

# **Assessing the Level of Learning: A comparative study of private verses government college teachers in Pakistan**

Asif Shahzad

---

## **Author(s) Biography**

**Asif Shahzad** is MS Scholar at National University of Modern Languages Faisalabad

**ABSTRACT:** *The purpose of this paper is to analyze the factors and to check the impact of climate of private college on the learning of teachers. The one objective of this research is to check the impact of climate of government and private colleges on the learning of teachers. The population is the number of teachers available in the city of Faisalabad. Technique of random sampling is use to withdraw a representative sample. The sample size was selected of 30 teachers of private college both male and female and 30 from government colleges. A structured questionnaire is prepared for the collection of data. Furthermore compare mean is use for the reliability of the analysis.*

**Keywords:** private colleges, Government College Teachers, level of learning, Pakistan

---

**N**ow a day private college is the great learning institutions. So in the quest of learning this paper is written to know that our teachers learning from the colleges. The learning in the colleges of the teachers divides into four categories according to the tool provided by GARVIN. (a) How teacher learning effect by the leadership (b) how teacher learning effect of the process learning (c) how teachers learning effect of the supporting learning of the organization.

Leadership is a very important factor, which affects all other factors. The word of leader used by top management and they start all changes (Senge 1999). Leaders can align their team member's values, efficiency, goal, and team identification (Bass & Riggio 2006). For the high dynamic context, leadership is positively related (De Hoogh et al 2005).

Organizational units prepare independent actions for the sake of confront of environment (Orton & Weick, 1990). Business groups adapted organizational structure in which individuals poorly coordinate with their common owner (Yiu, Lu, Bruton & Hoskisson, 2007).

In higher education, it is see that academies are not fully prepared according to teachers, no conception of teaching, very low knowledge (Evers & Hall, 2009). In the quest of learning, there is a little problem in academic development, educational development and faculty development (Gosling, 2009).

In the first part of the paper, include introduction in which we discuss about the problems faced by the government students compare with the private college students the significance and objective of the study. The second part is concerned with the previous studies relating to this paper. In the third part, we give a theoretical framework. Four fifth and sixth parts include the methodologies, data analysis and conclusion respectively.

### Significance of Study

Many research papers had written on that issue but there no any significant study that clearly tells about the learning of teachers in private and government colleges. Private college teachers are very loyal and competent in their work as compare to other units of the organization. A teacher is the person who teaches the new generation that they can compete in the professional life. The study told us that how teachers face problem in learning and how the leadership, environment and process make hurdles in their learning and how they manage these in Pakistan because Pakistan is not a developed country so we cannot say anything without any results.

### Objective of Study

- To examine the significant effect of leadership on learning about colleges
- To examine the significant effect of the learning process on learning about colleges
- To examine significant effect of supportive learning on learning at colleges.
- To examine overall effect of learning organization on learning about colleges.

### Literature Review

A lot of researchers said that suitable leadership differs according to context (De Hoogh, Den Hartog, & Koopman, 2005; Ensley, Pearce, & Hmieleski, 2006). Leaders behave in the last several decades in sound contexts (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Den Hartog, House, Hanges, Ruiz-Quintanilla, & Dorfman, 1999). Leadership enhanced a lot of characteristics of individuals such as provide vision, motivation for achieving the performance, direction, team working and intellectual stimulation (Dionne et al., 2004). Employees of any type of organization are encouraging through environment and they learn from that environment (Garvin, 1985). Garvin told three main learning pillars, which are supportive learning, concentrate learning process and leadership. These pillars also use separately to check the learning of the organization (Garvin 2008).

Garvin (2004) is defining the supportive learning is a culture in which the learning is shared through experience. The main point is to learn from the environment and transfer it. It is the practice and process study. In the next phase he said that why our culture need learning. It is because the competition, business complexity and globalization. Knowledge is first required to do any business (David A. Garvin 2004).

In team leadership it is stated that the leaders directly affect on the performance of the team working under ladders (Bass, Avolio, Jung, & Berson, 2003; Burke et al., 2006). The effected team performance by the leaders is consistence difference criteria of performance (Wang et al., 2011). Leadership is more effective when there is turbulence, instability and uncertainty in the environment (Waldman & Yammarino, 1999). Performance of team and leadership interlinked with the trust (Jung & Avolio, 2000).

May be the lack of learning in organizations because of new entrance of people and lack of investment, which is spend on the recruiters and their training programs (Luthans et al., 2006; Uhlmann & Cohen, 2007). When

the social programs designed, the managers provide their extra effort for the help of their subsidiary managers and employees (Sohn, 1994; Tolbert, 1988).

The organization needs such type of leaders which are supportive nature, including monitoring and coaching their subordinates rather than directive leaders. The caring style of leadership who trust their team members (Yukl, 1989) and organizations are categories in different cultures (Erdogan et al., 2006). Individual performance is directly relates to the relationship of employees and leaders (Elkins & Keller, 2003).

Efforts increase institutional practices to understand the how and why the organization learns from their environment and conduct new practices in the development of organizational studies (Lounsbury, 2008; Lounsbury & Crumley, 2007). The literature told us that there is a shortage of programs based on organizational process. The first one is the emphasized of local action and practical processes are turned into organizational studies thus we shaped organizational practices into Social learning processes (Chapman, Cooper & Miller, 2009) or at high level entities (Salvato & Rerup, 2011). The routines are changed for working in organizations and it is divided between individuals and other units with the help of learning' (Becker, Lazaric, Nelson & Winter, 2005, p. 778).

The developments of faculty have a great impact on the learning knowledge, attitude, and teacher's internal skills (Steinert et al., 2006). The effectiveness of faculty must help to explore knowledge, which helps in learning and lecture delivery Nasmith and Steinert (2001). The educational program compelling teachers to create knowledge rather than conveying (Stigmar 2008). The change in learning of teachers engages faculty that they involve in the process of learning and clarify their learning and teaching (Lueddeke, 2003) and include that change in learning in teaching (McAlpine & Weston, 2000).the teachers learn from their teaching practices and include a learning assessment (Middendorf, 2004).

### Hypothesis

**Hypothesis 1:** Private and government colleges are not equally learn from leadership

**Hypothesis 2:** Private and government colleges are not equally learn from supportive learning.

**Hypothesis 3:** Private and government colleges have not equally learned from the learning process.

### Methodology

The population consists of all teachers working in private and government colleges in Faisalabad. A quantitative technique used to conduct that study. Structured questionnaire tool of Garvin was use to collect data. The toolkit of David A. Garvin is consist of 60 variables but in this research we only use 36 independent variables, which are scale and are fill by 60 respondents. SPSS was use for interpretation of data. The impact of leadership, the environment and the learning process were check on learning with the help of comparative mean analysis.

### Results

In first table, we see the comparative means of twelve variables, which are describe supportive learning according the toolkit of David A. Garvin. We use five scale one for strongly agree and five for strongly disagree. Mean of most variables of private college are less than the government college means that the government colleges are learn less from environment.

Table 1 Mean values for Govt. and Pvt. Colleges

SR	Variables	Government	Private
1	In this college Freedom of expression	2.2333	2.0333
2	In this college Penalty for mistakes	2.3000	2.6333
3	In this college Discuss about problems	2.3000	2.2333
4	In this college Welcome different opinion	2.7667	2.8667
5	In this college Enhanced people saying	3.2000	2.7333
6	In this college Opinion handled	3.0333	2.4333
7	In this college People have a new idea	2.4333	2.1667
8	In this college Working in better ways	2.2333	2.1000
9	In this college Refuse new methods	2.9000	2.5333
10	In this college Time of work review	2.8333	2.5667
11	In this college Stress of people	2.7667	3.9333
12	In this college No time for reflection	2.8000	3.0333

In second phase, we compile these variables into one by using of compute variable technique in SPSS. Therefore, we see that the mean of supportive learning of private college teacher is less than government teachers

	information		
15	In this college decision according new knowledge	2.6667	2.6000
16	In this college post audits	3.0000	2.7000

	Government college	Private college
Mean	2.6500	2.6056

In second phase, we use 16 variables, which describe concentrate learning process in government and private college teachers. In this era, we use only those variables, which are concern in that research and skip other variables. Therefore, in the point it is also prove that the learning is more in private college rather than government colleges by using the toolkit of Garvin. We saw table no three in which the results are against the government colleges.

SR	Variables	Government	Private
1	In this college Adaptation of experiments	2.9667	2.4333
2	In this college Experiments are frequent	2.9667	2.5333
3	In this college formal experiments	2.5000	2.4667
4	In this college data collection according trend	2.6667	2.6667
5	In this college comparison of performance with competitors	2.4333	2.2333
6	In this college productive conflicts	3.0333	2.9333
7	In this college divergent view of discussion	2.5667	2.3000
8	In this college people say freely	2.6333	2.9333
9	In this college assumption effect decision	2.8333	2.7667
10	In this college training of new people	3.2000	2.6000
11	In this college old employ get trained	3.4667	3.2333
12	In this college training is valued	3.1667	2.6000
13	In this college learn from each others	2.9000	2.5333
14	In this college share of	3.0667	2.7333

Result shows that govt. teachers are more efficient when putted in learning process

	Government College	Private College
Mean	2.8792	2.6417

In third phase, we see that there is more involvement of leaders than government college leaders. Therefore, we get eight variables from toolkit of Garvin and prove that the learning form leader is better in private colleges. The results shown in table number five.

SR	Variables	Government	Private
1	In this college principal learn from others	2.9000	2.6667
2	In this college principal ask problems	2.8667	2.8000
3	In this college principal acknowledge their knowledge	2.8333	2.8333
4	In this college principal listen carefully	3.2333	2.5667
5	In this college principal encourage view points	2.9000	2.6000
6	In this college principal provide resources	2.9333	2.7000
7	In this college principal criticize views	3.1667	2.8333
8	managers set limitations	2.6333	2.3333

We are proving that by using of compute variables to show the significant effect of leadership in government and private sector. In table number, six it is prove that the mean of private college is less than Government College.

	Government college	Private college
Mean	2.9333	2.6667

At last we prove this by using compute variable technique including all thirty six variables in SPSS that in private college overall learning is better than Government colleges .table number seven show that overall mean of learning organization in private colleges

is less than the government colleges which show the nearness to agree.

	Government college	Private college
Mean	2.8148	2.6352

### Conclusion

In this paper we find that the study is better in private sector is better than the government sectors. However, there are some limitations in this article which are

1. The number of respondents is not enough
2. Some of the respondents are non serious to fill the questionnaire
3. Some of variables are skipping from this article
4. Male and female not separately defined

### References

1. Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
2. Becker, M., Lazaric, N., Nelson, R. R., & Winter, S. G. (2005). Applying organizational routines in understanding organizational change. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 14, 775–791.
3. Chapman, C. S., Cooper, D. J., & Miller, P. B. (2009). Linking accounting, organizations, and institutions. In: C. S. Chapman, D. J. Cooper & P. B. Miller (Eds.), *Accounting, organizations, and institutions* (pp. 1–29).
4. De Hoogh, A. H. B., Den Hartog, D. N., & Koopman, P. L. (2005). Linking the Big Five-Factors of personality to charismatic and transactional leadership; perceived dynamic work environment as a moderator. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26, 839-865.
5. Dionne, S. D., Yammarino, F. J., Atwater, L. E., & Spangler, W. D. (2004). Transformational leadership and team performance. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 17, 177-193.
6. Elkins, T., & Keller, R. T. (2003). Leadership in research and development organizations: A literature review and conceptual framework. *Leadership Quarterly*, 14(4-5), 587-606.
7. Ensley, M. D., Pearce, C. L., & Hmieleski, K. M. (2006). The moderating effect of environmental dynamism on the relationship between entrepreneur leadership behavior and new venture performance. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 21, 243-263.
8. Erdogan, B., Liden, R. C., & Kraimer, M. L. (2006). Justice and leader-member exchange: The moderating role of organizational culture. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49, 395-406.
9. Garvin, D. (2004), Building A Learning Organization, Harvard Business Review
10. Garvin, D. A. (1985). Building a learning organization. *Org Dev & Trng, 6E (1ae)*, 274.
11. Garvin, D. A., Edmondson, A. C., & Gino, F. (2008). Is yours a learning organization? *Harvard Business Review*, 86(3), 109.
12. Halpin, S. M. (2006). What type of leadership behaviors are functional in teams? A meta-analysis. *Leadership Quarterly*, 17, 288-307.
13. Jung, D. I., & Avolio, B. J. (2000). Opening the black box: An experimental investigation of the mediating effects of trust and value congruence on transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21, 949-964.
14. Lounsbury, M. (2008). Institutional rationality and practice variation: new directions in the institutional analysis of practice. *Accounting, Organization and Society*, 33, 349–361.
15. Lounsbury, M., & Crumley, E. T. (2007). New practice creation: an institutional perspective on innovation. *Organization Studies*, 28, 993–1012.
16. Lueddeke, G. R. (2003). Professionalising teaching practice in higher education: A study of disciplinary variation and “teaching-scholarship.” *Studies in Higher Education*, 28, 213–228.
17. Luthans, F., Zhu, W., & Avolio, B. (2006). The impact of efficacy on work attitudes across cultures. *Journal of World Business*, 41(1), 121-132
18. McAlpine, L., & Weston, C. (2000). Reflection: Issues related to improving professors’ teaching and students’ learning. *Instructional Science*, 28, 363–385.
19. Middendorf, J. (2004). Facilitating a faculty learning community using the decoding the disciplines model. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 98, 95–107.
20. Nasmith, L., & Steinert, Y. (2001). The evaluation of a workshop to promote interactive lecturing. *Teaching and Learning in Medicine*, 13, 43–48.
21. Salvato, C., & Rerup, C. (2011). Beyond collective entities: multilevel research on organizational routines and capabilities. *Journal of Management*, 37, 468–490.
22. Steinert, Y., Mann, K., Centeno, A., Dolmans, D., Spencer, J., Gelula, M., & Prideaux, D. (2006). A systematic review of faculty development initiatives designed to improve teaching effectiveness in medical education. *Medical Teacher*, 28, 497–526.
23. Sohn, J. (1994). Social knowledge as a control system: Propositions and evidence from the Japanese FDI behavior. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 25, 295-324

24. Stigmar, M. (2008). Faculty development through an educational action programme. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 27, 107–120.
25. Tolbert, P. (1988). Institutional sources of organizational cultures in major law firms. In L. Zucker (Ed.), *Institutional patterns and organizations* (pp. 101-113).Uhlmann, E., & Cohen, G. (2007). I think it, therefore, it's true: Effects of self-perceived objectivity on hiring discrimination. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 104, 207-223.