

# DIFFERENCES IN INTERNAL MARKETING DIMENSIONS IN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS OF PUNJAB: PUBLIC VS. PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES

Reetika Sharma

Assistant Professor, PG Department of Commerce and Business Administration, BBK DAV College for Women, Amritsar, Punjab

---

## ABSTRACT

This study examines differences in internal marketing dimensions between public and private higher education institutions (HEIs) in Punjab as perceived by faculty members. Using an independent sample *t*-test, data from 600 faculty participants (296 public, 304 private) were analysed across eight dimensions: Internal Communication, Internal Market Research, Training and Development, Psychological Factors, HR Rewards, Empowerment, Vision, and Sociological Factors. The findings reveal significant differences in all dimensions except Psychological Factors. Private HEIs performed better in Internal Communication, Training and Development, Empowerment, Vision, and Sociological Factors, while public HEIs showed stronger performance in Internal Market Research and HR Rewards. No significant difference was found in Psychological Factors, suggesting similar faculty perceptions across institution types. The study concludes that institutional structure and operational culture significantly shape internal marketing practices in Punjab's HEIs.

Originality/ Values- The uniqueness of the study is in its emphasis on the higher education landscape of Punjab, along with an empirical contrast between public and private HEIs, utilizing faculty perceptions and statistical evaluation.

**Keywords-** Internal Marketing (IM), Employee Job Satisfaction (EJS), Higher Education Institutions (HEI's), Human Resource Effectiveness (HRE), Job Satisfaction (JS), Human Resource Management (HRM), Private Higher Education Institutions (PHEI's), All India Survey on Higher Education (AISHE), Higher Education (HE), Performance Related Practices (PRP).

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Upon comparing as to how private and public sector higher education institutions operate differently, some factors come into picture. Various elements like training, briefings, group meetings and orientations, vision, core values, internal communication and reward determine the normative, affective and continuous commitment of faculty working in the HEIs. The faculty's working experience and variation of public and private HEIs are also likely to influence the faculty's commitment towards the HEIs (Anwer et al., 2020). Internal marketing not only enhances faculty's job satisfaction but also increases the overall competitive advantage of the institution by developing a significant employee-employer relationship. Hence, resilient internal marketing helps in generating favorable attitudes in existing and possible faculty.

In the present study an attempt has been made to find the importance of different IM dimensions namely Psychological Factors, Internal Communication, Internal Market Research, Training and Development, HR Rewards, Empowerment, Vision and Sociological Factors through differences in private sector or public sector HEIs in India (Butt et al., 2020).

## 2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Ewing and Caruana (1999) examined IM is an important antecedent to HRE (Human Resource Effectiveness). Data from 135 respondents was collected from Australian public sector through mails to heads of government departments in Queensland, Victoria and Western Australia. Moderated regression analysis depicted the important role of IM in fostering effective human resource management and IM is an important antecedent to HRE. An interface between marketing and HRE (Human Resource Effectiveness) is recommended to co-ordinate functional strategies, thereby facilitating effective overall corporate strategy implementation and ultimate organizational performance.

Judson et al. (2008) attempted to assess the clarity of university brand messages within institutions, university commitment to the brand, and the effectiveness of internal branding promotional methods targeting administrators. The survey instrument used for the purpose of the study was based broadly upon the work of Aurand, Gorchels, and Bishop (2005). The on-line survey instrument was developed and made available to university administrators across the United States. The survey was sent to 2,619 individual university administrators namely Chief Admissions Officer, Associate Admissions Officer, Enrolment Management, Financial Aid Registrar, etc. university via e-mail. Response of 343 respondents was received. The study suggested internal brand communications effectiveness should be enhanced both in public and private universities. Brochures were considered the most frequently used means of communication.

Shima and George (2014) wanted to find the intricacies between variables namely IM, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behaviour and organizational performance. Issues like internal communication, involvement of academicians, degree of cooperation between university principal management and faculty and the various motivational programs that university organizes for their faculty were focused. For this purpose, different private Albanian HEIs were selected and the data from persons in charge with marketing activities using individual interview method was taken. It was portrayed that there exists poor communication culture between the head office and the staff. The universities dealing in HE did not have a marketing department and a high level of academic staff turnover was seen among the academic staff. As far as motivational programs are concerned, a part from financial remuneration there were no other motivational policies in the private HEIs. It has been concluded that HEIs should make efforts to bring coordination between administration staff and faculty members.

Bello et al. (2017) wanted to know the level of JS between academic staff in private and public tertiary institutions in Nigeria. The sample of the study comprised of 120 academic staff members including 88 members from a public university and 32 members from a private university within Kwara state, Nigeria. JS was measured by recognition, pay and working condition. The data for the purpose of the study was collected with the help of a questionnaire. Independent “t” test was performed to find out the difference in JS level of the private and the public sector HEIs. The result also showed that the academic staff in private universities had better working conditions, better payment package, got more recognition for their job.

Halid et al. (2024) wanted to know the intention of employees to stay in private HEIs (PHEIs) with a focus on the relationship between the perceived practices of human resource management (HRM) and the intention to remain at Malaysia’s PHEIs. Data from 323 lecturers working at PHEIs in Malaysia was collected for the study. Results of the study

revealed that recruitment and selection; training and development; and rewards and recognition all had a meaningful relationship with the intention to stay.

### 3. OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

The main objective of the study is:

- To examine the differences in internal marketing dimensions between public and private higher education institutions as perceived by the faculty.

### 4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter deals with the data base and research methodology corresponding with the requirement of the study. The population comprises of all the faculty members teaching in the public and private universities in Punjab. According to AISHE (All India Survey on Higher Education) report 2019-20, there were 9 state public universities and 15 state private universities in Punjab. Out of these, the Universities offering courses in four major fields namely humanities, commerce, science and engineering were shortlisted. Thereafter, the oldest universities from amongst the shortlisted universities were chosen, 3 each from both the public and private sector. The data was collected from the faculty members working in these HEIs with university status in Punjab namely Panjab University, Chandigarh; Punjabi University, Patiala; Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar in the Public Sector and Lovely Professional University, Phagwara; Sri Guru Granth Sahib World University, Fatehgarh Sahib and Chandigarh University, Chandigarh in the Private Sector. The present study draws its sample from the faculty, teaching in these HEIs. As a result, total 6 universities, 3 public and 3 private universities were selected as shown in table 1.1.

**Table 1.1: List of Selected Universities**

<b>PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES</b>	<b>PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES</b>
• Panjab University, Chandigarh	• Lovely Professional University, Phagwara
• Punjabi University, Patiala	• Sri Guru Granth Sahib World University, Fatehgarh Sahib
• Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar	• Chandigarh University, Chandigarh

A purposive/judgement-cum-snowball sampling technique was used to select the sample. Data was collected through personal interactions with faculty members using both online and offline modes between December 2019 and December 2020. A total of 500 questionnaires were distributed each to faculty members in public and private universities of Punjab. After excluding incomplete responses, the final sample comprised 600 faculty members, including 296 from public universities and 304 from private universities.

### 5. DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

#### **Hypothesis Analysis: Following hypotheses were framed:**

Hypotheses to find out if there is a significant difference in the internal marketing dimensions across HEIs i.e. public and private sector HEIs in Punjab.

**H<sub>01</sub>** : There is no significant difference between the internal marketing dimensions across HEIs i.e. public and private sector HEIs in Punjab with regard to the dimension 'Internal Communication'.

- H<sub>02</sub>** : There is no significant difference between the internal marketing dimensions across HEIs i.e. public and private sector HEIs in Punjab with regard to the dimension ‘Internal Market Research’.
- H<sub>03</sub>** : There is no significant difference between the internal marketing dimensions across HEIs i.e. public and private sector HEIs in Punjab with regard to the dimension ‘Training and Development’.
- H<sub>04</sub>** : There is no significant difference between the internal marketing dimensions across HEIs i.e. public and private sector HEIs in Punjab with regard to the dimension ‘Psychological Factors’.
- H<sub>05</sub>** : There is no significant difference between the internal marketing dimensions across HEIs i.e. public and private sector HEIs in Punjab with regard to the dimension ‘HR Rewards’.
- H<sub>06</sub>** : There is no significant difference between the internal marketing dimensions across HEIs i.e. public and private sector HEIs in Punjab with regard to the dimension ‘Empowerment’.
- H<sub>07</sub>** : There is no significant difference between the internal marketing dimensions across HEIs i.e. public and private sector HEIs in Punjab with regard to the dimension ‘Vision’.
- H<sub>08</sub>** : There is no significant difference between the internal marketing dimensions across HEIs i.e. public and private sector HEIs in Punjab with regard to the dimension ‘Sociological Factors’.

**Table 1.2: Group Statistics (n=600)**

Basis	University	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
<i>Internal Communication</i>	Public	296	12.5574	6.08444	.35365
	Private	304	15.2829	5.53586	.31750
<i>Internal Market Research</i>	Public	296	16.6250	6.77667	.39389
	Private	304	14.9868	6.48938	.37219
<i>Training and Development</i>	Public	296	12.8514	4.93052	.28658
	Private	304	16.6118	5.64055	.32351
<i>Psychological Factors</i>	Public	296	16.9155	4.40527	.25605
	Private	304	16.5757	4.72206	.27083
<i>HR Rewards</i>	Public	296	14.9595	5.63509	.32753
	Private	304	13.1875	5.28099	.30289
<i>Empowerment</i>	Public	296	7.9527	3.77563	.21945
	Private	304	11.3914	4.18642	.24011
<i>Vision</i>	Public	296	8.8919	2.84190	.16518
	Private	304	9.4638	3.07529	.17638
<i>Sociological Factors</i>	Public	296	9.2027	3.99315	.23210
	Private	304	12.9408	3.79201	.21749

Table 1.2 presents descriptive statistics for 600 HEIs, comprising 296 public and 304 private institutions. Private sector HEIs reported higher mean scores in Internal Communication (15.28 vs. 12.56), Training and Development (16.61 vs. 12.85), Empowerment (11.39 vs. 7.95), Vision (9.46 vs. 8.89), and Sociological Factors (12.94 vs. 9.20) compared to public HEIs. Conversely, public sector HEIs showed higher mean scores in Internal Market Research (16.63 vs. 14.99), Psychological Factors (16.92 vs. 16.58) and HR Rewards (14.96 vs. 13.19).

**Table 1.3: Independent Samples t Test (n=600)**

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means							
		F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Decision about Null Hypothesis	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
										Lower	Upper
<b>Internal Communication</b>	Equal variances assumed	10.821	.001	-5.742	598	.000	<b>Reject</b>	-2.72546	.47467	-3.65768	-1.79324
	Equal variances not assumed			-5.735	589.400	.000	<b>Reject</b>	-2.72546	.47527	-3.65888	-1.79204
<b>Internal Market Research</b>	Equal variances assumed	.913	.340	3.025	598	.003	<b>Reject</b>	1.63816	.54160	.57448	2.70183
	Equal variances not assumed			3.023	595.086	.003	<b>Reject</b>	1.63816	.54192	.57386	2.70246
<b>Training and Development</b>	Equal variances assumed	2.075	.150	-8.686	598	.000	<b>Reject</b>	-3.76049	.43296	-4.61080	-2.91018
	Equal variances not assumed			-8.701	591.200	.000	<b>Reject</b>	-3.76049	.43219	-4.60930	-2.91168

	assumed										
<b>Psychological Factors</b>	Equal variances assumed	6.701	.010	.911	598	.363	<b>Accept</b>	.33988	.37305	-.39277	1.07253
	Equal variances not assumed			.912	596.913	.362	<b>Accept</b>	.33988	.37271	-.39209	1.07186
<b>HR Rewards</b>	Equal variances assumed	1.463	.227	3.975	598	.000	<b>Reject</b>	1.77196	.44573	.89658	2.64734
	Equal variances not assumed			3.972	593.039	.000	<b>Reject</b>	1.77196	.44611	.89580	2.64811
<b>Empowerment</b>	Equal variances assumed	2.402	.122	-10.557	598	.000	<b>Reject</b>	-3.43874	.32573	-4.07847	-2.79902
	Equal variances not assumed			-10.571	594.536	.000	<b>Reject</b>	-3.43874	.32529	-4.07760	-2.79989
<b>Vision</b>	Equal variances assumed	5.535	.019	-2.364	598	.018	<b>Reject</b>	-.57192	.24191	-1.04701	-.09684
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.367	596.380	.018	<b>Reject</b>	-.57192	.24165	-1.04651	-.09733
<b>Sociological Factors</b>	Equal variances assumed	.030	.863	-11.760	598	.000	<b>Reject</b>	-3.73809	.31785	-4.36233	-3.11384

	Equal varia nces not assu med			- 11.7 52	594. 355	.000	<b>Reject</b>	- 3.7380 9	.31807	- 4.362 77	- 3.113 41
<b>Note: Results significant at 5% level of significance. *p &lt;0.05;n=600</b>											

## 5.1 ANALYSIS OF INDEPENDENT SAMPLE T TEST

Table 1.3 explains that there exists significant differences between the internal marketing dimensions across HEIs i.e. public and private sector HEIs in Punjab except the dimension Psychological Factors. With regards to all the dimensions namely Internal Communication (t= -5.735, p=.000\*), Internal Market Research (t=3.025, p=.003\*), Training and Development (t=-8.686, p=.000\*), HR Rewards (t=3.975, p=.000\*), Empowerment (t=-10.557, p=.000\*), Vision (t=-2.367, p=.018\*), Sociological Factors (t=-11.760, p= .000\*), null hypothesis were rejected. H<sub>01</sub>, H<sub>02</sub>, H<sub>03</sub>, H<sub>05</sub>, H<sub>06</sub>, H<sub>07</sub>,H<sub>08</sub> which hypothesized that exists no significant differences between the internal marketing dimensions (Internal Communication, Internal Market Research, Training and Development, HR Rewards, Empowerment, Vision, Sociological Factors) across HEIs i.e. public and private sector HEIs stands rejected. Therefore, the internal marketing dimensions across HEIs i.e. public and private sector HEIs in Punjab are different as far as the dimensions Internal Communication, Internal Market Research, Training and Development, HR Rewards, Empowerment, Vision, Sociological Factors are concerned.

As far as the dimensions Internal Market Research and HR Rewards are concerned, table indicates the faculty of public sector HEIs are of the opinion that internal market research activities and reward packages are better in their universities as compared to the private sector HEIs (since the mean for the Internal Market Research (16.6250, 14.9868) and HR and Rewards (14.9595, 13.1875) are higher in case of public sector HEIs). This may be due to seniority/time based reward system in public universities which are not based on performance related practices (PRP). Contrary to the popular belief that private universities are paying better rewards, a study by (Nyanhete and Bhebhe, 2014) revealed that rewards are better in public. Similar results were reported by (Nazir, et al., 2013; Bello et al., 2017). Internal Market Research is indeed more prevalent in public sector HEIs than in private sector HEIs. Difference may exists as public sector HEIs often rely on government funding, which requires them to conduct market research to understand the needs of their stakeholders, including students, employers, and the broader community. Public sector HEIs are accountable to the government and the public, so they need to demonstrate their impact and effectiveness through market research and analysis. Public sector HEIs have a social mandate to serve the broader public interest, which includes conducting research that benefits society as a whole. In contrast, private sector HEIs tend to focus more on internal market research with respect to inform their business strategies, as their aim is to make profits and they are revenue oriented (Nyanhete and Bhebhe,2014).

The study on the other hand depicts that internal marketing dimensions namely Internal Communication, Training and Development, Empowerment, Vision and Sociological Factors are better in private sector HEIs than the public sector HEIs, since the mean for Internal Communication (12.5574, 15.2829), Training and Development (12.8514, 16.6118),

Empowerment (7.9527, 11.3914), Vision (8.8919, 9.4638) and Sociological Factors (9.2027, 12.9408) are higher in case of private sector HEIs).

Internal Communication is more in private universities as the present study also shows that role of sociological factors are more in private institutions. This may also be due to presence of less bureaucratic system with less layers of administrators in private universities that communication satisfaction is more (Khalid et al., 2012; Brennemann, 2018). Communication between staff and managers, was more satisfactory in private universities as it was perceived that there is lack of collegiality amongst staff and managers in public universities. (Khan et al., 2018). Results show that training is more in private universities as all private higher education institutions have their faculty development program in place. Faculty development program of private HEIs play “much” and have greater care for their status compared with the public universities (Muhallin, 2021).

Empowerment is more in private universities as there is less formal decision making and more flexible system (Nyanhete and Bhebhe, 2014; Farnham & Pimlott, 1995). This may be the reason that faculty feels free to innovate ideas and initiate plans on the board. The results are same as (Kolaci, 2014; Afande, 2015). As far as reason for more sociological factors in private universities are concerned, it might be there is more interaction among peer groups and they believe in doing work in a group. System is less bureaucratic and flexible leading to trust and bond among faculty members in private universities (Nazir et al., 2013) also revealed the same findings. Private universities faculty are well versed with the vision with which the organisation was set up. They are known about the vision well as the reason may be private universities are revenue oriented and pay to faculty on their performance basis. (Farnham & Pimlott, 1995; Nyanhete and Bhebhe, 2014). (Ozdem, 2011) also found that managers of public sector institutions tend to think and act with short-term considerations, fail to differentiate their organization from others, and overall, have difficulties in strategic planning and developing mission and vision statements. It was also revealed that there is lack of awareness of vision and mission in public universities by (Ojokuku & Akanbi, 2015).

As regards the dimension Psychological Factors, no significant differences were found between the internal marketing dimensions across public and private sector HEIs in Punjab. Psychological Factors are more closely tied to individual experiences, personalities, and perception towards workplace dynamics, level of autonomy they experience than to the institution's public or private status (Issac et al., 2023). The psychological factors tend to be more universal and less dependent on the institution's public or private status.

## 6. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, it was seen from the results that faculty members perceive that HR Rewards and Internal market research are more in public than private universities. Further, faculty members feel that Empowerment, Sociological Factors, Vision, Internal Communication and Training and Development are more in private than public universities. While there are no significant differences in Psychological Factors across public and private HEIs, with regard to perception about other internal marketing dimensions, it's worth noting that some differences in internal marketing dimensions between public and private HEIs may arise due to variations in public sector HEIs and private sector HEIs like bureaucratic culture comprising formal decision making leading to less flexibility, emphasis on serving public interest, caution in adopting new strategies or initiatives in public sector HEIs and focus on revenue growth, flexibility, encouragement of innovation in private sector HEIs. Therefore, it can be concluded from this chapter that there are significant differences in internal marketing dimensions (HR Rewards, Internal Market Research, Empowerment, Sociological Factors,

Vision, Internal Communication and Training and Development) in public and private HEIs except Psychological Factors.

## REFERENCES

1. Afande, F.O. (2015). Factors Affecting Internal Marketing in Public Universities in Kenya (A Case of Dedan Kimathi University of Technology), *Journal of Marketing and Consumer Research*, 9, 35-48.
2. AISHE Report (2019-20). Number of state Public Universities were 9 and state private universities were 15. Retrieved from: <https://aishe.gov.in/aishe-final-report/>
3. Anwer, M., Hussain, S., & Abbas, Z. (2020). Internal branding in higher education: what effects commitment of faculty. *New Horiz*, 14(2), 199.
4. Aurand, T. W., Gorchels, L., & Bishop, T. R. (2005). Human resource management's role in internal branding: an opportunity for cross-functional brand message synergy. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 14(3), 163-169.
5. Bello, A. O., Ogundipe, O. M., & Eze, S. C. (2017). Employee job satisfaction in Nigerian tertiary institution: a comparative study of academic staff in public and private universities. *Global Journal of Human Resource Management*, 5(4), 33-46.
6. Brennemann, C. (2018). *Internal Communication and Culture of Enrollment Management at Small, Private Christian University* (Doctoral dissertation, Regent University).
7. Butt, A., Lodhi, R. N., & Shahzad, M. K. (2020). Staff retention: a factor of sustainable competitive advantage in the higher education sector of Pakistan. *Studies in Higher Education*, 45(8), 1584-1604.
8. Ewing, M. T., & Caruana, A. (1999). An internal marketing approach to public sector management: the marketing and human resources interface. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 12(1), 17-29.
9. Farnham, D. and Pimlott, J. (1995). *Understanding Industrial Relations* (5th ed.). London: Cassell Educational Ltd.
10. Halid, H., Kee, D. M. H., & Rahim, N. F. A. (2024). Perceived human resource management practices and intention to stay in private higher education institutions in Malaysia: the role of organizational citizenship behaviour. *Global Business Review*, 25(1), 162-179
11. Isaac, J., Janani, N., Bhandwalkar, S.S., Kumar, R. & Jha, S. (2023), Psychological Factors Influencing Job Satisfaction: A Comprehensive Review, *Journal of Harbin Engineering University*, 1900-1908.
12. Judson, K. M., Aurand, T. W., Gorchels, L., & Gordon, G. L. (2008). Building a university brand from within: University administrators' perspectives of internal branding. *Services Marketing Quarterly*, 30(1), 54-68.
13. Khalid, S., Irshad, M. Z., & Mahmood, B. (2012). Job satisfaction among academic staff: A comparative analysis between public and private sector universities of Punjab, Pakistan. *International journal of Business and Management*, 7(1), 126.
14. Khan, N., Aajiz, N. M., & Ali, A. (2018). Comparison of Management Practices in Public and Private Universities in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. *Journal of Education and Educational Development*, 5(1), 108-122.
15. Kolaci, F. (2014). The dimensions of internal communication and the engagement of the employees in the decision making process in the Albanian education sector.
16. Muhallin, E. M. (2021). Best practices of private higher education institutions in region 02 along faculty development program: Bases for policy review and development. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Management and Social Sciences*, 10(4), 184-214.
17. Nazir, T., Khan, S. U. R., Shah, S. F. H., & Zaman, K. (2013). Impact of rewards and compensation on job satisfaction: Public and private universities of UK. *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research*, 14(3), 394-403.
18. Nyanhete, T., & Bhebhe, M. (2014). Factors impacting on reward systems: A comparative study between public and private universities in Zimbabwe. *Journal of Sustainable Development*, 7(5), 150-161.
19. Ojokuku, R. M., & Akanbi, F. K. (2015). Strategic human resource management practices and performance in Nigerian public universities. *Journal of Resources Development and Management*, 10(4), 221-247.
20. Ozdem, G. (2011). An analysis of the mission and vision statements on the strategic plans of higher education institutions. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice*, 11(4), 1887-1894.
21. Shima, B., & George, B. (2014). Strategies for the development of internal marketing orientation in the private high education institutions in Albania. *Academic journal of interdisciplinary studies*, 3(3), 393-393.