

Stakeholders Satisfaction regarding Service Quality in Higher Management Education

Amrinder Singh,

Research Scholar,
Department of Commerce and Management,
Sri Guru Granth Sahib World University,
Fatehgarh Sahib, India

Dr. Lalit Singla,

Assistant Professor,
Department of Commerce and Management,
Sri Guru Granth Sahib World University,
Fatehgarh Sahib, India

ABSTRACT

This study examined the comparative satisfaction of stakeholders regarding service quality being provided by higher management education institutions of public and private sectors of Punjab. Stakeholder's satisfaction is measured with the help of structured questionnaire across eleven service quality dimensions like, Access and Approachable, Exposure, Academic Reputation, Safety & Security, Infrastructure, Placements, Fee, Scholarships, Extra Curriculum Activities, Functioning, Feed Back. There is a difference between the satisfactions of students of public & private universities across the majority of the eleven dimensions of institution quality factors. Same results were found in the case of parents too. In the comparison of satisfaction of parents and students regarding quality of service in higher management education in public & private universities a significant difference was found.

Keywords: Stakeholders, Students, Parents, Stakeholder Satisfaction, Service Quality, Higher Management Education.

INTRODUCTION:

In marketing literature customer satisfaction is important topic (Churchill and Suprenant, 1982). Sustain greater extent of quality will lower the cost of the organization and will help you to make more satisfied customers, and will produce more quantity of profit for an organization (Crosby 1991). From existing research studies it is clear that to achieve strong customer satisfaction organization should understand the importance of customer expectation and tries to deliver the same service quality as expected by customer (Parasuraman et al., 1990; Cronin and Taylor, 1992). According to (Kotler and Levy 1969) now more and more higher education institutions are indulging in marketing and treat students as their customers. A modern student tries to find those institutions that will give them unlike others, worth remembering, and personal educational experiences (Ravidran et.al, 2012). Students are keener to choose those courses which will prepare them for a successful career and support him to gain good employment opportunities for education institutions students are the main customers (Zairi, 1995, Hill, 1995; Sakthivel et.al., 2005;).

Service Quality in Higher Education:

It is difficult to mention one specific definition of quality in higher education as it is very complex and multifaceted concept (Harvey and Green 1993), so best way to define the service quality is does not exist yet (Clewes 2003).

Service Quality differs from sector to sector. A stakeholder satisfaction is also varies from sector to sector because of their dynamic need and wants. If expectation meets correctly then equity of satisfied customer will increase, satisfied customers attract more customer for the organization which is desired result for any organization. Zeithaml et.al, described and distinguish among three types of service expectations:- desired

service, adequate service and predicted service. Further explained that desired expectation is most important and dependent on one particular service, so analyzing or understanding the desire service is more contributory aspect in higher education. In the last three decades number of instruments has developed to measure the service quality SERVQUAL (Parasuraman et.al, 1988), SERVPERF (Cronin and Tayler-1992), Evaluated Performance (EP) (Teas 1993), HEDPERF (Abdullah 2006), FM-SERVQUAL (Zahari et.al.2008). But among all of them despite its limitation SERVQUAL is worldwide popular.

Stakeholders Identification:

For all the educational institutes it is very much essential to identify their stakeholders, those are more or key factors for their success. That can be in the form of old students, their parents, and the area where they reside. Commonly Students, Parents, Research Scholars, central and state Government, Society, Employer of the students, Disciplinary Academics Communities, Accreditation Bodies, Staff/Faculty members are considered as a main customers(stakeholders) of the higher education institution (Quinn 2009).(Kasetwar 2008) identify various stakeholders in the higher education institutions that can improve their quality if they were satisfied, these are, parents, students, educationalist, faculties, statutory bodies, industries, researchers and academic scientist, society. But most important stakeholders are students, faculty, administration (non- teaching) and parents.

Stakeholders Satisfaction:

Every stakeholder has their own needs and wants from their service providers. Same thing is applicable in higher education sector. Students have their own needs and wants and so in the case of faculty and parents, this is described in the below table

Table No-1

Stakeholders	Stakeholders Wants and Needs
Students	Quality Education Academic Guidance Appropriate Academic environments
Academic staff	Achievements, academic support, teaching and research skills improvement opportunities and financial and non-financial benefits, recognition
Non Academic staff	Achievements, support, financial and non-financial benefits, recognition
Parents	Quality education and more opportunities for their Children, responsible and skillful graduates
Society	Quality education, employable and responsible graduates and accountability
Government	Smooth functioning , financial management and good Governance
Employers	Skillful and market oriented graduates

Source: Singh & Weligamage (2010)

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE:

Kaur et.al, (2015) measured the effectiveness of service quality in higher educational institutions of Punjab from the student's point of view. Finding of the study stated that availability of infrastructure facilities as an important factor followed by placement services, education environment, extracurricular activities, and knowledge up gradation, academic facilities, student support services and academic staff.

Kettumen (2015) described stakeholder collaboration with the help of process flow of stakeholder relationships. The finding of the study can be used in quality audits to indicate, how stakeholders are involved in a food manner in the development of activities.

Farahmandian et al. (2013) investigated the perceive service quality and student satisfaction regarding higher education in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, most of the students were satisfied with service quality, a positive and significant relationship was found between factors of advising, curriculum teaching quality, financial assistance and institutional cost and facilities with students satisfaction.

Jager and Gbadamosi (2013) examined student's satisfaction of service quality in higher education in South Africa. The researcher focused on these objectives namely, gap in student's perceptions regarding service quality, gender difference in student satisfaction, predictors of service quality and student's satisfaction. Three universities of South Africa and Swaziland were selected for the study, two from South Africa and one from

Swaziland. Outcome of the study showed that there was a significant gap exists between expectation and perception of service quality in South Africa and Swaziland.

Ravindran, et.al, (2012) measured the students expectation, perception and satisfaction of management educational institutional. In four categories of institutions a significant difference was found in all six dimensions of institutional service quality factors regarding the perception of the students. Majority of the five factors of service quality except cost significantly influence the overall satisfaction of students towards institution. Temizer et.al, (2012) test student satisfaction with new developed index called Student Satisfaction Index (SSI) for the higher education institutions from various dimensions, such as image of the university, expectations, perceived quality, perceived value, and loyalty. The finding of the study showed that greater student satisfaction and loyalty can be enhance if the managers of higher education give focus on the quality of the services they provide and image of the institution in the eyes of their students.

Hanaysha et.al, (2011) studied the quality of higher education. Quality of the higher education is one of the most important factors in the competing world. Student satisfaction assessment is vital to determine service quality at higher education institutions (HEIs). The findings of the study indicated that majority of students were satisfied with the facilities provided by universities.

Butt et.al, (2010) study the student satisfaction in higher education, most of the students was satisfied with their higher education but satisfaction differs from males to females. Teachers' expertise was more important factor for them where as courses offered and learning environment were next to them and class a room facility was least important factor among all of them.

Singh et.al, (2010) analyzed the performance prism model and find out the applicability of this model in higher educational institutes. At the end find out the relationship between stakeholders needs, organizational capabilities, existing process, strategies and stakeholder's role.

Mainardes et.al, (2010) studied the importance of stakeholders and how they are divided. Further he divided the stakeholders on the basis of three attributes power, legitimacy and degree of urgency. The finding of the study stated that stakeholder can be categorized on hierarchal basis, but there importance and uses will varied according to the service sector.

Vaniarajan et.al, (2010) studied the factors that were important for student satisfaction in higher management education, in Tamilnadu. Three different institutions were approached in this research. Positive and significant effect of service quality factor was found on student satisfaction. Study further reveals that Art & Science and Engineering colleges have to upgrade their standard of service quality if they want to compete with Specialized Management Institutes.

Hasan et.al, (2009) studied the relationship between service quality dimensions and overall satisfaction of the students. Results of the study indicated that service quality had significant positive relationship with student satisfaction.

Palli et.al, (2008) measured the relationship between students satisfaction and service quality factors with the help of service quality five dimensions. The finding of the study showed that students were satisfied with services in terms of their reliability, assurance, tangibility, and empathy but not with responsiveness.

Alves et.al, (2007) the perceived quality has a stronger effect on satisfaction as compare to functional quality. These findings were related to the student's life because it causes them to evaluate not only the service perceived but service specification also.

NEED AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY:

Stakeholder's satisfaction is very crucial aspect for every industry, when it comes to service industry it becomes more important, because of its intangible nature. In India higher education sector is facing a stiff competition; it becomes stiffer when it comes to level the demands and wants of the stakeholders. Various studies has been conducted on quality of service of higher education, stakeholders expectation and perceptions, their satisfactions, (Ravindran et.al, 2012, Chawla et.al, 2014, Jager et.al, 2013, Singh et.al, 2011, Guha et.al, 2013, Farahmandian et.al, 2013, khodoyari et.al, 2011, khosravi et.al, 2013) but their primary focus was students, very few studies has been conducted, on all the major stakeholders of higher education as cumulated. When we talking about stakeholder's satisfaction in higher management education, particularly in north Indian state of Punjab a very few studies has been done. So there is a need to know the satisfaction level of stakeholders in Punjab in both sectors public and private. So to find out the difference between the satisfaction level of stakeholders in public and private universities of Punjab this study has been conducted.

OBJECTIVES AND HYPOTHESIS OF THE STUDY:

Objectives:

1. To compare the satisfaction level of students regarding service quality in higher management education of public and private Universities.
2. To compare the satisfaction level of Parents regarding service quality in higher management education of public and private Universities.
3. To compare the satisfaction level of Parents & Students regarding service quality in higher management education of public and private Universities.

HYPOTHESIS:

H₀₁: There is a no significant difference in the satisfaction level of students regarding service quality in higher management education of public and private universities.

H₀₂: There is a no significant difference in the satisfaction level of parents regarding service quality in higher management education of public and private universities.

H₀₃: There is a no significant difference in the satisfaction level of parents & students regarding service quality in higher management education of public and private universities.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY:

Research Design: An exploratory leads to descriptive research design was used for the study.

Scope of the Study: Both public and private universities of Punjab are cover in this study. Two universities from each category are taken for the study.

Sample Design:

Sample Unit & Size: For this study 400 students and 200 parents were taken as a sample, 100 students and 50 parents form each university were selected.

Sampling Technique: Stratified random sampling technique was used to choose the respondents across two categories of management educational institutions i.e. Public and Private.

Data Collection: Both primary and secondary sources are used for this study. Secondary sources are like research papers, books, theses, and Questionnaire is used to collect primary data. A structured questionnaire is used to collect the data which was developed with the help of questionnaire used by earlier researchers (Ravindran et.al, 2012, Jager et.al, 2013, Singh et.al, 2011, Guha et.al, 2013, Farahmandian et.al, 2013). A two separate questionnaire was developed, one for students and one for parents. Questionnaire is divided into two sections - the first section for the demographic characteristics of the respondents and the second is for satisfaction level.

Statistical tools and Techniques Used

Descriptive analysis was done by computing the mean, standard deviation, and standard error. A comparative satisfaction level regarding service quality in higher management education in public and private universities was measured with help of t-test.

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION:

The demographic profile of students indicates that out of 400 sample size 47% (190) are male and 52% (210) are female, majority of the students with 53% (214) belongs to 21-22 age groups, and 60.8% (243) belongs to urban area and 39.3% (157) belongs to rural area.

The demographic profile of parents indicates that out of 200 sample size 81.5% (163) are male and 18.5% (37) are female, majority of the parents having govt. job and own business as their occupation with 37% (74) and 28% (56) respectively. 49% (98) parents have done graduation and most of the parents belong to Hindu religion with 63% (126) and 33% (66) belong to Sikh religion and 55% (111) parents lives in urban area and 45% (89) in rural area.

Comparison of Student Satisfaction of Service Quality of Public & Private Universities:

H₀₁: There is a no significant difference in the satisfaction level of students regarding service quality in higher management education of public and private universities with respect to institutional quality factors such as Access and Approachable, Exposure, Academic Reputation, Safety & Security, Infrastructure, Placements, Fee, Scholarships, Extra Curriculum Activities, Functioning, Feed Back.

Table No.2: Comparison of Student Satisfaction of Service Quality of Public & Private Universities

Dimensions	University	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	t-value	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Access & Approachable	Public	200	3.9867	0.61513	0.0435	3.717	398	0
	Private	200	3.7117	0.8465	0.05986			
Exposure	Public	200	3.4688	0.87538	0.0619	-2.458	398	0.014
	Private	200	3.6788	0.83289	0.05889			
Academic reputation & Quality	Public	200	4.16	0.53567	0.03788	2.453	398	0.015
	Private	200	3.9883	0.83233	0.05885			
Safety & Security	Public	200	4.2817	0.53058	0.03752	-1.65	398	0.1
	Private	200	4.3817	0.67283	0.04758			
Infrastructure	Public	200	4.2625	0.59718	0.04223	1.252	398	0.211
	Private	200	4.17	0.85719	0.06061			
Placements	Public	200	3.57	0.98995	0.07	-0.546	398	0.585
	Private	200	3.625	1.02328	0.07236			
Fee	Public	200	3.315	0.82106	0.05806	2.557	398	0.011
	Private	200	3.115	0.7413	0.05242			
Scholarships	Public	200	3.925	0.78098	0.05522	-2.294	398	0.022
	Private	200	4.12	0.91366	0.06461			
Extra Curriculum Activities	Public	200	3.88	0.78159	0.05527	-3.29	398	0.001
	Private	200	4.12	0.67337	0.04761			
Functioning	Public	200	4.0121	0.55648	0.03935	0.672	398	0.502
	Private	200	3.9771	0.4828	0.03414			
Feed back	Public	200	3.9338	0.70376	0.04976	3.783	398	0
	Private	200	3.63	0.89104	0.06301			

From Table 2, it can be understood that there is a significant ($t = > 1.96$ Sig. $< .05$) difference between the student satisfaction regarding service quality is higher management education in public and private universities in 7 quality factors namely Access and Approachable, Exposure, Academic Reputation and Quality, fee, Scholarships, Extra Curriculum Activities and Feedback expect the 4 factors namely Safety and Security, Infrastructure, Placements, and Functioning where t- statistics is found insignificant ($t = < 1.96$ Sig $> .05$).

Table 3: Comparison of Overall Satisfaction of Students regarding Service Quality of Public and Private Universities

	University	N	Mean Score	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Overall Satisfaction	Public	200	136.765	16.4384	1.16237	0.607	398	0.544
	Private	200	135.74	17.34087	1.22618			

From Table 3, it can be understood that there is an insignificant ($t = < 1.96$ Sig. $> .05$) difference between the overall student satisfaction regarding service quality is higher management education in public and private universities.

Comparison of Parents Satisfaction of Service Quality of Public & Private Universities:

H₀₂: There is a no significant difference in the satisfaction level of parents regarding service quality in higher management education of public and private universities with respect to institutional quality factors such as Access and Approachable, Exposure, Academic Reputation, Safety & Security, Infrastructure, Placements, Fee, Scholarships, Extra Curriculum Activities, Functioning, Feed Back

Table No 4: Comparison of Parents Satisfaction of Service Quality of Public & Private Universities

Dimensions	University	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Access & Approachable	Public	100	3.99	1.20367	0.12037	4.468	198	0
	Private	100	3.3633	0.72023	0.07202			
Exposure	Public	100	3.06	0.64854	0.06485	-8.046	198	0
	Private	100	3.8025	0.65645	0.06565			
Academic reputation & Quality	Public	100	4.2133	0.6241	0.06241	7.181	198	0
	Private	100	3.49	0.79059	0.07906			
Safety & Security	Public	100	4.3733	0.45512	0.04551	1.84	198	0.067
	Private	100	4.2567	0.44154	0.04415			
Infrastructure	Public	100	4.025	0.5192	0.05192	-0.952	198	0.342
	Private	100	4.095	0.52076	0.05208			
Placement	Public	100	3.27	0.86579	0.08658	-1.712	198	0.088
	Private	100	3.475	0.82687	0.08269			
Fee	Public	100	2.925	0.82074	0.08207	4.298	198	0
	Private	100	2.45	0.74026	0.07403			
Scholarships	Public	100	3.455	0.94574	0.09457	-2.349	198	0.02
	Private	100	3.74	0.76038	0.07604			
Extra Curriculum Activities	Public	100	3.76	0.74472	0.07447	-4.155	198	0
	Private	100	4.1233	0.4585	0.04585			
Functioning	Public	100	3.9057	0.52212	0.05221	2.598	198	0.01
	Private	100	3.7143	0.52006	0.05201			
Feed back	Public	100	3.3567	0.77017	0.07702	4.29	198	0
	Private	100	2.9	0.73474	0.07347			

From Table 4, it can be understood that there is a significant ($t = > 1.96$ Sig. $< .05$) difference between parents' satisfaction regarding service quality in higher management education in public and private universities in 8 quality factors, namely Access and Approachable, Exposure, Academic Reputation and Quality, fee, Scholarships, Extra Curriculum Activities, Functioning and Feedback. In the 3 factors, namely Safety and Security, Infrastructure, and Placements, where t-statistics is found insignificant ($t = < 1.96$ Sig. $> .05$).

Table No 5: Comparison of Overall Satisfaction of Parents regarding Service Quality of Public and Private Universities

	University	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Overall Satisfaction	Public	100	126.01	13.11988	1.31199	1.57	198	0.118
	Private	100	123.13	12.82332	1.28233			

From Table 5, it can be understood that there is an insignificant ($t = < 1.96$ Sig. $> .05$) difference between the overall parents' satisfaction regarding service quality in higher management education in public and private universities.

Comparison of Student and Parents Satisfaction of Service Quality of Public & Private Universities:

H₀₃: There is no significant difference in the comparative satisfaction level of parents & students regarding service quality in higher management education of public and private universities with respect to institutional quality factors such as Access and Approachable, Exposure, Academic Reputation, Safety & Security, Infrastructure, Placements, Fee, Scholarships, Extra Curriculum Activities, Functioning, Feed Back.

Table No 6: Comparison of Student and Parents Satisfaction of Service Quality of Public & Private Universities

Dimensions		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Access & Approachable	Parents	200	3.6767	1.03803	0.0734	-2.322	598	0.021
	students	400	3.8492	0.7517	0.03758			
Exposure	Parents	200	3.4313	0.74976	0.05302	-1.995	598	0.046
	students	400	3.5738	0.85978	0.04299			
Academic reputation & Quality	Parents	200	3.8517	0.79761	0.0564	-3.488	598	0.001
	students	400	4.0742	0.70428	0.03521			
Safety & Security	Parents	200	4.315	0.45106	0.0319	-0.344	598	0.731
	students	400	4.3317	0.6072	0.03036			
Infrastructure	Parents	200	4.06	0.51986	0.03676	-2.676	598	0.008
	students	400	4.2163	0.73924	0.03696			
Placement	Parents	200	3.3725	0.85065	0.06015	-2.715	598	0.007
	students	400	3.5975	1.00587	0.05029			
Fee	Parents	200	2.6875	0.81512	0.05764	-7.644	598	0
	students	400	3.215	0.78761	0.03938			
Scholarship	Parents	200	3.5975	0.86776	0.06136	-5.714	598	0
	students	400	4.0225	0.85444	0.04272			
Extra Curriculum Activities	Parents	200	3.9417	0.64317	0.04548	-0.951	598	0.342
	students	400	4	0.73841	0.03692			
Functioning	Parents	200	3.81	0.52856	0.03738	-4.075	598	0
	students	400	3.9946	0.52058	0.02603			
Feed back	Parents	200	3.1283	0.78489	0.0555	-9.364	598	0
	students	400	3.7819	0.81616	0.04081			

From Table 6, it can be understood that there is a significant ($t = > 1.96$ Sig. $< .05$) difference between students and parents satisfaction regarding service quality is higher management education in public and private universities in quality factors namely Access and Approachable, Exposure, Academic Reputation and Quality, Infrastructure, Placements, fee, Scholarships, Functioning and Feedback expect the 3 factors namely Safety and Security and Extra Curriculum Activities where t- statistics is found insignificant ($t = < 1.96$ Sig. $> .05$).

Table No 7: Comparison of Overall Satisfaction of Parents and Students of Service Quality of Public and Private Universities

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Satisfaction	Parents	200	124.57	13.02009	0.92066	-8.591	598	0
	students	400	136.2525	16.88228	0.84411			

From Table 7, it can be understood that there is a significant ($t = > -1.96$ Sig. $< .05$) difference between the overall parents and students satisfaction regarding service quality is higher management education in public and private universities.

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY:

In this study there are various service quality dimensions such as, Access and Approachable, Exposure, Academic Reputation and Quality, Fee, Scholarship, Extra Curriculum Activities and Feedback, where significant difference is found in satisfaction of students regarding higher management education being imparted by public and private universities, but study does not indicate the significant difference in overall satisfaction of students regarding higher management education of public and private universities with respect to all the service quality dimensions.

On parents' point of view, study explains the same kind of results, but added one more quality dimension in the significant table, that is "Functioning". In overall satisfaction of the parents there is an insignificant results are found. On comparisons of parents and students study points out significant difference in almost all the service quality dimensions except safety and Security and Extra Curriculum activities. Same results are found in overall comparative satisfaction of parents and students regarding higher management education of public and private universities of Punjab. In last it can be concluded that there is a difference in the satisfaction of stakeholders in public and private universities in various quality dimensions.(Ravindran et.al, 2012, Jager et.al, 2013, Singh et.al, 2011, Guha et.al, 2013, Farahmandian et.al, 2013) also explain that service quality does effect the satisfaction of the stakeholders.

CONCLUSIONS:

The study explain that there is significant difference between the satisfaction of students of public and private universities on most of the service quality dimensions, but there is an insignificant difference found in overall satisfaction of the students, because there is a very little difference in the mean score of the students. Same types of results are found in the case of parents, but there is an insignificant difference found in overall satisfaction of the parents too. Comparative results of parents and students have significant difference in overall satisfaction. The results are same with Chawla et.al, 2014) who found insignificant difference in overall satisfaction of the students with education and management education.

REFERENCES:

- Abdullah, F. (2006). The development of HEDPERF: a new measuring instrument of service quality for the higher education sector. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 30(6), 569-581.
- Alves H., and Raposo M., (2007). Conceptual Model of Student Satisfaction in Higher Education, *Total Quality Management*, Vol. 18(5), pp. 571-588.
- Butt B.Z., Rehman K. ur., (2010). A Study Examining the Student Satisfaction in Higher Education, *Procedia-Social and Behavioural Sciences*, Vol.2, pp.5446-5450.
- Chopra R., Chawla M., Sharma T., (2014). Service Quality in Higher Education: A Comparative Study of Management and Education Institutions, *NMIMS Management Review*, Vol.24, pp.59-72.
- Churchill Jr, G. A., & Surprenant, C. (1982). An investigation into the determinants of customer satisfaction. *Journal of marketing research*, 491-504.
- Clewes, D. (2003). A student-centred conceptual model of service quality in higher education. *Quality in Higher Education*, 9(1), 69-85.
- Cronin Jr, J. J., & Taylor, S. A. (1992). Measuring service quality: a reexamination and extension. *The journal of marketing*, 55-68.
- Crosby, L. A. (1991). Expanding the role of CSM in total quality. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 2(2), 5-19.
- Farahmandian S., Minavand H. & Afshardost, (2013). M. Perceived service quality and student satisfaction in higher education, *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, Vol. 12(4), pp. 65-74.
- Guha, P., Chattopadhyay, S., & Mondal, D. K. (2013). A study on the perception of undergraduates towards MBA education with reference to Kolkata Region. *International Journal*, 1(7).
- Harvey, L., & Green, D. (1993). Defining quality. *Assessment & evaluation in higher education*, 18(1), 9-34.
- Hanaysha, J. R., Abdullah, H. H., & Warokka, A. (2011). Service quality and students' satisfaction at higher learning institutions: The competing dimensions of Malaysian universities' competitiveness. *The Journal of Southeast Asian Research*, 2011, 1-10.
- Hasan, H. F. A., Ilias, A., Rahman, R. A., & Razak, M. Z. A. (2009). Service quality and student satisfaction: A case study at private higher education institutions. *International Business Research*, 1(3), 163.
- 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.
- Jager D.J., Gbadamosi G., (2013). Predicting Students' Satisfaction through Service Quality in Higher Education, *The International Journal of Management Education*, Vol.11, pp.107-118, 2013.
- Kasetwar, R. B. (2008). *Quality and Relevance in Indian Higher Education*. University News, 46(46), 17-23.
- Kaur H., Bhalla G.S., (2015). Satisfaction of Students towards Quality In Higher Education- A Study of Higher Education Sector Punjab (India), *Pacific Business Review International*, Vol.8, pp.83-91.
- Kettunen, J. (2015). Stakeholder relationships in higher education. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 21(1), 56-65.
- Khodayari, F., & Khodayari, B. (2011). Service quality in higher education. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Research in Business*, 1(9), 38-46.
- Khosaravi A.A., Poushaneh K., Roozegar A., Sohrabifard N., (2013). Determination of Factors Affecting Student Satisfaction of Islamic Azad University, *Procedia- Social and Behavioural Sciences*, Vol.84, pp.573-583, 2013.
- Kotler, P., & Levy, S. J. (1969). Broadening the concept of marketing. *The Journal of Marketing*, 10-15.
- Mainardes, E. W., Alves, H., & Raposo, M. (2010). An exploratory research on the stakeholders of a university. *Journal of Management and Strategy*, 1(1), 76.
- Malik M.E., Danish R.Q., Usman A., (2010). The Impact of Service Quality Students' Satisfaction in Higher Education Institutes of Punjab (pak), *Journal of Management Research*, Vol.2, pp. 1-11, 2010.
- Palli, J. G., & Mamilla, R. (2012). Students' opinions of service quality in the field of higher education. *Creative Education*, 3(04), 430.
- Parasuraman, A., Berry, L.L. and Zeithaml, V.A. (1990). *Delivering Quality Service*, The Free Press, New York, NY.
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1988). Servqual: A multiple-item scale for measuring consumer perc. *Journal of retailing*, 64(1), 12.
- Quinn, A., Lemay, G., Larsen, P., & Johnson, D. M. (2009). Service quality in higher education. *Total Quality Management*, 20(2), 139-152.
- S Ravindran. D. and Kalpana M., (2012). Students expectation, perception and satisfaction towards the management educational institutions, *Procedia Economics and Finance*, Vol. 2, pp. 401-410.
- Sakthivel, P. B., Rajendran, G., & Raju, R. (2005). TQM implementation and students' satisfaction of academic performance. *The TQM magazine*, 17(6), 573-589.
- Singh, K., & Weligamage, S. (2010). Thinking towards stakeholder satisfaction in higher education: An application of performance prism.
- Singh, L.A. and Khatri, P., (2011). Changing paradigms of Indian higher education: A comparative study of students perception at the undergraduate and postgraduate levels, *International Journal of Engineering and Management Sciences*, Vol. 2(4), pp. 179-186.
- Teas, R. K. (1993). Expectations, performance evaluation, and consumers' perceptions of quality. *The journal of marketing*, 18-34.
- Temizer, L., & Turkyilmaz, A. (2012). Implementation of student satisfaction index model in higher education institutions. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 46, 3802-3806.
- Vaniarajan T., Vijayadurai J., (2010). Service Quality in Higher Management Education: A Comparative Study on Three Group of Institutions, *International Journal of Management of Strategy*, Vol.1-24.
- Zahari Wan Yusoff, W., Ismail, M., & Newell, G. (2008). FM-SERVQUAL: a new approach of service quality measurement framework in local authorities. *Journal of Corporate Real Estate*, 10(2), 130-144.
- Zairi, M. (1995). Total quality education for superior performance. *Training for Quality*, 3(1), 29-35.
- Zeithaml, V. A., Berry, L. L., & Parasuraman, A. (1993). The nature and determinants of customer expectations of service. *Journal of the academy of Marketing Science*, 21(1), 1-12.
