingness to help students and provide immediately services, expectation is not met with perception of the students. This suggests that, universities have to make continuous efforts to match expectation of the stakeholders.
- On assurance, dimension student expectation (M=4.319) is not equal to the perception (M=3.903) which means expectation higher the perception.
- The personal and individual caring of the universities does not match with expectation of the students. So significant result is found. Which mean expectation is high and delivered service is low.

Gap Analysis (Overall Perception-Overall Expectation)

After analyzing expectation and perception on five quality dimensions separately, for public and private universities. Overall expectation and perception of the students was analyzed. To test the significance of results T test indicated that there was significant difference in expectation and perception of the students.

- The overall variance between expectation and perception is significantly different. Which mean students’ expectation is not match by the services (perceived) they receive. Therefore, the gap exists.
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Gap Analysis (Dimensions Wise, Public v/s Private Universities)

Earlier gap analysis was done on public, private, and overall basis, in expectation and perception of five quality dimensions. Now gap between expectation and perception (overall) is further analyzed in public and private sector. Out of 5-quality dimension, one has a significant result.

- The gap between expectation and perception regarding tangibility dimension in public (M=-1.8250) and private university (M=-.9800) is significant (P<0.05). A result indicates that private universities are performing better than public universities and providing adequate tangible facilities.

- A gap between perception and expectation in public universities (M=-2.9200) and a gap between perception and expectation in private universities (M=-2.4050) is produces an insignificant (P>.05) result. It indicates that both sectors are performing almost equally.

- Regarding responsiveness dimension, gap score in expectation and perception in public universities (M=-1.4700) and gap score in expectation and perception in private universities (M=-1.7000) shows an insignificant (P<.05) consequence. Private universities have a more gap then public universities. Therefore, it may be said that, public universities are performing well as compare to private universities.

- An insignificant result is found in public (M=-1.7700) and private universities (M=-1.5600) on gap score of expectation and perception regarding assurance. Gap score in private universities is less, which means they are performing well in competition with private universities.

- The gap in empathy dimension in public (M=-1.9800) and private universities (M=-1.4700) is an insignificant (P>0.05) too. Gap score of expectation and perception in private universities is less as equate to private universities. It can be say that private universities acting well as relate to public universities.

Gap Analysis (Public v/s Private) overall

Under this section, public and private universities were compared to with each other on. Combined Gap score of all dimension. Firstly, gap was calculated an expectation and perception on all quality dimension with respect to public and private universities. Then that gap is analyzed between public and private sector.
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- The result of gap analysis (public (M=9.97) and private (M=8.17) overall is an insignificant (P>0.05), mean there is no variance public and private universities.

**Gap analysis (Perception –Expectation, Public Universities) Parents**

(N-200) parents were approached for study, 100 from public universities. Gap analysis was done separately for public and private universities and then combined. Their expectation and perception was aliased on five-quality dimension independent T-test was used for this purpose.

- There is a significant (P<0.05) result found in tangibility dimension. Expectation regarding tangibility is not to the perception of tangibility. Therefore, the gap exists, which was significantly different. Therefore, at last, we can say that parents’ expectation (M=4.2675) is more and they are getting less in terms of perception (M=3.8225) Ravindran, et, al,. (2012) from public universities.

- On reliability, parents’ expectation (N=4.232) is more whereas their perception (N=3.704) regarding reliability (ability to perform promised service dependably and accurately) is far less. It means promised service are does not perform accurately and dependably.

- The expectation (M=4.19) and perception (M=3.815) regarding responsiveness is also not equal. Parents have more expectation from public universities and what they are getting is different. It means public universities are not willing to help their students and provide prompt services.

- The Assurance dimension also has a significant result regarding expectation and perception of the Parents from public universities. Expected mean (M=4.2932) is higher than the mean (M=3.955) of perception. It means knowledge of employee courtesy and their ability to convey trust and confidence is not available Ravindran, et, al,. (2012) as much they were looking for.

- The personal and individual caring (empathy) also have a significant result. Which means expected (M=4.18) is different from perception (M=3.838). It means expectation does not meet with actually delivered services.
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Gap analysis (Perception – Expectation, Private Universities)
Like public universities, too have significant results on all five quality dimensions. Which mean Parents’ expectation more and they are getting lesser in reality?

- Expectation and perception regarding tangibility dimension has significant (P<0.05) result which can explained that Parents expectation (M=4.455) regarding tangibility factors of universities is more and actually received services (perception) (M=3.935) is less.
- The ability to perform the promised services dependably and accurately is not match with expectation. On reliability dimension a significant (P<.05) result is found. So the result indicated that expectation (M=4.542) is more as compare to perception (M=3.744).
- The results of responsiveness dimensions is significant (P<.05) too. Universities willingness to help students and provide prompt services does not cross the expectations. Expectation (M=4.6225) regarding responsiveness is significantly different from perception (M=3.7375) which mean universities are not willing to help and to provide prompt services.
- The parents’ expectation (M=4.5675) for assurance dimension is high from perception (M=3.7275), knowledge does not build trust and confidence in students. It does not mean that they are insufficient, but their performance is not up to the mark according to parents’ expectation.
- Again personal and individual caring for the students does not meet with the expectation (M=4.534) of the parents’. Expectation is more and what they were getting is far less in terms of perception (M=3.746).

Gap analysis (Perception – Expectation, Public, and Private Universities Both)
Here the overall (including public and private universities) gap analysis is done on expectation and perception of parents with respect to five-quality dimension. That was done using independent T-test in all the dimensions a significant results were found the dimensions a significant results were found, which indicated that, there is a space between parents’ expectation and perception

- The expectation (M=4.361) regarding tangibility dimension is significantly (P<.05) different from perception (M=3.879) of parents. It means parents expectation is not fulfilled either public university nor by private universities.
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- The Universities ability to perform promised services accurately does not meet with the expectation of the parents. Significant (P<.05) result were found in the parents expectation (M=4.387) and perception (M=3.724) regarding reliability dimension.
- On willingness to help students and provide immediately services, (responsiveness) s’ expectation (M=4.406) is not met with perception (M=3.776) of the parents.
- On assurance, dimension parents expectation (M=4.43) is not equal to the perception (M=3.841) which means expectation higher than perception.
- The personal and individual caring of the universities do not match with expectation (M=4.357) of the parents. So significant result is found. Which mean expectation is high and delivered service is low.

Gap Analysis (Overall Perception-Overall Expectation)
After analyzing the expectation and perception of parents of service quality on five quality dimensions separately, for public and private universities. Overall expectation and perception of the students was analyzed. To test the significance of results T test indicated that there was significant difference in expectation and perception of the students.

- The overall expectation (M=96.51) and perception (M=83.565) of the parents for public and private in universities is analyzed and significant result is found. It means expectation is higher than perception.

Gap Analysis (Dimensions Wise, Public v/s Private Universities)
To accomplish this hypothesis gap between expectation and perception regarding five service dimensions in both public and private universities was examined. The results were significant (p<0.05) on four quality dimension, where one has a significant (p>0.05) service result.

- The gap between expectation and perception regarding tangibility dimension in public (M=1.7800) and private (M=2.0800) university is an insignificant (P>0.05). Result indicates that public universities are executing better performances than public universities.
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- A result of reliability gap analysis is significant, which means there is a variance between public (M=-2.6400) and private (M=-3.9900) universities with respect to expectation and perception of reliability.
- The gap score of expectation and perception on responsiveness between private (M=-3.5400) and public universities (M=-1.5000) is significant (P<.05). Private universities have a more gap than public universities. Therefore, it can be judged that public universities have an upper hand than private universities.
- A significant result is found between public (M=-1.3500) and private universities (M=-3.3600) on gap score of expectation and perception regarding assurance. Gap score in public universities is less, which means they are performing well in competition with private universities.
- The gap in empathy dimension between public (M=-1.7100) and private universities (M=-3.9400) is significant (P>0.05). Gap score of expectation and perception in public universities is less compared to private universities.

Gap Analysis (Public v/s Private) overall
Under this section, public and private universities were compared with each other on. Combined Gap score of all dimensions. Firstly, gap was calculated of expectation and perception on all quality dimensions with respect to public and private universities. Then that gap further analyzed between public and private sector.

- The gap between expectation and perception between public (M=-8.98) and private universities (M=-16.91) produce significant result. Public universities completely whitewash the private universities.

5.1.3 Objective 3- To study the extent of satisfaction level of students and parents with regard to institutional quality factors.
To achieve this objective (N=400) students and (N=200) parents from public and private universities were examined on eleven service quality factors. Firstly, student’s satisfaction level was examined in comparison with public and private universities. Then parent’s satisfaction level was also examined in public and private universities. At last students satisfaction level was compared with parents.
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Comparison of student’s satisfaction level of service quality in public and private universities.

Satisfaction level of students regarding institutional quality factors was examined on eleven institutional factors in comparison with public and private and public universities that out of eleven quality factors 7 quality factors Hasan et al (2009) has a significant (p<0.05) difference.

- With respect to access and approachable, students of public universities (M=3.9867) are more satisfied as compare to private universities (M=3.7117), which mean public universities are more accessible and approachable then private universities.
- The private universities (M=3.6788) are giving more exposure to students then public universities (M=3.4688). It means global exposure; business exposure is more associated with private universities.
- An academic reputation and quality of education is more associated with public universities (M=4.16) then private universities (M=3.9883). It means students have a strong satisfaction level academic reputation and quality from public universities.
- The results regarding safety and security is an insignificant (P>0.05) in comparison of public universities (M=4.2817) and private universities (M=4.3817). It means regarding safety and security students of both universities are satisfied. It is difficult to find variance between both sectors.
- Regarding infrastructure facilities a significant (P>0.05) result is found. It indicates that on infrastructure point of view, students satisfaction level is very similar in public (M=4.2625) and private (M=4.17) universities. It means infrastructure facilities are quite similar in both sectors.
- If we talk about placements, whether the big reputed companies often visit there or students get jobs opportunities regularly, results showed an insignificant figure. Students from both universities are satisfied, but there is no significant variance in public (M=3.57) and private universities (M=3.625).
- The fee of public universities is more affordable then private universities. Results are indicating the same outcome. Public (M=3.315) universities fee is
lower than private (M=3.115) universities, which indicating the significant variance.

- The results regarding scholarship in public universities (M=3.925) and private universities (M=4.12) are significant, results indicating that private universities are providing more scholarships to students than public universities.
- A significant result is found regarding extra curriculum activities. Private universities (M=4.12) are performing better than public universities (M=3.88) on organizing seminars, cultural fests, industrial trips.
- Both public (M=4.0121) and private (M=3.9771) universities showed an insignificant result regarding functioning. According to students points of public and private universities does not function equally, but public universities are performing well, but that does not differentiate them from private universities.
- On feedback public (M=3.9338) universities and private universities (M=3.9338) showed significant results which indicating that public universities are performing well than private universities.

**Comparison of overall satisfaction level of Students**

To compare the overall satisfaction level of students, firstly mean score of the entire eleven factors was calculated, separately for public and private universities, and then mean score level of satisfaction of students was analyzed on public and private universities.

- The comparison of overall satisfaction level of public universities (M=136.765) and private universities (M=135.74) shows an insignificant (P>0.05) results which does not mean that both sectors are not performing well, but this tells us the reality of higher education in the Punjab. Both public and private universities doing their best, on some factors public outplayed private sector, on some private factors private sector shines. so result is that, it is hard to describe which sector is the best.
Comparision of parent’s satisfaction level regarding institutional quality factor in public and private universities

To compare the satisfaction level of parents (N=200) regarding institutional quality factors in public and private universities, independent T-test was used. In eight among eleven quality factors, results were significant, which indicates the difference Ahmed et al. (2010) prevails in the public and private universities.

- The parents are more satisfied with respect to access and approachable from public universities (M=3.99) than private universities (M=3.3633). Which mean public universities are more accessible and approachable than private universities?
- From parents’ point of view, global exposure, business exposure is more associated with private universities, Private universities (M=3.8025) are giving more exposure to students then public universities (M=3.06) because of high fee structure.
- Regarding academic reputation and quality, public universities are always prefer over private universities by parents, because they think academic reputation and quality of education is more associated with public universities (M=4.2133) than private universities(M=3.49).
- An insignificant (P>0.05) result is found in comparison of public universities (M=4.3733) and private universities (M=4.2567) with respect safety and security. It means parents satisfied from both sectors regarding safety and security their wards.
- The infrastructure facilities are never be focus for parents. That is why an insignificant (P>0.05) result is found. Both public (M=4.025) and private (M=4.095) universities are close to each other. It means infrastructure facilities are quite similar in both sectors.
- From placements point of view both universities are on the same platform. Public universities (M=3.27) are little behind from private universities(M=3.475).
- The fee of public universities is more affordable than private universities. Results are indicating the same outcomes. Public (M=2.925) universities fee is lower than private (M=2.45) universities which indicating the significant variance.
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- The parents are always worried about the expenses incurred on education. Therefore, scholarship is a key factor. Private universities (M=3.74) giving more scholarships than public universities (M=3.455). A significant result indicates the same thing.
- The private universities (M=4.1233) are performing better than public universities (M=3.76) on organizing seminar cultural fest industrial trip. Significant result is found regarding extra curriculum activities.
- According to parents points of public universities (M=3.9057) does function better than private universities (M=3.7143).
- On feedback section public (M=3.3567) universities and private universities (M=2.9) showed significant results which indicating that public universities are performing well than private universities.

Comparison of overall satisfaction level of parents

The comparison of overall satisfaction level was the analyzed after calculating the mean satisfaction score of public and private universities. An insignificant (P>0.05) results are found, which suggests that space between public and private universities so narrow that cannot produced significant results.

- The comparison of overall satisfaction level of parents in public universities (M=126.01) and private universities (M=123.13) shows an insignificant (P>0.05) result, which does not mean that both sectors are not performing well.

Comparative satisfaction analysis (parents and students)

The comparison of overall satisfaction level was the analyzed after calculating the mean satisfaction score of public and private universities. An insignificant (P>0.05) results are found, which suggests that space between public and private universities so narrow that cannot produced significant results.

- With respect to access and approachable students (M=3.8492) are more satisfied as compare to parents (M=3.6767). Result is also indicating the same thing, suggesting significant outcomes.
- The students (M=3.5738) are more conscious and eager for global exposure that is why they are more satisfied as compare to parents (M=3.4313).
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- From academic reputation and quality point of view students (M=4.0742) are again running ahead of parents (M=3.8517).
- There is no great deal of variance between students (M=4.3317) and parents (M=4.315) regarding safety and security issues in universities campuses.
- An infrastructure brings significant result. Students (M=4.2163) are more attracted and satisfied from infrastructure, where as parents (M=4.06) are less.
- The parents are worried about the placements facilities provided by the universities because they are main investors for the education industry. That make them lesser satisfied from students (M=3.5975).
- The fee is very crucial factor, which make notable distinguish between public and private universities. Private universities are charging higher then public universities. Parents (M=2.6875) are not as satisfied as students (M=3.215) looks from fee.
- The scholarships attracts more to parents (M=3.5975) that is why they more satisfied then students (M=4.0225).
- Regarding extra curriculum activities students (M=4.00) are more satisfied as compare to parents (M=3.9417).
- The students (M=3.9946) are extra satisfied as relate to parents (M=3.81) with respect to functioning of the universities.
- Regarding feedback students (M=3.7819) are more satisfied as compare to parents (M=3.1283).

Comparison of overall satisfaction of parents and students

Overall, comparative satisfaction of parents (N=400) and students (N=200) shows significant results, where the parents are less satisfied, than students.

- The comparison of overall satisfaction level of students (M=136.2525) and parents (M=124.5700) showssignificant (P<0.05) results. It is clear from the result that students are more satisfied in comparison with parents.

5.1.4 Objective 4- To analyze the perception of teachers regarding the service quality and the constraints and challenged in providing quality services.

Forth objective is related with faculty member. So 100 faculty members were selected for the study. 50 faculty members were belonging to private universities and 50 faculty members were belong to public universities. To know the perception of
Faculties members regarding service quality, eight quality factors were taken from teacher point of among eight factors only two factor produced significant results, where we can say that, the difference exist between public and private sector. Further overall perception of faculty members are analyzed in public and private universities, which shows an insignificant result.

- An availability of basic amenities always makes the institute more workable, popular and visit able place, absence of them, make harder life, for the institute. Therefore, public universities (M=17.26) providing better basic facilities than private universities (M=15.42).

- An infrastructure facilities between public universities (M=20.5) and private universities (M=21.5) does not produce significant result. Teachers are more concern about intangibles factors as compare to tangibles.

- Now days, more and more focus is given on practical applicability of the education. To achieve this task teaching resources are so necessary. Private universities (M=16.46) are understand this aspect and proving the better facilities than public universities (M=14.56).

- To make your organization a brand, more emphasis should give on promotion and remuneration policies for the employees. For this private universities (M=17.76) are doing a bit, but still this is not significantly different form public universities (M=16.94).

- The faculty members think that administration of both, public universities (M=14.5) and private universities (M=15.14) is quite similar.

- The faculty has a very low score regarding teaching and research motivation aspect in their organization. Both public universities (M=7.64) and private universities (M=7.28) showing very low scores.

- The teachers are more indulge in extracurricular activities in public universities (M=11.36) as compare to private universities (M=10.48).

- Grievance handling mechanism is more applicable in public universities (M=6.82) rather than private universities (M=6.44).
Overall Perception Analysis (Public and Private Universities)
There is an insignificant results are found in the overall mean score of perception public and private universities.

- The overall perception of public university faculty is \( (M=109.6) \) lesser than private university faculty \( (M=110.5) \).

Comparison of constraints and challenges faced by faculty members in public and private universities
Further another of constraints and challenges faced by the faculty member is done. Total five constraints and challenges factor was formulated on the basis of literature review. Four factors shows significant result out of five factors.

- The faculty members of public universities \( (M=19.36) \) are feel more happy and satisfied from selection and remuneration constraint as compare to private universities \( (M=17.34) \).
- The distribution of work is more even is public universities \( (M=15.52) \) and more hectic and unfair in private universities \( (M=19.16) \).
- The public universities \( (M=13.56) \) has problem regarding student teacher ratio and in private universities \( (M=12.2) \) student teacher ratio and quality is little less.
- The faculty members of private universities \( (M=14.96) \) are more concern about institutional constraints, than public universities \( (M=12.86) \).
- But in one factor there is an insignificant variance is found. There is an insignificant variance in the mean score of perception of public \( (M=6.24) \) and private \( (M=6.4) \) for involvement in decision making.

Comparison of overall Constraint and Challenges Analysis (Public and Private Universities)
There is an insignificant difference in the overall comparison of constraint and challenges score public and private with respect to overall comparison of constraint and challenges score of public and private universities.

- There is an insignificant difference in the overall comparison of constraint and challenges score public \( (M=67.54) \) and private \( (M=70.06) \) so null hypothesis is accepted with respect to overall comparison of constraint and challenges score of public and private universities.
5.2 Suggestions

On the base of study some suggestions are given below:

- There is not a huge gap between the expectation from public management institutions and private management institutions from the stakeholders’ point of view. Therefore, it is important for the both sectors to enhance their service quality so one can expect more from one sector instead of other.

- The gap analysis of expected services and delivered services produced significant results in both sectors, from both stakeholders point view. Therefore, universities have to bridge the gap between expected and delivered services. So that students can be retained for, further more time.

- The study also reveals that there is a difference between public and private universities according to students and parents point of view. Parents’ expectation from educational institutes is more realistic than students have. Now days It is very important to identify the key stakeholders and satisfy them. The universities have to give more emphasis on to deliver the right value to the stakeholders’ and have to deliver what has promised earlier.

- Only tangibles attribute does not attract the stakeholders for long period, if the promised are not kept.

- There is a difference between the public universities and private universities according to parent’s point of view, whereas students do not think so. Therefore, service providers should give more attention to the parents.

- Access & approachability, academic reputation, and fee are the key element for the stakeholders, which make public sector more public oriented. Therefore,private sector universities have to look this factor.

- The faculty of public and private universities does not differ in their perception about service quality, for this, the main reason is the declining ratio of management students and industry in the Punjab. Therefore, wherever they are working they satisfy from that. To change this trend Punjab government has to amend their policies so that pass out management students can place in their own state.

- The constraint and challenges are the part of life, but again public sector employee has an upper hand as compare to private sector employees. Therefore, private sector has put efforts to make their employees happy.