INTERNATIONAL

RESEARCHERS

ASSESSING EGYPT'S HIGHER EDUCATION SERVICE QUALITY
FROM A STAKEHOLDER'S RELATIVE CONCEPT

Engi Gamal Eldin

Volume No 1 Issue No.3   September 2012

www.iresearcher.org

ASSESSING EGYPT'S HIGHER EDUCATION SERVICE QUALITY FROM A STAKEHOLDER'S RELATIVE CONCEPT

Engi Gamal Eldin

Economic and Statistical Researcher
(EGYPT)
imgamaleldin@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The higher education issue in Egypt is one of the raising demands on the scene at the moment, although it still remains uncompromising suffering from emerging and accumulated rush. Egypt's higher education system hardly serves the country's recent availing needs; however that Egypt's government had taken upon itself the task of developing standards of quality of higher education system, since the establishment of a "National Authority for Quality Assurance and Accreditation of Education," which aims to ensure the quality of education institutions in Egypt. Although their whole efforts but yet the quality in higher education is missing. Hence, the interest of the paper is to determine the reasons for the rising demands for re-affirming the urgent need for quality in higher education in Egypt, depending in its methodology on interpreting and analyzing the available stakeholders' perspectives about Egypt's higher education system quality.

Keywords: Egypt's higher education; service quality measures; teaching quality measures.

1. INTRODUCTION

Egypt's higher education system is no longer capable of providing neither high quality education nor social mobility upon graduation, although that Egypt's youth seems to be active and creative but the system doesn't encourage the critical thinking or even creativity; Unfortunately Egypt's universities tends to be 'assembly lines that produce thousands of unskilled graduates every year' (Butler, 2011; and Salem, 2011).

OECD and World Bank Reviews of National Policies for Higher Education (2010) stated that Egypt suffers from students' limited opportunities to access higher education institutions, deteriorated quality of educational inputs and processes, deficiencies of educational outputs and the graduates' incompetence with labor market needs, and under-developed university scientific research fitness.

The mismatch between higher education graduates and labor market orientations is jeopardy prevailing worldwide not only in Egypt; but still unemployment rates is obviously rising for Egypt's higher education graduates holding the first degree or more during (2000 – 2010) to increase from 14.3% in 2000 to 18.9% in 2010.

Egypt is in vital need to beat the dead weight of poor quality in educational inputs, processes and the scarce financial resources incompatible with the recent modern knowledge era changes to solve the prevailing quality problems. It is very crucial to evaluate quality of teaching and learning in Egypt's universities periodically, to stand on the strengths and weaknesses of Egypt's higher education system to bridge the quality gaps by proposing viable policy solutions to empower the universities, the lecturers' experiences and pedagogical skills, students' competencies and labor market needs.

This paper depends in its analysis on the surveys and polls run by The Egyptian Cabinet, Information and Decision Support Center (IDSC) during 2009 and 2010 under the umbrella of the project entitled *'Developing Higher Education Statistics Portal in Egypt'* funded by Ford Foundation, to gauge the views of academic staff, students and business owners on various higher education issues. The analysis will be mainly focusing on terms concerned with assessing the quality of teaching and learning behind the findings of teaching quality measures in higher education discussed below in the literature review.

The working paper highlighted into six segments, the first part is concerned with studying the various definitions for quality in higher education from various stakeholders' perspectives, and hence the second part concentrates on addressing its measures. The third and fourth part displays the methodology and definition of terms. Then, the next part focuses on browsing the main dysfunctions in Egypt's higher education system studying the quality concept from different stakeholder perspectives, and finally the working paper ends up with a conclusion to support policy makers with actions needed to be taken to reorient the higher education system.

2.   QUALITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION AS A STAKEHOLDER RELATIVE CONCEPT

Quality in higher education is a concept that doesn't have a common definition; it is complex having multiple definitions depending on those whom differently envisage higher education and quality; it depends on the meaning one chooses to give to the concept of 'quality' (Henard and Leprince-Ringuet, 2008)[1].

Harvey and Green (1993) stated that there must be a tendency to reject the likelihood of accepting a singular definition of quality in higher education, hence to realize its different perspectives and validate it.
Cullen, Joyce, Hassall & Broadbent (2003) stated that the key issue in the quality concept is its capability to extend various stakeholders' perspectives having different notions of higher education.
Cheng and Tam (1997) reported education quality as an ambiguous and arguable concept; Pounder (1999) assigned quality as a 'notoriously inexplicit term' (Khodayari 2011).
The literature declared that there is no single common definition of quality, but it is a "stakeholder-relative"[2] concept (Harvey and Green, 1993). Harvey (1992) ensured that there are more than few definitions for 'quality in higher education'; each stakeholder set what quality in higher education means in accordance to their own perspectives (Tam, 2001).
Quality in higher education is highly disputed due to the common nature of higher education which is a stakeholder relative concept (Sabry, 2010). Researches on higher education affirmed that quality has different meanings related to the use of the term and conditions in which it is invoked. This means that quality has various concepts according to the various stakeholders in higher education, and those stakeholders may assume different conceptions of higher education at different times (Harvey and Green, 1993); and (Sabry, 2010).
Since then, a crucial question surfaced which is 'Who are the stakeholders?', in fact there are variety of stakeholders in higher education which includes students, employers, teaching and non- teaching staff, government agencies and authorities, accreditors, validators, auditors and assessors. Each one of them has his own perspective, which means different people having different conceptions for the term 'quality' according to their term of use, mission and circumstances (Harvey and Green, 1993); and (Sabry, 2010).
We can say that Harvey and Green had clearly identified the dilemma of the concept 'quality in higher education', and then consequently they addressed its measures. (Sabry, 2010)
The definitions of quality in higher education were highlighted into seven segments as follows ((Harvey, L. 2002), (Parri, J. 2006) and (M.A.T.K Munasinghe & U.A.H.A Rathnasiri, 2010)):
Quality as exceptionality, excellence: This approach defines quality as universities set goals to achieve better outcomes than other ones.
Quality as zero errors: This approach defines quality as producing a consistent perfect graduate with no defects zero errors.
Quality as fitness for purpose: This approach is more widely used as it examines to what extent the quality service meets the goal set, and hence the concept and goals should be set in prior to study to what extent it meets the stakeholders' expectations and desires.
Quality as reshaping: This approach apparently focuses on the human capital which is the student, to what extent their learning experiences and environment had an impact on their knowledge, skills, experience acquired as a result of their study process in the university. As long as, the student can manage professionally in their future work life, this means that the university succeeded in meeting its goals.
Quality as threshold: This approach declares the existence of set of minimum of standards of expected knowledge, skills, and attitudes of their graduates; universities can add to those sets to increase their desired qualities through meeting its goals.
Quality as enhancement: This approach witnesses the idea of universities' autonomy in quality assurance.
Quality as value for money: This approach commends the quote states "you get what you pay for", linking the quality of education with the service value through demands for efficiency.
Franklin (1992) and Scott (1998) argued that Harvey's and Green definition for quality as a fitness for purpose could weaken the concept of 'quality of teaching', as it is extracted from the consumerisation and standardization of higher education service.
Cartwright (2007) stated that the definition 'quality as a value for money' is more relevant to the institution financials; it is not an adequate measure for the professors' teaching experiences.
Since then the most widely definition agreed upon was quality as fitness for purpose by Harvey. This part of the paper focused on the concept of 'quality in higher education' as a relative stakeholder concept; the concept of

---

[1] Clewes (2003) ensured that the best definition for determining service quality and measuring it doesn't exist yet; it depends unfortunately on stakeholders' desires in higher education, as everyone has his own perspectives in defining the service quality according to their desired needs and demands.
[2] Harvey and Green argued that the importance and value of higher education differs accordingly on a variety of stakeholder perspectives, each stakeholder has his own potentials when thinking about quality in higher education.

quality is complex having no single common definition, which was apparently borrowed from business and industry; despite that customer-based definitions of quality are not widely deploying in higher education compared to the business, due to the common nature of the 'quality in higher education' definition.

3. ADRESSING THE 'QUALITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION' MEASURES

In the 1980's and early 1990's quality was defined as 'excellence' or 'limited supply'; where universities tend to achieve high standard outcomes compared[3] to others. Research on service quality at the early 1980's focused on measuring the higher education service quality while referring to the student's view of quality not the academic and administration staff perspectives (Khodayari 2011).

New approach started to flow in the late 1990's entitled 'Total Quality Management and Continuous Quality Improvement', which identified quality as transformation, performance-oriented pressing on declaring the efficiencies students must acquire through their study trip in the university.

If we consider that higher education is a kind of service, then to define the quality of the service we will be focusing on three dimensions as Parasuraman, Zeithaml and Berry (1988) stated; what is service quality; what causes the problems; and what can the service institutions do to improve its quality.

3.1 Measures of quality from customer's perspectives

Sander (2000) and Hill (1995) considered student's expectations about the service a vital source of information (Khodayari, 2011).

Lethinen (1982) defined service quality from the customers' perspectives; customers not only assess their participation in the service production process but also its results.

Parasuraman (1985) developed a service quality model to define the dimensions of quality from customers' perceptions; he concluded that customers keep assessing the service by comparing their expectations with actual performance within five generic service-quality dimensions; tangibles[4], reliability[5], responsiveness[6], assurance[7], and empathy[8] (Khodayari, 2011).

O' Neill and Palmer (2004) declared that quality in higher education could be defined as how well students' expectations[9] match their actual delivery of the service (Khodayari, 2011).

The quality in higher education service depends mainly on students' expectations and values as it is very crucial to understand them; Students are the clients of higher education institutions, as they are the one paying for the increasingly tuition fees (Telford and Masson, 2005). Joseph (2005) stressed upon the importance of students' input on service quality in higher education rather than depending only on academics and administrators.

Khodayari (2011) highlighted the grounding variables that could be affected from student's expectations and values which are students' participation, role clarity, and their catalyst to share the service encounter.

Duckworth (1994) assured that educational institutions have to face two verifiable truths which are: students are their customers, and they have to act competitively for students.

3.2 Measures of quality from higher education institutions' perspectives

Bogue (1998) highlighted the quality into three perspectives related to higher education institutions as follows; quality as limited supply[10], quality as value added[11], and quality within mission[12].

---

[3] The indicators used to compare the high achievements within the universities are teaching staff size holding academic degrees, number of volumes in the university library, total amounts of endowments, and others.

[4] It is measured by four items which are the availability of physical facilities, equipments and personnel.

[5] It is measuring the institution's ability to attain the assured service accurately and dependably.

[6] It is measuring to what extent the institution responds rapidly to its customers' demands and needs.

[7] It is measuring institution's staff and administration knowledge and their ability to conduct assurance, conviction and credibility to customers.

[8] It is measuring to what extent the institution cares and concerned attention with their customers.

[9] Sander (2000) and Hill (1995) considered student's expectations about the service a vital source of information (Khodayari 2011).

[10] Quality as limited supply by Bogue 1998 resembles Harvey and Knight definition 'quality as exceptional'.

[11] Quality as value added defines quality as the impact not only on the student's knowledge, skills, attitudes and personnel development but on the academic staff productivity and pedagogical abilities as well (Astin 1985 as cited in Bogue 1998); It is somehow similar to Harvey and Knight definition 'quality as transformation' in terms of adding value to students and empowering them.

[12] Quality within mission by Bogue 1998 resembles Harvey and Knight definition 'quality as fitness for purpose'.

Oldfield and Baron (2000) found it is crucial to view quality in higher education from the institution point of view, whenever institutions should pay more attention to their students' expectations and values rather than only collecting data upon perceiving the students.

Mosadeghard (2006) stated that the higher education service quality improvement parades in higher education institutions' capability to have an overall variance in its educational climate in aspects of decision making systems, operating systems, and human resource management (Khodayari, 2011).

Owlia and Aspinwall's (1996) feature teaching quality dimensions in education into academic resources[13], competence[14], attitude[15], and content[16].

Skelton 2005 stated that any higher education institution is more likely to change its quality culture over time, but it has to review how it works before fostering any change in teaching excellence in higher education.

It remains very challenging choosing reliable statistics to measure quality in higher education. Student's achievement is more significantly correlated with the institution the student enrolled in mainly, besides professors' enthusiasm.

There are such number of factors that would foster students' learning experiences which could be lecture outlines, headings, subheadings, clear syllabus content, and well structured presentations (Feldman, 1989 and Murray, 1991).

3.3 Teaching Quality Measures

Quality teaching has become a pressing issue of importance in recent trends in higher education, as the landscape of higher education has been facing endless changes; the expansion recently held in the education sector drives most of the whole world leading universities to pay attention to the importance of teaching quality in the higher education service.

Henard and Leprince-Ringuet (2008) stated that researchers have been searching for what constitutes 'good and appropriate teaching', how to define 'quality in higher education' and how to achieve 'quality in teaching'?

Choosing the indicators to measure teaching quality is very critical; assessing the teaching quality process is considered a vital pillar for achieving better learning environment, empowering the institution and its students' competencies. (Parri, J. 2006)

The definition of teaching quality depends apparently on the meaning of 'quality in higher education', which necessarily has been given several definitions. Hau (1996) defines quality teaching as an endless process of eliminating and reducing the defects of educational system.

Good teaching constitutes of how sensitive the lecturer to the classroom and student's progress, how clear is the course contents, lecturers ability to clarify the syllabus in an easy and understandable manner, and finally their ability to communicate with students encouraging them to be creative, share ideas within the classroom besides respecting the students (Feldman, 1976).

Professor's teaching experiences have a significant role on students' progress and achievement (Greewald, Hedges & Laine, 1996 and Chalmers, 1997). Shulman (1987) ensured that lecturer's pedagogical experience and their overall command of curriculum are considered such critical features of the 'good lecturers'.

Kallisson (1986) mentioned that designing the study course and organizing it effectively is considered a crucial pillar for student learning. Marsh (1987) added that lecturer's should have a proper workload, obvious and definite explanation of the syllabus, and ability to understand students' minds and their problems.

Hativa 2001 confirmed that there are four critical features that stimulate good teaching which are material preparation, material clarity, learning concern, and positive learning climate. Skelton (2005) declared that there is no specific and single perception of what creates 'teaching excellence', but he suggested four meta understandings of teaching excellence in higher education which are traditional, performative, physcologized, or critical.

Quality of teaching also get affected by students learning approaches whether it is a deep approach, focusing on understanding the course material; or a surface approach targeting only memorizing the material itself (Marton and Saljö, 1976).

Van Rossum and Schenk (1984) stated that student's approach to study got influenced by the students' understanding of learning. Schönwetter, Clifton & Perry (2002) found that students whom are familiar with the syllabus/ educational material are more likely to get influenced positively by expressive instructors and organization.

---

[13] Having sufficient academic, educational equipments and tools, such as; laboratories, workshops, conferences, besides students and academic staff access to various information sources in the college, e.g. books, journals, networks, and software.

[14] Academic staff competence includes academic staff theoretical and practical knowledge besides their proficiency and expertise in teaching and communication.

[15] How far the academic staff accommodates students' specifications and needs, and to what degree the academic staff will provide help to students and their availability for counseling and guidance.

[16] It aims at measuring the students' competency in the gained skills, attitudes, and knowledge, e.g. to what extent students learn communication, team-work and leadership skills, and to what extent their study is compatible with labor market orientations and requirements.

There are other several researches setting a different trend as it states that good teaching is associated with the higher education institution leadership and its understanding of its mission (Webbstock, 1999).
Good teaching requires understanding of the global and the nature of education and leadership and management skills (Radloff, 2004).

Quality failure systems in higher education is due to having poor educational inputs, poor delivery services in terms of teaching systems and pedagogical methods, lack of performance standards and measurements, unmotivated faculty, and neglecting students' skills and potentials (Crawford and Shutler, 1999).

Quality in higher education is not only about determining the vision to satisfy the customers which are the students, it is about motivating staff for achieving sustainable and continuous improvements in teaching performances and knowledge advancement. It is about building up a comprehensive learning environment reflecting the long term vision of the institution to be fulfilled by focusing on management, customer, continuous restructure and the whole sector stakeholders' participation.

4. METHODOLOGY

This paper main interest is to measure the higher education quality in Egypt's universities, as a humble attempt to figure out the higher education system dysfunctions.

In that context, there is a lack of surveys measuring service quality in Egypt's higher education institutions, consequently the researcher depend on multiple of surveys and polls run by The Egyptian Cabinet, Information and Decision Support Center (IDSC) during 2009 and 2010, under the umbrella of the project funded by Ford Foundation entitled 'Developing Higher Education Statistics Portal in Egypt'.

Those polls and surveys aimed at offering a broad array of statistics, indicators and researches on different stakeholders' perspectives to gauge their views on various higher education issues in Egypt.

Hence, the researcher found it is critical and vital to measure Egypt's higher education service quality in Egypt's universities from available polls and surveys, by drawing on the variables tackling quality issues in the resources available from different stakeholders' perspectives.

Higher education has variety of stakeholders, each his own view and mission according to their conceptions for the term 'quality' (Harvey and Green, 1993); and (Sabry, 2010). The current paper will be addressing the quality from only the stakeholders having their perceptions in the surveys and polls run by IDSC. Those stakeholders are considered the main agents of higher education in Egypt (El Sebai, 2005).   The paper will focus on the following sources in its analysis;

Field Survey to Gauge the Views of Students on the Issues of Higher Education in Egypt: The Egyptian Cabinet, Information and Decision Support Center (IDSC) had conducted a field survey to gauge the views of public and private universities and higher institutes final year students on higher education issues for the academic year 2008/2009. The objective of the survey is to assess students' motives for enrollment in higher education, and to measure the degree for their satisfaction with the level of study in general, the performance of academic staff and the management systems and services. The survey measures, as well, the satisfaction level of students' with special needs pertinent to the educational services provided, and identifies their problems in addition to other issues. The frame ensured the representation of the governorates and students' gender within higher education institutions, which included a list of the whole public and private universities and institutes for the academic year 2007/2008. A multi stage stratified sampling was withdrawn, as a sample of the institutions will be distributed according to the geographical areas in proportion and then the other sub layers which are institution type (private/ public), practical/ theoretical education, gender. The actual sample size of students from both public and private universities and higher institutes is 4286; 12 faculties from 6 public universities; and 9 private higher institutes.

Field Survey to Gauge the Views of Academic Staff on Higher Education Issues in Egypt: The IDSC had conducted a field survey in March 2009 to gauge the views of academic staff on higher education issues; measure the degree of their participation in research and community development activities; the degree of their satisfaction with students' performance; higher education policies; and the method of decision making in academia besides other issues. A multi-stage stratified sample was withdrawn from the academic year 2008/2009 list of staff in Egypt's public & private universities, private higher institutes and workers' university. The sample was withdrawn according to the geographical regions, and from each region 2 public universities, 2 private universities, 4 private higher institutes, and a branch for the workers' universities were selected randomly. The actual sample size of academic staff in public and private universities and higher institutes is 1790 from 9 public universities (36 faculties), and 7 private universities (25 faculties), 23 private higher institutes, in addition to all academic staff holding a doctorate and appointed in Workers' University, Cairo branch (14 members).

Business Owners' Poll about Graduates' Competence with Labor Market Needs: The Public Opinion Poll Center (POPC), at IDSC, conducted an opinion poll by telephone in June 2009 on business owners, measuring graduates' competencies with labor market needs - on a sample of businesses that have 50 employees and above.

The poll aimed at identifying the selection methods and criteria of new hires, the preference of employers for overseas graduates, the difficulties and problems, they face when selecting new employees, and their assessment of the level of higher education graduates. The sample size is 1035 respondents.

5. BASIC CONCEPTS

Quality of teaching is concerned with the strategies, plans, tools and policies aimed at eliminating the educational system defects through enhancing the lecturers' capacity to provide the best teaching and learning environment to be able to produce appropriately skilled labor force to meet labor market orientations (Hau, 1996; and Parri, J. 2006). Quality of teaching helps in keeping up the personnel and intellectual development besides building the knowledge, and value beyond university.

Quality of learning can be defined as all the aspects related to the student learning environment which is constituted of physical, psychosocial and service delivery elements. (UNICEF, 2000).

Overall level of teaching can be defined as the process of imparting knowledge or skills whether in the university, or faculty. Students' satisfaction about overall teaching level encloses students' satisfaction with teaching level in the university in general, and the faculty in particular in terms of their satisfaction about the curriculum, pedagogical methods, textbooks availability, and their discipline relevance to labor market needs.

Academic staff performance can be measured by tackling the staff overall command of curriculum, their ability to have definite explanations of the syllabus, and to clarify it to their students in an easy and understandable manner, along with their ability to use modern pedagogical methods, besides their ability to interact with students encouraging them to be creative, share his notions with students, teach students how to learn and their ability to evaluate their students and give them feedback.

The administration system within the faculty includes data/ information about the lectures, schedules, number of students at lectures halls and sections, tuition expenses, and book prices, besides interacting with faculty management

Students' performance can be measured by tackling students' regularity in attending lectures, their interaction degree during lectures, their performance level in assignments, and final tests.
Students' density can be tackled as the number of students in lecture halls, or within sections.

6. ASSESSING EGYPT'S QUALITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION FROM DIFFERENT STAKEHOLDERS PRESPECTIVES

Higher education in Egypt seems to be one of the main issues under limelight at the present time, as higher education in Egypt is facing many challenges, which cast a shadow on the quality of education received by the students, which mainly affects the new graduates entering the labor market, despite the increasing rates of unemployment in Egypt and the large number of graduates of higher education in Egypt, at the same time employers are unable to find qualified graduates to work within an efficient and appropriate manner.

It is necessary to pay more attention to reorient Egypt's higher education and reform it through providing various stakeholders with the needed skills, disciplines and capabilities from the fact identifying the basic attributes necessary for the labor market in Egypt by gauging the views of employers on the needs of labor market at the moment, and the efficiency of higher education output in Egypt to provide highly qualified graduates in accordance with international standards of education and training to take advantage of their experiences and potentials.

And it is critical too to identify and evaluate the views of students whom are considered the main pillar of the educational system towards the quality of education they receive and the most important problems and obstacles facing Egypt's higher education system, in addition to their solutions and suggestions on the higher education development.

In this frame this section aims to identify the difficulties and problems the employers face when selecting new employees, and their Assessment of the level of higher education graduates, and then identifying the views of Egyptian universities students in higher education issues mainly concerned with quality of teaching and learning, and evaluate the degree of their satisfaction on the current situation general, and also identify the strengths and weaknesses of the higher education system in Egypt, which will enable us subsequently to enhance the performance and to take positive steps towards the achievement of progress in this area.

6.1 Students Assessment of the curricular programs, administration system and the services provided within the institution[17]

Although the universities' students were moderately satisfied with the overall level of teaching, academic performance, their satisfaction with the administration system and services provided besides their valuation of

---

[17] The results are revealed from a field survey to gauge the views of students on the issues of higher education in Egypt; the IDSC conducted on the public and private universities and higher institutes final year students for the academic year 2008/2009.

curricular programs and activities, but when it comes up to asking them whether they need an eminent education or just get a graduation certificate, the majority of the universities' students mentioned their desire to have an eminent education quantified about 76% of the whole universities' students within the sample, while about 10.5% of the students in need only to get a graduation certificate, and about 8.5% of the students were unable to decide currently what they need, and finally only 5% of the students didn't answer the inquiry itself.

6.1.1 Students' Satisfaction with Overall Level of Teaching[18]

The largest portion of Egyptian universities' students are satisfied to some extent with the overall teaching level in their universities (55%), followed by a major difference for those are very satisfied with the overall teaching level which amounts about 18% of the whole university students within the sample, this percent is somehow very close to those whom stated their dissatisfaction (17.1%), and about 6.3% only are not satisfied at all with the level of teaching.

Nearly 57.8% of the Egyptian universities' students within the sample are satisfied to some extent with the level of teaching in their faculties/ colleges, and about 15.6% of the students are very satisfied with the level of teaching which quantifies a similar percentage rate for those whom are not satisfied, and only 5.2% of the students are not satisfied at all with the level of teaching within the faculty/ college.

The results showed too that about half the Egyptian universities' students within the sample are satisfied somehow with the level of teaching in their teaching materials and courses in their faculties, and nearly 20.2% is very satisfied, while 18.9% of the students are not satisfied, and about 7.1% of them are not very satisfied with the level of teaching in their educational materials.

About 39.8% of the Egyptian universities' students within the sample are satisfied to some extent that their study in the faculty qualify them to labor market opportunities, followed by nearly 22.5% of the students are not satisfied with their study role in qualifying them to labor market orientations, and about 21.1% of the students are very satisfied, while 12.5% of the students are not satisfied at all with their study role in entitling them to labor market needs.

In terms of measuring students' satisfaction with their learning textbooks, about 42% of the Egyptian universities' students within the sample are satisfied to some extent, followed by nearly 23.4% of the students are not satisfied, and about 16% of the students are very satisfied, while 13.4% of the students are not satisfied at all with their learning textbooks.

Student's reply to the inquiry entitled 'Are you forced to buy any particular book?' had experienced such large proportions of missing rates between refusing to answer (14.8%) and do not know (4.5%), although nearly 31.9% of the Egyptian universities' students confirmed that they are forced to buy particular textbooks while 48.8% stated that they are not forced.

6.1.2 Students' Satisfaction with Academic Staff Performance

About 59.8% of the Egyptian universities' students within the sample are satisfied to some extent with the academic staff performance in terms of their ability to explain, clarify the materials to students, and provide them with academic guidance, followed by nearly 23.3% of the students are totally satisfied, on the contrary there is only 11% and 3.2% of the Egyptian universities' students within the sample are not satisfied and not satisfied at all with the academic staff performance respectively.

When it approaches asking students' need for private tutorials, about 68% of the universities' students don't need tutorials, although 28.9% of the students within the sample stated their need for it, due to the overcrowding in the students' sizes in lectures and sections (59.7%), besides mismanagement of the lectures and sections' schedules (39.5%), and non efficacy of the academic staff and their demonstrators (38.1%),

When it comes up to measuring the Egyptian universities' students' satisfaction with the academic performance in terms of the pedagogical approaches used in teaching, the results showed that nearly 45.9% of those students are satisfied somehow, and about 20.3% of the students are very satisfied, while 21.8% and 7.9% of the Egyptian universities' students are not satisfied, and not satisfied at all with their performance concerning the teaching approaches.

---

[18] It is a composite index consisting of six sub-indices, aiming at measuring the students' satisfaction with teaching level in the faculty - higher institute in particular measuring their satisfaction with educational programs and their relevancy to labor market. It also aims at measuring students' satisfaction with the curriculum clarity and whether the students are forced to buy certain books. These indices were normalized so that their values can range between 0 and 100 points, where the value "0" reflects the minimum value of the index, while 100 points indicate the maximum value of the index. It is calculated based on the respondents' answers to the following questions: What is the level of your satisfaction with overall teaching level in your university in general?, What is the level of your satisfaction with overall teaching level in your faculty - higher institute in general?, What is the level of your satisfaction with teaching courses and materials provided in your faculty?, What is the level of your satisfaction with overall teaching level in your faculty - institute in terms of qualifying you for the labor market?, What is the level of your satisfaction with textbooks?, and Are you forced to buy any particular book?.

Subsequently the Egyptian universities' students were asked to what extent they are content with the academic staff functioning in terms of considering practical application of the curricula in a 5 point scale, about 43% of those students are relatively satisfied with their academic staff practical application of the curricula, besides nearby 19.5% of the students are absolutely satisfied with their academic staff functioning. Conversely 23.2% of the Egyptian universities' students are not satisfied with their academic staff performance in respect to the practical application of the curricula, and nearly very few proportions of the students are wholly dissatisfied with their academic staff performance concerning the practical application of the curricula which amounted around 8.8% of the whole Egyptian universities' students within the sample.

Later when it comes up to inquiring students' state of comfort about the academic staff performance in regard to considering the students' discussions and responding to their questions, the results declared that about 40.3% of those students are relatively satisfied and around 15.4% are wholly satisfied with the academic staff attentions and responds to their discussions and questions. Conversely there is about 37.1% of the Egyptian universities' students unsatisfied at least with their academic staff performance regards to considering their discussions and responding to their questions (28.2% are unsatisfied and 8.9% are unsatisfied at all).

Measuring the Egyptian universities' students' satisfaction with the academic staff performance in terms of giving comments and feedback on assignments and exam results, the results showed that the larger proportion of the students are satisfied at least amounting about 79.3% of the whole Egyptian universities' students within the sample (48.1% somehow satisfied, and 31.2% are very satisfied). On the contrary there were only 12.7% and 4.5 % of the Egyptian universities' students within the sample are unsatisfied and entirely unsatisfied with the academic staff performance regards to giving comments and feedback on assignments and exam results respectively.

Since it comes to measuring students' state of comfort about the academic staff performance in terms of the relationship between the academic staff and students beyond the lectures' hall in the field of study, Most of the Egyptian universities' students stated that they are content at least with the relationship between them and their academic staff beyond the lectures' hall in the field of study (41.8% somehow satisfied, and 30.2% are very satisfied). Conversely, about 20.7% of the Egyptian universities' students unsatisfied at least with that relationship (13.3% are unsatisfied and 7.4% are entirely unsatisfied).

The Egyptian universities' students were asked to evaluate their satisfaction regards to the relationship between the academic staff and students beyond the lectures' hall in the field of student's extracurricular activities, the results showed that about 33.5% of the students are relatively satisfied, and 21.4% are very satisfied. On the other hand, about 16.4% of the students are unsatisfied and 8.5% are unsatisfied at all although there were large proportions of students whom respond saying 'Don't Know' amounting 16.4% of the whole Egyptian universities' students within the sample.

Subsequently when it comes up to asking the Egyptian universities' students about their satisfaction regards to the exam methods and how fair and equity it is among students, about 66.5% of the students are at least satisfied with it (44.3% are very satisfied and 22.2% are to some extent satisfied). Conversely 15.5% of the students are not satisfied with the exam methods, and its fairness and equitability, the results showed rising proportions for those whom are not satisfied at all amounted 11.3% of the whole Egyptian universities' students.

And when the Egyptian universities' students were asked to what extent they are satisfied with the academic staff performance in terms of assessing the correction system, the results explored that nearly 40.4% of those students are relatively satisfied, and 16.1% are entirely satisfied while 20.9% are not satisfied and 14% are not satisfied at all.

6.1.3 Students' Satisfaction with the Administration System

A slight increase about 12.3 degrees from the moderate level in universities' students' satisfaction of the administration system in general, as the index[19] quantified about 62.3 degrees; This slight increase can be explained by the lower proportions of satisfaction with the administration system in terms of appealing against exams results, their satisfactory and convincing respond to student's appeal, and student union elections.

---

[19] It is a composite index consisting of seventeen sub-indices, aiming at measuring students' satisfaction with the administration system in Egyptian universities in terms of lectures, schedules, number of students at lectures halls and sections, besides surveying the interaction with faculty management, tuition expenses, book prices, and academic staff performance. It also aims at measuring students' satisfaction with the courses schedule, exams timetables, and election method of student union. These indices were normalized so that their values can range between 0 and 100 points, where the value "0" reflects the minimum value of the index, while 100 points indicate the maximum value of the index. It is calculated based on the respondents' answers to the following questions: What is the level of your satisfaction with the administration system in your faculty in terms of lectures' schedule, lectures' frequency, lectures' duration, number of students attending lectures, sections' frequency, sections' schedule, sections' duration, number of students attending sections, interaction with management, tuition expenses, book prices, Academic Staff performance, demonstrators' performance, student affairs' system, appealing against exams results, satisfactory and convincing respond to student's appeal in exam results, student union elections.

The results showed that universities' students are highly satisfied with the administration system in regard to lectures' schedule amounted about 80.6% of the whole universities students within the sample (50.5% are somehow satisfied, and 30.1% are totally satisfied), on the reverse only few are unsatisfied with it quantifying 13% and about 4.4% are wholly unsatisfied.

In terms of lectures' frequency, universities' students were remarkably satisfied with the administration system regards to it amounting 83.9% of the whole universities' students (44% are relatively satisfied, and 39.9% are entirely satisfied), whereas 10.3% and 3.1% of the students are unsatisfied and vastly unsatisfied with the lectures' frequency respectively.

When it comes up to measuring universities' students satisfaction of the administration system in terms of lectures' duration, the majority of the students are at least satisfied about the lectures' duration amounting 80% of the whole universities' students (43.8% are relatively satisfied, and 36.2% are totally satisfied), whereas 13.7% and 3.6% of the students are unsatisfied and vastly unsatisfied with the lectures' duration respectively.

Nearly half of the universities' students are satisfied with the number of students attending lectures (22% are very satisfied, and 28.8% are to some extent satisfied), where as larger portions of the universities' students are unsatisfied and totally unsatisfied quantified 27.4% and 18.3% of the whole universities students respectively.

Subsequently when it comes up to measuring universities' students' satisfaction of the administration system in terms of sections' schedule, sections' duration, and number of students attending sections; The results showed that about 63.5% of the whole universities students within the sample are satisfied with the sections' schedule (40.8% are somehow satisfied, and 22.7% are totally satisfied), on the reverse only few are unsatisfied with it quantifying 16.6% and about 7% are wholly unsatisfied. Although there is about 8.4% of the students didn't answer that inquiry. In terms of sections' frequency, universities' students were at least satisfied with it quantifying 67.1% of the whole universities' students (40.8% are relatively satisfied, and 26.3% are entirely satisfied), though 13.4% and 5.6% of the students are unsatisfied and vastly unsatisfied with the sections' duration respectively, and about 9.2% of the students didn't mention their satisfaction level. In terms of sections' duration, the majority of the universities' students were at least satisfied with it amounting 70.6% of the whole universities' students (41.5% are relatively satisfied, and 29.1% are entirely satisfied), although 10.7% and 4.8% of the students are unsatisfied and vastly unsatisfied with the sections' duration respectively, and about 9.3% of the universities' students within the sample didn't mention their satisfaction level. Finally in terms of the number of students attending sections, nearly more than half of the universities' students slightly are satisfied with the number of students attending lectures (23.6% are very satisfied, and 29% are to some extent satisfied), where as larger portions of the universities' students are unsatisfied and totally unsatisfied quantified 20% and 13.7% of the whole universities students respectively.

When asking universities' students satisfaction of the interaction with the faculty administration system, nearly 41% and 20.9% of the whole students within the sample are somehow satisfied and well satisfied to that interaction respectively, reversely about 17.3% and 13.4% of the students are unsatisfied and vastly unsatisfied with the administration system in terms of interacting with them respectively.

Around 63.4% of the universities' students are at least satisfied with the faculty's tuition fees (24.7% are well satisfied and 38.7% are somehow satisfied), whereas 20.7% and 13.5% of the students are unsatisfied and vastly unsatisfied with the administration system in terms of the tuition fees. While in regards to the book prices, nearby 65.2% of the universities' students are at least satisfied with the prices (22.1% are very satisfied and 43.1% are somehow satisfied), whereas 20.3% and 8.3% of the students are unsatisfied and awfully unsatisfied with the administration system in terms of the book prices.

When it approaches measuring students' satisfaction with the administration system in terms of academic staff and demonstrators' performance, The results showed that although the students are satisfied from both academic staff and demonstrators, but actually they are more likely to be satisfied from the academic staff (33.3% are very satisfied and 52.5% are slightly satisfied) rather than the demonstrators (26.7% are very satisfied and 52% are slightly satisfied).

And then after measuring the students' satisfaction with the administration system in regards to student affairs system, the results declared that nearly 39.2% of those students are relatively satisfied with it, and 27.1% are wholly satisfied, though 16.7% are not satisfied and 11.9% are not satisfied at all with the administration system in terms of student affairs system.

Measuring students' satisfaction with the administration system in terms of appealing against exams results and satisfactory and convincing respond to student's appeal in exam results, The results showed larger portions for those whom respond with 'Don't Know' amounted 17.3%, while around 9.8% of those students are well satisfied with the appealing against the exams results, and 21.2% are slightly satisfied, whereas 23.2% are not satisfied and 23.3% are not satisfied at all with the administration system in terms of appealing against exams results. Though asking students' their satisfactory and convincing respond to student's appeal in exam results, there were huge portions of missing within those whom their answers were 'Don't know 31.1%' and 'Don't Answer 12.7%', students were more likely to be unsatisfied with the respond to their appealing against the exam results (12.5% are unsatisfied, and 21.1% are awfully unsatisfied).

There is a remarkable increase in students' refusal to quantify their satisfaction level with the administration system in terms of student union elections, as 32.4% responded as 'Don't Know' and 6% didn't reply the inquiry itself

and neglect it. At the same time, 29% of the students stated their dissatisfaction of the student union elections (32.4% are unsatisfied, and 6% are awfully unsatisfied), whereas nearly 11.1% and 21.6% of the students are satisfied and well satisfied with the administration system concerning student union elections respectively.

6.1.4 Students' valuation of curricular programs and activities

There is a remarkable decrease in proportion of students surveyed to evaluate the educational courses and activities they receive within their faculty, as it amounted exactly 47.5% nearby half of the sample size, while 11.6% of the students were unable to mention whether they are surveyed or not, and about 9.7% of the students refused to answer. Only 31.2% of the students within the sample are surveyed, and when they were asked whether their opinions and suggestions taken into consideration and responded to from the faculty side about 49.9% of them confirmed their faculty respond, while 21.7% of them mentioned that their survey opinions and suggestions are not taken into consideration, what was quite strange that 20% of the students were unable to mention whether the faculty took their suggestions into consideration or not, and about 8.3% of the students refused to answer.

6.1.5 Students' satisfaction with the services provided

A very little slightly increase amounted 4.6 degrees from the moderate level in students' satisfaction with the services provided by their faculty in general, as the index[20] quantified about 54.6 degrees; This very little increase can be determined by the lower proportions of satisfaction with computer and language labs, and medical care system.

About 58.3% of the universities' students are at least satisfied to some extent with the services provided in the faculty in terms of infrastructure (18.5% are well satisfied, and 39.8% are relatively satisfied), whereas 38.2% of the students are not satisfied with the service (23.5% are unsatisfied, and 14.7% are awfully unsatisfied).

Students are highly unsatisfied with the services provided from the faculty in regards to computer and language labs which amounted exactly 44.8% of the whole students within the sample (28% are unsatisfied, and 16.8% are awfully unsatisfied), though 13% and 33.7% of the students within the sample are slightly satisfied and very satisfied with computer and language labs available in the faculty.

In terms of measuring students' satisfaction with the faculty's library, about 64.4% of the whole students within the sample are at least satisfied (22.4% are well satisfied, and 42% are slightly satisfied), whereas 16.6% and 8.8% of the students within the sample are unsatisfied and awfully unsatisfied with the services provided by the faculty in terms of the library.

Students are moderately satisfied with the services provided from the faculty in regards to the various activities which quantified an amount equals to 49.7% of the whole students within the sample (18.5% are well satisfied, and 31.2% are relatively satisfied), whereas 16.3% and 10.8% of the students within the sample are unsatisfied and awfully unsatisfied with the various activities. There were also about 18.1% of the students within the sample unable to decide whether they are content about the service or not.

When it approaches subsequently to ask students their level of satisfaction with the services provided by the faculty in terms of medical care system, the results showed that 47.7% of the whole students within the sample are satisfied with the service provided (18.1% are well satisfied, and 29.6% are slightly satisfied), whereas 16.6% and 11.4% of the students within the sample are slightly unsatisfied and awfully unsatisfied with the medical care system provided in the faculty. The results showed that larger proportions of the students within the sample unable to decide whether they are content about the medical care system or not, it can be explained by their non usage to the service itself.

With regard to measuring students' satisfaction with the residency in hostels provided by the faculty, the results showed that about 41% of the students within the sample unable to decide whether they are satisfied with the service or not, may be due to their non usage to the service itself. And the results showed too that about 30.5% of the whole students within the sample are at least satisfied with the service (12.5% are well satisfied, and 18% are slightly satisfied), whereas 9.4% and 9.2% of the students within the sample are unsatisfied and awfully unsatisfied with the services provided by the faculty in terms of the residency in hostels.

---

[20] It is a composite index consisting of six sub-indices, aiming at measuring the students' satisfaction with the availability of services in faculties such as; infrastructure, benches, seats, lecture halls, bathrooms, as well as, computer and language labs, and their access to the internet. The index also aims at evaluating the library services provided to students such as borrowing, number and quality of books, medical care system and residency in hostels. Furthermore, the index aims at evaluating the extracurricular activities available in faculties. These indices were normalized so that their values can range between 0 and 100 points, where the value "0" reflects the minimum value of the index, while 100 points indicate the maximum value of the index. It is calculated based on the respondents' answers to the following questions: What is the degree of your satisfaction with the services available in your faculty in terms of the infrastructure, computer and language labs, the library, the various activities, the medical care system, and residency in hostels.

6.2 Academic staff Assessment of the quality of educational system[21]

6.2.1 Academic staff satisfaction with the student's performance

There is a remarkable increase in academic staff satisfaction with students' performance in the Public universities within the sample, as the index[22] recorded 72.9 points. About 80.4% of the public universities' academic staff within the sample are satisfied with the students' performance in terms of their attendance to lectures (21.7% are well satisfied, and 58.7% are slightly satisfied), whereas 15.7% and 3.7% of the Public universities' academic staff within the sample are slightly unsatisfied and awfully unsatisfied with the students' attendance to lectures.

When it comes up to measuring academic staff degree of satisfaction with the performance level of students in terms of their interaction during the lectures, the results declared that about 76.6% of the public universities' academic staff within the sample are satisfied with the students' interaction during the lectures (18% are well satisfied, and 58.6% are slightly satisfied), whereas 23.2% of the Public universities' academic staff within the sample are slightly and awfully unsatisfied with their interaction (20.7% are unsatisfied, and 2.5% are awfully unsatisfied).

With regard to measuring academic staff's satisfaction with the students' performance for required assignments, the results showed that about 75.5% of the public universities' academic staff within the sample are satisfied with the students' performance for required assignments (16% are well satisfied, and 59.5% are slightly satisfied), whereas 24% of the Public universities' academic staff are slightly and awfully unsatisfied (21.7% are unsatisfied, and 2.3% are awfully unsatisfied).

About 77.9% of the public universities' academic staff within the sample are satisfied with the students' performance in final exams (13% are well satisfied, and 64.9% are slightly satisfied), whereas 21.8% of the Public universities' academic staff are slightly and awfully unsatisfied (19.2% are unsatisfied, and 2.6% are awfully unsatisfied).

6.2.2 Academic staff satisfaction with the student's density

There is a marginally increase in academic staff satisfaction with students' density in the Public universities within the sample, as the index[23] recorded 67.9 points. About 59.5% of the public universities' academic staff are satisfied with students' number within the faculty relative to number of students within the lecture halls (20.1% are well satisfied, and 39.4% are slightly satisfied), whereas 30.7% and 9.6% of the Public universities' academic staff within the sample are slightly unsatisfied and awfully unsatisfied with the number of students within the lecture halls.

With regard to measuring academic staff's satisfaction with the number of students within the faculty relative to the number of students within the sections, the results showed that about 62.6% of the public universities' academic staff within the sample are satisfied with the number of students within the faculty relative to the number of students within the sections (24% are well satisfied, and 38.6% are slightly satisfied), though 32.8% of the Public universities' academic staff are slightly and awfully unsatisfied with the number of students within the sections (26.1% are unsatisfied, and 6.7% are awfully unsatisfied).

About 66.3% of the public universities' academic staff within the sample are satisfied with students' density within the faculty relative to the ratio of students to the academic staff (22.2% are well satisfied, and 44.1% are

---

[21] The results are revealed from a field survey to gauge the views of academic staff on higher education issues in Egypt, conducted by IDSC in March 2009 on 1790 higher education institutions.

22 It is a composite index of four sub-indices aiming at identifying the academic staff valuation of students' performance at the different educational levels through: the extent of students' regularly attending lectures, the degree of students' interaction during lectures, in addition to their performance level in assignments, and final tests. This composite index is constructed as follows: Experts' opinion settled to use arbitrary weights method by giving equal weight to each of the following sub indices: students' attendance to the lectures, interaction of students during lectures, their performance in the required assignments and final tests. And each sub index of the four sub-indices has an equal weight of 0.25 degree. This index is calculated depending on respondents' answers to the following questions: What is the degree of your satisfaction with the performance level of students in different educational levels of the university in terms of students' attendance to the lectures, interaction of students during lectures, students' performance for required assignments, and students' performance in final exams.

[23] It is a composite index composed of four sub-indices aiming at identifying academic staff valuation of students' density within the faculty - institute in terms of: number of students in lecture halls, within sections, ratio of students to academic staff, in addition to ratio of students to academic staff assistants. This composite index is constructed as follows: experts' opinion settled to use arbitrary weights method by giving equal weights to each side of the following sub indices: number of students in lecture halls, number of students within sections, ratio of students to academic staff, and ratio of students to academic staff assistants. And each sub index of the four sub-indices has an equal weight of 0.25 degree. This index is calculated depending on respondents' answers to the following questions: What is the degree of your satisfaction with students' density within the faculty relative to number of students within the lecture halls, number of students within the sections, ratio of students to the academic staff, and ratio of students to academic staff assistants.

slightly satisfied), whereas 33.3% of the Public universities' academic staff are slightly and awfully unsatisfied (26% are unsatisfied, and 7.3% are awfully unsatisfied).

With regard to measuring public universities' academic staff's satisfaction with the students' density within the faculty relative to the ratio of students to academic staff assistants, the results showed that about 60.8% of the academic staff within the sample are at least satisfied (17.2% are well satisfied, and 43.6% are slightly satisfied), whereas 38.6% of the Public universities' academic staff are slightly and awfully unsatisfied with the students' density within the faculty relative to the ratio of students to academic staff assistants (29.3% are unsatisfied, and 9.3% are awfully unsatisfied).

6.2.3 Academic staff use of different methods in assessing students

The results showed that the index[24] assessing public universities' academic staff use of different ways in assessing students like multiple choice tests, essay writing tests, quizzes, weekly assignments, and research papers preparation, recorded 55.4 points.

This slightly increase amounted 5.4 points from the moderate level can be interpreted as follows; about 44.9% of the public universities' academic staff within the sample don't use quizzes as a means to evaluate students, although 41.3% use them rarely and only 13% use them always. With regards to measuring public universities' academic staff use of essay writing tests as a means to evaluate their students, about 32% of them used it regularly, while 47.2% used it occasionally, and nearly 20.8% of the academic staff didn't use it when assessing students.

With regards to measuring public universities' academic staff use of students' preparing research papers, most of the academic staff in public universities use it at least as a means of assessing their students (42.3% use it regularly, and 48.2% use it occasionally) while only 9.5% of the academic staff don't use it in assessing students.

And about 86.3% of the academic staff in the public universities within the sample use regularly and occasionally the weekly assignments as a method to evaluate their students (44.6% use it regularly, and 41.7% use it occasionally), while only 13.7% of the academic staff don't use that method in assessing their students.

When it comes up to assessing students using multiple choice tests, nearly 78.8% of the academic staff in the public universities within the sample use regularly and occasionally the multiple choice tests as a method to evaluate their students (31.7% use it regularly, and 47.1% use it occasionally), while only 21.2% of the academic staff don't use it at all in assessing their students.

6.2.4 Academic staff viewing their evaluation reports

The results showed that the index[25] measuring the academic staff view of their evaluation reports recorded 51.7 points, rising only almost 2 points than the moderate level. This marginally increase from the moderate level can be interpreted as follows; about 22.5% of the academic staff noted the unavailability of a system to evaluate them, and about 13.5% indicated their lack of knowledge for the existence of such an Assessment system or not.

While nearly 64.1% of the academic staff in public universities within the sample pointed out the availability of an Assessment system for the teaching staff in faculty, as 65.8% of them documented their accessibility to their performance Assessment reports, while 31.1% of them noted the unavailability to access their Assessment reports and nearly 3.1% indicated their lack of knowledge for their capability to access such a report or not.

Besides 10.8% of the academic staff in public universities within the sample whom pointed out the availability of an Assessment system in their faculty, noted the non-participation of students in such Assessment report and nearly 4.2% indicated their lack of knowledge for the possibility of students' participation in assessing their teaching staff in the faculty or not. While 85% of the academic staff in public universities within the sample whom pointed out the availability of an Assessment system in their faculty, reported the students' participation in their performance Assessment report in the faculty, as 65.4% of them stated that each teacher receive a report presenting students' perspectives and opinions, while 29.1% pointed out that lecturers receive nothing and about 5.4% stated that they don't know whether each teacher receive a report presenting their students' perspectives and opinions.

---

[24] It is a composite index of five sub-indices aiming at assessing the academic staff use of different methods in evaluating students, which are: the multiple choice tests, essay writing tests, quizzes, and weekly assignments, in addition to asking the students to prepare research papers. This index is calculated depending on a set of selected questions from questionnaire designed to gauge the views of academic staff on higher education issues in Egypt. The following are the steps of composing the index: experts' opinion was settled to use arbitrary weights method by giving equal weights to each side of the following sub-indices: the extent academic staff uses multiple choice tests, essay writing tests, quizzes, weekly assignments, and to what extent academic staff ask students to prepare research papers. And each sub-index of the five has an equal weight of 0.2 degree.

[25] It is a composite index of two sub-indices aiming at measuring the academic staff view of their Assessment reports. This index is calculated depending on a set of selected questions from questionnaire designed to gauge the views of academic staff on higher education issues in Egypt. And each sub-index of the two has an equal weight of 0.5 degree.

6.3 Business Owners Assessment of the quality of Egypt's education outputs[26]

       The largest portion of business owners within the sample (42.9%) stated that higher education sector doesn't provide labor market with the basic attributes, disciplines, and skills required in general, although 20% of the business owners mentioned that the higher education sector provides them somehow with the competences, specialties and skills they need, while only 33.9% declared that the sector provides them with their where this proportion rises for the business owners working within the following economic activities: electricity and gas, and mining and quarrying.

       About 36.9% of the business owners within the sample assessed the quality of higher education in Egypt as acceptable, followed by a minor difference for those whom believe that the quality is good (30%), while 23.7% of them consider the quality of higher education outputs as weak at least and only 5.7% evaluate it as very well. And about 3.8% of the business owners within the sample were unable to evaluate higher education quality.

       About 29% of the business owners prefer universities graduates from outside Egypt, this proportion rises in some economic activities as follows: financial and insurance activities, food services and accommodation, and scientific and technical specialist activities. While the largest proportion of the business owners in the sample stated that graduates from outside Egypt are not more efficient than Egyptian universities' graduates in the area of operation (44%), and only 8% of business owners in the sample stated that they did hire graduates from universities outside Egypt during the past five years, and the most important jobs they have been recruited on were in the following professions: consultants, managers and customer service specialists.

       Proficiency in foreign languages comes at the forefront of the skills that are hardly available to be found between job applicants in general, and in most of economic activities in particular, followed by computer and internet proficiency, and expertise in communication skills.

       The Poll results showed too nearly 9.1% of business owners cannot find in graduates at all such certain disciplines that are applying for a job, the most important of these disciplines are: engineering in general, mechanical engineering in particular, translation, sales and marketing, and Applied Arts Department of Printing and Dyeing.

       Nearly 39.2% of the business owners within the sample mentioned that they don't find qualified employees to fill the empty vacancies in their companies, while 16.4% don't find efficient staff sometimes, and about 44.4% of the business owners within the sample declared that they always find qualified employees to fill the jobs easily, and it increased in the following economic activities: real estate activities, arts, entertainment and recreation activities, education, accommodation and food services, financial and insurance activities, electricity and gas, and mining & quarrying.

       The lack of experience and efficiency comes at the forefront of the difficulties faced by business owners who don't have efficient staff always or sometimes easily in vast majority of economic activities, followed by a large margin in the inability of the employee to bear the responsibilities of work, besides the new graduates asks to be highly paid. But the inability of an employee to bear the responsibilities of work comes at the top of difficulties faced by business owners in the following economic activities: real estate activities, and financial and insurance activities. While the results showed that the non-proficiency in foreign languages comes at the forefront of difficulties facing business owners when choosing their new employees to work in establishments that operate in arts, entertainment and recreation activities.

7.   CONCLUSION

       Egypt's higher education system remains uncompromising; it is not supplying somehow the country's contemporary availing needs. It is very necessary to amend the whole education system itself; there must be a clear vision about the purpose of higher education. It is not only the role of universities as well, but it's a common factor role among the various stakeholders; students, academic staff, employers, governments and others.
It is very critical for Egypt's higher education system to be more likely to check its quality and change it periodically; there is a pressing need for each faculty in Egypt to review its recent status-quo how it works; through analyzing the current performance using periodic surveys to review its mission and the academic goals to be achieved.

       Egypt's universities have to give more attention to reconceptualize of the relationship between teaching, and learning by setting more affordable strategies to achieve better students' learning environment, and empower the institution and the students' competencies.

       Faculties have to pay more attention to the contemporary labor market's basic attributes required to reorient the educational programs provided to students by taking into consideration the needed skills, disciplines and knowledge. Hence, Faculties must take upon itself the initiative of engaging with the potential and anticipated employers to bridge the gap to know more about their basic attributes besides offering some sort of fellowships and internships for students in various disciplines to enable them having their practical experience as a part of their curriculum success.

---

[26] The results are revealed from a poll entitled 'Business Owners' Poll about Graduates' Competence with Labor Market Needs'; The Public Opinion Poll Center (POPC), at IDSC, conducted an opinion poll by telephone in June 2009 on business owners.

Each Faculty has to work effectively on considering their students and graduates' perspectives, their expectations compared to the actual performance received in order to draft the curriculum rather than only depending on academics and administrators.

It is also compulsory for the Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research to reconsider the number of students attending or joining the faculties of engineering, applied arts, translation, sales and marketing; what is really needed to be addressed the pattern of students' enrolment by discipline and specialty. Business owners complained the scarcity of the graduates holding Mechanical Engineering, and Printing and Dyeing specialties. And perhaps this issue may outbreak the absence of the guiding role of higher education institutions in giving students the appropriate counsel about different disciplines and their employability.

Students are in need for an eminent education although that they are somehow satisfied with the current status-quo, which means they not just only want to get a graduation certificate, there is still number of competencies needed missing. Students are no more in need of the surface approach in learning; no more they find that memorizing the curricula is the only solution to find a better job opportunity in the labor market, and no more they believe that it is enough to get a certificate.

Students' learning approaches needed to be reviewed; Faculties must pay more attention to their students' expectations and values, their curricula must be clear, definite, well designed, and easy understandable in light of the positive learning environment and learning approaches concerns. Faculty has to check its level of teaching in terms of the teaching materials and courses, the pedagogical approaches used in teaching and learning textbooks, and the academic staff functioning and performance.

It is supposed that one of the crucial roles of academic staff in partnership with the higher education institutions is to qualify the students more to labor market opportunities, besides considering the students' discussions and respond more to their suggestions, in addition taking their comments as well as getting the students' feedback on their assignments and exam results. Besides, faculties have to set an evaluation system for academic staff ensuring academic staff view of their evaluation reports.

The academic staff has to engage more with their students beyond the lectures' hall in their field of study and extracurricular activities, besides fostering students to learn and give them the guidance needed and aid them in applying the practice for their educational materials and courses. It is crucial too for academic staff to encourage students to share their ideas, to be initiative, to participate in classroom discussions; they should teach students to learn, and to help them being more creative and critical thinking. Academic staff must take into consideration using different methods in assessing students like quizzes, research papers' preparation, multiple choice tests, and others.

Proficiency in foreign languages has to be given a master in all disciplines, it is not sufficient to study the curricula in only the mother tongue, it has to come at the forefront of the skills that the higher education institutions to be concerned with besides computers and internet skillfulness. There is still lack of practical skills in new graduates, lack of experience and efficiency, lack of 'soft skills' like communication, negotiation, team work, flexibility, loyalty, problem solving, and accountability.

Eventually, there must be an information center for higher education policy making and analysis in each institution; the center must make use of the whole information systems for the institution, to measure the service quality periodically to provide policy makers and analysts timely and accurate data and information that are useful in making sound higher education policy decisions in quality. It has to be a leader in coordinating the collection of desired missing data and information that are crucial for higher education policy analysis.

8. REFERENCES

Altbach, P. (2006). The Dilemmas of Ranking. International Higher Education. Center for International Higher Education. Boston College. Vol. 42 Winter. Retrieved from http://www.bc.edu/content/bc/research/cihe/about/pga/IHEarticles.html

Argyris, C. & Schön, D. (1974). Theory in Practice: Increasing Professional Effectiveness. Jossey-Bass Inc. San Francisco. CA 94104. Retrieved from ED344506

Bauer, M. & Henkel, M (1997). Tertiary Education and Management. Responses of Academe to Quality Reforms in Higher Education: A Comparative Study of England and Sweden. Vol.3. No.3 (pp.211-228).

Cartwright, M. (2007). The rhetoric and reality of "quality" in Higher Education. An investigation into staff perceptions of quality in post-1992 universities. Quality Assurance in Education, Vol.15 Iss: 3 (pp.287-301). DOI: 10.1108/09684880710773174.

Coaldrake, P. & Stedman, L. (1999). Academic work in the twenty-first century: changing roles and policies. Occasional paper Series. Australian Higher Education Division. Department of Education. Training and Youth Affairs. Canberra. Retrieved from http://www.google.com.eg/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&frm=1&source=web&cd=1&sqi=2&ved=0CB0QFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.colorado.edu%2Fgeography%2Fgfda%2Fresources%2Flifelongdevelopment%2Facademicworkin21c.pdf&ei=B5ZMUK75Jeec0AWh6IFA&usg=AFQjCNGzNCRsf8a3NsrTh0q7EKcUottDHQ&sig2=sZaNnL5KAbUAkTVlngB9Cg

Cullen, Joyce, Hassall & Broadbent (2003). Quality in higher education: From monitoring to management. Quality Assurance in Education. Vol. 11, Iss: 1 (pp. 5 – 14). DOI: 10.1108/09684880310462038.

Fahim, Yasmine and Sami, Noha. (2011). Adequacy, efficiency and equity of higher education financing: The case of Egypt. UNESCO.

Faranak Khodayari and Behnaz Khodayari. (2011). Service Quality in Higher Education - Case study: Measuring service quality of Islamic Azad University, Firoozkooh branch. Interdisciplinary Journal of Research in Business. Vol. 1. Iss: 9 (pp.38- 46).

Feldman, K.A. (1976). Grades and college students' Assessments of their courses and teachers. Research in Higher Education. Vol. 4.

Feldman, K.A. (1976b). The superior college teacher from the students' view. Research in Higher Education. Vol.5 (pp.243-288).

Feldman, K.A. (1989). The association between student ratings of specific instructional dimensions and student achievement: Refining and extending the Synthesis of data from multisection validity studies. Research in Higher Education. Vol.30 (pp.583- 645).

Franklin, L. (1992). Quality and equality: the case of East Birmingham College. Journal of Further and Higher Education. Vol.16, Iss: 2 (pp.34-40).

Gamal Eldin, Engi. (2010). Analytical Report to View Disaggregated Indicators Measuring the Views of Academic Staff on Higher Education Issues in Egypt. The Egyptian Cabinet Information and Decision Support Center. Retrieved from http://higheducation.idsc.gov.eg/Front/en/publishings_details.aspx?publishing_id=613

Gamal Eldin, Engi. (2011). Analytical Report to View Disaggregated Indicators Measuring the Views of Business Owners on Labor Market Requirements and Consistency of Higher Education in Egypt. The Egyptian Cabinet Information and Decision Support Center. Retrieved from http://higheducation.idsc.gov.eg/Front/en/publishings_details.aspx?publishing_id=612

Gamal Eldin, Engi. & Kamal, Mahmoud. (2011). Analytical Report to View Disaggregated Indicators Measuring the Views of Students on Higher Education Issues in Egypt (in Arabic). The Egyptian Cabinet Information and Decision Support Center. Retrieved from http://higheducation.idsc.gov.eg/Front/en/publishings_details.aspx?publishing_id=951

Harvey, L. and Green, D. (1993). Defining quality, Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education. Vol. 18, Iss. 1.

Harvey, L. (1995). Editorial, Quality in Higher Education, Vol 1.

Harvey, L. (2002). The End of Quality?, Quality in Higher Education. Vol. 8. No. 1.

Hativa, N., Barak, R. and Simhi E. (2001). Exemplary University Teachers: Knowledge and Beliefs Regarding Effective Teaching Dimension and Strategies. The Journal of Higher Education. Vol.72 (pp.699-729).

Hau, H. (1996). Teaching Quality Improvement by Quality Improvement in Teaching. Quality Engineering. Vol.9, Iss.1 (pp.77-94).

Marsh, H.W. (1987). Students' Assessment of university teaching: research findings, methodological issues and directions for future research. International Journal of Educational Research. Vol.11 (pp.255- 378).

Marton F. and Säljö R. (1976). On qualitative differences in learning, outcome and process. British Journal of Educational Psychology Vol. 46 (pp.4-11)

M.A.T.K Munasinghe & U.A.H.A Rathnasiri (2010). Quality in Higher Education: What say the undergraduates?. Retreived from http://www.kln.ac.lk/uokr/ICBI2010/13.pdf

M Galukande, HJM van Berkel and I Wolfhagen. 2009. Developing a Tool for Measuring Quality of Medical Education. Education for Health, Volume 22. Iss: 2. Retreieved from http://www.educationforhealth.net/

Newton, J. (2000). Feeding the beast or improving quality? Academics' perception of quality assurance and quality monitoring. Quality in Higher Education. Vol.6 Iss: 2 (pp.153 -162).

Nicholson, Karen. (2011). Quality Assurance in Higher Education: A review of the literature. Council of Ontario Universities Degree Level Expectations Project, McMaster University.

OECD and World Bank (2010). Reviews of National Policies for Education: Higher Education in Egypt. OECD Publishing.

Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V.A. & Berry, L.L. (1985). A conceptual model of service quality and its implications for future research. Journal of Marketing, Vol. 49, (pp 41-50).

Parri, Jane (2006). Quality in Higher Education. SCHOLARLY JOURNAL MANAGEMENT / VADYBA. 2006 m. Nr. 2(11).

Radloff, A. (2004) Decentralized approaches to education development: supporting quality teaching and learning from within a faculty, in Education Development and leadership in Higher Education. Kim Fraser (ed)

Sabry, Manar. (2010). Foreign Language Instructed Programs in Public Universities in Egypt: Implications for Resource Diversification, quality and Equity in Higher Education. PhD Dissertation - Comparative and Global Studies in Education Foundations. Department of Educational Leadership and Policy State, University of New York, Buffalo.

Schönwetter D.J, Clifton R.A. and Perry, R.P. (2002). Content familiarity: Differential Impact of Effective Teaching on Student Achievement Outcomes. Research in Higher Education. Vol.43, Iss:6.

Shulman, L.S. (1987). Knowledge and Teaching: Foundations of the New Reform. Harvard Educational Review. Vol.57 (pp. 1-22).

Skelton, A. (2005). Understanding Teaching Excellence in Higher Education - Towards a critical approach. Routledge, Oxon.

Skelton, A. (2007). Excellent idea in theory. Times Higher Education Supplement, 16 November.

Stefan, L., Roxana, S.H. & Leitner, M. (2004). Examination of the dimensions of quality in higher education. Journal of Quality Assurance in Education. Vol. 12(2) (pp 61-69).

Tam, M. (2001). Measuring Quality and Performance in Higher Education. Quality in Higher Education. Vol 7 Iss: 1.

Telford, R. & Masson, R. 2005. The congruence of quality values in higher education. Quality Assurance in Education. Vol. 13(2) (pp 1000-1009).

UNICEF (2000). Defining quality in Education. A paper presented by UNICEF at the meeting of the international Working Group on Education Florence. Working Paper Series. Education Section, Programme Division, United Nations Children's Fund. New York. USA.

Van Rossum, E.J. & Schenk, S.M. (1984). The relationship between learning conception, study strategy and learning outcome. British Journal of Educational Psychology. Vol.54 (pp.73-83).

Wahlen, S. (1998). Is there a Scandinavian Model of Education of higher Education? Higher Education Management. Vol 10 Iss: 3.

Watty, K. (2003). When will Academics Learn about Quality? Quality in Higher Education. Vol. 9 Iss: 3.

Webbstock, D. (1999). An evaluative look at the model used in the assessment of teaching quality at the University of Natal, South Africa: reflections rewards and reconsiderations. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education. Vol. 24 Iss: 2.

World Bank. (1994). Higher education: Lessons of experience. Washington. DC: The World Bank.