THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE HIGHER EDUCATION IN ZAMBIA WITH A SPECIFIC FOCUS ON THE MOVEMENT OF LECTURERS ACROSS PUBLIC AND PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES

A Dissertation Submitted to the University of Cape Town
in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirement for the Degree of
Master of Education in Education Policy, Leadership and Change
Faculty of Humanities
School of Education

By John Chisembele

Supervisor: Yunus Omar, Ph.D.

February 2023

University of Cape Town

The copyright of this thesis vests in the author. No quotation from it or information derived from it is to be published without full acknowledgement of the source. The thesis is to be used for private study or non-commercial research purposes only.

Published by the University of Cape Town (UCT) in terms of the non-exclusive license granted to UCT by the author.

University of Cape Town

Contents

Dedication and Acknowledgements

Dedication

I dedicate this work to my mother who battled cancer during the writing of this dissertation. You still live despite all odds. Your faith and strength inspired my tenacity and conviction that "If you can believe, all things are possible to him who believes" (Mark 9:23).

Acknowledgements

This study was undertaken with funding from the Mastercard Foundation Scholars Program and Completion Grant from the Faculty of Humanities, University of Cape Town, South Africa.

The success of the study is attributed to the steadfast support of countless persons, too many to mention, but I would be failing in my duties if I did not mention the following:

Firstly, my supervisor, Dr Yunus Omar, my mentor and teacher. A teacher of the first class indeed. I was the first student in my class to meet him on our first day of class. His interest in my welfare, background and his enthusiasm to learn about my country and culture was heart-warming. I thank him for his intellectual, emotional and moral support throughout this intellectual project. I pray that this dissertation represents the very high standard you set.

Many thanks go to Professor Azeem Badroodien, my co-supervisor who always teased my thinking in an attempt to bring out the best in me. Your passion for the Global South and political economy of education has left a lasting impact.

My thanks also extend to Associate Professor Zain Davis who introduced me to research methodology, Dr Musonda Lemba, Dr Sydney Malama, Dr Joseph Simbaya, Professor Austin Cheyeka, Dr Noy Mwanamakondo, Dr Grayson Kayo, and Dr Ferdinand Chipindi with whom I constantly consulted and chatted on matters related to academic writing and scholarship in general.

My parents, Victor Chisembele, Chitalu Lymbele and Dr Noy Mwanamakondo who kept pushing me to finalise my study.

Dr Evaristo Mwaba Kapungwe: a great mentor - one who inspired and guided me in the application processes at the University of Zambia for my undergraduate degree, and at the University of Cape Town for my Master's degree. Dr E.M Kapungwe also provided constructive criticism throughout the research period in Zambia.

My undergraduate lecturers from University of Zambia, School of Education Department of Languages and Social Sciences and Department of Religious Studies.

My teachers from Primary School Jack and Jill, Junior Secondary School Thorn Hill, and Secondary School Ellensmere.

Ms Ingrid Thomson, the Education Librarian at UCT, and other library staff at UCT.

Ms Carol Ojwang, Mr Xolani Mkoba, Mr Riyaadh Fakier, Ms Jean Alfeld, and Ms Insaaf Isaacs, and other staff and the Mastercard Foundation office, IAPO, at UCT.

Finally, my classmates from UCT 2018 intake, policy stream, for the interactions and insights.

Plagiarism Declaration

Name: JOHN CHISEMBELE

Student Number: NTPJOH001

Course: EDN5500W Minor Dissertation

Declaration

I know that plagiarism is wrong. Plagiarism is to use another's work and pretend that it is one's own.

This declares that the research in this study is my own work. Each contribution to, and quotation in, this dissertation that is from the work(s) of other people has been attributed, and has been cited and referenced. I have used the Harvard convention for citation and referencing.

Signature Signed by candidate

Date: 10/01/2023

Abstract

Studies conducted on the political economy of higher education in Zambia have inadequately tackled the impacts of neoliberalism on public universities in relation to public lecturers' motivation to teach for both public and private universities and implications for students' learning experiences in public universities. This study investigated the motivations of public university lecturers to teach for both public and private universities. The study also determined the implications of learning for students at the Public University where these lecturers were full-time employees. The main research question driving the study is: What are the implications of lecturers at public universities working simultaneously at private universities? This study is qualitative and phenomenological in nature in that it reported the participants' lived perspectives. The participants in the study comprise four lecturers and four postgraduate students. The responses from the participants were collated according to themes. The findings indicated that the motivations of public university lecturers to teach for both public and private universities were: socio-economic in that lecturers stressed the importance of additional remuneration that public university lecturers received from private universities; benevolence in the form of lecturers offering their service for purposes of creating capacity in new private universities; and management skills gained through positions of leadership that junior public university lecturers were given in private universities which they otherwise would not hold in public universities. The Public University postgraduate students perceived their lecturers' teaching for both public and private universities as retrogressive to the student learning experience in the public university because of: inadequate supervision of postgraduate studies due to teaching overloads by lecturers; time overrun of writing of postgraduate research theses; cost overrun through payment of additional annual tuition fees and inadequate academic mentorship which compromised the quality of their education. The results lead to the conclusion that dual employment practices by some public university lecturers engaged in both public and private universities have distinctly negative implications for the learning experiences of their students at the Public University. This study provides insights for policymakers, policy analysts and academic researchers on higher education in relation to the impacts of neoliberalism and privatisation on the political economy of higher education in Zambia, sub-Saharan Africa, and the Global South.

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Introduction

1.1.1 Background

Before Zambia gained its independence in 1964, the country had no university, although a few colleges and trades schools existed to provide higher education. The first ever university in Zambia was established by the University of Zambia Act Number 66 of 1965 a year after independence (UNZA, 2017: 1). After independence, the United National Independence Party (UNIP) lead by Kenneth Kaunda adopted Humanism which was a socialist ideology as the country's economic philosophy and governing principle (Makan, 1993: 33). Consequently from 1965 until the early 2000s Zambia only had two universities both of which were public: the University of Zambia (UNZA) and the Copperbelt University (CBU). The Copperbelt University was established as a breakaway of the University of Zambia through the enactment of the University of Zambia Act (Act 19 of 1987) and the Copperbelt University Act (Act 20 of 1987). The year 1991 ushered in a new government, namely the Movement for Multi-party Democracy (MMD) lead by Fredrick Chiluba who changed the economic ideology and governing principle from socialism to capitalism and liberalised the economy (Simutanyi, 1996: 4). The MMD government then repealed and replaced the University of Zambia Act and the Copperbelt University Act with the University Act No. 26 of 1992. Despite the liberalism of the economy, private players were still not participating in the provision of higher education. It would take eleven years before the first private university, Zambian Open University, would open its doors to the (paying) public in 2002 (ZAOU, 2016: 19). The introduction of private universities came with unprecedented changes in the academic labour market. This study explores one dimension of this change, namely the movement of lecturers across public and private universities, holding simultaneous employment at both the public and the private institutions.

1.1.2 Profound Statement

The notion of public education globally is under siege by the very notion of private education. The wholesale application of economic rationality to a county's provision of higher education is not apt, largely because the traditional notions of professionalism and employment relations are adversely affected by economic models such as corporate managerialism and market principles which usually result in the commodification of academic labour, exploitation of academic staff and depreciated quality of outcomes (Gupta, 2018: 1-3; Ostenson, Clegg and Wiggins, 2017: 510-511). The emergence of private universities in Zambia has attracted public university lecturers to teach simultaneously for both public and private universities. It is

however important to note that the private sector and the public sector have different motivations. Though public universities are gradually adopting business models in the running of their universities, they are still attentive to equitable service provision to all without discrimination, and also vigilant to the quality of outcomes, largely because they are substantially financed by public funds. Private universities employ business models and are motivated by profit maximisation, and therefore the 'customer' (read 'paying student') comes first and lecturers must aim for 'customer' satisfaction (Ostenson, Clegg and Wiggins, 2017: 515). In the words of Gupta (2018: 2) "…the production of knowledge as a commercial enterprise appears to be challenging the intellectual ownership of academic knowledge." However, education is a professional field and those involved in the provision of education (lecturers) should exercise their autonomy and professional knowledge in educating the learners through lessons and various forms of assessment (Gupta, 2018: 2). The relationship between the provider and the receiver is and should be lecturer and student, but the threat that the private sector poses amongst other threats is the redefinition of the relationship from lecturer and student to 'service provider' and 'customer'. In business, a customer is never wrong: the customer demands what they want from the provider (Connell, 2003: 102). But Higher education is more than just the provision of student desires (degrees). It is a chain of processes intended for the realisation of the purpose of education as a field of practice which Biesta (2015: 12) suggests should be associated with "the promotion of the cognitive and moral independence of students" (Biesta, 2015: 12). Education is of strategic importance to a country's social-economic development and therefore education as a social enterprise should not be entirely left to businesses that view profit as their first priority. If left unchecked, the core function of higher education institutions would be circumvented in the name of profitability (ECA, 1991, 14-15).

1.2 Rationale

This study will explore why some lecturers are motivated to teach for both the public and private universities simultaneously. The study will also explore the implications of teaching and learning and also the quality of education at the Public University where these lecturers are employed as full-time staff. These implications will be from the perspectives of lecturers and post-graduate students. This phenomenon has not yet been well researched or documented in Southern Africa. Therefore, the importance of a study of this nature is that it can make a modest contribution to the small but important field of the privatisation of higher education in Africa. This study may provide guidelines for policymakers, policy analysts and academic researchers by providing insights that inform them of the motivations of public university lecturers to takes up a second job and the impact that such actions may have on

their primary job (the Public University) as well as on student learning at the primary place of employment (the Public University). The study will also investigate how lecturers perceive their role in the public as well as in the private university, and the study explores the participants' perceptions of quality education, and their experiences and observations in interaction with both the public and the private sector in the higher education field.

1.3 Research Question

The main research question driving the study is: What are the implications of lecturers at a public university in Zambia working simultaneously at private universities?

Two sub research-questions flesh out the main research question and guide the collection of data in the study:

1.3.1 Sub-Research Questions

i. What is the motivation for lecturers at a public university in Zambia to lecture for more than one university simultaneously?
ii. What are the implications for student learning when lecturers work simultaneously at public and private universities?

1.4 Design of the study

Okeke and Van Wyk (2015) state that quantitative research is concerned with testing of theories and measuring variables using statistical procedures, whereas qualitative research is concerned with building a complete picture, using words and reporting the views of the study participants (respondents). This study utilised the qualitative approach over the quantitative one. The aim of the study was to report phenomena as it is experienced or lived by the study's participants. The study does not seek to generalise its findings. The aim is to study, from a particular perspective, the lived experiences of lecturers and students at the Public University and show how a localised study can contribute significant insights to the sphere of the privatisation of higher education in Africa. This study can then be placed alongside similar studies in other geographical spaces in order to provide a series of 'case-studies' from which broader insights may be taken.

1.4.1 Sampling

In this study I purposefully sampled a public university in Zambia, hereinafter 'the Public University' (to ensure anonymity and protection from harm for the institution and persons associated with it) as my study site. Savenye and Robinson (2005: 71) state that the site of

study must be chosen taking the following into consideration: the research topic, frequent occurrence of the phenomenon under observation, accessibility, and simplicity. All these were taken into consideration when selecting the study site.

The individual participants were sampled using purposeful sampling. Respondents were selected based on their current or past experience and knowledge about the research questions in order for me to gain depth and understanding of the phenomenon being explored (Thanh and Thanh, 2015; Savenye and Robinson, 2005: 71). Cohen et al. (2007: 115) state that purposeful sampling is used to select people "who have in-depth knowledge about particular issues, maybe by virtue of their professional role, power, access to networks, expertise or experience". As an indication here of the types of lecturers who were not included in the study, for example, were lectures and students from schools (faculties) like engineering, veterinary medicine and mining, as the lecturers I approached in these programmes informed me that they did not teach for private universities because their programmes were not yet offered in private universities.

There are two broad categories of respondents in the study, namely lecturers and students. Each category comprised four participants.

1.4.2 Instruments

In this study I used semi-structured interviews as a data collection method. According to Okeke and Van Wyk (2015: 297)

> An interview is a face-to-face conversational engagement between two people where questions are asked by the interviewer in order to elicit responses that can be analysed within the qualitative research situation.

According to Gill, Stewart and Treasure (2008: 291), Wilkinson and Birmingham (2003: 44), and Savenye and Robinson (2005: 78) there are three types of interviews, namely unstructured, semi-structured and structured interviews. I opted for semi-structured interviews because they permit respondents to provide insights that an interviewer may not anticipate. Semi-structured interviews also permit both me as an interviewer and the respondent to deviate from the question or interview guide in order to follow up or clarify a response in more detail (Corbetta, 2003: 270 and Gill, Stewart and Treasure, 2008: 291-292). Semi-structured interviews are more convenient than unstructured interviews because both the interviewer and the respondents are guided on the scope of the discussion through an interview guide (Corbetta, 2003: 270 and Gill, Stewart and Treasure, 2008: 291-292). Although I did not deviate from the interview guide, neither did I create new questions. The semi-structured

interviews gave me the latitude to pursue certain responses that I deemed key to my study even though, such responses may not have been provided in other interviews. The aim of semi-structed interviews is not uniformity of responses as the case may be in structured interviews or survey questionnaires but depth of the data collected (Corbetta, 2003: 270 and Gill, Stewart and Treasure, 2008: 291-292).

1.4.3 Anonymity and Confidentiality

According to Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2007: 64) "…the essence of anonymity is that information provided by participants should in no way reveal their identity." The university itself is anonymised, and a second layer of anonymity was introduced in the study by way of the use of pseudonyms for the study's participants as reported in the findings chapter (Chapter 4). For consistency, each participant was given an alias, for example 'Lecturer 1' or 'Student 2' to make it easy for readers to follow through the findings and analysis contained in Chapters 4 and 5. I have reported years of service and the schools in which the lecturers teach to demonstrate triangulation. This will not reveal participant identities because the university is not identified, and several public universities have similar departmental names. Further, the named departments/schools have several lecturers (all anonymised in the study) with similar characteristics. These layers of anonymisation make it almost impossible to identify persons and the institution. Based on the literature of Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2007:64) I have further kept the recordings and transcripts in a secure place under password-protection away from anyone who has no legitimate use for the data (only the researcher and supervisor may access the data).

I also assure the examiner and the readers as I did the participants that our conversations in interviews with respondents were confidential and never discussed with anyone outside the interview session (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2007: 65). Through an information sheet and consent form provided to all participants, their rights, including that all information gathered was confidential and only be used for educational purposes, was communicated (Bickman and Rog, 2008 :117).

1.4.4 Data Analysis

In analysing my data qualitatively, I followed the following processes prescribed by Savenye and Robinson (2005: 82) and Creswell (2012: 150-157). I transcribed the audio-recordings word for word, noting pauses and other indications (surprise, anger, joy etc.). I then began to read through my transcripts several times while reflecting (making comments on the hard-copies of the transcripts) in order to reduce the data (Creswell, 2012: 151).

Data reduction was effected using "themes, patterns and interpretations in order to understand the meaning that the subject attached to the phenomenon under study" (Savenye and

Robinson, 2005: 81). I read through my data many times in order to identify and create categories. (Savenye and Robinson, 2005: 81; Creswell, 2012: 148). According to Savenye and Robinson (2005: 82) categories can emerge from the data, the literature review and the conceptual framework or categories can be prepared in advance. Based on Creswell (2012: 151) the next step was detailed interpretation of what the researcher saw in the data, and the final stage was the presentation of results.

1.5 Chapter outline

This chapter (Chapter one) has introduced the study, providing an overview of its purpose, rationale, research questions and research design.

Chapter 2 discusses how four different countries on four different continents implemented neoliberal/market logic in their higher education sectors. Chapter 2 aids the reader to understand how casualisation of higher education is being implemented globally, and its impact in the four respective regions of the world. The literature review led to the development of the conceptual framework which was instrumental to the analysis and insights of my study of Zambia's higher education systems through the lenses of the movement of lecturers across public and private universities.

Chapter 3 discusses the methods and protocols I employed in conducting this study.

Chapter 4 presents the findings obtained from eight semi-structured interviews conducted at the Public University with four lecturers and four post-graduate students from various disciplines.

In Chapter 5 the results produced in Chapter 4 were analysed and discussed under three sections; the fourth section comprises insights from the analysis.

Chapter 6 comprises the concluding comments in the study, as well as recommendations. The conclusion takes into account the rationale, the profound statement, the research question, and the analysis and discussion of the findings. The recommendations are two-fold: first, for policymakers, and second, pointers for further research.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

The Introduction to this literature review has two main functions. First, it provides a guide to the literature review, and secondly, it provides an overview of the literature review. In section 2.1 the literature review will discuss global shifts in the adoption and implementation of policy discourse in higher education. I position my literature review within the theories of neoliberalism. Section 2.2 is about the theory or concept of neoliberalism. Subsection 2.2.1 provides three definitions offered by different authors who approach neoliberalism differently; from these definitions provided I choose Harvey's (2007: 22-23) definition on which I frame my dissertation. Subsection 2.2.2 describes the mechanisms employed to implement neoliberalism.

Subsections 2.3.1 to 2.3.4 discuss how four different countries on four different continents implemented neoliberalism in their higher education sectors. These sections will help us understand how the casualisation of higher education is being impacted in terms of the four regions of the world, and I bring these insights to my study of Zambian higher education and privatisation. The North American case is discussed in subsection 2.3.1; Subsection 2.3.2 discusses England as part of a broader 'European North' (although Brexit has now remade this reality, for analytical purposes this was the case at the time of writing); and subsection 2.3.3 discusses Australia. Subsection 2.3.4 discusses Zambia on the African continent and the influence of Bretton Woods institutions on education policies. Section 2.4 is a summary of the literature review, and the chapter concludes with Section 2.5, which develops the conceptual framework derived from concepts arising from the literature review. These concepts will be utilised to analyse my findings.

Having provided a guide to the chapter, I now move to an overview of the literature review.

2.1.2 Overview of Literature Review

Colclough (1993: 198) states that most developing countries struggle to provide sufficient education opportunities at the rate of growth of their populations largely due to financial, human and institutional constraints. In such circumstances private providers emerge as a solution to improve both access and quality of education (Pedró, Leroux and Watanabe, 2015: 4; Colclough, 1993: 198). Governments are also encouraging public universities to become more entrepreneurial, more competitive, market driven and less dependent on government funds (Torres and Schugurensky, 2002: 442 & 447). Some of the biggest public universities in Zambia are constantly looking to diversify their funding in order to be less dependent on government funding. Government funding has also reduced, and accounts for just more than

a quarter of some public universities' budgets in Zambia (University of Zambia, 2017: 5). According to Gupta (2018: 1), Masaiti and Shen (2013: 3), and Torres and Schugurensky (2002: 440), public universities have been left with no alternative but to expand private sources of funding and by so doing, opening themselves up to new forms of accountability, in a way relinquishing their autonomy in order to accommodate market demands. Gupta (2018: 1) further posits that this is inconsistent with their claimed mission and academic priorities of being committed to teaching and learning. Torres and Schugurensky (2002: 429) argue that values such as equity, autonomy and social transformation have been reimagined and replaced by demands for excellency, efficiency, low expenditure and calculations based on rates of return analysis.

Torres and Schugurensky (2002: 429) and Thornton (2011: 2) have argued that the changes that higher education sectors are experiencing should not be analysed in isolation from the changes in global political and economic orientations. Taberner (2018: 129) states that the new global economic order is characterised by free markets and increased movement of labour and capital. Harvey (2007: 23) states that, either coercively or willingly, most countries globally have shifted from welfare ideologies to free market ideologies. The concept of free markets is conventionally thought of in relation to neoliberalism. Taberner (2018: 129-130) describes the features of neoliberal economic policies as cutbacks in public expenditure; an emphasis on fiscal efficiency, and cost effectiveness in public management. According to Harvey (2007: 23), neoliberalism dictates diminished worker rights, lower pay, reduced pensions, reduced adequate conditions of work, and a reduced role for bargaining organised labour and bargaining power. Private sector values, processes and management practices are adopted in the public sector (ibid.). Harvey (2007: 23) states that neoliberalism has become so hegemonic the extent that its operations have come to be taken for granted as common sense or 'the' normal way life. Public services such as education, health and welfare, that were previously considered as human rights, are now for sale, traded on the market to the highest bidder (Bockman, 2013: 14). Neoliberalism, in essence, is a global phenomenon that takes different forms in different countries. But the end goal is always the same: an adoption of a market logic across all spheres of life.

In Zambia, after the 1991 elections that saw Kenneth Kaunda's United National Independence Party (UNIP) defeated by Frederick Chiluba's Movement for Multi-party Democracy (MMD), the MMD government implemented a wide range of neoliberal policies under the guidance of The World Bank and IMF (Simutanyi, 1996: 828). Zambia adopted a new education policy in 1996 called 'Educating Our Future', the policy that the country still uses today (Mwalimu, 2014: 1099-1100). The guiding principles of this policy are liberalisation, decentralisation, equality,

equity partnerships, and accountability (Ministry of Education, 1996: 3). The implementation of this policy, along with the change in legislation in 1992 through the enactment of the University Act of 1992, provided a foundation for the privatisation, marketisation, and commodification of higher education in Zambia (Ministry of Education, 1996: 3; Act No. 26 of 1992). In this dissertation I look at how neoliberal policies have played out in Zambia by examining the relationship between public and private higher education in Zambia through the lenses of the movement of lecturers across the public and private sector, and the impact of such actions on the progress and academic support provided to public university postgraduate students lectured and supervised by these lecturers.

In the next section I will define neoliberalism in more detail. This is necessary as it underpins all sections of the literature review and the study itself. I provide three definitions of neoliberalism by different scholars, from different fields of social science. I however, choose one definition that I feel is more encompassing of all three and sets the trajectory for my dissertation.

2.2 Neoliberalism

2.2.1 Defining Neoliberalism

Despite its anti-state rhetoric, neoliberalism according to Bockman (2013: 14) and Ganti (2014: 92) does not seek to eradicate the state but rather seeks to create a new form of state. In the contemporary state, neoliberalism seeks to expand existing markets by creating new markets. This is achieved by requesting governments to refrain from providing services to its citizens, but proposes that the private sector take over instead (Bockman, 2013: 14; Thorsen and Lie, 2016: 10).

According to Ganti (2014: 90-91) the term neoliberalism is polysemic with multiple referents. Ong (2006:1, in Ganti, 2014: 19) is quoted suggesting that “(N)eoliberalism seems to mean many different things depending on one’s vantage point”. Based on this, I have consulted various academic publications on neoliberalism. In what follows I provide three definitions of neoliberalism as articulated by Connell (2013), Ganti (2014), and Harvey (2007).

The term neoliberalism is defined differently depending on one’s vantage point. This is according to Ganti (2014: 91) who adds that neoliberalism has no single or universal definition. Ganti (2014:91) argues that a definition of neoliberalism may fall in any one or all four of the following categories:

a) a set of economic reform policies that some political scientists characterize as the “D-L-P formula,” which are concerned with the deregulation of the economy, the

> liberalization of trade and industry, and the privatization of state-owned enterprises (Steger & Roy 2010, p. 14); (*b*) a prescriptive development model that defines very different political roles for labour, capital, and the state compared with prior models, with tremendous economic, social, and political implications (Boas & Gans-Morse 2009, p. 144); (*c*) an ideology that values market exchange as "an ethic in itself, capable of acting as a guide to all human action and substituting for all previously held ethical beliefs" (Treanor 2005); and (*d*) a mode of governance that embraces the idea of the self-regulating free market, with its associated values of competition and self-interest, as the model for effective and efficient government.

Connell (2013: 100) defines neoliberalism broadly as

> …the agenda of economic and social transformation under the sign of the free market. It also means the institutional arrangements to implement this project that has been installed, step by step, in every society under neoliberal control.

A definition of neoliberalism is provided by Ganti (2014: 91) as:

> …an ideological and philosophical movement - what economic historians refer to as a 'thought collective' (Mirowski & Plehwe 2009) - that emerges at a particular historical moment and can be traced to the networks of specific intellectuals and institutions in post-World War 1 Europe and the United States. The aim of these intellectuals, mostly economists and philosophers, was to oppose what they saw as a rising tide of collectivism, state-cenetred planning and socialism. The underlying assumption of neoliberalism is that governments cannot provide economic development neither can they provide welfare for their citizens (Harvey, 2007: 22; Bockman, 2013: 14). Instead, these roles can best be achieved by private firms, private individuals and unencumbered markets.

Neoliberalism is defined by Harvey (2007: 22-23) as:

> …a theory of political economic practices proposing that human well-being can best be advanced by the maximization of entrepreneurial freedoms within an institutional framework characterized by private property rights, individual liberty, unencumbered markets, and free trade. The role of the state is to create and preserve an institutional framework appropriate to such practices. The state has to be concerned, for example, with the quality and integrity of money. It must also set up military, defense, police, and juridical functions required to secure private property rights and to support freely

> functioning markets. Furthermore, if markets do not exist (in areas such as education, health care, social security, or environmental pollution), then they must be created, by state action if necessary. But beyond these tasks the state should not venture. State interventions in markets (once created) must be kept to a bare minimum because the state cannot possibly possess enough information to second-guess market signals (prices) and because powerful interests will inevitably distort and bias state interventions (particularly in democracies) for their own benefit.

Thorsen and Lie (2006: 11) assert that Harvey stands out as one of the few who attempt to define neoliberalism broadly, further stating that Harvey's definition is suited to fit his analysis which posits that the world has since the 1970's moved towards neoliberalism in political economic practices and thought. I find all the literature I have engaged with on the subject of neoliberalism useful. However, I am more influenced by the definition and theoretical underpinnings offered by David Harvey in his 2005 publication *A brief History of Neoliberalism* and his 2007 publication *Neoliberalism as Creative Destruction*. It is it the context of employing these texts that I frame the concept of neoliberalism in the Zambian higher education sector. The next section explains the characteristics of neoliberalism as well as the mechanisms employed to implement it. These characteristics and mechanisms will be observed in the higher education systems of various countries discussed below.

2.2.2 How Neoliberalism Works

In describing a neoliberal state Bockman (2013:14-15) suggests that a state is neoliberal when or if it utilises market logic to rule, and/or to distribute services and rights. With market logic the state delegates some of its governance responsibility to businesspersons with little consideration as to whether or not the means these delegates (businesspersons) employ will be appropriate and equitable. Bockman (2013: 14) and Lynch (2006: 3) add that neoliberal societies are antithetical to citizen rights: they shift from national government to public-private governance as every citizen is forced to become an entrepreneur competing for aid from partners of the state in governance who include: non-governmental organisations (NGOs), religious organisations, microfinance institutions, and corporations. Harvey (2007: 35) states that welfare and other services that were previously provided by the state are commodified by putting these publicly provided services out on tender so that government agencies can compete with private firms, churches and NGOs. Marginalised citizens who are financially unable to compete in this market are excluded from participation and concomitantly cannot enjoy rights as citizens (Bockman, 2013: 15).

Since the global economic meltdown of the 1970s, neoliberalism began to guide policies at international, national and local levels. “The unchallenged assumption of neoliberalism is that whatever problem exists, market logic can fix it” (Connell, 2013: 104). According to Connell (2013: 101) neoliberalism promotes corporate models of profit-making as the ideal model for the public sector. Corporatisation, commodification and privatisation of public goods and services are encouraged alongside business structures of institutional or organisation control. This includes the public sector making themselves accountable or auditable to financial stakeholders based on business models (Connell, 2013: 101). Services like education and health that were previously considered as citizen-rights are now sold by firms in the marketplace (Harvey, 2007: 35).

Harvey (2007: 30) and Thornton (2011: 110) state that neoliberalism aims to replace representative bureaucracy and industrial democracy with managerialism. Connell (2013: 107) describes managerialism in an educational setup as an elite class comprising of principals and their deputies whose roles change from the traditional head-teacher of a learning institution, to a manager of a learning institution. Management of a learning institution under a neoliberal framing entails roles synonymous with those of a manager in the corporate world. School managers assume new responsibilities such as budget holding, marketing the school, attracting corporate funding, and recruiting and dismissing employees. Connell (2013: 101) postulates that market principles like managerialism adversely affect the teaching staff who lose their bargaining power and consequently their job security and other entitlements, mainly because managerialism places most power in the ambit of managers and attempts to do away with unions by creating a top-down hierarchy.

According to Bockman (2013: 14) the term neoliberalism has been stretched and is also used to refer to a variety of practices such as corporatization of universities, the replacement of welfare policies with philanthropy and entrepreneurship, privatisation of state corporations and the expansion of low wage employment. In what follows I will attempt to demonstrate how neoliberal policies have been implemented in higher education citing examples of how universities have undergone corporatisation, privatisation, marketisation, casualisation of academic labour and suspension of worker rights on four different continents from four countries, namely the United States of America (USA), England, Australia and Zambia.

2.3.1 The Corporatisation, Commodification and Privatisation of American Higher Education

The reach of the USA might have been behind the spread of neoliberal policies from the 1970s onwards (Harvey, 2005: 9). Education analysts around the globe talk about the

Americanisation of their national universities, in reference to the influence of America on their higher education (Torres and Schugurensky, 2002: 442). Torres and Schugurensky (2002: 442) state that the American model aims to reduce state provision of services by replacing them with market forces: the goal is for institutions to begin to compete against each other for funding and students. Dill (2013: 144) postulates that increased competition among American universities has changed the education environment as students have come to expect value for their money which is high grades and Ivy league universities like Harvard have begun inflating undergraduate grades. Dill (2013: 144-145) suggests that this may take away a student's motivation to work hard, because students depend on grades to inform them of the quality of their input, but Harvard's compromise makes grades misleading and insignificant. Connell (2003: 102) and Ostenson and Clegg and Wiggins (2007: 510) suggest that when education institutions begin to prioritise profits, teaching and learning becomes secondary as learning institutions reimagine their missions and academic priorities and conform to the demands of customers (students and parents). Lynch (2016: 8) asserts that such action has the potential to erode public confidence in the integrity of university research and teaching.

In discussing new funding modalities for universities, Dill (2013: 150) postulates that competition for private funds leads universities to adopt strategies that will attract wealthier students. Lynch (2016: 5) adds that the USA has 650 for-profit colleges and universities, the largest being the University of Phoenix in Arizona with 174 900 students, only 285 full time faculty and 17 000 adjunct or part-time staff who are expendable. Lynch (2016: 5) refers to this as academic capitalism, further stating that such high levels of academic staff casualisation are profit motivated.

According to Torres and Schugurensky (2002: 442) the public/private distinction is blurring. Private universities that previously received less than 2% of their income from state governments now receive more public subsidies. In contemporary times, public universities are forced to turn to private funds while private universities attempt to secure more public sources of funding. Torres and Schugurensky (2002: 442-443) indicate that as early as the 1990s big public research universities like UCLA only received 34.3% of their total funding from the state while the rest came from grants and contracts with corporations and the federal government, business initiatives, patents, interest earnings, alumni contributions, and tuition fees. In the 1990s this became the model for funding of universities in the USA, a shift from the 1980s when state governments provided the majority funding for public universities (Torres and Schugurensky, 2002: 442-443).

In highlighting how American private universities maximise funding from both private and public funds, Torre and Schugurensky (2002: 442) cite the example of Stanford University, an American Ivy League university that has heavily benefited from public funds. By the mid-1980s they were already receiving public funds in excess of $500 million. Torres and Schugurensky (2002: 442) also highlight the significance of private funding to higher education institutions by citing another private Ivy league university, Harvard, which receives more than $12 billion in endowments from private sources (corporations, family trusts, and individuals).

The foregoing discussion has shown that the USA's implementation of market policies in their higher education sector included the reconceptualization of a student as a customer, the casualisation of academic labour, cutbacks in public funding to public higher education, and the introduction of competitive funding to both public and private universities. In what follows, I will discuss how England privatised and marketized their higher education sector through the implementation of the Education Reform Act of 1988 and the consequences thereof.

2.3.2 The Corporatisation, Commodification and Privatisation of Higher Education in England

According to Lindsay and Rodgers (1998: 159) and Milliken and Colohan, (2004: 382), when the Conservative Party led by Margert Thatcher formed the government in 1979, they immediately embarked on a process to reform the public sector which they condemned as not efficient in its production process, not providing value for money, and ostensibly being indifferent to the needs of customers. The Conservatives saw the market principle of competition as a mechanism to achieve efficiency and customer satisfaction (Lindsay and Rodgers, 1998: 159; Milliken and Colohan, 2004: 382). Through the Education Reform Act of 1988, Thatcher's government reduced public funding to higher education in the name of accountability for public funds and as a mechanism to achieve efficiency (Torres and Schugurensky, 2002: 441; Lindsay and Rodgers, 1998: 159).

Writers like Torres and Schugurensky (2002: 441) and Lindsay and Rodgers (1998: 159) posit that the Education Reform Act of 1988 mandated universities to become more customer-friendly, more responsive to their clients, and more business-like. According to Torres and Schugurensky (2002: 441) the Act demanded that universities provide the highest quality at the lowest price while competing for students, research projects and subsidies. Molesworth, Scullion and Nixon (2010: 145) argue that in the business sense the customer is everything, and that in the higher education sector the customers' (fee-paying students and parents) opinions of quality are the only ones that matter. Universities should therefore strive for

‘customer satisfaction’ which can be measured through student retention, progression and graduation.

According to Pedró, Leroux and Watanabe, (2015: 6) payment of fees empower parents and students to make demands while educational institutions become accountable to parents and or students to deliver value for money. But Biesta (2015: 12) argues that educational processes do not exist merely to serve the desires of students but also exist to examine and interrogate such desire. Connell (2013: 106) further argues that these new policy changes erode the very essence of education. In this new market-oriented environment, universities that are supposed to be pioneers of truth and critical thinking “become purveyors of spin, image-making, manipulative marketing, organized boasting and sometimes more toxic forms of deceit” (ibid.). Educational values such as public interest and self-knowledge of society is diluted as extraction of private advantage to the detriment of others becomes the priority (Connell, 2013: 106).

Between 1979 and 1990, the Thatcher government dismantled the social democratic and solidarity systems of British society by relegating and undermining trade unions and other professional associations (Harvey, 2005: 22-23). According to Torres and Schugurensky (2002: 441) the Education Reform Act of 1988 brought about the abolition of tenure and promotions for all new appointments as casual labour became the replacement. According to May, Peetz & Strachan (2013: 260) over 50% of all academic staff in the UK are employed on a temporary basis. Prior to the enactment of The Education Reform Act of 1988 negotiations of salaries and conditions of service for academics was collective; after its enactment, collective bargaining was also abolished in favour of individual negotiations (Torres and Schugurensky, 2002: 441; Ostenson, Clegg and Wiggins, 2007: 510). According to Torres and Schugurensky (2002: 441) this adversely impacted on educational quality as faculty staff turned to part-time consultancies due to reductions in salaries in real terms. Torres and Schugurensky (2002: 441) state that reduction in promotion opportunities reduced the zeal that faculty members had for their careers, as it became unrewarding to them and unattractive to new recruits. There were also high volumes of retrenchment, consequently increasing the teaching and administrative loads of those who remained in the institutions.

According to Taberner (2018: 134) the commodification of knowledge has changed the nature of academic work as professional discretion has become secondary to the requirements of performativity. Taberner (2018: 134) asserts that “performativity is a form of incentive, control and attrition based on rewards and sanction.” Marshall (1999: 310) defines performativity as

> Performativity, post-Lyotard, has become almost a term of abuse to be used for the ideology and efficient practices of those institutions which, based upon the human sciences, are increasingly dominated by bureaucracy wherein goals are set in ever narrowing demands of reporting, and where accountability is measured by outputs. In the general cry for efficiency and accountability, in social welfare, in general, the Western World has shifted from inputs and professional discretion as to how objectives are to be achieved, to an emphasis of less discretion as to how to achieve aims or ideals. This emphasis on outputs is highly specific, wherein they are not only recorded but used as the basis for any further inputs. The debate therefore has shifted from aims or ideals to means or techniques…

Thornton (2011: 145) postulates that in the name of flexibility, staff have been asked to work more hours, including weekends, especially in the lower ranking universities. This puts a lot of pressure on academic staff, the extent to which some professors in lower ranking universities are accepting demotions when moving to higher ranking universities where they will teach less and also have some time to research. Taberner (2018: 134) further asserts that the professional role and survival of academics has become dependent on the fulfilment of certain programmed norms. This has led to frustration, fragmentation, and an identity crisis.

In this section I have attempted to show how the conservative government in England under the leadership of Margaret Thatcher implemented the Education Reforms Act of 1988 to transform public education based on market principles. The section indicated the effects of the Act which included intensified pressure on academics and universities to become more customer friendly and accountable to customers. It highlighted the reduction in public funding to universities leading to unhealthy competition between universities, the casualisation of academic labour, the emphasis on performativity, and the loss of professional discretion and job security by academics (Lindsay and Rodgers, 1998: 159; Milliken and Colohan, 2004: 382). The next section explores the adoption of neoliberal policies in the Australian higher education system and the implications thereof.

2.3.3 Marketisation, Privatisation and Casualisation of Higher Education and academic labour in Australia

Connell (2013: 102) states that Australian education has been described as an industry and that educational institutions now operate on the basis of profit-making. Ostenson, Clegg and Wiggins (2007: 511) go further by asserting that when there has been a migration from the concept of education as a social institution to education as an industry, intensified vocationalisation of the curriculum occurs as the primary task of education becomes the

production of workers. Biesta (2015: 11) and Lynch (2016: 6) remind us that teaching as a professional field of action is more than technical practices that are designed to be followed step by step in realising certain results, i.e. getting a job or passing an exam. Instead, teaching as a field of action should always be intended for the realisation of the 'telos' (purpose) of education which Biesta (2015: 12) suggests should be associated with "the promotion of the cognitive and moral independence of students".

Globally, universities have become corporations marketing themselves in the education market and hiring image creators to give them an academic face lift or brand (Gupta, 2018: 1). The management style of university education in Australia has changed from the traditional academic way to new managerialism which Connell (2013: 102) and Thornton (2011: 16) have argued undermines academic democracy as vice-chancellors become CEOs while deans and heads of departments begin to be appointed by management instead of being elected by their peers. Central managers and deans become more powerful and decision-making becomes centralized, while departments lose their jurisdiction. As new line-managers, deans and heads of department are now expected to report to central managements and not their peers as was the case previously (Thornton, 2011: 16).

Connell (2003: 107) and May, Peetz & Strachan (2013: 260) posit that educational institutions have changed their organizational structures with the birth of a new managerial class. They state that in order to remain profitable, Australian university managements have begun to look for cheaper and flexible labour, the extent to which about half of undergraduates in Australia are taught by casual labour. Thornton (2011: 142) asserts that because some faculties cannot afford full-time staff, they almost exclusively rely on casual labour. According to May, Peetz & Strachan (2013: 262) "…casual employment does not represent an entry level into the academic workforce. Rather, it is a separate, insecure secondary labour market." Thornton (2011: 143) argues that casual employees are mostly unable to voice out against management; they are voiceless members of the higher education teaching community.

According to Taberner (2018: 135) in post-1992 Australia a dramatic shift has occurred between managers and academics: from a relational contract based on trust, equity, ethics, and respect for professional judgment to a transactional contract, one that is de-personalised and whose characterises are described by Connell (2013: 102) in the following manner:

> University central managements are now in open conflict with higher education unions and are felt by many staff to be a remote and sometimes hostile force. The loss of trust within universities is papered over by corporate 'branding' – called exactly that, at the

> University of Sydney – and increasingly intrusive surveillance of staff in the name of efficiency and performance management.

Lynch (2016: 7) posits that in a neoliberal, managerialist educational culture "(E)verything one does must be measured and counted and only the measurable matters". In describing the effects of performativity, Lynch (2016: 7) indicates that the experience of constantly living to perform is alienating. Professional work environments are altered as performance indicators replace peer regulation and trust in professional integrity. Biesta (2015: 2) cautions against the culture of measurement, stating that measurements are only meant to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the processes involved in education without much care to comprehend and improve the essence of what we value about education as a field of practice. Taberner (2018: 135) asserts that the role of university management has become structured to "extract the maximum out of each employee while, at the same time, rewarding them for their efforts at the lowest possible wage." Connell (2013: 106-107) asserts that recently, marketisation of higher education has created a two-tier system where there has been growth of casual labour teaching on a part time basis alongside a privileged group whose tenure is secured with research and promotion opportunities.

Connell (2013: 107) and Biesta (2015: 7-8) describe a higher education environment in which teacher relationships with their students have also been redesigned. Teachers now teach with the sole intent that students pass tests because of the new competitive nature of education. Molesworth, Scullion and Nixon (2010: 145) argues that test scores are not a reliable measure of teaching quality as they are influenced by biases. Molesworth, Scullion and Nixon (2010: 143) further argue that league table ratings of universities based on student feedback are biased. It is possible that a student in an excellent university with very high expectations may rate it lower because it did not meet their expectations (good grades), while a student at a less prestigious university may rate it higher on account of meeting student expectations (good grades). In the end, an excellent university gets a lower rank than a mediocre institution. Thornton, (2011: 45) argues that paying high fees makes students expect high grades, and if they fail, the assumption is that they were not taught well.

The reconceptualization of students as customers makes them more interested in results than anything else and therefore those with money always choose an institution based on reputation of good results rather than excellence, and teacher performance is now measured by the results of their students. Molesworth, Scullion and Nixon (2010: 146) suggest that student-centeredness marginalises teachers in exploring the quality of what they do. According to Lynch (2016: 7) and Loveday (2018: 156) academic success is now being

measured by one's ability to serve what is measurable on the markets. This prompts Biesta (2015: 2) to query if what is being measured is actually good for education.

This section has shown how the Australian higher education sector has been re-engineered along business model lines, which include university vice chancellors taking up more managerial roles. The section has also shown the effects of this shift: the increasing casualisation of academic labour; replacement of collective bargaining with individual contracts; reconceptualization of students to mean customers who must demand value for their money while the academics must serve that which is demanded; and measuring of lecturer performance by customer satisfaction.

The next section discusses how academic labour is casualised and how higher education is marketized and privatised in Zambia continent with the guidance of Bretton Woods Institutions like the World Bank, International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Trade Organisation (WTO) who prescribe neoliberal policy instruments to developing countries.

2.3.4 The Corporatisation, Commodification and Privatisation of Higher Education in Zambia

Unlike developed countries where governments purposely formulate higher education policies that transform education on business models, Lynch (2006: 4) states that multinational agencies, in particular the International Monetary Fund (IMF), World Bank (WB) and the World Trade Organisation (WTO) influence education policy in developing countries through mechanisms such as Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs) and General Agreements on Trade and Services (GATS).

Makan (1993: 71) indicates that the IMF disapproves of state involvement in economic activity on the basis that this is unproductive and inefficient. The remedy they propose is state withdrawal via disinvestment and privatisation, claiming that this will surge competition and improve domestic production (Makan, 1993: 71). However, Makan (1993: 72) warns against wholesale privatisation, arguing that there is a risk that services that some organisations provide may be circumvented with the aim of becoming more profitable, and that those enterprises should not be left to businesses that prioritise profits over the core purpose of the organisation.

Zambia gained its political independence on 24 October 1964 with Kenneth Kaunda as its first republican president (Makan, 1993: 28; Masaiti and Shen, 2013: 1). At independence, Kaunda nationalised private educational institutions on the basis that private schools fostered class division and exploitation among Zambians (Mwalimu, 2014: 1096). The Zambian education

system from the period of independence until 1991 was fully public funded. The result of the 1991 Zambian general elections saw Kaunda and the UNIP suffer electoral defeat to Fredrick Chiluba of the Movement for Multiparty Democracy (MMD) (Simutanyi, 1993: 828).

Contrary to Chiluba's election campaign promises of higher standards of living, the MMD embraced the IMF and The World Bank and scaled up the implementation of stabilisation programs and SAPs. A year after the MMD victory, the University Act of 1992 was enacted, repealing and replacing the University of Zambia Act, 1987, and the Copperbelt University Act, 1987 (University Act, No. 26, 1992, 1992: s1). Unlike the two previous pieces of legislation that created and only permitted two universities, both of which were public, the University Act of 1992 under part III, Section 41, enabled private provision of higher education in Zambia (University Act, No. 26, 1992, 1992: s41). In 1996, the MMD government also introduced a new policy governing national education called 'Educating Our Future'. This new policy was based on the following principles: "liberalisation, decentralisation, equality, equity, partnership and accountability" (Ministry of Education, 1996: 3).

Colclough (1993: 198) argues that most developing countries lack the ability to expand educational opportunities at the rate of growth of their populations due to limited resources. Prior to 2000, Zambia had only two universities, both of which were public. Demand for higher education was very high. Prior to 1996, more than 20 000 pupils were graduating from secondary school each year, of whom 13 000 were obtaining full certificates and were eligible for admission to tertiary institutions (Ministry of Education, 1996: 93). Meanwhile, all the tertiary institutions (combined) in the country could only enrol 5 000 students annually. The consequence was that only a fourth of all applicants got admission, mainly due to limited institutional capacity (Ministry of Education, 1996: 93).

The Zambian government implemented liberalisation as a policy in order to give private enterprises, individuals, religious organisations and communities the latitude to form, own and manage learning institutions (Ministry of Education, 1996: 3). According to the Ministry of Education (1996: 97), the state made provision for all training institutions in the country to work together in achieving national human resource and economic objectives. The policy stated that this could either be done formally through public universities' accreditation of programmes of another training institution, or informally through the participation of public university staff in the activities of other training institutions (Ministry of Education, 1996: 97). Also , University Act No.11, 1999, 1999: s5, ss3 enables public universities to partner with other institutions of learning in terms of staff and student exchange, and also in collaborative research (University Act No. 11, 1999: s5, ss3). It states:

> (3) An educational institution may establish special relationships with the public university, particularly in the fields of staff and student exchange, priority admission for post graduate work, joint financing or research projects…

An assumption made by The World Bank (1993: 199) is that when students pay for education, they work very hard because failure is a financial cost. Colclough (1993) disputes this assumption arguing that there is no correlation between payment of fees and student ability or motivation. Colclough (1993: 202) argues that the introduction of user fees changes the characteristics of the student population because now the ability to pay, and not academic diligence, becomes the criteria for admission. If high examination standards are adhered to, it should be expected that the cost per student should actually rise and not the other way around.

In addition, Taberner (2018: 134) argues that academic endeavour is complex and cannot be improved by instruction alone. It requires time, judgment, ethos, and support. Rose (2002: 15) further argues that the World Banks' calculations, based on economic models, oversimplify the setting in which education takes place, as they do not account for the black box of education, i.e. The World Bank neglects the *processes* involved in teaching and learning. Rose (2002: 15) states that education happens in a social setting involving people and structures with complex relationships.

Having discussed the privatisation of the Zambian higher education sector, I move to summarise my literature review.

2.4 Summary of Literature Review

The literature review has foregrounded neoliberalism (and several derivative concepts such as managerialism, performativity, casualisation, a reduced state *et al*) as the key concept underpinning and framing this study. The literature has demonstrated how neoliberal states shift from government provision of good and services to public-private partnerships, and how what was previously considered as rights begin to be sold on the market place as commodities (Bockman, 2013: 14-15; Lynch, 2006: 3; Harvey, 2007: 34-35). The literature review has argued that neoliberal policies replace representative bureaucracy and industrial democracy with managerialism and discussed the impact of managerialism on the higher education sector (Harvey, 2007: 30 and Thornton, 2011: 110).

The literature has revealed how governments in both developed and developing countries have reduced funding to public universities in favour of user fees and the private provision of higher education (Torres and Schugurensky, 2002: 442; Thornton, 2011: 144). The literature

has indicated how public universities have adopted business values and models of operation (Connell, 2013: 101; Torres and Schugurensky, 2002: 438; Thornton, 2011: 116), and has shown how universities globally have been forced to compete against each other for student fees and research grants (Gupta, 2018: 1; Masaiti and Shen, 2013: 3; Torres and Schugurensky, 2002: 436-440). The literature has linked education policy to global political and economic currents (Thornton, 2011: 2).

The literature review has asserted that economic efficiency or value for money has been the justification for the implementation of market policies in higher education across the globe (Dill, 2013: 138; Lynch, 2016: 6). It has been shown that university vice chancellors have been elevated to CEO status, eliminating the collegial relationship that previously existed between them and academic members of staff (Connell, 2013: 102; Thornton 2011:16) The literature has also demonstrated how the student/lecturer relationships has been reconceptualised to mean customer/provider and how customer expectations and demands have become high (Dill, 2013: 144; Clegg and Wiggins, 2007: 510; Thornton, 2011: 144; Torres and Schugurensky, 2002: 441; Lindsay and Rodgers, 1998: 159). Universities began to casualise academic labour through part-time contracts, high retrenchments, few promotion opportunities and the abolition of collective bargaining (Torres and Schugurensky, 2002: 441; Connell, 2013:102; Thornton, 2011: 144; May, Peetz & Strachan, 2013: 260; Harvey, 2005: 22-23). The literature has also explored how academic staff began to sell their skills by way of taking on part-time consultancies which have been attributed to reductions in real time earning as a consequence of casualisation of academic labour (Torres and Schugurensky, 2002: 441).

The literature has also demonstrated how competition as a market principle transformed higher education from the intellectual production of knowledge and its critique, to selling academic commodities (qualifications) (Lindsay and Rodgers, 1998: 159-160). It has shown how performativity has taken precedence over professional discretion (Taberner, 2018: 134; Connell, 2013: 107; Biesta, 2015: 7-8). The literature has attributed the adoption and implementation of market-oriented policies in the higher education sectors of developing countries to the Bretton Woods Institutions (Bennell, 1995: 1; Torres and Schugurensky, 2002: 439; World Bank, 2015: 97). The literature has also demonstrated how Zambia adopted market-oriented education policies after the fall of the socialist government of Zambia's inaugural post-colonial leader, Kenneth Kaunda, through the enactment of the University Act, Act No.16 of 1992, and the implementation of a new education policy, 'Educating Our Future', in 1996. The review has also established that the University Act, Act No. No.11 of 1999, s5, ss3, legalised partnerships across public and private higher education institutions in terms of staff and student exchanges, and also in terms of collaborative research undertakings.

The literature review has demonstrated an understanding of neoliberalism as a global hegemonic force (albeit a contested one), and how it has been implemented in the higher education sectors of four different countries across different contexts on the globe. In Section 2.5 below, I provide a conceptual framework drawn from key concepts and their definitions in the literature review. These concepts will be utilised for the analysis of the findings of this study.

2.5 Conceptual Framework Arising from the Literature Review

The conceptual framework outlined below is drawn from and extends key concepts and their definitions in the literature review. Bickman and Rog (2008: 222) Defines a conceptual framework in the following terms:

> The conceptual framework of your study is the system of concepts, assumptions, expectations, beliefs, and theories that supports and informs your research. Miles and Huberman (1994) state that a conceptual framework "explains, either graphically or in narrative form, the main things to be studied - the key factors, concepts, or variables - and the presumed relationships among them" (p.18).

The conceptual framework presented in this section is not merely descriptive in relation to previous research and theories. The conceptual framework treats the literature as authoritative texts to be referred to, as well as a wellspring of ideas to develop sound, nuanced ways of explaining phenomena in my study (Bickman and Rog, 2008: 223). Each concept is named (either as a word or word-cluster), and elucidated in the table below. The table also creates a single space in the study in which these crucial theorisations can be consolidated and accessed.

CONCEPT	DEFINITION
Neoliberalism	According to Harvey (2007: 22-23), neoliberalism is a theory of political and economic practices proposing that human well-being can best be advanced by the maximization of entrepreneurial freedoms within an institutional framework characterized by private property rights, individual liberty, unencumbered markets, and free trade (Harvey, 2007). The role of the state is to create and preserve an institutional framework appropriate to such practices (ibid.). The state has to be concerned, for example, with the quality and integrity of money (ibid.). It must also set up military, defence, police, and juridical functions required to secure private property

CONCEPT	DEFINITION
	rights and to support freely functioning markets (ibid.). Furthermore, if markets do not exist (in areas such as education, health care, social security, or environmental pollution), then they must be created, by state action if necessary (ibid.). But beyond these tasks the state should not venture. State interventions in markets (once created) must be kept to a bare minimum because the state cannot possibly possess enough information to second-guess market signals (prices) and because powerful interests will inevitably distort and bias state interventions (particularly in democracies) for their own benefit (ibid.).
Managerialism	In the context of this study, Connell (2013: 107) defines managerialism as “Management of a learning institution under a neoliberal framing as entailing roles synonymous with those of a manager in the corporate world. School managers assume new responsibilities such as budget holding, marketing the school, attracting corporate funding, and recruiting and dismissing employees."
Casualisation of labour	According to May, Peetz & Strachan (2013: 262) “casual employment does not represent an entry level into the academic workforce. Rather, it is a separate, insecure secondary labour market.” Thornton (2011: 143) argues that casual employees are mostly unable to voice out against management, as they are voiceless members of the teaching community. Taberner (2018: 135) asserts that the role of university management is to “extract the maximum out of each employee while, at the same time, rewarding them for their efforts at the lowest possible wage.”
Corporatisation of Universities	The corporatisation of universities entails ‘harmonising’ the field of higher education with business and corporate objectives in order to become competitive on the international stage (Torres and Schugurensky, 2002: 442). University functions are redefined to mean facilitation of economic development and profit generation. In this new environment, universities must compete amongst themselves and other entities for government and other research grants (Torres and Schugurensky, 2002: 436).

CONCEPT	DEFINITION
Performativity	Performativity shifts the debate in higher education from the aims or ideals of education itself, to the means or techniques for obtaining efficient outcomes – the most efficient way of using the (now limited) welfare dollar (Marshall, 1999: 310).
Reconceptualization of Students as Customers	Ostenson, Clegg and Wiggins (2007: 510) suggest that when education institutions begin to prioritise profits, teaching and learning becomes secondary as learning institutions reimagine their missions and academic priorities and conform to the demands of customers. Molesworth, Scullion and Nixon (2010: 146) suggest that student-centeredness marginalises teachers in exploring the quality of what they (teachers) do. According to Lynch (2016: 7) and Loveday (2018: 156) academic success is now being measured by one's ability to serve what is measurable on the markets.
Blurring of the public and private spheres	"The increasing blurring of the public-private distinction includes the implementation of user fees in public universities, the public funding of private institutions, and the partnerships between public universities and private corporations" (Torres and Schugurensky, 2002: 443-444).

The concepts on the table will be used, alongside several other concepts and ideas emerging from the literature review, to categorise my data which is presented in Chapter 4. (The process of categorisation will be detailed in Chapter 3 of this study.) The concepts in the conceptual framework will drive my analysis in Chapter 5 of this study.

The study now moves to the Methodology chapter.

Chapter 3: Methodology

3.0 Introduction

According to Yilmaz (2013: 311) there are two kinds of approaches to social science research: quantitative and qualitative research methods. Yilmaz (2013: 311) further states that researchers need to adequately understand the two approaches to research in order to make an informed choice. Section 3.3 of this chapter makes a comparison between the quantitative and qualitative research designs to demonstrate my understanding of each approach and the adoption of the qualitative approach for this study.

This Chapter discusses the methods and protocols I employed in conducting the study. In Section 3.1, I provide a review of the research question and sub-questions. Section 3.2 defines qualitative research and quantitative research, and Section 3.3 makes comparisons between the quantitative and the qualitative research designs. Section 3.4 explains the sampling techniques and sample size of this study. Section 3.5 addresses the instrumentation used for data-collection in this study and the protocols followed in utilisation of the instrument for adequate data collection. Section 3.6 deals with the data analysis techniques employed in this study. Section 3.7 addresses issues of credibility, trustworthiness, and authenticity of the data collected in this study. Section 3.8 addresses the application of an ethical approach in this study, and Section 3.9 provides a summary of Chapter Three.

3.1 Research Question

The main research question animating the study is: “What are the implications of lecturers at a public university in Zambia working simultaneously at private universities?”

3.1.1 Sub Questions

The study has two sub-questions as follows:

i. What is the motivation for lecturers at a public university in Zambia to teach for more than one university simultaneously?
ii. What are the implications for student learning when lecturers work simultaneously at public and private universities?

3.2 Definition of Quantitative and Qualitative Research

Okeke and Van Wyk (2015: 21) state that “a research paradigm is a sort of ‘camp’ to which a researcher belongs to in terms of assumptions, propositions, thinking and approach to research.” There are two main research paradigms: these are ‘positivist’, also known as

'quantitative', and 'interpretive', also known as 'qualitative'. Okeke and Van Wyk (2015: 22) assert that:

> …quantitative research is based on testing a theory, where the theory relates to variables, which variables are measured with numbers and analysed with statistical procedures. While qualitative research is one that is based on building a holistic picture, formed with words and reporting detailed views of the respondents or study subjects.

Quantitative research is defined by Yilmaz (2013: 311) as

> …a type of empirical research into a social phenomenon or human problem, testing a theory consisting of variables which are measured with numbers and analysed with statistics in order to determine if the theory explains or predicts phenomena of interest.

Qualitative research is defined by Denzin and Lincoln (1994: 2 in Savenye and Robinson, 2005: 67) as

> …involving an interpretive, naturalistic approach to its subject matter. This means that qualitative researchers study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of, or interpret, phenomena in terms of meanings people bring to them.

3.3 Comparison Between Quantitative and Qualitative Research Methods

3.3.1 Research Designs

Research designs are defined by Punch, (2011: 62 in Okeke and Van Wyk, 2015: 165) as "the issues involved in planning and executing a research project – from identifying the problem through to reporting and publishing the results." Corbetta (2003: 41) describes research design as the planning of a research project which mainly include deciding the sample population, sample size, the instrumentation, the timing of data collection, and the study site.

A notable difference between quantitative and qualitative studies is that the former is more concerned with generalisation, while the latter does not seek to generalise its findings. In order to be able to generalise, quantitative designs strive to have large samples that are statistically representative (Yilmaz, 2013: 313). Corbetta (2003: 41) states that qualitative researchers, in contrast, are more concerned with comprehension than generalisation. According to Coyne (1997: 627) and Corbetta (2003: 41), statistical representativeness based on mathematical calculation is of little relevance in qualitative studies. The researcher will decide the sample size based on her/his own judgment.

Yilmaz (2013: 313), Corbetta (2003: 42), and Thanh and Thanh (2015: 25) state that the instruments of quantitative designs are standardised with pre-determined answers from which respondents are expected to select. For example, in survey questionnaires all respondents are asked the same questions, after which a data matrix will be created and data for all cases will be recorded. They are highly structured and must be rigidly followed. Because of this they are unable to report personal feelings, thoughts, and the lived experiences of participants. Thanh and Thanh (2015: 25) posits that quantitative research data is supposed to be objective and standardised or uniform, meaning that the data collected by the researcher should be comparable by different researchers: if another researcher attempts to replicate the study using the same techniques and data, they should arrive at the same conclusions. Qualitative research, in contrast, is subjective and standardisation is not required: wealth and depth of the data collected is what matters (Corbetta, 2003: 42).

According to Yilmaz (2013: 313), Lach, (2014: 91) and Savenye and Robinson (2005: 68), the objective in quantitative designs is to utilise deductive reasoning to generalise, predict and establish cause-and-effect relationships, while the objective of qualitative research is utilisation of inducive reasoning while focusing on the contexts and processes involved in order to adequately understand and interpret the respondent's perspective (Thanh and Thanh, 2015: 25).

According to Corbetta (2003: 39), in data collection processes, respondents may act differently because they are aware that they are being studied. Savenye and Robinson (2005: 68) and Lach (2014: 89) state that qualitative researchers study subjects in their natural environment. Qualitative researchers do not attempt to manipulate or control the environment. The aim is not to predict causation, but to describe perceptions of reality with words and/or images.

Another major difference between the two research approaches is proximity to the subject. Yilmaz (2013: 312) and Corbetta (2003: 40) state that quantitative researchers keep a distance from the subject of the study and focus on the objectives they have set for the study. The subject is viewed as passive and the researcher does everything possible to avoid or minimise interaction. The opposite is the reality for qualitative research. Yilmaz (2013: 312) and Thanh and Thanh (2015: 26) state that qualitative researchers minimise the distance and maximise interactions between themselves and the subjects of the study. In qualitative research the subject is viewed as active and the researcher wants to be as close as possible to the subject. Qualitative researchers seek to study social reality through the subject's perspective (Thanh and Thanh, 2015: 26; Lach, 2014: 89).

Based on the literature in this section, I chose the qualitative approach over the quantitative one. The aim of my study was to report phenomena as was experienced or lived by my study's subjects. I did not seek to generalise my findings as the aim of the study is to explore a fairly recent phenomenon in Zambian higher education (only emergent after 1991) from the perspectives and lived experiences of lecturers and students at a Zambian public university. The study explores and seeks to understand the motivations of public university lecturers to teach for both public and private universities simultaneously, and to explore the implications thereof.

In the next section I will demonstrate how I selected my study site and the study's participants.

3.4 Sampling

According to Maree (2007: 79), sampling "refers to the process used to select a portion of the population for a study." According to Bickman and Rog (2008: 78) there are two main sampling techniques used in research, namely probability and non-probability sampling. Bickman and Rog (2008: 81) state that qualitative research utilises non-probability sampling. According to Cohen et al. (2007: 113) non-probability sampling is when the researcher targets particular individuals or groups, while other members of the larger population set do not have an opportunity to be selected.

"Nonprobability samples are best used to provide information about specific cases or members of the study population that are intrinsically interesting or important for the study" (Bickman and Rog, 2008: 79). Examples of non-probability sampling types include "convenience, quota, dimensional, purposive and snowball." In this study, sampling was finalised in two stages. The first was to select a university, and the second was selecting individual respondents from the general university population. Both the university and the individual respondents were selected using non-probability sampling, in particular purposeful sampling (Bickman and Rog, 2008: 81).

In this study I purposefully sampled a public university in Zambia (rendered anonymous as 'Public University' in this study), as my study site. Savenye and Robinson (2005: 71) state that the site of study must be chosen taking the following into consideration: the research topic, frequent occurrence of phenomenon under observation, accessibility, and simplicity. All these were taken into consideration when selecting the study site.

3.4.1 Sampling Individual Respondents

The individual respondents were sampled using purposeful sampling. Respondents were selected based on their current or past experience and knowledge about the research questions in order for me to gain depth and understanding about the phenomena being researched (Thanh and Thanh, 2015; Savenye and Robinson, 2005: 71). Not every member of the university was able to meaningfully contribute to my study. Cohen et al. (2007: 115) state that purposeful sampling is used to select people "who have in-depth knowledge about particular issues, maybe by virtue of their professional role, power, access to networks, expertise or experience". For example, lectures and students from schools (faculties) like engineering, veterinary medicine and mining were excluded, because each of the lecturers I approached as potential participants in the study informed me that they did not teach for private universities because their programmes were not yet offered at private universities.

Savenye and Robinson (2005: 71) posit that because of the intensity involved with the process of collecting and analysing qualitative data, only a few samples are required: the number is left to the discretion of the researcher, but the researcher should be cautious to ensure that the numbers are not too few as this may cause bias. Based on this framing, I chose a sample of eight respondents for the study. Their characteristics will be set out in Section 3.4.2.

3.4.2 Sample Size

Eight respondents were chosen as participants in the study. I had two categories of respondents, namely lecturers and postgraduate students. I interviewed four lecturers and four postgraduate students.

3.4.2.1 Four Lecturers

Only lecturers who at the time of the interviews were teaching at both public and private universities simultaneously or had done so in the recent past were considered as participants in the study. For triangulation purposes, lecturers were chosen from different schools and departments, with different ages, years of service and academic seniority. At the time of the interviews the longest serving lecturer had taught for Public University for 34 years, while the most junior lecturer had only taught at Public University for two years. I interviewed lecturers from the Education faculty, from the Humanities and Social Sciences faculty, and the Natural Sciences faculty.

3.4.2.2. Four Post-Graduate Students

Four post-graduate students were selected as participants in the study. Only post-graduate students were chosen, as the actions of lecturers teaching for both public and private universities had a lesser impact on undergraduates than on postgraduate students. For postgraduate studies, the research relationship at Public University is not rigidly structured. When lecturers are tasked with heavy teaching loads and other commitments, their postgraduate supervised students may be impacted directly due to insufficient time for supervision of their research projects. The respondents in this category were also purposively sampled: two female participants and two male participants were selected for the study. The postgraduate participants were all studying in different programmes, and their age distribution ranged from 28 years old to 51 years old.

Having discussed my sampling strategies, I now move to discuss the considerations I made in selecting and designing my research instruments.

3.5 Instrumentation

3.5.1 Interviews

In this study I used interviews as a data collection method. According to Okeke and Van Wyk (2015: 297):

> An interview is a face-to-face conversational engagement between two people where questions are asked by the interviewer in order to elicit responses that can be analysed within the qualitative research situation.

Maree (2007: 87) defines an interview as “a two-way conversation in which the interviewer asks the participant questions to collect data and to learn about the ideas, beliefs, views, opinions and behaviours of the participants.” The standard procedure of conducting interviews is to listen attentively, in order to learn more about the study. Interviews are conducted to discover the perspectives, beliefs and experiences of the study population (Gill, Stewart and Treasure, 2008: 292).

Gill, Stewart and Treasure (2008: 291), Wilkinson and Birmingham (2003: 44), and Savenye and Robinson (2005: 78) state that there are three types of interviews: unstructured, semi-structured, and structured interviews.

Structured interviews are similar to survey research techniques as questions are detailed and worked out in advance. Gill, Stewart and Treasure (2008: 291) and Kothari (2004: 98) posit

that unstructured interviews are conducted in an unsystematic manner. They take the form of a conversation between the interviewer and the participant. Wilkinson and Birmingham (2003: 44) have argued that the discussion is guided by the interviewee. By their very nature, unstructured interviews usually span for long time periods (Gill, Stewart and Treasure, 2008: 291).

Semi-structured interviews are more systematic than unstructured interviews. They consist of key questions that set the parameters of the study but also give the interviewer the latitude to deviate in order to probe a response (Wilkinson and Birmingham, 2003: 44). Gill, Stewart and Treasure (2008: 291-292) state that semi-structured interviews are systematic and permit the interviewer more flexibility to probe in order to gain in-depth information about social phenomena as shared by interviewees. I opted for semi-structured interviews because they permit respondents to provide insights that I as an interviewer could not anticipate. Semi-structured interviews also permit both me as an interviewer and the respondent to deviate from the question or interview guide in order to follow up or clarify a response in more detail. Semi-structured interviews are more convenient than unstructured interviews because both the interviewer and the respondents are guided in terms of the scope of the discussion through an interview guide. The semi-structured interview form provided me with the latitude to pursue certain responses for additional insights. The aim of semi-structed interviews is not uniformity of responses as the case may be in structured interviews or survey questionnaires, but rather depth of the data collected (Corbetta, 2003: 270; Gill, Stewart and Treasure, 2008: 291-292).

3.5.2 Fieldwork and Data Collection

The interviews were conducted in person. The interviews were conducted in 2019, before the outbreak of the Covid-19 global pandemic. The interviews were conducted in a place chosen by the respondents themselves so as to provide a level of comfort and assurance to the respondents. A total of eight interviews were conducted with four lecturers and four students. Three lecturers chose to be interviewed in their offices while one opted to be interviewed in his car because his office was a shared space. All students opted to be interviewed in their study rooms.

Based on the literature of Kothari (2004: 99) I made the following considerations in conducting successful interviews: I received adequate training at the University of Cape Town through lectures, video footage in class, and role-play in class. I made every effort to create a comfortable, stress-free, friendly and conversational environment. This enabled my respondents to freely and confidently participate. My questions were constructed clearly with simple and moderate language, and I had piloted the questions with non-participating students

in order to correct any potentially non-useful questions. During the interviews, if the respondent seemed not to understand, I rephrased my question. I used a tape recorder for accurate data capturing. I was sincere and pleasant, and attempted to be impartial throughout. I made every effort not to react to the responses of the respondents. I tried not to act surprised, show approval or disapproval. I made every effort in keeping the respondent on course by minimising as much as possible conversation that was not related to the topic while the interview was in session (Kothari, 2004: 99).

Based on the literature of Savenye and Robinson (2005: 79) I made the following considerations in order to conduct successful interviews. For clarity I asked follow-up questions when I did not understand or when I needed them to elaborate about an aspect of their narratives that was insightful and interesting. In maintaining integrity of the data, I transcribed the voice recordings in the respondents' own words, and included in each transcript indications of places where respondents had paused, seemed happy/sad/angry, and tried to capture the emphasis they placed on certain responses so that I could reflect on the relative importance the respondents had placed on certain questions and their responses.

As an interviewer, I was cautious not to dominate the interview because such action had the potential to make a respondent passive (Bryman, 2001). I was also cautious not to be too quiet as this could have made the respondent feel as if they were not providing the 'correct' responses. I tried not to judge or criticise, and collected, recorded and transcribed all responses irrespective of what my feelings or thoughts on the matter were (Bryman, 2001). I was very cautious not to agree, disagree, argue or counsel the respondent because I was interested in *their* communicated perceptions. I was also attentive in observing the respondents' non-verbal communication gestures, while also ensuring that my non-verbal cues like maintenance of eye contact and an upright posture were maintained (Maree, 2007). Before commencement of the interview, I asked for the permission of a respondent for recording the session (Maree, 2007). At the end of each interview, and after thanking each respondent courteously and respectfully, I listened to each recording in order to improve my next interview. All records were transcribed for the purpose of reporting my findings and data analysis (Maree, 2007).

Having discussed semi-structured interviews as a data-collection instrument and how I used semi-structed interviews to collect my data, I now address the concept of anonymity and how I guaranteed my participants of this very important ethical commitment.

3.6 Autonomy, Anonymity and Confidentiality

Based on the literature of Orb, Eisenhauer and Wynaden (2001: 95), I sought to uphold the research principle of autonomy of the participants in the study. Orb, Eisenhauer and Wynaden (2001: 95) state that autonomy includes the right of the participant to refuse to answer any questions that make them feel uncomfortable, and, generally, the rights of participants to make informed decisions throughout the research process are upheld.

According to Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2007: 64) "the essence of anonymity is that information provided by participants should in no way reveal their identity." As a way of ensuring the anonymity of my respondents, I used pseudonyms when reporting my findings in Chapter 4. For consistency, each respondent was given an alias to make it easy for examiners and readers to follow through the findings and analysis contained in Chapters 4 and 5. I have reported the schools and departments in which the lecturers teach to demonstrate triangulation, and note here that this will not give away their identities because several public universities have similarly named faculties, departments and programmes, and these departments have several lecturers with similar characteristics. These two layers of anonymity will ensure that lecturers, and students, are not identifiable.

The participants were assured that their interview data were confidential and would never be discussed with anyone outside the interview session (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2007: 65). Through an information sheet and consent form, both of which were handed to and retained by the respondents, I read and explained to all participants their rights, including that all information gathered was confidential and only be used for educational purposes for the completion of this study (Bickman and Rog, 2008 :117). In addition, my own contact details and those of the university's ethical clearance board were on the information sheet for clarification, inquiry or complaints with regards to my conduct in the field. To the best of my knowledge, I did not induce participants to commit acts diminishing their self-esteem (Robson, 1993). Based on full disclosure of all research protocols, and how anonymity and confidentiality was going to be handled, participants then made an informed choice to participate in the study (Bickman and Rog, 2008: 121).

Having addressed autonomy, anonymity, and confidentiality, and how I effected this in the study, I now move to discuss data analysis and the processes that were involved in analysing my data qualitatively.

3.7 Data Analysis

Data is defined by Bogdan and Biklen (1998: 106, in Savenye and Robinson, 2005: 81) as "materials researchers collect from the world they are studying; they are the particulars that form the basis of analysis". Thanh and Thanh (2015: 26) and Corbetta (2003: 43) state that qualitative analysis does not employ mathematical and statistical instruments or computer software in the organisation of empirical material, acknowledging that of late software has been developed but its use is rare and minimal. The lived experience of an individual on a case-by-case basis is the object of analysis in qualitative research analysis (Yilamz, 2013: 315).

Corbetta (2003: 43-44) indicates that qualitative data analysis involves studying the subject as fully as possible. Qualitative researchers operate from the premise that human behaviour has to be analysed holistically. Creswell (2012: 148) states that the process of qualitative data analysis involves preparation of the data through transcribing of voice recordings or the organisation of images and other forms of data. The data is then reduced into themes or categories through a process called coding, and eventually the results of the analysis are presented in the form of discussions. According to Corbetta (2003: 44) and Wilkinson and Birmingham (2003: 76), these themes are created based on patterns that emerge from the narratives of the research subjects.

In analysing my data qualitatively, I followed the processes prescribed by Savenye and Robinson (2005: 82) and Creswell (2012: 150-157). I transcribed the voice recordings word by word using the respondents' own words. At this step I made no attempt to interpret the data, although this was the first step in immersing myself in the data after the interviews had been conducted. When I had completed transcribing the data, I began to read through my transcripts several times while reflecting (making marginal comments) on the transcripts in order to reduce the data (Creswell, 2012: 151).

Data reduction was actioned using "themes, patterns and interpretations in order to understand the meaning that the subject attached to the phenomenon under study" (Creswell, 2012: 151). I read through my data many times in order to conceptualise categories under which data-segments from the interviews could be placed. (Savenye and Robinson, 2005: 81; Creswell, 2012: 148). According to Savenye and Robinson (2005: 82) categories can emerge from the data, the literature review, and the conceptual framework, or categories can be prepared in advance. Creswell (2012: 151) states that the next step is detailed interpretation of what the researcher sees within the context of the situation, and the last stage is presentation of results.

Having discussed data analysis protocols, I now move to discuss various aspects relating to ethical considerations brought to the study.

3.8 Ethics

Orb, Eisenhauer and Wynaden (2001: 93) posit that ethical principles exist in order to avoid or reduce harm to the human subjects that participate in a study. They (ibid.) state that qualitative research is about exploring and describing people and the reasons for people's beliefs and actions. Interviews are the most popular instrument employed in qualitative studies for collecting and exploring these beliefs and actions, and researchers are cautioned to take care when conducting interviews because they may cause anxieties and distress in respondents. Power relations are very important to foreground in qualitative research. Participation should always be voluntary. Researchers are therefore supposed to balance between research principles and the welfare of a participant (Orb, Eisenhauer and Wynaden, 2001: 93; Richards, and Schwartz, 2002. 136).

Robson (1993: 33) identifies 10 unethical practices in social research:

1. Involving people without their consent.
2. Coercing them to participate.
3. Withholding information about the true nature of the research.
4. Otherwise deceiving the participant.
5. Inducing the participants to commit acts diminishing their self-esteem.
6. Violating rights of self-determination (e.g. in studies seeking to promote individual change).
7. Exposing participant to physical or mental stress.
8. Invading their privacy.
9. Withholding benefit from some participants (e.g. in comparison groups).
10. Not treating participants fairly, with consideration, or with respect.

I fully understood that it is unethical to manipulate methods and misrepresent facts in order to produce misleading results. This study was guided by ethical principles expounded in the Belmont Report in Mertens (2012: 22) which are justice, respect and beneficence. Mertens (2012: 22) states that respect is one of the ethical principles of the Belmont Report. According to Mertens (2012: 22) respect entails treating participants with courtesy and respectfully.

According to Richards and Schwartz (2002: 136) justice means equally "share and fairness". Justice is important because it prevents the exploitation and abuse of participants. This entails

identifying the vulnerability of participants and prevention of anxiety. Mertens (2012: 22) states that justice entails that those who stand to benefit from the study should be involved in the study. In doing so the procedures and relations that I employed in dealing with participants were reasonable, non-exploitative and considerate. In addressing the issue of involving beneficiaries, I involved both lecturers and students because both stand to benefit from the study through policy changes that would be brought about by their own voices and lived experiences that I report in this study.

Mertens (2012: 22) writes that justice entails being reasonable, non-exploitative, considerate, and fair in the administration of research procedures. Based on the guidance of Richards and Schwartz (2002: 137) and Robson, (1993: 33), I was not covert. I presented myself to the participants as a university student from the University of Cape Town conducting research in partial fulfilment of a Master's degree. I did not impersonate anyone in order to obtain information which I would not otherwise obtain. I was transparent and did not withhold any information about the true nature of the research.

Using insights from Robson (1993: 33), Orb, Eisenhauer and Wynaden (2001: 95), and Richards and Schwartz (2002: 138), I developed an information sheet and a consent form, which I read to the participants, emphasising their rights, including that their participation was voluntary. Before I began an interview, I ensured that participants understood that they were under no obligation to participate in my study and that they could withdraw from the study at any stage without having to justify their withdrawal. I also assured them of confidentiality.

Following the guidance of Mertens (2012: 25) on upholding the ethical principles of respect, courtesy and beneficence, before commencement of every interview I ensured that I gave participants the opportunity to seek clarity before commencement of the interview. When their questions or concerns were addressed and they were clear about aspects of the research process they had enquired about. Only after respondents voluntarily signed the consent forms did the interviews begin (Kvale, 1996).

According to Orb, Eisenhauer and Wynaden (2001: 95) and Mertens (2012: 23), beneficence is interpreted as "doing good for others and preventing harm." As a researcher I ensured that I protected the reputation of my participants. I gave effect to this through the use of pseudonyms to render the participants unidentifiable. Given that qualitative research collects large volumes of personal information from participants, anonymity should be guaranteed because identification of these participants may cause harm or prejudice to them or their communities.

Based on the writings of Okeke and Van Wyk (2015), before the commencement of data collection, I applied for ethical clearance twice: first from the Research Ethics Committee in the School of Education (Faculty of Humanities) at the University of Cape Town, where this study is being read, and at the Public University's Directorate of Research and Graduate Studies: Humanities and Social Sciences Research Committee. Both universities, via these ethics committees, granted approval for the study.

3.10 Summary

In Section 3.1 this chapter presented the research questions that drive this study. Section 3.2 defined quantitative and qualitative research methods respectively, while Section 3.3 discussed the differences between the two research methods in planning and executing a research plan. It is in this section where I indicated the choice of a qualitative research design as opposed to a quantitative research design. Under Section 3.4, I discussed the sampling techniques that I employed in this study, where I highlighted that non-random methods were used. I further justified why I chose purposeful sampling technics in selecting both the study site and individual participants. In Section 3.4.1 and Section 3.4.2, I addressed the sample size and category of respondents.

Under Section 3.5, I discussed interviews as a form of instrumentation in qualitative research. I discussed the three types of interviews and made justifications as to why I had settled for semi-structured interviews for data-collection purposes. In sub-section 3.5.2 I explained the processes and procedures I followed in conducting the interviews. In Section 3.6 I addressed the principles of autonomy, anonymity, and confidentiality, which are very important in order to protect my participants and all institutions from any sort of harm. Under Section 3.7 I explained the data analysis techniques I used in reporting my results. I demonstrated that qualitative research does not systematically use statistical and other computer packages, but instead emphasises a holistic approach to interpreting and understanding peoples' lived experiences. It was established that qualitative results are presented as accounts or narrations of respondents in their own words.

Finally, in Section 3.8 I addressed ethics as a major component of research. Under this section I described the ethical considerations I made in this study and declared that I submitted ethics applications to, and was awarded permission to conduct the study from two institutions: the University of Cape Town, where I am enrolled as a Master of Education student, and the Public University, which was both a gatekeeper for Zambian ethical standards, and also a gateway into the study site. In this section I described the protocols and precautions I took when collecting, reporting and analysing data in ensuring honesty while I protected the reputations

of my participants. I also declared that all participants were fully informed about all aspects the study and that I obtained signed, voluntary consent from each participant. In this section I also stated that I conducted this research in accordance with the Belmont Report on ethical principles, which are beneficence, respect and justice. In the process of conducting this study, I worked hard to prioritise the rights, dignity and reputation of respondents over and above the researcher's desire to know.

Having discussed my research design and methodology, I now move to Chapter 4, which present the findings of this study.

Chapter 4 Findings

4.1 Introduction

The findings presented in this chapter are from 8 semi-structured interviews conducted at the Public University with four lecturers and four post-graduate students from various disciplines. All respondents were purposively sampled based on their suitability to provide data to answer the study's research questions. Only lecturers that have taught for both public and private universities simultaneously were interviewed. Only post-graduate students were selected as participants, on the basis that the research component of their postgraduate degree programmes require more consultations, time and guidance from lecturers than the taught component. These postgraduate students could therefore speak directly to that aspect of the study. The aim was to gather the lived experiences of the respondents. Lecturers discussed their motives for teaching for more than one university; they appraised the nature of work in both public and private universities; they discussed their professional relationships with management in both sectors; they discussed their academic relationships with students in both public and private universities, and spoke about the implications thereof on the quality of teaching and learning in both sectors. Students discussed what they thought were their lecturers' motives for teaching for both public and private universities, and they also spoke meaningfully about how their lecturers' dual lecturing loads impacted on their studies.

All the names used in this chapter have been anonymised to protect the identities and reputations of the participants and institutions in accordance with ethical considerations. As stated in the Methodology chapter (Chapter 3), I interviewed 4 lecturers and 4 postgraduate students. Table 4.1 below shows the number of participants, and the ranks of lecturers and the schools they teach in. In the case of the students, the table shows their year of study, and in the last column I state the designated pseudonym of each participant. These pseudonyms are used consistently throughout this dissertation to describe each participant. As stated in Chapter 3, these interviews were conducted at the Public University. I have taken further steps to guarantee anonymity, I have withheld any distinguishing features that can lead to the identity of my respondents such as their ages, years of service to the university, but to demonstrate that I gathered data from people of different characteristics, I have included the schools they belong to. This does not put anyone at risk of being identified given that schools (equivalent to faculties in other universities) have a large number of academics and students.

Table 4.1 Participants and their Pseudonyms

Participant number	School where lecturer or student belongs	Department	Pseudonym used in minor dissertation
1	Natural Sciences	Biology	Lecturer 1
2	Humanities and Social Sciences	Demography	Lecturer 2

Participant number	School where lecturer or student belongs	Department	Pseudonym used in minor dissertation
3	Education	Education Policy	Lecturer 3
4	Humanities and Social Sciences	Political Science and Administrative Studies	Lecturer 4
5	Education	Educational Psychology	Student 1
6	Humanities	Linguistics	Student 2
7	Humanities	English	Student 3
8	Natural Sciences	Natural Resources	Student 4

Table 4.2 shows the pseudonyms of the private universities in the last column, the middle column shows the role that the lecturer plays at that particular university while the first column gives the pseudonyms of these lecturers so that reads may follow easily.

Table 4.2 Lecturers and the Private Universities they Teach in, in Addition to the Public University

Lecturer Pseudonym	Role/Designation that Public University lecturers play in private university	Pseudonym of private university used in minor dissertation
Lecturer 1	Post-graduate Supervisor	University B
Lecturer 1	Dean of school	University C
Lecturer 2	Lecturer	University B
Lecturer 2	Lecturer	University D
Lecturer 2	Lecturer	University E
Lecturer 2	Consultant	University I
Lecturer 3 Education	Senior Fellow	University B
Lecturer 3 Education	Lecturer	University D
Lecturer 3 Education	Consultant	University F
Lecturer 3 Education	Lecturer	University G
Lecturer 4 Humanities	Lecturer	University H

As I frame what will appear in my findings chapter, I find it beneficial to remind the reader what my research title, research question and sub-questions are.

4.1.1Research Title

The relationship between public and private higher education in Zambia with a specific focus on the movement of lecturers across public and private universities.

4.1.1 Research Questions

4.1.1.1 Main Research Question

What are the implications of lecturers at public universities working simultaneously at private universities?

4.1.1.2 Sub Research Questions

i. What is the motivation for lecturers at a public university in Zambia to lecture for more than one university simultaneously?

ii. And the second sub-question is; 'what are the implications for student learning when lecturers work simultaneously at public and private universities?'

The themes in this chapter were derived from the conceptual framework that was developed from the literature review. This findings chapter is constructed by means of foregrounding speech extracts of the eight participants (often in the form of indented quotes). In order to show what I view as important in these narrations of the participants, there are linking notes between quotations 'lifting out' what is of immediate importance in relation to the objectives of this study. This is in no way an analysis. The analysis will be conducted in Chapter 5. At the beginning of each section, I have defined or described the themes or categories based on the definition or description provided in the conceptual framework. This is important because it explains why I place excerpts under that category.

4.2 Partnership / Blurring of the public and private

The blurring of the public-private distinction in higher education is characterised by Torres and Schugurensky (2002: 443-444) as: the implementation of tuition fees in public universities; the public funding of private institutions; and partnerships between universities. Partnerships are described in 'Educating our Future' - Zambia's current policy on education – as: government pronounced policy stating that there would be no hindrances to anyone seeking to partner with the state in the provision of education and that the autonomy of these partners was guaranteed (Ministry of Education, 1996: 4). The policy also makes provisions for all training institutions in the country to work together in achieving national human resource and economic objectives. The policy states that this could either be done formally through public universities' accreditation of programmes of another training institution, or informally through the participation of public university staff in the activities of other training institutions (Ministry of Education, 1996: 97).

The findings in this section speak to the concepts of the blurring of the public private distinction and also to the concept of partnership in the context defined above.

Lecturer 1 is currently a full-time employee of the Public University: he is a lecturer in the School of Natural Sciences. In addition to his primary job at the Public University, he was also attached to two private universities, bringing the total number of universities he was working for at the time to three. His roles in all three universities were different. At the Public University he lectured undergraduates, conducted laboratory sessions, and supervised post-graduate students and final year under-graduate research module. He stated that at one private university he worked as Dean for the School of Health while on leave from the Public University, and that at the second private university he only supervised post-graduate students.

> Currently I am attached to two private universities… University C where I just ah! When I was on leave, I was working as a Dean there for the School of Health. And another private university where I work as post-graduate supervisor, University B. (Lecturer 1, Biology Department, School of Natural Sciences)

When asked which group of students benefit the most from his service between those at the Public University and those at private universities, Lecturer 2 was unequivocal in stating that it was obvious that it was the Public University students that benefit from his work in the main. He went further to add that he preferred to spend much more time with the Public University students than those at the private university.

> Obviously, my students here, I would rather spend more time with them here Ah! Rather than those from the private University. (Lecturer 2, Demography Department, School of Humanities and Social Sciences)

In emphasising the group of students that benefited the most from his service, Lecturer 3 (below) used the word “obvious” coupled with “my institution” to point out that students at the public university benefited more from his service than those at the private university. The use of the words ‘my institution’ is significant as it demonstrates that the lecturer identifies more with the Public University than the private universities where he teaches at simultaneously. He goes further to state that he is more often found at the public university and therefore his students there can easily access him as opposed to the private university students who only meet him occasionally.

> I think that's quite obvious, maybe, my institution where you find me, because we have open access we can talk, those students sometimes we only talk once or twice or not talk at all. (Lecturer 3, Education Policy Department, School of Education)

Lecturer 2 stated that when he taught for both private and public universities simultaneously, he taught at the Public University on weekdays during working hours, and in private universities after work hours. He also worked at the private universities over weekends and sometimes on public holidays. During the week he would teach at private universities from after 5pm to 9pm. Lecturer 2 indicated that, per week, he taught for nine hours for the Public University and six for the private university. He described the nine hours of teaching at the public university as an overload. In total, Lecturer 2 taught a combined fifteen hours a week for both the Public University and the private university. Lecturer 2 lamented that time management was difficult under these conditions, but added that he somehow always managed as he always found a way to teach fifteen hours a week, and in addition to this he also managed to supervise all the students for whom he was responsible.

> I would teach in the evenings, after 5pm. I would go there, and it used to be very stressful and tiresome. Knock off from here, go there, teach from 5pm up to somewhere 9pm. Something like that, and occasionally on weekends and holidays… obviously I had a lot of hours here. Like I said, I handle more than a normal load, like I had something like three courses of undergraduates, which translated into something like nine hours in a week. Then there I would have something like two days a week, in the evening three hours. So, you are talking about nine plus six, you are talking of fifteen hours for both, the private and the Public University here… time management sometimes is a problem. I find, I have always found a way of supervising all of these students somehow. (Lecturer 2, Demography Department, School of Humanities and Social Sciences)

Lecturer 1's use of the expression "Oh, my God" in response to the number of hours that he teaches for both the Public University and the private universities where he teaches part time is indicative of an extraordinary situation. He said for the Public University he teaches between twelve to fifteen hours per week. In addition to these teaching hours he has four hours of lab sessions in a week. He informed me that though a lab session is more than an hour, he only goes into the lab to introduce an experiment, after which the students will conduct the session under the supervisor of demonstrators. Lecturer 1 therefore teaches a total of nineteen (19) hours per week for the Public University alone. In addition to this heavy load, Lecturer 1 also teaches in private universities for a maximum of four hours per week, bringing his total teaching hours to 23 hours a week. In his own words, Lecturer 1 relates:

> Oh, my God! For the Public University! For the Public University it's almost… hmm! the Public University could be teaching could be 12 hours, 15 hours per week and lab sessions about 4 hours because for lab sessions we just go there and introduce the experiment and then leave. So, it's every, one hour in the afternoon for 5 days… private university the maximum is 4 hours per week. (Lecturer 1, Biology Department, School of Natural Sciences)

Student 2 said she had witnessed a significant number of students whose graduations have been delayed due to the inaccessibility of their supervisors. She narrated a case of a female student she knew, who narrated her predicament to her. Student 2 indicated the said student graduated in June, and attributed the graduation to her own efforts. She said the supervisor of the said student was hardly available to be consulted by the student. The student said she could not even identify the said lecturer's office on campus as he was always engaged in the corporate world. In the event the said student went to his corporate office, which was not on campus. The student was not afforded the opportunity to enter her lecturer's office. Instead, he would come out and meet her at his secretary's desk. Student 2 suggested that this was not a peculiar case.

> I have seen a good number of students that have not graduated because the supervisor is not available. There is a case of a certain student, she was telling me, at this campus, she graduated in June. But she told me it was her own hard work; the supervisor was never there. She can't point at his office here on campus, he's into the corporate world out there. When she goes to, I don't know if it's his place of work wherever he's found, she cannot even point at his office, they would just meet by his secretary's desk maybe somewhere there. And some of them it's the same things. Just yesterday I met a certain gentleman, he told me he has not graduated, he was supposed to graduate in June, but it has issues to do with the supervisor and for some of them we have seen the student calls, calls actually calling, the student would call ten times, the supervisor even stopped picking calls. (Student 2, Linguistics Department, School of Humanities)

Student 4 contended that what he detested about the Public University is the delay that most post-graduate students face in terms of graduating. He narrated incidents that had occurred when he was still an undergraduate student. Postgraduate students protested on the university campus because, out of a number of 200 or more enrolled students, fewer than five students would be graduating in the prescribed time.

> What I dislike about this institution is ah! Maybe the delayments in terms of graduating students, because you find those days when we were still undergraduates, we had

> situations where, we used to see postgraduates sometimes doing demonstrations, no, out of maybe 200 something that were admitted only 4 graduates, only 3, 5. (Student 4, Natural Resources Department, School of Natural Sciences)

Despite observing that most postgraduate students hardly graduate in time, Student 4 was very satisfied with his supervisor. He stated that his supervisor provided him a lot of assistance, adding that his programme of study required a lot of fieldwork and that his supervisor was always at hand to assist him. Student 4 stated that his supervisor would drive from the Public University in Lusaka district to Kafue River in Kafue district, approximately 60km away from campus, using his own resources like a motor vehicle, fuel, food and time. Student 4 considers himself fortunate to have this particular supervisor, who has always availed himself, notably over weekends. He would call Student 4 just to check on his welfare and progress, and when Student 4 requested help from him, his supervisor was always available. Student 4 stated that his relationship with his supervisor was stable, and that he had never experienced an unproductive relationship with his supervisor. However, Student 4 pointed out that his student peers experienced academic progress delays caused by their supervisors. Student 4 added that the students indicated how they were actively doing their part in terms of completing research processes such as data collection. A few students had written up their full dissertations, but their supervisors would be unavailable to help them take their work forward.

> …we have a lot of assistance especially for me, because like my programme requires fieldwork… So, he could take me to Kafue… drive using his own car, own fuel, even buy food for me… Ah! he has been readily available because for me I think am just lucky, because my supervisor is always there for me, especially, even over the weekends he would call and say are you, every time I want him, would drive all the way from Chilanga to come and see me to come and see my work. So, I think he is fine. Hmm! Yeah, I think on the supervision part, I don't know, I have not experienced that, but my friends have in terms of the same delayments. Maybe you find a student is active, he is collecting data, he has everything, he has written. You go to a supervisor; no, the supervisor has just boarded a flight to we don't know. You find he will come after some time you are stranded, yeah, such things. (Student 4, Natural Resources Department, School of Natural Sciences)

4.4 Casualisation of Labour

The findings presented in this section speak to the concept of the casualisation of labour in the higher education sector in Zambia. Casualisation of labour is described by May, Peetz & Strachan (2013: 262) as "casual employment (that) does not represent an entry level into the academic workforce. Rather, it is a separate, insecure secondary labour market." Thornton

(2011: 143) argues that casual employees are mostly unable to voice out against management: they are voiceless members of the teaching community. Taberner (2018: 135) asserts that the role of university management is to "extract the maximum out of each employee while, at the same time, rewarding them for their efforts at the lowest possible wage." In this section, the Public University lecturers will explain how they offer casual labour to private universities while working on a permanent basis for the Public University.

Lecturer 1 from the School of Natural Sciences: Department of Biological Science said that job security at public universities in Zambia is better and more guaranteed than that in private universities. One of the reasons he gave for the lack of job security in private universities is that the proprietors of these private universities meddle with the work of academic staff, with the aim that their investments in these academics should remain profitable. Lecturer 1 said that this status quo does not guarantee job security and takes away an academic's professional discretion and autonomy as they become voiceless and timid. As a consequence, they find themselves unable to professionally contradict the proprietors of these universities for fear of losing their jobs. Lecturer 1 said this phenomenon, among other reasons, compromised an academic's job security in a private university. He further added that the chief aim for private universities was to maximise profits. In the event that a lecturer would want to uphold certain academic standards and invoke quality assurance modalities, and if such desires by an academic interferes with the university's profit-motive, the academic risks his job as the proprietors of the university may easily fire such a lecturer. Lecturer 1 emphasised that the lack of job security for academics in private universities is largely due to the interference of management and the proprietors of these universities in the work of an academic.

> …not compared to public universities because like I mentioned, there is too much interference by the owners or the directors as it were in terms of academic activities, so that in itself does not guarantee job security, because I would think of a situation where probably you don't agree with their suggestion as an academician, I don't think you can be in good books with them. Those are the things and of course being private the core value is to make profit so even for example one would want to demand for one or two things you find that may not be seen and people may easily you know, change their minds and get rid of you. So, the fact that the directors or the owners of these universities have a direct hand simply means that, job security is not guaranteed… (Lecturer 1, Biology Department, School of Natural Sciences)

Lecturer 2 indicated that he had been informed by his colleague with whom he worked both at the Public University, on a full time basis, and at the same private university (University B)

on a casual basis, that after conducting an exam and presenting results to management at the private university, management had inflated the results of all the students that had failed. As a result, all failing students were passed by management, not through an academic process, but through an administrative one. Lecturer 2 stated that the reason for such actions is to have a high throughput rate and consequently more money. Lecturer 2 stated that such acts by the private university is a demonstration that, for them, financial gain takes precedence over the core purpose of teaching and learning. Lecturer 2 stated it as:

> …a friend of mine was teaching school, you know, in the School of Law there… had a similar experience of failing students who are all passed by management. It's like management overriding the decision of an academic. Just so that the students could come back and continue paying us, so that we can make money. So, it's like, you know, putting money above standards, although they seem very aggressive in marketing themselves as a premier university now. (Lecturer 2, Demography Department, School of Humanities and Social Sciences)

Lecturer 3 is of the opinion that academics enjoy more autonomy and professional discretion when they work for public universities compared to their work for private universities. Lecturer 3 was visibly anxious as he narrated an incident he had experienced with a private university, whose name he withheld. He narrated that he had marked an examination, and it later came to his attention that the results of that exam had been, in his own words, "manipulated". That did not sit well with him, as he saw very poor quality-assurance procedures in that institution. He stated that he felt "betrayed" and sensed a lack of trust between himself and the private university. His expectation was that once he had awarded grades to a student, he had done so professionally, and expected his work to be treated as such. Lecturer 3 used the word 'respect' to describe his relationship with public universities in this regard, adding that it was not about financial gain in public universities, but about the quality of student learning outcomes. He stated that at the Public University it did not mattered what a student's economic status was, and that one only graduated when your academic performance was satisfactory, adding that there were no shortcuts to academic excellence:

> I think in public institutions, we are more independent. One of the universities that I dropped, am sorry to say this but I will say it, I happened to mark, people started manipulating my… at one of the institutions I used to teach some time back, I said no, not this kind of quality assurance. If I give you a grade, you must trust me. So, in public institutions we are respected, it's not about money, you can have the money, you will not get the degree unless you perform ah, these students cannot use any shortcuts,

> no way, if you don't write your work you cannot graduate. Yeah! (Lecturer 3, Education Policy Department, School of Education)

In responding to whether or not he would consider studying with a private university in Zambia, Student 4 averred. He stated that he got a sense of pride in being associated with the Public University and its degree. He went further to state that this was the case, notwithstanding that obtaining a degree from the Public University was not quite easy. This seemed to be an indication that the student valued quality over convenience.

> No! Ah! I am just proud of being a student who has gotten the paper at the Public University (laughter). Though they are very difficult to give to graduate yeah! (Student 4, Natural Resources Department, School of Natural Sciences)

Student 1 said that, in some instances, the Public University students' graduations are delayed, not out of their own making or because of their sluggish attitudes, but because of their lecturers. Student 1 stated that in certain cases a student may have completed the tasks given to them in order to fulfil the requirements of their postgraduate programmes, but their lecturers would cause delays, at times for many months, to their studies due to lecturers' failure to provide adequate supervision, largely because lecturers had other income generating commitments to which they gave their time. The student posited that financial gain was a motivating factor for his lecturers, and people have a tendency to give their full attention to activities that pay well. Hence, at the Public University, lecturers sometimes neglected their Public University students by privileging other paying commitments at the private universities where they took additional employment, causing unwarranted delays to their students at the public universities. In Student 1's words:

> …sometime people delay here not because the students are lazy, or they have not done their part, but you find sometimes the problems are caused by lecturers who fail to mark, and they fail to provide proper supervision because they are engaged. You know where monies are concerned and where you are paid well. Even your heart, that's where it is and your concentration. (Student 1, Educational Psychology Department, School of Education)

4.5 Corporatisation of Universities and Reconceptualising Students as Customers

The findings presented in this section speak to the concept of corporatisation of universities, which is defined as harmonising higher education with business and corporate objectives in order to become competitive on the international stage (Torres and Schugurensky, 2002: 442). Through deliberate efforts, university functions are redefined to mean the facilitation of economic development and profit generation. In this new environment, universities must compete among themselves and other entities for government research grants (Torres and

Schugurensky, 2002: 436). Ostenson, Clegg and Wiggins (2007: 510) suggest that when education institutions begin to prioritise profits, teaching and learning becomes secondary as learning institutions reimagine their missions and academic priorities and conform to the demands of customers. Molesworth, Scullion and Nixon (2010: 146) suggest that student-centeredness marginalises teachers in exploring the quality of what they do. According to Lynch (2016: 7) and Loveday (2018: 156), academic success is now being measured by one's ability to serve what is measurable on the markets.

Student 3, a second-year Master's student in Humanities and Social Sciences indicated that her supervisor was not very helpful, and alleged that he was delaying the progress of her study because of his tardiness. Her supervisor, she said, did not respond in reasonable time to her submissions. She stated that she had to undertake numerous follow-up communications to him to receive a response to her submissions. She described attempts to get an audience with him as not easy:

> I will give an example of my supervisor; he is delaying my work… he doesn't respond in time, for him just to respond, you just have to call and look for him. Just seeing him, it's not easy. (Student 3, English Department, School of Humanities)

Student 2 said that the majority of prospective postgraduate students snub the Public University, arguing that the lecturers at the Public University are not generous in awarding good grades. She said that, for her, the fact that the Public University lecturers do not simply award high marks signals to her that the management and academic staff at the Public University have made the provision of quality education their priority. She said many people are now interested in smaller universities within the country, where they may study for their Master's degree within one year or a maximum of one-and-a-half years, because the lecturers in those private higher education institutions are generous in awarding marks.

> …most people are avoiding Public University because they are saying people are mean, they don't give marks anyhow. So, for me that means they don't ah, those that are concerned with the running of the university or the lecturers they are still interested in quality… yeah! Small, small universities around, where to them, they will do their thing in 1 year 6, within 1 year 6 months and people are not mean with marks and so on. (Student 2, Linguistics Department, School of Humanities)

Lecturer 4 related that his experience of working for both the Public University and (private) University H had provided him an insight into how both universities related to their students. He noticed that the Public University and University H assessed their students differently. He stated that the Public University did not treat students as customers: they objectively assessed students, and awarded grades based on the performance of the student. In contrast, Lecturer

4 stated that private universities were not as objective in their academic assessment of students. He said that some students who had failed a course and therefore needed to repeat that course were somehow able to proceed as their failing results had been 'moderated' and had been converted to passing grades. Private universities, said Lecturer 4, treated students as customers and their focus was on maintaining a viable, paying customer base:

> …when it comes to my basic experience, I feel when it comes to assessment, the public university does not really look at a person as a customer; they look at really the performance of a person. In the private sector, some people who may need to repeat a course, are usually, results are easily moderated because the focus is the customer to maintain a customer base. (Lecturer 4, Political Science and Administrative Studies Department, School of Humanities and Social Sciences)

4.9 Conclusion

This chapter has reported the lived experiences of lecturers who have taught for both the Public University and private universities simultaneously. It has highlighted their motivations for teaching at both public and private higher education institutions simultaneously. The chapter has also compared their relationships with management and students in both the public and private sectors, as well as their reported conditions of service and the differential ways in which both sectors adopt business principles in running these higher learning institutions. The chapter also explored and showed, through their own narratives, how lecturers divided their time between all the institutions that they taught in. The chapter also brought to the fore lecturers' views on their students' attitudes towards education in both the public and private sectors, and showed how their opinions often alternated in terms of which group of students (should) and do benefit more from their service in terms of their time at the Public University and those in private universities.

The chapter foregrounded the postgraduate students' opinions on their lecturers' commitment to their work at the Public University and offered insights as to which group of students benefits the most from their lecturers (between themselves and those in private universities). Students also highlighted the impact of dual employment by their lecturers on the progress and completion times of their studies. The chapter showed that there were differing takes on their preferences in terms of whether to attend public or private universities, and showed that there was a distinct discursive trend in these students' choices that reflected on the issue of academic quality or the perceived lack thereof.

The next chapter is the Discussion and Analysis chapter. In the next chapter I will analyse and discuss the finding presented in this chapter. This will be done by comparing the findings to

the literature review and the conceptual framework in order to answer the research questions that drive the study.

5.0 Chapter 5 Discussion and Analysis

5.1 Introduction

In this chapter the results produced in Chapter 4 will be analysed and discussed under three sections, while a fourth section will offer insights from the analysis. The three sections of discussion and analysis are Section 5.2, in which lecturers' commitment to maintain high standards of teaching and learning across the board are probed, and students' views are analysed alongside this. Section 5.3 focuses on the implications for teaching and learning when lecturers take up extra jobs at private universities in addition to their heavy teaching loads at the Public University. Section 5.4 presents the findings related to teaching and learning implications that a lack of job security has for casual lecturers, coupled with management's intrusion on academic activities.

Before I proceed to discuss my findings, it is useful to restate the research title, main research question and the sub-questions of the study. The title of my study is "The relationship between public and private higher education in Zambia with a specific focus on the movement of lecturers across public and private universities." The main research question animating the study is: What are the implications of lecturers at public universities working simultaneously at private universities? The study has two sub-questions, the first of which is: what is the motivation for lecturers at the Public University to lecture for more than one university simultaneously? The second sub-question is: what are the implications for student learning when lecturers work simultaneously at public and private universities?

Because this is a qualitative study, the data and findings produced are non-numerical. According to Wang and Park (2016: 211) the process of data reduction and analysis in qualitative studies may sometimes be somewhat complex. Cohen, Manion, and Morrison (2007: 461) add that there is not a single procedure that is considered as the golden standard for all types of qualitative studies. According to Merriam and Tisdell (2015: 201) qualitative data analysis is mostly inductive and comparative, therefore analysis in this chapter will be done by comparing my findings to the main research question, to the two sub-questions, to the literature review and to the conceptual framework in order to obtain theoretical ideas from the empirical data.

Lama and Joullié (2015: 6) provide very strong evidence of how stakeholders in a First World country like Australia are concerned about the future of their country's higher education due to casualisation of academic labour. Casualisation of academic labour is expressed in terms of the following: the lack of research activity by academics; appraisals and evaluation of lecturers by students; inflation of students' grades; the lack of professional development for academic staff; compromised academic and professional integrity which arguably negatively

impacts the quality of both the student in particular and education in general; the lack of job and financial security; and wages are paid by contact hours or number of courses taught and the interference of university management in the academic work of lecturers. Given the lack of information about a very new sector in Zambian higher education, namely the private higher education system, this study, and the discussion and analysis that follows, is a modest contribution to broadening our understanding of the impact of the private sector's intrusion into the higher education sector of a formerly colonised African country that seeks to modernise and insert itself and its people into the world on an equal footing.

5.2 Lecturers' Commitment to Maintain High Standards of Teaching and Learning Across the Board and How Students View This

As stated by Lama and Joullié (2015: 6), there is a developing trend where casually employed academics are holding multiple jobs teaching many courses in different universities simultaneously. According to Ochoa (2011: 140), overdependence on contingent faculty may plausibly threaten the provision of quality education, arguing that adjunct academic staff do not always strongly identify with institutions and that they have very minimal academic and non-academic interactions with their students outside the classroom. This is because part-time lecturers do not enjoy priority commitment from institutions that engage them on a casual basis. Likewise, part-time lecturers also do not always give priority to these institutions. Jacoby (2006, 1083) states that part-time lecturers are not provided with office space, telephones, computers and other such work equipment necessary for the effective execution of their duties. This impedes their ability to meet with and guide students.

The findings in Chapter 4 of this study showed that over 75% of the lecturers interviewed for this study confirmed that the Public University students, where the lecturers are permanently employed, benefit more from lecturers' services than students in private universities where the same lecturers are contracted as adjunct staff. Lecturers 1, 2 and 3 were emphatic in their use of words like 'obviously' and 'of course' to accentuate the status quo with regard to which group of students benefits the most from their services. Lecturer 2 articulated that it was 'obvious' that students in public universities benefited more than their counterparts from private institutions where he taught simultaneously. Lecturer 2 said that he. as a matter of preference, gave precedence to the Public University students over those from private universities. This, perhaps, is an indication that he identified more with the Public University than the private universities he taught in. He said:

> Obviously, my students here, I would rather spend more time with them here Ah! Rather than those from the private University (Lecturer 2, Demography Department, School of Humanities and Social Sciences).

Like Lecturer 2, Lecturer 3 from the Education Policy Department, School of Education, was emphatic in stressing that it was 'quite obvious' that the Public University students benefited the most from his service. Lecturer 3 drew attention to a key issue that drives this dissertation, namely, differential access that his students at the public university enjoy as opposed to the limited access his students have to him at the private university. He stressed that in his case students at the institution where he was employed permanently benefited more than the institution where he taught part-time. He, like Lecturer 1, stressed that he was entirely present at his primary place of employment (Public University) and that students registered at the Public University could conveniently get access to him for academic conversations, while those in private universities did not have such an equal privilege. Lecturer 3 added that his students in the private universities only conversed with him once in a while. In responding to which group of students benefited the most from his services, Lecturer 3 revealed that:

> I think that's quite obvious, maybe, my institution where you find me, because we have open access we can talk, those students sometimes we only talk once or twice or not talk at all. (Lecturer 3, Education Policy Department, School of Education)

Despite lecturers' affection for the Public University and their students at this institution, and their belief that the Public University students benefit more from their services than students from private universities, Student 1, a post-graduate student at the Public University Department of Education Psychology in the School of Education, did not feel the same way. Student 1 indicated that private university students benefit more than the Public University students because students in private universities graduate in shorter time periods than those from the Public University. Student 1 expressed his distaste at the delays involved for the Public University to graduate postgraduate students. The student attributed such delays to lecturers: the student claimed that students are not to blame because they would have fulfilled all the academic requirements asked of them by their supervisors. Yet such a student's study would be extended into the next academic year because of their supervisor's unavailability. Student 1 wondered why lecturers at the Public University were not available. The student suggested that it might be that the lecturer-student ratio might be high or alternatively the delay may be caused by lecturers who have other commitments in addition to their responsibilities at the Public University. The student alleged that he was aware that some of the Public University lecturers also taught in private universities and further alleged that private

universities paid them better. Student 1 submitted that, unlike the case at the Public University, students in private universities supervised by the same lecturers graduated in time. The student wondered why lecturers, who had every positive employment incentive at the Public University, took longer periods to graduate students at the Public University than in the private universities. The student charged that the Public University lecturers that teach in private universities owe their allegiances to private universities. The student stated:

> I think what I dislike is the issue of delays, caused by lecturers sometimes not necessarily the students… You have done your best, you have paid your school fees, you have done your research work but, eh, your study will be extended in another academic year because of lecturers, maybe they are few or maybe they have other engagements with private universities where they are paid well, because am aware that some lecturers who are lecturing us, they are also lecturing in other private universities and students in those private universities, they graduate on time. Students here, where they are employed and where they are permanent, where they have offices, they take 3, 4, 5 years to graduate… So, it's like their loyalty is more to private universities than public universities where they are working from. (Student 1, Educational Psychology Department, School of Education)

Similarly to Student 1, Student 3 from the School of Humanities and Social Sciences, Department of Languages also feels that lecturers delay students' studies. Student 3 uses her case as an example. She feels that her supervisor is causing delays to her work. The student laments that it is not easy for her to meet with her supervisor. The student held that her supervisor had a poor communication culture. She describes a situation where her supervisor does not respond to her calls despite her many attempts and that she has to go looking for him. She said even having an audience with him was a challenge. She disclosed that it was not easy for her to receive timely feedback from him despite his promises to do so. Student 3 lamented:

> I will give an example of my supervisor; he is delaying my work… He doesn't respond in time, for him just to respond, you just have to call and look for him. Just seeing him, it's not easy… Yeah! He would promise I would send the document, but I would wait even for a month. (Student 3, English Department, School of Humanities)

Lecturer 2 From the Demography Department, School of Humanities and Social Sciences, is aware that some of his postgraduate students are dissatisfied with the time he allocates to their studies. He views such students as selfish and self-centred based on how they address their dissatisfaction. Lecturer 2 articulated that he works in such a way that he gives priority to

students that are lagging behind. He stated that some students may be progressing well with their studies but would still pressure him to attend to their needs without realising that he has a similar responsibility to other students as well. He said in the spirit of fairness he wants to find the best way of dividing his time among all the students under his direct supervision. He questioned the audacity of some students who follow up with him inquiring whether or not he is done reviewing their work. He is of the opinion that this is not proper and he insists that he has his own way of handing the supervision feedback process. He said he creates a roster and workplan and he knows which students to give priority to. He said that he knows what he is doing adding that some students do not have patience and an understanding of the processes involved. Lecturer 2 stated that the current crop of students that the university had registered wanted to dictate to the supervisor when the supervisor should read their work. He described some students as arrogant. He described such experiences as an academic cultural shock adding that his days as a student were different:

> Yes! Ah! There are students I supervise, who feel unhappy that I don't have time for them. Now some of them it's selfishness. I think I alluded to a situation where someone has made a lot of progress, but this person doesn't want… it's like this person wants almost all the attention paid to them, you know. Which is unfair because you have to find an optimal way of sharing your time across the other students you are supervising... I mean how does a student come to you and ask you that "have you finished writing, reading my dissertation?" That's wrong, you know, because for me I have my own schedule and plans in terms of who comes first. I know what to do, but you find some of them… and I am not the only one complaining. There are some of the current crop of students we are picking up who seem to want to be telling the supervisor when to read their dissertations… They are that arrogant some of them, which I find almost shocking. It's like a cultural shock, because I think I grew up in a different era. (Lecturer 2, Demography Department, School of Humanities and Social Sciences)

Student 2 from Linguistics, School of Humanities and Social Sciences said that she was aware that most people were avoiding doing their postgraduate studies with the Public University on the basis of the unpleasantness of academic staff. Student 2 stated that those students who avoided the Public University argued that the Public University lecturers were not generous with their marking or grading of academic work. But unlike those students that avoided the Public University on the basis of a perceived lack of generosity by academics in grading academic work, Student 2 saw this as positive, because for her it entails quality and standards:

> …most people are avoiding the Public University because they are saying people are mean, they don't give marks anyhow. So, for me that means they don't ah, those that are concerned with the running of the university or the lecturers they are still interested in quality. (Student 2, Linguistics Department, School of Humanities)

5.3 Implications on Teaching and Learning when Lecturers Take Up Extra Jobs in Private Universities in Addition to the Heavy Teaching Load at the Public University

Klopper and Power (2014: 110) caution that increased numbers of casual lecturers negatively impact student success because most casual lecturers have a heavy teaching load and other tasks such as preparation for class, tutorials and marking of assessments. Sometimes a lecturer may owe these responsibilities to both undergraduate and postgraduate students. These lecturers also have other paid commitments in other institutions. According to Klopper and Power (2014: 105), student success is negatively affected by the employment of casual lecturers and they cite Jacoby's (2006) study who studied the relationships between student graduation rates at American community colleges and the increase of part-time faculty and suggested that graduation rates decrease when casual lecturers increase.

Lecturer 2 from the Demography department attested that working for both public and private universities simultaneously was very taxing and tedious. He indicated that he clocked off from his permanent employment at the Public University at 5pm and would then immediately proceed to the private university, where he would work until 9pm in the evening. He revealed that for private universities, he worked even on weekends and on public holidays. In responding to how many hours he taught in a week for both public and private universities, Lecturer 2 was categorical in his use of the words "obviously I had a lot of hours". He testified that at the Public University he was already carrying more than a normal teaching load and that he handled both undergraduate and postgraduate students at the Public University, while he only handled postgraduate students at the private university. He said:

> I would teach in the evenings, after 5pm, I would go there, and it used to be very stressful and tiresome. Knock off from here go there, teach from 5pm up to somewhere 9pm. Something like that and occasionally on weekends and holidays… obviously I had a lot of hours here like I said, I handle more than a normal load, like I had something like three courses undergraduates, which translated into something like nine hours in a week, then there I would have something like two days a week, in the evening three hours. So, you are talking about 9+6, you are talking of 15 hours for both, the private and the Public University here… time management sometimes is a problem. I find, I have always found a way of supervising all of these students

somehow. (Lecturer 2, Demography Department, School of Humanities and Social Sciences)

Lecturer 1 from the Biology Department used the exclamation “Oh, my God!” to emphasis the magnitude of the overload he had at the Public University, and perhaps some frustration as a consequence of the overload. He says he teaches between 12 to 15 hours a week and in addition to this he has 4 to 5 laboratory sessions where he goes to introduce a 4-hour lab session, although he only spends an hour with students during these sessions. Lecturer 1 stated:

> Oh, my God! For the Public University! For the Public University its almost hmm! the Public University could be Teaching could be 12 hours, 15 hours per week and lab sessions about 4 hours because for lab sessions we just go there and introduce the experiment and then leave. So, its every, one hour in the afternoon for 5 days…. Private university the maximum is 4 hours per week. (Lecturer 1, Biology Department, School of Natural Sciences)

When asked what recommendation he would make to the Public University in order for him to be more efficient and effective, Lecturer 1’s priority recommendation which he emphasised by using the expression “first and foremost”, indicated that the Public University should reduce the number of hours that some lecturers teach. His second recommendation was quite similar to the first, as it also hinges on workload. He exhorted the university to establish a threshold with regard to the number of, especially, undergraduate students that a lecturer should teach. He said this was important because his undergraduate students from Natural Sciences, Department of Biological Sciences also had a research component which had to be supervised in their fourth and final year. Lecturer 1 said that, occasionally, lecturers are overburdened due to the high number of students, and this was exacerbated by the lack of a university policy on the number of students that a lecturer may supervise. He lamented that the situation was already overwhelming just taking into account undergraduate supervision. It got worse, said Lecturer 1, when you add the undergraduate students that he co-supervises. In addition to this supervision load, he also supervised three doctoral. students.

Lecturer 1, in addition to teaching, laboratory sessions, and supervision of student research, also conducts research in his personal capacity. He suggested that adding research to the general overload of teaching duties was the reason lecturers were overwhelmed, and that it was ‘common knowledge’ that this was the reason for lecturers overworking themselves at the office, and even taking their work home in order to meet deadlines and keep pace with current trends: He said:

> To first and foremost reduce a little bit on the teaching hours as well as just to limit on the number of students that one can handle especially at undergraduate. Because we also supervise the undergraduate research component. Sometimes we get overwhelmed with the number of students especially that there is no clearcut policy on the numbers… (clears throat) and of course it should be noted that the numbers that I have talked about are like me being the core or the main supervisor, but I also have students who I co-supervise, so in terms of numbers that I have talked about could even double, because I also supervise like current three PhD's.… other than that of course I also have my own research that I do at individual level. So, you find that being overwhelmed with work, it's actually out there and that's why you find that in most cases we tend to even overwork ourselves either at the office or even at home just to meet some of the deadlines and also just to keep abreast with what is going on out there. (Lecturer 1, Biology Department, School of Natural Sciences)

While lecturers bemoaned their huge workloads at the Public University, Student 2 from Linguistics said she that had witnessed a substantial number of postgraduate students failing to graduate from the Public University, which she attributed to the unavailability of their supervisors. Student 2 alluded to a situation concerning one of her female colleagues, now a graduate, who narrated her experience with her supervisor. Student 2 states that though her colleague graduated from the Public University, the graduate does not attribute her success to her supervisor but her own efforts. The graduate told Student 2 that her supervisor was hardly available for consultations and that even his office on campus could not be identified.

Student 4, from Natural Sciences, Department of Natural Resources, spoke in a similar way to Student 2. He indicated that postgraduate students have delays in graduating from the Public University and that he dislikes this. He recalled a time during his undergraduate studies when postgraduate students held protests due to the unreasonably low number of postgraduate students who were graduating from the Public University at the time. He surmised that out of 200 students enrolled in postgraduate studies only 3 to 5 would graduate. This is less than five percent of the cohort, adding that this sparked demonstrations back then: He said:

> What I dislike about this institution is ah! Maybe the delayments in terms of graduating students, because you find those days when we were still undergraduates, we had situations where, we used to see postgraduates sometimes doing demonstrations, no, out of maybe 200 something that were admitted only 4 graduates, only 3, 5. (Student 4, Natural Resources Department, School of Natural Sciences)

Despite Student 4 making a similar submission to that of Student 2 with regard to delays in students graduating due to the unavailability of their supervisors, Student 4 said for him the case was different, as he received a lot of support from his supervisor, adding that the nature of his degree involves a lot of fieldwork. The student said his supervisor had time for him as he would assist him with transport; in fact, his supervisor picked him up using his own motor vehicle and paid for fuel and food during the student's fieldwork. Student 4 said his lecturer was unhesitatingly available and this made Student 4 consider himself quite fortunate. While Lecturers 1 and 2 said they worked for private universities on weekends and public holidays, Student 4 said his supervisor was always available to him, especially on weekends. In his words:

> …we have a lot of assistance especially for me, because like my program requires fieldwork… So, he could take me to Kafue drive using his own car, own fuel, even buy food for me… Ah! He has been readily available because for me I think am just lucky, because my supervisor is always there for me, especially, even over the weekends he would call and say are you, every time I want him, would drive all the way from Chilanga to come and see me to come and see my work. So, I think he is fine. Hmm! Yeah, I think on the supervision part, I don't know, I have not experienced that, but my friends have in terms of the same delayments. Maybe you find a student is active, he is collecting data, he has everything, he has written. You go to a supervisor; no, the supervisor has just boarded a flight to we don't know. You find he will come after some time you are stranded, yeah, such things. (Student 4, Natural Resources Department, School of Natural Sciences)

5.4 Teaching and Learning Implications of Lack of Job Security for Casual Lecturers coupled with Management's Intrusion on Academic Activities

Klopper and Power (2014: 103) indicate that casual lecturers are employed every semester, and by implication casual lecturers do not have job security, neither do they have financial certainty. Lama and Joullié (2015: 4) argue that this causes anxiety amongst casual lecturers as they begin to worry about the next semester before the end of the current one. The lack of job security can lead lecturers to compromise their academic and professional integrity to secure a contract for the next semester. These compromises take the form of grade inflation and weakening of marking criteria aimed at getting positive evaluations from students as well as impressing management.

Lecturer 1 from Biological Sciences said he enjoys more autonomy in the execution of his academic duties when he works for the public university, where he is permanently employed,

in comparison to when he works for private universities, where he works part-time. He lamented the intrusion of shareholders and university management in the academic affairs of private universities. Lecturer 1 submits that such managerial intrusion does not guarantee job security for lecturers; he suggests that a lecturer may fall out with management and possibly get fired in the event that a lecturer does not agree with the position of management based on his/her professional discretion. He states:

> …not compared to public universities because like I mentioned, there is too much interference by the owners or the directors as it were in terms of ah! Ah! Academic activities, Ah! So that in itself does not guarantee job security, because I would think of a situation where probably you don't agree with their suggestion as an academician so I don't think you can be in good books with them… and people may easily you know, change their minds and get rid of you. (Lecturer 1, Biology Department, School of Natural Sciences)

Lecturer 2 from Demography narrates his colleague's encounter who taught at the Public University fulltime in the School of Law and was engaged to teach Law part-time in a private university. This lecturer aspired to maintain similar teaching and assessment standards at the private university as those at the Public University, but these efforts were frustrated by management at the private university. Lecturer 2 said that students who had failed, had their grades inflated by management, and subsequently these students passed. Lecturer 2 suggested that management in that instance prevailed over the verdict of an academic in order to maintain a customer base and continue generating profits. He said such actions amounted to prioritising financial gains over the telos of education, adding that such universities are deceptive as they market themselves as premier universities in the face of these irregularities. He framed it in the following way:

> …a friend of mine was teaching in the School of Law there had a similar experience of failing students who are all passed by management. It's like management overriding the decision of an academic. Just so that the students could come back and continue paying us, so that we can make money. So, it's like, you know, putting money above standards, although they seem very aggressive in marketing themselves as a premier university now. (Lecturer 2, Demography Department, School of Humanities and Social Sciences)

Lecturer 3 from Education Policy Department said lecturers that teach for both public and private universities are more independent when they work for the Public University than when they work for private universities. He indicates that he discontinued his engagement with a

private university on account of their interference with the examination process. He recounted that he had graded exams, after which the results had allegedly been manipulated upwards. He became discontented with the lack of standards and in fact quality-assurance modalities. He said at the Public University, lecturers are respected, as the institution does not prioritise financial benefits over teaching and learning, and that students did not graduate until they met the stipulated standards. He said there are no compromises:

> I think in public institutions, we are more independent. One of the universities that I dropped, am sorry to say this but I will say it, I happened to mark, people started manipulating my, at one of the institutions I used to teach some time back, I said no, not this kind of quality assurance. If I give you a grade, you must trust me. So, in public institutions we are respected, it's not about money, you can have the money, you will not get the degree unless you perform ah, these students cannot use any shortcuts, no way, if you don't write your work you cannot graduate. Yeah! (Lecturer 3, Education Policy Department, School of Education)

In responding to whether he would consider studying at a private university in Zambia, Student 4 from Natural Resources said he had never contemplated studying with a private university and that studying with and concomitantly graduating from the Public University gives him a sense of pride. He however acknowledged that graduating from the Public University is not easy:

> No! Ah! I am just proud of being a student who has gotten the paper at the Public University (laughter). Though they are very difficult to give to graduate yeah! (Student 4, Natural Resources Department, School of Natural Sciences)

Unlike student 4, Lecturers 2 and 3 stated that the Public University postgraduate students delayed their own graduation because lecturers are thorough with students, and that they upheld the highest standards possible. Student 1 from the Psychology of Education Department had a different opinion. For him, delays were caused by lecturers who did not hold up their end of the bargain due to other commitments at the private universities. Student 1 said that students may do what is requested of them but would still be delayed due to poor supervision by lecturers. The student alleged that lecturers are well paid in private universities and so they concentrate their efforts towards private universities. He said his experience with his Master's degree would determine whether he would return to the Public University or leave for a private university when he registers for his next degree (Ph.D.). Unlike Students 2 and 4 who would not consider a private university, Student 1 said he would if it came to it:

> As I earlier on said, sometime people delay here not because the students are lazy, or they have not done their part, but you find sometimes the problems are caused by lecturers who fail to mark, and they fail to provide proper supervision because they are engaged. You know where monies are concerned and where you are paid well. Even your heart that's where it is and your concentration. So, you find if it may reach a point where I have done my best and things are not working out eh, I may consider. Maybe for my next study, when I go for Ph.D. I may do it at a private eh, private university. (Student 1, Educational Psychology Department, School of Education)

Insights From the Analysis

This chapter has analysed and discussed the findings presented in Chapter 4 in relation to the literature review and the conceptual framework. The analysis was aimed at answering the research questions that propelled the study. As a way of concluding the chapter I summarise some of the analysis and discussion points presented in the chapter.

The positive impact of lecturer's movement across public and private universities can be summed up as personal social economic welfare, benevolence, and management skill. Personal social economic welfare comes in the form of payments that lecturers receive from private universities, which has assisted in avoiding a brain drain as a result of low wages paid by public universities to academic staff at the recommendation of Bretton Woods institutions. The 1980s is a case in point, during which the Public University alone lost more than 60% of its academic staff who left in pursuit of greener pastures to neighbouring Southern African Development Corporation (SADC) countries due to dire economic challenges coupled with poor general remuneration and grim outlooks for the future of the Zambian higher education sector. Working at a public university and then taking up simultaneous employment at private universities attenuates the harsh economic climate for many of these public university academics.

The matter of benevolence arises in the study, in the form of lecturers offering their service for purposes of creating capacity in these new private universities (as per the University Act of 1992). When the study was in its initial stages, I did not realise that the phenomenon of lecturers teaching simultaneously at public and private higher education institutions in Zambia was underwritten in policy. My intitial thinking was that these lecturers were operating illegally, and that these practices were tacitly allowed by the state. This study has corrected my misunderstanding. The University Act of 1992 was intended, in part, to use the small pool of intellectual capital in the form of the academic staff at the only two public universities in Zambia (in 1992) to share their expertise with a newly (legislatively) enabled private higher education

sector that could not be staffed by anyone other than the academic staff that existed at the two public universities at the time of the promulgation of The University Act of 1992. It is arguable whether this 'benevolence' has, in fact, not unintentionally created a two-tier higher education (university) sector in Zambia: a public university sector in which, to a large extent, the emphasis on academic integrity appears to be intact, and a private university sector in which the profit-motive overrides academic integrity. The implications for students who graduate from these private universities with less-than-thorough qualifications and skills will be found out in the employment sectors, but, in a country in which the pool of graduates is very small, this phenomenon might not be an issue for the foreseeable future.

The third important insight from the analysis, namely the acquisition of management skills gained through positions of leadership in private universities that junior public university lecturers are provided, is significant. Several lecturers indicated that their employment at the private universities involved them being tasked with, at times, very senior leadership at these private universities. One lecturer, for example, was a senior lecturer at the Public University and worked simultaneously at a private university as the dean of a faculty. It is worth noting at this point that this is not normal. Many academic faculty members across the world spend lifetimes seeking tenure and promotion, with a minority achieving these positions. In the Zambian case, comparatively junior academic staff are taking up (legislatively provisioned) senior academic and management posts even as they begin their academic careers. How this will play out in the decades ahead is unknown.

The insights above are from the perspectives of lecturers, as, in the main students did not see many positives in their lecturers working simultaneously for both private and public universities.

The negative impact of lecturer's movements across public and private universities have been articulated in the students' narratives in this study in the following terms. Students explicitly noted, and were aggrieved by, the inadequate time provided to them by their lecturers and supervisors. Lecturers used every available moment to fulfil part-time responsibilities at the private universities, to the detriment of postgraduate research time made available to their students in the public universities.

The majority of the lecturers interviewed in this study complained that, as it stands, they had a general overload of teaching and supervision at the Public University. They recommended that the Public University reduce this load. This is ironic, as the same lecturers take up extra academic responsibilities, of a similar nature. in private universities. As the literature has shown, the adoption of neoliberal policy practices in higher education across the globe have

seen an intensification of teaching and administrative duties on the desks of a shrinking full-time, tenured academic corps. When this intensified load is exacerbated by a voluntary, legislatively-enabled set of simultaneous employment practices across public and private universities, the inevitable pressures on maintaining high-quality educational standards appears self-evident. Put more simply, education quality is compromised.

The Public University students, generally, think that the movement of their lecturers across public and private universities negatively impacts public university education. These perceptions take many forms, as have been detailed by the student-participants of this study. Inadequate supervision of postgraduate students' work was the most frequently cited problem noted by students as they related what they regarded as the key challenge presented by the movement of their supervisors across public and private universities. This resulted in time-overruns for their studies, and students related their own and anecdotal cases of students not graduating even though they had presented their work timeously to their postgraduate supervisors. This also had a financial implication for students, who had to re-register for a new academic year if they wanted to graduate.

The matter of inadequate academic mentorship underscored the full spectrum of negative perceptions held by postgraduate students of their lecturers' working simultaneously in public and private universities. The students, except for one student who felt that he had been well served by his supervisor, felt that they had been provided with less academic nurturing than they felt they were entitled to. What was quite startling to find in the study was that, in spite of students at the Public University noting that the academic standards at the Public University were to be admired, they felt that students in the private universities benefited from their Public University supervisors than they did at the Public University, whose students, they said, are supposed to be the primary focus of their lecturers' attention.

Contrary to the core assertion of neoliberalism that privatisation brings about efficiency and quality in the provision of education, the Zambian case presented in this study suggests otherwise. Public university lecturers, who are supposed to deliver a public service to the youth of the country via research, teaching and learning, appear to be compromised by their simultaneous taking up of academic and administrative posts in the expanding private university sector. As the literature review has shown, the public purse now subsidises the private sector, with public sector academics now *becoming de facto* agents of neoliberalism through selling their knowledge and skills to the private sector. This knowledge and skills, of course, were gained through their own education paid for by public funds at public universities. This study contributes to a deeper understanding, from the vantage point of Zambian higher

education, how neoliberal policy take-up has begun to shape the Zambian university sector to the perceived detriment of the students who rely on public universities to lift them out of the colonial-inspired poverty into which they were born.

6.0 Chapter 6. Conclusion and Recommendations

6.1 Introduction

6.1.1 Overview of Chapter 6

This, the final chapter of this dissertation; concludes the study, and suggests recommendations for policymakers, future research, university leadership, and to African and Global South countries on issues relating to access and quality of higher education for all, more especially the poor and impoverished majority.

The chapter consists of five sections. Section 6.1 fulfils two roles. First, it provides an outline to the chapter, and second, states what the study set out do. Section 6.2 revisits the main research question and the two sub questions that animated the study. Section 6.3 briefly reminds us of the study's key informants and the data-set they generated. Section 6.4 consists of a brief set of policy recommendations as it identifies the main insights from the data and its analysis. Section 6.5 contains suggestions for future research, and indicates how this study can be used by other researchers to further develop our understanding of the intersection of public and private higher education and how this is related to social inequalities. Section 6.5 contains brief recommendations to higher education policymakers, university leadership, and African and Global South countries. This section relates to key issues of access to high-quality tertiary education for the poor.

6.1.2 What the Study Set Out to Do

This study investigated reasons for lecturers at a public university (The Public University – pseudonym) in Zambia are motivated to teach at both public and private universities at the same time. The study explored the implications of of this simultaneous employment for the teaching and learning programmes of postgraduate students registered at the public university. The study further set out to understand issues of education quality at the Public University, where these lecturers are employed as full-time staff. The implications of their simultaneous lecturing duties were investigated through the lecturers' own narratives, as well as the reflections and inputs of postgraduate students registered at the Public University. This phenomenon has not been the focus of a substantial body of research in Southern Africa. The importance of the study is therefore that it opens a novel way of conducting research on an increasingly significant field of research globally, namely the intersection and implications of private provision of education on matters of quality and equity in Africa and the Global South. In effect, the study may additionally provide insights and guidelines for policymakers, analysts, academic researchers, university leadership, and African and Global South countries by informing them of the motivations of public university lecturers to take up a second (and

sometimes third!) job in a private university, and the impact that such actions may have on the quality of provision of service to postgraduate students at public universities. The study also investigated how lecturers perceived their roles in the Public University in relation to private universities where the same lecturers teach. It investigated the extent to which lecturers have academic freedom and/or professional autonomy in both public and private universities. Finally, the study explored the participants' perceptions of quality education as key stakeholders, namely lecturers and postgraduate students, engaged in teaching and learning at a Zambian public university as this university increasingly shares its academic staff with the burgeoning private university sector.

6.2 Main Research Question

What are the implications of lecturers at a public university in Zambia working simultaneously at private universities?

6.2.1 Sub-Research Questions

i. What is the motivation for lecturers at the Public University to lecture for more than one university simultaneously?
ii. What are the implications for student learning when lecturers work simultaneously at public and private universities?

6.3 Key Informants and Data Sets

The study had two categories of participants: lecturers and postgraduate students. The sample size was eight, consisting equally of four lecturers and four postgraduate students.

6.4 Main Insights from the data and its analysis

Contrary to the central claim of neoliberalism that privatisation brings about efficiency and quality in the provision of education, the Zambian case of higher education privatisation has caused complexity and compromise in the provision and quality of higher education. At first glance, one would assume that private universities are more efficient and effective than public universities because they charge less, utilise the same staff as public universities, and graduate postgraduate students in record time, as opposed to public universities which charge more, and take a comparatively longer time to graduate postgraduate students. In reductive economic language, students in public universities do not appear to be receiving value for their money. Several students at the Public University felt that it was beneficial to do their postgraduate studies with private universities based on delays at the public universities, while

others were not as concerned as to how long it takes. These postgraduate students were more concern about the quality of education they received from the Public University. This study has shown that, although the public-private dichotomy is blurring in the field of Zambian higher education as seen through the prism of the movement of lecturers across public and private universities, a most interesting situation exists in which the same lecturers, teaching in two different universities (and university systems – public and private), appear to be forced to hold to different levels of quality and perceptions of professionalism within these two sectors.

Public university lecturers who also teach at private universities simultaneously have stuck to their traditional understandings of their training, and seek to achieve high quality educational outcomes while they teach in public universities. These lecturers express a clear sense that they enjoy and appreciate their autonomy and professional discretion in the public universities. The lecturers gave clear insights into how they are de-professionalised by elements of management and funders at the private universities. Though some of their students are dismayed at the insistence of their lecturers at the public institutions to maintain high academic standards, these lecturers protect the knowledge project and the true purpose of education as they see it, which is to nurture the cognitive and social development of their learners. The study has revealed that, while some students understand this, others rank their universities (public universities) lower in comparison to mediocre private universities that graduate students in record time.

Notwithstanding the above, it is also important to note that standards or quality of education in public universities are indeed compromised due to the movement of lecturers across public and private universities, added to several layers of work intensification under neoliberal education policy regimes. Public university lecturers, who are supposed to provide a service to the public through research, teaching and learning facilitated by the public purse, now become agents of neoliberalism by virtue of them selling the knowledge and skills they gained through their own education in the public universities.

As has been shown in the study, private universities in Zambia are run on similar operational models as those universities in the USA, England, and Australia, where the majority of the lecturing staff are employed on a casual basis, without security of tenure, and little to no autonomy and professional discretion in their work. Private universities treat students as customers, whose opinions of quality are the only opinions that count in terms of measuring the effectiveness of the system. Private universities prioritise profits and teaching and learning becomes secondary.

Private universities have reimagined their missions and academic priorities in order to conform to the demands of their customers. Lecturers in this study have expressed their fears over contradicting management in private universities, saying that such actions may potentially lead to their dismissal, while other lecturers took the noteworthy step of leaving the employment of private universities when they saw management intruding in their work to the detriment of quality educational outcomes.

6.4.1 Motivations for teaching simultaneously at public and private universities, and implications for student learning

As the study has shown, public university lecturer's movements across public and private universities were motivated by depressed economic circumstances which have seen real salaries and other financial inducements for academic staff decline rapidly since the 1980s. Under such conditions of relative precarity, the coming into being of the University Act of 1992, which not only allowed, but made a virtue of sharing public university intellectual resources and personpower with the new private universities, saw cash-strapped public university lecturers take up the opportunity to attract additional pay, even though the conditions at the private universities were non-permanent.

In addition, the study has shown that there is an aspect of benevolence that also gives effect to the simultaneous employment of lecturers at public and private universities. The national urgency, expressed through the University Act of 1992, for public lecturers to share their skills with private institutions created a quasi-moral rationale for this phenomenon. In a country which had only one university at independence in 1964, and a severely limited formally educated population, it is worth noting that the supply of qualified lecturing staff to the increasing private university sector to cope with the growing demand for tertiary education was simply inadequate. The policy solution was not to train new academics, but to allow the simultaneous employment of public university staff at the new private universities.

At the same time, this study has shown that there is a potential upside to this complex public-private higher education field in Zambia. Several lecturers pointed to the opportunity they had been presented with to learn the skills of university management. This was the case as the private universities were established without staff complements, and public lecturers recruited to the private universities were almost always called upon to provide high-level leadership at these new private universities.

The negative impact of lecturer's movements across public and private universities can be summed up in the following ways: inadequate time for research as lecturers begin to use every

available time to fulfil parttime responsibilities in private universities to the detriment of research in public universities; teaching/ work overloads - most of the Public University lecturers complained that as it stands, they were overworked at the Public University and recommended that the Public University reduce this load. Ironically, these lecturers still take up extra responsibilities in private universities. The contradictions abound, and the result is a compromised quality of education in both the public and private universities.

The study has revealed that postgraduate students registered at the Public University generally perceive the movement of their lecturers across public and private universities negatively. The negative impact of their lecturers' dual employment at public and private universities are captured in the following context: inadequate supervision time and attention of postgraduate students' work; expected graduation time overruns; cost overruns as students have to re-register for a new academic year; and inadequate academic mentorship. The students, with one outlier, felt that no good came out of their lecturers teaching in public and private universities simultaneously. If anything, the Public University students believe that students in private universities benefit more from the public university lecturers, to the detriment of the Public University students who are supposed to be the primary focus of their lecturers.

6.5 Research Recommendation

This section indicates how the current study can be used by other researchers to further develop our understanding of the intersection of public and private higher education in Africa and the Global South, and how this relates to social inequalities.

By legislating the legal framework stated in the Higher Education Act 2013, and the policy in 'Educating our Future' (Ministry of Education, 1996), the post-1992 Zambian government has provided for an interface between public and private universities. This is ostensibly for the advancement of education and society, but the policy is limited because it has not provided the guidelines in terms of rules and regulations that should guide such an interface. Put differently, the legal framework that should facilitate the interface between public and private universities is not very instructive. This may be due to an unintended policy outcome, but a less forgiving reading may point to the fact that the lack of intensive oversight may be deliberate in fostering conditions friendly to the neoliberal agenda that dominates the Zambian policy arena since 1992. Hence, the private sector has been able to exploit the lacunae in the legal and policy frameworks in order to maximise their financial interests. The state, in reality, is subsidising the wages of lecturers who teach simultaneously for both public and private universities. This is the case as these public university lecturers do not command pensions

and other subsidies from the private universities. In addition, several lecturers use their public university offices as spaces in which to meet with their private university students, and use the state's equipment (computer technologies, printers etc.) at the public university to prepare and print teaching and learning materials for use at the private universities.

Government should update both the legal and policies framework in order to provide guidelines for these synergies in order for quality teaching and learning to take place. Though there have been developments since the University of Zambia Act of 1966 all the way to the Higher Education Act of 2021. The current legal framework is inadequate in dealing with the challenges that emerge due to the unprecedented raise of private universities coupled with the massive engagement of casual lecturers some of whom are public university employees. At policy level, the national education policy educating our future (1996) is revised and updated if it has to be able to address the challenges of 2023 and beyond. The policy that guides Zambia's education system was developed at a time when the country had no private university and as such it has become inadequate to deal with the current challenges, hence the need to updated it.

6.6 Policy Recommendations

This section provides a brief set of recommendations to higher education policymakers, university leadership, and African and Global South countries on key issues related to access to high-quality higher education for the poor.

At institutional level, memorandums of understanding (MOU) between public and private universities should be entered into in order to regulate and moderate lecturers' movements across the public and private universities in the best interests of teaching and learning. By doing so, the protection of lecturers' and students' rights, and the knowledge project in general, can better be framed and protected.

A further legal and policy framework should be considered, one that compels universities both public and private to employ lecturers on a full-time basis, with all remuneration and entitlements guaranteed in accordance with the country's labour laws. This will have the effect of reducing casual academic labour, and will concomitantly enhance the quality of education provision as it will reduce lecturers' anxieties with regard to job security and career progression.

Finally, International Monetary Fund (IMF) policy recommendations, when analysed in their entirety, are problematic and contain "contradictions, inconsistency, policy inadequacy, policy

paradoxes and policy overkill" (Biersteker, 1991, 489). This study therefore recommends that the Zambian government ignores calls from the IMF and the World Bank to reduce funding to public universities, to do away with bursaries, and to introduce user fees. As has been shown in Chapter 2, the adoption of such neoliberal policy recommendations has a negative impact on salaries, leading to casualisation of academic labour, as universities struggle to find ways to 'save' money in the absence of government subsidies. These neoliberal policy prescriptions negatively impact low-income families who are not able to pay university fees, and lose their places at the university. Government funding of public universities is key for quality outcomes and equal education opportunities for both wealthy and poor students.

6.7 Conclusion

This study investigated why university lecturers at a public university in Zambia are motivated to teach for both public and private universities at the same time. The study established the implications of this phenomenon for teaching and learning, and the effects on the provision of the quality of education at the Public University where these lecturers are employed as full-time staff.

The results from this study indicated that there are positive features of lecturer's movements across public and private universities, which can be summed up as personal social economic welfare, benevolence, and the acquisition of management skills.

Nevertheless, the study has shown the layered negative effects of this movement of public university lecturers across public and private universities. This has been shown in the form of inadequate time for research as lecturers use every available moment to fulfil part-time responsibilities in private universities, to the detriment of their primary-paid-work in the public universities. It has also been reflected in narratives of teaching/ work intensification, which is already part of a creeping neoliberal influence in higher education globally. The result of these intersecting factors results in a compromised quality of education in both public and private universities.

Despite the relatively limited economic benefits that individual lecturers gain from teaching for both public and private universities simultaneously, the negative implications for student learning far outweigh these individual benefits. This study has shown that the practice by some public university lecturers to teach in both public and private universities simultaneously have negative implications on the learning experience of their students. In the context of human rights, social justice and fairness, this study asserts that public higher education should again

be prioritised by the Zambian state as it works to modernise and offer all its people a chance to receive a free, high quality education.

Bibliography

Bennell, P., 1995. *Using and Abusing Rates of Return: A Critique of the World Bank's 1995 Education Sector Review.* Working Paper 22. Sussex: Institute of Development Studies.

Bickman, L. and Rog, D.J. eds., 2008. *The SAGE handbook of applied social research methods*. Sage publications.

Biesta, G. J. J., 2015. Education, Measurement and the Professions: Reclaiming a space for democratic professionality in education, *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, DOI: 10.1080/00131857.2015.1048665

Bockman, J., 2013. Neoliberalism. *Contexts*, *12*(3), pp.14-15.

Bryman, A., 2001. *Social Research Methods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Byrne, B., 1994. *Gender Profile of Zambia, Brighton*: Institute of Development Studies.

Cohen, L. Manion, L & Morrison, K., 2011*. Research Methods in Education*. 7th ed. New York: Routledge.

Cohen, L., Manion, L. and Morrison, K., 2007. *Research methods in education*. Routledge.

Colclough, C., 1993. 'Who Should Learn to Pay? An Assessment of Neo-Liberal Approaches to Education Policy'. In C. Colclough and J. Manor (eds.) *States or Markets? Neo-Liberalism and the Development Policy Debate*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Connell, R., 2013. The neoliberal cascade and education: an essay on the market agenda and its consequences, *Critical Studies in Education*, 54:2, 99-112. Web

Corbetta, P., 2003. *Social research: Theory, methods and techniques*. Sage.

Coyne, I., 1997. Sampling in qualitative research. Purposeful and theoretical sampling; merging or clear boundaries? Journal of advanced nursing. [Online] 26 (3), 623–630.

Creswell, J. W., 2012. *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approached*. Sage Publications.

Cuban, L., 2013. *Inside the black box of classroom practice: Change without reform in American education*. Harvard Education Press.

Dill, D.D., 2003. Allowing the market to rule: The case of the United States. *Higher Education Quarterly*, *57*(2), pp.136-157.

Dupont, D. & Pearce, F., 2001. Foucault Contra Foucault: Rereading the `Governmentality' Papers. *Theoretical Criminology*, 5(2), 123–158. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362480601005002001

Economic Commission for Africa (ECA)., 1991. *African Alternative Framework to Structural Adjustment for Socio Economic Recovery and Transformation. A Popular Version*. UNECA, Addis Ababa,

Emmel, N., 2013. *Sampling and Choosing Cases in Qualitative Research: A Realist Approach.* London: SAGE Publications.

Fonjong, L., 2014. Rethinking the Impact of Structural Adjustment Programs on Human Rights Violation in West Africa. *Perspectives on Global Development and Technology* 13. Pp 87-110.

Gant, T., 2014. Neoliberalism. *Annual Review of Anthropology* Vol. 43:89-104

Gill, P., Stewart, K., Treasure, E. *et al.,* 2008. *Methods of data collection in qualitative research: interviews and focus groups*. *Br Dent J* **204,** 291–295. https://doi.org/10.1038/bdj.2008.192

Giroux, H. A., 2005. The Terror of Neoliberalism: Rethinking the Significance of Cultural Politics. *College Literature, Winter, Vol. 32, No. 1 pp. 1-19*. John Hopkins University Press.

Green, R.H., 1998. A Cloth Untrue: The Evolution of Structural Adjustment in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Journal of International Affairs*, Fall, 58 no.1. New Yok: The Trustees of Columbia University.

Grill, P. Stewart, K. Treasure, E. & Chadwick, B., 2008. *Methods of Data Collection in Qualitative Research: Interviews and Focus group discussions*. Springer Nature. Viewed on 5th November 2018 https://www.nature.com/articles/bdj.2008.192

Gupta, T., 2018. The Marketization of Higher Education. *International Journal of Recent Research Aspects.*

Harvey, D., 2005. *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Harvey, D., 2007. Neoliberalism as Creative Destruction. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 610*, 22-44.

Hawkins, J 1991."Understanding' The Failure OF IMP Reform: The Zambian Case, *World Development, Vol 19, no.7*, pp.839 -849, Higher Education Act, No. 4 of 2013 viewed on 23rd October 2018. http://www.parliament.gov.zm/acts-of-parliament?page=6

Jacoby, D., 2006. Effects of part-time faculty employment on community college graduation rates. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *77*(6), pp.1081-1103.

Klopper, C.J. and Power, B.M., 2014. The casual approach to teacher education: What effect does casualisation have for Australian university teaching?. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education (Online)*, *39*(4), pp.101-114.

Kothari, C.R., 2004. *Research methodology: Methods and techniques*. New Age International.

Kvale, S., 1996. Interviews: *An Introduction to Qualitative Research Interviewing*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Lach, D., 2014. Challenges of interdisciplinary research: Reconciling qualitative and quantitative methods for understanding human–landscape systems. *Environmental management*, *53*(1), pp.88-93.

Lama, T. and Joullié, J.E., 2015. Casualization of Academics in the Australian Higher Education: Is Teaching Quality at Risk? *Research in Higher Education Journal*, pp. *28*.

Leautier, A. and Mutahakana, F (2012) *Capacity Development for Higher Education in Africa: The Role of Capacity Building Institutions*. ACBF Working Paper No.23. Harare: The African Capacity Building Foundation

LeCompte, M. and Preissle, J. 1993. *Ethnography and Qualitative Design in Educational Research* (second edition). London: Academic Press

Lindsay, G. and Rodgers, T., 1998. Market Orientation in the UK Higher Education Sector: the influence of the education reform process 1979-1993. *Quality in Higher Education*, *4*(2), pp.159-171.

Lockwood Report, 1963. *Report of the Development of a University in Northern Rhodesia.* Lusaka Government Printers. Viewed on 23rd December 2018. https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007%2FBF01096338.pdf

Loveday, V., 2018. The neurotic academic: anxiety, casualisation, and governance in the neoliberalising university, *Journal of Cultural Economy*, 11:2, 154-166, DOI: 10.1080/17530350.2018.1426032

Lungu, G., 1990. Educational Development in Zambia: A General Overview. *Educational Policy and Human Resource Development. Proceeding of the Joint Friedrich Ebert Foundation and the Institute for African Studies workshop*, Intercontinental Hotel Lusaka, 17-18, 1990.

Lungwangwa, G., 1990. Alternative Model for Educational and Human Resource Development in Zambia. *Educational Policy and Human Resource Development. Proceeding of the Joint Friedrich Ebert Foundation and the Institute for African Studies workshop*, Intercontinental Hotel Lusaka, 17-18, 1990.

Lynch, K., 2006. Neo-liberalism and marketisation: The implications for higher education. *European educational research journal*, *5*(1), pp.1-17.

Mace, J., 1984. The Economics of Education*. Higher Education Review, 16(3), 39-56*

Makan, A., 1993. *The Impact of Structural Adjustment Programmes Upon the Political Economy of Zambia : A Critical Analysis Submitted to Rhodes University in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of Masters of Arts*. Viewed on 21st November 2018 https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/11985187.pdf accessed on 29/10/2018 at 1624.

Maree, K., 2007. *First Steps in Research.* Van Schaik Publishers: Pretoria

Marshall, J.D., 1999. Performativity: Lyotard and Foucault through Searle and Austin. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, *18*(5), pp.309-317.

Masaiti, G., & Shen, H., 2013. Cost Sharing in Zambia's Public Universities: Prospects and Challenges. *European Journal of Educational Research, 2*(1), 1-16. Doi:10.12973/eu-jer.2.1.1

May, R. Peetz, D. and Strachan, G., 2013. The casual academic workforce and labour market segmentation in Australia, Labour & Industry*: A journal of the social and economic relations of work*, 23:3, 258-275, DOI: 10.1080/10301763.2013.839085

Mertens, D.M., 2012. Ethics in qualitative research in education and the social sciences. *Qualitative research: An introduction to methods and designs*, pp.19-39.

Milliken, J. and Colohan, G., 2004. Quality or control? Management in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, *26*(3), pp.381-391.

Minerva., 1963. *Vol. 3, No. 2 (Winter, 1965), pp. 245-260. Report on the Development of a University in Northern Rhodesia [Zambia]*: Springer viewed on Wednesday 18th February, 2018 on https://www-jstor-org.ezproxy.uct.ac.za/stable/pdf/41821663.pdf?refreqid=excelsior%3A3d2c8584217030168e0310b732c0f10c

Molesworth, M., Scullion, R. and Nixon, E. eds., 2010. *The marketisation of higher education*. Routledge.

Mwalimu, M., 2014. Education and the Economy: Achievements and Shortfalls in Independent Zambia, 1964-2014. *Journal of South African Studies*. Vol. 40, No. 5, 1091–1108

Novelli, M., 2016. *Public Private Partnerships in Education in Crisis and Conflict Affected Contexts: A Framing Paper*. Prepared for the Roundtable on Public Private Partnerships in Education in Crisis and Conflict Affected Contexts, Open Society Foundations, New York.

Ochoa, A., 2011. Contingent faculty: Helping or harming students? *The Journal of the Professoriate*, *6*(1), pp.136-151.

Okeke, C. and Van Wyk, M., 2016. *Educational research: an African approach*. Eds. Oxford University Press Southern Africa.

Orb, A., Eisenhauer, L. and Wynaden, D., 2001. Ethics in qualitative research. *Journal of nursing scholarship*, *33*(1), pp.93-96.

Ostenson, J., Clegg, J. and Wiggins B. 2017. “Industrialized Higher Education and Its Sustainable Alternatives.” *Review of Higher Education* 40.4: 509–532.

Pedró, F., Leroux, G. and Watanabe, M. 2015. *The Privatization of Education in Developing Countries. Evidence and Policy Implications*. Paris: Unesco.

Richards, H.M. and Schwartz, L.J., 2002. Ethics of qualitative research: are there special issues for health services research?. *Family practice*, *19*(2), pp.135-139.

Robson, C. 1993. *Real World Research: A Resource for Social Science and Practitioner Researchers.* Blackwell Publishers: Oxford.

Rose, P. 2002., *Education and the Post-Washington Consensus: The Triumph of Human Capital.* Paper prepared for the conference 'Towards a New Political Economy of Development. Globalisation and Governance'. Political Economy Research Centre, University of Sheffield, 4-6 July 2002. First draft.

Samoff, J., .2009. 'Foreign Aid to Education: Managing Global Transfers and Exchanges'. In L. Chisholm and G. Steiner-Khamsi *South-South Cooperation in Education and Development*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Savenye, W.C. and Robinson, R.S., 2005. Using qualitative research methods in higher education. *Journal of computing in Higher education*, *16*(2), pp.65-95.

Shaw, I., 2008. Ethics and the practice of qualitative research. *Qualitative Social Work*, *7*(4), pp.400-414.

Sikwibele, A., 1990. Financing and the Public Budget. *Educational Policy and Human Resource Development. Proceeding of the Joint Friedrich Ebert Foundation and the Institute for African Studies workshop*, Intercontinental Hotel Lusaka, 17-18, 1990.

Simutanyi, N., 1996. The Politics of Structural Adjustment in Zambia. *Third World Quarterly, Vol. 17, No. 4*, pp. 825-839,

Sweetland, S.R., 1996. Human Capital Theory: Foundations of a Field of Inquiry. *Review of Educational Research,* Fall 1996, 66(3), 341-359.

Taberner, A.M., 2018. The marketisation of the English higher education sector and its impact on academic staff and the nature of their work. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*.

Thanh, N.C. and Thanh, T.T., 2015. The interconnection between interpretivist paradigm and qualitative methods in education. *American Journal of Educational Science*, *1*(2), pp.24-27.

The Higher Education Authority, (n.d.) *Providing Quality Assurance to Higher Learning Institutions*, The Higher Education Authority, viewed on 24th November 2018. http://www.hea.org.zm/

The Higher Education Bill 2013 (Zambia) obtained from http://www.parliament.gov.zm/node/3097 on 15th October 2019.

The University Act No. 26 of 1992 (Zambia) obtained from http://www.parliament.gov.zm/node/876 on 13th October 2019

Thornton, M., 2011. *Privatising the public university*. Routledge.

Thorsen, D. E. and Lie, A., 2006. What is neoliberalism. *Oslo, University of Oslo, Department of Political Science, Manuscript*, pp.1-21.

Torres, C. A. and Schugurensky, D., 2002. The Political Economy of Higher Education in the Era of Neoliberal Globalization: Latin America in Comparative Perspective. *Higher Education, Vol. 43, No. 4,* pp429 – 455.

Toye F., (2015). 'Not everything that can be counted counts and not everything that counts can be counted' (attributed to Albert Einstein). *British journal of pain*, *9*(1), 7. https://doi.org/10.1177/2049463714565569

University of Zambia., 2017. *Strategic Plan 2018-2022*. Lusaka: University of Zambia Press view on 2nd November, 2018 https://www.unza.zm/sites/default/files/article_files/2018-08/Strategic_Plan_2018-22.pdf

Verger, A., Steiner-Khamsi, G. and Lubienski, C., 2017. The emerging global education industry: analysing market-making in education through market sociology. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, *15*(3), pp.325-340.

Wamundila, S. & Ngulube, P., 2011. Enhancing Knowledge Retention in Higher Education: A Case of the University of Zambia. *SA Journal of Information Management, Vol 13, No 1*.

Wilkinson, D. and Birmingham, P., 2003. *Using research instruments: A guide for researchers*. Psychology Press.

Williamson, J., 1990. What Washington means by policy reform. in J. Williamson (ed) *Latin American Adjustment. How much has happened?,* Washington DC: Institute for International Economics

World Bank., 2015. “Education Public Expenditure Review in Zambia.” World Bank, Washington, DC. License: Creative Commons Attribution CC BY 3.0 IGO

Yilmaz, K., 2013. Comparison of quantitative and qualitative research traditions: Epistemological, theoretical, and methodological differences. *European journal of education*, *48*(2), pp.311-325.

Zambia Open University., (ZAOU). 2016. Strategic Plan: 2016 – 2019 obtained from file:///C:/Users/User/Downloads/Documents/ZAOUStrategicPlan-Final-copy-Ver-2-3-Revised-28-07-2016.pdf on 29th January 2019.