

Measuring Customer Satisfaction Using ServQual Model – An Empirical Study

¹Dr. Anil K. Bhatt, ²Divya Sahil Bhanawat

¹Professor, Pacific Institute of Business Studies, Udaipur, Rajasthan, India

²Research Scholar, Pacific Institute of Higher Education and Research University, Udaipur.

Abstract: This research uses SERVQUAL to analyze the gap between perceptions and expectations of the customer, concerning with the service at retail units in the South Rajasthan. Customer Satisfaction level is assessed for the services offered at select retail units in the city of Udaipur. Five dimensions in service quality (SERVQUAL), tangibility, reliability, responsiveness, empathy, and assurance have been considered for this empirical research. The research methodology was carried out in a survey crosssectional applied to 114 respondents. Result of research showed that services offered by retail units have positive impact and are significant in building customer satisfaction. Nevertheless, this research would render scope to marketers, retailers, and decision makers to calibrate attributes configuring services quality for improved customer satisfaction.

Keywords: *Customer Satisfaction, Service Quality, SERVQUAL Dimension, Expectations, Perceptions.*

I. INTRODUCTION

Today organizations operate in high dynamic business environment, which is compounded by the complexity and uncertainty in rapid changing global setting. The key for sustainable competitive advantage lies in delivering high service quality which in turn results in satisfied customer. Satisfying customer is one of the main objectives of every business because businesses know that retaining a satisfied customer is more profitable than acquiring the new one. Retailing in India is gradually edging its way towards becoming the next boom industry. In today's competitive retail environment, delivery of high service quality has long been treated as basic business strategy. This can be achieved through the delivery of high service quality. A retail store environment offer complicated mix of product and services (Dabholkar, P.A., 1996), its experience involve non-retail service experience like locating merchandise they desire, integration and negotiations with personnel along the way, returning merchandise. Westbrook (1991) has also highlighted some non-product satisfaction offered by retail outlets, like other facets of shopping, buying and interacting with outlet itself, are as significant as product (Chandra et.al, 2012).

Consumers today are better informed, sophisticated (Leung & To, 2001) and they expect high service quality (e.g. helpful and courteous salespeople, convenient store layout, etc.) apart from the quality of

merchandise purchased. The practice of excellent service quality has been proven to increase in profitability (Anderson et al., 1994), customer satisfaction (Sivadas & Baker-Prewitt, 2000), loyalty (Wong and Sohal, 2003) and certainly the effectiveness of the retailers' performance. Customer satisfaction can also lead to repurchase behavior (Fornell, 1992; Burns & Neisner, 2004), sales (Anderson et al, 1994), increase word-of-mouth advertising (Oh, 1999), stock value (Fornell et al., 2006), reduces marketing and warranty cost (Reichheld & Sasser, 1990; Fornell et al., 2006).

When a customer is satisfied from service, each customer will tell nine to ten other people, but a dissatisfied customer typically relates dissatisfaction to fifteen to twenty others. Moreover, if the service is poor, 91 percent customer will not return to store (Gitomer 1998). Prior research on economic impact of defecting customers suggests that a service company can increase profit by 100 percent by retaining only 5 percent of existing customers (Reichheld & Sasser, 1990). As service quality can be the basis to retailing success, retailers need to constantly calculate their service quality through the use of a reliable measuring instrument. As of the unique nature of retail service, measurement of quality of services cannot be approached in the same way as of services perspective (Chouhan et.al, 2013; Chouhan et.al, 2013 & 2014). Intangibility, heterogeneity, inseparability and permissibility are some unique characteristics which makes service quality difficult to define and measure (Bateson, 1995).

Customers' satisfaction about the service quality results from comparison between customer expectations and customer perceptions of actual service performance. The service considered to be excellent, if the perception exceeds expectation; services are measured as good or adequate, if both expectation and perception are equal; and services are classified as bad, if expectation exceeds perception. Based on this perspective, Parasuraman et al (1985; 1998) developed a scale of measurement service quality, popularly known as SERVQUAL. According to the developers of SERVQUAL, service quality is derived from a difference between perceptions and expectations results in the service quality gap, which is also known as GAP 5. A wide gap would represent poor service quality. Parasuraman et al. (1988) study also suggested five service quality dimensions namely, 'tangibles', 'reliability', 'assurance', 'responsiveness' and 'empathy'. Most researchers have consensus that

SERVQUAL being a crucial element in measuring customer satisfaction even for combination of product and services.

Against this backdrop, the present study attempts to measure empirically the customers' satisfaction on service quality, confined to hypermarkets of departmental store format. In accordance with this objective, an empirical survey was conducted surrounding following objective:

- a. To measure service quality gap corresponds to each SERVQUAL dimension.
- b. To analyze the customer satisfaction on service quality for hypermarkets using SERVQUAL dimensions.
- c. To investigate the level of customer satisfaction vis-à-vis select hypermarkets.

The first part of research being introductory discusses about the significance of service quality at the current level of business requirements. Moreover, it focuses on the research so far initiated to measure the service quality based upon customer expectations and perceptions on service offerings correspond to the identified dimensions. Following the introduction section, the remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Second section provides an extensive related literature review. The next section deals with the research methodology & data source which chiefly includes development of hypotheses, identification of survey pool, adoption & administration of questionnaire. The following section focuses on the results & analysis of the study. The final section concludes the paper.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

From the perspective of both manufacturer and retailer, customer satisfaction is vital because it makes several desirable outcomes and effects in future purchase intention. However there is no single definition exists on satisfaction in marketing literature. It is generally recognized that satisfaction is a psychological state that a customer experiences after consumption (Oliver 1980). Oliver (1981) introduced the expectancy-disconfirmation model for studying of customer satisfaction in retail and service sector. Customer satisfaction is considered to be predictor of customer loyalty.

During the last few decades service quality has become a major area of consideration among researchers and practitioners in retail sector. Swartz and Brown (1989) drew some dissimilarity between different viewson service quality, drawing from the work of Grönroos (1983) and Lehtinen and Lehtinen (1982) concerning the dimensions of service quality. "What" the service delivers is evaluated after performance (Swartz and Brown, 1989, p.190). This dimension is called outcome

quality by Parasuraman et al. (1985), technical quality by Grönroos (1983), and physical quality by Lehtinen and Lehtinen (1982). "How" the service is delivered is evaluated during delivery (Goswami, 2015; Swartz and Brown, 1989, p. 190). This dimension is called process quality by Parasuraman et al. (1985), functional quality by Grönroos (1983), and interactive quality by Lehtinen and Lehtinen (1982). Parasuraman et al. (1985) have also stated that service quality is quite difficult to measure for a customer than a product quality.

Since its introduction and development, SERVQUAL has extremely applied to many studies undertaken by both academicians and practitioners alike. It has been tested and applied in diverse service settings, cultural contexts and geographic locations which includes hospitals (Babakus & Mangold, 1989), a dental school patient clinic, business school placement centre, tire store and acute care hospital (Carman, 1990), a utility company (Babakus & Boller, 1992), pest control, dry cleaning and fast food (Cronin & Taylor, 1992), and banking industries (Lassar et al., 2000). SERVQUAL has also been expanded and applied to internet retailing (Trocchia & Janda, 2003; Long & McMellon, 2004), Hotels (Saleh and Ryan, 1992), Travel and tourism (Fick and Ritchie, 1991), car servicing (Bouman and Van der Wiele, 1992), business schools (Rigotti and Pitt, 1992; Mathur and Goswami, 2012), information services (Pitt et al 1995), higher education (McElwee and Redman, 1993) and discount and departmental stores (Finn and Lamb, 1991). The Scale items measuring five basic dimensions are listed below in Table 1.

Table 1: Servqual Dimensions

Dimension	Definition
Tangibles	Appearance of physical facilities, equipment, personnel and written materials
Reliability	Ability to perform the promised service dependably and accurately
Responsiveness	Willingness to help customers and provide prompt service
Assurance	Employees' knowledge and courtesy and their ability to inspire trust and confidence
Empathy	Caring, easy access, good /communication, customer understanding and individualized attention given to customers

Source: Adapted from Parasuraman et al. (1988)
Parasuraman et al. (1988) also tested their SERVQUAL scale for reliability and validity (Asubonteng et al, 1996). In respect to scale reliability, the Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficients for the five SERVQUAL dimensions are similar across studies (e.g. Babakus and

Boller, 1992; Babakus and Mangold, 1992; Bowers et al., 1994; Carman, 1990; Cronin and Taylor, 1992; Finn and Lamb, 1991; Taylor and Cronin, 1994; Goswami, 2012) and at least of the same magnitude as those reported in Parasuraman et al. (1988). These findings validate the internal reliability or cohesiveness of the scale items forming each dimension. The lowest reliability is 0.59 reported by Finn and Lamb (1991) and the highest reliability is 0.97 reported by Babakus and Mangold (1992).

In testing validity, findings from the majority of study differ from the original study with respect to SERVQUAL's discriminant validity. Most studies involve greater overlap among the SERVQUAL dimensions – especially among responsiveness, assurance, and empathy – than implied in the original study (Peter et al., 1993). The number of distinct dimensions based solely on the factor analysis results is not the same across studies. It varies from two in the Babakus and Boller (1992) study to eight in one of the four settings studied by Carman (1990).

III-RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This section discusses a phase-wise development of comprehensive methodology, which chiefly involves

selection of variables, development of hypotheses, identification of survey pool, designing and pretesting of questionnaire, and scale reliability. Research methodologies used in this study are descriptive method and historical method. Descriptive method is a method that describes the study systematically, factually and accurately utilizing facts, behaviors and relationship between the phenomena being studied (Sumadi Suryabrata, 2003).

Phase I: Selection of Attributes

In the present study, SERVQUAL dimensions as proposed by Parasuraman & Zeithaml (1988) have been used to measure the customers' satisfaction. Parasuraman et al (1988) performed a series of scale purification exercise which finally resulted in a refined scale ("SERVQUAL") with 22 items spread among five dimensions which included Reliability, Assurance, Responsiveness, Empathy and Tangible. In the current study, a scant respecified twenty one scale items have been imbibed in to measure the customers' satisfaction in terms of service quality rendered in select hypermarkets. The detailed scale items correspond to each SERVQUAL dimension have been enlisted in Table 2

Table 2: Explanation of Scale items and Attributes of SERVQUAL Dimensions

Dimension	Scale Items	Attributes
Reliability	1. Employees in the store must have knowledge to answer customer's queries	Knowledge
	2. Store should show willingness in handling returns and exchanges	Willingness
	3. Employee should show a sincere interest in solving customer's problem	Sincerity
	4. Communication of employees should be firm and understandable	Communication
Responsiveness	1. Employees in store should give prompt service to customers	Prompt Service
	2. Store should response to complaint in time	Response to Complaint
Assurance	1. Store should do repairs, alterations in the given time	Timely alteration
	2. Store should offers high quality merchandise/product	Quality merchandise
	3. Transactions should be Safe and accurate	Safe Transaction
Empathy	1. Store should give individual attention to customers	Individual Attention
	2. Employees in store should be courteous with customers	Courteous
	3. Employee should show patience in answering customer's queries	Patience
Tangible	1. Store should have modern looking equipment and fixture	Modern looking
	2. Store should have enough parking spaces	Parking Space
	3. Availability of food courts is important in store	Food Courts
	4. Store should have clean environment	Clean Environment
	5. Each facility should be well-maintained inside the store	Clean Environment

	6. Store should have trial rooms 7. Products should be classified and arranged accordingly in the store 8. Store layout should make easier for customers to move around in the store 9. Store should offers range of products	Well-Maintained facility Trial-room Assortment Layout Range of Products
--	--	---

Phase II: Development of hypotheses

The following hypotheses were developed and further subjected to empirical testing:

H₁: Customers are satisfied with the quality of service rendered by select hypermarkets.

H₂: The level of satisfaction remains considerably same across the chosen hypermarkets for study.

Phase III: Survey pool and data collection

In order to examine the hypotheses, a questionnaire was developed and tested for appropriateness through a pilot study. The responses were sought from 20 respondents consisting of research scholars and faculty members. Based on the problems surfaced during the pilot study, followed by necessary rectifications, the finally corrected questionnaire was advanced to conduct survey. The current study has been conducted at the Udaipur city of Rajasthan state. Three malls viz. Big Bazaar, Easy Day and Vishal Mega mart have been selected to assess the customers’ satisfaction on the SERVQUAL dimensions. Initially, a tentative sample size of 200 was selected by applying convenience and judgmental sampling technique. Mall intercept method was administered to get responses of the shoppers. Actually, Shoppers were intervened at the malls and responses were sought i.e. asked to fill up the questionnaire. Respondents of size 204 were intercepted but finally 114 had responded, which implies a response rate of 55.88%. The analysis of responses is shown in table 3.

In order to test the hypotheses, a questionnaire was developed using five point Likert Scale (1 for strongly disagree and 5 for strongly agree) and tested for appropriateness through a pilot study. The responses were sought from shoppers sporadically. Based on the problems surfaced during the pilot study, followed by necessary rectifications, the finally corrected questionnaire was advanced to conduct survey. The scale reliability was tested by deploying the statistical test ‘Cronbach’s alpha’ to the responses finally received from 114 respondents. The Cronbach’s alpha covering the overall responses was found to be 0.939, which is considered a good sign of reliability of the questionnaire

Table 3: Analysis of Responses

Hypermarkets	No. of shoppers intercepted	No. of shoppers responded	Response Rate (%)
Big Bazaar	63	39	61.91
Easy Day	89	58	65.17
Vishal Mega Mart	52	17	32.69
Overall	204	114	55.88

IV-RESULTS

This section deals with the testing of hypotheses by using appropriate statistical tools. SPSS-19 software has been used for the purpose of analyzing responses gathered as discussed in Section III.

A. Testing of H₁

H₁: Customers are satisfied with the quality of services rendered by select hypermarkets.

In order to test this hypothesis, a questionnaire was developed using five point Likert Scale (1 for strongly disagree and 5 for strongly agree) on attributes explaining SERVQUAL dimensions correspond to expectations and perceptions for select hypermarkets. The hypothesis primarily measures the significance of gap between general expectations of the customers and perceptions developed when exposed to select hypermarkets which included Big Bazaar, Easy Day and Vishal mega mart of Udaipur city. The outputs produced are shown in three table viz. table-4, 5 and 6. The first table labeled paired sample test for Big Bazaar connotes an iota of satisfaction for the attributes which include prompt service, provision of trial rooms, store layouts, and assortment as the gap is not significant ($t_{\text{prompt service}} = 1.9270, p = 0.0560 > 0.05$; $t_{\text{trial rooms}} = 0.7860, p = 0.4330 > 0.05$; $t_{\text{layout}} = 1.8580, p = 0.0660 > 0.05$; $t_{\text{assortment}} = 1.6160, p = 0.1090 > 0.05$). However, for the rest of the attributes explaining SERVQUAL, the customers’ demonstrated their dissatisfaction as the expectation and perception gap is positively significant. The result appears reverse in case of ‘Easy Day’ as customers have displayed satisfaction on all the attributes except few ($t_{\text{response to complaint}} = 2.6930, p = .0080 < .05$; $t_{\text{safe and accurate transaction}} = 2.3250, p = .0220 < .05$; $t_{\text{willingness to damage handling}} = 2.4130, p = .0170 < .05$; $t_{\text{patience}} = 2.2260, p = 0.0280$) of them. This

provides sufficient evidence to infer that customers have a broad spectrum of satisfaction for 'Easy Day' in comparison to 'Big Bazaar'. Moreover, customers have experienced delightment for the attributes which include prompt service, modern look, provision of food courts and trial room, clean environment, layout of the

mall and, merchandise as the gap is negatively significant in each mentioned case. Surprisingly, the customers are not at all satisfied on any attribute configuring SERVQUAL dimensions for 'Vishal Mega Mart' as gap is positively significant in all the cases.

Table 4: Paired t test for Big Bazaar

Attributes	Expectation		Perception		Gap (E-P)		T	DF	Sig (2 tailed)
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Individual attention	3.9386	0.9245	3.4474	1.1529	0.4912	1.3254	3.9570	113	0.0000
Courteous	4.0877	0.8980	3.6491	0.8923	0.4386	1.0973	4.2680	113	0.0000
Patience	4.0175	0.8412	3.4561	1.0231	0.5614	1.2196	4.9150	113	0.0000
Prompt service	3.9298	0.8797	3.6930	0.9967	0.2368	1.3123	1.9270	113	0.0560
Response to complaint	4.1579	0.8263	3.5789	0.9857	0.5790	1.2891	4.7950	113	0.0000
Modern look	3.9912	0.8146	3.6316	0.9890	0.3597	1.2769	3.0070	113	0.0030
Parking space	4.1053	0.9059	3.6404	1.1061	0.4649	1.4885	3.3350	113	0.0010
Food courts	3.9211	1.0057	3.5702	1.1128	0.3509	1.5627	2.3970	113	0.0180
Clean environment	4.0526	0.9942	3.5965	1.0620	0.4561	1.4213	3.4270	113	0.0010
Well maintained	4.0526	1.0958	3.6491	1.0474	0.4035	1.3614	3.1650	113	0.0020
Trial rooms	3.9825	0.9499	3.8860	1.0198	0.0965	1.3101	0.7860	113	0.4330
Assortment	4.0351	0.9016	3.8421	0.9080	0.1930	1.2752	1.6160	113	0.1090
Layout	3.9737	0.7810	3.7544	1.0690	0.2193	1.2604	1.8580	113	0.0660
Range of products	4.2544	0.8072	3.7544	1.0353	0.5000	1.2708	4.2010	113	0.0000
Timely damage handling	3.9737	0.8143	3.6930	0.9036	0.2807	1.1171	2.6830	113	0.0080
Merchandise	4.0175	0.9684	3.7105	1.1423	0.3070	1.4459	2.2670	113	0.0250
Safe and accurate transaction	4.0439	0.8864	3.6667	1.1725	0.3772	1.3978	2.8810	113	0.0050
Knowledge of employees	4.0526	0.9762	3.4386	0.9597	0.6140	1.3137	4.9910	113	0.0000
Willingness to damage handling	3.9649	0.8918	3.3596	1.1220	0.6053	1.4911	4.3340	113	0.0000
Sincerity	4.0263	0.8669	3.5351	1.0234	0.4912	1.4158	3.7050	113	0.0000
Firm communication	4.1579	0.8782	3.7456	1.0203	0.4123	1.2252	3.5930	113	0.0000

Table 5: Paired t test for Easy Day

Attributes	Expectation		Perception		Gap (E-P)		T	DF	Sig (2 tailed)
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Individual attention	3.9386	0.9245	3.7807	1.1881	0.1579	1.4178	1.1890	113	0.2370
Courteous	4.0877	0.8980	3.9912	0.9911	0.0965	1.1519	0.8940	113	0.3730
Patience	4.0175	0.8412	3.7544	0.9645	0.2631	1.2625	2.2260	113	0.0280
Prompt service	3.9298	0.8797	4.1053	0.9252	-0.1755	1.1071	-1.6920	113	0.0930
Response to complaint	4.1579	0.8263	3.8246	1.0412	0.3333	1.3215	2.6930	113	0.0080
Modern look	3.9912	0.8146	4.1667	0.9859	-0.1755	1.1768	-1.5920	113	0.1140
Parking space	4.1053	0.9059	4.0789	1.0231	0.0264	1.2299	0.2280	113	0.8200
Food courts	3.9211	1.0057	4.0263	1.0345	-0.1052	1.4656	-0.7670	113	0.4450
Clean environment	4.0526	0.9942	4.1140	0.9845	-0.0614	1.3054	-0.5020	113	0.6160
Well maintained	4.0526	1.0958	3.8596	1.0798	0.1930	1.3689	1.5050	113	0.1350
Trial rooms	3.9825	0.9499	4.1228	0.9514	-0.1403	1.1589	-1.2930	113	0.1990
Assortment	4.0351	0.9016	3.9561	1.0675	0.0790	1.4399	0.5850	113	0.5590
Layout	3.9737	0.7810	4.1053	0.9252	-0.1316	1.2230	-1.1490	113	0.2530
Range of products	4.2544	0.8072	4.1140	0.9290	0.1404	1.2257	1.2230	113	0.2240
Timely damage handling	3.9737	0.8143	3.8860	1.0370	0.0877	1.2378	0.7570	113	0.4510
Merchandise	4.0175	0.9684	4.0263	1.1088	-0.0088	1.4421	-0.0650	113	0.9480
Safe and accurate transaction	4.0439	0.8864	3.7193	1.3600	0.3246	1.4904	2.3250	113	0.0220
Knowledge of employees	4.0526	0.9762	3.8158	1.0936	0.2368	1.4713	1.7190	113	0.0880
Willingness to damage handling	3.9649	0.8918	3.6491	1.2046	0.3158	1.3973	2.4130	113	0.0170
Sincerity	4.0263	0.8669	3.9211	0.9699	0.1052	1.2506	0.8990	113	0.3710
Firm communication	4.1579	0.8782	4.0614	1.0667	0.0965	1.2549	0.8210	113	0.4130

Table 6: Paired t test for Vishal MegaMart

Attributes	Expectation		Perception		Gap (E-P)		T	DF	Sig (2 tailed)
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Individual attention	3.9386	0.9245	3.2018	1.2422	0.7368	1.4516	5.4200	113	0.0000
Courteous	4.0877	0.8980	3.4035	1.0281	0.6842	1.2360	5.9100	113	0.0000
Patience	4.0175	0.8412	3.5000	0.8949	0.5175	1.2426	4.4470	113	0.0000
Prompt service	3.9298	0.8797	3.2982	1.0385	0.6316	1.3121	5.1400	113	0.0000
Response to complaint	4.1579	0.8263	3.6053	1.1180	0.5526	1.3041	4.5240	113	0.0000
Modern look	3.9912	0.8146	3.2982	1.0470	0.6930	1.3445	5.5030	113	0.0000
Parking space	4.1053	0.9059	3.3684	1.1844	0.7369	1.5518	5.0700	113	0.0000
Food courts	3.9211	1.0057	3.3158	1.1076	0.6053	1.4911	4.3340	113	0.0000
Clean environment	4.0526	0.9942	3.3860	1.0931	0.6666	1.5324	4.6450	113	0.0000
Well maintained	4.0526	1.0958	3.4561	1.0317	0.5965	1.4311	4.4500	113	0.0000
Trial rooms	3.9825	0.9499	3.6754	1.0767	0.3071	1.3576	2.4150	113	0.0170
Assortment	4.0351	0.9016	3.6140	0.9640	0.4211	1.3626	3.2990	113	0.0010
Layout	3.9737	0.7810	3.4649	0.9972	0.5088	1.1843	4.5870	113	0.0000
Range of products	4.2544	0.8072	3.3333	1.1024	0.9211	1.2631	7.7860	113	0.0000
Timely damage handling	3.9737	0.8143	3.4912	1.0240	0.4825	1.2064	4.2700	113	0.0000
Merchandise	4.0175	0.9684	3.4123	1.1811	0.6052	1.5436	4.1870	113	0.0000
Safe and accurate transaction	4.0439	0.8864	3.3596	1.3379	0.6843	1.5245	4.7920	113	0.0000
Knowledge of employees	4.0526	0.9762	3.3421	1.1197	0.7105	1.3808	5.4940	113	0.0000
Willingness to damage handling	3.9649	0.8918	3.2807	1.2084	0.6842	1.4593	5.0060	113	0.0000
Sincerity	4.0263	0.8669	3.4561	1.0571	0.5702	1.3168	4.6230	113	0.0000
Firm communication	4.1579	0.8782	3.7982	1.1381	0.3597	1.3111	2.9290	113	0.0040

B. Testing of hypothesis H₂

H₂: The level of satisfaction remains considerably same across the chosen hypermarkets for study.

In order to test this hypothesis, the responses were sought on a five point Likert rating scale. The

respondents were asked to display their degree of agreement/disagreement on the level of satisfaction they experienced for each selected hypermarket. ANOVA test was performed in order to examine whether mean satisfaction level remains same across the category formed on select hypermarkets considered

for study. The result as shown in the table 8, connotes a significant variation in the level of satisfaction across the categories ($F= 64.727, p = 0.000 < 0.05$) at 5% level of significance. Thus, as shown in the table 7, respondents have demonstrated their agreement on

level of satisfaction for 'Easy Day' (mean = 4.3421) in comparison to the other two hypermarkets. The iota of dissatisfaction intensified in case of 'VishalMaga Mart'.

Table 7: Descriptive statistics- Level of Satisfaction

Hypermarkets	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Big Bazaar	114	3.4386	1.04784	.09814	3.2442	3.6330	1.00	5.00
Easy Day	114	4.3421	.75056	.07030	4.2028	4.4814	2.00	5.00
Vishal Megamart	114	2.9035	1.06405	.09966	2.7061	3.1009	1.00	5.00
Total	342	3.5614	1.13102	.06116	3.4411	3.6817	1.00	5.00

Table 8: ANOVA- Level of Satisfaction

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	120.544	2	60.272	64.727	.000
Within Groups	315.667	339	.931		
Total	436.211	341			

CONCLUSION

Satisfying customer is one of the main objectives of every business because businesses know that retaining a satisfied customer is more profitable than acquiring the new one. Retailing in India is gradually edging its way towards becoming the next boom industry. In today's competitive retail environment, delivery of high service quality has long been treated as basic business strategy. This can be achieved through the delivery of high service quality. This paper makes an attempt to measure the customers' satisfaction for select hypermarkets which include Big Bazaar, Easy Day and Vishal Mega Mart in Udaipur city of Rajasthan. Five dimensions in service quality (SERVQUAL) viz. tangibility, reliability, responsiveness, empathy, and assurance have been considered for this empirical research. The research methodology was carried out in a survey cross sectional applied to 114 respondents. The results reveal that customers are highly satisfied with the service quality of 'Easy Day'. Moreover, customers have experienced delightment for the attributes which include prompt service, modern look, provision of food courts and trial room, clean environment, layout of the mall and, merchandising of products. However, dissatisfaction for 'Easy Day' is chiefly attributed to the service qualities which include response to complaint, safe and accurate transaction, overall patience and willingness of the employees to damage handling. The customers have attributed satisfaction for Big Bazaar on

few constructs which include prompt services, provision of trial rooms, and internal layout. The iota of dissatisfaction intensified in case of 'Vishal Mega Mart' as customers have experienced dissatisfaction on each attribute corresponds to each SERVQUAL dimension.

References

- [1]. Anderson, E. W., Fornell C. and Lehmann, D.R. (1994). Customer satisfaction, market share and profitability: findings from Sweden. *Journal of Marketing*, 58(3), 53-66
- [2]. Angur, M.G., R. Natarajan and J.S. Jahera (1999). Service quality in the banking industry: an assessment in a developing economy. *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, 17 (3), 116-123
- [3]. Asubonteng, Patrick, McCleary, Karl J. and Swan, John E. (1996), SERVQUAL revisited: a critical review of service quality, *The Journal of Services Marketing*, Vol. 10 No. 6, pp. 62-81
- [4]. Babakus, E. & Boller, G.W. (1992). An empirical assessment of the SERVQUAL scale. *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 24, 253-268.
- [5]. Babakus, E. & Mangold, W.G. (1989). Adapting the SERVQUAL scale to hospital services: an empirical investigation. *Hospital Services Research*, Vol. 26, No. 6, 767-786.
- [6]. Bateson (1995), "SERVQUAL: review, critique, research agenda", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 30 No. 1, pp. 8-32.

- [7]. Boshoff et al (1997) "Service quality in internet banking: the importance of customer role", *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, Vol. 20 No. 6, pp. 327-35.
- [8]. Bouman, M. & Van der Wiele, T. (1992). Measuring service quality in the car service industry: building and testing an instrument. *Journal of Service Industry Management*, Vol. 3, No. 4, 4-16.
- [9]. Burns, D. J. & Neisen, L. (2004). Customer Satisfaction in a retailing setting: the contribution of emotion. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, 34(1), 49-66
- [10]. C.N. Krishna Naik ,SwapnaBhargaviGantasala and Gantasala V. Prabhakar (2010), "Service Quality (Servqual) and its Effect on Customer Satisfaction in Retailing", *European Journal of Social Sciences – Vol 16, No 2* , pp.. 231-243
- [11]. Carman, J.M. (1990). Consumer perceptions of service quality: an assessment of the SERVQUAL dimensions. *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 66, No. 1, Spring, 33-55
- [12]. Chandra, B., Chouhan, V., and Goswami, S.,(2012) Analyzing Trends and Profitability vis-à-vis Working Capital Organizations of India Management (WCM) – A Study of Select Information Technology (IT), *Indian Journal of Finance*, ISSN: 0973-8711, Vol.6, No. 7, July, PP 13-26.
- [13]. Chandra, B., Goswami, S. and Chouhan, V., (2012) Investigating Attitude towards On-Line Advertising on Social Media – An Empirical Study, *Management Insight, SMS Varanasi*, ISSN: 0973-936X, Vol. VIII, No. 1, June, PP 1-14.
- [14]. Chouhan, V. & Verma, P., (2014:b), Measuring validity of performance appraisal tools in Performance Appraisal System, *Nirnay the Journal of Decision Science*, Vol. 6, No. 1, Jan-July, pp 57-64.
- [15]. Chouhan, V. & Verma, Pushpa (2014:a), Improving effectiveness of Performance appraisal tool: Who thinks that it uses improved techniques?, *Business Spectrum*, 4(1), 71-82.
- [16]. Chouhan, V., (2013), Global Convergence of Accounting Standard And Indian Perspective, *International Journal of Research in Finance & Marketing*, 33(7), 15-27
- [17]. Chouhan, V., Chandra, B., Goswami, S. (2014), Predicting financial stability of select BSE companies revisiting Altman Z score, *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences*, 15(2), 92-105.
- [18]. Chouhan, V., Verma, Pushpa, Sanghvi, Himanshu and Gupta, Apurv (2013), Assessing Worker's and Manager's Perception on Judgment Accuracy in Performance Appraisal System (PAS) *International Journal of Engineering, Business and Enterprise Applications (IJEBA)*, 5(1), 95-99.
- [19]. Cronin, J. Joseph and Stephen A. Taylor (1992), "Measuring Service Quality: A Reexamination and Extension", *Journal of Marketing*, 56 (July), 55-68
- [20]. Dabholkar, P.A. (1996), "Consumer evaluations of new technology-based self-service operations: an investigation of alternative models", *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, Vol. 13 No. 1, pp. 29-51.
- [21]. Fick GR and Rictche J R B (1991). Marketing service quality in the travel and tourism industry. *Journal of Travel Research* 30, 2-9
- [22]. Finn, D. and Lamb, C. (1991). An evaluation of the SERVQUAL scale in a retailing setting. *Advances in Consumer Research*. Vol. 18, pp. 483-90.
- [23]. Fornell C. (1992). A national customer satisfaction barometer: the Swedish experience. *Journal of Marketing*, 56(1), 6-21
- [24]. Fornell C. ,Mithas, S. , Morgeson, F. V. III & Krishan, M.S. (2006). Customer satisfaction and stock prices: high returns, low risk. *Journal of Marketing*. 70(1), 3-40
- [25]. Gitomer, J. (1998). Customer satisfaction is worthless, customer loyalty is priceless: How to make customers love you, keep them coming back, and tell everyone they know. Austin, TX: Bard Press.
- [26]. Goswami S (2015), A Study on the Online Branding Strategies of Indian Fashion Retail Stores, *IUP Journal of Brand Management* 12 (1), 45-55
- [27]. Goswami, S. (2012). A Study of Private Labels of Organized Retail Stores in South Rajasthan. *International Journal of Research in IT and Management*, 2(2), 1027-1037
- [28]. Grönroos, C. (1983), *Strategic Management and Marketing in the Service Sector*, Marketing Science Institute, Boston
- [29]. Hayes, B. (1998). *Measuring Customer Satisfaction*. Milwaukee, WI: ASQ Quality Press.
- [30]. Khan, S., Chouhan, V., Chandra, B. & Goswami, S. (2012). Measurement of Value Creation Vis-à-Vis EVA: Analysis of Select BSE Companies, *Pacific Business Review*
- [31]. Lapierre et al, (1996), "Use of service quality gap theory to differentiate between food service outlets", *The Service Industries Journal*, Vol. 16 No. 3, pp. 321-46.
- [32]. Lassar W. M., Manolis C., and Winsor R. D., 2000, "Service Quality Perspectives and Satisfaction in Private Banking", *Journal of Services Marketing*, vol. 14. No. 3 pp. 244-271
- [33]. Lehtinen, U. and Lehtinen, J.R. (1982), "Service quality: a study of quality dimensions", working paper, Service Management Institute, Helsinki.
- [34]. Leung, C. & To, C.K. (2001). Measuring perceived service quality of fashion stores: a test-retest reliability investigation. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management*, Vol. 5, No. 4, 324-329.
- [35]. Mary Long, Charles McMellon, (2004). Exploring the determinants of retail service quality on the Internet. *Journal of Services Marketing*, Vol. 18 Iss: 1, pp.78 - 90
- [36]. Mathur, M., & Goswami, S. (2012). A study of consumer behavior and product placement in Indian cinema. *Annals of Management Research*, 2(1), 29-38.
- [37]. McElwee G and Redman T (1993). Upward appraisal in practice: An illustrative example using the QUALED scale. *Education Training* 35: 27-31
- [38]. Mehta et al. (2000), "A service quality model based on ideal value standard", *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, Vol. 3 No. 3, pp. 18-33.
- [39]. Oh, H. (1999). Service quality, customer satisfaction and customer value: a holistic perspective. *Hospitality Management*. 18(1), 67-82
- [40]. Oliver, R. L. (1980). A cognitive model of the antecedents and consequences of satisfaction

- decisions, *Journal of Marketing Research* 17(4), 460-469
- [41]. Oliver, R. L. (1981). Measurement and Evaluation of Satisfaction Processes in Retail Settings. *Journal of Retailing*, 57(3), 25-48
- [42]. Parasuraman, A., Berry, L, &Zeithaml, V. (1988). SERVQUAL: A multiple-item scale for measuring customer perceptions of service quality. *Journal of Retailing*, 64, 26-43.
- [43]. Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V.A. & Berry, L.L. (1991). Refinement and reassessment of the SERVQUAL scale. *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 67, No. 4, Winter, 420-450.
- [44]. Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V.A. & Berry, L.L. (1994). Alternative scales for measuring service quality: a comparative assessment based on psychometric and diagnostic criteria. *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 70, No. 3, 201-230.
- [45]. 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. 3, pp. 41-50.
- [46]. Peter, P.J. and Churchill, G.A. (1986), "Relationships among research design choices and psychometric properties of rating scales: a meta-analysis", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 23, February, pp. 1-10.
- [47]. Philip J. Trocchia, SwinderJanda, (2003). How do consumers evaluate Internet retail service quality?. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 17 (3), pp.243 - 253
- [48]. Pitt L F, Waston R T and Kaven C B (1995). Service quality: A measure of information system effectiveness. *MIS Quarterly* 26: 173-85
- [49]. Reicheld, F.F. & Sasser, W.E. Jr. (1990). Zero defections: quality comes to services. *Harvard Business Review*, 68(5), 105-110
- [50]. Rigotti S and Pitt L (1992). SERVQUAL as a measuring instrument for service provider gaps in business school. *Management Research News*15:9-17
- [51]. Saleh F and Ryan C (1992). Analysis service quality in hospitality industry using the SERVEQUAL model. *Services Industries Journal* 11: 324-43
- [52]. Sivadas, E. & Baker-Prewitt, J.L. (2000). An examination of the relationship between service quality, customer satisfaction and store loyalty. *International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management*, Vol. 28, No. 2, 73-82.
- [53]. Swartz, T.A. and Brown, S.W. (1989), "Consumer and provider expectations and experience in evaluating professional service quality", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 17, Spring, pp. 189-95.
- [54]. Taylor, S.A. and Cronin, J.J. (1994), "Modeling patient satisfaction and service quality", *Journal of Health Care Marketing*, Vol. 14 No. 1, pp. 34-44.
- [55]. Westbrook, R. A. & Oliver, R.L. (1991). The Dimensionality of Consumption Emotion Patterns and Customer Satisfaction. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 18(1), 84-91
- [56]. Wong, Amy and AmrikSohal (2003). Service quality and customer loyalty perspectives on two levels of retail relationships, *Journal of Services Marketing*, 17 (5), 495-513