

**Retrospect and Prospect of Private
Higher Education Provision in Africa**

**Proceedings of the 12th International
Conference on Private Higher Education in
Africa**

Organized By:

Research and Knowledge Management Office,

St. Mary's University

August 23, 2014

United Nations Conference Centre,

Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

Investigating students' preference for Private Higher Education in Zimbabwe

Evelyn Chiyevu GARWE

Zimbabwe Council for Higher Education (ZIMCHE), Zimbabwe

Email: garweec@gmail.com or ecgarwe@zimche.ac.zw

Abstract:

The study is aimed at investigating the critical factors considered by students when deciding to make private higher education institutions their institution of choice. The study uses a case study approach and draws data from all the six private higher education institutions in Zimbabwe. Self-administered questionnaires were given to students representing at least 5% of the student enrolment and representing all gender, study disciplines and levels of study from each university. Irrespective of gender, six main factors influencing student choice were identified to be, in order of priority: access and opportunity; promotional information and marketing; reference or influence by others; quality of teaching and learning; fees and cost structure, and finally academic reputation and recognition. The study has implications on the way private higher education institutions market, manage and sustain the quality of educational provision. The study therefore provides private institutions with useful and practical insights on what students want in their institution of choice. This will assist these institutions in strategizing in order to sustain or gain competitive advantage and to maximise on the increasing demand for private education. The study recognizes the critical role played by private universities in improving access and recommends African governments who face financial and resource constraints to fund and expand public universities to encourage private higher education as a meaningful and viable way to improve access and provide higher education opportunities to potential students. The study contributes to the current dearth of literature on factors influencing student choice to study with private institutions.

Keywords: Private higher education institutions; access and opportunity; marketing and promotion; student decision-making

1. Introduction

Although this study focuses on the Zimbabwean context, it is applicable to other countries given that all over the world, a significant number the students who are eligible to get admission into public institutions of higher education are willingly seeking admission in private institutions. This has resulted in tremendous and rapid growth of both the number of institutions as well as in enrolments in the private higher education sector. This development has been considered as an enigma by many people who perceive that private higher education institutions charge significantly higher fees (Jamil, 2012; Garwe, 2013) and are of lower quality when compared to public higher education institutions. This paradox can be attributed to the limited research on why students are making private higher education institutions their universities of choice. Pursuant to the aim of addressing the existing knowledge gap, the current study provides a research based analysis of the critical motivating factors considered by students who prefer to pursue their post-secondary studies in private institutions.

2. Development and expansion of private higher education

Although generally a worldwide phenomenal growth of the private higher education sector has been reported, the contribution of the sector varies from country to country. In Malaysia, Philippines, Japan, Brazil, Chile, Indonesia and India, the share is in excess of 70 per cent (Gregorutti, 2011; Gupta, 2008). In South Korea, Kim (2010) reported that 78 per cent of students are enrolled in private higher education institutions. Al-Atiqi and Alharbi (2009) reported that by 2025, private higher education enrolments will exceed those of public institutions in Kuwait.

The share of private higher education in African countries is 47%, 32% and 24% in Gabon, Mozambique and Ethiopia respectively (UNESCO, 2009). Waruru (2013) reports a contribution of 20% in Kenya, and in Uganda, Businge (2013) reports that out of a total of 34 universities 29 are private. According to Materu (2007), about one-third of sub Saharan higher education institutions established from the year 2000, are privately funded. Private participation in tertiary education has undoubtedly made

a significant contribution to easing the social demand for higher education, accounting for up to 20 percent of enrolments in some countries. The increase in the demand for higher education is consistent with the findings that expanding higher education contributes to greater technological development, improving the ability to optimize output and narrow the knowledge gaps and poverty in the region, particularly in the context of Sub-Saharan Africa (Bloom et al., 2005).

At a time when most public higher education institutions in developing countries, especially Africa, are struggling with challenges of student unrest, excessive enrolments, financial woes, quality assurance reforms and brain drain of critical academic staff, private higher education institutions enjoy more freedom to enroll students, charge market-related tuition fees, and engage part-time lecturers whom they pay well. In some instances, the institutions or their students are supported by the fiscus (Nganga 2014). Private higher education institutions have been lauded for possessing the following attributes: learner-friendliness, cultural diversity, less prone to political interference or activism, secular (Levy, 2007), improving access (Oketch, 2009; Chae & Hong, 2009; McCowan, 2004), more responsive to national economic priorities (Jalowiecki, 2001) and accommodative to societal higher education needs (Galbraith, 2003). The fact that enrolment statistics of private institutions are significantly lower than those of their public counterparts makes it possible for extensive interactions among students and lecturing as well as non-lecturing staff members. These institutions typically have programs specially designed to facilitate communication and dialogue, thus enabling students to build strong and personal relationships with their lecturers, instructors, mentors and administrators. It is very common for private institutions to organize dinners, cocktails and other events that facilitate interaction and correspondence between academic staff and students on a personal level. This motivates students and lays fertile ground for effective and individualized teaching and learning. Private institutions also offer extra-curricular activities and programs for students to participate in, thereby developing in them a sense of community.

3. Development and expansion of private higher education in Zimbabwe

Zimbabwe's higher education sector comprises of nine public and six private institutions. The first private higher education institution started in 1992 and these institutions have greatly broadened the pool of universities available to students for university level studies, thereby increasing the need for institutions to be competitive.

The historical antecedents and how private higher education started is detailed in a study by Garwe (2013) which focuses on quality assurance challenges and opportunities faced by private universities in Zimbabwe. The same research indicates that the share of enrolments in private higher education institutions increased steadily from 4.6% in 1995 to peak at 10.2% in 2008. However, in 2008, the contribution of enrolments for private universities for females was 13.1%.

4. Student choice of higher education institution

According to the Institute for Higher Education Policy (2002), institution choice refers to the ability of a student to be admitted in the institution that appeals the most to one's desires and that suits their academic capabilities. The article further elucidates that policymakers view choice as closely related to access whereas both choice and access are aspects of educational opportunity. Access is providing access (immediately when due or at any time) to students to enable them attend university (Institute for Higher Education Policy, 1999).

Kim and Periyayya (2013) report that students face hard choices in selecting the institution of higher learning to enroll in after completing secondary education. Private institutions should therefore do their best in assisting prospective students in the process of making decisions. Institutions can only contribute effectively after identifying the appropriate and key attributes that are highly valued by prospective students (Samsinaret al., 2003). Although very few studies have explored the factors that students consider when making decisions of choice to join which private institution, several studies have dealt with the factors that

affect the decisions by students to select institutions with respect to public institutions (Chapman, 1984). These studies reveal the ultimate decision to select an institution is a complex multi-stage process (Kusumawati, 2010; Shankle, 2009) that is affected by a number of factors namely: institutional characteristics, financial reasons, students' characteristics, influence from influential persons, graduate employment as well as promotion and marketing.

4.1. Institutional characteristics

Literature review shows that in many studies, the highest ranked factor is characteristics of the institution (Chen, 2006; Cubillo et al., 2006; Gutman & Miaoulis, 2003; Price et al., 2003; Seneca & Taussig, 1987). Students tend to be very critical about the reputation of an institution and hence they make it a point to find out more about the institution before enrolling in it (Binsardi & Ekwulugo, 2003; Gutman & Miaoulis, 2003; Nagaraj et al., 2008). Thus institutional reputation strongly influences and has persuasive power in making students select their institutional choice (Brown, 1991; Lay & Maguire, 1981; Murphy, 1981). Students obtain this information from institutional websites, hearsay, marketing and promotional material and past experience (Ivy, 2001). Paramewaran and Glowacka (1998) recommend that building and maintaining a good image gives institutions competitive advantage.

Institutional characteristics include the image; geographic location; academic programs and facilities; social life and social facilities, accommodation and dining facilities; safety, lighting and security; sports facilities (Absher & Crawford, 1996; Discenza, Ferguson & Wisner, 1985; Hooley & Lynch, 1981; Roberts & Higgins, 1992; Servier, 1994; Tackey & Aston, 1999) as well as the possibility for students to live at or close to home or families (Jackson, 1982; MORI, 2002). The Academic program offerings, in terms of entry requirements, content, structure, flexibility and duration were also reported to be critical (Bourke, 2000; Ford et al., 1999; Holdsworth & Nind, 2006; Nagaraj et al., 2008; Shanka et al., 2005; Qureshi, 1995; Yousaf et al., 2008). In addition to these characteristics, Maringe (2006) found that availability of

equipment, for example computers, quality of library facilities, quality of lecturers, reputation for research, hygiene, part-time employment opportunities; staff attitude towards students, availability of telephones and quiet areas for study as well as graduate employment rates to have a bearing on students' choice of institution.

4.2. Financial reasons

Several researchers have examined the effect of cost in making a choice of institution (Domino et al., 2010; Joseph & Joseph, 1998; Wagner & Fard, 2009; Webb, 1993). Some studies found that the costs associated with learning at an institution were the most important factor affecting institutional choice (Domino et al., 2010; Wagner & Fard, 2009; Webb, 1993) whilst others found that although cost has a major bearing on institution choice, it was ranked as the fourth (Beneke & Human, 2010) important factor. Other studies discovered that allowing for flexibility in fee payment, in the form of payment plans and availing scholarships and financial aid are among the major factors influencing student choices (Cabrera & La Nasa, 2000; Foskett et al., 2006; Jackson, 1986; Manski, 1983; Wagner & Fard, 2009; Yusof et al., 2008).

4.3. Students' Characteristics

The student background, characteristics (Jackson, 1982), age, abilities, aptitudes, personal aspirations (Chapman, 1984; Jackson, 1982), and academic performance (Hossler & Gallagher, 1987) of students determine where they choose to pursue their post-secondary studies.

4.4. Influence from other people

To many students seeking to enroll in institutions of higher learning, the process of collecting of information pertaining to the best institution that suits their requirements is very challenging. They therefore rely on other people to assist them in evaluating the available options. The influence from members of the family, teachers, friends, peers, and other influential persons have a significant role to play in assisting students in selecting among the institutions available (Baharun et al., 2002; Falsey & Haynes,

1984; Joseph & Joseph, 1998; Hossler & Stage, 1987; Shanka et al., 2005).

4.5. Graduate Employment

Paulsen (1990) investigated the extent to which graduate employment rates affects choice of institution and found that this variable is a powerful predictor of enrolment decisions. Similar studies also found that employment rates of graduates are positively correlated decisions to enroll at a particular institution (Garma & Moy, 2003). The study by Maringe (2006) reveals that the weight given to the prospects of graduate employment and career prospects is significantly greater than that of pursuing higher education based on interest in program offerings.

4.6. Promotion and Marketing

It has been observed that the higher education sector has become highly competitive thereby forcing institutions to position themselves aptly (Maringe, 2006). Hossler and Bean (1990) opine that marketing and promotion efforts as well as marketing channels influence students' choice to a very large extent. Hossler (1999) investigated the effect of advertising on student choice of institution and discovered that radio and television channels are the best vehicles for educational communication. The importance of coming up with a good marketing mix that represents the institution's brand is vital in order to make the institution competitive. The components of the marketing mix should depend on the expectations of the students. Felix (2006) posits that degree program and cost attributes of the marketing mix strongly determine the choice of institution by students when compared to variables in other marketing mixes. Echoing similar sentiments, Maringe (2006) revealed that students employ a "consumerist approach" when selecting institutions to pursue their studies. He found program and price mix to be more important than any other variables of institutions' marketing mix. Institutions that organize career and open day events that allow students to visit the institution before enrolling also position themselves favorably (Hossler, 1999; Sevier, 1992). These events tend to persuade prospective students to enroll at the institutions.

5. Statement of the problem

The expansion of the higher education sector led to the growth in the numbers for both public and private institutions. These institutions have different fee structures and they offer different academic programs packaged differently. This implies that prospective candidates have a large pool of institutions to select from. An increase in enrolments and in numbers of private institutions has been reported. The foregoing analysis of literature revealed six categories of factors that have a bearing on choice of institution by students namely: institutional characteristics; financial reasons; students' characteristics, influence from other persons; graduate employment as well as promotion and marketing. The question that remains to be answered is: What are the factors that attract students to pursue studies in private institutions of higher education? This study was therefore designed to investigate the reasons underlying the student preferences to undertake studies in private institutions of higher education. The researcher hypothesized, that the same factors affecting choice of students to study at public institutions would perhaps explain the current trends and patterns of increasing enrolments in private institutions.

6. Research objectives

The objective of the study was to determine and prioritize the main reasons influencing students' preference to pursue post-secondary studies in private institutions of higher education.

7. Methodology

The study used the case study approach as described by Yin, (2003) and draws data from all the six private universities in Zimbabwe. The case study approach was chosen because of the interest in understanding the contextual circumstances pertaining to the phenomenon under study (Yin, 2003). For example, Baxter and Rideout (2006) in his study to determine the types of decisions made by nursing students and the factors that influenced the decision making utilised the case study approach in order to get a true picture of nursing students' decision making within the

context it occurred. Self-administered questionnaires were used to reach a population of 8030 students enrolled in the six private universities in Zimbabwe representing all gender, study disciplines and levels of study from each university. The enrolment figures of these institutions ranged from 34 and 2,751 students (Table 1) These institutions offer undergraduate and postgraduate degree programmes in diverse disciplines including: agricultural sciences; business and commerce; humanities, social sciences and gender studies; health sciences and theology.

Self-administered questionnaires offer several advantages over alternative methods. Respondents answer questionnaires at their convenience and there is no need to organise interview appointments. The costs are lower hence the method is economically advantageous. In addition since no interviewer is present, there is no bias in the way the questions are asked or answered. The major disadvantages of self-administered questionnaires include the long timelines, low response rates and the need for literate respondents. However, in this study these did not pose challenges since the distribution of questionnaires was overseen by Deans and done by student representatives who were given definitive timelines to return completed questionnaires. The respondents were undergraduate students whose literacy levels are beyond reproach.

The researcher initially analysed the student profiles from each of the six universities and then used these to identify the number of students to sample from each category using secondary data available in the Zimbabwe Council for Higher education (ZIMCHE) database. The secondary data included university enrolment database, university official websites, brochures, prospectus and annual reports. Purposive sampling was used to select students to participate in the study (Miles and Huberman, 1994). According to the secondary data

After analysis of the student profiles in terms of field of study, year of study, level of study and gender, the researcher determined the number of students to be sampled that was representative of all these categories. A predetermined number of questionnaires (1000) were then given to

students' representatives through their Deans. The student representatives distributed and collected the completed questionnaires to students who were available and willing to participate in the study. The Deans were responsible for receiving the completed questionnaires from student representatives and sending them back to the researcher. Out of the 1000 questionnaires that were distributed to the six private universities, 617 (response rate of 61.7%) were completed and returned. The actual numbers of completed questionnaires and the sample representation are shown in Table 1. The sample sizes from each university represented at least 5% of the population thus allowing the researcher to make for university wide inferences.

The questionnaire consisted of three sections. The preliminary section included five questions focussing on demographic characteristics of respondents inclusive of age, sex, year of study, study programme and level of study (undergraduate or postgraduate). The main section required students to list the six major factors that influenced their choice of university. Based on the literature review, a list of the six factors influencing university selection was made to guide students namely: institutional characteristics; study costs; students' characteristics; influence from influential persons; graduate employment as well as promotion and marketing. However, the students were asked to include other factors that influenced their own decisions that might have been different to the ones listed to guide them. The students were requested to rate each of the six factors of their choice using a five-point Likert scale.

The final section of the questionnaire was open ended, it required students to give their reasons why each of the six factors they prioritised was important and to give further details for example if promotional information exerted a lot of influence on their choice what were the major sources of information? If influence by others was important who influenced them and how? If the quality of teaching and learning was a critical factor for them what aspects did they consider and why? If study costs influenced them then why did they select a private university?

Table 1: Enrolment figures and percentage distribution of private universities from which students were sampled

Institution	Enrolment (2013)	Sample (%)	No. of students
Women's University in Africa	2751	6.3	173
Reformed Church University	197	5	20
Africa University	2504	8.3	208
Solusi University	2142	8.2	176
Catholic University in Zimbabwe	402	7.5	30
Zimbabwe Ezekiel Guti University	34	30	10

N=617

8. Results

The objective of the research was to identify and rank the major factors affecting the decision to choose to enrol at a private university. The findings showed that based on mean values, there are six important factors that influence the students to select private universities (see Table 2). Among these factors, access and opportunity was identified as the main determining factor leading students to enrol in private universities (mean value, 4.6). The other factors in descending order of importance were: promotional information and marketing; reference or influence by others; quality of teaching and learning; fees and cost structure, and finally academic reputation and recognition. The information given on each factors will be presented and discussed in the forthcoming sections.

Table 2: Ranking of factors irrespective gender

Rank	Characteristic	Mean Value
1	access and opportunity	4.16
2	promotional information and marketing	4.06

3	reference or influence by others	3.79
4	quality of teaching and learning	3.21
5	fees and cost structure	2.93
6	academic reputation and recognition	2.67

8.1. Access and Opportunity

Respondents ranked access and opportunity as the number one factor that influences their decision to join private universities. Access here was considered in terms of geographical location of the university as well as the recruitment policies and entry requirements. Some students considered proximity to home as very important. This was so because the tuition fees at private universities was high and hence by staying at home or close to home students were able to balance the costs. This might explain why fees and cost structures per se did not appear to be the major determining factor in the ultimate choice made by students.

Respondents explained that the recruitment policies for all the nine public universities articulate that the normal entry into university requires a prospective student to have obtained at least 2 points in 2 Advanced Level subjects. However, because of the intense competition for places, only students with more than 10 points end up getting those places. Private institutions, on the other hand, put more emphasis on the ability to pay since they charge full cost fees. Therefore, students with fewer points easily get access into private universities. These universities also pitch their minimum entry requirements at 5 Ordinary Level subjects and not Advanced Level as in the case of public universities. In addition, mature students and working students have better opportunities to study at private universities because of their flexibility of learning times and venues. On the whole, a lot of students including females and those from other African countries, who would otherwise find it impossible to enter

public universities, are given a lifetime opportunity to get university education.

The issues of access were also subject to previous research, for example Aluede et al. (2012) found that the proportion of students admitted annually in Nigeria ranged from 5.2-15.3 percent of the total applicants thereby implying that approximately 84.7-94.8 percent of students applying to be admitted failed to get admission into universities in Nigeria. This is very worrying considering that access to education is a right according to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Okeke (2008) defined access to higher education as free and unlimited opportunities availed to people to enable them to acquire knowledge, skills, and capabilities required to effectively contribute to and participate in national development.

8.2. Promotional Information and Marketing

Respondents indicated that their major source of information pertaining to private universities was from promotional materials, websites, radio and television advertisements, exhibitions, and by word of mouth from family, friends, peers, teachers and other interested and influential persons. In addition, respondents cited current students as important ambassadors who represent and market their institutions by interacting with their juniors at their respective former schools as well as other schools they interact with. This therefore builds a strong case for the need to effectively market and promote private universities. This is against a background that private universities have to compete not only among themselves but also with their public counterparts which are relatively well established and who enjoy government subsidy. Furthermore, public universities are often overwhelmed with student applications and rarely require any promotion outside the official websites. This finding also agrees with that by Al-Hawary and Batayneh (2010) who found that public universities in Jordan were well sought after by international students. Respondents suggested that private universities should employ various forms of promotional tools in order to effectively market their institutions and their academic programs to the public as well as

prospective students, their families and friends. Kitchen (2003) avers that these tools should include advertising, public relations, personal selling among others.

8.3. Reference or Influence by Others

Respondents explained that decisions about selecting a higher education institution are not made by students alone: there are other people who influence these choices. Those who provide students with information based on their own personal experience or on information obtained from others, press and visits exert a strong influence on how prospective students choose their study destination. The study found evidence that choices were influenced by family, friends and acquaintances of the students. Alumni usually form very strong ties with their former institutions so much that they take every opportunity to proudly give recommendations for others to pursue studies at their former institutions. One respondent had this to say: “My friends told me that it is great to study at the Women’s University in Africa. You can actually study whilst you are still on full time employment” and “Some of my colleagues have studied at Solusi University and they secured jobs there immediately after graduation. That is what attracted me here.” Students also feel at ease going to a university with friends and family. “My sister is studying at Africa University. All my family members thought I should study there too, so that we can take care of each other.” Respondents suggested that instead of them finding information from all over the place, private universities should invest more into marketing their institutions and academic programs.

8.4. Quality of Teaching and Learning

There were four major areas that were established to influence quality of teaching. These were: quality of staff; teaching and learning facilities; equipment; hard copies of books as well as electronic resources. Respondents’ perception of teaching quality embraces the rating given to the academic services that are offered by institutions to students during their educational training. The quality of teaching also includes the curriculum design and content, available technologies and methods of

delivery as well as qualifications and experience of teaching staff. The availability of facilities was ranked number seven by the respondents. The findings revealed that private higher education institutions made various facilities available to students in order to make the campus environment as conducive as possible to teaching and learning. These included: teaching and learning facilities such as computers; laboratories; teaching venues equipped with multimedia systems; good libraries equipped with physical and electronic reading resources; sporting facilities; bookshops; clinics accepting medical aid and banking facilities.

8.5. Fees and Cost Structure

The financial factor was ranked as the number five factor by students. Students were more interested in access to higher education such that the costs involved in pursuing studies at private institutions were not an impediment. Furthermore, private universities are usually attended by employed students or by children of relatively well-off parents since the tuition fees in private universities are higher than for public universities (Garwe, 2013) and the students are not supported by the fescues.

8.6. Academic Reputation and Recognition

The university's reputation and recognition was the least ranked factor influencing the choice of an institution. Respondents based their perceptions on the reputation of a private university on its presence, status and prominence in the public eye since no national university rankings were being done in Zimbabwe. They also regarded a stable and efficient leadership as an important factor contributing to students choosing to study at private institutions. The stability was measured by the non-existence of strikes very little corruption in allocating resources. Private universities were also applauded for their low involvement of students in politics. Although studies by Veloutsou et al. (2004) found university reputation, to be the most critical factor, this study found this factor to be of relatively little importance mainly because issues of access were more prominent.

9. Implications

The objective of this study sought to identify and offer useful and practical guidelines to private higher education institutions pertaining to the major factors that are considered by students when choosing a private university. The results of this study are beneficial to private higher education institutions in crafting strategies to attract and satisfy students in a highly competitive environment. Some of the findings were comparable to those articulated in the review of literature pertaining to students' choice of a public university. Findings of this study featured access and opportunity as the key driver when selecting an institution of choice. The implication is that, in order to effectively influence the choice process among potential students, private higher education institutions should address the important variables considered by students.

The findings, whilst confirming some of the choice criteria reported in literature, also revealed different ranking of variable to that of the existing literature. For example whilst many studies pinpoint reputation and cost as the key attributes, this study found that access and opportunity as well as marketing and promotion were the major factors influencing students' choice. Cost and reputation were not as critical as was found in previous studies (Domino et al., 2010; Wagner & Fard, 2009; Webb, 1993). The findings might imply that this ranking of factors is unique to the Zimbabwean higher education context.

The study showed that promoting and marketing institutions is of prime importance in providing information to potential students and other influential stakeholders. Considering the recent drastic increase in higher education provision and the increasing demand for accountability and quality, private institutions need to be more business-like in order to survive. This implies that they should assent to the modern day marketing and promotion concept, advocating the imperativeness of student satisfaction. This is because students are discerning and will always opt for higher education institutions that show potential to best fulfill their needs and concerns. It was also clear from the study that students choose institutions that are mainly promoted through promotional materials, websites, radio and television advertisements, exhibitions, and by word

of mouth from family, friends, peers, teachers and other interested and influential persons. Private institutions should therefore be encouraged to use these methods to market and promote their programs to potential students. In addition, current students are suggested to become ambassadors by representing their institutions and interacting with their juniors at their respective former schools.

The finding that quality of teaching and learning is considered an important factor of choice is extremely critical to both private higher education providers and policy makers, since it indicates clearly that student choice of an institution can be influenced positively if knowledgeable and experienced academics are available, thus attracting students to choose it for their higher education studies. Accordingly, private institutions should focus on improving the academic status of their teaching staff in order to promote their institutions to potential students.

10. Conclusions

The findings of the current study identified the major factors considered by students when making choices to study in private universities. This will enable the institutions to make good use of limited funds in attracting students. The findings of this study also contribute towards closing the knowledge gap by contributing to the body of knowledge on factors affecting choice of private institutions.

The results of this study recognizes the critical role played by private universities in improving access to higher education by offering opportunities otherwise unavailable at public institutions who pitch their entry requirements at levels unattained by many students. These results will be useful especially to African countries whose governments face financial and resource constraints to fund and expand public universities. Policy makers can therefore, encourage the growth of private higher education institutions as a meaningful and viable way to improve access and provide higher education opportunities to potential students.

The study also highlights the importance of marketing and promotional activities in aiding the prospective students to make a choice of institution since preferences for attending the selected institution are rooted in both the social and the marketing environment. The study, therefore, recommends that private institutions should strengthen and sharpen their marketing and promotional strategies so as to reach out to as many people as possible. These strategies need to be reinforced by targeted career guidance and counseling, open days and exhibitions at public fora.

The study concludes that there are several factors that influence student choice to enroll in a private institution. It is the researcher's consideration that the objective of this study that was set out to identify and rank the underlying reasons for students' choices of private institutions was successfully achieved. However, although the study revealed six most critical factors considered by Zimbabwean students when choosing a private institution, these factors and their ranking order may be unique to Zimbabwe and thus may be interpreted in that context. Future research is needed that can build on these findings especially in the contexts of countries other than Zimbabwe.

References

- Absher, K. & Crawford, G. (1996). Marketing the community college starts with understanding students' perspectives. *Community College Review* 23(4), 59-67.
- Al-Atiqi, I. M. & Alharbi, L. M. (2009). Meeting the challenge: quality systems in private higher education in Kuwait. *Quality and Higher Education* 15(1), 5-16.
- Al-Hawary, I.S. & Batayneh, A. M. I. (2010). The effect of marketing communication tools on non-Jordanian students' choice of Jordanian public universities: A field study. *International Management Review* 6(2), 90-99.
- Aluede, O., Idogho, P.O. & Imonikh, J.S. (2012). Increasing access to university education in Nigeria: Present challenges and suggestions

- for the future. *The African Symposium: An Online Journal of the African Educational Research Network*, 12(1), 4-6.
- Baharun, R. (2002). A study of market segmentation in tertiary education for local public higher learning institutes. *Malaysian Management Review*, 37(1), 1-8.
- Beneke, J. & Human, G. (2010). Student recruitment marketing in South Africa—an exploratory study into the adoption of a relationship orientation. *African Journal of Business Management*, 4(4), 435-447.
- Binsardi, A. & Ekwulugo, F. (2003). International marketing of British education: Research on the students' perception and the UK market penetration. *Marketing Intelligence and Planning*, 21(5), 318-27.
- Bloom, D., Canning, D., & Chan, K. (2006). *Higher Education and Economic development in Africa* (African Region Human development working paper series No. 102). Washington, D.C: The World Bank.
- Bourke, A. (2000). A model of the determinants of international trade in higher education. *The Service Industries Journal*, 20(1), 110-138.
- Briggs, S. (2006). An exploratory study of the factors influencing undergraduate student choice: The case of higher education in Scotland. *Studies in Higher Education*, 31(6), 705-722.
- Brown, J.D. (1991). Identifying benefit segments among college students. *The Journal of College Admission*, 131, 30-33.
- Businge, C. (2013, March). Uganda's higher education chocking. *New Vision*, 19.
- Cabrera, A.F. & La Nasa, S.M. (2000). Understanding the college-choice process. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 107, 5-22.
- Chae, J.E. & Hong, H.K. (2009). The expansion of higher education led by private universities in Korea. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 29(3), 341-355.

- Chapman, R. (1984). *Toward a theory of college choice: A model of college search and choice behavior*. Alberta: University of Alberta Press.
- Chen, L.H. (2006). Attracting East Asian students to Canadian graduate schools. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 36(2), 77-105.
- Cubillo, J.M., Sanchez, J., & Cervino, J. (2006). International students' decision-making process. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 20(2), 101-115.
- Discenza, R., Ferguson, J.M., & Wisner, R. (1985). Marketing higher education: using a situation analysis to identify prospective student needs in today's competitive environment. *NASPA Journal*, 22, 18-25.
- Domino, S., Libraire, T., Lutwiller, D., Superczynski, S., & Tian, R. (2006). Higher education marketing concerns: Factors influence students' choice of colleges. *The Business Review, Cambridge*, 6(2) 101-111.
- Falsey, B. & Haynes, B. (1984). The college channel: Private and public schools reconsidered. *Sociology of Higher Education*, 57, 111-122.
- Ford, J.B., Joseph, M., & Joseph, B. (1999). Importance-performance analysis as a strategic tool for service marketers: The case of service quality perceptions of business students in New Zealand and the USA. *Journal of Service Marketing*, 13, 171-186.
- Foskett, N., Maringe, F., & Roberts, D. (2006). Changing fee regimes and their impact on student attitude to higher education. *Higher Education Academy UK*, 22(2), 23-31.
- Galbraith, K. (2003). Towards quality private higher education in Central and Eastern Europe. *Higher Education in Europe*, 28(4), 539-558.
- Garma, R. & Moy, T.Y. (2003). University selection: a comparison of Australian and Malaysian students' pre-choice behavior. *Adelaide*, 1(3), 1344-1350.

- Garwe, E.C. (2013). Quality assurance challenges and opportunities faced by private Universities in Zimbabwe. *Journal of Case Studies in Education*. Retrieved from: <http://aabri.com/jcse.html>
- Gregorutti, G. (2011). Commercialization of Higher Education in Latin America: The case of Mexico. *Comparative and International Higher Education*, 3, 11-14.
- Gupta, A. (2008). International trends and private higher education in India. *International Journal of Education Management*, 22(6), 565-594.
- Gutman, J. & Miaoulis, G. (2003). Communicating a quality position in service delivery: An application in higher education. *Managing Service Quality*, 13(2), 105-111.
- Holdsworth, D.K. & Nind, D. (2006). Choice modeling New Zealand high school seniors' preferences for university education. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, 15(2), 81-102.
- Hooley, G.J. & Lynch, J. E. (1981). Modeling the student university choice process through the use of conjoint measurement techniques. *European Research*, 9(4), 158-170.
- Hossler, D. & Bean, J. P. (1990). *The strategic management of college enrollments*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.
- Hossler, D. & Gallagher, K. (1987). Studying college choice: A three-phase model and the implication for policy makers. *College and University*, 2, 207-221.
- Hossler, D. & Stage, F. (1987). *An analysis of student and parent data from pilot year of the Indiana College placement and assessment Center*. Bloomington: Indiana College Placement and Assessment Center.
- Hossler, D. (1999). Effective admissions recruitment. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 27(4), 15-30.
- Institute for Higher Education Policy. (1999). *What is opportunity? Defining, operationalizing, and measuring the goal of postsecondary*

education opportunity. Washington, DC: Institute for Higher Education Policy, The Education Resources Institute, and the Council for Opportunity in Education.

Institute for Higher Education Policy. (2002). *The policy of choice: Expanding student options in higher education*. Retrieved from: <http://www.ihep.org/%5Cassets%5Cfiles%5C/publications/M-R/PolicyChoice.pdf>

Ivy, J. (2001). Higher education institution image: A correspondence analysis approach. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 15(6), 276-82.

Jackson, G. (1982). Public efficiency and private choice in higher education. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 4, 237-47.

Jackson, G.A. (1986). *Workable, comprehensive models of college choice* (final and technical report). Washington, D.C: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, National Institute of Education, and Spencer Foundation.

Jalowiecki, B. (2001). Prospects for the development of private higher education in Poland. *Higher Education in Europe*, 26 (3), 421-425.

Jamil, A.A., Sarker M., & Abdullah. (2012). Students' choice criteria to select a private university for their higher education in Bangladesh. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 4(17), 177- 185.

Joseph, M. & Joseph, B. (1998). Identifying needs of potential students in tertiary education for strategy development. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 6(2) 90-96.

Kim, T. (2010). *Higher education reforms in South Korea: Towards ethnocentric internationalization or global commercialization of higher education*. Bristol CEAS and SRHE Seminar, Graduate School of Education, University of Bristol.

Kim, V.W.E & Periyayya, T. (2013). Student expectations and branding strategies among private institutions of higher education in Malaysia. *Malaysian Journal of Chinese Studies*, 2(1), 69-81.

- Kitchen, P.J. (2003). *Critical times: An integrated marketing communication perspective*. Paper presented at the first International Conference on Business Economics, Management and Marketing, Athens.
- Kongolo, M. & Imenda S.N. (2012). Institutional type preferences of South African higher education students. *Research in Higher Education Journal* Retrieved from: <http://www.aabri.com/manuscripts/11973.pdf>
- Kusumawati, A., Yanamandram, V.K., & Perera, N. (2010). *University marketing and consumer behavior concerns: The shifting preference of university selection criteria in Indonesia*. Paper presented at the 18th Biennial Conference of Asian Studies Association of Australia, Adelaide, Australia.
- Lay, L. & Maguire, J. (1981). Coordinating market and evaluation research on the admission rating process. *Research in Higher Education*, 14 (1) 71-85.
- Levy, D.C. (2007). *Private public interfaces in higher education development: Two sectors in sync?* Paper presented at World Bank Regional Seminar on Development Economics.
- Manski, C. & Wise, D. (1983). *College choice in America*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Maringe, F. (2006). University and course choice: Implications for positioning, recruitment and marketing. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 20(6), 466-479.
- Materu, P. (2007). *Higher Education quality assurance in Sub-Saharan African status, challenges, opportunities and promising practices*. Washington DC.: The World Bank.
- McCowan, T. (2004). The growth of private higher education in Brazil: implications for equity and quality. *Journal of Education Policy*, 19(4), 453-472.
- Miles, M.B., & Huberman, A.M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- MORI. (2002). Student Living Report, UNITE, MORI, Bristol. In Nutt, B., McLennan, P. (Eds). *Facility Management: Risks and Opportunities*, retrieved from www.unitegroup.co.uk/docs/UNITE_SLR_2002.pdf
- Murphy, P. E. (1981). Consumer buying roles in college choice: Parents and students' perceptions. *College and University*, 56(2), 140-150.
- Nagaraj, S., Munisamy, S., Jaafar, N.I.M., Wahab, D.A., & Mirzaei, T. (2008). *How do undergraduates choose their university? A study of first year University of Malaya students* (FEA Working Paper No. 2008–8). University of Malaya.
- Nganga, G. (2014). First state-funded students to enter private universities. *University World News, Issue No. 310*. Retrieved from: <http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20140309161458848>
- Okeke, E.A.C. (2008). Access in Nigerian education. In B.G. Nworgu and E.I. Eke (Eds.) *Access, quality and cost in Nigerian education* (pp. 20- 34). Nigerian Academy of Education.
- Oketch, M. (2009). Public-private mix in the provision of higher education in East Africa: stakeholders' perspective. *Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 39(1), 21-33.
- Paramewaran, R. & Glowacka, A.E. (1995). University image: An information processing perspective. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, 6(2), 41-56.
- Paulsen, M. B. (1990). *College Choice: Understanding student enrollment behavior* (Report No. EDO-HE-90-60). Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education.
- Price, I., Matzdorf, F., Smith, L., & Agahi, H. (2003). The impact of facilities on student choice of university. *Facilities*, 21(10), 212-222.
- Qureshi, S. (1995). College accession research: New variables in an old equation. *Journal of Professional Services Marketing*, 12(2), 163–170.

- Samsinar, M.S., Siti, R.H. & Tan, H.S. (2003). An exploratory study of factors influencing the college decision making of undergraduate students in Malaysia. *Asia Pacific Review*, 8(3) 259-280.
- Savickas, M.L. (1990). The use of career choice measures in counseling practice. In E. Watkins & V. Campbell (Eds.), *Testing in counseling practice* (pp 373-417). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Seneca, J. & Taussig, M. (1987). The effects of tuition and financial aid on the enrolment decision at a State University. *Research in Higher Education*, 26, 337-362.
- Servier, R.A. (1994). *Image is everything: Strategies for measuring, changing and maintaining your institution's image*, (White paper No.1). Cedar Rapids, IA: Stamats Communications, Inc.
- Sevier, R.A. (1992). Recruiting African-American undergraduates: A national survey of the factors that affect intuitional choice. *College and University*, 68, 48-51.
- Shanka, T., Quintal, V., & Taylor, R. (2005). Factors influencing international students' choice of education destination: A correspondence analysis. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, 15 (2), 31-46.
- Shankle, N.M. (2009). *African Americans and college-choice: Case studies of four families*. Cincinnati: University of Cincinnati.
- Tackey, N.D. & Aston, J. (1999). *Making the Right Choice: How Students Choose Universities and Colleges*. Brighton: Institute for Employment Studies.
- UNESCO. (2009). *A New dynamic: Private higher education*. Retrieved from: <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0018/001831/183174e.pdf>
- Veloutsou, C., Lewis, J.W., & Paton, R.A. (2004). University selection: information requirements and importance. *The International Journal of Educational Management*, 18(2/3), 160-171.
- Wagner, K. & Fard, P.Y. (2009). *Factors Influencing Malaysian Students' Intention to Study at a Higher Educational Institution*.

- Chinese American Scholars Association, Retrieved from:
<http://www.g-casa.com/PDF/malaysia/Wagner-Fard.pdf>
- Waruru, M. (2013). Thriving private universities compete for students. *University World News Issue No. 290*. Retrieved from:
<http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20131002162621160>
- Webb, M. (1993). Variables influencing graduate business students' college selections. *College and University*, 68(1), 38-46.
- Wiese, M. van Heerden, C. H. & Jordaan Y. (2010). The role of demographics in students' selection of higher education institutions. *Acta Commercii*, 10(1), 150-163.
- Yusof, M. B., Ahmad, S. N., Tajudin, M. B., & Ravindran, R. (2008). A study of factors influencing the selection of a higher education institution. *UNITAR e-Journal*, 4(2), 27-40.