Chapter – 3

Review of Literature

3.1   **Introduction**

3.2   **Review of Related Literatures**

3.3   **Research Gap**

Chapter 3
REVIEW OF LITERATURES

3.1 Introduction

A researcher surveys the related literatures in order to review the current status of the research topic. The important benefits of the literature reviews are, helps the researcher to adopting methodologies used for the research study, suggest new approaches and methods related to study and improve theoretical knowledge and implications of the related topic.

This chapter discusses and give the idea about latest literatures in the field of higher education that supports frame for this research work and provide conceptual theory and model. It is also helpful to understand the theoretical background and aspects of the study and discusses various viewpoints offered by different authors and different research studies.

This chapter also attempts to critically review the literature on service quality dimensions as well as satisfaction of the stakeholders specially students and staffs of the Educational Institutes. Research papers published in various international and national journals, peer reviewed, referred and reputed journals, various published and unpublished Ph.D. thesis on service quality dimensions and satisfaction of stakeholder of the education institutes have been thoroughly analysed and an effort has been made to gain key insights on impact of service quality dimensions on satisfaction of stakeholders.

3.2 Review of Related Literatures

1. **Moodliar and Govender (2021)** aimed to explore the satisfaction level of students based on SERVQUAL model. They have adopted a descriptive design and quantitative approach to conduct this survey, using the validated SERVQUAL instrument. They have found that most concern dimension among the students is Responsiveness and Reliability. Thus, the private higher education institution needs to identify, define and strengthen the elements of the aforementioned SERVQUAL instrument if it intends to improve student satisfaction.[1]

2. **Viet Van Vo (2021)** examined the effect of service quality dimensions on satisfaction and loyalty of students using HEdPERF model. With the help of convenience sampling techniques, 1825 respondents were voluntarily participated in this study. Nine hypotheses are framed and tested with Structural Equation Model analysis. The analysis revealed that satisfaction of students was significantly affected by academic, access, administrative and reputation dimensions.[2]

3. **Twum and Peprah (2020)** assessed the service quality of students' satisfaction with SERVQUAL instrument. Total 100 responses were collected and analysed with SPSS software in generating the mean, standard deviation and regression. The results of the study showed that the assurance, tangibility and responsiveness dimensions are very satisfied while, empathy is at moderate level. It means that students are very satisfied with the quality provided by the school of business based on SERVQUAL instrument. The researcher has recommended that school of business must consider the needs of the students to get 100% satisfaction level.[3]

4. **Yahaya et al. (2020)** measured the quality of services provided by the higher education institutions with SERVQUAL tool. Samples of 384 students were collected and analysed. The finding of the study reveals that most of the students are very satisfied with the quality of services. Study also confirms that the university is doing well in its tangible services. Authors have ranked all the dimensions from higher to lower satisfaction like: tangibility, reliability, responsiveness, empathy and assurance.[4]

5. **Alam (2020)** used the SERVQUAL dimensions to evaluate the effects on user satisfaction. He made 30 statements under five dimensions of the SERVQUAL model and used 7 Point Likert scale. To study the regression, the author has taken the all five variables as independent and satisfaction as dependent variable. Study found that the tangible facilities and staff responsiveness influenced user satisfaction. Author also recommended that

the SERVQUAL Model is most suitable method to measure the academic service quality.[5]

6. **Bawais et al. (2020)** selected two stakeholders of academic institutions i.e. students and academic staff. The main objective of the research is to explore the relation between overall SERVQUAL dimensions and overall service quality and satisfaction of students and academic staffs. The results of the study found a higher correlation between satisfaction of student and academic staffs. On the basis of findings, higher education institutions need to prioritize on those activities, which represent the higher satisfaction of students and academic staffs.[6]

7. **Rajput et al. (2019)** have established the relationship between student satisfaction and various factors of service quality. Taking all the dimensions of SERVQUAL model, researchers have developed the questionnaire using five point likert scales and collected 300 samples. After the analysis of data with correlation and regression, it can be said that, there is a significant positive relationship between service quality and Student satisfaction. Thus, it can be conclude that by improving service quality, academic institution can improve the student satisfaction. The regression analysis resulted that there is a negative impact of assurance on service quality, rest four dimensions impacted positively.[7]

8. **Fatima et al. (2018)** have studied the student expectation and service quality in HEIs. The research is based on 162 responses collected through structured questionnaire and SERVQUAL model. By using the exploratory factor analysis, researchers eliminate the factors which had a considerable impact on satisfaction of students. Based on findings, the role of student expectation plays very important role in identification of gap between expectation and overall satisfaction.[8]

9. **Azam (2018)** has found that academic service shows strong association with satisfaction and retention of students. Further the study concludes that, students considering the academic empathy, reliability and assurance

is most important factor for satisfaction. There is no any sufficient contribution have been recorded from Responsiveness dimension. Author also mentioned the administrative service of service quality dimension is also important for satisfaction and retention of students. Finally, the results show a strong positive relationship between satisfaction of students and service quality.[9]

10. **Moyo and Ngwenya, (2018)** identified specific dimensions of service quality. Study also explores differences in service quality perception based on demographic characteristics of selected students. To reduce the service quality variables in to service quality dimensions, exploratory factor analysis were used. After that five dimensions were identified i.e. Facilitating Elements, General Attitude, Access, health services and lecture rooms. Result of the study also shows that most of the students (48.3%) perceived overall service quality. While 23.1% positive and 28.6% negative perception of overall service quality.[10]

11. **Hossain (2018)** attempted to examine the relationship between satisfaction of students and service quality dimensions (SERVQUAL tool). The author found the significant correlation between all the dimensions and satisfaction of students at 1%. The findings also depict that the most important factor is tangible factor because of largest proportion of the variance. Researcher has identified highest correlation between reliability dimension and satisfaction. While the lowest correlation found between empathy and satisfaction.[11]

12. **Son et al. (2018)** have reviewed the role of service quality in satisfaction of students using the SERVQUAL model. The said model influenced in satisfaction of students in the order of increasing importance as responsiveness, empathy, reliability, assurance and tangibility. Hence, tangibility is most impacting dimension to the satisfaction. Using two way ANOVA and Post Hoc test, there is no any difference in assigning satisfaction of female students and male students. While, there is a

difference in accessing the satisfaction of 1st year students and 5th year students.[12]

13. **S. P. Singh and Savita Malik (2017)** studied that there is a significant gap between perception and expectation of management education. The students of management are not satisfied in respect of all dimensions of the SERVEQUAL model. To reduce this gap, HEIs need to understand the expectation of the students and provide good infrastructure, highly educated faculties, and placements. Therefore, the institutions should focus on the service quality for increasing the level of satisfaction of the students.[13]

14. **Manik and Sidharta (2017)** measured the level of satisfaction of student on academic services with SERVQUAL model. The result shows that there is a significant influence of SERVQUAL on satisfaction of students. The result also conveys that the satisfaction of students on academic services can be achieved by increasing SERVQUAL. In this study all the dimensions except assurance, showing good results on satisfaction of students.[14]

15. **Banahene et al. (2017)** adopted the SERVQUAL model to measure the quality of services of private universities. With the help of 321 students as respondents, the study found the perception of students on performance of private university predicts their loyalty better than the expectations. However, authors have used different methods like SERVPERF and HEdPERF to compare the results with modified SERVQUAL model. Critical literature review suggests that, many researchers and professionals use SERVQUAL model to study the service quality in different academic institutions.[15]

16. **Daniel et al. (2017)** have used their own developed variables to study the satisfaction. These dimensions are Instructor student interaction, Facility provision, programs and other service and administrative student support. Based on findings, students are satisfied with current services provided by

the institute. In administrative student support, half of the students are not satisfied.[16]

17. **Woldetsadik (2017)** has studied students' satisfaction with SERVQUAL tool. The study reveals that there is positive and significant relationship between all the dimensions of SERVQUAL and students' satisfaction. Tangibility has the lowest correlation, while reliability has the highest. According to students' satisfaction the author has ranked the dimensions from highest to lowest correlation, reliability, assurance, responsiveness, empathy and tangibility. Furthermore, the study reveals that there is association between gender, age, and students' satisfaction. The result also indicated that all the dimensions of SERVQUAL tool are very significant and highly correlated with each other.[17]

18. **Galeeva (2016)** has examined the service quality of higher educational services with SERVQUAL tool. Based on literature review, the researcher suggested that, various alternative tools like HEdPERF and SERVPERF gives the similar results. The researcher has identified the large gap between expectations and perceptions of service quality among the Russian students.[18]

19. **Rouf et al. (2016)** examined satisfaction of students on services provided by HEIs. The study found the significant relationship between all the dimensions of SERVQUAL model and satisfaction of students. Findings indicate that the services provided by the HEIs are satisfactory. The results are indicating that all the five dimensions are correlated with satisfaction of students.[19]

20. **Sheikh and Ahmed (2016)** in their research article "Contribution of Service Quality Dimensions towards Students' Satisfaction: A Higher Education Context", examined students satisfaction as dependent variable they measured service quality with SERVEQUAL model. Students were asked to answer questions about their expectations and their perceptions

together. The study found all dimensions is statistically significant and positively correlated with students' satisfaction. All the hypotheses of the study were supported. This study confirms the relationship between five dimensions of SERVEQUAL model and students' satisfaction.[20]

21. **Truong et al. (2016)** have studied the student level of satisfaction in private colleges. They have selected 500 students and asked almost 24 questions. They have analysed the data with KMO analysis and multiple regression analysis. As per the regression results, there are five variables: tangibility, responsiveness, guarantee, reliability and empathy, actually affected the satisfaction of students at 5% level of significance. They have given a simple conclusion that the variables of service quality and the level of satisfaction of students have a moderately positive correlation.[21]

22. **Kaur and Bhalla (2015)** in their research paper studied the satisfaction of students under various selected variables like, placement services, infrastructure facilities, extra-curricular activities, education environment, knowledge up gradation, academic facilities, student support services and academic staffs. Students were positive towards education environment, while neutral for statements related to infrastructure facilities; they disagree with statements related to placement services. Students responses also were positively in extra-curricular activities, students were also agreed in knowledge up gradation statements. Students responded disagreed for statements related to academic facilities. For student support services, positive respond was found for all the statements. Academic staffs were helpful and supportive to students, researchers found positive respond in all the statements related to academic staffs.[22]

23. **Kajenthiran and Karunanithy (2015)** have conducted a research study to examine the relationship between quality of services of private universities and student satisfaction. The research study contains the questionnaire having 46 statements of service quality based on five dimensions of SERVQUAL model. They have found that, the dimensions of SERVQUAL model are contributing to the satisfaction of students and

they have positive association between the all five dimensions and satisfaction of students. In this, there are two dimensions namely assurance and responsiveness are contributing significantly to the satisfaction of students.[23]

24. **Sabina and Samira (2015)** have conducted a research study on service quality in higher education with the most frequently used the SERVQUAL model. They have collected the responses from the students, as the students are most important stakeholder in the higher education. Based on the data collected and analysed, they have proved that both the hypotheses are positively confirmed. The SERVQUAL model can be used to measure the service quality in higher education and the gap between students' expectations and perceptions were identified. They have also mentioned that in the limitations of the study, use of 7 point likert scale is more appropriate for higher education instead of only 5 point likert scale.[24]

25. **Adikaram et al. (2015)** analysed the impact of five RATER dimensions on service quality. RATER model is another name of SERVQUAL model, developed by Parashuraman et al. in 1988. Results depict that the relationship between satisfaction of students and service providers have a positive impact. Researchers have also found that all the dimensions are contributing to service quality.[25]

26. **Kokku Randheer (2015)** used various models to measure the service quality in higher education. He used SERVQUAL Model developed by Parsuraman et al., SERPERF Model developed by Cronin and Taylor, ES-QUAL Model developed by Parsuraman et al. and BANQUAL-R Metric developed by Evangelos et al. According to him, SERVQUAL and SERVPERF models are universally acceptable for their applicability in service sector. In his study he also suggests that HEdPERF model is designed to measure the service quality in higher education. This model is developed by Firdaus in 2006.[26]

27. **Grudowski and Szefler (2015)** defined the role of various groups of stakeholders in quality management system of universities of Poland and measuring the satisfaction level of stakeholders of higher education institutions. For the purpose of the study, 7 sample groups of stakeholders, namely students, alumni, parents, employees and entrepreneurs, representative authorities, teaching staff and administrative staff, is measured. The biggest benefits of stakeholder satisfaction survey it to gain current knowledge about the needs and perception towards the university services. Such knowledge can be used in many processes to improve quality management systems, such as verification of mission and vision, quality policy and for development of organization appropriate goals.[27]

28. **Alnaser and Almsafir (2014)** have studied the student satisfaction using SERVQUAL Model and other dimensions: University Facility, Tuition Fees, University Location, Curriculum Structure, Information Resources and University Image. They have formulated 13 hypotheses based on these dimensions. Results show that there are eight critical variables need further investigation and the study provides comprehensive picture of the relationship between satisfaction of students and service quality dimensions. To develop the demand and enhance the ability to cope the market challenges, higher education needs to develop strategies according to the needs of the students.[28]

29. **Kontic (2014)** suggested the use of SERVPERF model to measure the service quality in higher education. This model can be used to understand service performance of the higher education institutions. According to him, Assurance and Reliability dimensions are most important and then responsiveness and empathy come in to the picture. In the study, he has suggested that the main area for quality improvement for course management teams. The small sample size and the selection of only one university is main limitation of the study.[29]

30. **Chopra et al. (2014)** in their research paper found that the most of the students perceive that their institution is lacking the empathy and

reliability dimensions of service. They have used SERVQUAL model with some modification. They explained that different field has different requirements. Compare to student management expectations and perceived service quality is greater than their counterparts in the education colleges. With the help of service marketing mix, HEIs can offer the improved service quality which can fulfil the needs of the students.[30]

31. **Reddy and Karim (2014)** has conducted the study to examine the relationship between service quality dimensions and students satisfaction. They have found the positive relationship between service quality dimensions and students satisfaction. Hence, the HEIs improve the service quality, the students satisfaction will also improve. After the regression analysis, they found that two dimensions in service quality i.e. empathy and responsiveness are the most critical factors in explaining students satisfaction. More than that, by focusing on these critical factors, higher education institutions is paving a way towards a better evaluation in satisfaction.[31]

32. **Krsmanovic et al. (2014)** found that the service quality of faculty of science is in negative value. Students are not satisfied with the facility provided by the faculty. They also found highest quality in tangibility and lowest quality in reliability. From lowest to highest gap score, authors have ranked the dimensions viz. Tangibility – Empathy – Assurance – Responsibility – reliability.[32]

33. **Martins and Dastane (2014)** have measured the perspective of students on service quality and performance. They have selected 10 private HEIs based on stratified sampling method. Using the SERVQUAL model, they have found that the quality of services in HEIs and the satisfaction level of students are at moderate level. Analysis reveals that no gender is significant with the satisfaction. Research study has revealed that tangibles have the lowest gap score, while reliability has highest gap score. This means higher education institutes needs to work more in reliability

dimension. According to gap score from lowest to highest, the dimensions are tangibles, empathy, assurance, responsiveness and reliability.[33]

34. **Yousapronpaiboon (2013)** has investigated the service quality and satisfaction of students using SERVQUAL measurement. The total 350 respondents have collected with the help of primary data using structured questionnaire. The researcher has found that the higher education institutes are not fulfilling the expectations of the students. The service quality gap between expectations and perceptions are as follows: tangibility -2.88, responsiveness **-**2.72, empathy -2.48, assurance -2.48 and reliability -2.25. The overall findings of the study reveal that tangibility dimension is having the highest gap and reliability dimension is having the lowest gap.[34]

35. **Vaz and Mansori (2013)** studied the impact of service quality factors on satisfaction of students. They have collected the data from 431 respondents with the help of questionnaire. The findings revealed that tangibility has most influence in service quality. There is a direct and positive effect of Empathy, assurance and, responsiveness on service quality. While reliability has no any impact on satisfaction of students.[35]

36. **Maric (2013)** has analysed the stakeholders of HEIs. A list of stakeholders including, administration, Government entities, clientele (parents, students, employees, service partners etc.), employees, competitors, donors, suppliers, government and non-government regulators are selected for the study. The perspective of stakeholders' analysis in HEI, that needs to fulfil the three key dimensions: (i) teaching and education, (ii) research & innovation and (iii) knowledge transfer and community service.[36]

37. **Enayati et al. (2013)** indentified a significant difference between the expectations and perceptions of students in five dimensions of service quality and in all dimensions, students' expectations has higher level than the students' perceptions. So, the highest and lowest service quality is given to tangibility and empathy.[37]

38. **Seng and Ling (2013)** investigated the service quality and satisfaction of the students. They have developed their own dimensions viz. Instructor, Assessment, Learning Resources, Student Engagement and Academic Course. Statistical analysis concluded that satisfaction of students is a multidimensional construct. There is a positive and significant influence of instructor, academic curse, learning resources and student engagement on satisfaction of students. Various studies (Sampson et al., 2010; Parayitam et al., 2007; Kane, 2004) also reveal that assessment is the insignificant dimension of student satisfaction.[38]

39. **Hanaysha et al. (2012)** have examined the satisfaction of students concentrated on passed out and passing out students. Researchers have used proportionate probabilistic sampling size to find the accurate sample size. With this, they have taken 320 students as respondent. The researchers found that there is a significant relationship between satisfaction of students and all five dimensions of service quality. They have also found out that majority of students are satisfied with services and facilities provided by the universities. Universities require focusing on all the dimensions, if they really want to improve the level of satisfaction.[39]

40. **Akhlaghi et al. (2012)** have attended to study the satisfaction level of students of technical and vocational colleges. The research is based on SERVQUAL model. Results of the study show that, there are quality gaps in all the dimensions of service quality. Results also reveal that there is a least service quality weighted gap (-0.31) is for reliability dimension and the most service quality weighted gap (-0.65) is for responsiveness. This means that universities and higher education institutes need to improve the service quality to enhance the satisfaction level of students.[40]

41. **Abili et al. (2012)** determined the service quality of university in Iran. Preparing the SERVQUAL questionnaire, they have collected 102 responses and analysed the data with mean, standard deviation and t-test. The results are depicting that, there is a negative gap ($p > 0.05$) in all the SERVQUAL dimensions. It means the expectations are higher than

perceptions and students are not satisfied with the service quality. The Friedman Test results that, assurance and responsiveness are the most important dimensions. However, responsiveness has the largest gap.[41]

42. **Ijaz et al. (2011)** have identified the service quality of public sector business schools. Based on modified SERVQUAL model, they have collected 501 responses from 4 business schools. The findings are demonstrating that, there are significant positive impact on satisfaction of various dimensions namely tangibles, responsiveness and reliability.[42]

43. **Wei and Ramalu (2011)** found that service quality is a vital factor that determines the satisfaction level of students. The result shows that, the service quality and satisfaction of students is directly associated. This means that, if HEIs improve the service quality, the level of satisfaction will improve. Out of five dimensions of SERVQUAL, only assurance, empathy and responsiveness are significantly related to the level of satisfaction.[43]

44. **Shekarchizadeh et al. (2011)** have studied the perceptions and expectations of international students in Malaysia. Preparing the questionnaire using the dimensions of modified SERVQUAL Model, they have collected 522 responses of international students. The research reveals that, there is a negative between perception and expectations of the students. The expectation is higher than the perceptions.[44]

45. **Chowdhury et al. (2010)** have examined and explored the service quality perceptions and service quality expectations with SERVQUAL model. Researchers have used factor analysis to identify basic dimensions. Findings demonstrating that, tangibility dimension variance have the highest explanatory power for perception. This means, tangibility is most important factor to examine the perception of the students. While responsiveness dimensions variance have the highest explanatory power for expectations.[45]

46. **Malik et al. (2010)** in their research article analysed the impact of different quality services on satisfaction of students in higher education. The study is based on primary data collected from 240 business courses students of bachelors and masters. They found that the students are overall satisfied with service of reliability, tangibility, empathy and assurance but less satisfied with computer labs, parking facilities, complaint handling system and cafeteria services. Based on the six hypotheses framed, they have concluded that the service quality greatly influences the satisfaction of students in multiple dimensions. Learned and experienced faculty members, quality of teaching, learning environment of the institution are the major factors to satisfy the students. To create the image of excellence, contribution of tangible factors like library, digital labs, class setup and other assured facilities are very important.[46]

47. **Shauchenka and Buslowska (2010)** said that the customer in higher education is students. They have prepared the questionnaire with the SERVQUAL variables and compared the expectations and perceptions of the students. To measure the service quality in higher education, various instruments namely SERVPERF, HEdPERF, FM-SERVQUAL, INTQUAL and DL-sQUAL are also can be used. In this SERVQUAL is extremely and extensively used in higher education service quality measurement. Ease of use, generalization capacity and simple structure is the main reason behind it.[47]

48. **Brochado (2009)** compared the alternative tools to measure service quality in HEIs. He has used various tools namely SERVQUAL, weighted SERVQUAL, SERVPERF, weighted SERVPERF and HEdPERF. As per the research, tangibility requires managerial intervention in SERVQUAL model, weighted SERVQUAL model, SERVPERF model and weighted SERVPERF model. In the HEdPERF model, non-academic aspects require more interventions of management. Researcher also found that, all five models are getting good results in terms of measuring the service quality. However, the weighted SERVQUAL and SERVPERF is the best model fitting in the measurement of service quality.[48]

49. **Quinn et al. (2009)** in their research paper they have focused on identification and evaluation of techniques used to take on the challenges of quality improvement in higher education. This study aimed two primary difficulties: first is definition of the customer and second is measuring customer quality perceptions. They have found commonly eight customers i.e stakeholders in higher education viz. students, parents, research sponsors, state and central government, society, future employers of students, academic communities and staff and faculty members.[49]

50. **Al-Alak (2009)** founds that there is a gap between service quality of public and private universities. Private universities are having good infrastructure and other academic facilities as compare to public universities. Private universities are giving higher level of satisfaction as compare to public university.[50]

51. **Zafiropoulos and Vrana (2008)** have studied the service quality by asking to students and academic staffs. Researchers have used the SERVQUAL tool with some adjustment in academic context. The research founds the gap between expectations and perceptions among the students as well as academic staffs. However, academic staffs have more expectations and more perceived value in service quality. Hence, academic staffs have more satisfaction than students. On the other hand, students have more expectations and least perception. According to Researchers, SERVQUAL is valuable tool to measure the service quality in higher education. They also added that, this tool can be used effectively in the higher education to measure the service quality.[51]

52. **Ilias et al. (2008)** have done the research in context of demographic factors that contribute in service quality and satisfaction. They have selected demographic factors namely: gender, races and semester of studies. Researchers have tested eight hypotheses based on demographic variables and service quality. They have found that, there is no any relation between the demographic profile and service quality. Overall conclusion

of the study is that, the important factors, which are taken for the study; do not have any significant role in determining the satisfaction.[52]

53. **Hasan et al. (2008)** studied the relationship between overall service quality and students satisfaction. The study also examines critical factors of service quality dimensions that contribute the most in satisfaction of students. With the help of structured questionnaire, 200 responses are collected from private universities. The study is based on SERVQUAL model and how these dimensions are contributing in the satisfaction of students.[53]

54. **Petruzzellis et al. (2006)** studied the student satisfaction in Italian universities with the SERVQUAL measurement. They have found that universities are lacking the facilities and need to improve the teaching and non-teaching services. Employees need to give promptly response to students' problems. Also they need to develop strong relationship with surrounding economic and productive systems. According to students' survey, universities also need to provide job and placement services and support to start business and entrepreneurship.[54]

55. **Chen et al. (2006)** though that most of the studies are focusing only students as external stakeholder and study the satisfaction level. Here the researchers are taken the academic staff as internal stakeholder and studied their satisfaction. 248 teachers have been selected and taken their responses for the study. Work environment, organization vision, respect, management system and pay and benefits, variables are selected for the study. The findings depict that academic staff is focusing on high salary and fair promotion system. Finally the conclusion shows the importance of employee satisfaction for higher education institutions. Management and owners of HEIs should also understand the needs of employee and give importance to find the proper solution. If the employees are satisfied, they can provide best services to the students.[55]

56. **Tan and Kek (2004)** have examined the service quality in HEIs using the SERVQUAL model. The researchers have identified the highest gap between expectations and perceptions in communication with management i.e. -2.51. While lowest gap is found in university facilities i.e. -0.97. In the overall satisfaction, the highest gap is found in the communicating ideas of students to management. Moreover, university appearance having the lowest gap.[56]

57. **Ham et al. (2003)** said that universities have to fulfil the needs of their customers, mainly students and industry. The main aim of the research is to implement the SERVQUAL model in higher education and find the gap between expectations and perceptions. Further, the research has found that to minimize the gap between expectations and perceptions, SERVQUAL dimensions can be used.[57]

58. **Kusku (2001)** mainly focused the employee satisfaction of state university with General Satisfaction, University Management Satisfaction, Faculty Management Satisfaction, Colleague Satisfaction, Job Satisfaction, Physical Environment and Other Work Group Satisfaction. Overall findings show that improvement required in institutional job satisfaction and professional satisfaction should be made to improve the general satisfaction of academic staff.[58]

59. **Comm and Mathaisel (2000)** have examined the satisfaction of employees by the difference in perception and expectations. The SERVQUAL model is used for the same. After the data collection, findings depict that, there is a significant gap between expectations and perceptions of employees. Researchers also found the largest discrepancy in the Importance of Pay and adequacy of employee salaries.[59]

60. **Aldridge and Rowley (1998)** have evaluated the method which was developed to measure the satisfaction of students. Using the survey method, data has been collected. Overall conclusion of the study suggested

that the SERVQUAL tool is very effective to measure the service quality in higher education.[60]

61. **Cuthbert (1996)** has identified the importance of SERVQUAL in service quality management. The research has been undertaken collecting the 134 samples. The findings of the study depict that there is a high perception score as compare to expectations in all four dimensions of SERVQUAL model except tangibility. The study also reveals that the reliability dimension has the lowest coefficient than other variables. No any effect found of Factor analysis in all five dimensions of Parasuraman's SERVQUAL model. Hence, all the variables are important in research.[61]

62. **Hill, (1995)** explained the aspects of current service quality theory in British higher education context. Study has focused on the role of the student as primary consumer of higher education services and the implications of this for the management of service quality in higher education organizations. The author has discussed an exploratory study which has monitored a group of students' expectations and perceptions of service quality over time.[62]

3.3 Research Gap

Many research studies have done to test the satisfaction level of students in higher education institutions using SERVQUAL model. Different approaches and models have used by various authors to study the satisfaction of teachers. However, few research studies have found which used SERVQUAL model to test the satisfaction level of teachers. Researcher did not come across any research study on satisfaction level of parents in higher education institutions. There are researches which investigate that how the SERVQUAL Model is useful to test the satisfaction level of students. Therefore this current research study explores the satisfaction of students, parents and teachers of selected universities.

References

1. Moodliar, R., & Govender, K. K. (2021). Exploring Student Satisfaction and Service Experience among Non-Traditional Students in a Private Higher Education Institute in South Africa. *Psychology and Education , 58* (2), 8352-8364.

2. Vo, V. V. (2021). The Effect of Service Quality Dimensions on Student's Satisfaction and Loyalty. *ABAC Journal , 41* (1), 81-99.

3. Twum, F. O., & Peprah, W. K. (2020). The Impact of Service Quality on Students' Satisfaction. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences , 10* (10), 169-181.

4. Yahaya, W., Asante, J., & Alhassan, I. (2020). Institutional Service Quality and Students' Satisfaction: Perceptions from the University for Development Studies. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management , 22* (7), 31-42.

5. Alam, J. (2020). Effects of Service Quality on Satisfaction in Eastern University Library, Bangladesh. *International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions .*

6. Bawais, J. H., Sagsan, M., & Ertugan, A. (2020). The Impact of Service Quality on Student and Academic Staff Satisfaction within Higher Education Institutions: A Case Study of Sulaimani City in Northern Iraq. *Revista Argentina De Clinica Psicologica (Argentine Review of Psychological Clinic) , XXIX* (5), 440-452.

7. Rajput, S., Sengar, A. S., & Gupta, S. (2019). Establishing the Relationship between Service Quality and Students Satisfaction. *Proceedings of 10th International Conference on Digital Strategies for Organizational Success*, (pp. 1050-1063).

8. Fatima, S., Ahmed, A., Fatima, S., & Fatima, N. (2018). The Role of Student Expectation and Service Quality in Higher Education Institutions of Pakistan. *Journal of Management and Research , 2*, 44-63.

9. Azam, A. (2018). Service Quality Dimensions and Students' Satisfaction: A Study of Saudi Arabian Private Higher Education Institutions. *European Online Journal of Natural and Social Sciences , 7* (2), 275-284.

10. Moyo, A., & Ngwenya, S. N. (2018). Service quality determinants at Zimbabwean state universities. *Quality Assurance in Education , 26* (3), 374-390.

11. Hossain, M. (2018). An Empirical Model of Students Satisfaction and Service QUality of Jahangirnagar University. *Journal of Social Science Research , 13*, 2806-2814.

12. Son, H. T., Ha, N. T., & Khuyen, P. T. (2018). Measuring Students' Satisfaction with Higher Education Service-An Experimental Study at Thainguyen University. *International Journal of Business Marketing and Management , 3* (4), 21-34.

13. Singh, S. P., & Malik, S. (2017). Service Quality Gap between Perceptions and Expectations of Management Studies. *International Journal of Research in Computer Application & Management , 7* (5), 21-23.

14. Manik, E., & Sidharta, I. (2017). *The Impact of Academic Service Quality on Student Satisfaction.* Munich Personal RePEc Archive (MPRA).

15. Banahene, S., Ahudey, E., & Asamoah, A. (2017). Analysis of SERVQUAL Application to Service Quality Measurement and Its Impact on Loyalty in Ghanaian Private Universities. *Journal of Management and Strategy , 8* (4), 18-33.

16. Daniel, D., Liben, G., & Adugna, A. (2017). Assessment of Students' Satisfaction: A Case Study of Dire Dawa University, Ethiopia. *Journal of Education and Practice , 8* (4), 111-120.

17. Woldetsadik, A. A. (2017). Students' Satisfaction on Service Provided by Private University Colleges: A Case of Selected Private University Colleges in Adama City Administration. *International Education and Research Journal , 3* (1), 14-16.

18. Galeeva, R. B. (2016). SERVQUAL application and adaptation for educational service quality assessments in Russian higher education. *Quality Assurance in Education , 24* (3), 329-348.

19. Rouf, M. A., Rahman, M. M., & Uddin, M. M. (2016). Students' Satisfaction and Service Quality of HEIs. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences , 6* (5), 376-390.

20. Sheikh, A. Y., & Ahmed, I. S. (2016). Contribution of Service Quality Dimensions towards Students' Satisfaction: A Higher Education Context. *Proceeding-Kuala Lumpur International Communication, Education, Language and social sciences 4* (pp. 657-667). Lumpur, Malaysia: KLiCELS 4.

21. Truong, H. V., Pham, C. H., & Vo, N. H. (2016). Service Quality and Students Level of Satisfaction in Private Colleges in Vietnam. *International Journal of Financial Research , 7* (3), 121-128.

22. 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 , 8* (6), 83-91.

23. Kajenthiran, K., & Karunanithy, M. (2015). Service Quality and Student Satisfaction: A Case Study of Private External Higher Education Institutions in Jaffna, Sri Lanka. *Journal of Business Studies , 1* (2), 46-64.

24. Donlagic, S., & Fazlic, S. (2015). Quality Assessment in Higher Education using the SERVQUAL Model. *Management , 20* (1), 39-57.

25. Adikaram, C. N., Yajid, M. S., & Khatibi, A. (2015). Dimensions of Service Quality at Private Higher Education Institution in Shri Lanka. *European Journal of Business and Management , 7* (30), 16-30.

26. Randheer, K. (2015). Service Quality Performance Scale in Higher Education: Culture as a New Dimension. *International Business Research , 8* (3), 29-41.

27. Grudowski, P., & Szefler, J. P. (2015). Stakeholders Satisfaction Index as an Important Factor of Improving Quality Management System of Universities in Poland. *Journal of Management and Finance , 13* (2), 25-36.

28. Alnaser, A. S., & Almsafir, M. K. (2014). Service Quality Dimensions and Students Satisfaction. *Journal of Advanced Social Research , 4* (6), 01-17.

29. Kontic, L. (2014). Measuring Service Quality in Higher Education: The Case of Serbia. *Human Capital without Borders: Knowledge and Learning for Quality of Life* (pp. 645-654). Portoroz, Slovenia: Management, Knowledge and Learning.

30. Chopra, R., Chawla, M., & Sharma, T. (2014). Service Quality in Higher Education: A Comparative Study of Management and Education Institutions. *NMIMS Management Review , XXIV*, 59-72.

31. Reddy, E. L., & Karim, S. (2014). Service Quality and Student Satisfaction: A Case Study in Private Management Institutions in Chittoor District of Andhra Pradesh. *International Journal of Human Resource Management and Research , 4* (2), 1-8.

32. Krsmanovic, M., Horvat, A., & Ruso, J. (2014). Application of SERVQUAL Model in High Education. *11th International Conference "Standardization, Protypes and Quality: A means of Balkan Countries' Collaboration".*

33. Martins, N., & Dastane, O. (2014). Service Quality Gap for Private Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in Malaysia: African Students' Perspective. *International Journal of Accounting & Business Management , 2* (2), 10-17.

34. Yousapronpaiboon, K. (2014). SERVQUAL: Measuring higher education service quality in Thailand. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences , 116*, 1088-1095.

35. Vaz, A., & Mansori, S. (2013). Malaysian Private Education Quality: Application of SERVQUAL Model. *International Education Studies , 6* (4), 164-170.

36. Maric, I. (2013). Stakeholder Analisys of Higher Education Institutions. *Interdisciplinary Description of Complex Systems , 11* (2), 217-226.

37. Enayati, T., Modanloo, Y., Behnamfar, R., & Rezaei, A. (2013). Measuring Service Quality of Islamic Azad University of Mazandaran using SERVQUAL Model. *Iranian Journal of management Studies , 6* (1), 99-116.

38. Seng, E. L., & Ling, T. P. (2013). A Statistical Analysis of Education Service Quality Dimensions on Business School Students' Satisfaction. *International Education Studies , 6* (8), 136-146.

39. Hanaysha, J. R., Kumar, D., & Hilman, H. (2012). Service Quality and Satisfaction: Study on International Students in Universities of North Malaysia. *International Journal of Research in Management , 3* (2), 116-133.

40. Akhlaghi, E., Amini, S., & Akhlaghi, H. (2012). Evaluating educational service quality in technical and vocational colleges using SERVQUAL model. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences , 46*, 5285-5289.

41. Abili, K., Thani, F. N., & Afarinandehbin, M. (2012). Measuring university service quality by means of SERVQUAL method. *Asian Journal on Quality , 13* (3), 204-211.

42. Ijaz, A., Irfan, S., Shahbaz, S., Awan, M., & Sabir, M. (2011). An Empirical Model of Student Satisfaction: Case of Pakistani Public Sector Business Schools. *Journal of Quality and Technology Management , VII* (II), 91-114.

43. Wei, C. C., & Ramalu, S. S. (2011). Students Satisfaction towards the University: Does Service Quality Matters? *International Journal of Education, 3* (2), 1-15.

44. Shekarchizadeh, A., Rasli, A., & Hon-Tat, H. (2011). SERVQUAL in Malaysian universities: perspectives of international students. *Business Process Management Journal , 17* (1), 67-81.

45. Chowdhury, A. H., Iqbal, M. T., & Miah, M. K. (2010). A Study of Service Quality Determinants of Private Universities in Bangladesh using SERVQUAL. *Journal of Knowledge Globalization , 3* (1), 49-74.

46. Malik, M. E., Danish, R. Q., & Usman, A. (2010). The Impact of Service Quality on Students' Satisfaction in Higher Education Institutes of Punjab. *Journal of Management Research , 2* (2), 1-11.

47. Shauchenka, H., & Buslowska, E. (2010). Methods and Tools for Higher Education Service Quality Assessment (Survey). *Scientific Journals of the Białystok University of Technology , 5*, 87-102.

48. Brochado, A. (2009). Comparing alternative instruments to measure service quality in higher education. *Quality Assurance in Education , 17* (2), 174-190.

49. Quinn, A., Lemay, G., Larsen, P., & Johnson, D. M. (2009). Service Quality in Higher Education. *Total Quality Management , 20* (2), 139-152.

50. Al-Alak, A. M. (2009). Measuring and Evaluating Business Students Satisfaction Perceptions at Public and Private Universities in Jordan. *Asian Journal of Marketing* , 1-19.

51. Zafiropoulos, C., & Vrana, V. (2008). Service Quality Assessment in A Greek Higher Education Institute. *Journal of Business Economics and Management , 9* (1), 33-45.

52. Ilias, A., Hasan, H. F., Rahman, R. A., & Yasoa, M. R. (2008). Student Satisfaction and Service Quality: Any Differences in Demographic Factors? *International Business Research , 1* (4), 131-143.

53. Hasan, H. F., Ilias, A., Rahman, R. A., & Razak, M. Z. (2008). Service quality and student satisfaction: a case study at private higher education institutions. *International Business Research , 1* (3), 163-185.

54. Petruzzellis, L., D'Uggento, A. M., & Romanazzi, S. (2006). Student satisfaction and quality of service in Italian universities. *Managing Service Quality , 16* (4), 349-364.

55. Chen, S.-H., Yang, C.-C., Shiau, J.-Y., & Wang, H.-H. (2006). The development of an employee satisfaction model for higher education. *The TQM Magazine , 18* (5), 484-500.

56. Tan, K. C., & Kek, S. W. (2004). Service quality in Higher Education using an enhanced SERVQUAL approach. *Quality in Higher Education , 10* (1), 17-24.

57. Ham, L., Johnson, W., Weinstein, A., Plank, R., & Johnson, P. L. (2003). Gaining competitive advantages: analyzing the gap between expectations and perceptions of service quality. *International Journal of Value-Based Management , 16*, 197-203.

58. Kusku, F. (2001). Dimensions of Employee Satisfaction: A State University Example. *METU Studies in Development , 28* (3-4), 143-173.

59. Comm, C. L., & Mathaisel, D. F. (2000). Assesssing employee satisfaction in service firms: An example in higher education. *The Journal of Business and Economic Studies , 6* (1), 43-53.

60. Aldridge, S., & Rowley, J. (1998). Measuring customer satisfaction in higher education. *Quality Assurance in Education , 6* (4), 197-204.

61. Cuthbert, P. F. (1996). Managing service quality in HE: is SERVQUAL the answer? Part 1. *Managing Service Quality: An International Journal , 6* (2), 11-16.

62. 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.