IMPACT OF SERVICE QUALITY ON STUDENT SATISFACTION IN HIGHER EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTES OF INDORE

*Minal Uprety

ABSTRACT

In the competitive era of education sector, it is very necessary for the already existing and new entrant to know about the service quality which they are providing to the students from student's perspective. This study aims to examine student satisfaction on quality of educational institutions of higher education in Indore. A random sample of total 120 undergraduate and postgraduate students was considered in the study. The satisfaction level of students was evaluated on the five dimensions of service quality, namely tangibility, reliability, responsiveness, assurance and empathy. Correlation and regression analysis were used to analyze the relationship between satisfactions and above mentioned five dimensions of service quality. It is seen that all these five dimensions have a positive relation with the student's satisfaction. Assurance was found as the most significant dimension in determining student's satisfaction followed by empathy, reliability, tangibility and responsiveness. The study helps the educational institutes to improve the overall service quality as well as the student's satisfaction.

Keywords: Service quality, Dimensions, Student satisfaction, Correlation, Higher educational institutes.

Introduction:

Higher education institutes facing major challenges from last two decades across the world, due to the privatization of education institutes, national and international entries which are providing various options to the students in terms of different course, varying cost etc. This increasing competition compelling educational institute to catch the attention of prospective students by offering them quality education. In current scenario, education institute are also performing as profit making organization and Students are considered as the key consumers for education service providers. The service provider should make their customer satisfied by providing them high quality of education, students are concerned about the quality of education, and they evaluate the educational institute on several parameters before taking the admission. Beaumont (2012) stated that in higher education institutes, students are the main stake holders therefore it is vital to review the service quality from their point of view. These trend calls upon the educational player to pay attention to make their customer satisfied with the high service quality. Service performance is determined by the service quality and customer satisfaction (J. Douglas, A. Douglas & Barnes, 2006 & Hill, 1995). Since the

---

*   Assistant Professor, Prestige Institute of Management and Research, Indore, M.P., India.

service quality of educational institute is intangible in nature because it is a knowledge based service, it is not an easy task to measure it. Previous Literature says that service quality can be measured by either comparing student perceptions with their expectations of an institution (Lewis et al., 1994) or by evaluating student feedback of their academic life. Parasuraman et al. (1988) also said that quality is the degree up to which customer expectations are met. Service quality firmly linked to the customer's satisfaction, Customer satisfaction which can be defined as the attitude or feeling of a customer towards a product or service following the usage of it.

Review of Literature

Kotler and Clarke (1987) define satisfaction as a state felt by a person who has experienced performance or an outcome that fulfill his or her expectation. Due to the intangible attribute, it is not easy to define service quality. O'Neill and Palmer (2004) also supported that the quality of education is difficult to define (Macukow, 2000). There is no universally accepted definition of quality in higher education but the most wide and conventional definition of quality of education (Houston, 2008; Cartwright, 2007; Venkatraman, 2007; Lomas, 2007,2002; Parri, 2006; UNESCO, 2006; Lagrossen et al, 2004; Harvey, 2002) is that proposed by Harvey and Green (1993) who explained it in the framework which consists of five definition of quality, namely quality as exceptional, quality as perfection, quality as value for money, quality as fitness for purpose and quality as transformation. It was observed by Majeed et al. (2008) that the university which is much concerned for the quality system, will be able to accomplish students' needs based on students' persona and desires. Ravindran and Kalpna (2012) found that the overall satisfaction of students in higher education institutions is greatly influenced by location, academics, infrastructure, image and personnel. In the same manner, De Jager (2015) researched that facilities, infrastructure, access to that university and location of the university are accountable for students' satisfaction.

There are certain criteria of quality performance which should be fulfilled by the institutes and these criteria and characteristics are associated to the inputs, outputs, and processes that meet society's needs and requirements as well as students' needs and desires (Alfrejat, 2009). Husain.et al,(2009) examined that physical environment, interaction and support, feedback and assessment, and administration, are major influencing factors on students satisfaction, Dib & Alnazer (2013) stated that increase in student satisfaction, increase the loyalty and decrease the complaint. Kundi et. al (2014) said that , the service quality of universities are significantly associated with the tangibility and assurance. According to Archambault (2008) revealed that there is correlation between service quality performance and satisfaction and if students are satisfied, their retention rate will also increase. Farahmandian, Minavand & Afshardost (2013) also done a study on students satisfaction in higher education institutes and revealed that there is significant and positive association correlation between the factors of advising, curriculum, teaching quality, financial assistance and tuition costs and facilities

Objective: To analyze the contribution of service quality dimensions on student's satisfaction in higher educational institutes of Indore city.

The following hypothesis was framed for the research:

H1: There is no significant correlation between tangibility and student satisfaction of management institutes.

H2: There is no significant correlation between reliability and student satisfaction of management institutes.

H3: There is no significant correlation between responsiveness and student satisfaction of management institutes.

H4: There is no significant correlation between assurance and student satisfaction of management institutes.

H5: There is no significant correlation between empathy and student satisfaction of management institutes.

Research Methodology

In the proposed study, the students' satisfaction was evaluated on the basis of five service dimensions developed by using the five service dimensions of service quality defined by Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry (1988).

The target sample was under graduate and postgraduate students of different educational institute of Indore city were considered. The self structured questionnaire was used to collect the response, 120 respondents were participated. The correlation and regression analysis were used to analyze the relationship between students satisfaction and five dimensions of service quality.

Data Analysis

Table 1: Reliability Test

SI No	Dimension	Cronbach á
1	Tangibility	0.712
2	Reliability	0.788
3	Responsiveness	0.708
4	Assurance	0.854
5	Empathy	0.844
6	Customer Satisfaction	0.774

Reliability Test

Reliability test was conducted on the dependent variable (i.e., customer satisfaction), and independent variables- service quality factors (i.e., tangibility, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy). The reliability coefficient of the study variables have more than the minimum acceptable level of 0.60 (Nunnally, 1978). The above table show the Cronbach's Alpha value for dependent variables, student s satisfaction, and for the independent variable; tangibility, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy are all above 0.7 which is considered as acceptable.

Correlation analysis was implemented to determine the inter correlation among dimensions. The results indicated in table 2 that all dimensions had positive correlation greater than 0.5 except for the dimension of responsiveness. The coefficient for the assessment was 0.479.

Table- 2

Dimension	Student's Satisfaction
Tangibility	0.520
Reliability	0.634
Responsiveness	0.479
Assurance	0.532
Empathy	0.507

Results presented in table 1 above indicate significant positive relationships exist among the service quality dimensions and students' academic satisfaction. In specific terms, students'

academic satisfaction has significant relationship with tangibility (0.520), reliability (0.634), responsiveness (0.5479), assurance (0.532) and empathy (0.557).

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant relationship between tangibility and student's satisfaction

Hypothesis 2: There is significant relationship between Reliability and student's satisfaction.

Hypothesis 3: There is significant relationship between Responsiveness and student's satisfaction.

Hypothesis 4: There is significant relationship between Assurance and student's satisfaction.

Hypothesis 4: There is significant relationship between Empathy and student's satisfaction.

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted	Std. Error of the	R Square Change	Change Statistics			
						Change	F df1	df2	Sig. F Change
Tangibility	.521ᵃ	.328	.325	0.63134	.325	7.281	1	118	0.001
Reliability	.642ᵃ	.467	.465	0.5988	.467	10.533	1	118	0.000
Responsi-veness.	477ᵃ	.280	.277	0.4113	.280	6.875	1	118	.000
Assurance	.689ᵃ	.488	.486	0.4674	.488	12.778	1	118	0.003
Empathy	.680ᵃ	.385	.384	0.4200	.384	9.775	1	118	.000

Table-3

From the above table, it can be seen that

- There is positive strong correlation between predictor variable i. e customer satisfaction & tangibility and tangibility accounts for 32.48% variation in student's satisfaction. The (R= 0.521, adjusted R square =.328, p<.05).

- There is positive strong correlation between predictor variable i. e customer satisfaction & reliability and reliability accounts for 46.7% variation in student's satisfaction. The (R= 0.642, adjusted R square =.467, p<.05).

- There is positive strong correlation between predictor variable i. e customer satisfaction & responsiveness and responsiveness accounts for 28.0 % variation in student's satisfaction. The (R= 0.477, adjusted R =.280, p<.05).

- There is positive strong correlation between predictor variable i. e customer satisfaction & assurance and assurance accounts for 46.7% variation in student's satisfaction. The (R=0.689, adjusted R square = =.486, p<.05).

- There is positive strong correlation between predictor variable i. e customer satisfaction & empathy and empathy accounts for 38.4% variation in student's satisfaction. The (R= 0.680, adjusted R square =.384, p<.05).

Discussion

The identified five dimensions Tangibility, Reliability, Responsiveness, Assurance and Empathy were found to be effective on student's satisfaction in higher education institutions. The finding also supported by Ahmed et. al (2014) in his research that responsiveness of academic staffs, tangibles, empathy, assurance, and academic programmes resultant on satisfaction. The assurance was examined as the strongest association with student's satisfaction, followed by

reliability and empathy. Tangibility has also strong correlation with student's satisfaction but responsiveness was found as a moderate relationship with student's satisfaction. Maushart (2003) also observed that students feel highly satisfied in with their respective institute services, teaching and learning process is more important criteria for student's assessment of service quality, Clewes (2003). O'Driscoll (2012) and Nadiri (2011) also supported that teaching staffs and teaching methods were the major contributor on student's satisfaction. It can be seen that student's satisfaction is more influenced by tangibility than responsiveness, they are concern about the physical facilities provided to them while evaluating institute's service quality, in line with this finding, Smith and Ennew (2001) also investigated that the peripheral aspects and facilities will have a direct and indirect effect on the evaluation of higher institution.

Conclusion

The objective of the study was to establish relationship of student's satisfaction with the five dimensions of service quality in higher education institutes. All the hypothesis were empirically supported, i.e. all the five dimensions tangibility, reliability, responsiveness, assurance and empathy have significant relationship with student's satisfaction. The student's satisfaction is found to be more influenced by assurance, reliability, tangibility and empathy rather than responsiveness. The study could be helpful to the higher educational institutions in improving their service quality in order to increase satisfaction level of students.

References

- Adenuga, A & Ayodele, K (2009).General self-efficacy and emotional intelligence as predictors of postgraduate students' choice and interest in conducting experimental research.*African Journal of Research in Personnel and Counselling Psychology, 1, 2, 23-31.*

- Ahmed, Selim, and Muhammad Mehedi Masud (2014): "Measuring Service Quality of a Higher Educational Institute towards Student Satisfaction." *American Journal of Educational Research* 2.7 , 447-455.

- Alfrejat , Ghalib (2009). Higher Education Reality and Ambition. Amman : Azmenah for publication and distribution.

- Al-Naggar, R, Al-Sarory, S, Al-Naggar, A & Al-Muosli, M (2012) Doctorate international students' satisfaction and stress on academic supervision in a Malaysian University: a qualitative approach. *Educational Research*, 3, 3, 264-269.

- Archambault, L. Z. (2008). Measuring Service Performance , Student Satisfaction and its Impact on Student Retention in Private , Post-Secondary Institutions, procedings EDU-COM International Converence, Edith Cowan University. Retrieved from http://ro.eco.edu.au/ceducom/2.

- Beaumont, D. J. (2012): *Service quality in Higher Education: The students' viewpoint.* University of Manchester, Manchester Business School, Manchester, UK

- Clewes, D. (2003). A Student-centred Conceptual Model of Service Quality in Higher Education. Quality in Higher Education, 9(1), 69-85.

- De Jager, J. W., & Jan, M. T. (2015). Antecedents of customer satisfaction in the higher education institutions of South Africa. Problems and Perspectives in Management, 13(3),87–95.

- Dib, H., & Alnazer, M. (2013). The Impact of Service Quality on Student Satisfaction and Behavioral Consequences in Higher Education Services, TI Journal2, 285–290.

- Douglas, J., Douglas, A., & Barnes, B. (2006). Measuring student satisfaction at a UK university. *Quality Assurance in Education, 14*(3), 251–267. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09684880610678568.

- Farahmandian, S., Minavand, H., & Afshardost, M. (2013). Perceived service quality and student satisfaction in higher education. IOSR Journal of Business and Management, 12(4),65–74.

- Hill, F. M. (1995). Managing service quality in higher education: The role of the student as primary consumer. *Quality Assurance in Education, 3*(3), 10-21. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1353832950010107.

- Husain. F,and others. (2009), "Education Service Delivery and Students' Satisfaction: A Study of Private Colleges in Malaysia" Global Business and Management Research: An International Journal, Vol. 1, No. 1, PP. 64-72.

- Ismail. A, M., Parasuraman. B. (2009) " Effect of Service Quality and Perceive Value on Customer Satisfaction" International Journal of Management Perspective.

- Kotler, P. & Clarke, R.N. (1987). "Marketing For Health Care Organizations," Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

- O'Driscoll, F. (2012). What matters most: An exploratory multivariate study of satisfaction among first year hotel/hospitality management students. Quality Assurance in Education, 20(3), 237–258. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09684881211240303.

- O'Neill M.A., & Palmer, A. (2004). Importance–performance analysis: a useful tool for directing continuous quality improvement in higher education. *Quality Assurance Education, 12*(1), 39–52.

- Macukow, B. (2000). Education Quality in the Warsaw University of Technology. European *Journal Of Engineering Education, 25*(1), 9.

- Majeed, Sawsan and Ziadat, Muhammad (2008). Quality and Accreditation of public education institutions and university. Amman: Dar al -Safaa for publication and distribution.

- Maushart, J. (2003). Study says students are satisfied with college experience. The Daily Aztec, San Diego State U.

- Nadiri, H. (2011). Strategic Issue in Higher Education Marketing: How University Students' Perceive Higher Education Services. Asian Journal on Quality, 7(2), 125-140.http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/15982688200600020.

- Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1988). SERVQUAL: A multiple-item scale for measuring conumer perceptions of service quality. *Journal of Retailing, 64*(1), 12-24. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1251430.

- Smith, R. & Ennew, C. (2001, January). Service quality and its impact on word of mouth communication in higher education. Online: http://www.unim.nottingham.ac.uk /dbm/papers/ 2001-01.pdf. on 15th September 2004.

- Yong JK (2000). A multidimensional and hierarchiral model of service quality in the participant sport industry.Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University.

❧❧❧