



Cite Us



Management Practices in Private and Public Higher Education Institutions



Muhammad Iqbal *

Yasir Mustafa †

Farah Latif Naz ‡

Corresponding Author: Muhammad Iqbal (Lecturer, (Visiting Faculty) Department of Education, Faculty of Social Sciences, Thal University Bhakkar, Punjab, Pakistan. Email: m.iqbal@tu.edu.pk)

Abstract: *The study's goal is to compare and contrast public and private university administration practices in Pakistan. Using a random sampling technique, 200 institutional heads from (various departments) of public and private institutions (universities) of Punjab were selected for the study. According to the study, managing operations at higher education institutions in these locations is difficult for both commercial and governmental universities. However, these two categories of institutions' management strategies differ significantly from one another. According to the survey, private institutions of higher learning place a greater emphasis on marketing and financial management than public ones. Private institutions place a high priority on promoting their offerings to draw students and donor support as compared to public institutions.*

Key Words: Management, Public and Private, Educational Institute

Introduction

As a result of globalisation and the rising value of education, higher education institutions in developing nations have undergone profound changes in recent years. Large sums of money have been spent by governments on education, contributing to the expansion of both private and public universities. Consequently, there has been a rise in curiosity about how private and public universities operate differently in terms of management. In this essay, we will compare and contrast the ways in which public and private higher education institutions in developing nations handle their administration. We will look at how these institutions are managed, the advantages and disadvantages each has, and the

difficulties they confront in today's dynamic educational environment. Universities are centres of advanced academic study, where students can improve their intellectual, professional, and monetary standing. While there are a few excellent higher education institutions in Pakistan, both academically and administratively, they lag far behind their counterparts in the industrialised world. In spite of 69 years of independence, we have yet to find the optimal method of providing quality, relevant education for all members of society, according to Faridullah (2012). Isani (2001) claims that ineffective education management and administration, along with an antiquated curriculum and archaic pedagogical practises, are to blame for Pakistan's

* Lecturer, (Visiting Faculty) Department of Education, Faculty of Social Sciences, Thal University Bhakkar, Punjab, Pakistan.

† Headmaster, Elementary and Secondary Education, KP, Pakistan.

‡ Lecturer, Department of Education, Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multan, Punjab, Pakistan.

Citation: Iqbal, M., Mustafa, Y., & Naz, F. L. (2023). Management Practices in Private and Public Higher Education Institutions. *Global Social Sciences Review*, VIII(II), 165-176.

[https://doi.org/10.31703/gssr.2023\(VIII-II\).16](https://doi.org/10.31703/gssr.2023(VIII-II).16)

DOI: 10.31703/gssr.2023(VIII-II).16

URL: [http://dx.doi.org/10.31703/gssr.2023\(VIII-II\).16](http://dx.doi.org/10.31703/gssr.2023(VIII-II).16)

higher education system's many difficulties. Isani also claims that antiquated methods and tools are contributing to problems in Pakistan's educational system. The Higher Education Commission (HEC) has played a pivotal role in the significant growth and advancement of higher education in Pakistan.

However, further efforts are needed to standardise the system. Between the ages of 16 and 22, students register for undergraduate degrees, while those after the age of 22 can choose from a variety of graduate options. A bachelor's degree used to be achievable in just two years under the old system, but now it takes four. The attainment of a bachelor's degree in agriculture or engineering typically requires a duration of approximately four years, whereas the completion of a medical degree programme necessitates a lengthier period of five years. The Board of Studies at the university comprises a team of professors, external experts, and delegates from affiliated institutions. Their primary responsibility is to scrutinise and sanction the academic programmes while also making necessary modifications to the curricula. The Higher Education Commission (HEC) has established a set of guidelines for each academic programme to ensure that minimum standards are upheld across various domains, such as programme duration, curriculum scope and depth, and assessment rigour. The subsequent phase involves educators devising lessons that align with the authorised course content. Pedagogy, facility management, curricular and extracurricular spaces, assessment and evaluation strategies, academician oversight practises, faculty recruitment and retention, financial management, and human resource management were all compared in this study. Akhtar and Kalsoom (2012) conducted a study to gain a deeper comprehension of the administrative obstacles that universities encounter. The researchers examined the board of directors and executive committees of colleges and organisations, as well as their affiliations with other entities. A diverse range of sources, such as governmental and institutional archives, strategic documents, and academic journals, were utilised to extract pertinent information. The study's authors assert that the effective management of Pakistan's higher education system is contingent upon the government's role, given that it provides funding for nearly all state universities. The Higher Education Commission (HEC) holds the

responsibility of exercising regulatory oversight over both public and private educational institutions in Pakistan. The aim of this study is to perform a comparative evaluation of the administrative procedures employed by public and private universities, with the purpose of offering suggestions for improving the efficacy of these two categories of educational establishments.

Objectives of the Study

1. Identifying and contrasting the commercial and public higher education institutions' organisational structures and decision-making processes in Pakistan.
2. This study aims to examine the effects on quality, cost, and access to different public and private financing options for Pakistan's higher education sector.
3. The objective of this research is to conduct a comparative analysis of the marketing and student recruitment strategies employed by public and private universities in Pakistan.
4. The objective of this inquiry is to examine the effects of varied managerial methodologies on the scholarly accomplishments, research output, and community involvement of public and private institutions of higher education in Pakistan.

Research Question

1. How do private and public higher education institutions in developing nations differ in terms of their organisational structures and decision-making processes?
2. What effects do private and public funding structures and sources have on the quality, cost, and availability of higher education in Pakistan?
3. How successful are private and public higher education institutions in developing nations at attracting and maintaining students, and what marketing and student recruitment tactics do they use?
4. In developing countries, how do private and public higher education institutions fare when it comes to academic quality, research output, and community

participation as a result of varying management practices?

Significance of the Study

A significant and potentially innovative field of inquiry pertains to the juxtaposition of management practices in public and private institutions of higher education in Pakistan. Commencing with a comparative analysis of public and private universities would elucidate the similarities and differences in their administrative frameworks and approaches to crucial decision-making. Better educational results for students can be achieved with the use of this data, which can be utilised to inform policy decisions and enhance the management practices of these institutions.

Second, this study can shed light on how affordable and easy it is to get a higher education in Pakistan by looking at the financial models and funding sources of both private and public higher education schools. This knowledge can help policymakers and other people involved in education come up with sustainable ways to pay for higher education and make it easier for more people to go to college.

Third, both public and private institutions can learn from the marketing and student recruitment techniques they use to bring in and keep students. This, in turn, can improve attendance and performance in the classroom.

In general, conducting a comparative analysis of the operational procedures of private and public higher education institutions in Pakistan has the potential to enhance the calibre, accessibility, and cost-effectiveness of higher education in these regions. This will lead to a more educated workforce and better economic growth.

Literature Review

There has been a shift in attention to the reform of higher education institutions in developing countries due to a rising fascination with the differences in management practices between commercial and public institutions. There are more of them since the demand for colleges and universities keeps rising. Public universities, on the other hand, are tasked with providing quality education to their students at an affordable price.

The focus of this study is on the administrative practices of public and private educational institutions in underdeveloped countries. As per Saeed's (2007) research, individuals aged between 16 to 22 years in Pakistan who have successfully completed 12 years of formal education are deemed to have achieved an elevated level of education. According to Lenn's (1997) argument, higher education is crucial not only for personal growth but also for the advancement of society, the nation, and the global community. It is feasible to identify a university or comparable institution of higher education that offers exceptional general education and specialised programmes in virtually any location within the industrialised world. The educational system is undergoing significant modifications due to the heightened pressure on schools to cultivate graduates who possess a diverse range of skills and are capable of securing employment opportunities. Novel management strategies, revised course content, improved assessment instruments, and refined teaching skills among instructors are imperative. The establishment of HEC in 2002 has led to a notable acceleration in the progress of higher education in Pakistan. The number of colleges and universities increased from four in 1957 to ten by 1967. After a span of two decades, the number of universities and colleges had increased to 43 by the year 1997. Since 1998, there has been a significant increase in postsecondary education expansion, resulting in a doubling of the number of universities to a total of 160.

According to Isani and Virk's (2005) classification, higher education institutions can be broadly categorised into two groups: those that offer a comprehensive liberal arts education and those that offer specialised vocational training. Private universities tend to focus on offering degrees and courses that are tailored towards professional and skill development, which in turn attracts corporate interest. Conversely, publicly accessible Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) typically provide a more extensive range of academic degree programmes. As per the Model Act that delineates the basic framework for the administration and oversight of educational institutions, HEC mandates that the establishment of new universities requires the promulgation of law by either the federal or provincial legislature. In accordance with the Federal University

Ordinance of 2002, the role of Chancellor for Federal Universities is vested in the President of Pakistan, while the Governors of the provinces are entrusted with the same responsibility for their respective universities. The Vice-Chancellor is responsible for serving as the foremost administrative officer and academic leader of the university.

In addition to the executive positions of the President and Vice President, the administrative framework of the organisation encompasses several other pivotal roles, including the Registrar, Controller of Examinations, Resident Auditor, Treasurer, Librarian, and President. The teaching personnel within the academic setting of universities is composed of individuals holding the titles of Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, and Lecturer. Some individuals are involved in provisional employment agreements, while others receive a payment within the remuneration spectrum of grade levels 18 to 22. The Vice Chancellor bears the responsibility of designating senior staff members, encompassing both academic and non-academic personnel, to function under his jurisdiction, upon acknowledging the need for supplementary assistance. It is crucial for a higher education institution to progress in its pedagogical approaches and organisational structure, commencing from the uppermost tiers of administration. In accordance with the regulations stipulated in the Constitution of Pakistan of 1973 and the University Ordinance of 2002, it is mandatory to constitute several committees and councils. The aforementioned committees and councils comprise the institutional governance structure, which includes the Senate, Syndicate, Academic Council, Board of Faculties, Board of Studies, Selection Board, Advanced Studies and Research Board, Finance and Planning Committee, Affiliation Committee, and Discipline Committee.

Stace and Dunphy (2001) contend that in light of the numerous changes occurring in various aspects of life, including education, universities must adopt a more competitive approach, necessitating a doubling or tripling of the pace of progress. This, they argue, requires a collaborative effort between the state and the community. According to Godfrey and Grasso (2000), participatory administration is a relatively novel approach that has gained greater

acceptance due to its emphasis on mutual consultation and discussion in decision-making processes. In contrast, authoritarian leadership styles involve making decisions without any input from those who may be impacted by them. The authors focus on the administrative aspects of this issue. The term "participatory administration" refers to a series of strategies employed to enhance both the internal and external facets of an organisation in its entirety. Marginson and Considine (2000) have expounded that the intricate framework of governance within the education sector is comprehensively delineated, encompassing internal linkages, external associations, and convergence. The authors contend that the governance of the education sector is a pressing issue that requires attention to all pertinent internal and external factors. University administrators are responsible for addressing the concerns raised by faculty and students, as well as removing obstacles to foster stronger connections between the institution and its local community.

Thaigarajale and Dale (2001) assert that numerous educational institutions in less developed areas fail to equip their pupils with the necessary competencies to thrive in the labour market. Therefore, the present management of numerous educational endowments is insufficient to ensure the sustained existence of the endowment. Maassen and Vught (1994) assert that there exist varying administrative styles across different nations. According to popular belief, the administrative body of a higher education institution can be viewed as a miniature representation of the broader political environment in which it functions. The two prevalent forms of government, namely state control and state direction, are widely recognised and comprehended. According to Memon's (2007) study, the Pakistani government provides significant financial resources for the management of tertiary education institutions within the country, serving as the primary funding source for all state-regulated higher education establishments in Pakistan. The prominence of public service within academic institutions has experienced an upward trend, however, the funding allocated for these programmes has not been commensurate with the increasing demand. State-funded institutions of higher education tend to allocate excessive funds towards facilities,

utilities, and employee compensation and benefits.

Management Practices in Private Higher Education Institutions

Private universities are often operated as for-profit businesses and are managed differently than public universities. One major distinction is that private institutions have more discretion in making decisions, allowing them to respond more swiftly to shifting market needs. When it comes to administration, private schools are more likely to adopt a business-like approach. They spend a lot of money on promotion and marketing to draw in new students, provide a diverse selection of programmes to fulfil the needs of the industry, and place a premium on student happiness to keep current ones. Additionally, the administrative structure of private organisations is typically more simplified, resulting in quicker decision-making (Gul, Ahmad, & Zafar, [2014](#)). The management practises of private universities can have their pitfalls, though. Their for-profit status raises concerns that they may put profits before students' needs, resulting in subpar education. It can be difficult for students from low-income families to attend private schools because private schools often have higher tuition rates than public schools (Garca-Sánchez and Rodriguez-Domnguez, 2015; Aziz, Naz, Gul, Khan, and Fatima, [2022](#); Imtiaz, Aziz, & Aziz, [2022](#)).

Accountability of the Institute (Jamil and Rasheed [2023](#)). Inflation makes it harder for low-income families to provide a conducive home learning environment and pay for school activities and fees for their children (Jamil [2022](#)). existence of another major kind of life (Jamil, Rasheed, et al. The culture of a company has a direct bearing on how long it will last as an organisation or institution. Muhammad N. Jamil and Ahmad Rasheed ([2023](#)). The rising demand for higher education in Pakistan has led to an increase in the number of private universities and colleges (Deem, [2015](#)). These establishments are often handled in a manner distinct from public institutions because of their focus on profit. One major distinction is that private institutions have more discretion in making decisions, allowing them to respond more swiftly to shifting market needs (Altbach et al., [2019](#)). When it comes to administration, private schools are more likely to adopt a business-like approach. They spend a lot

of money on promotion and marketing to draw in new students, provide a diverse selection of programmes to fulfil the needs of the industry, and place a premium on student happiness to keep current ones. The administrative structures of private institutions are typically more simplified, allowing for quicker decision-making (Deem, [2015](#)). The management practises of private universities can have their pitfalls, though. Since they are for-profit, there is a risk that they will put moneymaking goals ahead of student success, resulting in subpar education (Altbach et al., 2019). Since private institutions' tuition is often greater than that of public ones, making a private education affordable for children from low-income families can be difficult (Deem, [2015](#)).

Management Practices in Public Higher Education Institutions

Public higher education institutions are typically funded by the government and are focused on providing quality education to students at an affordable cost (Marginson, [2019](#)). Due to their non-profit nature, they are more focused on academic excellence rather than profitability. However, they also face challenges in terms of bureaucratic decision-making processes, which can lead to slower decision-making and less flexibility in adapting to changing market demands (Marginson, [2019](#)). In terms of management practices, public institutions tend to focus more on academic research and community engagement. They often have a more diverse range of programs and a more comprehensive curriculum. Public institutions also tend to offer scholarships and financial aid to students from low-income families, making education more accessible (Marginson, [2019](#)). However, public institutions also face challenges in terms of budget constraints and lack of resources, which can lead to a lower quality of education (Altbach et al., [2019](#)). They may also face challenges in adapting to changing market demands, as decision-making processes may be slower due to bureaucratic structures (Marginson, [2019](#)).

Public higher education institutions are typically funded by the government and are focused on providing quality education to students at an affordable cost. Due to their non-profit nature, they are more focused on academic excellence rather than profitability. However,

they also face challenges in terms of bureaucratic decision-making processes, which can lead to slower decision-making and less flexibility in adapting to changing market demands. In terms of management practices, public institutions tend to focus more on academic research and community engagement. They often have a more diverse range of programs and a more comprehensive curriculum. Public institutions also tend to offer scholarships and financial aid to students from low-income families, making education more accessible (Layton, 2012). However, public institutions also face challenges in terms of budget constraints and lack of resources, which can lead to a lower quality of education. They may also face challenges in adapting to changing market demands, as decision-making processes may be slower due to bureaucratic structures (Layton, 2012).

Comparison of Management Practices in Private and Public Higher Education Institutions

The management practices of private and public higher education institutions differ in several ways. Private institutions prioritize market demand and student satisfaction and tend to have a more streamlined administrative structure. On the other hand, public institutions prioritize academic excellence and affordability and tend to have a more diverse range of programs and a more comprehensive curriculum.

One of the significant differences between private and public institutions is their funding structure. Private institutions rely on tuition fees and other sources of income, while public institutions are primarily funded by the government. This difference in funding structure can significantly impact the management practices of the two types of institutions (García-Sánchez and Rodríguez-Domínguez, 2015). Private institutions have the advantage of more

autonomy in their decision-making processes, allowing them to adapt to changing market demands quickly. They can also invest more in marketing and advertising to attract students. However, this autonomy can also lead to a focus on profit over quality education. Private institutions may prioritize short-term profitability over long-term sustainability, leading to a lower quality of education (Gul, Ahmad, and Zafar, 2014).

Methodology

This research aims to evaluate and contrast the management styles of public and private universities. The study relies on interviews with the directors of two hundred (200) Punjab-based institutes (100 public and 100 private). The sample was chosen using a random sampling method. A questionnaire was used to gather information for this investigation. The purpose of the survey was to gather data on current methods of administration in educational institutions of higher learning. Part one of the instrument asked participants basic questions about themselves, such as their age, gender, level of education, and length of time in their current position. The second section focused on institutional management, with questions covering topics such as institutional policy, budgeting, staffing, and student services. Descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyze the data. The sample's demographics, geographic distribution of public and private universities, and institutional presidents' ages and genders were all described using descriptive statistics. The management styles of public and private universities were compared using inferential statistics. The management practices of public and private universities were compared using a t-test to see whether or not they differ significantly on average.

Data Analysis and Results

Table 1

Distribution of Private and Public Higher Education Institutions in the Sample

Institution Type	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Sample
Private (15 universities)	100	50%
Public (15 universities)	100	50%

Total	200	100%
-------	-----	------

Table 1 shows the distribution of private and public higher education institutions in a sample of 200 respondents were selected from overall higher universities in Pakistan. The table displays the number of respondents and the percentage of the sample that each type of institution represents. In this case, the sample is evenly split

between private and public institutions, with 15 (or 50% of the sample) belonging to each category. The "Total" row represents the total number of institutions in the sample, which is 200, and the percentage of the sample, which is 100%.

Table 2
Demographic Characteristics of Heads of Institutes in the Sample

Demographic Characteristic	Private Institutions	Public Institutions	Total Sample
Age	Mean: 45.2 SD: 5.6	Mean: 47.5 SD: 6.2	Mean: 46.4 SD: 5.9
Gender	Male: 65% Female: 35%	Male: 57% Female: 43%	Male: 61% Female: 39%
Educational Qualification	PhD: 75% Masters: 20% Others: 5%	PhD: 60% Masters: 35% Others: 5%	PhD: 67.5% Masters: 27.5% Others: 5%
Years of Experience	Mean: 10.5 SD: 3.8	Mean: 11.8 SD: 4.2	Mean: 11.1 SD: 4.0

Table 2 provides information about the demographic characteristics of the heads of institutes in a sample of private and public higher education institutions, as well as the total sample. The table displays the mean and standard deviation of age, the percentage of male and female heads, the percentage of heads with PhD and Master's degrees, and the mean and standard deviation of years of experience.

In terms of age, the mean for private institutions is 45.2, and for public institutions, it is slightly higher at 47.5. The standard deviation is 5.6 and 6.2, respectively, indicating that the ages of heads of institutes in both types of institutions are relatively similar. In terms of gender, male heads of institutes are more prevalent than female heads in both private and

public institutions. However, the percentage of male heads is higher in private institutions at 65%, compared to 57% in public institutions.

In terms of educational qualification, a higher percentage of heads in private institutions have PhD degrees at 75%, compared to 60% in public institutions. On the other hand, a higher percentage of heads in public institutions have Master's degrees at 35%, compared to 20% in private institutions. The mean years of experience for heads of institutes in both private and public institutions are similar at 10.5 and 11.8, respectively. However, the standard deviation is slightly higher for heads in public institutions, indicating greater variability in the years of experience for those heads.

Table 3
Comparison of Governance Practices between Private and Public Higher Education Institutions

Governance Practices	Private Institutions	Public Institutions	Mean Difference	T-Value	P-Value
Decision-making	3.6	3.9	-0.3	-2.25	0.026
Structures	4.1	4.0	0.1	0.95	0.345
Accountability	3.9	3.8	0.1	0.98	0.326
Transparency	3.7	3.6	0.1	1.08	0.283
Total score	15.3	15.3	0.0	0.12	0.905

Table 3 presents a comparison of governance practices between private and public higher education institutions. The table shows the mean scores for four governance practices (decision-making, structures, accountability, and transparency) for both private and public institutions, as well as the mean difference, t-value, and p-value. Further, the results indicate that public institutions scored higher than private institutions in decision-making, with a mean score of 3.9 compared to 3.6 for private institutions. The mean difference between the two was -0.3, and the t-value was -2.25, which is statistically significant with a p-value of 0.026.

Table 4

Comparison of Finance Practices between Private and Public Higher Education Institutions

Finance Practices	Private Institutions	Public Institutions	Mean Difference	T-Value	P-Value
Budgeting	3.8	3.6	0.2	2.39	0.018
Resource allocation	4.2	4.0	0.2	2.18	0.032
Cost-effectiveness	4.0	4.1	-0.1	-0.78	0.436

Table 4 compares the finance practices of private and public higher education institutions. The table shows the mean scores for budgeting, resource allocation, and cost-effectiveness for each institution type, as well as the mean difference, t-value, and p-value. The mean difference is the difference in means between private and public institutions for each finance practice. The t-value is a measure of the difference between the means relative to the variability in the data. The p-value indicates the probability of observing a difference as large as the one observed if the null hypothesis (that there is no difference between private and public institutions) were true.

Based on the table, private institutions scored higher than public institutions on budgeting and resource allocation, with mean differences of 0.2 for each. The t-values for these comparisons were 2.39 and 2.18, respectively, which are statistically significant at the 0.05 level. In contrast, public institutions scored slightly higher than private institutions on cost-effectiveness, with a mean difference of -0.1. However, this difference was not statistically significant, as the p-value was 0.436, which is greater than 0.05.

In terms of structures and accountability, public and private institutions scored relatively similarly, with only a 0.1 mean difference and non-significant t-values. Lastly, in terms of transparency, public institutions scored slightly higher than private institutions, with a mean score of 3.6 compared to 3.7 for private institutions. However, this difference was not statistically significant, as the t-value was only 1.08 and the p-value was 0.283. The total score for all governance practices combined was the same for both private and public institutions, with a mean score of 15.3 and a non-significant t-value of 0.12 and p-value of 0.905.

Discussion

Higher education institutions, whether public or private, are expected to be managed effectively to ensure their smooth functioning and success. The management practices in these institutions are crucial for maintaining their academic and financial sustainability. Private institutions are typically run by a board of directors or a group of owners, while public institutions are governed by a board of trustees appointed by the government. Private institutions have the advantage of being able to make decisions quickly and effectively, as they are not bound by bureaucratic processes like their public counterparts. However, this can also lead to a lack of transparency and accountability, which can have negative consequences in the long term. Public institutions, on the other hand, have a more structured decision-making process that is subject to government regulations and scrutiny, but this can also result in delays and inefficiencies.

In terms of governance practices, both private and public institutions must maintain certain standards to ensure the transparency, accountability, and fairness of their decision-making processes. The comparison of governance

practices between private and public institutions can help identify areas for improvement and best practices. The data from Table 3 shows that public institutions have a slightly higher mean score than private institutions in decision-making, structures, accountability, and transparency, although the differences are not significant in most cases. This indicates that public institutions have a more robust system of governance, which can help them make more informed and effective decisions. Similarly, finance practices are also critical in ensuring the sustainability and growth of higher education institutions. Table 4 shows that private institutions have a higher mean score than public institutions in budgeting and resource allocation, indicating that they may have more financial resources available to them or a more efficient system of financial management. However, both private and public institutions scored similarly in cost-effectiveness, suggesting that both types of institutions are equally concerned with optimizing their financial resources.

Overall, the management practices of private and public higher education institutions differ in certain ways, but they share a common goal of ensuring the success and sustainability of the institution. By comparing these practices, institutions can identify areas for improvement and implement best practices to enhance their overall performance.

Conclusion

In conclusion, management practices in private and public higher education institutions play a crucial role in shaping the educational landscape. Both sectors have their unique challenges and opportunities, and the way institutions manage these challenges can have a significant impact on their success. Private institutions often have greater autonomy and flexibility in their management practices, allowing them to be nimbler and more innovative in their approach to education. Public institutions, on the other hand, often face greater scrutiny from government bodies and have to operate within more stringent regulations. Nevertheless, both sectors face common challenges, such as funding constraints, rising costs, and increasing competition for students. Effective management practices can help institutions address these challenges and remain competitive in an ever-changing educational landscape.

One of the most critical management practices for higher education institutions is strategic planning. Institutions that engage in strategic planning can develop a clear vision for their future and create a roadmap for achieving their goals. This involves assessing current strengths and weaknesses, identifying opportunities and threats, and developing strategies for addressing these factors. Effective strategic planning can help institutions prioritize resources, allocate funding, and create a culture of innovation and continuous improvement.

Another key management practice is effective leadership. Leaders in higher education institutions must be able to inspire and motivate their teams, foster a collaborative and inclusive culture, and build strong relationships with stakeholders. Effective leadership can help institutions navigate complex challenges, promote innovation, and create a positive and supportive environment for students, faculty, and staff.

In conclusion, management practices in higher education institutions are essential for their success. Private and public institutions have unique challenges, but they can both benefit from effective strategic planning, leadership, and a culture of continuous improvement. As the educational landscape continues to evolve, institutions must adapt and adopt new management practices to remain competitive and fulfill their mission of providing quality education to students.

Recommendation

- Develop a comprehensive strategic plan: Both private and public institutions should engage in strategic planning to develop a clear vision, mission, and goals. This process should involve all stakeholders and consider the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats of the institution. The plan should be regularly reviewed and updated to ensure it remains relevant and effective.
- Foster a culture of innovation and continuous improvement: Institutions should encourage creativity, experimentation, and risk-taking to foster innovation and improve performance. They should also provide opportunities for professional development and training to

help staff develop new skills and keep up with emerging trends and technologies.

- **Prioritize effective leadership:** Institutions should prioritize effective leadership by selecting leaders who are visionary, collaborative, and inclusive. They should provide leadership training and support to help leaders develop the skills and competencies necessary to lead their teams and navigate complex challenges.
- **Enhance communication and collaboration:** Institutions should improve communication and collaboration among different departments, faculty, staff, and students to foster a supportive and

inclusive culture. They should also engage with external stakeholders such as alumni, employers, and government bodies to build strong relationships and enhance the institution's reputation.

- **Develop a data-driven approach to decision-making:** Institutions should use data analytics to inform decision-making and monitor performance. They should collect and analyze data on student outcomes, faculty productivity, financial performance, and other key indicators to identify areas for improvement and make informed decisions.

References

- Altbach, P. G., Reisberg, L., & Rumbley, L. E. (2010). *Trends in Global Higher Education: Tracking an Academic Revolution*. http://atepie.cep.edu.r/public/Altbach_Reisberg_Rumbley_Tracking_an_Academic_Revolution_UNESCO_2009.pdf
- Akhtar, S., & Kalsoom, T. (2012). Issues of universities' governance in Pakistan. *Journal of Elementary Education*, 22(2), 81-94.
- Anwar, M. N. (2008). Decision making practices in universities of Pakistan. *Journal of Diversity Management*, 3(4), 19-26. <https://doi.org/10.19030/jdm.v3i4.4998>
- Aziz, F., Muhammad, M., & Akhtar, S. (2014). Impact of Training on Teachers Competencies at Higher Education Level in Pakistan. *Researchers World*, 5(1), 121. http://www.researchersworld.com/vo15/issue1/Paper_15.pdf
- Aziz, M. F., Naz, F. L., Gul, H., Khan, M. H. N., & Fatima, S. (2022). How Stress Affects Work and Self-Efficacy of Female Teachers? An Empirical Evidence from Pakistan. *Journal of Policy Research*, 8(3), 407-413.
- Haque, A., Aziz, M., & Mahmood, A. (2017). An Empirical study of Entrepreneurial Intent; An application on Business Graduates of Sultanate of Oman. *TIJ's Research Journal of Social Science & Management - RJSSM*, 7(01). <https://www.theinternationaljournal.org/ojs/index.php?journal=tij&page=article&op=view&path%5B%5D=5877>
- Biberos-Bendezú, K., Cárdenas, Ú., Kahhat, R., & Vázquez-Rowe, I. (2021). Introducing environmental decision-making criteria to foster Green Public Procurement in Peru. *Integrated Environmental Assessment and Management*, 18(5), 1206-1220. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ieam.4488>
- Faridullah, K. (2010). *Developing A Total Quality Management Framework For Public Sector Universities In Pakistan*. <http://pr.hec.gov.pk/jspui/handle/123456789/1884>
- Deem, R. (2001). Globalisation, New Managerialism, Academic Capitalism and Entrepreneurialism in Universities: Is the local dimension still important? *Comparative Education*, 37(1), 7-20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03050060020020408>
- Gul, R., Ahmad, M., & Zafar, M. (2014). Management practices in public and private higher education institutions: a comparative study. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 4(2), 215-220.
- Godfrey, P. C., & Grasso, E. T. (2000). Working for the common good : concepts and models for service-learning in management. In *American Association for Higher Education eBooks*. <http://ci.nii.ac.jp/ncid/BA82866383>
- Higher Education Commission HEC. (2016). University Management Practices and university organization. www.hec.gov.pk/english/Pages/Home.aspx/management/practices/universities/
- Higher Education Commission. (2016). Quality assurance cell. University education framework; Retrieved from www.hec.gov.pk
- Imtiaz, A., Aziz, S., Aziz, M. F. (2021). Integration Through Transformation: Training Madrassa Teachers for Teaching English. *Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 30(1), 49-70.
- Isani, U. A. G., & Virk, M. L. (2005). *Higher Education in Pakistan: A historical and futuristic perspective*. (2nd ed.), Islamabad: National Book Foundation.
- Jamil, M. N. (2022). "Monetary policy performance under control of exchange rate and consumer price index." *Journal of Environmental Science and Economics* 1(1), 28-35. <https://doi.org/10.56556/jescae.v1i1.7>
- Jamil, M. N. and A. Rasheed (2023). "Corporate Social Environment and Carbon Dioxide emissions Reduction impact on Organizational Performance; mediator role of Social Capital." *Journal of Environmental Science and Economics* 2(1), 17-24. <https://doi.org/10.56556/jescae.v2i1.427>
- Jamil, M. N., et al. (2023). "Cross-cultural study the macro variables and its impact on exchange rate regimes." *Future Business Journal* 9(1), 9-12. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s43093-023-00189-1>
- Jamil, M. N., & Rasheed, A. (2023). How does Corporate Social Environment contribute to

- firm sustainability: mediator role of Social Capital. *Journal on Innovation and Sustainability RISUS*, 14(1), 77-86.
- Lenn, M. P. (1997). The global alliance for transitional education. Proceeding network for quality assurance agencies in secondary education conference. Association Conference Organisers.
- Layton, D. (2012). Public and private universities in developing countries: A comparative study. *Higher Education*, 64(1), 59-73.
- Marginson, S. (2019). The worldwide trend to high-participation higher education: dynamics of social stratification in inclusive systems. *Higher Education*, 78(4), 531-546. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-016-0016-x>
- Marginson, S., & Considine, M. (2000). *The enterprise university. Power, governance and reinvention in Australia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Marzano, R. J. (2000). A new era of school reform: Going where the research takes us. ERIC Document Reproduction Service. No. ED454255. <http://scottbarrykaufman.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/07/Marzano-20001.pdf>
- Mazhar, S., & Akhtar, M. S. (2016). Knowledge management practices: A Comparative study of public and private sector universities at Lahore. *Journal of Quality and Technology Management*, 12(1), 81-90.
- Memon, G. (2007). Education in Pakistan: the key issues, problems, and challenges. *Journal of Management and Social Sciences*, 3(1), 47-55.
- Mishra, M. (2007). *Modern methods of educational administration*. New Delhi: Navprabhat Printing Press.