

<b>Contents</b>	<b>page</b>
Acknowledgement	i
Contents	ii
Tables	v
Figures & Appendices	vi
Abstract	vii
<b>Chapter 1 : INTRODUCTION</b>	
1.1. Background of the Study	2
1.2. Significance of the Study	8
1.3. Research Problem	9
1.4. Objectives of the Research	9
1.5. Research design	
1.5.1. Data	10
1.5.2. Methodology	13
1.6. Organization of Chapters	13
<b>Chapter 2 : A CRITICAL REVIEW OF CONCEPTS, METHODS AND STUDIES RELATED TO EFFICIENCY</b>	
2.1. Introduction	16
2.2. The Concept and Measurement of Efficiency	16
2.3. Main methods of Efficiency Measurement	21
2.4. Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA)	22
2.4.1. The Basic DEA Models	
2.4.1.1. Charnes, Cooper, and Rhodes (CCR) Version	23
2.4.1.2. Banker, Charnes, and Cooper (BCC) Version	27
2.5. The Empirical Studies Concerning Efficiency Measurement of Universities	31
2.6. Conclusion	36

**Chapter 3 : DEVELOPING DEA MODELS FOR THE  
EVALUATION OF EFFICIENCY IN MALAYSIAN  
UNIVERSITIES**

3.1.	Introduction	38
3.2.	Some Underlying Issues	38
3.3.	Modeling of the university	40
3.3.1	Input Variables	41
3.3.2	Output Variables	43
	3.3.2.1. Teaching Output	43
	3.3.2.2 Research Output	45
3.3.3	DEA Models Employed	46
3.3.4.	Model Orientation and Scale Assumption	48
3.4.	Conclusion	49

**Chapter 4 : EVALUATING THE EFFICIENCY OF MALAYSIAN  
UNIVERSITIES**

4.1.	Introduction	51
4.2.	Data	51
4.3.	DEA Empirical Results	55
4.3.1.	Understanding the DEA Results	56
4.3.2.	Results by Model Specification	58
	4.3.2.1. DEA1	58
	4.3.2.2. DEA2	61
	4.3.2.3. DEA3	64
	4.3.2.4. DEA4	66
4.4.	Conclusion	72

**Chapter 5 : CONCLUSION**

5.1.	Summary	76
5.2.	Implication and Recommendations	77
5.2.1.	Potential Cost Reduction	77
5.2.2.	Other Areas of Improvements	79
5.2.3.	Policy Implications	
5.3.	Perspectives on the current issues	81
5.4.	Contributions of the study	83
5.5.	Future Direction	84
		84
	References	88
	Appendices	96

## Tables

Table 2.1.	Definitions of the Variables	24
Table 2.2.	The CCR Input Orientation Model	26
Table 2.3.	The CCR Output Orientation Model	26
Table 2.4.	The BCC Input Orientation Model	28
Table 2.5.	The BCC Output Orientation Model	28
Table 3.1.	Input and Output Data for the DEA Models	47
Table 4.1	Descriptive Statistics of Inputs and Outputs for the universities (2001/2002)	53
Table 4.2	Pearson Correlation Matrix of the Input and Output Data	54
Table 4.2.	EMS Results of Efficiency, Weights and Benchmarks of DEA1	59
Table 4.3.	EMS Results of Efficiency, Weights and Benchmarks of DEA2	62
Table 4.4.	EMS Results of Efficiency, Weights and Benchmarks of DEA3	64
Table 4.5.	EMS Results of Efficiency, Weights and Benchmarks of DEA4	66
Table 4.6.	DEA Efficiency Scores of 15 Malaysian Public Universites	67
Table 4.7.	Benchmarks of the Fully-efficient Universities (DEA1-DEA4)	70
Table 4.8.	Output Weights Allocation of the Comprehensive Model - DEA3	71
Table 5.1.	Potential Percentage of Operating Cost Reduction for the inefficient universities	78
Table 5.2.	Reviewed EMS results on the Teaching and Research outputs of the universities	80

## **Figures**

Figure 1.2.	Number of Student Enrolments in Public Universities (1997-2001)	4
Figure 2.1	Technical and Allocative Efficiency	18
Figure 2.2.	DEA Graphic Potrayal of Efficiency Modeling	30

## **Appendices**

Appendix 1.1.	Public Universities in Malaysia and the Year of Establishment	96
Appendix 1.2.	Some Examples of Private Higher Education Institution (PHEI) in Malaysia established in the three generations	97
Appendix 2.1.	Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA) Efficiency Measurement applied to Higher Institutions of Learning	98