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ABSTRACT

This study aims to explore the perception of students with regard to critical antecedents and dimensions of service quality, and their causal relationships in the context of a university in Australia. The study used qualitative research method to derive a theoretical model. Three focus group discussions with nineteen students were conducted at the Central Queensland University (CQUni), Rockhampton, Australia. The findings reveal that the critical antecedents to perceived service quality are information and past experience. Students perceive service quality as a set of attributes and that they evaluate it cognitively. These attributes are categorized as academic, administrative and facilities service qualities. All of the interrelationships among the key themes are positive.
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INTRODUCTION

Service quality is defined as the totality of features and characteristics of a product or service that bears on its ability to satisfy stated or implied needs (Johnson & Winchell 1988). Service quality has also been viewed as a critical determinant of competitiveness (Lewis 1989), a source of lasting competitive advantage through service differentiation (Moore 1987), and a driver of corporate financial and marketing performance (Buttle 1996). Until now two critical measures are dominating in the service quality literature. These are the SERVQUAL (Parasuraman, Zeithaml & Berry 1985, 1988) and the SERVPERF (Cronin & Taylor 1992, 1994). These scales are developed focusing on the commercial service sectors and subsequently are tested in the higher education domain. Reviewing available literature (see Table 1) conceptualised either on SERVQUAL or SERVPERF scales in the higher education domain in various country specific contexts, it is found that no study focuses on antecedents to service quality in the context of higher education. Hence, the purpose of this paper is to discuss empirically the antecedents and dimensions of service quality from performance–only approach in the context of an Australian university.

“Insert Table 1 here”
LITERATURE REVIEW

Most of the service quality measures in the last few decades have focused on the dimensional approach, and thus the dimensional study of service quality still dominates the current literature. The dimensions of service quality varies by the thoughts of two different schools, Nordic (Grönroos, 1982, 1984) school and American school (Parasuraman et al. 1985, 1988), by industries (Lee, Lee & Yoo 2000), by service types (Babakus & Boller 1992), by culture (Furrer, Liu & Sudharshan 2000) or even by providers or firms in the same industry (Abdullah 2005; Sureshchandar, Rajendran & Kamalanabhan 2001; Zeithaml, Berry & Parasuraman 1993). Studies have failed to replicate the five original dimensions of the SERVQUAL or the SERVPERF measures, namely, reliability, responsiveness, tangibility, assurance and empathy (Carrillat, Jaramillo & Mulki 2007; White & Schneider 2000). Therefore, studies suggest that service quality scales need to be adapted to the study context (Carman 1990; Carrillat et al. 2007). A comparative analysis (see Table 2) may provide helpful insights between dimensional aspects and antecedent aspects of service quality.

“The antecedent approach to study service quality received a little attention in academic literature. Study demonstrates that service quality is influenced by four of its dimensions, namely reliability, personal attention, comfort and features. The authors refer these dimensions as the antecedents to service quality (Dabholkar, Shepherd & Thorpe 2000). Dabholkar et al.’s (2000) longitudinal study uses three measures, namely perception–only measure; measured disconfirmation and computed disconfirmation. The findings state that perception–only measure is superior to computed disconfirmation and measured disconfirmation. The study recommends that if the objective of the study is to predict service quality or to gauge its determinants, perception–only measure should be used rather than disconfirmation. Although Dabholkar et al. (2000) show that the four dimensions are the four antecedents to service quality; this findings may not be applicable across service types, firms, service industries and cultures in general. This is because service quality is a contextual issue, its dimensions vary widely. Moreover, the bulk of recent studies still consider these to be the dimensions
of service quality instead of antecedents (Bigne, Molinar & Sanchez 2003; Kilbourne, Duffy, Duffy & Giarchi 2004; Kim & Jin 2002; Sureshchandar et al. 2001; Swanson & Davis 2003).

In summary, the available literature suggests that dimensional aspects of service quality in higher education context vary by industry and culture, and that there is no study that considers antecedent and dimensional aspects of service quality in the context of higher education. A limited effort has also been devoted in academic literature to find a research model specifically designed for higher education services marketing through qualitative research method. Thus, it is appropriate to start with qualitative research method, specifically, the focus group discussions, to gain insights about antecedents and dimensional aspects of service quality.

RESEARCH METHOD

This research adopted an exploratory qualitative method and thus, this research employed focus group technique. There were several reasons for employing focus group technique. First, to study the perceptions of students with regard to critical antecedents of service quality. Second, to study the perceptions of students with regard to critical service attributes and their categorization. Third, to study the causal relationships among the themes developed and to formulate a theoretical model.

Research examining students’ choice processes of university course selection used 22 students as focus group members (Brown et al. 2009). Although there is no rule of thumb about the number of members in a focus group, one study suggested that “a group consisting of 5–10 respondents is appropriate (Krueger & Casey 2000, p. 10).” This study selected 19 undergraduate and postgraduate (including research) students for three focus group discussions based on convenience and purposive sampling techniques. This study tried to ensure representative members of the larger population of the CQUni following the suggestions of several studies (Morgan 1997; Stewart & Shamdasani 1990; Stewart, Shamdasani & Rook 2007).

First, the respondents were explained about the research aims, and the tasks they would perform during focus group discussion. Second, broad and open-ended questions were posed; including what affects quality of services in terms of the CQUni prior to enrolment? How do they evaluate service
quality in terms of their university? What are the critical quality aspects of this university? Third, to facilitate the discussion and to keep it compact within the aim of this study, the principal researcher summarized the discussions when necessary during each of the interviews. This facilitated participants to focus on the content of discussions. The discussions were recorded using an electronic device. On an average, each discussion took one hour duration.

The analysis of focus group data requires a great deal of judgment and care, and they depend on the research question and the purpose of focus group discussion (Morgan 1988). For the purpose of this study, a thorough content analysis is employed. “Content analysis entails a systematic reading of a body of texts, images and symbolic matters, not necessary from an author’s or user’s perspective” (Krippendorff 2004, p. 3). It is used when verbal data are gathered in the form of answers to open ended interview questions and focus group conversation. First, the researchers identified the recorded information that was important for developing themes and the interrelationships following the theoretical and conceptual suggestions (Krippendorff 2004; Neuendorf 2005). In this stage of analysis, transcriptions were prepared from the recorded focus group discussions onto paper. The manuscripts were cleaned and edited through eliminating typographical errors and contradictions in the text that were irrelevant with the central issue of the study. The second stage followed coding and categorizing. In this stage, key words were assigned suitable for a section of text, giving a particular meaning to or labelling a section of the material (Sarantakos 1997), and thus the texts were classified or categorized.

The coding process not only involved categorizing the chunks of texts but also included memoing the data. Memo is the notes, backgrounds, ideas or thoughts about coding data (Babbie 2007; Sarantakos 1997). The third stage was concept mapping. Concept mapping is the display of concepts and their interrelations to formulate a theory (Babbie 2007). It also helps strengthening the theoretical model. The theoretical model was purified following a two step procedures. First, each researcher independently reviewed the transcripts and developed a list of themes, and formulated the interrelationships among them. Second, the researchers shared their inferences, and finally developed the theoretical model and key hypothesis.
FINDINGS

Demography of the Respondents

Demography is important in qualitative analyses. This is because it validates the responses collected to achieve research objective. The ages of the degree, master’s and doctoral students were between 19 and 21, 26 and 34, and 33 and 38 respectively. Total female to male ratio was 5:14 in three focus groups. They all were studying for more than six months at the CQUni. Table 3 shows their demographics.

“Insert Table 3 Here”

The Critical Antecedents to Service Quality

Information: The focus groups were asked to discuss the factors that affect quality of services in terms of their university prior to enrolment. Respondents state that information affects the level of quality judgment. They have also underlined that the information provided by the institution should be true, want satisfying and reliable. The following are the quotes of focus groups’ participants.

“If the product is new and there is no set standard, in that case, the level of quality in terms of my needs would be very much influenced by whatever product related promotional materials are being discharged by the supplier”.

“The underlying factors affecting quality are adequate information and its genuineness”.

“…delivered promise must be equal to the delivered service”.

“Quality is affected, among other things, by the promise that would have been provided by the supplier”.

“Quality evaluation starts from promise and information provided by the supplier”.

“…I consider how the delivered service attributes are important to me. That is the most basic is what is that I want from the service”.

Thus, information can be defined as explicit and implicit messages that students receive directly and indirectly (via media) from the university before enrolment. Based on the focus group discussions, we find information as promise, information communicated through marketing tools, genuineness of information, and desired information in the context of a higher education. Studies ascribed that formal communications from various sources, including advertisements, leaflets, and related articles in magazines and newspapers, affect the way customers interpret ambiguous evidence concerning
quality (Deighton 1984; Devlin, Gwynne & Ennew 2002; Mathews 1994). Devlin et al. (2002) states that information provides opportunities to influence assessment of service quality. However, the extant literature is lacking to explore the nexus between information and service quality. Information affects quality evaluation in that students evaluate stated or implied promise and provided information during or after service encounter. Therefore,

\( H1. \) There is a positive relationship between information received by the students and their evaluation of service quality.

**Past experience:** The focus group findings state that past experience of students affect service quality assessment. Students’ recent experience of meeting or interacting with staff of a university also affects service quality judgment. Students, especially the undergraduate students, use high school experience as a fuzzy input to predict service quality of higher educational services. This may result to build a set of unrealistic expectations about service quality of a university. The following are the quotes relevant to past experience and its relationship with perception of service quality.

“…among the other factors that play a key role to form quality is past experience”.

“…before coming to this university, I had only high school experience. From that point, it is hard to say. But at least it tells that we would learn some advanced stuff at the university”.

“I’d say like if I had experience of attending other university, I was gonna learn quite advanced stuffs”.

“I will compare my past experience, for example, the experience with my previous university and present university”.

“…definitely past experience has a role to play and evaluate quality of university services”.

“As a student of this university, I can’t compare the services of other universities. To me it has no bad experience and it fulfils what I want.”

“I’ve attended three different universities in Australia. Many people would agree that out of these three, …..University is the prestigious. But why I didn’t go back to that university? So, considering location, proximity and recent experience with staff, I’m keep going with the Central Queensland University”.

Thus, past experience refers to students’ previous educational experience before enrolling at the university, previous experience of service encounter, their interaction and relationships with staff
and/or the university prior to enrolment, and subsequent treatment provided by the university. Studies
find that past experience helps forming service expectations (Devlin et al. 2002; Gounaris,
Stathakopoulos & Athanassopoulos 2003; Zeithaml et al. 1993). However, inexperience of service
encounter or unrealistic expectations may results to fuzzy prediction of service quality standards. In
the extant literature, the relationship between past experience and service quality is unexplored.
Students’ previous experience of service encounter and their interaction and relationships with the
university are the determinants to get enrolled at the university. This leads to the second hypothesis.

H2. There is a positive relationship between past experience of the students and perception of service
quality.

The Nature of Service Quality

In order to understand the nature of service quality, the focus groups were asked how they evaluate
service quality in terms of their university. As revealed from focus group findings, the assessment of
quality of service is a cognitive process. The following statements are extracted from focus group
discussions.

“…quality relates to certain attributes of a product which exceeds certain perceived standards
or set standard. If it exceeds set standards, it’s of quality and if it’s below set standards, it’s
below quality”.

“I consider my recent experience and present performance to assess quality”.

“I think we add–up the issues like recent experience, present performance and our interests in
a subconscious manner. This is a psychological process of understanding”.

“Quality is a relative performance and it is result oriented to me”.

“When it comes to quality of service it’s obviously a bit difficult if not impossible for anyone
who assesses service actually before he experiences. Therefore, three issues that would play,
firstly, what is it that I want and what promises the services provider has put forward.
Secondly, of course whether the service is able to actually meet the promises that are made
before customers. Thirdly, the consumption experience, which is itself an important one. I
think these three issues would be the core of evaluating a service”.

The focus group findings state that service quality assessment is students’ judgments of service
attributes during service encounter. It is a cognitive process, meaning that service quality assessment
is a psychological result of perception, learning, reasoning and understanding of the service attributes. Further, the focus groups were asked to discuss the critical quality aspects of services of their university in order to fully comprehend the nature of service quality. The following are the quotes of focus group discussions. We categorize these quotes as academic, administrative and facilities.

The academic service quality refers to those service attributes that are relevant to teaching quality and ability, course development and teacher–student relationships in order to provide core academic values and/or benefits to the students. The following are the specific quotes relevant to academic service quality.

**Category: Academic**

“I think the most important is the quality of lecturers and how entertaining they are. The lecture should not be boring. After lecture availability is also important”.

“To me the delivery of lecture should be good and lecturers to be interactive, so that at the end I can understand that I have learnt something”.

“...they should have research expertise and intellectual capacity to conduct research and supervise the research students”.

“...yes they should be specialized in research of a particular area”.

The administrative service quality refers to those service attributes that are relevant to skills and abilities of the administrative and supporting staff, and their relationships with students in order to provide smooth functioning of academic activities of a university. These are critical service attributes for providing the support services to smooth running the programs/courses. The following are the specific quotes.

**Category: Administrative**

“Sometimes staff takes time to reply to our query, and send us the common web links to search instead of addressing the queries. They should know what they are doing”.

“...student recruitment procedures, overall people and process of delivery are also vital as quality aspects.”

Facilities service quality refers to those service attributes that are required to create a good higher education environment. This refers to library facilities, entertainment facilities, career counselling, transport facilities, dining facilities, access to computer and other resources, and
workshops/seminar/conference. Particularly, the following are some of the specific quotes with regard to facilities service quality.

*Category: Facilities*

“...of course the critical aspects are library facilities and then is career counselling”.

“I face specific problem with transport services”.

“We do not have a good dining facility here”.

“The other important issues are whether the university holds workshops and invites renowned people to deliver speeches”.

“...accessibilities to entertainment centres and resources”.

These findings suggest that antecedents to service quality and dimensions of service quality are two distinct thoughts. The antecedent to service quality mainly involves those issues that students consider prior to interacting with the service. In contrast, the dimensions of service quality are related to specific features of services during service encounter. In the context of CQU, the antecedents to service quality are information (In) and past experience (PE), and the key categories of service quality attributes are academic (AcSQ), administrative (AdSQ) and facilities (FSQ). Figure 1 shows the theoretical model in the context of higher education.

“Insert Figure 1 Here”

**DISCUSSION**

Unlike the products, services have special characteristics. These are heterogeneity, perishability, intangibility, inseparability (Zeithaml, Parasuraman & Berry 1985). Due to special nature of services, it is imperative to focus on students’ pre-enrolment information structure that can be strengthened through good experience of present students and previous alumnae, maintaining promises, providing adequate and specific information and ensuring its genuineness, and above all focusing on what students’ desires in terms of educational information. Because quality is affected by reliable information, the marketing communication message should design the promises carefully. Therefore, managers of higher education institute should concentrate their attentions to these particular areas, and allocate available resources in order to strengthen students’ information structure prior to enrolment and optimize the outcomes.
The higher education institutions should continuously improve students’ experience with the service that they receive, and should focus on maintaining relationships. As the high school students might build a fuzzy set of assumptions about higher education services due to absence of concrete experience, the university should maintain relationships with local and regional high schools, and invite high school teachers and students to participate in short courses, short visits, meetings and symposiums. This might increase enrolments and impact favourably on quality judgment.

The present study finds that there are three critical categories of service quality in the context of an Australian university. These are academic service quality, administrative service quality and facilities service quality. These categories are related to specific attributes of higher educational services that students encounter during their study. For example, first, the academic service quality includes the quality of lecturers, entertaining and interactive lecture, after lecture availability for consultation, and lastly lecturer’s intellectual ability and understandings of the course, students and research. Second, the administrative service quality includes effective reply to students’ queries, efficiency and effectiveness during admission procedures and services relevant to overall process of delivering quality education. Third, the facilities service quality includes library facilities, workshops and seminars of resource person, career counselling, transport facilities, dining facilities and entertainment facilities are fundamental to higher education service facilities.

The findings of this study state that the antecedent perspective (e.g. information and past experience) provides academic—managers an insight of what affects students’ perception of service quality, how students view service quality as a whole and how this view contribute predicting their behaviour in the context of an Australian university. The dimensional perspective, in contrast, provides an understanding about the critical aspects of services that students evaluate during/after service encounter. Thus, antecedent and dimensional perspectives help predicting other cognitive, behavioural and attitudinal outcomes in the long-run.
CONCLUSION, LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

The aims of this study were to explore the perception of students with regard to critical antecedents and dimensions of service quality in the context of CQUni, Australia. This study used qualitative method to derive a theoretical model. The focus group findings show that the critical antecedents to service quality are information and past experience. Students perceive service quality as the performance of a set of attributes relevant to academic, administrative and facilities. The managerial implications of this study have several facets. First, the information designed for the students should contain desired and true messages. Second, the higher education institute should focus on continuous improvement of service performance in order to have good perceived experience of the students. Third, it is imperative for managers to develop and to maintain good and long–term relationships with the students, and to maintain good relationships with local and regional high schools and communities. They should invite high school teachers and students to participate in short courses, short visits, fair, meetings and symposiums. This might increase enrolments and impact favourably on quality judgment.

There are several limitations in this study. Although selecting samples from a single university was one of the limitations, previous studies have conducted experiments considering a single university (Brown, Varley & Pal 2009; Douglas, McClelland & Davies 2008; Smith, Smith & Clarke 2007; Stodnick & Rogers 2008). However, particular attention was given to select student samples for each of the focus groups to ensure representativeness of the larger population of the CQUni. Second, selecting three focus groups with 19 students posses one of the challenges for this study. This was done to comply with the allotted budget and timeframe. Third, there were six Australian and 13 international participants in three focus group discussions. The type of nationality may have an impact on the findings of this study. Future study should address these limitations, and generalise and validate the model using quantitative research method and large samples. The validation of the model in the context of higher education industry across various countries should also be contributing to the literature. Future study can also extend this model using similar research method.
Table 1: Service quality dimensions in higher education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author, Date</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Country/University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Sultan &amp; Wong 2010a)</td>
<td>67 Items</td>
<td>Dependability, effectiveness, capability, efficiency, competencies, assurance, unusual situation management and semester–syllabus</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Rojas-Me´ndez, Vasquez-Parraga, Kara, &amp; Cerda-Urrutia 2009)</td>
<td>18 Items</td>
<td>Instructors, program director, secretaries, service attitude and competence development</td>
<td>Chilean University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Stodnick &amp; Rogers 2008) *</td>
<td>18 Items</td>
<td>Reliability, Assurance, Tangibles, Empathy and Responsiveness</td>
<td>One course, Southwestern University, USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Angell, Heffernan &amp; Megicks 2008)</td>
<td>18 Items</td>
<td>Academic, leisure, industry links and cost</td>
<td>One university, UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Smith et al. 2007)*</td>
<td>22 Items</td>
<td>Reliability, Assurance, Tangibles, Empathy and Responsiveness</td>
<td>IT Department, one university, UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Abdullah 2006c)</td>
<td>41 Items</td>
<td>Non-academic, academic, reputation, access, program and understanding</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Abdullah 2005, 2006a, 2006b)</td>
<td>35 Items</td>
<td>Non-academic, academic, reliability and empathy</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Gatfield, Barker, &amp; Graham 1999)</td>
<td>26 Items</td>
<td>Academic instruction, campus life, guidance, recognition</td>
<td>One Australian University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Kwan &amp; Ng 1999)</td>
<td>31 Items</td>
<td>Course content, concern for students, facilities, assessment, medium of instruction, social activities and people.</td>
<td>China and Hong Kong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Li &amp; Kaye 1998)*</td>
<td>27 Items</td>
<td>Reliability, Assurance, Tangibles, Empathy and Responsiveness</td>
<td>One university, UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Joseph &amp; Joseph 1997)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Program, academic reputation, physical aspects, career opportunities, location, time and other</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(LeBlanc &amp; Nguyen 1997)</td>
<td>38 Items</td>
<td>Contact personnel/faculty, contact personnel/administration, responsiveness, reputation, curriculum, physical evidence and access to facilities</td>
<td>Business School, one university, Canada</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Items were not exactly loaded under each of the dimensions as claimed in the SERVQUAL scale.
Table 2: Antecedent and dimensional perspectives of service quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Dimensional approach</th>
<th>Antecedent approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key focus</td>
<td>The dimensional approach of service quality provides an understanding of quality dimensions and its relevant attributes.</td>
<td>The antecedent framework provides an insight of how consumers view service quality as a whole and how this view contributes predicting their behaviour (Dabholkar et al., 2000).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>This approach is a service specific approach.</td>
<td>This approach is consumer (market) specific approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction</td>
<td>The direction is from service to consumer.</td>
<td>The direction is from consumer to service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurement</td>
<td>The items focus on functional, delivery and physical aspects of a product/service.</td>
<td>The items focus on consumers’ cognitive understanding and try to answer—what and how a certain thing occurs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective versus formative</td>
<td>The dimensional approach is reflective. This is because the content of each item should primarily reflect the construct of interest (Diamantopoulos &amp; Siguaw, 2006).</td>
<td>The antecedent approach is formative or causal. The formative indicators can be viewed as causing rather than being caused (Diamantopoulos, 1999).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale versus index</td>
<td>This forms a scale.</td>
<td>This forms an index.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>The major benefit of using the dimensional approach is that it gives an understanding of the service features and their relevant dimensions. It also shows the importance of service features that are desired by consumers.</td>
<td>The major benefit of using the antecedent approach is that it provides an understanding of how consumers view a particular phenomenon and what are the dominating factors. This in turn helps predicting consumers’ behaviour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>The resulting dimensions vary based on service types, firms or provider, industry and even culture.</td>
<td>The antecedents aspects may also vary but in a limited manner. This is because consumers use more or less similar cues in their cognition to view a particular phenomenon.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Demographics of the focus group participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Level of Study</th>
<th>Program of Study</th>
<th>Duration of Study at the CQU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>07 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Information Tech</td>
<td>10 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Business Studies</td>
<td>09 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Business Studies</td>
<td>09 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Information Tech</td>
<td>10 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>Business Studies</td>
<td>07 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>Business Studies</td>
<td>07 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>Business Studies</td>
<td>07 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>Business Studies</td>
<td>07 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>Business Studies</td>
<td>07 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>Business Studies</td>
<td>07 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>Business Studies</td>
<td>07 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>Business Studies</td>
<td>07 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>06 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>07 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>07 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>&gt;03 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>Information Tech</td>
<td>&gt;01 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>Information Tech</td>
<td>&gt;03 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: The theoretical model
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