

A Comparative Analysis of Student Satisfaction towards Service Quality of Post Graduate Management Institution: A Case Study of Delhi Metropolitan City

Dr. Gopal Singh Latwal*

Abstract

In higher education the attention is paid to the effectiveness of the teaching and learning but, very little attention has been given to students' attitude, belief and experiences. Students are the main stakeholders in the higher education. Students' satisfaction is an important element that decides the fate of the organization in the long run. Their satisfaction indicates the overall service provided by the institute which in turn, increases student enrolment and retention.

This study assesses management education students' (studying in Post Graduate Diploma in Management (PGDM) and Master in Business Administration (MBA) courses) satisfaction across the institutes in West Delhi. The primary data was obtained through structured questionnaire consisting of nine dimensions namely physical information, behavior of staff, communication and commitment of institute, faculty input quality, guest and visiting faculty, industrial and recreational activity, placement services, and overall satisfaction. Significant differences were found between PGDM and MBA students' satisfaction with respect to the entire nine dimensions of Institute quality factors. Both PGDM and MBA students were moderately satisfied but, satisfaction of PGDM students were more in comparison to MBA students.

Keywords: Management education, Satisfaction, Service quality, Stakeholder

Introduction

LPG (Liberalization, Privatization, and Globalization) has brought phenomenal transformation in all sectors of the economy. In 21st century, the overall quality of the national competition is attributed to the current development of education in particular, the quality of higher education. Higher education is the source of dynamism for the economy, creating employment and social opportunities for the people. India is the third largest higher education provider in the world and is now exposed to serious threat of cut-throat competition in terms of quality and fulfilling the over growing demands. So, the education service providers have started the innovative and strategic process to provide quality service to the society in order to sustain in the global competition.

Customer satisfaction has been considered as a central issue in the marketing literature (Churchill and

Suprenant, 1982). Crosby (1991) maintains that providing a high level of quality, lowers costs and retains satisfied customers, and ultimately generates higher profit margins for an organisation. Parasuraman et al. (1990), Cronin and Taylor (1992) in their earlier researches have shown the importance of understanding what the customer expects, which will help the organisation to achieve the first step in delivering quality service and satisfaction. Now, more than ever, higher education institutions have embraced the marketing concept and the idea of the student as a consumer, the customer who is involved in the purchase of higher education programs and services (Kotler and Levy, 1969). Quality and customer satisfaction have long been recognized as playing a crucial role for success and survival in today's competitive market (Yap and Kew, 2007).

In an educational institution, students are the main customer of the organization (IWA, 2007; Hill, 1995; Zairi, 1995). Students' satisfaction should always be considered important by the institutions due to intensive competition among institutes, higher

Dr. Gopal Singh Latwal*

Institute of Information Technology and Management,
New Delhi

expectation of customer towards higher educational institution, and the classification of education as a marketable service (Kwek et al., 2010).

Management education courses provide basic knowledge about management concepts and business structure. Mostly Post Graduate Management Institutes offer two year Post Graduate programme (MBA/PGDM), both full time and part time that follow semester/tri-semester examination system. Most of the Management institutes in Delhi offer PGDM (Post Graduate Diploma in Management), approved from All India Council of Technical Education (AICTE) in various specialization and MBA (Master in Business Administration) affiliating to some university, namely Guru Gobind Singh Indraprastha University, etc. yet have not developed their facilities due to variety of reason. Many institutes lack the range of physical facilities and services such as sports and leisure facilities, student accommodation, specialist careers advice and support. Students are important stakeholders so, it is important to know their perspective and their satisfaction in order to gain competitive advantage (Arambewela, 2010). The main purpose of this study is to discover the extent to which students of MBA and PGDM courses are satisfied with their institutions and its service offering. The findings are intended to provide useful information to institutional stakeholders, who can then implement strategies to bring about substantial improvements.

Objectives

1. To identify the student satisfaction factors.
2. To measure student satisfaction towards service quality of Institutes.
3. To analyse the relationship between the institution quality factors and overall students' satisfaction towards the institution.
4. To analyse the impact of service quality dimension with various groups viz. age, gender, income, course, etc.

Review of Literature

Service Quality

In general, the concept of service quality is defined as a form of attitude representing a long run overall evaluation. It is a critical prerequisite and determinant

of competitiveness for establishing and sustaining satisfying relationship with customer. Previous studies suggest that organizations must focus on the satisfaction of customers to gain long lasting competitive advantage. Various researchers have developed alternative concepts for service quality such as the European Perspective (Grönroos, 1982, 1984; Lehtinen, and Lehtinen, 1982) and the American perspective (Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A. and Berry, L.L. 1985, 1988). The European perspective states that service quality should include three dimensions like technical quality, functional quality and corporate image. The American perspective proposes that service quality may be evaluated on the functional quality dimensions described by five components viz., tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, assurance and empathy (Kang and James, 2004).

Parasuraman, Zeithaml, & Berry (1985, 1988 and 1991) define perceived service quality as “a global judgment, or attitude, relating to the superiority of the service.” Delivery of higher levels of service quality is the strategy that is increasingly being offered as a key to service providers' efforts to position themselves more effectively in the marketplace (Parasuraman, Zeithaml, & Berry 1988). Bitner, Booms and Tetreault (1990) define service quality as the individuals' general attitude towards the service firm. In general, service quality promotes customer satisfaction, stimulates intention to return, and encourage recommendations (Nadiri and Hussain, 2005). Asubonteng et al., 1996 defined service quality as “the difference between customers' expectations for service performance prior to the service encounter and their perceptions of the service received”. According to Gefan, D. (2002), service quality is defined as the subjective comparison that customers make between the quality of the service that they want to receive and what they actually get. In other studies, service quality has been defined as the difference between customer's expectations of service provider's performance and their evaluation of the services they received (Parasuraman et al. 1985, 1988). According to Woodside et al., 1989, service quality is represented by answers to the following questions

- (i) Is the service delivered to customer what they expected or different from that?

(ii) Was the service they received approximately what they expected or better or worse than expected?

A majority of studies have sought to find the criteria that contribute to evaluate service quality in the traditional service environment (Parasuramna et al., 1985, 1988; Grönroos, 1982, Lehtinen, 1982, Lehtinen and; Johnston, 1995, 1997). The traditional service quality can be defined as the overall evaluation of firm's service by comparing the firm's performance with the customer's general expectations of how firms should perform (Parasuramna et al., 1985, 1988).

Mario Rapso Helena Alves (1998), stated that the service expectations are formed around three main areas a) Learning & Career b) Reputation & facilities of the Universities c) Availability & sympathy of the staff.

From the research studies (Sevier, 1993; McDonnell; 1995, Mazzarol, (1998, Soutar, and Mcneil, 1996; and Lin, 1997) it can be deduced that faculty reputation, institution's reputation, academic environment, size of school, employment after graduation, specific academic programs, financial aid availability, student population and social atmosphere, geographical location and quality of faculty were the overriding factors that affect undergraduates' decision to enroll in a higher learning institution. (Bitner, 1990) asserts that the physical facilities do influence the overall students' perceived service quality because students will associate various tangible elements with the services provided by the higher education institution.

The core function of every service is to satisfy the customers who consume it. There is evidence to suggest that service quality leads to customer satisfaction and helps to keep existing customers and attract new ones (Arambewela and Hall, 2009). Customer satisfaction is based on the perception and expectations of customer about quality of facilities available at the institution (Ekinic, 2004; Christou and Sigala, 2002). Bolton and Drew (1991), Spreng and Mackoy (1996) also found that customer satisfaction is the result of service quality.

Research Methodology

Research Instrument

For this study descriptive study using primary data was considered appropriate. A questionnaire was

formed after rigorous literature review in order to find the dimensions of service quality on which their satisfaction would be measured. The structured questionnaire consisted of 42 items/statements that were divided into two parts - the first part captures the satisfaction of students and the second captured the demographic characteristics of the respondents. The questionnaire consisted of five point Likert Scale, where 1= highly dissatisfied, 2= dissatisfied, 3= neutral, 4=satisfied, and 5= highly satisfied. The questionnaire is pre-tested so that questions could be reframed and some necessary improvements could be incorporated. Factor analysis was carried out for testing construct validity and all the statements having factor loading greater than 0.5 were categorized into nine dimensions namely physical information, behavior of staff, communication and commitment of institute, faculty input quality, guest and visiting faculty, industrial and recreational activity, placement services, and overall satisfaction.. The questionnaire was also tested for its reliability.

Proportionate Stratified random sampling technique was used to choose the respondents across MBA and PGDM offering institutes in West Delhi. Total 135 questionnaires were distributed but only 115 filled questionnaires were received from the respondents and were used for data analysis. SPSS 19.0 was used for various statistical test viz, univariate analysis, t-test, F-test, etc.

Data Analysis and Findings

The data thus collected, was coded and entered in excel. The data is analyzed using software SPSS 19.0. The data was analysed for its reliability. The Cronbach's Alpha technique was used to find out the reliability of the scale. The reliability 0.60 and 0.70 or above is considered to be the criteria for demonstrating internal consistency of new scales and established scales respectively (Nunnally, 1978).

In this study the Cronbach's alpha score of reliability is 0.863, shows that the factor scales are internally consistent and good conformity of items to each dimensions (Table 1).

The summary of demographic profile of the respondents is represented in Table 2. From the analysis

Table 1: Reliability for the Service Quality Constructs

Total Number of Items	Cronbach's alpha (α)
09	0.863

Table 2: Demographic Profile of the Respondents (N=115)

Profile		Number of Respondents	Percentage
GENDER	Male	62	53.9
	Female	53	46.1
AGE (in years)	Below 23 yrs	77	66.9
	23 and Above	38	33.1
YEAR OF STUDY	1 st year	44	38.3
	2 nd year	71	61.7
SUBJECT SPECIALIZATION*	Marketing	53	46.1
	HRM	23	20.0
	Finance	43	37.4
MODE OF COURSE FINANCE	Self/ Parent Financed	92	80.0
	Financed by Bank	23	20.0
MARKS (in % last qualifying exams)	Below 60 %	11	9.6
	60 – 75 %	67	58.3
	Above 75%	37	32.1
STUDENT'S STATUS	Traditional Student	95	82.6
	Non-Traditional Student	20	17.4
ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME (in ₹)	Below ₹5 Lakhs	38	33.0
	₹5- 10 Lakhs	52	45.2
	Above 10 Lakhs	25	21.7
PROGRAMME	MBA	56	48.7
	PGDM	59	51.3

*The response of the respondents are multiple and overlapping. Multiple responses percentages do not add to 100.

it was found that 53.9 per cent of the respondents were males. As for the age distribution, the majority of respondents (66.91 %) fall in the age group up to 23 years. The table 2 depict that majority of student (53 students) are having Marketing Management as a major specialization followed by Finance (43 students). Marketing and Finance are most sought subjects in management education.

As for annual household income, majority of respondents (45.2 %) belong to the family whose annual household income is between Rs. 5-10 Lakhs. Majority of respondents (80.0 %) paid fee by themselves or by their parents, while 20.0 per cent respondents had availed education loan for their course. The aspiration of the middle class people is rising, so people are availing bank loan for pursuing

higher education. About 58.3 per cent of respondents had 60-75 percent marks in their previous semester or qualifying exams. 17.4 percent respondents belonged to the category of non-traditional student (students who had discontinued their education after graduation for job, preparing for exams etc. and taken admission in management programme). Traditional students were those who continued their education without any gap and non-traditional were those students having gap in their studies. While, 48.7 percent of respondents were pursuing MBA and rest 51.3 per cent respondents were pursuing PGDM programme.

Student satisfaction were assessed against eight

dimensions (Physical infrastructure, Behaviour of staff, Communication commitment, Course Curriculum, Faculty input quality, Guest & Visiting faculty quality, Industrial visit and recreational activity and placement services).

Across all of the dimensions examine in this study, the scores awarded by respondents indicates that they are satisfied with the services at their institute. But, the satisfaction level is not very promising as the mean score of all dimensions are between 3.62-3.83 range. The means score awarded by students for each of the eight dimensions, and the standard deviations, are presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Student Score for their Satisfaction towards Service Quality Dimension
 N= 115

Dimension	Mean	Standard deviation
Physical Infrastructure	3.75	1.033
Behaviour of Staff	3.70	.818
Communication and commitment	3.88	.890
Course curriculum	3.77	.889
Faculty input quality	3.75	.926
Guest & Visiting faculty quality	3.83	.830
Industrial visit and Recreational activity	3.62	.987
Placement services	3.63	1.096

On a 5- point rating scale where 1=strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree

Table 4: The Relationship between Physical Infrastructure and Student Satisfaction

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.619 ^a	.383	.377	.652	.383	70.028	1	113	.000

Hypothesis 1: *There is a significant relationship between physical infrastructure and student satisfaction.*

The relationship between physical infrastructure and student satisfaction was investigated using Pearson correlation coefficient. The result in Table 4 indicates, a strong and positive relationship between physical infrastructure and student satisfaction exists among students (R square = 0.383, n= 115, P<.01). This

means that 38 per cent of their satisfaction is determined by physical infrastructure.

Hypothesis 2: *There is a significant relationship between behavior of staff and student satisfaction.*

The relationship between behavior of staff and student satisfaction was investigated using Pearson correlation coefficient. The result in Table 5 indicates, a strong and positive relationship between behavior of staff and

Table 5: The Relationship between Behaviour of Staff and Student Satisfaction

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.561a	.314	.308	.687	.314	51.770	1	113	.000

student satisfaction exists among students (R square = 0.314, n= 115, P<.01). This means that 31 per cent of their satisfaction is determined by behavior of staff.

Hypothesis 3: *There is a significant relationship between communication and commitment and student satisfaction.*

Table 6: The Relationship between Communication & Commitment and Student Satisfaction

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.569 ^a	.323	.317	.683	.323	54.025	1	113	.000

The relationship between communication and commitment and student satisfaction was investigated using Pearson correlation coefficient. The result in Table 6 indicates, a strong and positive relationship between communication and commitment and student satisfaction exists among students (R square =

0.323, n= 115, P<.01). This means that 32 per cent of their satisfaction is determined by communication and commitment.

Hypothesis 4: *There is a significant relationship between course curriculum and student satisfaction.*

Table 7: The Relationship between Course Curriculum and Student Satisfaction

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.438 ^a	.192	.185	.746	.192	26.850	1	113	.000

The relationship between course curriculum and student satisfaction was investigated using Pearson correlation coefficient. The result in Table 7 indicates, a strong and positive relationship between course curriculum and student satisfaction exists among

students (R square = 0.192, n= 115, P<.01). This means that 19 per cent of their satisfaction is determined by course curriculum.

Hypothesis 5: *There is a significant relationship between faculty input quality and student satisfaction.*

Table 8: The Relationship between Faculty Input Quality and Student Satisfaction

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.541 ^a	.293	.287	.698	.293	46.833	1	113	.000

The relationship between faculty input quality and student satisfaction was investigated using Pearson correlation coefficient. The result in Table 8 indicates, a strong and positive relationship between faculty input quality and student satisfaction exists among students

(R square = 0.293, n= 115, P<.01). This means that 29 per cent of their satisfaction is determined by faculty input quality.

Hypothesis 6: *There is a significant relationship between Guest and Visiting faculty and student satisfaction.*

Table 9: The Relationship between Guest and Visiting Faculty and Student Satisfaction

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.367 ^a	.135	.127	.772	.135	17.588	1	113	.000

The relationship between Guest and visiting faculty and student satisfaction was investigated using Pearson correlation coefficient. The result in Table 9 indicates, a strong and positive relationship between Guest and visiting faculty and student satisfaction exists among students (R square = 0.135, n= 115, P<.01). This

means that 13 per cent of their satisfaction is determined by Guest and visiting faculty.

Hypothesis 7: *There is a significant relationship between Industrial visit & Recreational activity and student satisfaction.*

Table 10: The Relationship between Industrial Visits and Recreational Activities conducted and Student Satisfaction

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.406 ^a	.164	.157	.759	.164	22.244	1	113	.000

The relationship between Industrial visit & Recreational activity and student satisfaction was investigated using Pearson correlation coefficient. The result in Table 10 indicates, a strong and positive relationship between Industrial visits & Recreational activities conducted and student satisfaction exists

among students (R square = 0.164, n= 115, P<.01). This means that 16 per cent of their satisfaction is determined by Industrial visit & Recreational activity.

Hypothesis 8: *There is a significant relationship between Placement services and student satisfaction.*

Table 11: The Relationship between Placement Services and Student Satisfaction

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.532 ^a	.283	.276	.703	.283	44.529	1	113	.000

The relationship between Placement services and student satisfaction was investigated using Pearson correlation coefficient. The result in Table 11 indicates, a strong and positive relationship between Placement services and student satisfaction exists among students

(R square = 0.283, n= 115, P<.01). This means that 28 per cent of their satisfaction is determined by Placement services.

Hypothesis 9: *There is a significant difference between PGDM and MBA students and satisfaction.*

Table 12: Comparison of Satisfaction Factors (Variables) between MBA and PGDM

Variables	PGDM (N=59)		MBA (N =56)		t-value
	Mean	S. D.	Mean	S. D.	
Physical Infrastructure	4.12	0.81	3.36	1.10	4.23**
Behaviour of Staff	3.90	0.76	3.48	0.83	2.81**
Communication and commitment	4.25	0.73	3.48	0.87	5.14**
Course curriculum	4.19	0.63	3.34	0.92	5.79**
Faculty input quality	4.03	0.85	3.45	0.91	3.57**
Guest & Visiting faculty quality	4.07	0.83	3.57	0.76	3.35**
Industrial visit and Recreational activity	3.90	0.92	3.32	0.97	3.26**
Placement services	4.05	0.76	3.18	1.21	4.63**
Overall service quality	4.12	0.75	3.54	0.81	4.03**

** Significant at 0.01 level

It appears from the **table 12** that there is significant difference between the PGDM and MBA students towards the satisfaction derived from their institutes. The mean value of the respondents for all the satisfaction factors and overall service quality represents that PGDM students are more satisfied in comparison to MBA Students as their mean value is higher. PGDM students are highly satisfied whereas MBA students are moderately satisfied. The calculated value of the t-test for various factors as shown in table 12, $P < 0.05$, and it is significant at 0.01 levels. Hence, the hypothesis that there is no statistically significant difference

between PGDM and MBA student regarding service quality dimension is rejected. From this, it is concluded that the both PGDM and MBA students are satisfied with service quality of their Institute but PGDM students are more satisfied it may be because PGDM institutes are autonomous programme and institute really work hard to provide better facility to attract more students in comparison to institute offering MBA programme affiliated to some University.

Hypothesis 10: *There is a significant difference between male and Female and satisfaction.*

Table 13: Comparison of Satisfaction Factors (Variables) between Male and Female Respondent

Variables	Male (N=62)		Female (N =53)		t-value
	Mean	S. D.	Mean	S. D.	
Physical Infrastructure	3.74	1.007	3.75	1.072	0.07NS
Behaviour of Staff	3.63	0.87	3.77	0.75	0.94NS
Communication and commitment	3.82	0.86	3.94	0.93	0.72NS
Course curriculum	3.77	0.97	3.77	0.80	0.01NS
Faculty input quality	3.60	0.90	3.92	0.94	1.92NS
Guest & Visiting faculty quality	3.69	0.78	3.98	0.87	1.87NS
Industrial visit and Recreational activity	3.52	1.01	3.74	0.97	1.20NS
Placement services	3.69	0.93	3.55	1.27	0.71NS
Overall service quality	3.71	0.78	3.98	0.87	1.77NS

NS- Not significant

It appears from the **table 13** that there is significant difference in the opinion between the male and female students towards the satisfaction of their institutes. The mean value of the respondents for all the satisfaction factors and overall service quality represent that both male and female are moderately satisfied with the service quality of their institutes. The calculated value of the t-test for various factors as shown in table 13, $P > 0.05$, and it is not significant at 0.05 levels. Hence the hypothesis that there is no statistically significant difference between male and female

students regarding service quality dimension is accepted. From this it is concluded that the both male and female students are satisfied with service quality of their Institute.

Hypothesis 11: *There is a significant difference among various income group and satisfaction.*

F-test was used to determine if there was any significant difference among various income group and satisfaction and in order to check the difference within the group Duncan's mean test was also calculated.

Table 14: Comparison of Satisfaction dimension among three Income Group of respondents (I1= below 5 Lakhs, I2= 5-10 Lakhs, I3= Above 10 Lakhs) - DUNCAN'S Mean Test

Dimension(s)	I1 (N=38)		I2 (N=52)		I3 (N=25)		I1 v/s I2	I1 v/s I3	I2 v/s I3	F-Value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD				
Physical Infrastructure	3.55	1.18	3.87	0.97	3.80	0.91	-	-	-	1.05NS
Behaviour of Staff	3.32	.809	3.88	.676	3.88	.927	*	*	-	6.73**
Communication and commitment	3.74	.921	3.88	.855	4.08	.909	-	-	-	1.13NS
Course curriculum	3.58	.976	3.81	.841	4.00	.816	-	-	-	1.78NS
Faculty input quality	3.45	.891	3.96	.928	3.76	.879	*	-	-	3.54NS
Guest & Visiting faculty quality	3.68	.873	3.88	.808	3.92	.812	-	-	-	0.84NS
Industrial visit and Recreational activity	3.32	1.118	3.81	.793	3.68	1.069	*	-	-	2.88NS
Placement services	3.71	1.088	3.58	1.054	3.60	1.225	-	-	-	0.17NS
Overall service quality	3.63	.852	3.94	.777	3.92	.862	-	-	-	1.74NS

** Significant at 0.01 level

NS - Not Significant

It appears from the **table 14** that the respondents from three income group are moderately satisfied with all the service quality dimension of their institutes except behavior of the staff. The calculated value of the t-test has shown in table 14 where $P > 0.05$, and it is not significant at 0.05 levels. Hence the hypothesis that there is no statistically significant difference among various income groups and the satisfaction dimension is rejected. The respondents belonging to income group below 5 lakhs are less satisfied with the behavior of the staff in comparison to rest two group (5-10 lakhs and above 10 lakhs). Although there is no significant

difference among various age group and faculty input quality, industrial visit and recreational activity but, as per Duncan's mean test the respondents belonging to income group below 5 lakhs are comparatively less satisfied with these factors in comparison to the rest. It was found from the data analysis that the age group, status of the student (*Traditional- without any gap in education and non-traditional- student having gap in their studies*), year of study, etc do not have any significant difference on the service quality of the institutes. All the categories are moderately satisfied with the existing service quality of their institutes.

The core function of every service is to satisfy the customer who consumes it. There is evidence to suggest that service quality leads to customer satisfaction and helps to keep existing customers and attract the new ones (Arambewela and Hall 2009). Satisfaction is a result of quality service (Bolton and Drew, 1991).

Summary and Conclusion

The results of the study indicates that students evaluate wide range of service quality dimension viz. physical information, behavior of staff, communication and commitment of institute, faculty input quality, guest and visiting faculty, industrial and recreational activity, and placement services. There is positive strong relationship between overall student satisfaction vis-à-vis service quality dimensions.

The students of both MBA and PGDM programme are moderately satisfied with the service quality offered by their institute. But, PGDM students are more satisfied since PGDM course is an autonomous programme where institute has greater degree of flexibility and self initiated control regarding the course curriculum and examination; and to increase the enrolment they work hard on placement and provide more facilities whereas MBA programme is under the control of Affiliating University and all the activities are in direct control of university such as course

curriculum, examination and even the entire admission process.

In higher education the attention is paid on the effectiveness of the teaching and learning but, very little attention has been given to students' attitude, belief and experiences. Since students are the main stakeholders in the higher education, their satisfaction is an important element that decides the fate of an institution in the long run. Their satisfaction indicates the overall service provided by the institute which in turn, increases student enrolment and retention. The best way of marketing the institute or any business is through positive word of mouth through their existing students as well as from their alumni. Thus, it helps institute to gain competitive advantage. It is now universally accepted that student satisfaction results from the total student experience and not just from quality in teaching & learning (Wright & O'Neill, 2002). It is imperative for institute management to monitor & measure students' satisfaction on regular basis and incorporate innovative changes to bring out better services to their stakeholders. Berry and Parasuraman (1991) remarked that "Service quality is the foundation of service marketing". All these quality attributes are under the control of the education administrators. Thus, it is most important for the management to concentrate on the service quality.

References

1. Asubonteng, P., Mcclary, K.J. and Swan, J.E. (1996), "SERVQUAL Revisited: A Critical Review of Service Quality", *Journal of Service Marketing*, 10(6), 62-81.
2. Arambewela, R. and Hall, J. (2009), "An empirical model of international student satisfaction", *Asian Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, 21(4), 555-569.
3. Arambewela, R. (2010), "Student Experience in the Globalized Higher Education Market: Challenges and Research Imperatives". In F. Maringe & N. Foskett (Eds), *Globalization and Internationalization in Higher Education: Theoretical, Strategic and Management Perspectives*, London: Continuum.
4. Berry and Parasuraman (1991), *Marketing Services: Competing Through Quality*, New York: The Free Press.
5. Bitner, M. J., (1990), "Evaluating Service Encounters: the Effects of Physical Surroundings and Employee Responses", *Journal of Marketing*, 54(2), 69-82.
6. Bitner, M.J., Booms, B., and Tetreault, S. (1990), "The Service Encounter: Diagnosing Favourable and Unfavourable Incidents", *Journal of Marketing*, 54(1), 71-84.
7. Bolton, R.N. and Drew, J.H. (1991), "A Multistage Model of Customer's Assessment of Service Quality and Value", *Journal of Consumer Research*, 17(4), 365-84.
8. Christou, E. and Sigala, M. (2002), "Conceptualising the Measurement of Service Quality and TQM Performance for Hotels: The HOSTQUAL Model", *Acta Touristica*, 14(2), 140-69.

9. Churchill, G.A. and Surprenant, C. (1982), "An Investigation into the Determinants of Customer Satisfaction", *Journal of Marketing Research*, 19, 491-504.
10. Cronin Jr, J. J., & Taylor, S. A. (1992), "Measuring Service Quality: A Reexamination and Extension", *Journal of Marketing*, 56(3), 55-68.
11. Crosby, L. (1991), "Expanding the Role of CSM in Total Quality", *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 2(2), 5-19.
12. Ekinici, Y. (2004), "An Investigation of the Determinants of Customer Satisfaction", *Tourism Analysis*, 8(2-4), 197-203.
13. Gefan, D. (2002), "Customer Loyalty in e-Commerce", *Journal of the Association of Information System*, 3(1), 27-51.
14. Grönroos, C. (1982), "Strategic Management and Marketing in Service Sector", Marketing Science Institute, Cambridge, MA.
15. Grönroos, C. (1984), "A Service Quality Model and its Marketing Implications", *European Journal of Marketing*, 18(4), 36-44.
16. 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.
17. IWA 2:2007, International Standard, Quality management Systems - Guidelines for the Application of ISO 9001:2000 in Education on http://www.iso.org/iso/catalogue_detail.htm?csnumber=45805
18. Joseph, M., Yakhou, M. and Stone, G. (2005), "An Educational Institution's Quest for Service Quality: Customers' Perspective", *Quality Assurance in Education*, 13 (1), 66-82.
19. Kang, G.D., and James, J. (2004), "Service Quality Dimensions: An Examination of Gronroos's Service Quality Model", *Managing Service Quality*, 14(4), 266-277.
20. Kotler, P., & Levy, S. J. (1969), "Broadening the Concept of Marketing", *Journal of Marketing*, 33(1), 10-15.
21. Kwek, Choon Ling et al. (2010), "The 'Inside-out' and 'Outside-in' Approaches on Students' Perceived Service Quality: An Empirical Evaluation", *Management Science and Engineering*, 4(2), 01-26.
22. Lehtinen, J.R. and lehtinen, U. (1982), "Service Quality: A Study of Quality Dimensions", Unpublished Working Paper, Service Management Institute, Helsinki.
23. Letcher, D.W. and Neves J.S. (2010), "Determinant of Undergraduate Business Student Satisfaction", *Research in Higher Education Journal*, 1-26.
24. Lin, J.G., & Yi, J.K. (1997), "Asian International Students' Adjustment: Issues and Program Suggestions", *College Student Journal*, December 1997, 31 (4), 473-480.
25. Mario Rapso Helena Alves (1998), Marketing higher education: students expectations, Econ papers
26. Mazzarol, T. (1998), "Critical Success Factors for International Education Marketing", *The International Journal of Educational Management*, 12(4), 163-175.
27. McDonnell, M. (1995), "Things to Consider When Evaluating College", Received March 2002, <http://www.gseis.ucla.edu/mm/cc/info/choosing/eval.html>
28. Nadiri, H., and Hussain, K. (2005), "Perceptions of Service Quality in North Cyprus Hotels", *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 17(6), 469-480.
29. Nunnally, J. C. (1978), *Psychometric theory* (2nd ed), New York: McGraw-Hill.
30. Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A. and Berry, L.L. (1985), "A Conceptual Model of Service Quality and its Implication for Future Research", *Journal of Marketing*, 49 (Fall), 41-50.

31. Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, Valerie A. & Berry, Leonard L. (1988), "SERVQUAL: A Multiple-Item Scale for Measuring Consumer Perceptions of Service Quality," *Journal of Retailing*, 64(1), 12-40.
32. Parasuraman, A., Berry, L.L. and Zeithaml, V.A. (1990), *Delivering Quality Service*, The Free Press, New York, NY.
33. Parasuraman, A., Berry, L. L., & Zeithaml, V. A. (1991), "Perceived Service Quality as a Customer-Based Performance Measure: An Empirical Examination of Organizational Barriers Using an Extended Service Quality Model", *Human Resource Management*, 30(3), 335-364.
34. Sevier, R. (1993), "Image is Everything", *College and Universities*, Winter, 60 – 75.
35. Sohail, M.S. and Shaikh, N.M. (2004), "Quest for Excellent in Business Education: A Study of Student Impressions of Service Quality", *The International Journal of Educational Management*, 18(1), 58-65.
36. Soutar, G. & McNeil, M. (1996), "Measuring Service Quality in a Tertiary Institution", *Journal of Educational Administration*, 34(1), 72-82.
37. Spreng, R. A. & Mackoy, R. D. (1996), "An Empirical Examination of a Model of Perceived Service Quality and Satisfaction", *Journal of Retailing*, 72(2), 52-64.
38. Sudharani Ravindran D., M. Kalpana., K. Ramya. (2011), 'Impact of Service Quality on Students' Satisfaction', *Asian Journal of Research in Social Science & Humanities*, 1 (4), 480 -495.
39. Sudharani Ravindran D., M. Kalpana., K. Ramya. (2012), "Students' Expectation, Perception and Satisfaction towards the Management Educational Institutions, *Procedia Economics and Finance*" 2 (2012), 401-410. www.sciencedirect.com doi: 10.1016/S2212-5671(12)00102-5.
40. Wright, C., & O'Neill, M. (2002), "Service Quality Evaluation in the Higher Education Sector: An Empirical Investigation of Students' Perceptions", *Higher Education Research & Development*, 21(1), 23-39.
41. Zairi, M. (1995), "Total Quality Education for Superior Performance", *Training for Quality*, 3(1), 29-35.
42. Kang, G.D., and James, J. (2004), "Service Quality Dimensions: An Examination of Gronroos's Service Quality Model", *Managing Service Quality*, 14(4), 266-277.
43. Nadiri, H., and Hussain, K. (2005), "Perceptions of Service Quality in North Cyprus Hotels", *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 17(6), 469-480.
44. Yap, S F., and Kew, M.L. (2007), "Service Quality and Customer Satisfaction : Antecedents of Customer's Re-Patronage Intentions", http://eprints.sunway.edu.my/46/1/service_quality.pdf