

Effects of Organizational Characteristics on QUAL Prevalence and its Implementation in Business Schools of Pakistan

Mudassar Mushtaq*

Ayesha Ch.†

Sajida Parveen‡

Abstract *An organizational characteristic plays a vital role in ensuring QUAL prevalence in any institution. The investigation is conducted to comprehend the association among the concepts. The secondary data was used for analysis, and data was gathered from different websites. There are thirty business schools in Punjab and the information of these institutions is gathered from their official websites. The gathered information was analyzed by using SPSS. Organizational characteristics include the types of organization (private or govt.), size of the organization (Large or small), and tuition fees and the dependent variable (response to implement QUAL measures). The conclusion is drawn based on results that response to the implementation of QUAL measure is strongly associated with the type of organization.*

Key Words: Organizational Characteristics, Type of Organization, size of the Organization, Tuition fees, and QUAL Prevalence.

JEL Classification: I21,I23,L84,M14.

Introduction

Qual and Qual Prevalence in Higher Education

The QUAL considers an inherent and expected component education based on academic professional responsibility (Harvey & Askling, 2003). Therefore, the literature presents that an increase can be observed in implementing QUAL measures in the educational system (Papadimitriou, 2011). The reason behind this increase is a rapid change in all other social institutions such as politics, economy, and socio-cultural patterns, especially in the last few decades. The major changes may be realized in the arena of learning as numbers of programs are being offered to fulfill the needs of the market. Limited resources are there to run the system so different accountability measures are a device to ensure the QUAL prevalence (Brennan & Shah, 2000; Harvey & Newton, 2004; Dill, 2007; Westerheijden et al., 2007).

In the last few decades QUAL prevalence in the educational system became a significant part of the structure of advanced learning together in established besides emerging republics while it was introduced by Western Europe and the USA between

*PhD Scholar, Department of Business Administration, National College Of Business Administration & Economics, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan. Email: mudassar172@yahoo.com

† Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology, Govt. College University, Faisalabad, Punjab, Pakistan.

‡ Lecturer, Department of Sociology, Govt. College Women University, Faisalabad, Punjab, Pakistan

1980 and 1990 (Schwarz & Westerheijden, 2004; Dill, 2010). Now a day, QUAL prevalence in education structure is spreading all over the world with diverse performers for example regional institutions, World Bank, OECD, and UNESCO (Singh, 2010).

QUAL Prevalence in Pakistan's Higher Education System

The educational system in Pakistan is facing numerous problems and various attempts are being made to deal with these challenges. Since 1990, different policies are formed to compete with the global market. The initiatives taken by the government of Pakistan are given below:

- Institutions are privatized
- A decentralized educational system is introduced
- Different reforms are made for the development of higher education
- Policies are made to attract the number of students and to maintain that number
- The assurance of QUAL education has become the most prior responsibility of the state.

Numerous challenges are hindering the QUAL prevalence in higher education of Pakistan which in clue lack of research and development activities, non-availability of the highly developed facility, and poor infrastructure. The competitive environment makes Pakistan a hub of educational institutions but it reduced the admission standard, QUAL of curriculum, assessment method, and creative activities. The absence of strict regulatory measures is a reason behind the decline of control and QUAL prevalence. The graduates who receive degrees from these institutions lack professional skills and could not meet the requirements of the market (Usta, 2015). In such circumstances, academic research is needed to make policies for the implementation of QUAL prevalence (Ghafoor, et al., 2019).

Determination of the Study

The investigation was designed to find the driving forces for implementing QUAL prevalence measures in higher education. Tuition fees, type, and size of the organization were the key factors to measure the QUAL prevalence in HEIs. The emphasis is given to private universities and particularly to the business schools because of the higher number of pupils and they are the largest educational system of the country (CERD, 2016). The QUAL prevalence measures adopted by these institutions can help the researcher to find its relation with QUAL of education.

Literature Review

Background of the Study

The adoption of QUAL prevalence measures depends on different characteristics of the organization as they manipulate and accept the implementing policies related to QUAL prevalence ([Csizmadia, 2006](#)), which helps us to understand the factors that force the educational institutions to change their structure to cope with the global changes. Further, the failure and success of QUAL prevalence policies are also included in the study. The proceeding review throws light on the characteristics that influence the QUAL prevalence in higher education.

The consumption of profit by any organization is highly attached to its type. The donated money in nonprofit organizations is spent on achieving its goal and to run it smoothly. The mostly spent money on the welfare of students in the form of aid and

other services. But those organizations which are privately owned consume their profit for further extension of college or shared by the stakeholders. Private institutions solely depend on tuition fees whereas public institutions have different sources such as donations and gifts.

The response to QUAL prevalence is a costly matter for a private organization. The decision to spend funds on implementing QUAL prevalence also depends on the willingness of the owner ([Woolston, 2012](#)).

[Rogers \(2003\)](#) claimed that innovation in advanced learning is inclined through the size of institutions. The extent of the institutions refers to the number of workers and the structure and processes of organizations are highly influenced by the size ([Damanpour, 1991](#)). In the current study, the number of students is considered by way of the size of the organization equally held through Papadimitriou (2011) and Csizmadia (2006).

[Hitt et al. \(1990\)](#) said that huge in size business schools can start a new project as they have enough sources and in case of failure they can again join innovative activities. Whereas, some other researchers stated that large institutions are not flexible and too bureaucratic; this hinders the large organizations to accept and implement QUAL prevalence measures. The utilization is the priority of large organizations while they are not quick in the adoption of changes thus the innovative activities are slow in these institutions ([Dougherty, 1996](#)). It is argued that the stability of the institutions is a hurdle in the way of change ([Winter, 1994](#)). While, small organizations are more responsive to change as they are more capable of adopting new policies ([Aldrich & Auster 1986](#); [Damanpour, 1996](#)).

Private institutions are bound to facilitate the students as they receive high fees that are the only source of their earning ([Tempus-Pakistan, 2012](#)). The private institutions develop their structure that is student-oriented (Machin & Wilson, 2005). At the same time, it is considered that high fees are an assurance of QUAL education ([Mora, 2005](#)). Moreover, students expect QUAL education from private universities as compared with public institutions ([Garcia et al., 2005](#)).

The investment in higher education strongly affects the QUAL of education; as the benefits are measure by the cost of education and on the choice of the institution ([Paulsen, 2001](#)). Similarly, the number of admissions in the organization is related to its fee structure. [Henard and Roseveare \(2012\)](#) claimed that high tuition fees are a prediction of the implementation of QUAL prevalence. [Cooper et al. \(2014\)](#) argued that when there are several universities with high fees then the focus should be put on QUAL of education.

Methodology

Methods

Secondary data was collected and content analysis was done for its interpretation. There is a total of thirty business schools in Punjab and the information of all these institutions is included in the research. For secondary data collection, the websites of the organizations were consulted. If any difficulty was faced by the researcher in case of missing data, the concerned institutions were directly approached. It is assumed that the information gathered through these websites is reliable and valid. Then, with the

help of (SPSS) the gathered information is examined. This methodology was carried out to achieve the objectives of the research.

The Objective of the Research

Keeping in view the responsibility of the educational institutions in implementing QUAL prevalence, the following objective was advanced to conduct the investigation:

- To find out the features of the organizations that influence the response of private and public business schools towards QUAL prevalence.

The Hypothesis of the Study

Based on the research objective, the given hypotheses were established to measure the association among the factor's learner.

- There is an association among private institutions and response to QUAL prevalence.
- There is a relationship between small institutions and response to QUAL prevalence.
- There is a relationship between large business institutions and response to QUAL prevalence.
- There is a relationship between business institutions with higher fees and response to the QUAL prevalence.

Results and Discussion

Results

The result of organizational features over response to QUAL prevalence is measured by the researcher in this study. The hypotheses are formed to address the goal of the investigation that is in the direction of discovering the characteristics of the organizations which influence the QUAL prevalence in business schools. Further, different statistical techniques for univariate and bivariate were used. Descriptive statistics for univariate and for measuring association Fisher's exact test were carried out.

Descriptive Analysis

In this section, the information of the total thirty business schools of Punjab is discussed in detail. The researcher approached the websites of these institutions. The researcher consulted the institutions for clarifying the information and when he felt difficulty in finding some data.

In Business school's QUAL prevalence can be implemented by internal or external forces but in current research, the internal characteristics are considered to study its influence on quality prevalence. Further, the absence of any QUAL prevalence measure is explained as low QUAL prevalence ([Pinkovetskaia, et. al.,2019](#)). Key terms were developed while analyzing the websites of business schools which include accreditation, QUAL, and QUAL prevalence. The given table describes the QUAL prevalence with several business schools.

Table 1. The State of QUAL Prevalence with Quantity of Professional Colleges

| Category of Response | No. of Schools |
|----------------------|----------------|
| Low-qual prevalence | 16 |
| High-qual prevalence | 14 |
| Total | 30 |

The table shows that out of 30, 16 business schools have low QUAL prevalence while the state of QUAL prevalence is good in the remaining 14 business schools. The results predict that business schools are not fulfilling the requirement of the country or the rate of adopting QUAL prevalence activities is very slow.

To explain the characteristics of the organization, central tendency measures were used to describe the data. Different types of measures, such as mode and median were applied to the nominal, interval, and ordinal data respectively to avoid the influence of extreme value.

Table 2. Results of Descriptive Statistics

| | Low QUAL | | High QUAL | |
|---|----------|------|-----------|------|
| | Median | Mode | Median | Mode |
| 1 Type of business school (0=Pvt., 1= Govt.) | | 1 | | 0 |
| 2 Age (years) | 17 | | 17 | |
| 3 Size (No. of faculty members) | 15 | | 22 | |
| 4 Tuition Fees per credit) | 77500 | | 92500 | |
| 5 No. of Programs | 4 | | 7 | |
| 6 No. of Branches | 1 | | 1 | |
| 7 Level of conferred degrees (1 = Graduation, 2 = Masters, 3 = M.Phil, 4 = Ph.D.) | | 3 | | 3.50 |

The above-mentioned information throws light on the fact that those business schools that are old, large in size, receiving high tuition fees, and offering limited programs within limited branches are more effective in applying QUAL prevalence measures as compare with institutions. It can be concluded that these characteristics are prerequisites for adopting QUAL prevalence measures.

Table 3. Type of Business

| | Low QUAL | High QUAL |
|---------|----------|-----------|
| Private | 7 | 10 |
| Govt. | 9 | 4 |
| Total | 16 | 14 |

Table 3 depicts the type of business school and level of QUAL prevalence. It is observed that private institutions are providing high QUAL prevalence whereas govt. institutions are offering poor QUAL prevalence measures; the satisfactory point is that private business schools are greater in number as compared with govt. business schools. At the same time, govt. organizations have to rethink about their mechanism for making it suitable for QUAL prevalence activities.

Table 4. Level of Offered Degrees

| | Low QUAL | High QUAL |
|----------------------|-----------------|------------------|
| Bachelor degree only | 1 | 0 |
| Master degree | 4 | 1 |
| M.Phil. | 11 | 3 |
| Ph.D. | 0 | 10 |
| Total | 16 | 14 |

Table 4 elaborates that a Ph.D. degree is offered by the institutions that have high QUAL prevalence measures which are a good sign. On the other hand, it is alarming that 11 out of 16 with low QUAL prevalence institutions are offering M. Phil degree. Serious action should be taken to ensure that the institutions, who are offering higher levels of degrees, must adopt the QUAL prevalence measures otherwise they should not be allowed to continue such programs.

Codification and Operationalization of the Data

The data was operationalized and codified with the help of different indicators. The presence of QUAL prevalence activities refers to a higher level of QUAL prevalence while the absence of QUAL prevalence activities is associated with a lower level of QUAL prevalence in business schools. Hence, the followed codification is given below:

The absence of QUAL prevalence activities causes low QUAL prevalence and less responsiveness.

Those institutions that are implementing any type of QUAL prevalence activity are more responsive.

It is expected that the independent variable should influence the responsiveness as it is formulated with the help of a review of the literature. The variables are coded and operationalized in the preceding portion.

The type of Business School

There are two types of business schools in Pakistan, first, those are run by the state are called government institutions and the second ones are privately owned business schools that are run by multiple partners. Government schools are funded by different sources while the main earning source in private business schools happens to be the tuition fees. Thus, the implementation of QUAL prevalence measures is an expensive activity so the decision to use profit depends on the owners of private business schools ([Samburskiy & Grodzenskiy, 2019](#)).

The 0 was used as code for Government and 1 is given to the Private institutions.

Size of the Business School

The number of faculty members was used to describe the size of the business school for the year of 2017-20118. In 2018, 5 was the minimum no of the faculty members whereas 80 was the highest number in business school. By keeping in view the size of the organization zero is given to small business schools (less than 20 faculty members) while 1 is given to large institutions (more than 20 faculty members).

The Level of Tuition fee for a Semester

Ninety thousand were the minimum tuition fees for one credit hour in a business school in 2019 so 0 code is used for less than Rs. 80000 fees per semester and 1 as code is given to those institutions who are receiving more than Rs. 80000 fees per semester.

Table 5. Summary of the Factors Plus Coding

| Factors | Variable | Groups | Code |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|------|
| Dependent | Response to QUAL Prevalence | -Any QUAL prevalence activity is not implemented by the institution (Non-Responsive) | 0 |
| | | -At least one QUAL prevalence activity is performed by the institution (Responsive) | 1 |
| Independent | Institution type | -Private | 0 |
| | | -Government | 1 |
| | Size of the business school | -Small (No. of faculty members equivalent or under the average of 20) | 0 |
| | | -Enormous (No of faculty members above 20) | 1 |
| | Tuition fees | -Equivalent or under to Rs. 80000 per semester | 0 |
| -More than Rs. 80000 per semester | | 1 | |

Fisher's Exact Test Results

The link between independent variables and dependent was analyzed with the help of Fisher's exact test. This test is used to measure the association between understudy concepts (DeCoster, 2004). It is preferred to use for analyzing the relationship between variables in case of small sample size. The minor sample SIZ is definite in various books differently, somewhere it is fewer than 20 whereas in other texts it is less than 40 and the minimum no in some researches expected fewer than five cases (Bland, 2000; Kirkwood & Sterne, 2003). The difference between 2 factors, when they are related, maybe determined with the help of this test. If the relationship among two factors is the outcome of sample error, the assessment is used to find out that either the association is the result of any error or it is a real association (DeCoster, 2004). The relationship between responsiveness to QUAL prevalence (dependent variable) and organizational characteristics (independent variables) was measured with the help of Fisher's exact examination.

The formulated (H0) is either accepted or rejected while testing it. If the Ho is excluded that means the (H1) will be acknowledged. If the calculated value is 5% (level of significance) the null hypothesis will not be rejected and it predicts that the variables are independents.

Null Hypothesis(H0): No relationship exists between organizational characteristics and response to the QUAL prevalence

Alternative Hypothesis (H1): Relationship exists between organizational characteristics and response to QUAL prevalence.

The level and way of the relationship between the constructs are tested by using the and Kruskal's gamma and the non-parametric Goodman (γ or G) in case of significant values.

Type of Business

It is observed by reviewing the literature that government institutions used the donated and earned money to run the system smoothly and to achieve their objectives. Thus, it is expected that government institutions should be more responsive to QUAL prevalence than private business schools. The data of 30 business schools were analyzed to test the hypothesis and the following results were extracted.

The results depict that private institutions (58.8%) are more responsive than government organizations (30.8%).

Table 7. Type of Organization and QUAL Prevalence

| | | | QUAL Prevalence | | Total |
|-----------|------------|--------------------|------------------------|-------------|--------------|
| | | | Low | High | |
| Sector | Private | Sum | 7 | 10 | 17 |
| | | %age within Sector | 41.2% | 58.8% | 100.0% |
| | Government | Sum | 9 | 4 | 13 |
| | | %age in Sector | 69.2% | 30.8% | 100.0% |
| Aggregate | | Sum | 16 | 14 | 30 |
| | | %age in Sector | 53.3% | 46.7% | 100.0% |

Table 8. Fisher’s Exact Assessment Outcome- Type of Institution besides QUAL Prevalence

| | Cost | Df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) | Precise Sig. (2-sided) | Precise Sig. (1-sided) |
|-------------------------------|--------------------|-----------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 2.330 ^a | 1 | .127 | | |
| Steadiness Correction | 1.339 | 1 | .247 | | |
| Probability Proportion | 2.372 | 1 | .124 | | |
| Fisher's Exact Assessment | | | | .159 | .123 |
| Linear-by-Linear Relationship | 2.252 | 1 | .133 | | |
| N of Effective Cases | 30 | | | | |

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have a predictable sum of fewer than 5. The smallest predictable sum is 6.07.
 b. Calculated merely aimed at a 2x2 table

The p-value (p=0.249) considered by the help of Fisher’s exact assessment shows that the null hypothesis is acknowledged. In other words, there is no association among types of institutions as well as answers to QUAL prevalence.

The Size of Business School

Literature helps us to understand that large organizations readily accept innovation and have the ability to bear the expenditures of new projects as they have enough resources (Hitt et al., 1990; Rogers, 2003). At the same time, minor in size administrations are additional advanced and flexible in implementing changes. The given table illustrates that small (in terms of faculty members) organizations are less responsive towards QUAL prevalence implementation as compare with large business schools.

Table 9. Cross-tab of Professional College SIZ besides QUAL Prevalence

| Crosstab | | | QUAL insurance | | Total |
|----------------------------------|-------|---------------------------------------|----------------|-------|--------|
| | | | Low | High | |
| Size (number of faculty members) | Small | Count | 12 | 4 | 16 |
| | | % within Size (No of faculty members) | 75.0% | 25.0% | 100.0% |
| | Large | Count | 4 | 10 | 14 |
| | | % within Size (No of faculty members) | 28.6% | 71.4% | 100.0% |
| Total | | Count | 16 | 14 | 30 |
| | | % within Size (No of faculty members) | 53.3% | 46.7% | 100.0% |

Table 10. Fisher's Exact Exam Outcome College size besides QUAL Prevalence

| Chi-Square Examinations | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|--------------------|----|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| | Value | Df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) | Exact Sig. (2-sided) | Exact Sig. (1-sided) |
| Pearson Chi-Square | 6.467 ^a | 1 | .011 | | |
| Steadiness Correction ^b | 4.736 | 1 | .030 | | |
| Likelihood Proportion | 6.709 | 1 | .010 | | |
| Fisher's Examination | | | | .026 | .014 |
| Linear-by-Linear Relationship | 6.251 | 1 | .012 | | |
| N of Valid Cases | 30 | | | | |

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have a predictable total of fewer than 5. The smallest predictable total is 6.53.
 b. Calculated merely aimed at a 2x2 table

The p-value is fewer than 0.01 which means the null hypothesis is not accepted or it is determined that there is a tough association among the SIZ of the professional college besides its response toward QUAL prevalence. The similarity is confirmed through the outcomes of Kruskal's gamma and Goodman examination ($G = .928, p = .0005$). Thus, the organizations that have more faculty members are more responsive in implementing QUAL prevalence measures.

Table 11. Goodman and Kruskal Test

| Symmetric Methods | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|-------|-------------------------|------------------------|--------------|--------------------|------|
| | Cost | Asymp. S.E ^a | Approx. T ^b | Approx. Sig. | Exact Significance | |
| Ordinal through Ordinal | Gamma | .765 | .172 | 2.856 | .001 | .001 |
| N of Effective Cases | | 30 | | | | |

a. Not supposing the Ho.
 b. Consuming the asymptotic S.E supposing the Ho.

The Tuition fee level for one Credit

The higher tuition fees are considered as an indicator of responsiveness to QUAL prevalence. The given table describes the results in detail.

Table 12. Cross-tab of the Education fee level besides QUAL Prevalence

| Crosstab | | | QUAL prevalence | | Total |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|-------|--------|
| | | | Low | High | |
| Tuition Fee (per semester) | Blow or equal the median of 80000 | Count | 10 | 4 | 14 |
| | | % within Tuition Fee (per semester) | 71.4% | 28.6% | 100.0% |
| | Above 80000 | Count | 6 | 10 | 16 |
| | | % within Tuition Fee (per semester) | 37.5% | 62.5% | 100.0% |
| Total | | Count | 16 | 14 | 30 |
| | | % within Tuition Fee (per semester) | 53.3% | 46.7% | 100.0% |

Table 13. Fisher's Exact Trial Outcome Tuition fee level besides QA

| Chi-Square Examinations | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|--------------------|----|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| | Cost | Df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) | Exact Sig. (2-sided) | Exact Sig. (1-sided) |
| Pearson Chi-Square | 3.453 ^a | 1 | .063 | | |
| Continuity Correction ^b | 2.225 | 1 | .136 | | |
| Likelihood Ratio | 3.534 | 1 | .060 | | |
| Fisher's Exact Test | | | | .081 | .067 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 3.338 | 1 | .068 | | |
| N of Valid Cases | 30 | | | | |

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have a predictable total of fewer than 5. The least predictable total is 6.53.
b. Calculated merely aimed at a 2x2 table

The null hypothesis is excluded by way of the p-value ($p=.282$) shows no association among the factors. The tuition fees besides the approachability to QUAL prevalence are not associated with each other.

Conclusion

The results show that organizational characteristics are linked with the response to QUAL prevalence. The literature review helped the researcher to extract the variables to define the characteristics of a business school. It is indicated by the results of descriptive statistics that organizations that receive high tuition fees and large in size have association with responsiveness to QUAL prevalence the same is predicted by Hitt et al. 1990. There is a constructive association among the size of the organization and dependent variables while no association exists in tuition fees received by the business school and response to QUAL prevalence measures.

References

- Aldrich, H., & Auster, E.R. (1986). Even dwarfs started small: Liabilities of age and size and their strategic implications. *Research in organizational behavior*.
- Baldrige, J.V. & Deal, T.E. (1983). The basics of change in educational organizations, in J. V. Baldrige, T. E. Deal & G. L. Ingols (Eds.) *The Dynamics of Organizational Change in Education*. Berkley, CA: McCutchan.
- Clark, T. (2006). OECD Thematic Review of Tertiary Education: Country Report: United Kingdom. Department for Education and Skills.
- Cooper, S., Parkes, C. & Blewitt, J. (2014). Can accreditation help a leopard change its spots? Social accountability and stakeholder engagement in business schools. *Accounting Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 27(2), 234–258.
- Crosby, P.B. (1979). *QUAL is free: The art of making QUAL certain* (Vol. 94). New York: McGraw-hill.
- Csizmadia, T.G. (2006). *QUAL Management in Hungarian Higher Education*, Doctoral Dissertation, University of Twente, Greece, 381.
- Damanpour, F. (1991). Organizational Innovation: A Meta- Analysis of Effects of Determinants and Moderators. *Academy of Management Journal*, 34, 555–590.
- Damanpour, F. (1996). Organizational Complexity and Innovation: Developing & Testing Multiple Contingency Models. *Management Science*, 42 (5), 693–716.
- Damanpour, F. & Evan, W.M. (1984). Organizational innovation and performance: the problem of ‘organizational lag’. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 29(3), 392-409.
- Dougherty, D. (1996). Organizing for innovation, in Clegg, S., Hardy, C., Nord, W. (Eds.), *Handbook of Organization Studies* (pp. 424–439, London: Sage.
- Erdkunde, D.B. (2015). Education for Development in Northern Pakistan. Opportunities and Constraints for Rural Households. *Erdkunde*, 191-195.
- Feigenbaum, A.V. (1951). *QUAL control: principles, practice and administration*. New York: McGraw- Hill.
- Garcia, I., Kennett, C., Quraishi, M. & Durcan, G. (2005), A measure of concerns, Mental health today, pp. 29–31, Brighton, England.
- Gilmore, H.L. (1974). Product conformance, *QUAL Progress*, 7(15), 16-19.
- Gornitzka, Å. (1999). Governmental policies and organisational change in higher education. *Higher education*, 38(1), 5-31.
- Henard, F. & Roseveare, D. (2012). Fostering QUAL teaching in higher education: Policies and practices. *An IMHE Guide for Higher Education Institutions*, 7-11.
- Hitt, M., Hoskisson, R.E. & Ireland, R.D. (1990). Mergers and Acquisitions and Managerial Commitment to Innovation in M-form Firms, *Strategic Management Journal*, 11, 29-47.
- Hoodbhoy, P. (1998). Education Reform In Pakistan – Challenges and Prospects.
- Hoodbhoy, P. (2009). Pakistan's higher education system-What went wrong and how to fix it. *The Pakistan Development Review*, 48(4), 581-594.
- Juran, J.M. & Gryna, F.M. Jr (Eds) (1988). *QUAL Control Handbook*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Khalili, N.R., Duecker, S., Ashton, W. & Chavez, F. (2015). From cleaner production to sustainable development: the role of academia. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 96, 30-43.

- Machin, S. & Wilson, J. (2005). Public and Private Schooling Initiatives in England, presented at the Conference on Mobilizing the Private Sector for Public Education, October 5-6, Harvard University.
- Mohanty, J. (2000). *Current trends in higher education*. New Delhi: Deep & Deep Publications.
- Mora, J.G. (2005). Public-Private Partnerships in Latin America: A Review Based on Four Case Studies, presented at the Conference on Mobilizing the Private Sector for Public Education, Harvard University. 1-27.
- Mughal, A.M. (2008). The brain gain drive of the higher education commission in Pakistan.
- Papadimitriou, A. (2011), The enigma of QUAL in Greek higher education. [Online]. Available from: <http://purl.org/utwente/doi/10.3990/1.9789036531559>.
- Papadimitriou, A. & Westerheijden, D.F. (2010). Adoption of ISO-oriented QUAL management system in Greek universities. *The TQM Journal*, 22(3), 229–241.
- Parasuraman, A., Berry, L. & Zeithaml, V. (1991). Refinement and reassessment of the SERVQUAL scale, *Journal of Retailing*, 67(4), 420-50.
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V.A. & Berry, L.L. (1985). A conceptual model of service QUAL and its implications for future research. *Journal of Marketing*, 49(4), 41-50.
- Paulsen, M.B. (2001). The economics of human capital and investment in higher education. The finance of higher education: Theory, research, policy, and practice, 55-94. New York: Agathon Press.
- Peters, T.J. & Waterman, R.H. (1982). *In search of excellence*. New York, NY: Harper and Row.
- Pinkovetskaia, I., Lyubovtseva, E., Arbelález-Campillo, D., & Rojas-Bahamón, M. (2019). Small and medium enterprises in Russia and other countries. *Amazonia Investiga*, 9(25), 99-106.
- Rogers, E. M. (2003). *Diffusion of Innovations*. 5th ed New York NY Free Press.
- Rogers, E.M. (1962, 2003), Diffusion of innovations, (4th ed.), Free Press, New York.
- Rogers, E.M. (1995), Diffusion of innovations. [Online]. Available from: <http://hollis.harvard.edu/?itemid=%7Clibrary/m/aleph%7C006256656>.
- Samburskiy, G., & Grodzenskiy, S. (2019). Approaches to risk assessment and selection of water treatment technologies to provide consumers with QUAL drinking water. *Amazonia Investiga*, 9(25), 33-43
- Tam, M. (2001). Measuring QUAL and performance in higher education. *QUAL in higher Education*, 7(1), 47-54.
- Tempus-Pakistan (2012). Higher Education in Pakistan, 1–14.
- Tilak, J.B. (2015). Higher education in South Asia: crisis and challenges. *Social Scientist*, 43(1/2), 43-59.
- Winter, S.G. (1994), Organizing for continuous improvement: Evolutionary theory meets the QUAL revolution, in J. A. C. Baum & J. V. Singh (Eds.), *Evolutionary Dynamics of Organizations*, 90-108, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Woolston, P.J. (2012). The costs of institutional accreditation: a study of direct and indirect costs, Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California.