International Journal of Environmental Sciences
ISSN: 2229-7359
Vol. 11 No. 22s, 2025
https://www.theaspd.com/ijes.php

Service Failures To Service Quality: Evidence From The Education Sector

Dr. J. Krithika[1], Dr. P. Priyadarsini[2], M. Kamatchi[3], Dr. ShynaK .S[4], P. Pooja[5], Ms. Arul Thava Mary A[6]
[1]Associate Professor, RV Institute of Management, Bangalore(corresponding author)
[2]Professor& Head, Tagore Engineering College, Chennai
[3]Assistant Professor, Tagore Engineering College, Chennai
[4]Assistant Professor, School of Commerce, Accounting and Finance, Kristu Jayanti (Deemed to be University), Bangalore
[5]IIMBA student, Christ University, Bangalore
[6]Senior Faculty Associate, Xavier Institute of Management and Entrepreneurship, Chennai.

Abstract:
When Quality is a universally accepted phenomenon, it becomes mandatory for educational sector too. The popular model to check the quality dimensions of the service sector is the SERVQUAL model, a widely used tool in service quality management. As this model is designed for the service sector, this model can be effectively applied to the educational sector. The major objectives of this study is to understand the level of perception for each SERVQUAL item among B-school students and to assess the perceived service failures in B schools. The respondents, who are the primary beneficiaries of this research, were 248 students pursuing an MBA or PGDBM in Bangalore. The t-test and the Analysis of Variance test were applied to compare the means in different sample groups. The results of this study indicated that the service failure items significantly predicted the overall SERVQUAL. Staff Unavailability and Poor classroom structure, Lack of qualified staff, Lack of efficient and friendly services, poor fee structure, Lack of adequate information, Lack of Time management and long travel hours were negatively correlated.
Keywords*: SERVQUAL model, B schools, MBA, PGDBM and Respondents.*

INTRODUCTION:

The globalized India has big opportunities and challenges in recent days of rapid changes. Hence to harness this opportunities, future managers must posses superior qualities to cope with these challenges and utilise opportunities. When Quality is a universally accepted phenomenon, it becomes mandatory for education. In Indian minds, quality consciousness has become a dominant factor, especially while receiving services as customers. India faced a terrific development in establishing Management Institutions, and many private sector institutions offer management programs at various functional points.

The popular model to check the quality dimensions of the service sector is the SERVQUAL model, a widely used tool in service quality management. It measures service quality by assessing the gap between customer expectations and their experiences. As this model is designed for the service sector, this model can be effectively applied to the educational sector. It helps to assess the gap between the students' expectations and their experiences with the academic services, thereby supporting the assessment of the service quality dimensions even in educational institutionsinterms of a. Understanding the students' perceptions b. Identify the gap in expectation and delivery c. Prioritizing the student's overall experience d. Student-centric approach to continuous improvement**.**

LITERATURE REVIEW:

Kang & James (2004) state that service qualityarises from matching consumer expectations with actual service delivery. This can be divided into technical and functional components. While the technical side involves meeting tangible needs, the organizational resources and Responsiveness fall under the functional elements—Zeithaml et al. (1996) relatedservice quality with enhanced customer loyalty, which yields business outcomes. In a globalised market, investment in service quality helps an organisation to maintain a strong brand compared with its competitors.

Santos (2003) focuseson how service quality helps businesses to differentiate themselves, especially when entry barrier competition is low. Similarly, Cronin & Taylor (1992) state that Quality provides satisfaction and influences their loyalty and retention. Gorla et al. (2010) and Ramseook Munhurrun (2010) insist on the concept of digital infrastructure and the need for competent employees to deliver consistent Quality. Effective leadership and resource optimization are critical (Mosadeghrad, 2014) while providing customer service.

Nancy Bouranta et al. (2025) conducted a study with 452 business undergraduate students who enrolled in public universities in Greece. A modified version of the HEdPERF model was utilized to evaluate the service quality. The article could justify its findings by applying the SEM model. It found that those universities gained the students' satisfaction by focusing on academic aspects, access, program issues and online learning. Voss et al. (2007) advocated tools like the means-end approach to assess service delivery. Students expect faculty to be knowledgeable, approachable, enthusiastic, and flexible in teaching methods. Faculty effectiveness is seen as critical to students' academic success.

Educational institutions face unique challenges. Quinn et al. (2009) state that institutions focusing on total quality management (TQM) benefit from teamwork and a long-term focus.Angell et al. (2008) found that students appreciate teaching and learning quality over the physical infrastructure of the institution. Pitman (2000) states that educational institutions 'customers include parents, industries, and society.Prabha et al. (2010) highlighted the importance of education quality in the face of increasing competition. Shahin (2013) advises on reducing the service gap in educational institutions. Abdullah et al. (2010)found Responsiveness to be a significant dimension of service quality in the academic sector.

Yousapronpaiboon (2014) tested the SERVQUAL model and found Responsiveness to be a dominant factor influencing student satisfaction. Arash (2010) and Zeithaml et al. (1990) highlighted the importance of understanding student expectations, influenced by their earlier experiences and word of mouth.Appleton-Knapp & Krentler (2006) discuss the four elements: expectations, performance, disconfirmation, and satisfaction. Satisfaction hits the customers when performance exceeds expectations, while dissatisfaction occurs when it falls short. Azimov, B. (2025) examined the state of competition in the educational sector, and the researchers used a mixed approach method, integrating qualitative and quantitative techniques. Even this paper discussed benchmarking practices of the industry, and a SWOT analysis was also carried out. Findings are from stakeholders' perception, and they suggested filling the gap with enhanced strategies, effective decision making and improved service quality.

Dobson (1985) and Harris & Sass (2011) proved that teacher performance and experience significantly impact education quality in the classroom. Spence (2000) emphasised personalised supervision to cater to students' emotional and academic needs. Athiyaman (1997) stressed the dimensions of the preferred model, as they connect with student satisfaction, especially with social media amplifying feedback. Building institutional trust is a key consideration based on the research findings of Eisingerich & Bell (2008).Trust in management, feedback mechanisms, and Responsiveness to policy changes are crucial satisfaction drivers based on the research findings of Sharabi (2013) and De Jager & Gbadamosi (2013).

Farahmandian (2013) identified several quality determinants in management education: physical infrastructure, advisory services, curriculum relevance, tuition fees, and scholarship policies. All these influence students' satisfaction and service perception. Abdullah (2006) listed key educational performance indicators: academic and non-academic aspects, university reputation, accessibility, program structure, academic performance, and learning attitude. Given the uniformity of curricula across institutions, Danjum & Rasli (2012) urged institutions to innovate in service delivery.

Objectives of the study:

1. To understand the level of perception for each SERVQUAL item among B-school students
2. To assess the perceived service failures in B schools

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY:

The study was conducted in Bangalore, India's management education hub. The respondents, who are the primary beneficiaries of this research, were 248 students pursuing an MBA or PGDBM in Bangalore. These students had answered a specific questionnaire on the SERVQUAL dimensions regarding the educational services included in this study. The study adopted the web-based data collection method. A

survey instrument- Google Forms, was circulated, and the shortened link was copied and shared on various platforms.

The modified version of Parasuraman et al.'s scale included four items on the dimension Tangibility, four items on Reliability, four items on Responsiveness, four items on Assurance and five on Empathy. To check the Service Failure, the failure dimensions factors of Keaveney 1995 were considered. The ethical aspects were informed, consent, an option not to participate, and anonymity or the right to withdraw from the process were practiced.The t-test and the Analysis of Variance test were applied to compare the means in different sample groups. The Pearson correlation coefficient was used to check the relationship between the instruments utilized by the researchers.

Analysis and Interpretations:

Table 1- Demographic details of the Respondents(MBA students)

		Male		Female		Total	
		n	%	n	%	n	%
Age	21-23	65	26.2	35	14.1	100	40.3
	24-26	56	22.6	52	21.0	108	43.5
	27-29	24	9.7	8	3.2	32	12.9
	30 & above	4.0	1.6	4.0	1.6	8.0	3.2
Specialization	HRM	5.0	2.0	4.0	1.6	9.0	3.6
	Operations	5.0	2.0	7.0	2.8	12	4.8
	Finance	36	14.5	23	9.3	59	23.8
	Marketing	83	33.5	56	22.6	139	56.0
	International business	1.0	0.4	4.0	1.6	5.0	2.0
	Business Analytics	19	7.7	5.0	2.0	24	9.7
Parental occupational	Government employee	63	25.4	51	20.6	114	46.0
	Private sector employee	17	6.9	5.0	2.0	22	8.9
	Own venture	7.0	2.8	15	6.0	22	8.9
	Professionals	62	25.0	28	11.3	90	36.3
Economic status of the respondent's family	Below poverty	5.0	2.0	1.0	0.4	6.0	2.4
	Lower middle	9.0	3.6	9.0	3.6	18	7.3
	Middle	88	35.5	53	21.4	141	56.9
	Upper middle	38	15.3	35	14.1	73	29.4
	Upper	9.0	3.6	1.0	0.4	10	4.0
Under graduation	BBA	81	32.7	59	23.8	140	56.5
	BCOM	58	23.4	26	10.5	84	33.9
	BE/BTech	7.0	2.8	7.0	2.8	14	5.6
	BSC	2.0	0.8	3.0	1.2	5.0	2.0
	Others	1.0	0.4	4.0	1.6	5.0	2.0

Two hundred forty-eight students were willing to fill in the details, which are represented in Table 1. The highest category of age group is21-23, and 32.7% had BBA as their undergraduate qualification. Marketing specialized students were high in numbers, and most of the respondents' parents were government employees or professionals 35.5% them fall under the middle-class income group.

SERVQUAL: Service Quality-Perceived:

The 3-point scale(Likert) was applied, and the options given were Disagree, Neutral and Agree. The values wererepresented in Table 2. The average score for the Tangibility(3.21±0.76), reliability(3.11±0.81), responsiveness(3.18±0.81), Assurance(3.27±0.85) and Empathy(3.08±0.78)dimensions indicated more than neutral perception. All the items' mean was 3.23±0.67.

Table 2 – Responses of SERVQUAL by its dimensions

Dimensions	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Mean	Std. deviation
TANGIBILITY					
Infrastructure and Lab facilities are up to date with modern standards	23.4	36.7	39.9	3.18	1.06
Quality Journals, E-books and newspapers for reference - available	27.4	38.7	33.9	3.07	1.03
Placement results and commendable	17.7	32.7	49.6	3.35	1.07
Employability skill-oriented programmes are a need of the hour for postgraduate programmes	24.2	34.7	41.1	3.21	1.12
RESPONSIVENESS					
Prompt response of Admin staff	25.0	33.9	41.1	3.18	1.09
Transparent rules and policies	17.3	37.5	45.2	3.33	0.95
Adequate facilities are required	22.6	28.3	49.2	3.29	1.11
Existence of team culture	16.9	37.1	46.0	3.33	1.00
ASSURANCE					
Transactional safety must be promised	19.0	34.7	34.7	3.35	1.09
Inculcating confidence among the students is essential	19.0	34.7	46.4	3.35	1.09
Well-disciplined and sincere behaviour has to be reflected as culture	22.2	27.8	50.0	3.37	1.13
Knowledge sharing between students and faculty members needs importance	25.4	33.9	41.5	3.27	1.13
EMPATHY					
Individualized attention towards the students must be focused	25.0	34.7	40.3	3.17	1.03
Moderate working hours are essential	25.0	39.9	35.1	3.12	1.05
Comfortable transport is expected from the Institution	29.4	34.3	36.3	3.08	1.08
Best Interest without prejudice is the mandate aspect expected from lecturers	19.4	37.1	43.5	3.28	1.05

Students' specific needs need to be addressed	19.0	40.3	40.7	3.28	1.02
RELIABILITY					
Delivery at the promised lines	27.4	35.9	36.7	3.11	1.06
Since Interest in solving problems	23.0	40.3	35.7	3.16	1.05
Do things right the first time	22.2	31.5	46.4	3.29	1.06
Serve at the right time as promised	26.6	33.9	39.5	3.14	1.07

The midlevel empathy score indicated the importance of challenges the management institution faces.

Service Failure Experience:

The Likert scale, which has three options, namely Rare, Sometimes, and Often, utilized to collect data on customers' experience of service failures. The mean value of these items was 2.75±0.68. The service failure variables and the valuesmentioned in the table below.

Table3– Service Failure Items

Service Failure - variables	Rare	Sometimes	Often	Mean	SD
Lack of qualified staff	45.6	23.4	31.0	2.76	1.32
Lack of efficient services	44.8	26.6	28.6	2.77	1.16
Lack of friendly services	53.2	26.2	20.6	2.49	1.16
Staff Unavailability	28.2	27.4	44.4	2.80	1.12
Poor fee structure	52.8	24.2	23.0	2.52	1.23
Lack of Quality in the Workplace	46.0	19.4	34.7	2.88	1.16
Lack of adequate information	51.2	16.9	31.9	2.75	1.21
Lack of Time management	37.9	14.9	47.2	3.13	1.22
Long travel hours	67.3	19.4	13.3	2.12	1.16
Poor classroom infrastructure	46.4	28.2	25.4	2.70	1.17
Outdated syllabus	37.5	17.7	44.8	3.06	1.27

The highest mean value found was for the service failure 'Lack of time management' followed by outdated syllabus, Lack of Quality of workplace, staff unavailability, continued by the variablesLack of efficient services, Lack of qualified staff,Lack of adequate information,Poor class room infrastructure,Poor Fees structure,Lack of friendly services and Long travel hours.

Relationship between SERVQUAL dimensions and SERVICE FAILURE Items

Pearson's correlation coefficient was utilized to understand the relationship between the Service quality dimensions and Service failure items.

Table 4– Correlation Between SERVQUAL and Service Failure

Service Failure - variables	Tangibility	Reliability	Responsiveness	Awareness	Empathy
Lack of qualified staff	-0.077	-0.085	-0.164**	-0.182**	-0.153*

Lack of efficient services	-0.081	-0.053	-0.112	-0.132*	-0.173**
Lack of friendly services	-0.118	-0.141*	-0.142*	-0.198**	-0.104
Staff Unavailability	-0.244**	-0.282**	-0.222**	-0.231**	-0.220**
Poor fee structure	-0.087	-0.067	-0.081**	-0.116	-0.100
Lack of Quality in the Workplace	0.083	0.035	0.033	-0.034	-0.113
Lack of adequate information	-0.057	-0.019	-0.016	-0.057	-0.035
Lack of Time management	0.048	-0.025	-0.065	-0.008	-0.048
Long travel hours	-0.134	-0.085	-0.071	-0.116	-0.124
Poor classroom infrastructure	-0.130*	-0.091	-0.159*	-0.180**	-0.186**
Outdated syllabus	-0.006	-0.018	-0.006	0.003	-0.095

(Note:* Correlation is significant at 0.05 level; **Correlation is significant at 0.01 level)

The above analysis shows that the "Staff Unavailability" correlated with all five dimensions of SERVQUAL. The Lack of qualified staff showed a significant relationship with SERVQUAL's dimensions, such as Responsiveness, awareness, and Empathy.'Lack of efficient services' correlated with the dimensions Awareness and Empathy.Lack of friendly services correlated with the dimensions reliability, Responsiveness and awareness.'Poor Fees structure' and 'Poor Fees structure' correlate with dimension responsiveness.'Poor classroom infrastructure correlates with all four dimensions of service quality:: Tangibility, Responsiveness, Assurance, and Empathy.

Regression analysis:

A result of regression analysis (R-squared value) indicates that the demographic values explain only 9.7% of the variables. Hence, the demographic variables on service failure items are insignificant.

Table 5 – Regression summary

R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	SE	R^2change	F change	sig F change
0.401	0.160	0.097	0.78	0.147	3.609	0.000

Predictors: for analyzing the data, the demographic variables Age, Specialisation opted, Parental occupation, Economic status of the family and Under graduation of the respondents and service failure items were considered. Further 11 Items on service failure namely Lack of qualified staff,Lack of efficient services,Lack of friendly services,Staff Unavailability,Poor Fees structure,Lack of Quality of workplace,Lack of adequate information,Lack of Time management,Long travel hours,Poor class room infrastructure,Outdated syllabus and Staff Unavailability were checked.

FINDINGS & DISCUSSIONS:

The results of this study indicated that the service failure items significantly predicted the overall SERVQUAL. Staff Unavailability and Poor classroom structure, Lack of qualified staff, Lack of efficient and friendly services, poor fee structure, Lack of adequate information, Lack of Time management and long travel hours were negatively correlated.

Based on our analysis of the responses, we could observe that the SERVQUAL parameter's responses were generally positive. This study was conducted by faculty members working with institutions that offer MBA or PGDBA degrees. The role of education in the growth of the nation is highly significant. The

general observation on service failure items indicates no difference among different demographic groups. The standard practices in the Indian education system, guided by UGC & AICTE, established quality practices and stabilized educational services.

The mean values are almost neutral (3.11-3.37). This is supported by the findings of the research work of Zeithaml, V. A., Berry, L. L., & Parasuraman, A. (1996),Cronin, J. J., & Taylor, S. A. (1992), which proved that any service providing organization needs to concentrate on customer satisfaction and engagement. The service quality dimensions, Empathy and Tangibility's values were lower than other dimensions, which require special focus from the service providers. These results vary with the findings of Abdullah, F, "Measuring service quality in higher education (2006) and Yousapronpaiboon, K. (2014)'s study on "Measuring higher education service quality in Thailand". In both research articles, Responsiveness wasfound to be low in value compared to other service quality dimensions.

CONCLUSION:

The link between the perception of service quality and service failures is worth further research in the entire service sector. The service failure methods are not explored like the SERVQUAL measure. The educational institutions must understand their service failure items, while the Service quality dimensions are discussed enough.

REFERENCES

1. Abdullah, F. (2006). Measuring service quality in higher education: HEdPERF versus SERVPERF. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning, 24*(1), 31–47.
2. Angell, R., Heffernan, T., & Megicks, P. (2008). Service quality in postgraduate education. *Quality Assurance in Education, 16*(3), 236–254.
3. Appleton-Knapp, S. L., & Krentler, K. A. (2006). Measuring student expectations and their effects on satisfaction: The importance of managing them. *Journal of Marketing Education, 28*(3), 254–264.
4. Azimov, B., &Yodgorova , Y. (2025). METHODS OF STUDYING THE STATE OF COMPETITION IN THE EDUCATIONAL SERVICES MARKET. Journal of Applied Science and Social Science, 1(1), 66–75. Retrieved from https://inlibrary.uz/index.php/jasss/article/view/7131
5. Cronin, J. J., & Taylor, S. A. (1992). Measuring service quality: A reexamination and extension. *Journal of Marketing, 56*(3), 55–68.
6. De Jager, J., & Gbadamosi, G. (2013). Predicting students' satisfaction through service quality in higher education. *The International Journal of Management Education, 11*(3), 107–118.
7. Eisingerich, A. B., & Bell, S. J. (2008). Perceived service quality and customer trust. *Journal of Service Research, 10*(3), 256–268.
8. Farahmandian, S. (2013). Perceived service quality and student satisfaction in higher education. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management, 12*(4), 65–74.
9. Gorla, N., Somers, T. M., & Wong, B. (2010). Organizational impact of system quality, information quality, and service quality. *The Journal of Strategic Information Systems, 19*(3), 207–228.
10. Griffin, L., Dodds, P., & Rovegno, I. (1996). Pedagogical content knowledge for teachers: Integrate everything you know to help students learn. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance, 67*(9), 58–61.
11. Hill, F. M. (1995). Managing service quality in higher education: The student's primary consumer role. *Quality Assurance in Education, 3*(3), 10–21.
12. Jain, R., Sinha, G., & Sahney, S. (2011). Conceptualising service quality in higher education. *Asian Journal on Quality, 12*(3), 296–314.
13. Kang, G., & James, J. (2004). Service quality dimensions: An examination of Grönroos's service quality model. *Managing Service Quality: An International Journal, 14*(4), 266–277.
14. Kasiri, L. A., Cheng, K. T. G., Sambasivan, M., & Sidin, S. M. (2017). Integration of standardisation and customisation: Impact on service quality, customer satisfaction, and loyalty. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services, 35*, 91–97.
15. Lee, G., & Lin, H. (2005). Customer perceptions of e-service quality in online shopping. *International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management, 33*(2), 161–176.
16. Mosadeghrad, A. M. (2014). Factors influencing healthcare service quality. *International Journal of Health Policy and Management, 3*(2), 77–89.
17. Nancy Bouranta, Evangelos L. Psomas, Dimitrios Kafetzopoulos; Integrating online learning into service quality assessment in higher education: its influence on student satisfaction. *The TQM Journal* 14 May 2025; 37 (5): 1418–1445. https://doi.org/10.1108/TQM-06-2023-0180
18. Quinn, A., Lemay, G., Larsen, P., & Johnson, D. (2009). Service quality in higher education. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence, 20*(2), 139–152.

19. Ramseook-Munhurrun, P., Lukea-Bhiwajee, S. D., & Naidoo, P. (2010). Service quality in the public service. *International Journal of Management and Marketing Research, 3*(1), 37–50.
20. Santos, J. (2003). E-service quality: A model of virtual service dimensions. *Managing Service Quality: An International Journal, 13*(3), 233–246.
21. Seth, N., Deshmukh, S. G., & Vrat, P. (2005). Service quality models: A review. *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management, 22*(9), 913–949.
22. Shahin, A., & Samea, M. (2010). Developing the models of service quality gaps: A critical discussion. *Business Management and Strategy, 1*(1), 1–11.
23. Voss, R., Gruber, T., & Szmigin, I. (2007). Service quality in higher education: The role of student expectations. *Journal of Business Research, 60*(9), 949–959.
24. Yousapronpaiboon, K. (2014). V SERVQUAL: Measuring higher education service quality in Thailand. *Procedia - Social and Behavioural Sciences, 116*, 1088–1095.
25. Zeithaml, V. A., Berry, L. L., & Parasuraman, A. (1996). The behavioural consequences of service quality. *Journal of Marketing, 60*(2), 31–46.