Because the cost of attracting the fresh customers is much advanced than cost of retaining current and old customers, possession on students' satisfaction has become scorching debate in modern era. Service quality management plays its vital role for this concern. This current research paper aims to highlight the concepts of service quality management dimensions and its effect on students' satisfaction. In this study, the dependent variable was students' satisfaction that measured by the independent variable service quality. The secondary school students of public and private education institutions were the population of this study in Punjab Pakistan. Random sampling approach applied for the delimitation of the population. Sample was 727 students (public 345, private 382). Five point Likert scale used in questionnaire for the collection of data. This study adopted from Parasuraman'S SERVEQUAL dimensions model (1991). The test applied for analysis: Descriptive analysis, Factor analysis, independent sample t-test and Pearson Correlation. The findings of the study show that the quality of the public secondary schools was better as compare to private school. The correlation was resulted between .7 to .8, It shows that there was a significance effect of service quality management on students' satisfaction. The paper provides the guidance for sort out the most effective factors about the customers' satisfaction regarding service quality. This research study will prove as a stepping-stone for the development of the managerial strategies. It will also helpful for educational leaders, policy makers and head of the department for the development of quality education.
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INTRODUCTION

Education is one of the most crucial factors to strengthen the social and economic situation of a nation and empowering generation with skills and knowledge. Quality education plays its significance role for the development of the nation's due to the emergence of global competition in education and technology in 21st century (Awan & Zia, 2015). The Pakistan National Policy on education thrive to widening the access of education by improving the quality of secondary education through enhancing the enrolment, increasing retention through less dropout rates and enrolled the students for the achievement of national objectives. (National Education Policy, 2016). Pakistan is a developing country and taking the operational steps for the
development of education sector. It is said that the education is a fundamental right for all the people throughout the world. Educational organizations are extremely customer sloping service commerce besieged to build up relationship (Sultan and Wong, 2010). Service industries play a vital role for the economic development. Better quality plays a vital role for the development of education institution (Saeed, 2014). The satisfaction of the customers is an important factor for the development of education institution. It can produce the number of new students. It is impossible for the education institutions to survive if the students feel dissatisfaction. The dissatisfaction of the students is a solemn threat for the institution (Zeshan, A. 2010). The concept of satisfaction varies among different students (Munteanuet al., 2010). The satisfaction of the students depends upon the expectations of the students after perceived the services (Brown and Mazzarol, 2009). The students judge the quality on the behalf of their previous practices to usage the facilities after receiving the services; students evaluate the new ones with the previous amenities. The growth of the education institution is based on the satisfaction of the students (Hamidullah M., 2009). Moreover, the quality of education is one of the major requirements in the age of globalization that have given rise to many problems for institutions to face. Therefore, school education requires overcoming these challenges, cope with the difficulties, may need to search for effective and creative way to enhance their quality management system (Yousapron-paiboon, 2014).

There are plenty of gaps in literature on quality management and substantial challenges on the different perception of quality in developing countries (Chui et al., 2016). The quality management is one of the best tools that we use to upgrade the quality of education

### Service Quality

A Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry (1988) explained that service quality is “On the whole assessment of particular service organizations that results from matching up the performance of that firm with the general hope of the customers (students) that hoe firms in that sector should carry out business. Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry (1988) stated that in the field of learning and education the service quality has its essential role through word of mouth communications. It mostly depends upon the perception of the customers after receiving services (Alves & Raposo, 2010). Service quality is a source of motivation among students by rendered them effective performance in both areas in academic as well as administration (Ahmad & Nawaz, 2010). The educational organizations lay stress on the service quality to attract, enhance the number of students and for the marketing point of view (Usman, 2010). Service quality provides information and awareness to the students according to the services which organizations rendered to their customers as well as marketing strategies. The satisfaction is measured to the students by their expectations and past experiences (Tahar, 2008). The students measure the facilities agreeable by comparing what they are really getting according to their perception and expectation (Gruber, Voss, & Glaser-Zikuda, 2010). Educational organizations determined on the service quality dimensions to attract their customers. They delivered the service quality on satisfactory way to the students because it is the essential element for their progress (Sapri et al 2009). Tahar (2008) described that educational organizations in USA lay stress on the academic status firstly and cost/time is after to it but in New Zealand organizations firstly focus on the cost/time, physical appearance and location. The service quality evaluates by the satisfaction of the customers after rendered the services. (Rasool, M. 2010). The service quality creates an interaction of physical environment and output of the quality.

### Students' Satisfaction

Satisfaction is an actual font of happiness after receiving the services according to expectations and perception of an individual (Gruber et al 2010). It is strappingly connected with the prospects of the students. Satisfaction means the result according to the expectations after rendered the services. Satisfaction is the assessment of the service quality by past experience of students. Customer satisfaction is a real dread of perceptions and expectations of customer. Hansemark and Albinsson (2004) stated that the satisfaction is expressive reply of the customer and admiration of their moods permitting to their prospects. (Petruzzellis et al 2006) suggested
that satisfaction is an understanding before and after using the new things. The students take their negative and positive decisions about service quality regarding to their mind set (Sapri and Finch, 2009). Hasan & Ilias (2008) stated that the life experience of the students during their learning mainly based on the satisfaction about service quality. They judge the organizational culture, staff behavior and response. Tian and Wang (2010) observed that satisfaction is a positive response of customer according to their interest and fulfillment of their desires after getting the services. The satisfaction of the students depends upon the cultural impact regarding their perception. Every student has different kinds of background so it is difficult to satisfy them according to the cultural background. Navarro et al., (2005) stated that the consciousness of students about quality is essential; it renders the organization with significant info regarding the betterment of student’s satisfaction.
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**Objectives**
- Explore the level of service quality and students’ satisfaction at secondary level in Punjab, Pakistan.
- Determine the difference between public and private secondary school students in Punjab, Pakistan.
- Investigate the correlation between service quality dimensions and students’ satisfaction at secondary school level.

**Research Questions**
- Is there significance difference between public and private students at secondary school level in Punjab, Pakistan?
- Is there significance correlation between service quality dimensions and students satisfaction at secondary school level in Punjab, Pakistan?
**Hypothesis**

H1. There is a significance difference between public and private secondary school students in Punjab, Pakistan.

H2. There is a significance correlation between service quality dimensions and students satisfaction at secondary school level in Punjab, Pakistan.

**METHODOLOGY**

In this study the dependent variable is students’ satisfaction that is measured by the independent variable service quality. The secondary school students of public and private education institutions were the population of this study in Punjab Pakistan. Random sampling approach was applied for the delimitation of the population. Sample was 727 students (public 345, private 382). Five point Likert scale was used in questionnaire for the collection of data. This study was adopted from Parasuraman’S SERVEQUAL dimensions model. The study is comprised on five main dimensions i.e. tangible infrastructure, responsiveness, reliability, empathy and assurance. SPSS software was used for analysis of data. Cronbach’s Alpha was conducted to find out the reliability of scale. The reliability of the scale was .869 (Parasuraman et al., 1991). The validity of the scale was checked by experts. Mean and Standard Deviation, Factor analysis, independent sample t-test and Pearson correlation tests were applied for analysis.

**TABLE 1** Review of past studies regarding quality management tool

| Citation | Tan Res Rel Emp Ass |
|----------|---------------------|
| Zeshan, A. S. H. I., Afridi, T. A. H. I. R. A., & Khan, S. M. (2010, December). Assessing service quality in business schools: implications for improvement. In 3rd international conference on assessing quality in higher education (pp. 6-8). | + + + + + |
| Usman, A. (2010). The Impact of Service Quality on Students' Satisfaction in Higher Education Institutes of Punjab. Journal of Management Research, 2 (2). | + + + + + |
| Asaduzzaman, M., Hossain, M., & Rahman, M. (2014). Service quality and student satisfaction: a case study on private universities in Bangladesh. International Journal of Economics, Finance and Management Sciences, 1(3), 128. | + + + + + |
| Shaari, H. (2014). Service quality in Malaysian higher education: Adult learners’ perspective. International Journal of Business and Social Science, 5(1), 86-90. | + + + + + |
| Yousupronpaboon, K. (2014). SERVQUAL: Measuring higher education service quality in Thailand. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 116, 1088-1095. | + + + + + |
| Al-aeid, S., Khalid, M., & Info, A. (2014). Service Quality Dimensions and Student’s Satisfaction. Journal of Advanced Social Research, 4(6), 1-17. | + + + + + |
| Hazilah Abd Manaf, N., Ahmad, K., & Ahmed, S. (2013). Critical factors of service quality in a graduate school of Malaysia. International Journal of Quality and Service Sciences, 5(4), 415-431. | + + + + + |
| Chui, T. B., & bin Ahmad, M. S. (2016). Evaluation of Service Quality of Private Higher Education Using Service Improvement Matrix. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 224, 132-140. | + + + + + |

**TABLE 2** Descriptive Analysis

| Factors               | M  | SD |
|-----------------------|----|----|
| Tangible Infrastructure| 3.51| .75 |
| Responsiveness        | 3.27| .89 |
| Reliability           | 3.73| .74 |
| Empathy               | 3.29| 1.00|
| Assurance             | 3.51| .83 |
| Total                 | 3.51| .64 |

Factor loading of the statements No 1 to 8 is ranging from .473 to .677. All factor loadings are moderate except statement no 3, 7 and 8 which is ranging from .473 to .590 even accepted for factor loading.

Factor loading of the statements No 1 to 5 is ranging from .584 to .742. All factor loadings are moderate except statement no 2. This is ranging from .584 even accepted for factor loading.

Factor loading of the statements No 1 to 8 is ranging from .513 to .686. All factor loadings are moderate except statement no 8, 9. This is ranging from .513 to .556 even accepted for factor loading.
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TABLE 3 | Factor Analysis

| Statements                                                      | Factor Loading |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| General appearance of the building is appreciated               | .623           |
| There is sufficient light in class rooms                        | .677           |
| Classroom temperature is always remain normal                   | .588           |
| The campus is safe from security threats.                       | .651           |
| Learning environment of the school is appreciated               | .630           |
| Nice physical appearance of staff members                       | .606           |
| There is furnished computer labs                                 | .473           |
| Sitting position in the class room is comfortable                | .590           |

TABLE 4 | Confirmatory Factor Analysis about Responsiveness

| Statements                                                      | Factor Loading |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| Career counselling facility is available for students.          | .703           |
| Staffs are cooperative with the students.                       | .584           |
| First aid facilities are available in school.                   | .684           |
| Queries of the students handle appropriately.                   | .742           |
| Focus on dealing the queries efficiently.                       | .694           |

TABLE 5 | Confirmatory Factor Analysis about Reliability

| Statements                                                      | Factor Loading     |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| Registration of the students is completed in time and error free.| .617               |
| Student’s record is urgently available when it required.        | .661               |
| Classes are conduct regularly.                                  | .661               |
| Syllabus is always completed as per requirement.                | .688               |
| Exams are always conducted according to schedule.               | .704               |
| Results are always announced with accuracy.                     | .657               |
| Teaching staff is highly qualified.                             | .649               |
| The behavior of the management staff is polite to solve the student’s problem as claimed. | .556               |
| Time table is implemented without clashes.                      | .513               |

Factor loading of the statements No 1 to 3 is ranging from .672 to .799. All factor loadings are moderate even accepted for factor loading.

TABLE 6 | Confirmatory Factor Analysis about Empathy

| Statements                                                      | Factor Loading |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| Study rooms are available for students.                         | .734           |
| Behaviour of the teachers towards students is good.             | .799           |
| Rules are not so strict for the students to make the learning process successfully. | .672           |

Factor loading of the statements No 1 to 5 is ranging from .564 to .729. All factor loadings are moderate except statement no 1 and 5 which is ranging from .564 to .588 even accepted for factor loading.

Independent sample t-test was conducted between public and private secondary school students. There was not a significance difference in tangible infrastructure. The public school respondents score is higher (M= 3.55, SD=.84) than Private (M=3.45, SD=.64). There was a significance difference in responsiveness. The public school respondents score is higher (M= 3.47, SD=.93) than Private (M=3.05, SD=.78). There was also significance difference in reliability. The public school respondents score is higher (M= 3.83, SD=.76) than Private (M=3.63, SD=.69). There was also significance difference in empathy. The public school respondents score is
TABLE 8 | Independent Sample t-test

| Factors                 | Private | Public | Independent sample t-test |
|-------------------------|---------|--------|---------------------------|
|                         | M       | SD     | M       | SD     | df   | sig  |
| Tangible infrastructure | 3.45    | .64    | 3.55    | .84    | 705  | .07  |
| Responsiveness          | 3.05    | .78    | 3.47    | .93    | 720  | .00**|
| Reliability             | 3.63    | .69    | 3.83    | .76    | 724  | .00**|
| Empathy                 | 3.02    | 1.61   | 3.54    | 1.05   | 716  | .00**|
| Assurance               | 3.47    | .80    | 3.55    | .86    | 724  | .15  |

higher (M= 3.54, SD= 1.05) than Private (M=3.02, SD= 1.61). There was not significance difference in assurance. The public school respondents score is higher (M= 3.55, SD= .86) than Private (M=3.47, SD=.80).

TABLE 9 | Pearson Correlation

Relationship between service quality dimensions and students' satisfaction

| Variables                  | Tangible infrastructure | Responsiveness | Reliability | Empathy | Assurance | Students' satisfaction |
|----------------------------|-------------------------|----------------|-------------|---------|-----------|-----------------------|
| Pearson Correlation        | 1                       |                |             |         |           |                       |
| Sig.                       |                         | 727            |             |         |           |                       |
| Pearson Correlation        | .584**                  | 1              |             |         |           |                       |
| Sig.                       | .000                    | 727            | .517**      |         | .560**    |                       |
| Reliability                |                         |                |             |         |           |                       |
| Sig.                       | .000                    | 727            | 727         | .517**  | .560**    | 1                     |
| Pearson Correlation        | .467**                  | .545**         | .560**      |         |           |                       |
| Sig.                       | .000                    | .000           | .000        | 727     | 727       | 727                   |
| Empathy                    |                         |                |             |         |           |                       |
| Sig.                       | .000                    | 727            | 727         | 727     | 727       | 727                   |
| Pearson Correlation        | .497**                  | .474**         | .572**      | .532**  | .777**    | 1                     |
| Sig.                       | .000                    | .000           | .000        | .000    | .000      | 727                   |
| Assurance                  |                         |                |             |         |           |                       |
| Sig.                       | .000                    | 727            | 727         | 727     | 727       | 727                   |
| Pearson Correlation        | .808**                  | .772**         | .840**      | .732**  | .777**    | 1                     |
| Sig.                       | .000                    | .000           | .000        | .000    | .000      | 727                   |

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Pearson correlation was conducted between independent variable (service quality dimensions) and dependent variable (students' satisfaction). The statistical result was found that tangible infrastructure and students satisfaction have strong positive relationship with (r=.808, sig=.00) whereas, responsiveness and students satisfaction have moderate positive relationship with (r=.772, sig=.00), reliability and students satisfaction have strong positive relationship with (r=.840, sig=.00), empathy and students satisfaction have moderate positive relationship with (r=.732, sig=.00) and assurance and students satisfaction have moderate positive relationship with (r=.777, sig=.00).

CONCLUSION

It was concluded that the students of secondary school level have satisfaction of the service quality dimensions. There was a significance difference was found in responsiveness, reliability and empathy between public and private secondary school students. The respondents of public education institutions had higher score than private. The service quality dimensions have strong
correlation between students satisfaction at secondary level.

The quality management is an attitude of mind as well as a technique for the improvement of education sector. Quality management in education is a philosophy that insists on the betterment, enhancement and change for all the service provided to the students (Sallis E. 2014). Quality management is a concept that focuses to render the quality education to the students within the institution (Gharakhani et al., 2013). Therefore, quality management is an important factor for the development of the education institutions and it has a solid theoretical foundation that can be implemented and adapted in educational system (Wani & Mehraj, 2014). The workshops are necessary at every level for the awareness of service quality at secondary level. It is required to conduct the studies for evaluate the teachers’ (employees) satisfaction. Further studies should be conducted between two developing countries and also between the developing and developed countries. It is need to develop a multi dimensions model which can be investigated the quality of whole education organization at every level (graduate, post graduate) and also in different areas of the country.
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