

CHAPTER – 6

FINDINGS, SUGGESTIONS & CONCLUSION

- 6.1 Findings of the Study**
- 6.2 Suggestions & Recommendations of the Research Study**
- 6.3 Conclusion of the Study**
- 6.4 Limitations of the Research Study**
- 6.5 Directions for the future Research Study**
- 6.6 Managerial Implications of the Study**

Chapter 6

FINDINGS, SUGGESTIONS AND CONCLUSION

6.1 Findings of the Research Study

After the data collection and analysis the researcher has found following findings:

6.1.1 Findings from Demographic Profile of the respondents:

- ⇒ Data were collected from 771 students, 387 parents and 260 teachers. 51% students were male and 49% students were female. While 65% parents were male and 35% parents were female. In the case of teachers, 58% teachers were male and 42% teachers were female. Thus, percentage of male was higher than female in all three categories.
- ⇒ 43% of students were of age group between 21 to 23 years. Only 4% students were of age above 27 years. While the same 43% of parents were of age group between 41 to 50 years. Only 5% parents were of age above 61 years. 35% teachers were of age group between 31 to 40 years. While, 17% teachers were of age above 51 years.
- ⇒ 73% students and parents both were residing in urban area while 77% teachers were residing in urban area. Thus, percentage of urban was higher than rural in all three categories.
- ⇒ 96% students were unmarried. While 18% parents were Divorced / Widow. 62% teachers are married and only 6% teachers were divorced.
- ⇒ 46% parents of students (Data collected from students) were doing services. Only 10% of parents were engaged with agricultural activity. Out of total parents, 45% of parents were doing services. While 12% parents were engaged in professional activity.
- ⇒ Out of total data collected from teachers, 66% of teachers were “Assistant Professor”. Only 2% teachers were “Senior Professor”.
- ⇒ 73% of teachers were permanent and 27% were temporary.

- ⇒ 39% of students were having the family income less than Rs. 30,000. While 36% of parents were having their family income less than Rs. 30,000. 34% of teachers were having the family income more than Rs. 90,000.
- ⇒ 53% of students and parents both were living in nuclear family and 47% were living in joint family. While 58% of teachers were living in joint family and 42% were living in nuclear family.
- ⇒ 49% of students, 39% of parents and 44% of teachers were having 3 to 5 family members. Only 10% of students and teachers and only 14% of parents were having more than 7 family members.
- ⇒ 44% of students, 31% of parents and 26% of teachers were having only one earning person in the family. 44% of teachers were having two earning members in the family.
- ⇒ 48% of students, 40% of parents and 55% of teachers were found in “General” caste. Only 7% of students, 8% of parents and 6% of teachers were found in “Minority” caste. Thus, percentage of general caste was higher than other castes in all three categories.
- ⇒ Out of total students, 33% of students were selected from commerce stream. 31% of parents were selected from science and commerce stream. While 31% of teachers were selected from science stream. Thus, majority of respondents were selected from commerce and science stream.
- ⇒ 27% of total students were studying in third semester. Only 6% of students were studying in fourth semester. 41% of parents were selected from third semester. Only 4% of parents were selected from forth semester. Majority of teachers i.e. 36% were teaching in sixth semester. Only 3% of teachers were teaching in first semester.
- ⇒ 55% of students were selected from undergraduate course. Only 1% of students were selected from Ph.D. course. 65% of parents were selected from undergraduate course, while, 40% of teachers were selected from undergraduate course and only 2% were selected from M.Phil. Course.

- ⇒ Out of total students, 41% of students were selected the program because of “Job Prospects” while, only 5% of students were selected the program because of “Friend’s Advice”. 48% of parents were suggested that the selection of program is due to “Job Prospects”. According to 41% of teachers’ opinion, students were selected the program due to “Job Prospects”.
- ⇒ 34% of students were selected the university due to “Parent’s Advice”. Only 10% of students were selected the university due to “Scholarship”. Out of total parents, 25% of parents were selected the university due to “Friend’s Advice”. Only 17% of parents were selected the university due to “University Ranking (NAAC)”.
- ⇒ 39% of students were selected “To be a Govt. Employee” as career ambition. While, only 14% of students were selected “To be a Scientist / Researcher” as career ambition. 28% of parents were selected “to be an Entrepreneur” as career ambition of their child. While, 24% of parents were selected “to be an Executive” as career ambition of their child. From the overall teachers, 40% were selected “To be a Govt. Employee” as well as “To be an Entrepreneur”.
- ⇒ 46% of students were selected “Job” as future plan. While only 3% were selected “Marriage”. 38% of parents were selected “Further Study” as future plan. From the point of view of teacher, 41% of students may select “Job” as a future plan.
- ⇒ Out of total students, 28% students were selected “Normal” effect of government policies on higher education. Only 9% students were selected “Very Poor” effect. 36% of parents were selected “Good” effect of government policies on higher education. While, 44% of teachers were selected “Good” effect of government policies on higher education.

6.1.2 Objective wise Findings:

Objective-1: To identify the relationship between Demographic variables and satisfaction of Stakeholders (particularly students, parents and teaching staff) of selected universities of Gujarat.

⇒ To identify the relationship between Demographic variables and satisfaction of Stakeholders, hypotheses were tested with chi-square test. The summary of hypotheses are as follow:

Table-6.1: Summary of Chi-Square Test of Demographic Profile

Hypotheses		Results
H0 ₁ :	There is no significant association between university type and overall satisfaction of students.	Reject
H0 ₂ :	There is no significant association between gender and overall satisfaction of students.	Fail to Reject
H0 ₃ :	There is no significant association between age group and overall satisfaction of students.	Reject
H0 ₄ :	There is no significant association between Residential Location and overall satisfaction of students.	Reject
H0 ₅ :	There is no significant association between occupation of parents and overall satisfaction of students.	Reject
H0 ₆ :	There is no significant association between family monthly income and overall satisfaction of students.	Reject
H0 ₇ :	There is no significant association between type of family and overall satisfaction of students.	Fail to Reject
H0 ₈ :	There is no significant association between Number of earning person in family and overall satisfaction of students.	Reject
H0 ₉ :	There is no significant association between Caste and overall satisfaction of students.	Reject
H0 ₁₀ :	There is no significant association between study program and overall satisfaction of students.	Reject
H0 ₁₁ :	There is no significant association between semester and overall satisfaction of students.	Reject
H0 ₁₂ :	There is no significant association between academic qualification and overall satisfaction of students.	Fail to Reject
H0 ₁₃ :	There is no significant association between caste and effect of government policies on higher education.	Reject
H0 ₂₀ :	There is no significant association between university type and overall satisfaction of parents.	Reject
H0 ₂₁ :	There is no significant association between gender and overall satisfaction of parents.	Fail to Reject
H0 ₂₂ :	There is no significant association between age group and overall satisfaction of parents.	Fail to Reject
H0 ₂₃ :	There is no significant association between Residential Location and overall satisfaction of parents.	Fail to Reject
H0 ₂₄ :	There is no significant association between occupation and overall satisfaction of parents.	Fail to Reject

H0 ₂₅ :	There is no significant association between family monthly income and overall satisfaction of parents.	Reject
H0 ₂₆ :	There is no significant association between type of family and overall satisfaction of parents.	Fail to Reject
H0 ₂₇ :	There is no significant association between Number of earning person and overall satisfaction of parents.	Reject
H0 ₂₈ :	There is no significant association between Caste and overall satisfaction of parents.	Reject
H0 ₂₉ :	There is no significant association between study program and overall satisfaction of parents.	Reject
H0 ₃₀ :	There is no significant association between semester and overall satisfaction of parents.	Reject
H0 ₃₁ :	There is no significant association between academic qualification and overall satisfaction of parents.	Reject
H0 ₃₂ :	There is no significant association between caste and effect of government policies on higher education.	Reject
H0 ₃₉ :	There is no significant association between university type and overall satisfaction of teachers.	Reject
H0 ₄₀ :	There is no significant association between gender and overall satisfaction of teachers.	Fail to Reject
H0 ₄₁ :	There is no significant association between age group and overall satisfaction of teachers.	Reject
H0 ₄₂ :	There is no significant association between Residential Location and overall satisfaction of teachers.	Reject
H0 ₄₃ :	There is no significant association between designation and overall satisfaction of teachers.	Reject
H0 ₄₄ :	There is no significant association between nature of appointment and overall satisfaction of teachers.	Fail to Reject
H0 ₄₅ :	There is no significant association between type of family and overall satisfaction of teachers.	Fail to Reject
H0 ₄₆ :	There is no significant association between Number of earning person and overall satisfaction of teachers.	Fail to Reject
H0 ₄₇ :	There is no significant association between Caste and overall satisfaction of teachers.	Reject
H0 ₄₈ :	There is no significant association between program and overall satisfaction of teachers.	Fail to Reject
H0 ₄₉ :	There is no significant association between semester of teaching and overall satisfaction of teachers.	Reject
H0 ₅₀ :	There is no significant association between academic qualification and overall satisfaction of teachers.	Reject
H0 ₅₁ :	There is no significant association between caste and effect of government policies on higher education.	Reject

⇒ From the above table, it can be concluded that there is a significant relationship between Demographic variables and satisfaction of Stakeholders.

Objective-2: To measure the gap between expectation and performance of services provided by the universities among the stakeholders (particularly students, parents and teaching staffs).

- ⇒ To measure the gap between expectations of stakeholders and performance of selected universities, mean score has been used. Table no. 5.19 compares the mean score and gap score of students from MSU and SPU. While, 5.20 compares the mean score and gap score of students from PU and GLSU. Table no. 5.104 compares the mean score and gap score of parents from MSU and SPU. While, 5.105 compares the mean score and gap score of parents from PU and GLSU. Table no. 5.190 compares the mean score and gap score of teachers from MSU and SPU. While, 5.191 compares the mean score and gap score of parents from PU and GLSU.
- ⇒ The gap between mean scores of expectation of stakeholders and performance of services are positive in all the cases. It states that the expectation is higher than the actual performance of services.
- ⇒ The gap between mean scores of expectation of stakeholders and performance of services compared with paired sample t-test analysis as shown from table no. 5.21 to 5.24 for students, from table no. 5.106 to 5.109 for parents and from table no. 5.192 to 5.195 for teachers.
- ⇒ The result of paired sample t-test shows significant difference in the expectation of stakeholders and performance of universities.

Objective-3: To determine and compare the level of satisfaction of stakeholders (particularly students, parents and teaching staffs) among selected universities.

- ⇒ To identify the level of satisfaction, mean score and standard deviation have used. Table no. 5.25 shows the mean score and standard deviation of students of selected universities. While, table no. 5.110 shows the mean score and standard deviation of parents of selected universities. Table no. 5.196 shows the mean score and standard deviation of teaching staff from selected universities.

- ⇒ The average of mean score of selected universities for students indicates high satisfaction in MSU, SPU and PU, while average satisfaction in GLSU.
- ⇒ The average of mean score of selected universities for parents indicates high satisfaction in all four selected universities.
- ⇒ The average of mean score of selected universities for teaching staff indicates high satisfaction in MSU and GLSU, while average satisfaction in SPU and PU.

Objective-4: To examine the relationship between service quality dimensions (Reliability, Responsiveness, Empathy, Assurance and Tangibility) and satisfaction of stakeholders (particularly students, parents and teaching staffs).

- ⇒ To identify the relationship between service quality dimensions and satisfaction of Stakeholders, hypotheses were tested with regression model. The summary of hypotheses are as follow:

Table-6.2: Summary of Regression Analysis

Hypotheses		Results
H0 ₁₅ :	There is no significant association between Reliability Dimension and Satisfaction of Students.	Reject
H0 ₁₆ :	There is no significant association between Responsiveness Dimension and Satisfaction of Students.	Reject
H0 ₁₇ :	There is no significant association between Empathy Dimension and Satisfaction of Students.	Reject
H0 ₁₈ :	There is no significant association between Assurance Dimension and Satisfaction of Students.	Reject
H0 ₁₉ :	There is no significant association between Tangibility Dimension and Satisfaction of Students.	Reject
H0 ₃₄ :	There is no significant association between Reliability Dimension and Satisfaction of parents.	Reject
H0 ₃₅ :	There is no significant association between Responsiveness Dimension and Satisfaction of parents.	Reject
H0 ₃₆ :	There is no significant association between Empathy Dimension and Satisfaction of parents.	Reject
H0 ₃₇ :	There is no significant association between Assurance Dimension and Satisfaction of parents.	Reject
H0 ₃₈ :	There is no significant association between Tangibility Dimension and Satisfaction of parents.	Reject
H0 ₅₃ :	There is no significant association between Reliability Dimension and Satisfaction of Teachers.	Reject

H0 ₅₄ :	There is no significant association between Responsiveness Dimension and Satisfaction of Teachers.	Reject
H0 ₅₅ :	There is no significant association between Empathy Dimension and Satisfaction of Teachers.	Reject
H0 ₅₆ :	There is no significant association between Assurance Dimension and Satisfaction of Teachers.	Reject
H0 ₅₇ :	There is no significant association between Tangibility Dimension and Satisfaction of Teachers.	Reject

Table-6.3: Correlation between Service Quality dimension and overall Satisfaction of Stakeholders

Dimensions	Satisfaction of Students	Satisfaction of Parents	Satisfaction of Teachers
Reliability Sig. (2-tailed)	0.628 (0.000)	0.708 (0.000)	0.487 (0.000)
Responsiveness Sig. (2-tailed)	0.628 (0.000)	0.729 (0.000)	0.520 (0.000)
Empathy Sig. (2-tailed)	0.645 (0.000)	0.719 (0.000)	0.485 (0.000)
Assurance Sig. (2-tailed)	0.631 (0.000)	0.711 (0.000)	0.580 (0.000)
Tangibility Sig. (2-tailed)	0.606 (0.000)	0.663 (0.000)	0.529 (0.000)

⇒ As stated in table no. 6.2, all null hypotheses were rejected. While, table no. 6.3 shows the value of correlation between service quality dimensions (Reliability, Responsiveness, Empathy, Assurance and Tangibility) and satisfaction of stakeholders (particularly students, parents and teaching staffs). Therefore, it is concluded that there is a positive relationship between service quality dimensions (Reliability, Responsiveness, Empathy, Assurance and Tangibility) and satisfaction of stakeholders (particularly students, parents and teaching staffs).

Objective-5: To determine critical factors in service quality that contributes most to satisfaction of stakeholders (particularly students, parents and teaching staffs).

⇒ Exploratory Factor analysis was used to determine these critical factors. Table no. 5.66 (for students), 5.151 (for parents) and 5.237 (for teachers) shows the Range Communalities. 5.68 (for students), 5.153 (for parents) and 5.239 (for teachers) indicates factor loading values.

⇒ For students, “Contribution of Staff in Satisfaction”, “Contribution of Sports in Satisfaction” and “Contribution of Infrastructure in Satisfaction” have been identified. While, for parents “Contribution of Staff in Satisfaction”, “Contribution of Infrastructure in Satisfaction” and “Contribution of Safety & Solution in Satisfaction” have been identified. In the case of teachers, there are four factors have been identified namely, “Contribution of Non-Teaching Staff & Infrastructure in Satisfaction”, “Contribution of Management Relationship in Satisfaction”, “Contribution of Faith on University in Satisfaction” and “Contribution of Perk in Satisfaction”

Objective-6: To know the impact of SERVQUAL dimensions on satisfaction of stakeholders (particularly students, parents and teaching staffs).

⇒ Regression analysis was used to know the impact of SERVQUAL dimensions on satisfaction of stakeholders.

Table-6.4: Regression analysis between Service Quality dimension and overall Satisfaction of Stakeholders

Variables	Stakeholders	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	P-Value
Reliability	Students	.646	.417	.409	.000
	Parents	.071	.505	.499	.000
	Teachers	.495	.245	.231	.000
Responsiveness	Students	.657	.432	.424	.000
	Parents	.742	.551	.545	.000
	Teachers	.480	.231	.216	.000
Empathy	Students	.662	.438	.431	.000
	Parents	.730	.533	.527	.000
	Teachers	.485	.235	.220	.000
Assurance	Students	.644	.415	.407	.000
	Parents	.772	.596	.590	.000
	Teachers	.543	.295	.281	.000
Tangibility	Students	.647	.419	.411	.000
	Parents	.719	.517	.511	.000
	Teachers	.551	.304	.290	.000

⇒ The above table shows the value of adjusted R². This is the impact of SERVQUAL dimensions (Reliability, Responsiveness, Empathy, Assurance and Tangibility) on satisfaction of stakeholders.

6.2 Suggestions & Recommendations of the Research Study

The researcher has undertaken the study and with the help of data collection and data analysis, important findings have been drawn. The researcher has identified some important area wherein improvement is required to enhance the satisfaction of stakeholders. Such improvements in form of suggestions have been featured as follows:

For Students:

- ⇒ As the high mean gap found in “University addresses student grievances” for MSU and SPU, both the universities need to improve and implement such policies to fulfill this gap.
- ⇒ MSU and SPU both universities have more positive gap in “University provides a regular and a reliable forum of parent-teacher interaction”. Both the universities should implement regular interaction between parents and teacher.
- ⇒ MSU and SPU both universities should provide good Wi-Fi facility in the campus area. While PU and GLSU are providing such facilities to the students.
- ⇒ MSU, SPU and GLSU universities should provide the transportation facility for students. PU is found to be good in transportation facility.
- ⇒ MSU and GLSU universities should provide good canteen facility for students.
- ⇒ All the selected universities should declare the result on time as the students are found dissatisfied in this.
- ⇒ All the selected universities should train their non-teaching staff to improve the service quality.

For Parents:

- ⇒ All the selected universities should collect the feedback from parents regarding the quality of education and allied services as majority of parents found dissatisfied.
- ⇒ All the selected universities should provide the parents-teacher interaction forum to improve the academic quality.

- ⇒ Parents are dissatisfied when they seek any information from universities.
All the selected universities should train their teaching and non-teaching staff to provide the information to parents.
- ⇒ All the selected universities should make an arrangement to provide the information regarding scholarship and fellowships schemes to parents.

For Teachers:

- ⇒ All the selected universities should provide the reliable information regarding Promotion and Increments as the level of satisfaction is low in all the selected universities.
- ⇒ All the selected universities should collect feedbacks from employees for the quality of its services.
- ⇒ In the both PU and GLSU universities, training to teachers should be provided.
- ⇒ Transportation facilities to employees should be provided. However, PU is providing transportation facility satisfactory.
- ⇒ Behavior of management should be improved as the discrimination between staffs found more gap between expectation and performance.

6.3 Conclusion of the Research Study

The competition is increasing day by day due to globalization and privatization. It is essential to understand the satisfaction level of various stakeholders, to retain the customer in this era. In the Higher Education, the most important stakeholders are students and teachers as external and internal stakeholders respectively. The role of parents is also significant as the cost of education is bare by them. Hence, it is mandatory to understand the satisfaction level of various stakeholders such as students, parents and teachers.

This study provides a gap between expectations of stakeholders (particularly students, parents and teachers) and actual performance of selected universities. This study identifies various factors that affecting the satisfaction. Survival of any educational institutes is depending upon students. Hence, the positive word of mouth of students can be a good strategy to attract more number of students.

The data analysis has reveals that there is a positive gap between expectations of stakeholders and performance of selected universities. That means, the expectation is greater than the actual performance. The study also found that all the stakeholders are satisfied with service quality provided by the universities. The data analysis also shows positive correlation between all the dimensions of SERVQUAL model and satisfaction of selected stakeholders.

The demographic profile (such as age group, occupation, family type, caste, family income, academic qualification and semester) of the stakeholders is positively affecting the satisfaction. The study findings lead us to the conclusion that private university is providing more satisfaction as compared to state universities. To remain competitive, state universities should work on improving the services. Parul University provides high satisfaction to students; M. S. University provides high satisfaction to parents and GLS University provides high satisfaction to teachers.

6.4 Limitations of the Research Study

- ⇒ The data is collected from the respondents through the structured non-disguised questionnaire, there may be possibility that respondents might be in hurried and given incorrect answers, even they may not be fully loyal in answering the questions might be distorted the analysis and findings.
- ⇒ The researcher had collected the primary data from selected four universities in Gujarat. Hence, it would not be appropriate to generalise the results as representation of all the universities in Gujarat and fit for the entire population.
- ⇒ The time factor in collecting the responses might be limiting factor. The COVID-19 Pandemic is one of the limitations in collecting the data from respondents.
- ⇒ The research design and sample size used in the research may limit the findings of the study.
- ⇒ Statistical software and tools used by the researcher may limit the findings of the study.

6.5 Directions for the future Research Study

- ⇒ This research has focused on four selected universities; similar research can be carried out in other universities of the country.
- ⇒ This researcher has consider only three major stakeholder i.e. students, parents and teaching staff. Future research may conduct by taking other stakeholders.
- ⇒ This research covered state and private universities. Similar research can be carried out on colleges and other educational institutions.
- ⇒ Future research studies can be incorporating other service quality models and variables.

6.6 Managerial Implications of the Study

- ⇒ HEIs i.e. Universities play a vital role in enriching the knowledge of the students as well as providing high quality youth (Man power) to the nation. The stakeholders of the HEIs are directly or indirectly contribute to the same. Therefore, this satisfaction among stakeholders is required to be evaluated critically.
- ⇒ The undertaken research study will be useful to HEIs to enhance the satisfaction level among selected stakeholders namely students, parents and teachers.
- ⇒ This study will also highlight various important and critical variables which are required to be focused for enhancing the level of satisfaction of the selected stakeholders.