

IMPACT OF UNIVERSITIES SERVICE QUALITY ON FACULTY SATISFACTION-A CASE OF SELECT UNIVERSITIES IN SOUTHERN INDIA

Dr N Udaya Bhaskar¹

Dr P Uma Maheswari Devi²

Abstract

The utmost preference of any country is the development of its human resources, the socio-economic development of any country solely depends on the quality of education it has. In the recent years, India is witnessing an unprecedented consumption boom towards educational services. The economy is growing between seven and nine percent and the resulting improvements in income dynamics along with the factors like favorable demographics and spending patterns are driving the consumption demand towards higher education. The quality and level of higher education plays a crucial role in creating skills, knowledge and abilities. Hence, the quality of educational services becomes the value proposition to any educational institute. Though several measures have been taken for the improvement of quality, still Indian higher educational institutions are not ranked top in the world most preferred institutions. In this connection the present paper aims at identifying the critical factors of service quality from the faculty perspective and their impact on faculty satisfaction. Data was collected from 25 universities in the Southern India, the sample constitutes of 250 faculty members, and the data analyzed using statistical techniques like factors analysis and multiple regressions with help of SPSS 24.0. The results will help in formulating, designing and modifying service strategies so as to improve the university service quality and there by faculty satisfaction.

Keywords: *Service Quality, Higher Education, University, Faculty Satisfaction*

¹ Assistant Professor, Dept. of Management Studies, AdiKavi Nannaya University, India

² Assistant Professor & Head, Department of Management Studies, Adikavi Nannaya University, India

Introduction

India is witnessing an unprecedented consumption boom towards educational services. The economy is growing between seven and nine percent and the resulting improvements in income dynamics along with the factors like favourable demographics and spending patterns are driving the consumption demand towards higher education. The socio-economic development of any country solely depends on the quality of education it has. The utmost preference of any country is development of its human resources, keeping intact with the societal values and changes in various aspects like scientific development of the country. The quality and level of higher education plays a crucial role in creating skills, knowledge, abilities, and awareness among students. It acts as an antidote to poverty, hunger, malnutrition and corruption. The higher education sector acts as a powerful tool to build a knowledge-based society and also has a direct bearing on it.

There are many countries which are reeling with poverty and its implications majorly on varied verticals of human development due to dearth of awareness and an eminent education system. Thus the research in higher education paves way for a knowledgeable and healthy society. So higher education is a medium to place country on the right path dissolving various disparities arising in the communities and directly aids to the nation's economy. Higher education brings healthier, balanced life style, culture, greater choices, and more possibilities in life, enhances leadership qualities in people, encourages volunteer work and also plays crucial part in the growth of any nation. Hence, the quality of educational services becomes the value proposition to any educational institute and the satisfaction of the faculty is an indispensable link in the delivery of quality of services

Though several studies and research has been conducted on higher education service quality so far, yet there is need for up gradation of service quality with time and technology. This paper is an attempt to find out the critical factors of service quality and to know the impact of serviced quality on faculty satisfaction in southern India.

Review of Literature

The management of quality needs a different approach when it comes to the services sector. The studies of service quality on different sectors have been increasing from past four decades. Among all the service sectors, higher education needs a special emphasis on evaluating the issues related to quality of services and its measurement. Quality in higher education is a complex and multifaceted concept and a single correct definition of quality is

lacking (Harvey & Green, 1993). As a consequence, consensus concerning the best way to define and measure service quality does not exist yet (Clews, 2003). Significant conceptual contribution has been made by a number of researchers from different academic disciplines on issues of service quality measurement in higher education. Clemes, Cohen & Wang, (2013) examined the relationships between students behavioral intentions, satisfaction, service quality, perceived value, and university image using multilevel modeling approach in the Chinese context. Chahal and Devi (2013) stated that service failure in education sector refers the extent of gap in the service delivery. Parves Sultan and Ho Yin Wong (2013) conducted a study at Australian university with 19 students by focused group discussions to identify the antecedents to perceived service quality in a higher education context. They found that academic, administration and facilities are the three aspects of service quality. Cristina Calvo, Jean Pierre & Isabel (2013) conducted a study on perceived quality in higher education: an empirical study by using a modified SERVQUAL instrument in private and public Universities. Huili & Jing (2012) developed a customer satisfaction index model about postgraduate education service quality by using Structural Equation Modeling method. Authors identified the relationships between perceived service quality, student satisfaction and student loyalty. Mason (2012) examined the roles that innate psychological needs and student satisfaction have on doctoral student motivation. The author measured the relationships between relatedness, competence, autonomy, satisfaction, and motivation which help to continue graduate school. Results found that all of these variables have positive relationship. De Jager & Badamosi, (2010) carried out a study on process of developing a standardized measure of service quality in higher education in South Africa and also examined the relationship between the measures of service quality on the one hand and some other related variables such as intention to leave the university, trust in the university management and the overall satisfaction with the university. Kwek, Lau & Tan (2010) made an attempt to explain the relationship between the process model of education quality and the student perceived service quality. Sahney, Banwet & Karunes, (2010) conducted an empirical study of administrative staff to find internal customers perspective on quality. Sultan & Wong (2010) developed a 67-item instrument for measuring performance-based service quality with a particular focus on the higher education sector. Oliveira & Ferreira (2009) conducted a study that provided a contribution towards improving education service by adapting SERVQUAL scale to higher education service activity and presented a result of its application in an engineering institution. Clemes, Gan, & Kao (2008) proposed and tested a comprehensive model that has identified the sub and primary dimensions of service quality

and analyzed the relationships among the other higher order constructs: satisfaction, image, tuition fee and behavioral intentions in the higher education in the New Zealand context. Mostafa (2006) conducted study to understand how students perceive service quality in Egypt private universities. Abdullah (2006) reported that the six dimensions, namely, academic aspects, non-academic aspects, reputation, access, program issues and understanding are distinct and important issues in the higher education context. Douglas & Douglas (2006) suggested that the student experience and its improvement should be at the forefront of any monitoring of higher education quality. Sobral, (2004) found that autonomous motivation was reported to be significantly associated with the student perceptions of course quality, in terms of the meaningfulness and value of the educational experience. Joseph, Stone & Joseph, (2003) conducted a study to identify the determinants of service quality in education from the perspective of foreign students using a set of measurement scales based upon the importance. Ahmed et al., (2000) examined the relationship between service quality, satisfaction and motivation in higher education institutions using SERVQUAL model. The findings show that service quality has a significant effect on satisfaction and motivation of students... Ford, Joseph & Joseph, (1999) developed an instrument to assess service quality perceptions of business students in New Zealand and the USA. Kwan (1999) conducted a study on “quality indicators in higher education – comparing Hong Kong and China’s students. Cheng & Tam (1997) developed a framework of multi-models of quality in education for facilitating practice, supporting policy making and developing research agendas. Owlia & Aspinwall (1996) conducted a study that compares various service quality dimensions models in higher education. Hill (1995) discussed aspects of current service quality theory in the context of British higher education, focused on the role of the student as a primary consumer of higher education services.

So it is evident from the earlier studies that improving the service quality of Universities plays a crucial role in improving the student as well as faculty satisfaction.

Objectives of the Study

1. To identify the critical factors of service quality from the faculty perspective
2. To know the impact of service quality on faculty satisfaction

Methodology

The study was undertaken in southern India, all state Universities in southern India and the regular faculty working becomes the population for the study

For this study Multi stage sampling procedure was adopted. In India, five major states representing, Southern part of India namely Tamil Nadu, Andhra Pradesh, Telangana, Kerala, and Karnataka were selected. From each state, five universities were selected on the basis of year of establishment, number of courses offered by the university and its student's enrolment.

The sample of the study constitutes 25 Universities in Southern India, among which from each university 10 faculty members were selected representing both genders on the basis of regularity and seniority. Hence the total sample is $25 \times 10 = 250$ faculty members. Convenience Sampling Technique was employed in the final selection of sample.

The data was collected from both primary and secondary sources. The primary data was collected from the respondents by administering a structured questionnaire. Modified service quality scale has been adopted to measure the service quality of universities, 21 items were taken considering the NAAC parameters to measure service quality. Customer Satisfaction was measured using 13 items was measured on a five point Likert scale. The questionnaire was modified after the pilot study and found reliable to measure the variables of study

Secondary data was collected from books, journals, research reports etc. The collected data was analyzed with use of SPSS 24.0 software. Statistical techniques like factor analysis and multiple regressions were used.

Results and Discussion

To identify the critical factors of service quality from the faculty perspective

Factor Analysis

Factor analysis is an advanced statistical and data reduction technique used to reduce a large number of variables to a smaller set of underlying factors/constructs. In research there may be a large number of variables, most of which are correlated and which must be reduced to a manageable level. Relationships among sets of many interrelated variables are examined and represented in terms of a few underlying factors.

To identify the critical factors of service quality, Factor Analysis test was conducted to the 21 items, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling values is .890 (above .5 is desirable) and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity is .000 (it should be close to Zero), proves the test was efficient and reliable. The KMO value indicates the pattern of correlations between the variables, higher the KMO value indicates the factors analysis is appropriate. The Bartlett's

Test of Sphericity indicates that there are no correlations between the extracted variables, if it is close to Zero, means that the factor analysis is appropriate. A total of four factors namely Research amenities, Governance, Research support and Curriculum were extracted whose eigen values (>1) are above one (Field, 2005). Total variance explained by all factors is 69.074 (table: total variance explained), the communalities tables explains the factor loading of individual item.

Table 1: KMO and Bartlett's Test

KMO and Bartlett's Test		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.890
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	2223.812
	df	210
	Sig.	.000

Table 2: Total Variance Explained

Total Variance Explained									
Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	7.684	36.591	36.591	7.684	36.591	36.591	3.567	16.987	16.987
2	1.644	7.829	44.420	1.644	7.829	44.420	3.249	15.472	32.459
3	1.495	7.120	51.539	1.495	7.120	51.539	3.115	14.834	47.293
4	1.032	4.914	56.453	1.032	4.914	56.453	1.924	9.160	56.453
5	.990	4.713	61.165						
6	.922	4.392	65.558						
7	.859	4.091	69.649						
8	.790	3.762	73.410						
9	.694	3.303	76.714						
10	.669	3.184	79.898						
11	.553	2.633	82.531						
12	.546	2.601	85.132						
13	.465	2.214	87.346						
14	.444	2.113	89.459						
15	.393	1.871	91.330						
16	.374	1.779	93.109						
17	.338	1.611	94.720						
18	.323	1.537	96.257						
19	.300	1.427	97.684						

20	.254	1.209	98.893						
21	.233	1.107	100.000						
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.									

Form the above table the Eigen values and the Total variance explained was indicated. The number of factors to be extracted is determined by the Eigen value, the most commonly used practice is that those factors whose Eigen values are above 1 will be retained. From the above it is observed that four factors Eigen values are above one and the total variance explained was 56.453.

Table 3: Rotated Component Matrix

Rotated Component Matrix ^a					
	Items	Component			
		Research amenities	Governance	Research support	Curriculum
Item 1	University has financial support from industry for innovation and consultancy	.743			
Item 2	University library has access to data base to conduct research	.700			
Item 3	Library has a wide range of journals and magazines	.693			
Item 4	University has foreign collaboration in research projects	.682			
Item 5	University has strong research unit/cell	.675			
Item 6	University web site is user friendly			.383	
Item 7	Administrative staff are willing to help and understand your specific needs		.737		
Item 8	Faculty are engaged in decision making		.631		
Item 9	University follows proper administrative policies and procedures		.614		
Item 10	Faculty has control in curriculum development				.436
Item 11	University involves teaching faculty in administration				.460
Item 12	Academic and administrative records are maintained accurately		.545		
Item 13	University shows sincere interest in redressal of grievances		.443		

Item 14	University provides financial assistance to attend seminar/workshops		.436		
Item 15	University encourages faculty to attend orientation/refresh courses			.760	
Item 16	University encourages to do research projects			.747	
Item 17	University has a wide variety of courses			.718	
Item 18	University has patents in various research areas			.557	
Item 19	Physical facilities like computer lab, Wi-Fi, printer etc are readily available			.436	
Item 20	The course content reflects Industry and social needs				.817
Item 21	Curriculum is Research based				.707
Eigen Values		7.684	1.644	1.495	1.032
Cumulative Variance Explained		36.591	44.420	51.539	56.453

Factor Interpretation

The above rotated component matrix explains the degree to which variables load into factors. From the above table it is observed that all the items were loaded into four factors, varimax rotation was used to minimize the correlations across the factors, in each item the highest correlated value with the other factors was taken as a basis for grouping the items into factors (Pallant,J, 2005). The first factor was named **Research amenities**, which consists of 5 Items. The second factor was named **Governance**, which consists 6 items. The third factor was named **Research support**, which consists of 6 Items. The fourth factor was named **Curriculum**, which consists of 4 Items. The factors were used as service quality variables (Independent) for further analysis.

Factor 1 Research amenities

Item 1: University has financial support from industry for innovation and consultancy

Item 2: University library has access to data base to conduct research

Item 3: Library has a wide range of journals and magazines

Item 4: University has foreign collaboration in research projects

Item 5: University has strong research unit/cell

Factor 2: Governance

Item 7: Administrative staff is willing to help and understand your specific needs

Item 8: Faculty are engaged in decision making

Item 9: University follows proper administrative policies and procedures

Item 12: Academic and administrative records are maintained accurately

Item 13: University shows sincere interest in redressal of grievances

Item 14: University provides financial assistance to attend seminar/workshops

Factor 3: Research support

Item 6: University web site is user friendly

Item 15: University encourages faculty to attend orientation/refresh courses

Item 16: University encourages to do research projects

Item 17: University has a wide variety of courses

Item 18: University has patents in various research areas

Item 19: Physical facilities like computer lab, Wi-Fi, printer etc are readily available

Factor 4: Curriculum

Item 10: Faculty has control in curriculum development

Item 11: University involves teaching faculty in administration

Item 20: The course content reflects Industry and social needs

Item 21: Curriculum is Research based

Impact of Service quality on Faculty Satisfaction

To know the impact of service quality on faculty satisfaction, a multiple regression test was conducted. The dependent variable is faculty satisfaction and independent variables are service quality factors like Research amenities, Governance, Research support and Curriculum. The following analysis reveals the impact of service quality on faculty satisfaction

H: There is an impact of service quality on faculty satisfaction

Regression Analysis

To know the impact of service quality on faculty satisfaction, a multiple regression test was conducted. The dependent variable is faculty satisfaction (Y) and independent variables are Research amenities (X1), Governance (X2), Research support (X3), Curriculum (X4) various services provided by Universities.

$$\text{Customer Satisfaction (Y)} = a + b (\text{Research amenities (X1)}) + c (\text{Governance (X2)}) + d (\text{Research support (X3)}) + e (\text{Curriculum (X4)})$$

a = regression constant,

b,c,d,e, are the regression coefficients of the independent variables X1 to X4

Table 4: Regression Model Summary

Model Summary									
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.754 ^a	.569	.562	4.56701	.569	80.868	4	245	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), Research amenities, Governance, Research support and Curriculum

From the above table it is observed that the R Square value is .569(acceptable standard is .50) which indicates that around 56 percent of the dependent variable (Faculty Satisfaction) variation was explained by all the independent variables and the ANOVA table reveals that the model was fit as F value is 80.868 and sig value is .000.

Table 5: ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	6746.797	4	1686.699	80.868	.000 ^a
	Residual	5110.099	245	20.858		
	Total	11856.896	249			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Research amenities, Governance, Research support and Curriculum

b. Dependent Variable: Faculty Satisfaction

Table 6: Regression Coefficients

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
1 (Constant)	32.304	.289		111.839	.000		

Research amenities	2.424	.289	.351	8.376	.000	1.000	1.000
Governance	2.736	.289	.396	9.452	.000	1.000	1.000
Research support	3.202	.289	.464	11.062	.000	1.000	1.000
Curriculum	1.866	.289	.270	6.448	.000	1.000	1.000
a. Dependent Variable: Faculty Satisfaction							

The above table provides the information about coefficients of the independent variables, it is inferred from the above that the independent variables Research amenities (.000), Governance (.000), Research support (.000), Curriculum (.000) are significantly effecting the dependent variable faculty satisfaction as their sig. values are less than .05 and there is no multi co linearity as the VIF values of each independent variable is close 1 (acceptable standard is 1 and above). Hence the hypotheses may be accepted. Thus Faculty Satisfaction can represent in an equation

$$Y=32.304+2.424X_1+2.736X_2+3.202X_3+1.866X_4$$

Conclusion

The quality of services in any higher education institute has become the primary differentiation strategy. In order to deliver superior quality of service it is inevitable to identify the critical factors of service quality and also to know the impact of these factors on faculty satisfaction. The present study focused on indentifying the critical factors of service quality from faculty perspective and how these factors effects faculty satisfaction. Results proved that Research amenities, Governance, Research support and Curriculum are the critical factors and will significantly affect the faculty satisfaction. Knowledge on what critical factors affects faculty satisfaction will help in developing and designing a better service strategy. The study may be extended to other stake holders in a university system like students, administrators, Local industries and supporting staff etc.

References

1. 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.
2. Ahmed et al., (2000). Does service quality affect students' performance? Evidence from institutes of higher learning. *African Journal of Business Management*, 4(12), 2527-2533.

3. Babakus, E. and Boller, G.W. (1992), “An empirical assessment of the SERVQUAL scale”, *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 24 No. 3, pp. 253-68.
4. Brown, T.J., Churchill, G.A. and Peter, J.P. (1993), “Improving the measurement of service quality”, *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 69 No. 1, pp. 127-39.
5. Cheng, Y.C. and Tam, W. M. (1997).Multi-models of quality in education. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 5 (1), 22–31.
6. Clemes, M.D., Gan, C.E.C. & Kao, T. (2008). University student satisfaction: an empirical analysis. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, 17 (2), 292-325.
7. Clewes, D. (2003). A Student-Centered Conceptual Model of Service Quality in Higher Education.*Quality in Higher Education*, 9(1), 69-85.
8. Cronin, J. and Taylor, S. (1994), “SERVPERF versus SERVQUAL: reconciling performance-based and perceptions-minus-expectations measurement of service quality”, *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 58 No. 1, pp. 125-31.
9. Cronin, J. J. Jr., & Taylor, S. A. (1992).Measuring Service Quality: A Reexamination and Extension .*Journal of Marketing*, 56(3), 55-68.
10. Deming, W. E., & Edwards, D. W. (1982).*Quality, productivity, and competitive position* (Vol. 183). Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Center for Advanced Engineering Study.
11. Douglas, J. & Douglas, A. (2006).Evaluating teaching quality.*Quality in Higher Education*, 12 (1), 3-12.
12. Fitzsimmons, J. A., & Fitzsimmons, M. J. (2006).*Service management: operations, strategy, and information technology*. Irwin/McGraw-Hill.
13. Ford, J. B., Joseph, M., & Joseph, B., (1999). Importance-performance analysis as a strategic tool for service marketers: the case of service quality perceptions of business students in New Zealand and the USA. *The Journal of Services Marketing*, 13 (2) 171-186
14. Gronroos, C. (1984). A service quality model and its marketing implications.*European Journal of marketing*, 18(4), 36-44.
15. Harvey, L. & Green, D. (1993).Defining quality.*Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 18 (1), 9-34.

16. Hill, F. (1995). Managing service quality in higher education: the role of the student as primary consumer. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 3 (3), 10-21.
17. Higher Education Statistics at a Glance 2014 survey report.
18. Huili, Y. & Jing, Y. (2012). Empirical Research and Model Building about Customer Satisfaction Index on Postgraduate Education Service Quality. *Canadian Social Science*, 8, 108-11.
19. Joseph, M., Stone, G., & Joseph, B. (2003). Using the importance-performance grid to evaluate international Student perceptions of service quality in education: an investigation from an Australian college perspective. *Journal for Advancement of Marketing Education*, 3.
20. Juran, J.M. (1974). *Quality Control Handbook*, 3rd edition, New York: McGraw-Hill.
21. Kwan, P.Y.K. & Ng, P.W.K. (1999). Quality indicators in higher education – comparing Hong Kong and China’s students. *Managerial Auditing Journal*, (14) 1/2, 20-27.
22. Kwek, C. L., Lau, T. C. and Tan, H. P. (2010). Education Quality Process Model and Its Influence on Students’ Perceived Service Quality. *International Journal of Business and Management* 5(8).
23. Mostafa, M. M., (2006), a Comparison of SERVQUAL and I-P Analysis: Measuring and Improving Service Quality in Egyptian Private Universities. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, 16(2), 83-104.
24. National Knowledge Commission report 2009.
25. Oliveira, O. J. D. and Ferreira, E. C. (2009). Adaptation and application of the SERVQUAL scale in higher education. *POMS 20th Annual Conference*, Orlando, Florida U.S.A.
26. Owlia, M.S. & Aspinwall, E.M. (1996). A framework for the dimensions of quality in higher education. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 4 (2), 12- 20.
27. Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A. & Berry, L. L. (1988). SERVQUAL: A multiple-item scale for measuring consumer perceptions of service quality. *Journal of Retailing*, 64(1), 12–40.
28. Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1985). A conceptual model of service quality and its implications for future research. *The Journal of Marketing*, 41-50.

29. Sahney, S., Banwet, D. K., & Karunes, S. (2004). A SERVQUAL and QFD approach to total quality education: A student perspective. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 53(2), 143-166.
30. Senthilkumar, N., & Arulraj, A. (2011). SQM-HEI – determination of service quality measurement of higher education in India. *Journal of Modeling in Management*, 6(1), 60 – 78.
31. Sobral, D. T. (2004). What kind of motivation drives medical students' learning quests? *Medical Education*, 38(9), 950-957.
32. Subrahmanyam, A., & Raja Shekhar, B. (2012). Development of HiEdQUAL for Measuring Service Quality in Indian Higher Education Sector. *International Journal of Innovation, Management and Technology*, 3(4), 412-416. ISSN: 2010-0248.
33. Calvo-Porrall, C., Lévy-Mangin, J. P., & Novo-Corti, I. (2013). Perceived quality in higher education: an empirical study. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 31(6), 601-619.
34. Chahal, H., & Devi, P. (2013). Identifying satisfied/dissatisfied service encounters in higher education. *Quality assurance in Education*, 21(2), 211-222.
35. Parves Sultan Ho Yin Wong, (2013). Antecedents and consequences of service quality in a higher education context, *Quality Assurance in Education*, Vol. 21 Iss 1. 70 – 95
36. Mason, M. M. (2012). Motivation, Satisfaction, and Innate Psychological Needs. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies*, 7, 259 -277.
37. Sultan, P. & Wong, H. (2010). Performance-based service quality model: an empirical study on Japanese universities. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 18 (2), 126-143,
38. Huili, Y. & Jing, Y. (2012). Empirical Research and Model Building about Customer Satisfaction Index on Postgraduate Education Service Quality. *Canadian Social Science*, 8, 108-11.
39. De Jager, J., & Gbadamosi, G. (2010). Specific remedy for specific problem: measuring service quality in South African higher education. *Higher Education*, 60(3), 251-267.
40. Sahney, S., Banwet, D. K., & Karunes, S. (2010). Quality framework in education through application of interpretive structural modeling: an administrative staff perspective in the Indian context. *The TQM Journal*, 22(1), 56-71.

Author's Profile

Dr. N. Udaya Bhaskar and Dr. P. Uma Maheswari Devi, are working as Senior Assistant Professors in the Department of Commerce and Management Studies, Adikavi Nannaya University, Rajamahendravaram, Andhra Pradesh. Currently they are doing research in Service quality in Indian Retailing and Education sector. They have presented many papers in National and International Conferences.