A Study on the Impact of Service Quality on Student Satisfaction towards the University Libraries in Dindigul District, Tamil Nadu, India

S. Mathurajothi[1], S. Subramani[2] and P. S. Venkateswaran[3]
[1]Assistant Librarian, (SG), Gandhigram Rural University, Dindigul, Tamil Nadu, India
[2]Assistant Librarian, PSNA College of Engineering & Technology, Dindigul, Tamil Nadu, India
[3]Professor, Department of Management Studies, PSNA College of Engineering & Technology, Dindigul, Tamil Nadu, India
E-mail: mathurajothis@gmail.com, subramanicareer@gmail.com, venkatespsna07@gmail.com

Abstract - **The main objective of this study is to find out the service quality on student satisfaction towards the University libraries in Dindigul District. A review of literature was collected to find out the relationship among service quality and student satisfaction. A survey was conducted to collect the data from 308 students from the two Universities in Dindigul District. The result shows that except empathy, other service quality factors are positively related to student satisfaction. Tangibility and reliability shows the highest positive correlation with student satisfaction. Finding suggests that Librarian should focus on the service quality factors tested in this research to improve the student satisfaction.**
Keywords: **Library, Service Quality, Student Satisfaction**

I. INTRODUCTION

The treatment of students as customers may make teachers please their students even at the cost of compromising desired rigor (Clayson & Haley, 2005) .There is a conceptual gap between what students and teachers want (Nguyen & Rosetti, 2013). There is a tendency of students to critically evaluate demanding teachers which will affect the future progress of such teaching staff (Yunker & Yunker, 2003).It is vital for university management to know what factors lead to student loyalty. The antecedents of loyalty will guide management of universities to devise policies aiming at retention of students. The main determinants of student loyalty are perceived service quality; student satisfaction (Alves & Raposo, 2007a) and university image (Nguyen & LeBlanc, 2001). Determining which facets of university experience are crucial for student satisfaction and their magnitude of impact, are the continuous subject of inquiry (Elsharnouby, 2015). In the present study,

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

A. Service Quality

Parasuraman *et al.,* (1988) suggested that 'SERVQUAL', which measures service quality, is based on five aspects; these are tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy (Andam *et al.,* 2015). Researchers are of the view that the dimensions used by SERVQUAL require more generalization (Iwaarden& Van der Wiele, 2002).Service quality (Chang, 2009) is difficult to be measured because of its intangible nature (Eshghi *et al.,* 2008).

Douglas *et al.,* (2006), students were asked to rank service quality dimensions with respect to importance. Results showed that teaching ability, subject knowledge, consistency of quality, information technology facilities were ranked more important compared to the parking area, vending machines, decoration in tutorial rooms, and layout of lecture room facilities, seminar rooms and cafeteria quality.

B. Student Satisfaction

De Jager (2015) analyzed that facilities, infrastructure, location of the University and accesses to that university are responsible for students' satisfaction. Besides institution quality factors namely, location, academics, infrastructure, image and personnel significantly influence the overall satisfaction of students towards the institution (Ravindran & Kalpana, 2012).

Khan & Fasih (2014) identified that service quality and all its dimensions such as tangibles, reliability, assurance and empathy have significant and positive association with satisfaction and loyalty of customers towards their respective financial service providing organizations. According to Archambault (2008) there is a positive relationship between service quality performance and satisfaction, and satisfaction and student retention. Further, there are a positive and significant correlation between the factors of advising, curriculum, teaching quality, financial assistance and tuition costs and facilities with student satisfaction (Farahmandian, Minavand, &Afshardost, 2013).

Peng (2006) stated that students expect to have significant gains in the knowledge and expect to use it as a tool for their career development. But the most important responsibility of higher education institutions is to manage all aspects of their services to students by improving student satisfaction which can be achieved by way of improving perceived service quality (Helgesen 2006).

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A. Research Design

The research design for the study is descriptive. The methodology of the study is based on the primary data as

well as secondary data. The study depends mainly on the primary data collected through a well-framed and structured questionnaire to obtain the opinions of the respondents. Convenient Sampling Method was used in the study to select the sample.

A total of 400 questionnaires (200/ University- two Universities) have been distributed and out of which 332 were received. After the scrutiny of these questionnaires, 24 questionnaires were rejected due to incomplete responses. Finally, 308 completed questionnaires were used for the present study.

IV. ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

A. Demographic Characteristics of the Sample

Majority (70.1%) of the students were in the age group of 19-21 years. Most of the students (80.6%) were female and 32.1 % were post graduates. 31 % were frequently visiting libraries.17% are visiting libraries only twice or thrice in a semester. 58 % of the students visiting library to take subject books and renewal. 7% of the respondents are coming to library to read newspapers and magazines. Only 4% of the PG and scholar are using online journals.

TABLE I RELIABILITY ANALYSIS, MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF THE STUDY VARIABLES

Variables	No of items	Cronbach's Alpha	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Reliability	6	0.908	2	5	3.819	0.808
Assurance	4	0.856	1	5	3.766	0.811
Responsiveness	3	0.792	1	5	3.841	0.839
Empathy	4	0.869	1	5	3.693	0.825
Tangibility	6	0.831	1	5	3.766	0.778
Student Satisfaction	6	0.884	1	5	3.904	0.854

Reliability ranges from 2 to 5 and the Mean and Standard Deviation is 3.819 and 0.808 respectively. Assurance ranges from 1 to 5 and the Mean and Standard Deviation is 3.76 and 0.811 respectively For Responsiveness, Mean and Standard Deviation is 3.841 and 0.839 respectively with the minimum and maximum value ranges from 1 to 5. Empathy ranges from 1 to 5 and the Mean is 3.766 and the Standard Deviation is 0.825. Tangibility ranges from 1 to 5 with the Mean of 3.766 and the Standard Deviation of 0.778. The minimum and maximum value for student satisfaction is 1 to 5 and the Mean and Standard Deviation is 3.904 and 0.854 respectively. It has been observed from the table 4.2 that almost all the Means are similar. High Standard Deviation means that the data are wide spread, which means that students give variety of opinion and the low standard deviation means that students express close opinion.

B. Regression Analysis

Our objective was to measure the relationship between service quality dimensions and student satisfaction. A

reliability test for each dimension of service quality was performed which showed that Cronbach's alpha coefficients were above 0.60 for all five dimensions (0.911 for reliability and 0.839 for assurance; 0.746 for responsiveness; 0.850 for empathy and 0.735 for tangibility).

C. Student Satisfaction and Service Quality Attributes

The table II indicates a strong relationship (0.801) between the two variables indicating that service quality is a strong predictor of student satisfaction. R square indicates the portion of variability in dependent variable (satisfaction) is explained by the model. From the analysis above, it indicates that the model explains 65 percent variability in satisfaction of the students. The table III summarizes the results of an analysis of variance. The ANOVA test result is shown in Table III It shows that F = 29.77is significant at 0.001 level. This indicated that the combination of the predictors significantly predict Student satisfaction.

TABLE II MODEL SUMMARY (B)

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	0.801(a)	0.6561	0.6557	2.309

a. Predictors: *(Constant), Tangibility, Assurance, Reliability, Responsiveness, and Empathy.*
b. Dependent Variable*: Student Satisfaction*

TABLE III ANOVA (B)

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1698.048	5	339.609	29.77	0.000(a)
	Residual	3444.828	302	11.406		
	Total	5142.876	307			

a. Predictors: *(Constant), Tangibility, Assurance, Reliability, Responsiveness, and Empathy.*
b. Dependent Variable: *Student satisfaction*

TABLE IV COEFFICIENTS (A)

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	5.517	1.679		5.113	0.001
	Reliability	0.116	0.031	1.692	3.228	0.001
	Assurance	0.453	0.024	0.467	6.178	0.001
	Responsiveness	-.087	0.012	-.1113	-1.112	0.853
	Empathy	0.279	0.043	0.301	4.794	0.001
	Tangibility	0.761	0.0013	0.179	7.116	0.001

a. Dependent Variable: *Student satisfaction*

Student Satisfaction = 5.517 + 1.692Reliability + 0.467Assurance -.113 Responsiveness + 0.301 Empathy + 0.179Tangibility.

If we look at the column Beta under Standardized Coefficients, we see that the highest number in beta is 0.562for Tangibility, which is significant at the 0.01 level. The next higher number in Beta is 0.451for Assurance, which is significant at the 0.01 level. The next higher number in Beta is 0.258for Empathy, which is significant at the 0.01 level. The next number in Beta is 1.681for Reliability, which is significant at the 0.01 level.

From the above, Libraries should focus on four major elements – Reliability, Assurance, Empathy and Tangibility if student satisfaction is to be treated as an important one. From the result, Reliability (t =3.228; P = 0.001), Assurance (t = 6.178; P = 0.001), Empathy (t = 4.794; P = 0.001) and Tangibility (t = 7.116; P = 0.001) are significant. Only responsiveness (t = -1.112; P = 0.853 >0.001) is not significant. Based on the regression coefficients, "Responsiveness" was determined to be least important variable in student satisfaction. This indicates that students are unhappy with the following facts; the prompt service, not immediately respond to the student's request and willingness to help them.

V. MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS

The current study has shown the impact of service quality attributes on student satisfaction towards their universityLibraries in Dindigul. Jones and Sasser (1995) pointed out that there is a huge difference between merely satisfied and completely satisfied students. Therefore Librarians should pay attention on the complete student satisfaction.

This study confirms the positive relationship between the service quality attributes (except responsiveness) and student satisfaction. This study also suggests that SERVQUAL is a suitable instrument for measuring the Library service quality. Therefore, Librarianscan use this instrument to assess the service quality in university libraries. Tangibility shows the highest positive correlation with student satisfaction in the current study. The core concept of tangibility are student expectation towards the facts such as - modern looking, visually appealing facilities, neat and professionally appearing staff, convenient study hours and study atmosphere. At present the students are highly satisfied with the above facts.

VI. CONCLUSION

The main purpose of the study is to find out the impact of service quality attributes on student satisfaction for the University Libraries. The findings of this study have indicated that the quality of service perceived by the students of the twoLibraries is high. The implications of this study suggest that Libraries must dedicate sizeable efforts toward the quality of their services. They can maintain long-term relationship with students. This study also highlights the significance of establishing a sustainable relationship with students.

REFERENCES

[1] Alves, H., & Raposo, M. (2007a). Conceptual Model of Student Satisfaction in Higher Education. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, *18*(5), 571–588.

[2] Andam, R., Montazeri, A., Feizi, S., & Mehdizadeh, R. (2015). Providing a multidimensional measurement model for assessing quality of sport tourism services: Empirical evidence from sport conference as sport event tourism. *Iranian Journal of Management Studies*, *8*(4), 607-629.

[3] Archambault, L. Z. (2008). Measuring Service Performance, Student Satisfaction and its Impact on Student Retention in Private , Post-Secondary Institutions, procedings EDU-COM International Conference, Edith Cowan University.

[4] Clayson, D. E., & Haley, D. A. (2005). Marketing Models in Education: Students as Customers, Products, or Partners. *Marketing Education Review*, *15*(1), 1–10.

[5] De Jager, J. W., & Jan, M. T. (2015). Antecedents of customer satisfaction in the higher education institutions of South Africa. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 13(3), 87–95.

[6] Elsharnouby, T. H. (2015). Student co-creation behavior in higher education: the role of satisfaction withthe university experience. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, 25(2), 238–262.

[7] Eshghi, A., Roy, S. K., & Ganguli, S. (2008). Service quality and customer satisfaction: An empirical investigation in Indian mobile telecommunications services. *Marketing Management Journal*, *18*(2), 119-144.

[8] Farahmandian, S., Minavand, H., & Afshardost, M. (2013). Perceived service quality and student satisfaction in higher education. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, 12(4), 65–74.

[9] Ghazali, E., Nguyen, B., Mutum, D. S., & Mohd-Any, A. A. (2016). Constructing online switchingbarriers: examining the effects of switching costs and alternative attractiveness on e-store loyaltyin online pure-play retailers. *Electronic Markets*, 26(2), 157–171.

[10] Helgesen, Øyvind. (2006). Are loyal customers profitable? Customer satisfaction, customer (action) loyalty and customer profitability at the individual level. *Journal of Marketing Management,* 22(3-4), 245-266.

[11] Iwaarden, V., J., & Van der Wiele, T. (2002). A study on the applicability of SERVQUAL dimensions for websites. *Erim Report Series Research in Management.* Available on the ERIM website: www.erim.eur.nl.

[12] Jacqueline Douglas, Alex Douglas, & Barry Barnes. (2006). Measuring student satisfaction at a UKuniversity. *Quality Assurance in Education*, *14*(3), 251–267.

[13] Khan, M. M., & Fasih, M. (2014). Impact of Service Quality on Customer Satisfaction andCustomer Loyalty: Evidence from Banking Sector. *Pak J CommerSocSci Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences*, *8*(2), 331–354.

[14] Nguyen, N., & LeBlanc, G. (2001). Image and reputation of higher education institutions in students'retention decisions. *International Journal of Educational Management*, *15*(6), 303–311.

[15] Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1988). SERVQUAL: A multiple-item scale for measuring customer perceptions of service quality. *Journal of Retailing*, 64(1), 12-40.

[16] Peng, P. J. (2006). Measuring students 'Satisfaction for Quality Education in a e-Learning University, *unitar e-journal*, 2(1), 11–21.

[17] Ravindran, S. D., & Kalpana, M. (2012). Students' Expectation, Perception and Satisfaction towards the Management Educational Institutions, 2nd Annual International Conference on Accounting and Finance, *2*, 401–410.

[18] Yunker, P. J., &Yunker, J. A. (2003). Are Student Evaluations of Teaching Valid? Evidence From anAnalytical Business Core Course. *Journal of Education for Business*, *78*(6), 313–317.