



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RESEARCH IN COMPUTER APPLICATION AND MANAGEMENT

CONTENTS

Sr. No.	TITLE & NAME OF THE AUTHOR (S)	Page No.
1.	FEASIBILITY STUDY OF E-SERVICING ON IRANIAN MUNICIPALITIES (G2C): A CASE STUDY OF AHWAZ MUNICIPALITY <i>DR. MEHRDAD ALIPOUR & SHAHIN KOLIVAND AVARZAMANI</i>	1
2.	ANALYSIS OF MOBILE AGENT BASED E-SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGEMENT SYSTEM USING QUEUING THEORY: A COMPARATIVE STUDY BETWEEN M/M/1 AND M/D/1 MODELS <i>DR. RIKTESH SRIVASTAVA</i>	7
3.	PREPARING PRE-SERVICE TEACHERS TO INTEGRATE EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY IN THE COLLEGES OF EDUCATION CURRICULUM IN THE CENTRAL REGION OF GHANA <i>ABREH MIGHT KOJO</i>	18
4.	THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE INFORMAL AND FORMAL FINANCIAL SECTOR IN NIGERIA: A CASE STUDY OF SELECTED GROUPS IN LAGOS METROPOLIS <i>ABIOLA BABAJIDE</i>	24
5.	AN APPRAISAL OF SERVICE QUALITY MANAGEMENT IN MANAGEMENT EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS: A FACTOR ANALYSIS <i>DR. BHANWAR SINGH RAJPUROHIT, DR. RAJ KUMAR SHARMA & GOPAL SINGH LATWAL</i>	33
6.	AN EFFECTIVE TOOL FOR BETTER SOFTWARE PRODUCT <i>DR. V.S.P. SRIVASTAV & PIYUSH PRAKASH</i>	44
7.	HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ISSUES FOR IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF CARE IN HEALTH SECTOR: AN EMPIRICAL STUDY <i>SAJI MON M.R., N.MUTHUKRISHNAN & DR. D.S. CHAUBEY</i>	49
8.	THE EFFECT OF E-MARKETING AND ITS ENVIRONMENT ON THE MARKETING PERFORMANCE OF MEDIUM AND LARGE FINANCIAL SERVICE ENTERPRISES IN ETHIOPIA <i>TEMESGEN BELAYNEH ZERIHUN & DR. V. SHEKHAR</i>	57
9.	ERGONOMICS RELATED CHANGES ON TRADITIONAL BANKS IN KERALA CONSEQUENT ON CHANGES IN TECHNOLOGY AND ITS IMPACT ON EMPLOYEES <i>DR. P. M. FEROSE</i>	66
10.	MODERN FACES OF FINANCIAL CRIMES IN ELECTRONIC BANKING SYSTEM <i>VIKAS SHARMA</i>	70
11.	QUALITY OF SERVICE (QOS) BASED SCHEDULING ENVIRONMENT MODEL IN WIMAX NETWORK WITH OPNET MODELER <i>ARUN KUMAR, DR. A K GARG & ASHISH CHOPRA</i>	73
12.	A DECENTRALIZED INDEXING AND PROBING SPATIAL DATA IN P2P SYSTEM <i>T. MAHESHWARI & M. RAVINDER</i>	78
13.	CONVERGENCE TO IFRS - AN INDIAN PERSPECTIVE <i>CA SHOBANA SWAMYNATHAN & DR. SINDHU</i>	81
14.	COMPARING EFFICIENCY AND PRODUCTIVITY OF THE INDIAN AUTOMOBILE FIRMS – A MALMQUIST –META FRONTIER APPROACH <i>DR. A. VIJAYAKUMAR</i>	86
15.	EMERGING TRENDS IN KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT IN BANKING SECTOR <i>DR. DEEPIKA JINDAL & VIVEK BHAMBRI</i>	93
16.	A STUDY ON CONSUMER ACCEPTANCE OF M-BANKING IN TIRUCHIRAPPALLI CITY <i>S. MOHAMED ILIYAS</i>	97
17.	TECHNICAL ANALYSIS AS SHORT TERM TRADING STRATEGY IN THE INDIAN STOCK MARKET- AN EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE IN THE PUBLIC SECTOR BANKS <i>S. VASANTHA</i>	102
18.	SOFTWARE DEFECTS IDENTIFICATION, PREVENTIONS AND AMPLIFICATION IN SDLC PHASES <i>BHOJRAJ HANUMANT BARHATE</i>	114
19.	A STUDY ON TIME MANAGEMENT IN EMERGENCY DEPARTMENT THROUGH NETWORK ANALYSIS IN A CORPORATE HOSPITAL <i>DR. L. KALYAN VISWANATH REDDY & HENA CHOWKS</i>	118
20.	MAINTAINING CENTRALIZED BANK INFORMATION FOR GETTING QUICK ACCESS OF INFORMATION OF ALL OTHER ACCOUNTS USING DENORMALIZATION OF DATABASE CONCEPT OF COMPUTER <i>AMIT NIVARGIKAR & PRIYANKA JOSHI</i>	124
21.	DIGITAL OPPORTUNITIES IN NORTH INDIA: A STUDY ON DIGITAL OPPORTUNITY PARAMETERS AMONG NORTH INDIAN STATES <i>DEEP MALA SIHINT</i>	126
22.	BUSINESS ETHICS & GOVERNANCE <i>ARIF SULTAN, FATI SHAFAT & NEETU SINGH</i>	131
23.	EMPLOYEES' PERCEPTION ON TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT (A STUDY WITH REFERENCE TO EASTERN POWER DISTRIBUTION OF AP LIMITED) <i>DR. M. RAMESH</i>	134
24.	AN OPTIMAL BROKER-BASED ARCHITECTURE FOR TRANSACTIONAL AND QUALITY DRIVEN WEB SERVICES COMPOSITION <i>KAVYA JOHNY</i>	140
25.	WEB USAGE MINING: A BOON FOR WEB DESIGNERS <i>RITIKA ARORA</i>	148
	REQUEST FOR FEEDBACK	151

A Monthly Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International e-Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories

Indexed & Listed at: [Ulrich's Periodicals Directory](#) ©, [ProQuest, U.S.A.](#), [Index Copernicus Publishers Panel, Poland](#), [Open J-Gate, India](#),

[EBSCO Publishing, U.S.A.](#), as well as in [Cabell's Directories of Publishing Opportunities, U.S.A.](#)

Circulated all over the world & Google has verified that scholars of more than Hundred & Eighteen countries/territories are visiting our journal on regular basis.

Ground Floor, Building No. 1041-C-1, Devi Bhawan Bazar, JAGADHRI – 135 003, Yamunanagar, Haryana, INDIA

www.ijrcm.org.in

CHIEF PATRON

PROF. K. K. AGGARWAL

Chancellor, Lingaya's University, Delhi
Founder Vice-Chancellor, Guru Gobind Singh Indraprastha University, Delhi
Ex. Pro Vice-Chancellor, Guru Jambheshwar University, Hisar

PATRON

SH. RAM BHAJAN AGGARWAL

Ex. State Minister for Home & Tourism, Government of Haryana
Vice-President, Dadri Education Society, Charkhi Dadri
President, Chinar Syntex Ltd. (Textile Mills), Bhiwani

CO-ORDINATOR

MOHITA

Faculty, Yamuna Institute of Engineering & Technology, Village Gadholi, P. O. Gadholi, Yamunanagar

ADVISORS

DR. PRIYA RANJAN TRIVEDI

Chancellor, The Global Open University, Nagaland

PROF. M. S. SENAM RAJU

Director A. C. D., School of Management Studies, I.G.N.O.U., New Delhi

PROF. S. L. MAHANDRU

Principal (Retd.), Maharaja Agrasen College, Jagadhri

EDITOR

PROF. R. K. SHARMA

Professor, Bharti Vidyapeeth University Institute of Management & Research, New Delhi

CO-EDITOR

MOHITA

Faculty, Yamuna Institute of Engineering & Technology, Village Gadholi, P. O. Gadholi, Yamunanagar

EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

DR. RAJESH MODI

Faculty, Yanbu Industrial College, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

PROF. PARVEEN KUMAR

Director, M.C.A., Meerut Institute of Engineering & Technology, Meerut, U. P.

PROF. H. R. SHARMA

Director, Chhatrapati Shivaji Institute of Technology, Durg, C.G.

PROF. MANOHAR LAL

Director & Chairman, School of Information & Computer Sciences, I.G.N.O.U., New Delhi

PROF. ANIL K. SAINI

Chairperson (CRC), Guru Gobind Singh I. P. University, Delhi

PROF. R. K. CHOUDHARY

Director, Asia Pacific Institute of Information Technology, Panipat

DR. ASHWANI KUSH

Head, Computer Science, University College, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra

DR. BHARAT BHUSHAN

Head, Department of Computer Science & Applications, Guru Nanak Khalsa College, Yamunanagar

DR. VIJAYPAL SINGH DHAKA

Head, Department of Computer Applications, Institute of Management Studies, Noida, U.P.

DR. SAMBHAVNA

Faculty, I.I.T.M., Delhi

DR. MOHINDER CHAND

Associate Professor, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra

DR. MOHENDER KUMAR GUPTA

Associate Professor, P. J. L. N. Government College, Faridabad

DR. SAMBHAV GARG

Faculty, M. M. Institute of Management, Maharishi Markandeshwar University, Mullana

DR. SHIVAKUMAR DEENE

Asst. Professor, Government F. G. College Chitguppa, Bidar, Karnataka

DR. BHAVET

Faculty, M. M. Institute of Management, Maharishi Markandeshwar University, Mullana

ASSOCIATE EDITORS**PROF. ABHAY BANSAL**

Head, Department of Information Technology, Amity School of Engineering & Technology, Amity University, Noida

PROF. NAWAB ALI KHAN

Department of Commerce, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh, U.P.

DR. ASHOK KUMAR

Head, Department of Electronics, D. A. V. College (Lahore), Ambala City

ASHISH CHOPRA

Sr. Lecturer, Doon Valley Institute of Engineering & Technology, Karnal

SAKET BHARDWAJ

Lecturer, Haryana Engineering College, Jagadhri

TECHNICAL ADVISORS**AMITA**

Faculty, Government M. S., Mohali

MOHITA

Faculty, Yamuna Institute of Engineering & Technology, Village Gadholi, P. O. Gadholi, Yamunanagar

FINANCIAL ADVISORS**DICKIN GOYAL**

Advocate & Tax Adviser, Panchkula

NEENA

Investment Consultant, Chambaghat, Solan, Himachal Pradesh

LEGAL ADVISORS**JITENDER S. CHAHAL**

Advocate, Punjab & Haryana High Court, Chandigarh U.T.

CHANDER BHUSHAN SHARMA

Advocate & Consultant, District Courts, Yamunanagar at Jagadhri

SUPERINTENDENT**SURENDER KUMAR POONIA**

CALL FOR MANUSCRIPTS

We invite unpublished novel, original, empirical and high quality research work pertaining to recent developments & practices in the area of Computer, Business, Finance, Marketing, Human Resource Management, General Management, Banking, Insurance, Corporate Governance and emerging paradigms in allied subjects like Accounting Education; Accounting Information Systems; Accounting Theory & Practice; Auditing; Behavioral Accounting; Behavioral Economics; Corporate Finance; Cost Accounting; Econometrics; Economic Development; Economic History; Financial Institutions & Markets; Financial Services; Fiscal Policy; Government & Non Profit Accounting; Industrial Organization; International Economics & Trade; International Finance; Macro Economics; Micro Economics; Monetary Policy; Portfolio & Security Analysis; Public Policy Economics; Real Estate; Regional Economics; Tax Accounting; Advertising & Promotion Management; Business Education; Business Information Systems (MIS); Business Law, Public Responsibility & Ethics; Communication; Direct Marketing; E-Commerce; Global Business; Health Care Administration; Labor Relations & Human Resource Management; Marketing Research; Marketing Theory & Applications; Non-Profit Organizations; Office Administration/Management; Operations Research/Statistics; Organizational Behavior & Theory; Organizational Development; Production/Operations; Public Administration; Purchasing/Materials Management; Retailing; Sales/Selling; Services; Small Business Entrepreneurship; Strategic Management Policy; Technology/Innovation; Tourism, Hospitality & Leisure; Transportation/Physical Distribution; Algorithms; Artificial Intelligence; Compilers & Translation; Computer Aided Design (CAD); Computer Aided Manufacturing; Computer Graphics; Computer Organization & Architecture; Database Structures & Systems; Digital Logic; Discrete Structures; Internet; Management Information Systems; Modeling & Simulation; Multimedia; Neural Systems/Neural Networks; Numerical Analysis/Scientific Computing; Object Oriented Programming; Operating Systems; Programming Languages; Robotics; Symbolic & Formal Logic and Web Design. The above mentioned tracks are only indicative, and not exhaustive.

Anybody can submit the soft copy of his/her manuscript **anytime** in M.S. Word format after preparing the same as per our submission guidelines duly available on our website under the heading guidelines for submission, at the email addresses: 1 or info@ijrcm.org.in.

GUIDELINES FOR SUBMISSION OF MANUSCRIPT

1. COVERING LETTER FOR SUBMISSION:

DATED: _____

THE EDITOR

IJRCM

Subject: SUBMISSION OF MANUSCRIPT IN THE AREA OF

(e.g. Computer/IT/Engineering/Finance/Marketing/HRM/General Management/other, **please specify**).

DEAR SIR/MADAM

Please find my submission of manuscript titled '_____ ' for possible publication in your journals.

I hereby affirm that the contents of this manuscript are original. Furthermore, it has neither been published elsewhere in any language fully or partly, nor is it under review for publication anywhere.

I affirm that all author (s) have seen and agreed to the submitted version of the manuscript and their inclusion of name (s) as co-author (s).

Also, if my/our manuscript is accepted, I/We agree to comply with the formalities as given on the website of journal & you are free to publish our contribution in any of your journals.

NAME OF CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:

Designation:

Affiliation with full address, contact numbers & Pin Code:

Residential address with Pin Code:

Mobile Number (s):

Landline Number (s):

E-mail Address:

Alternate E-mail Address:

2. **MANUSCRIPT TITLE:** The title of the paper should be in a 12 point Calibri Font. It should be bold typed, centered and fully capitalised.

3. **AUTHOR NAME (S) & AFFILIATIONS:** The author (s) **full name, designation, affiliation (s), address, mobile/landline numbers, and email/alternate email address** should be in italic & 11-point Calibri Font. It must be centered underneath the title.

4. **ABSTRACT:** Abstract should be in fully italicized text, not exceeding 250 words. The abstract must be informative and explain the background, aims, methods, results & conclusion in a single para. Abbreviations must be mentioned in full.

5. **KEYWORDS:** Abstract must be followed by list of keywords, subject to the maximum of five. These should be arranged in alphabetic order separated by commas and full stops at the end.

6. **MANUSCRIPT:** Manuscript must be in **BRITISH ENGLISH** prepared on a standard A4 size **PORTRAIT SETTING PAPER**. It must be prepared on a single space and single column with 1" margin set for top, bottom, left and right. It should be typed in 8 point Calibri Font with page numbers at the bottom and centre of the every page. It should be free from grammatical, spelling and punctuation errors and must be thoroughly edited.
7. **HEADINGS:** All the headings should be in a 10 point Calibri Font. These must be bold-faced, aligned left and fully capitalised. Leave a blank line before each heading.
8. **SUB-HEADINGS:** All the sub-headings should be in a 8 point Calibri Font. These must be bold-faced, aligned left and fully capitalised.
9. **MAIN TEXT:** The main text should follow the following sequence:

INTRODUCTION

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

NEED/IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

OBJECTIVES

HYPOTHESES

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

RESULTS & DISCUSSION

FINDINGS

RECOMMENDATIONS/SUGGESTIONS

CONCLUSIONS

SCOPE FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

REFERENCES

APPENDIX/ANNEXURE

It should be in a 8 point Calibri Font, single spaced and justified. The manuscript should preferably not exceed 5000 words.

10. **FIGURES & TABLES:** These should be simple, centered, separately numbered & self explained, and **titles must be above the table/figure. Sources of data should be mentioned below the table/figure.** It should be ensured that the tables/figures are referred to from the main text.
11. **EQUATIONS:** These should be consecutively numbered in parentheses, horizontally centered with equation number placed at the right.
12. **REFERENCES:** The list of all references should be alphabetically arranged. The author (s) should mention only the actually utilised references in the preparation of manuscript and they are supposed to follow **Harvard Style of Referencing**. The author (s) are supposed to follow the references as per following:
 - All works cited in the text (including sources for tables and figures) should be listed alphabetically.
 - Use (ed.) for one editor, and (ed.s) for multiple editors.
 - When listing two or more works by one author, use --- (20xx), such as after Kohl (1997), use --- (2001), etc, in chronologically ascending order.
 - Indicate (opening and closing) page numbers for articles in journals and for chapters in books.
 - The title of books and journals should be in italics. Double quotation marks are used for titles of journal articles, book chapters, dissertations, reports, working papers, unpublished material, etc.
 - For titles in a language other than English, provide an English translation in parentheses.
 - The location of endnotes within the text should be indicated by superscript numbers.

PLEASE USE THE FOLLOWING FOR STYLE AND PUNCTUATION IN REFERENCES:

BOOKS

- Bowersox, Donald J., Closs, David J., (1996), "Logistical Management." Tata McGraw, Hill, New Delhi.
- Hunker, H.L. and A.J. Wright (1963), "Factors of Industrial Location in Ohio," Ohio State University.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO BOOKS

- Sharma T., Kwatra, G. (2008) Effectiveness of Social Advertising: A Study of Selected Campaigns, Corporate Social Responsibility, Edited by David Crowther & Nicholas Capaldi, Ashgate Research Companion to Corporate Social Responsibility, Chapter 15, pp 287-303.

JOURNAL AND OTHER ARTICLES

- Schemenner, R.W., Huber, J.C. and Cook, R.L. (1987), "Geographic Differences and the Location of New Manufacturing Facilities," Journal of Urban Economics, Vol. 21, No. 1, pp. 83-104.

CONFERENCE PAPERS

- Garg Sambhav (2011): "Business Ethics" Paper presented at the Annual International Conference for the All India Management Association, New Delhi, India, 19-22 June.

UNPUBLISHED DISSERTATIONS AND THESES

- Kumar S. (2011): "Customer Value: A Comparative Study of Rural and Urban Customers," Thesis, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra.

ONLINE RESOURCES

- Always indicate the date that the source was accessed, as online resources are frequently updated or removed.

WEBSITE

- Garg, Bhavet (2011): Towards a New Natural Gas Policy, Political Weekly, Viewed on December 17, 2011 <http://epw.in/user/viewabstract.jsp>

AN APPRAISAL OF SERVICE QUALITY MANAGEMENT IN MANAGEMENT EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS: A FACTOR ANALYSIS

DR. BHANWAR SINGH RAJPUROHIT
VICE CHANCELLOR
JAI NARAYAN VYAS UNIVERSITY
JODHPUR

DR. RAJ KUMAR SHARMA
PROFESSOR
BHARATI VIDYA PEETH UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE OF MANAGEMENT & RESEARCH
NEW DELHI

GOPAL SINGH LATWAL
RESEARCH SCHOLAR
JAI NARAYAN VYAS UNIVERSITY
JODHPUR

ABSTRACT

LPG (Liberalization, Privatization, and Globalization) has brought phenomenal transformation in all sectors of the economy especially service sector. Among Services, Education is one of the fastest growing industries. Education is a powerful instrument of social, economic and political change. Service quality is new area that interests the scholars, service providers, and researchers as service is different form of the product than that of the goods. All the economy of the world either developing or developed is basically dominated by the service sectors. This paper attempt to find out the Service Quality dimensions related to the Management Education Institution in Delhi which not only satisfy the students but also important for the service provider for the long time sustainability and success of the institutions. A comprehensive scale /questionnaire were designed to evaluate the service quality with respect to management education institutions. The questionnaire was pre tested and pilot test was carried out with the sample size of 52 students in the west Delhi from two institutes offering two year full time PGDM programme. The pilot test was analyzed using SPSS 17.0 for factor analysis. Twelve factors are derived through factor analysis that is categorized as the parameter of service quality. The Service quality is very important. There is general acceptance that quality is the most important for the customer satisfaction and provider competitive advantage in this competitive world of market.

KEYWORDS

Education, Perception, Service, Quality, Quality Dimensions.

INTRODUCTION

LPG (Liberalization, Privatization, and Globalization) has brought phenomenal transformation in all sectors of the economy. Service industry is growing very rapidly and Higher education is fast growing industry (Damme, 2001; O'Neil & Palmer, 2004). Service quality is new area that interests the scholars, service providers, and researchers as service is different form of the product than that of the goods. All the economy of the world either developing or developed is basically dominated by the service sectors.

The National Policy on Education, 1968 laid emphasis on education. Education has always been accorded an honoured place in the Indian society. The great leaders of Indian freedom movement realised the fundamental role of education and throughout the national struggle for independence stressed its unique significance for national development. The development of education in India during the post- Independence period has been guided by the national goals and aspirations as embodied in the Indian Constitution. Education being a powerful instrument of social, economic and political change, its broad principles and objectives are related to the long-term national goals, the programme of national development on which the country is engaged and the complex short term problems it is called upon to solve

Management education providers are now working hard towards understanding the needs, perceived and expected service quality of their stakeholders viz. primarily students, parents, employers, etc. In the cut throat competition and quality conscious's customers the survival of the service provider only depends upon the satisfaction of the students.

Hennig-Thurau et.al. 2001, has also emphasized that educational services 'fall into the field of services marketing'. So the most conceptual frameworks for measuring service quality are based on marketing concepts (Gummesson, 1991).

Service being intangible is not easy to assess. Service is the core of any product so it can not be simply ignored. Service quality promotes customer satisfaction, stimulate intention to return, encourage recommendation and bring business (Nadiri & Hussain, 2005). Management education system improve the service quality to have competitive advantage as customer satisfaction is the key to survival in the competitive world it increases profitability, market share and return on investment (Barsky & Labagh, 1992; Fornell, 1992; Hackl & Westlund, 2000; Halstead & Page, 1992; LeBlanc, 1992; Legohere, 1998; Stevens et. al, 1985).

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND MANAGEMENT EDUCATION IN INDIA

Management education in India is barely 60 years old. It began in the 1950s as a part-time education for practicing executives, and full-time management degree offered by a few universities. Later in 1961, the government of India established the Indian Institute of Management at Calcutta and Ahmadabad in collaboration with the Sloan School of management (MIT), the Ford Institute, and the Harvard Business School respectively. Soon several commerce departments in universities repacked their curriculum to offer an MBA degree. By 1990, 82 university based department and schools of management were functioning in the country. Another IIM was established at Banlgore in 1973, and later at Lucknow, Kozhikode, Indore and Shilong. As in, 2006-07 there were over 1100 business schools in the country. Of these, 5 were private aided institutions, 903 were private unaided and 149 were government aided (NKC Report 2003-09). As of now, the number of business schools has risen to approximately 1817 (www.aicte-india.org). To meet the growing demand of schools in the 11th five year plan of India proposed 7 new IIMs by the end of 2012. The three IIMs are operational from session 2010-11 at Ranchi, Raipur and Rohtak. Rest will come up in the cities/ states of Tiruchirapalli, Jammu and Kahsmir, Rajasthan and Utrtrakhand. (www.wikipedia.com)

Management education courses provide basic knowledge about management concepts and business structure and follow semester/tri-semester examination systems. This is followed by two year PG MBA/PGDM programme.

INDIAN BUSINESS/MANAGEMENT SCHOOLS ARE BROADLY CLASSIFIED AS:

1. Autonomous schools which are affiliated to Ministry of Human Resources Development (MHRD) and All India Council for Technical Education (AICTE) (Under Ministry of Human Resource Development) such as, Indian Institute of Management (Presently 10 IIMs), XLRI, etc. to create professional managers for the corporate world.
2. Management schools and department in universities come under purview of National University Education system. These departments are regulated and monitored by the University Grant Commission. Central universities are wholly funded by the UGC, while state universities are funded by the state government and may partly by the UGC.
3. University affiliated colleges are also guided substantially by the process and rules of the universities.
4. Private universities/Institutions which are sponsored by various societies/trusts/corporate bodies interested in promoting educational venture in the country are playing an increasing role in management education.

CHARACTERISTICS OF SERVICE

Service is different from the goods as there is nothing tangible to show when money is spent on them. **Berry** defines Services as “acts, deeds, and performance”. **(AMA) American Marketing Association** defines services as “activities, benefits, or satisfaction that are offered for sale, or provided in connection with the sale of goods.” This has identified two types of services viz. pure services and services provided along with the product. The characteristics of Services in the context of education are as follows:

1. INTANGIBILITY

Services are activities or performance executed by the providers. Services are intangible offerings which can't be touched, smelt, seen or tasted. In services, the performance is supported by a tangible element, but one should keep in mind that what is purchased by the customer is a performance (**Verma, 2008**). It is the process of delivering a service which comprises the product (**McLuhan, 1964**).

Customer considers tangible cues particularly before using or buying the services. So the service provider tangibilise the intangible services. In case of education institution, service provider tangibilise through infrastructures (building, campus, canteen, class rooms, promotional and communication materials, etc.)

2. INSEPARABILITY

Unlike goods, services are produced and consumed simultaneously. It tends to be performed in real time in which customer- provider's interaction and cooperation is a must. For instance, professor delivering lectures must need the presence (interaction) of students otherwise it is a waste.

Customer interaction with the service provider may be different types. In some case such as classroom lecture students need to be present during the entire course of service delivery. While in some cases (repair, etc.) contact may be in two stages that is at the beginning and end. But, where some media is used then it is reduced in case of online /distance education yet, mental presence of the customer is sought.

They help to create and improve service delivery through continuous feedback but for this we must have right customer mix.

3. INCONSISTENCY

Unlike goods, services suffer from lack of standardization. The customer experience services with the provider tend to vary though the service product remains the same. For example the two students find different experience from the same professor. This element of service makes a service buyer uncertain about what is in store for him even if the service bought is not for the first time.

In service humans are involved in both as service provider and service recipient and their performance can not be controlled as it is the most complex and dynamic element of the universe. The behaviors and knowledge of human aspects by the service provider helps in delivering the service and increases the customer satisfaction and profitability of the service provider. Customer involvement can be increased by giving more active role and greater flexibility in controlling the outcome.

4. PERISHABILITY

Services can not be stored like goods can be. Services go waste if they are not consumed along with creation so motivation, behavior, cooperation, customer mix, etc are very important area of concern. Services are available locally as it can not be transported like goods. Service must be the 'best the first time' as there is no other chance of correction if goes wrong the first time.

SERVICE MARKETING MIX

The traditional marketing mix comprises of 4 P's viz. Product, Price, Place and Promotion. Since the services are different from the goods. It has total seven P's (4 P's of marketing and 3 additional P's) that forms the service marketing mix. The Service marketing mix is as follows.

1. **PRODUCT:** A product is anything that can be offered to a market to satisfy a need or want. The products, which can be marketed, include physical goods, services, persons, places, organizations, and ideas.
2. **PRICE:** Monetary price implies the payment of certain sum by the customer, and the social price refers to the additional effort that the customer must make in order to obtain access to a product.
3. **PLACE:** It represents distribution. When, 'Where' and 'How' service is made available for the user. 'When' implies the time period in which information is provided. 'Where' indicates the location of the services provides and How constitutes the type of distribution
4. **PROMOTION:** It involves the communication that marketer engages in while the customers in order to acknowledge the product.
5. **PEOPLE:** All human actors who play a part in service delivery and thus the buyer's perception, namely, the firm's personnel, the customers, and other customer in the services environment. E.g., students and faculty, etc.
6. **PHYSICAL EVIDENCE:** The environment in which the service is delivered and where the firm and customer interest, and may tangible components that facilitate performance or communication of the services. E.g., brochures, letter head, business card, signage, equipment, mark sheet, etc.
7. **PROCESS:** The actual procedures, mechanism, and flow of activities by which the service is delivered – the service delivery and operating system.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

QUALITY: CONCEPTS

Quality is much debated term. Quality means different to different people. For 'relativists' it is like 'beauty', that lies in the eye of the beholder. Whereas, 'objectivists' believe quality can be specific attributes that can be identified. The word quality derived from Latin word 'qualitas' (property, quality, value, characteristic, features and ability) which refers to 'quails' meaning 'what kind of'. Quality with a variety of meaning and connotations, it has been referred to as 'slippery concept' (**Pfeffer and Coote, 1991**). Many authors (**Nigvekar, 1996; Warren et al, 1994; Sallis, 1996**) have referred to the highly cited words of **Pirsig (1974)**.

Quality..... you know what it is, yet you don't know what it is. But some things are better than others, that is, they have more quality. But when you try to say what the quality is, apart from the things that have it, it all goes pool! There's nothing to talk about it. But if you can't say what quality is, how do you know what it is, or how do you know that it even exists? If no one knows what it is, then for all practical purposes, it doesn't exist at all. But for all practical purposes it really does exist.... So round and round you go, spinning mental wheels and nowhere finding any place to get traction. What the hell is Quality? What is it?

QUALITY: DEFINITION

Quality has different meaning to different people. Some of the definition covering the broader aspects of quality is being discussed below.

The British Standard Institution (BSI) defines quality as “the totality of features and characteristics of a product or service that bear on its ability to satisfy stated or implied needs” (**BSI, 1991**).

Many scholars have defined quality in different ways:

Crosby (1979) defines quality as 'conformance to requirement'.

Juran and Gryna (1980) define quality as "Fitness for use".

Deming (1980) defines quality as "predictable degree of conformance to a standard" later they defined in terms of "customer focus".

Delmore & E Shaker (2002) defined quality "as the degree of excellence of entire educational experience".

Harvey and Green (1993) in their seminal work "Defining quality, assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education" have pointed out that quality is a relative concept. They have provided five discrete but interrelated notion of quality. As cited in **Watty (2003)** key aspects of each of these categories can be summarized as follows:

- i) **Exception:** distinctive, embodies in excellence, passing a minimum set of standards.
- ii) **Perfection or consistency:** zero defects, getting things right the first time (focus on process as opposed to inputs and outputs).
- iii) **Fitness for purpose:** relates quality to a purpose, defined by the provider.
- iv) **Value for money:** a focus on efficiency and effectiveness, measuring outputs against inputs. A populist notion of quality (government).
- v) **Transformation:** (in term of qualitative change); education is about doing something to the student as opposed to something for the consumer includes concepts of enhancing and empowering, democratisation of the process, not just outcomes.

These different notions of quality have lead **Reeves and Bedner (1994)** to conclude "The search for a universal definition of quality and a statement of law like relationship has been unsuccessful". According to **Gummesson (1990)** it might be useful to create an insight into the many dimensions that from a fuzzy entity referred to as quality through social consensus rather than defining it. **Garvin (1988)** classified the various definitions of quality into five major groups, viz. Transcendent definition, product-based definition, user-based definition, manufacturing-based, and value-based definitions.

Quality has a few central ideas around which the whole concept revolves: Quality as absolute, Quality as relative, Quality as a process, and Quality as culture.

According to **Mukhopadhyay (2005)**, the adherence to "product specification is actually the minimum conditions for quality, but not the sufficient condition".

QUALITY: IN HIGHER EDUCATION CONTEXT

There is a considerable debate about the best way to define service quality in higher Education (**Becket and Brookes, 2006**). The concept of quality is not well defined in higher education (**Cheng and Tam, 1997; Pounder, 1999**). Quality in Education has been defined variedly as, excellence in education (**Peters and Waterman, 1982**) fitness for purpose, fitness of educational outcome and experience for use (**Juran and Gryna, 1988**), "value addition in education" (**Feigenbaum, 1951**), conformance of education output to planned goals, specifications and requirements (**Crosby 1979**) defect avoidance in education process (**Crosby 1979**) and meeting or exceeding customer's expectation of education (**Parasuraman et. al., 1985**). (**Sahanye et. al., 2006**) in their research defined that quality in Education is a multiple concept which includes within its ambit the quality of inputs in the form of students, faculty, support staff and infrastructure; the quality of processes in the form of the learning and teaching activity; and the quality of outputs in the form of the enlightened students that move out of the system. In fact, it is all permeating covering all the aspects of academic life. **Allen and Davis (1991)** and **Holdford and Patkar (2003)** defined educational service quality as a student's overall evaluation of services received as part of their educational experience. Therefore, a single definition of education quality is not possible, rather, it would be more appropriate to define education quality based on the criteria that stakeholders used to judge quality, and also to consider the competing views when assessing the education quality (**Green, cited in Sahney et al., 2004**).

Barnett (1992) quotes a 'suggestive definition by **Barrow (1991)** to define 'quality' in higher education:

.... a high evaluation accorded to an educative process, where it has been demonstrated that, through the process, the students' educational development has been enhanced.... not only have they achieved the particular objectives set for the course but, in doing so, they have also fulfilled the general educational aims of autonomy of the ability to participate in reasoned discourse, of critical self evaluation, and of coming to a proper awareness of the ultimate contingency of all thought and action.

Watty (2003) suggests that the dimension of quality as perfection can be removed, since higher education does not aim to produce defect-free graduates.

Lomas (2001) suggests that fitness for purpose and transformation seem to be the two most appropriate definitions of quality, according to small-scale research with a sample of senior

Cheng (1995) argues, "Education quality is the character of the set of elements in the inputs, process and output of the education system that provides services that completely satisfy both internal and external strategic constituencies by meeting their explicit and implicit expectations". There is also an increasing expectation by students that they should have choices in terms of subjects, modes of delivery, methods of assessment and time spent on campus.

DIMENSIONS OF QUALITY

Service quality is an abstract and elusive construct because of three features unique to the service: intangible, heterogeneity and inseparability of production and consumption (**Parasuramn, Zeithaml and Berry, 1985**).

Among the various service quality models, the Service Quality Gap Model, also known as SERVQUAL model (**Parasuraman, Zeithaml, & Berry, 1985**) is the most commonly quoted service quality models. In their exploratory research which dates back to 1985 they revealed that the criteria used by customers in assessing service quality fit in ten, potentially overlapping dimensions viz. tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, competence, courtesy, credibility, security, access, communication and understanding the customer. The authors (**Parasuraman, Zeithaml, & Berry, 1988**) extended their research in 1988 and reduced the list to five attributes (**reliability, assurance, tangibles, responsiveness and empathy**) to form the basic structure of the well-know SERVQUAL, which is considered to be a useful tool to determining service quality. There are five key dimensions of the SERVQUAL model which can be used by consumers to evaluate perception of the perceived service quality. The five generic dimensions are:

- i) **Tangibles** the physical surroundings represented by the objects.
- ii) **Reliability** the service provider's ability to provide accurate and dependable services.
- iii) **Responsiveness** a firm's willingness to assist to customer by providing fast and efficient service performance.
- iv) **Assurance** diverse features that provide confidence to customers such as specific service knowledge; polite and trustworthy behavior from employees.
- v) **Empathy** service provider's readiness to provide each customer with personal service.

Generally there are eight dimensions or attributes which characterize quality of product or services for the use (**Garvin, 1987**) These are:

- i) **Performance** Concerned with the primary operating characteristics of a product.
- ii) **Reliability** can be considered as to what extent the knowledge gained is correct, and up-to-date.
- iii) **Durability** is the product's assumed life to perform satisfactorily. It can be defined as the depth of the learning.
- iv) **Aesthetics** concerned with the design, looks, color and presentation and how the customer views it.
- v) **Futures** are the characteristics that supplement the basic performance functions. Flexibility of course offering could be a future.
- vi) **Conformance** extent of meeting the established specification/ standard.
- vii) **Serviceability** concerned with the repair and field service of the product. In services it is concerned with handling of complaints from the service recipient and stakeholders.
- viii) **Perceive Quality** the experience of the service or the brand image of the service created in the mind of the customer through communication, word-of-mouth, etc.

In the study **The development of HEDPERF (F.Abdullah, 2006)** suggested the quality dimension related to the higher education as:

- i) **Access-** the factors consists of items that relate to such issues as approachability, ease of contact, availability and convenience.
- ii) **Reputation-** factors suggest the importance of higher learning institutions in projecting a professional image.
- iii) **Programme issue-** offering wide range and reputable academic programmes with flexible structure and syllabus.
- iv) **Understanding-** understanding students' specific need in terms of counseling, etc.

- v) **Academic Aspects**- factors responsible for the academics.
vi) **Non-academic Aspects**- enables students fulfill their study obligations and it relates to duties carried out by non- academic staff.

OBJECTIVE

The research attempts to draw a set of service quality parameters, drawn from students' (defined as customers) perceptions about service quality. These service quality parameters have been used in the context of Management Education Institution in Delhi & NCR.

The objectives of the study are as follow:

1. To measure service quality dimensions in Management Education Institution.
2. To validate the instrument to measure service quality in Management Education Institution
3. To measure the service quality perception of the students in Management Education Institution.

A statistical approach "Factor Analysis" will be used for the study.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Following research stages is used for this study

STAGE 1: IDENTIFICATION OF CRITICAL FACTORS OF SERVICE QUALITY

This involved in-depth searching of the literature to ascertain the determinants of service quality. A total 15 students from PGDM institutes in Delhi were selected to identify a series of relevant service quality evaluation criteria or critical factors.

STAGE 2: DEVELOPMENT OF RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

The literature review and focus group interview provided the basis for generating items for draft questionnaire. The draft questionnaire consisted of three sections A, B and C Section. Section A contained 70 items related to different aspects of management education institution's service quality. The items were presented randomly as statements on the questionnaire, with the same rating scale used throughout. The items were measured on a 5-point Likert-type scale that varied from 1= strongly disagree to 5= strongly agree. In addition to the main scale addressing individual items, respondents were asked in Section B to provide an overall rating of the quality services, satisfaction level and suggestion to improve the service quality. Whereas section C contained 9 questions pertaining to respondents profile. The developed questionnaire was of pre-tested on 30 respondents in order to check accuracy, rephrasing of questions, and eliminating items that fails to measure the any variation. The cronbach's alpha value for reliability of 70 items was 0.877. After making the necessary changes (rephrasing and deletion) 43 items were retained for the final instrument with the cronbach's alpha value for reliability was 0.909, which is excellent (Nunnally, 1978).

STAGE 3: PILOT TESTING

The draft questionnaire was eventually subjected to pilot testing with a total of 52 representative students drawn from management education institutions in Delhi, and subsequently submitted to experts (academician, practitioners) for feedback. They were asked to comment on any perceived ambiguities, omissions or errors concerning the draft questionnaire, and consequently changes were made accordingly.

SPSS 17.0 for windows was employed in order to access the particular results required for the scale measurement.

DATA ANALYSIS

Multivariate normal distribution can serve as an approximate sampling distribution for many statistics, namely, factor analysis, which was used extensively in this study.

THE SAMPLE

Demographic profile of the respondents in **Table 2** shows that 44.20 % of the respondents were males. As for the age distribution, the majority of respondents fall between the age group below 23 years (61.50 %). With the respect to the semester 57.7 % respondents were from II-semester. 34.60 % students are having Human Resource Management and Finance as a major specialization respectively and 30.8 % has marketing as a major specialization. As for annual house hold income majority or respondent belong to below 10 lakh (88.50 %). Majority of respondent (78.80 %) paid fee from themselves/ parents, while 21.20 % respondent had availed education loan for the same. About 53.80 % respondents had percentage marks in previous semester/ qualifying exams were 60.75 %. Since, the pilot study is carried out in west Delhi so 100 % respondents belong to west zone only. In terms of student status majority 76.90 % of respondent were traditional student means that there were no education gap after the graduation.

RELIABILITY ANALYSIS

In this study, two internal consistency estimates of reliability, namely, coefficient alpha and split-half coefficient expressed as Spearman-Brown corrected correlation were computed for the service quality constructs. An alpha value of 0.7 and above is considered to be the criteria for demonstrating internal consistency of new scales and established scales respectively (Nunnally). For the split-half coefficient, each construct was split into two halves such that the two halves would be as equivalent as possible, and Cronbach's study in 1943 (cited in Wagner *et. al.*) stated that '....the split yielding the highest correlation ordinarily gives the most nearly comparable halves'. The values of both coefficient alpha and split-half coefficient for all the construct or factors are shown in **Table 1** All the values meet the required prerequisites, thereby demonstrating that all the construct or factors are internally consistent.

TABLE 1: RELIABILITY FOR THE SERVICE QUALITY CONSTRUCTS

Dimensions	Cronbach alpha (α)	Split-half coefficient (r)
42	0.909	0.900

FACTOR ANALYSIS

Factor analysis was used to identify the dimensional structure of service quality within management education sector. One critical assumption underlying the appropriateness of factor analysis is to ensure that the data matrix has sufficient correlations to justify the application (Hair *et al.*,). A first step is visual examination of the correlations, identifying those that are statistically significant. Inspection of the correlation matrix reveals that practically all correlations are significant at $P = 0.01$, (**Table 4**) and this certainly provides an excellent basis for factor analysis.

The next step involves assessing the overall significance of the correlation matrix with Bartlett test of sphericity (**Table 3**), which provides the statistical probability that the correlation matrix has significant correlation among at least some of the variable. The results were significant $\chi^2 (42, n=52) = 1351.22 (P = 0.00)$, a clear indication of suitability for factor analysis. Finally, Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy was computed to quantify the degree of inter-correlations among the variables, and the results indicate an index of 0.551, a 'adequate' sign of adequacy for factor analysis (Kaiser, 1970) since the sample size is very small.

All the 42 items from section A of the questionnaire were subjected to a factor analysis utilizing the principal components procedure, which was followed by a varimax rotation (**Table 7**). The decision to include a variable in a factor was based on factor whose eigen values was greater than 1.0 were retained in the factor solution (Tabachnick and Fidell). The choice regarding factor loading greater than ± 0.5 was not based on any mathematical proposition but relates more to practical significance. According to Hair *et.al.* factor loading of 0.5 and above are considered significant at $P = 0.05$ with a sample size of 50 respondent. From **Table 5**, twelve factors were extracted which is named as under.

The first factor (eigenvalue= 10.250) was labeled **Reputation** for 8.63 % of the covariance. The four items defining this factor, with loading ranging from 0.798 to 0.527 includes good teacher-student relationship, willingness to help, availability of faculties, etc.

The Second factor (eigenvalue= 3.198) was labeled **Performance** for 7.78 % of the covariance. The three items defining this factor with loading ranging from 0.777 to 0.595 includes course curriculum and the reorganization of intellectual efforts.

The third factor (eigenvalue= 2.805) was labeled **Futures** for 7.46 % of the covariance. The four items defining this factor with loading ranging from 0.733 to 0.509 includes electives, industrial interaction platform, quality of guest lectures and promotional material.

The fourth factor (eigenvalue= 2.399) was labeled **Assurance** for 6.72 % of the covariance. The two items defining this factor with loading ranging from 0.760 to 0.620 it includes feedback and inculcation of interest.

The fifth factor (eigenvalue= 2.15) was labeled **Understanding** for 6.52 % of the covariance. The two items defining this factor with loading ranging from 0.845 to 0.673 includes summer training and complain handling within time frame.

The sixth factor (eigenvalue= 1.873) was labeled **Reliability** for 5.73 % of the covariance. The two items defining this factor with loading ranging from 0.835 to 0.708 includes knowledgeable faculties, and attitude of director.

The seventh factor (eigenvalue= 1.81) was labeled **Support Service** for 5.71 % of the covariance. The four items defining this factor with loading ranging from 0.641 to 0.590 includes usage of teaching methods, individual attention.

The eighth factor (eigenvalue= 1.765) was labeled **Durability** for 5.70 % of the covariance. The two items defining this factor loading ranging from 0.717 to 0.700 includes course curriculum and theory related to business realities.

The ninth factor (eigenvalue= 1.460) was labeled **Responsiveness** (prompt service) for 5.65 % of the covariance. There is only one item with loading 0.798

The tenth factor (eigenvalue= 1.402) was labeled **Conformance** for 5.46 % of the covariance. The three items defining this factor loading ranging from 0.782 to 0.582 includes meeting schedule deadlines, economic value by the course, motivation to attend conferences.

The eleventh factor (eigenvalue= 1.273) was labeled **Dark Sides** for 5.15 % of the covariance. The two items defining this factor loading ranging from -0.727 to 0.662 includes faculties taking revenge and feel secure and confident in the institute.

The twelfth factor (eigenvalue= 1.202) was labeled **Suitable Environment** for 4.65 % of the covariance. There is only one item with loading 0.789.

CONCLUSION

The study was focused on the students of (PGDM) Post Graduate Diploma in Management to measure the perception towards the service quality being offered to them by the institutions. Management Education is highly demanding course and institutions are feeling pressure from various customers group namely students, parents, and the industry. The liberalization in education policy and private partnership programme to make the nation educated society is posing greatest challenge for the sustainability of the institutions.

This is pure service industry where quality, customer service is the key to success. The paper attempted to evaluate the SERVQUAL model and designed a comprehensive scale /questionnaire in order to evaluate the service quality with respect to management education institutions. Nine factors has been evolved about as important criteria of service quality in context of management education. The pre test and pilot test reveal the important aspect of service quality that must be addressed by the institutions.

The pilot study is limited to small sample size and area. Further research may examine which of the factors discriminate most significantly among the institutions from the perspective of different customer group viz. parents, owner, employer and various governing authorities.

REFERENCES

1. Abdullah. F. (2006), "The Development of HEDPEFR: A new measuring instrument of service quality for the higher education sector", *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, Vo. 30, no. 6, pp 569-581
2. Allen, J. and D. Davis, (1991)., "Searching for excellence in marketing education: The relationship between service quality and three out-come variables." *Journal of Marketing Education*, 13: 47-55.
3. Becket, N. and M. Brookes, (2006)., "Evaluating quality management in university departments." *Quality Assurance in Education*, 14: 123-142.
4. Barnett, R. (1992), "Improving Higher Education: Total Quality Care", Buckingham: SRHE & OU.
5. BSI(1991), "Quality Vocabulary Part 2: Quality concepts and Related Definitions," London: BSI
6. Cheng, Y.C. (1995), "School education quality: Conceptualization, monitoring and enhancement", in Siu P.K. and Tarn T.K. (Eds.), *Quality in education insights from different perspectives*, Hong Kong Education Research Association, Hong Kong, pp.123-47
7. Cronin, Jr. J.J. and S.A. Taylor, (1992)., "Measuring service quality: A reexamination and extension.", *Journal of Marketing*, 56: 55-68.
8. Crosby, P.B. (1979), "Quality is Free", McGraw-Hill, NewYork.
9. Garvin, D.A. (1987)., "Competing on the eight dimensions of quality", *Harvard Business Review*, Vol.65, No.6, 101-109.
10. Hair, J.F., R.L. Tatham, R.E. Anderson and W. Black, (1998)., "Multivariate Data Analysis." 5th Edn., Prentice Hall International, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, London, ISBN-13: 978-0138948580, pp: 169-215.
11. Harvey, L. & Green. D (1993), "Defining Quality", *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, Vol.18, No.1,9-34
12. Hill, Y., L. Lomas and J. MacGregor, (2003)., "Students' perceptions of quality in higher education." *Quality Assurance in Education*, 11: 15-20.
13. Holdford, D. and A. Patkar, (2003)., "Identification of the service quality dimensions of pharmaceutical education." *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, Vol. 67, No. 4.
14. Juran, J.M. and F.M. Jr. Gryna, (1988)., "Juran's Quality Control Handbook." 4th Edn., McGraw-Hill, New York, ISBN-10: 0070331766, pp: 1808., In De.S.K., Sinha.G and Jain. R, "Service Quality in Higher Education: An Exploratory Study," <http://www.scialert.net/abstract/?doi=ajm.2010.144.154>, assessed on 20 March 2011.
15. NAAC (2006)., "Quality Assurance in Higher Education: An Introduction," Bangalore: NAAC.
16. National Knowledge Commission Report 2003-09
17. Nadiri.H, Kandampully.J. and Hussain K(2009). "Students' Perception of Service Quality in Higher Education", *Total Quality Management*, Vol.20,No.5.
18. Nunnally, J. and I. Bernstein, (1994)., "Psychometric Theory." 3rd Edn., McGraw-Hill, New York, ISBN-10: 007047849X.
19. Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V.A., and Berry, L.L. (1985). "A conceptual model of service quality and its implications for future research", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 49, No. 4, Autumn, 41-50.
20. Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V.A., and Berry, L.L. (1988). "SERVQUAL: a multiple-item scale for measuring consumer perceptions of service quality", *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 64, No.1, Spring, 12-40.
21. Pfeffer, N. and Coote, A. (1991), *Is Quality Good for You? A Critical Review of Quality Assurance in the Welfare Services*, London, Institute of Public Policy Research.
22. Peters, T.J. and R.H. Waterman, (1982)., "Search of Excellence." 1st Edn., Harper and Row, New York, USA., ISBN: 0060150424. In De.S.K., Sinha.G and Jain. R, "Service Quality in Higher Education: An Exploratory Study," <http://www.scialert.net/abstract/?doi=ajm.2010.144.154>, assessed on 20 March 2011.
23. Pirsig, R.M. (1974), "Zen and The Art of Motorcycle Maintenance", New York:Vintage.
24. Pounder, J. (1999). "Institutional performance in higher education: is quality a relevant concept", *Quality Assurance in Education*, Vol. 7, No.3, 14-22.
25. Tandon B.B., Angrish. A. K. (2006), "Management Education in India is Crying for Reforms", *University News*, 2006, Vol. 44, No.31, July-August 31-06, 6-12.
26. Verma, H.V.(2008), *Service Marketing, Text & Cases*, 3rd Ed., Pearson Education, pp. 267-303.
27. Watty, K. (2003), "When will Academics Learn about Quality?", *Quality in Higher Education*, Vol. 9, No. 3

WEB LINKS

1. <http://www.aicte-india.org>
2. http://www.doccentre.net/docsweb/Education/Scanned_material/New_Folder/edupolicy_n00.34.pdf
3. <http://www.latinwordlist.com>

4. <http://www.nacc-india.org>
5. [http://www.wikipedia.com.\(http://www.education.nic.in/cd50years/g/u/9F/0U9F0201.htm\)](http://www.wikipedia.com.(http://www.education.nic.in/cd50years/g/u/9F/0U9F0201.htm))

APPENDIX

TABLE 2: DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF THE RESPONDENTS

Demographic Factors	Number of Respondents	Percentage
GENDER		
Male	23	44.20%
Female	29	55.80%
Total	52	100%
AGE		
Below 23	32	61.50%
Over 23	20	38.50%
Total	52	100%
SEMESTER		
II-Semester	30	57.70%
IV-Semester	22	42.30%
Total	52	100%
SPECIALIZATION		
Marketing	16	30.80%
HRM	18	34.60%
Finance	18	34.60%
Total	52	100%
INCOME (Rs.)		
Below 10 Lakh	46	88.50%
Over 10 Lakh	6	11.50%
Total	52	100%
ZONE		
West	52	100.00%
Total	52	100%
MODE OF FINANCE		
Self/ Parents	41	78.80%
Bank	11	21.20%
Total	52	100%
MARKS %		
Below 60 %	7	13.50%
60- 75 %	28	53.80%
75-80 %	17	32.70%
Total	52	100%
STUDENT'S STATUS		
Traditional	40	76.90%
Non-Traditional	12	23.10%
Total	52	100%

TABLE 3: KMO AND BARTLETT'S TEST

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.	.551
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	1351.217
Approx. Chi-Square	861
Df	.000
Sig.	

TABLE 4 : COMMUNALITIES

Variables	Initial	Extraction
V_1	1.000	.736
V_2	1.000	.705
V_3	1.000	.774
V_4	1.000	.784
V_5	1.000	.685
V_6	1.000	.768
V_7	1.000	.724
V_8	1.000	.847
V_9	1.000	.726
V_10	1.000	.653
V_11	1.000	.803
V_12	1.000	.724
V_13	1.000	.847
V_14	1.000	.801
V_15	1.000	.725
V_16	1.000	.671
V_17	1.000	.725
V_18	1.000	.733
V_19	1.000	.743
V_20	1.000	.798
V_21	1.000	.751
V_22	1.000	.733
V_23	1.000	.792
V_24	1.000	.724
V_25	1.000	.750
V_26	1.000	.737
V_27	1.000	.707
V_28	1.000	.838
V_29	1.000	.637
V_30	1.000	.767
V_31	1.000	.858
V_32	1.000	.812
V_33	1.000	.736
V_34	1.000	.697
V_35	1.000	.834
V_36	1.000	.769
V_37	1.000	.787
V_38	1.000	.759
V_39	1.000	.724
V_40	1.000	.833
V_41	1.000	.727
V_42	1.000	.638

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

TABLE 5: 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	10.250	24.404	24.404	10.250	24.404	24.404	3.625	8.631	8.631
2	3.198	7.614	32.018	3.198	7.614	32.018	3.267	7.778	16.409
3	2.805	6.679	38.697	2.805	6.679	38.697	3.134	7.461	23.871
4	2.399	5.711	44.408	2.399	5.711	44.408	2.840	6.762	30.633
5	2.145	5.107	49.514	2.145	5.107	49.514	2.738	6.519	37.152
6	1.873	4.460	53.975	1.873	4.460	53.975	2.405	5.725	42.878
7	1.810	4.309	58.283	1.810	4.309	58.283	2.397	5.706	48.584
8	1.765	4.202	62.485	1.765	4.202	62.485	2.393	5.699	54.282
9	1.460	3.477	65.962	1.460	3.477	65.962	2.374	5.652	59.934
10	1.402	3.339	69.301	1.402	3.339	69.301	2.293	5.459	65.393
11	1.273	3.030	72.331	1.273	3.030	72.331	2.163	5.151	70.544
12	1.202	2.863	75.194	1.202	2.863	75.194	1.953	4.650	75.194
13	.949	2.259	77.453						
14	.862	2.052	79.505						
15	.799	1.902	81.407						
16	.784	1.866	83.273						
17	.739	1.760	85.033						
18	.671	1.598	86.630						
19	.607	1.445	88.076						
20	.571	1.359	89.435						
21	.530	1.262	90.697						
22	.484	1.153	91.850						
23	.425	1.011	92.861						
24	.401	.954	93.815						
25	.350	.834	94.649						
26	.301	.718	95.367						
27	.297	.707	96.074						
28	.268	.638	96.712						
29	.224	.534	97.245						
30	.197	.468	97.713						
31	.176	.420	98.133						
32	.160	.382	98.515						
33	.136	.324	98.839						
34	.094	.224	99.063						
35	.086	.205	99.267						
36	.081	.193	99.460						
37	.063	.149	99.609						
38	.049	.118	99.727						
39	.037	.088	99.815						
40	.033	.078	99.892						
41	.026	.061	99.953						
42	.020	.047	100.000						

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

TABLE 6: COMPONENT MATRIX^a

	Component											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
V_1	.400	.233	.065	-.488	-.048	.277	-.240	.345	.030	-.130	.064	.036
V_2	.400	-.012	-.294	-.133	.206	-.293	-.441	-.112	-.135	-.007	-.294	-.033
V_3	.409	.116	-.100	.449	.208	-.002	-.151	.149	.106	-.420	.235	.224
V_4	.768	-.116	-.215	.000	.142	.226	-.092	-.057	.101	.157	-.058	.119
V_5	.343	-.486	-.074	.088	-.165	.069	.212	-.289	.174	-.155	.000	.321
V_6	.420	.486	-.308	-.313	.093	.187	-.023	-.086	.087	-.232	.201	-.095
V_7	.373	-.048	-.051	-.104	-.155	-.650	-.039	.266	.152	.080	-.130	.065
V_8	.630	.011	-.383	.049	-.243	.189	.257	.055	-.142	.231	.183	.175
V_9	.561	-.158	-.379	-.114	-.150	.281	.264	.011	.095	-.044	-.081	.201
V_10	-.382	.063	.052	.407	.189	.168	-.031	-.040	.492	.127	.028	-.096
V_11	.341	-.373	.069	-.395	.450	-.233	-.052	-.118	-.073	-.012	.305	.119
V_12	.325	-.370	-.180	-.219	.301	-.329	.274	-.120	.331	-.036	.039	-.010
V_13	.350	-.021	.256	-.232	-.181	.149	.414	-.336	-.080	-.286	-.041	-.419
V_14	.244	-.001	.691	-.052	.025	.194	.144	.374	.111	.218	.019	-.043
V_15	.440	.033	.024	.079	.429	-.277	.343	.244	-.094	-.064	.232	-.139
V_16	-.047	.453	.472	-.086	.254	.084	.109	-.100	-.225	.237	.019	.180
V_17	.427	-.034	.223	-.005	-.192	-.251	-.022	-.508	-.174	.105	.073	.294
V_18	.580	-.376	.138	-.128	-.207	.042	.021	.069	-.273	.283	.037	-.118
V_19	.416	.304	.451	.094	-.215	-.197	.249	.221	.206	-.048	.154	.026
V_20	.533	-.054	-.001	.571	-.004	-.165	-.035	.067	-.134	-.200	.303	-.043
V_21	.422	-.222	.203	.624	-.114	.193	-.075	.003	-.022	.004	-.131	-.140
V_22	.358	.642	.218	-.153	.006	.057	-.109	-.184	-.144	-.088	.032	-.207
V_23	.427	.412	-.054	.243	.283	-.223	.389	.079	-.253	-.034	-.134	.083
V_24	.479	.438	-.291	.054	-.123	-.184	.175	.118	.204	.261	-.102	.036
V_25	.520	.465	-.200	-.188	-.096	-.011	.128	.110	.105	.331	-.049	.164
V_26	.449	-.324	-.127	-.172	.300	.259	-.117	.312	.147	.233	-.110	-.170
V_27	.391	-.371	-.220	-.202	.156	.297	.122	.368	-.080	-.235	.047	-.013
V_28	.446	-.203	-.020	.159	.500	.111	.427	-.156	-.147	-.010	-.223	-.181
V_29	.636	-.221	.096	-.024	-.283	-.091	.006	-.036	.150	-.181	-.153	-.069
V_30	.537	.045	.026	.202	.162	.156	-.082	.020	-.067	-.011	-.601	.104
V_31	.450	.582	-.313	.077	.273	.119	-.147	-.170	-.070	-.229	-.128	.003
V_32	.687	-.057	-.137	.143	-.405	-.093	-.136	-.092	.047	-.047	-.006	-.304
V_33	.318	.064	.493	-.154	.360	-.066	-.249	-.031	.400	-.079	-.031	.000
V_34	.653	-.066	.011	-.082	-.144	-.166	-.355	.043	-.086	-.040	-.011	-.271
V_35	.446	-.330	.283	.135	.259	.190	-.386	-.074	-.269	.146	.191	.199
V_36	.587	-.076	.371	-.221	.048	-.183	-.018	-.235	.231	-.109	-.226	.157
V_37	.670	.105	.212	.399	.012	.136	-.065	-.047	.282	.123	.046	-.042
V_38	.474	-.069	.305	.048	-.129	-.171	.006	.417	-.360	-.149	-.209	.137
V_39	.695	.087	-.272	.097	-.120	-.078	-.243	.124	.021	.057	.227	.009
V_40	.587	-.036	-.135	.043	.159	-.109	-.021	-.259	-.032	.439	.192	-.363
V_41	.680	-.021	.263	-.270	-.213	.163	.068	.000	.027	-.198	.068	.021
V_42	.598	.165	.136	-.032	-.100	.278	-.022	-.304	.044	.075	.105	.186

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. 12 components extracted.

TABLE 7: ROTATED COMPONENT MATRIX^A

	Component											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
V_1	.042	.157	.509	-.019	.255	.001	.121	.447	.068	-.290	.285	.008
V_2	.284	.162	.158	-.147	-.458	.038	.377	.066	.173	.013	.230	.332
V_3	.032	.054	.167	.104	-.002	.835	.084	.090	.037	.043	-.038	.121
V_4	.263	.376	.183	.355	-.039	.141	.166	.342	.388	.117	-.025	.289
V_5	.112	-.024	-.204	.760	-.059	.127	.140	.015	.094	.039	.010	.048
V_6	.061	.285	.765	.096	-.111	.116	.070	.194	-.057	.050	-.008	-.123
V_7	.308	.425	-.239	-.076	.041	.104	.465	-.046	-.179	-.029	.349	.010
V_8	.211	.595	.087	.434	-.020	.135	-.281	.201	.235	.155	.177	-.062
V_9	.118	.368	.110	.620	-.077	.040	-.050	.371	.007	.086	.111	.113
V_10	-.141	-.089	-.178	-.150	.091	.103	-.045	-.047	-.111	-.065	-.727	.054
V_11	-.032	-.088	.033	.119	-.090	.031	.590	.197	.443	.255	.230	-.263
V_12	.092	.131	-.144	.309	-.136	-.014	.598	.194	-.052	.373	-.048	-.156
V_13	.349	-.247	.398	.400	.263	-.274	-.024	-.067	-.156	.391	.127	-.052
V_14	.005	.002	-.044	-.070	.845	-.074	.067	.166	.169	.046	.047	.095
V_15	.046	.183	.047	-.104	.178	.339	.225	.166	.032	.637	.163	-.134
V_16	-.412	.062	.275	-.219	.373	-.142	-.027	-.315	.287	.143	.049	.097
V_17	.189	.125	.071	.373	.026	.012	.202	-.516	.398	.032	.247	.033
V_18	.471	.124	-.117	.213	.215	-.156	-.020	.202	.417	.142	.362	.017
V_19	.167	.271	.121	.065	.673	.256	.136	-.196	-.150	.068	.127	-.063
V_20	.404	.059	-.028	.085	.075	.708	-.073	-.078	.168	.260	.090	.015
V_21	.461	-.097	-.176	.170	.244	.336	-.219	-.002	.196	.129	-.127	.422
V_22	.158	.121	.733	-.167	.208	-.007	.003	-.234	.068	.076	.098	.096
V_23	-.104	.397	.190	-.056	.077	.301	-.020	-.161	-.068	.582	.228	.257
V_24	.182	.776	.164	.024	.053	.084	.045	-.038	-.151	.110	-.017	.114
V_25	.041	.777	.312	.073	.130	-.052	.047	.048	.046	.018	.093	.084
V_26	.211	.156	-.038	.007	.068	-.082	.201	.700	.263	.124	-.063	.192
V_27	.052	-.037	.038	.268	-.004	.139	.012	.717	.042	.172	.255	-.002
V_28	.051	-.029	.034	.226	.001	.013	.076	.189	.143	.782	-.040	.326
V_29	.527	.076	.046	.407	.176	.094	.242	.072	-.050	.010	.210	.188
V_30	.127	.163	.108	.131	.041	.096	.065	.119	.099	.149	.107	.789
V_31	.019	.281	.686	-.035	-.256	.302	.012	-.007	.007	.164	-.034	.348
V_32	.798	.226	.150	.238	.003	.159	.002	.008	.016	.014	.105	.094
V_33	.037	-.107	.243	-.072	.389	.094	.641	.040	.158	-.040	-.159	.188
V_34	.659	.108	.208	-.030	.019	.118	.219	.126	.186	-.024	.282	.115
V_35	.122	-.162	-.019	.078	.108	.250	.110	.125	.798	.008	.121	.181
V_36	.191	.050	.177	.353	.272	-.028	.604	-.119	.112	.046	.162	.285
V_37	.391	.261	.143	.186	.386	.353	.085	-.014	.253	.105	-.267	.291
V_38	.170	.055	-.085	-.007	.343	.238	.029	.076	.040	.071	.662	.306
V_39	.457	.455	.196	.084	-.055	.392	.071	.171	.231	-.047	.128	-.013
V_40	.524	.341	.127	-.016	-.065	-.068	.134	.020	.446	.413	-.153	-.071
V_41	.304	.063	.369	.426	.393	.045	.161	.154	.115	-.002	.306	.034
V_42	.157	.232	.408	.419	.213	.070	.027	-.085	.376	-.020	-.019	.134

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

a. Rotation converged in 22 iterations.

TABLE 8: FACTORS

Factor 1: Reputation	
V_29	Faculties are available regularly for students' consultation
V_32	There is good Teacher-Student relation at your institute.
V_34	Staffs in your institute are willing to help you.
Factor 2: Performance	
V_8	Faculties at your institute appreciate/ recognize intellectual efforts.
V_24	The course provides primary knowledge required by you.
V_25	Course and curriculum of your institute stimulate you intellectually.
Factor 3: Futures	
V_1	Informational/ promotional material associated with the service provided by your institute such as pamphlets, brochures, flyers, etc., are visually appealing.
V_6	Your institute arranges for high quality visiting faculty / guest lectures.
V_22	You are free to opt for electives in your Institutes.
V_31	Your institute Provide Platform for Industrial interaction.
Factor 4: Assurance	
V_5	Your institute has faculties who can inculcate interest in the subject among students.
V_9	Faculties at your institute encourage feed back in the class.
Factor 5: Understanding	
V_14	Summer training is well planned and managed at your institute.
V_19	Your complaints are constructively handled within a reasonable time frame at your institute.
Factor 6: Reliability	
V_3	Faculties at your institute are knowledgeable.
V_20	The attitude of your institute's Director is positive and helpful.
Factor 7: Support Service	
V_11	Faculties at your institute use modern teaching methods viz. Case Study, Role play, Simulation.
V_12	The faculty provides the chance to develop students' abilities and preparing them for their career. (i.e., students activities and students society-Co-curriculum).
V_33	When the institute promises to do something by certain time, it does so.
V_36	Your institute gives individual attention.
Factor 8: Durability	
V_26	Course and curriculum of your institute help shape the requisite professional skills.
V_27	Theory taught in courses is related with business reality.
Factor 9: Responsiveness	
V_35	Academic staff provides prompt services.
Factor 10: Conformance	
V_15	Your institute motivates you to participate in conferences (national / international).
V_23	Courses provide extended economic knowledge to make you employable.
V_28	Your institute meets scheduled deadlines for classes, examination and result posting, etc.
Factor 11: Dark Side	
V_10	Faculties at your institute tend to take revenge on students.
V_38	You feel secure and confident in your institute.
Factor 12: Suitable Environment	
V_30	Faculties at your institute create a challenging supportive and learning environment.

REQUEST FOR FEEDBACK

Dear Readers

At the very outset, International Journal of Research in Computer Application and Management (IJRCM) acknowledges & appreciates your efforts in showing interest in our present issue under your kind perusal.

I would like to request you to supply your critical comments and suggestions about the material published in this issue as well as on the journal as a whole, on our E-mails i.e. **infoijrcm@gmail.com** or **info@ijrcm.org.in** for further improvements in the interest of research.

If you have any queries please feel free to contact us on our E-mail **infoijrcm@gmail.com**.

I am sure that your feedback and deliberations would make future issues better – a result of our joint effort.

Looking forward an appropriate consideration.

With sincere regards

Thanking you profoundly

Academically yours

Sd/-

Co-ordinator