

# IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN NIGERIA – INSIGHTS FROM STUDENTS' ASSESSMENTS

**Nnamocha, Obiageli Angela**  
Department of Marketing  
Faculty of Business Administration  
Imo State University, Owerri

## **Abstract**

*The focus of this study is the assessment of the quality of higher education, from the students' perspective, using a modified version of the SERVPERF scale. The respondents for the study comprises of 250 students of Imo State University, Owerri. Responses were analyzed using the simple regression tests and the multiple regression tests, facilitated by the use of the SPSS Version 18. In addition, responses from focus group discussions supplemented the questionnaire reports. The major findings of this study include the fact that the most relevant service attributes which determined students' satisfaction are the Reliability, Tangibles and Responsiveness components, while the other attributes of Assurance and Empathy did not significantly impact on the students' satisfaction. In addition, several sources of dissatisfaction were reported by the students to include insecurity and a lack of access to internet services. Among others, it is recommended that government recruits more staff so as to improve the potentials for personalized attention, security measures should be beefed up and staff re-orientation be embarked upon in order to improve the empathy and assurance dimensions which are lacking. In conclusion, it is hoped that when the needful as enumerated above are done, the quality of education in this institution would be significantly improved.*

## **Introduction**

The service industry plays an increasingly important role in the economy of many nations, (Prabha, Soolakshna & Perunjodi, 2010), and Nigeria is not an exception. Therefore, delivering quality service is an essential success strategy,

especially in today's competitive environment. This study is focused on identifying workable strategies for improving the Nigerian higher education sector, using IMSU Owerri as a case. Although education belongs to the not for profit services sector, it is important to ensure client (student) satisfaction in order to ensure viability and social improvement.

A necessary condition for achieving this desired improvement, however, must stem from an assessment of the current quality of service delivery, in order to establish gaps that must be filled, for such improvement to come true.

Research-based evidence suggests that the quality of education in Nigeria is poor and there is a consistent tendency in this trend (Nwameme, (2012), Adeswu, Uwandu & Iruoma (2016) Duze (2011). This is of great concern to the researcher, as it has grave implications for the future of our country. Of particular interest in this study is the higher education sub-sector, which is positioned to provide the labour for the most critical and sensitive positions of authority and control in the nation. This study is therefore positioned to evaluate the service quality dimensions in the typical Nigerian higher institution, so as to establish any lapses and to seek an improvement in this all-important sector.

## **Literature Review**

### ***Conceptualizing Services***

Services are deeds, processes and performances (Zeithaml, Gremler & Bitner, 2009), which do not lead to the permanent ownership of any good. Palmer (2011) defines a service as the production of an essentially intangible benefit, either in its own

right or as a significant element of a tangible product, which through some form of exchange, satisfies an identified need.

Arising from these definitions, four characteristics are identified to be unique to services. These are the features of intangibility, heterogeneity, inseparability and perishability. The implications of these are of marketing relevance. These include the fact that due to the intangibility feature, services cannot be pre-assessed before experience, neither can they be displayed, touched or promoted. In addition, services cannot be promoted; rather, the benefits accruable from its consumption or use can be promoted.

The marketing implication of the heterogeneity feature of services is that different experiences of services yield different outcomes, as the human interface creates an inability to standardize it in strictly quantifiable terms. The inseparability feature recognizes the role of the consumer as a co-producer, since production and consumption are consummated simultaneously. The perishability feature implies that services are lost in the event of an unavailability of the consumer, as it cannot be held in inventory.

Given these characteristics and consequent marketing implications, the potentials of measuring service quality in absolute terms are impinged.

### ***Assessing/Measuring Service Quality***

The conceptualization and measurement of service quality have been debated as controversial in the services marketing literature (Cronin, 2001). There is no generally accepted notion of service quality among scholars. Some perspectives are however discernable and focus on meeting customers' needs, and how well the service delivered matches the customer's expectations. As noted by Zeithaml (1988), service quality is the customer's judgment about its overall excellence or superiority. These differences in perspectives have led to the attempt to determine quality of services not in absolutes, but on a continuum. This approach, as noted by Rajaseker, Munirayanappa, and Reddy (2009), leads to the measurement of service quality being riled with the tendencies of subjectivity, bias, attitudes, and perceptions.

As noted by Cummingham and Young (2002), assessment of service quality is not a function of statistical measures of quality, including physical defects or managerial judgment, rather, it is a function of customers' perceptions.

Service encounters are human interactions (Suprenant & Solomon, 1987) and so its quality may inadvertently be compromised due to the circumstances of these interactions, as well as the environment of encounter.

A heavily debated issue in the services marketing literature relates to whether satisfaction influences service quality or whether service quality influences satisfaction. This issue of determining which is the antecedent of the other has become more like the egg and the hen primacy debate. However, regardless of which construct is the antecedent or the effect, it is obvious that their relationship is strong, when examined from either perspective. For the purpose of this study, however, service quality is taken to be an antecedent of satisfaction; that is, that the quality of higher education leads to student satisfaction.

### **Foundation/Model for the Study**

An examination of relevant literature (Oldfield & Baron (2000), Faganel (2010), Snipes, Thomson & Oswald (2006), Smith, Smith & Clarke (2007), Yeo (2008), Jain and Gupta (2004)) reveals that the most frequently used scales for measuring service quality are the SERVQUAL and the SERVPERF.

The SERVQUAL is the first recognized attempt, and proposes that the evaluation of service quality is based on five dimensions of reliability, assurance, tangibles, empathy and responsiveness. According to the SERVQUAL model, quality is a multi-dimensional concept, having its components defined as:

**Reliability:** The capability to perform the promised service in a careful and accurate manner.

**Assurance:** The competence and politeness of the personnel which inspires confidence.

**Tangibles:** The attractiveness and quality of the physical facilities, equipment and staff.

**Empathy:** The personalized assistance which is conveyed to customers.

Responsiveness: The willingness to help customers and to perform services promptly.

The SERVQUAL test instrument consists of a total of 44 statements; 22 statements measuring service expectations (before encounter) and 22 statements measuring service perceptions (after encounter) and determining, based on the size and direction of the deviation/gap, whether a service delivery is considered as either excellent, good or bad. The SERVQUAL instrument has however, been criticized especially in the domain of stability of expectations, improper wordings of some scale items and the practical problem of respondents’ inconvenience in the administration of a test instrument with 44 items. In addition, its emphasis is on the delivery process, rather than on the outcome.

Although Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry (1994) in a re-assessment of the SERVQUAL model had argued that scores which identified service gaps have superior diagnostic value, Cronin and Taylor (1994) proposed the SERVPERF as an improvement of the SERVQUAL, arguing that even though expectations can impart valuable information if their unique effects on purchase behaviour and performance perceptions are conceptualized properly, expectations should not be included when measuring service quality. The major point of difference in the two scales is the elimination of the perception component from the SERVPERF, thereby basing quality assessment strictly on performance. This is in line with the views of Babakus and Biller (1992) that the expectation component of the SERVQUAL scale adds no additional information beyond that obtained from performance – perception alone.

The researcher is of the view that in determining the compositions of the SERVQUAL/SERVPERF models, emphasis was centred on the 3 extra components of the services marketing mix, viz the physical environment, people and process. The physical environment attempts to tangibilize the service experience, people refers to the human interfaces at the service touch – points, while processes concern the “how” or manner of the service delivery process.

### Model Specification of the Study

The model specifications of the study are stated thus

$$SQA = \alpha + \beta \text{ REL} \dots \mu \quad \text{Equation I}$$

$$SQA = \alpha + \beta \text{ ASSUR} \dots \mu \quad \text{Equation II}$$

$$SQA = \alpha + \beta \text{ TAN} \dots \mu \quad \text{Equation III}$$

$$SQA = \alpha + \beta \text{ EMP} \dots \mu \quad \text{Equation IV}$$

$$SQA = \alpha + \beta \text{ RESP} \dots \mu \quad \text{Equation V}$$

$$SQA = \alpha + \beta_1 \text{ REL} + \beta_1 \text{ TAN} + \beta_1 \text{ ASSU} + \beta_1 \text{ EMP} + \beta_1 \text{ RESP} \dots \mu \quad \text{Equation I}$$

Where:

SQA = Service Quality Assessment

TAN = Tangibles

REL = Reliability

ASSU = Assurance

EMP = Empathy

RESP = Responsibility

$\alpha$  = Constant

$\beta$  = Coefficient of the variable

The study adopted the adjusted  $r^2$  value to measure the individual effects of these components, as well as their combined effect (in percentage contribution) to the service quality assessment. All these were tested at 5% level of significance.

### Methodology

The principal purpose of this study is to investigate the quality of education in the Nigerian higher education sector, using IMSU, Owerri as a case, with a view to providing a basis for continuous measurement, management and improvement.

Having compared the earlier discussed models and in agreement with Brady, Cronin and Brand (2002) who noted that the SERVPERF is more superior to the SERVQUAL, as well as Jain and Gupta (2004) who asserted that the SERVPERF provides a more convergent as well as discriminate valid explanation of service quality than the SERVQUAL, the researcher is led to adopt the SERVPERF model in this study.

In addition, as noted by Tan and Kek (2004), student perceptions, are shaped by their cultural orientation. It therefore became pertinent that the researcher modified the test instrument to suit the learning environment and culture of the selected

respondents. Therefore, the wordings of the various components of the SERVPERF rating were adjusted in line with this, in order to achieve customization and a more perfect fit to the environment of the study. In addition, a satisfaction-grid was introduced as a useful complement to the modified scale used in this study.

This study is delimited to the issue of higher education quality assessment, from the perspective of the students.

The researcher recognizes that there are multiple stakeholders in this industry, but contends that the students are unarguably the most fundamental of these, being “outputs” of the refining process. Other stakeholders, such as the management, staff and external publics are considered as merely “players” not “takers” in this service delivery process. The geographical scope of this study is Imo State University, Owerri, Imo State, while the unit scope is made up of both the undergraduate and the post graduate students of this institution.

The sampling unit is the undergraduate and post-graduate students of the Faculty of Business Administration of IMSU, Owerri, comprising of a total of 250 students; which is considered representative of the university population, based on the assertion of Israel (2009). Of these, 198 usable copies of questionnaire were retrieved, representing a return rate of 79.2%.

The respondents were selected based on the conveniently, where the willing and accessible subjects were involved. The instrument for data collection is a structured modified SERVPERF questionnaire, validated for its content, face, criterion and construct dimensions, as recommended by Greco, Walop, and McCarthy (1987).

The reliability of the instrument was ensured by the conduct of a pilot test in which the pre-test and post-test was conducted on a set of 10 students; 2 from each level of study (i.e. Years 1, 2, 3, 4, and PG). Based on their comments and the consistency of their responses after a 1 – week interval, the final version of the questionnaire was generated in order to achieve a near – perfect fit.

The statistical tools employed in this study are the simple regression test and the multiple regression test. These were achieved by the use of the SPSS Version 18 package.

A combination of these tools was adopted in order to achieve the effect of triangulation, so that the weaknesses of each tool are improved in this process.

Focus group discussions with selected course representatives and faculty representatives supplemented the information obtained from the survey.

**Table 1**

<b>Gender Distribution of the respondents</b>	<b>Class Distribution of the respondents</b>	<b>Participation in focus group</b>
Male 94 students	Year 1 = 59 students	Year 1 = 5 students
Female 104 students	Year 2 = 67 students	Year 2 = 5 students
Total 198 students	Year 3 = 46 students	Year 3 = 5 students
	Year 4 = 15 students	Year 4 = 5 students
	Post graduates =11 students	Post graduates = 5 students
	Total = 198 students	Total = 25 students
		*Each group discussion was conducted separately.

**Results of Analysis**

**Simple regression/Linear regression**

This tests the relationship of each of the individual components under study to the perception of service quality. The single effect models are given as follows

**Reliability and Service Quality Assessment**

**Table 2 Model Summary<sup>b</sup>**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics					Durbin-Watson
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change	
1	.384 <sup>a</sup>	.148	.143	5.946	.148	33.927	1	196	.000	1.809

a. Predictors: (Constant)

Reliability

b. Dependent Variable: Summary of Service Quality

Assessment

**Table 3 Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	3.793	1.876		2.022	.045	.093	7.493
	Reliability	.803	.138	.384	5.825	.000	.531	1.075

a. Dependent Variable: Summary of Service Quality Assessment

RELIABILITY Model = 3.793 + 0.803 reliab.

$$r = 0.384; r^2 = 0.148$$

**Assurance and Service Quality Assessment**

**Table 4 Model Summary<sup>b</sup>**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics					Durbin-Watson
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change	
1	.274 <sup>a</sup>	.075	.070	6.194	.075	15.862	1	196	.000	1.796

a. Predictors: (Constant),

Assurance

b. Dependent Variable: Summary of Service Quality

Assessment

**Table 5 Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval for B	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1 (Constant)	8.779	1.440		6.236	.000	6.139	11.819
Assurance	.828	.158	.274	3.983	.000	.317	.939

a. Dependent Variable: Summary of Service Quality Assessment

ASSURANCE Model = 8.779 + 0.828 assur  
 $r = 0.274, r^2 = 0.075$

**Tangibles and Service Quality Assessment**

Table 6 Model Summary<sup>b</sup>

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics					Durbin-Watson
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change	
1	.337 <sup>a</sup>	.114	.109	6.063	.114	25.097	1	196	.000	1.877

a. Predictors: (Constant), TANGIBLES

b. Dependent Variable: Summary of Service Quality Assessment

Table 7 Coefficients<sup>a</sup>

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval for B	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1 (Constant)	6.090	1.722		3.537	.001	2.694	9.485
TANGIBLES	.688	.137	.337	5.010	.000	.417	.959

a. Dependent Variable: Summary of Service Quality Assessment

TANGIBLES Model = 6.090 + 0.688 Tangi  
 $r = 0.337, r^2 = 0.114$

**Empathy and Summary of Service Quality Assessment**

**Table 8 Model Summary<sup>b</sup>**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics					Durbin-Watson
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change	
1	.272 <sup>a</sup>	.074	.069	6.197	.074	15.699	1	196	.000	1.804

a. Predictors: (Constant),

EMPATHY

b. Dependent Variable: Summary of Service Quality

Assessment

**Table 9 Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	9.032	1.434		6.298	.000	6.204	11.860
	EMPATHY	.367	.093	.272	3.962	.000	.184	.549

a. Dependent Variable: Summary of Service Quality

Assessment

$$\text{EMPATHY Model} = 9.032 + 0.367 \text{ empa}$$

$$r = 0.272; r^2 = 0.074$$

**Responsiveness and Service Quality Assessment**

**Table 10 Model Summary<sup>b</sup>**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics					Durbin-Watson
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change	
1	.341 <sup>a</sup>	.117	.112	6.053	.117	25.850	1	196	.000	1.832

a. Predictors: (Constant),

Responsiveness

b. Dependent Variable: Summary of Service Quality

Assessment

**Table 11 Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval for B	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1 (Constant)	7.658	1.401		5.465	.000	4.895	10.422
Responsiveness	.584	.115	.341	5.084	.000	.357	.811

a. Dependent Variable: Summary of Service Quality Assessment

RESPONSIVENESS Model = 7.658 + 0.584resp.  
 $r = 0.341; r^2 = 0.112$

**Interpretation**

From the results of the simple linear regression stated above, when the individual components of the model are regressed against service quality perception, the  $r^2$  values indicate the extent to which each of these contribute to the overall service quality. Therefore,

- Reliability contributes 14.8%
- Assurance 7.5%
- Tangibles 11.4%
- Empathy 7.4%
- Responsiveness 11.2%

This suggests that the SERVPERF attribute that is most effective in determining the student’s satisfaction is the Reliability component, followed by Tangibles and Responsiveness. The components of Assurance and Empathy are low and so do not drive satisfaction among students, as evidenced from the students’ responses.

**Multiple Regression/Joint effect Model**

This test seeks to establish the joint effect of all the SERVPERF component taken together on the service quality perception. It seeks to assess the extent of synergy of these independent components, as perceived and reported by the students sampled.

The model of given as

**Table 12 Model Summary<sup>b</sup>**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics					Durbin-Watson
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change	
1	.458 <sup>a</sup>	.210	.189	5.785	.210	10.184	5	192	.000	1.806

a. Predictors: (Constant), Reliability, TANGIBLES, Assurance, EMPATHY, Responsiveness

b. Dependent Variable: Summary of Service Quality Assessment

**Table 13 Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval for B		Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Tolerance	VIF
1 (Constant)	-.028	2.117		-.013	.989	-4.204	4.147		
TANGIBLES	.344	.153	.168	2.244	.026	.042	.646	.731	1.368
EMPATHY	-.018	.117	-.013	-.153	.879	-.248	.212	.549	1.823
Responsiveness	.265	.157	.155	1.691	.093	-.044	.575	.489	2.046
Assurance	.061	.184	.027	.333	.740	-.302	.425	.639	1.564
Reliability	.524	.161	.250	3.256	.001	.206	.841	.695	1.438

a. Dependent Variable: Summary of Service Quality Assessment

$$- 0.028 + 0.344 \text{ Tan} + (-0.018) \text{ Emp} + 0.265 \text{ Resp} + 0.061 \text{ Assur} + 0.524 \text{ Reliab}$$

r value = 0.458, r<sup>2</sup> value = 0.210

**Interpretation**

The r<sup>2</sup> value indicates that only 21% of the service quality perception is accounted for by the SERVPERF component, while other variables outside the scope of this study, account for the

other 79%. In addition responses to open ended questions on the major challenges experienced by students as well as suggested remedies are presented in table 14 below:

**Table 14**

	Major Challenges	No	%	Suggested Remedies	No	%
(1)	Lack of a conducive environment	81	29%	Improvement in school facilities and provision of internet services	78	36%
(2)	Cultism and insecurity on campus	60	22%	Better communication between staff and students	45	20%
(3)	Lack of communication/guidance for the students	53	19%	Improved security measures	30	14%
(4)	Lecture timing/unpunctuality of lecturers	36	13%	Improved discipline of staff (both academic and non-academic)	36	17%
(5)	Late publishing of students’ results	27	10%	Accommodation provisions for students	26	12%
(6)	Improper Records/Missing Results	14	5%			
	Miscellaneous	6	2%	Miscellaneous	3	1%
	Total	277	100%	Total	218	100%

### **Other Findings of the Study**

Responses to the questions posed to the focus groups during interviews reveal that;

- (1) 80 percent of the IMSU student population are attracted by the free education policy of the incumbent Governor and so not much emphasis is attached by the students to the service quality being delivered by staff;
- (2) Due to the fact that the students are too many, the demand for service-personalization, as expected by students in a higher institution cannot be attained. This was reported as a lack of guidance and close communication between the staff and students;
- (3) Insecurity concerns were expressed by the students as the most critical challenge they experience on campus, which reduced satisfaction, as well as the reluctance to recommend the school to others;
- (4) The non-residential policy of the institution was seen as a contributory factor in reducing the students' perception of service quality. This is because of the inconvenience associated with lecture scheduling, either in the early mornings or the late evenings;
- (5) The students noted that the school environment was not conducive, especially as it relates to waste disposal and availability of conveniences. This component was however not covered in the SERVPERF questionnaire which they responded to;
- (6) The post-graduate students in particular complained of the lack of automatic and free access to the internet within the campus, which limited the extent and depth of research they could engage in at school.

### **Conclusion**

The burden which necessitated this study is the assertion that the quality of education in Nigeria is poor. The heart of research into customer satisfaction is the understanding of the perceptions of the customers which provides information for the improvement of the business. In this study, the customers are the students of the institution. It is important to strengthen the education service sector, since it functions as a chain; having inter-related parts, which invariably are negatively impacted whenever any part is weakened. Focusing on the students in a select tertiary institution and

using the modified SERVPERF questionnaire, valuable insights have been generated on the students' perception of the service quality they receive. Based on these, relevant recommendations have been proffered.

It is the hope and expectation of the researcher that this study contributes to the existing body of knowledge in this field, and that the recommendations are implemented to ensure a reversal of this observed down-ward trend in the quality of Nigerian tertiary education. In essence, the aim of the study has been actualized.

### **Recommendations**

Based on the findings of this study, the researcher is led to proffer the following suggestions, which could improve the quality of higher education in Nigeria.

- (1) Government is encouraged to recruit more staff, academic and non-academic, so as to strike a balance in the staff-student ratio. This would reduce the current strain on the emotional bonding of the staff and students and give an opportunity for personalized attention to students;
- (2) Security measures should be beefed up by the government and specifically, efforts should be made to curb cultism among the students. This would improve the assurance component rating of service quality, and ensure that the students feel safe in their learning environment.
- (3) Although the institution operates a non-residential policy, it is recommended that organized public-private-partnership schemes could be put in place, so as to develop estates within the vicinity of the university, to ameliorate the stress experienced by students in meeting with scheduled lectures, practicals and other school activities.
- (4) In addition to the construction of large edifices mostly intended for classrooms and offices, it is recommended that the institution be made more conducive by the provision of conveniences, regular cleaning up and maintenance of the environment. This would improve the tangibles component perception of service quality;
- (5) Staff re-orientation is recommended on the need for emotional bonding with the students.

This would improve the empathy dimension of service quality perception by the students.

### **Limitations of the Study and Directions for Future Studies**

- (1) In this study, only the students served as respondents. However, it is advised that research on service quality should, if possible, include the perspectives of both the provider and the receiver. It is suggested that future studies on this topic incorporate the opinions of the staff in order to achieve this balance.
- (2) The sample for this study was drawn from only the Faculty of Business Administration of Imo State University, Owerri. Though it is the expectation of the researcher that this group is representative of the other faculties, it is suggested that future studies be sampled from other facilities in the university and indeed from other institutions of higher learning.

### **References**

- Abdullah, F. (2006). Measuring Service quality in higher education: Hedperf versus SERVPERF. *Marketing Intelligence and Planning*, 24(1).
- Babacus, E. and Boller, G., (1992). An Empirical Assessment of the SERQUAL Scale, *Journal of Business Research*, 24(3).
- Bassan, T.A. and Shawi S.A. (n.d). Analysing the use of the SERVQUAL Model to Measure Service Quality in Specific – Industry contexts, Brunel University, Middlesex, Uk
- Beaumont, D. (2012) Service Quality in Higher education: The Students’ viewpoint, A dissertation Submitted to the University of Manchester for the degree of Bachelor of Science in the faculty of Humanities, Manchester Business school.
- Brady, M. Cronin Jr. J., Brand. R. (2002) Performance-only Measurement of Service Quality; A Replication and Extension. *Journal of Business research*, 55 (1).
- Cronin, J., and Taylor, S., (1994). “SERVPERF Versus SERVPERF: Reconciling Performance-based and Perception minus-expectation Measurement of Service Quality”, *Journal of Marketing*, 58(1)
- Fajanel, A. (2010) Quality Perception Gap Inside the Higher Education Institution, *International Journal of Academic Research* 2(1).
- Harvey L. and Green D. (1993). Defining quality: Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education 18 (1).
- Israel G. (2009) Determining Sample Size
- Jain, S. and Gupta, G. (2004), Measuring Service Quality: SERVQUAL versus SERVPERF scales, *VIKALPA* 29 (2).
- Ljiljana, K. (2014), “Measuring Service Quality in Higher Education: The case of Serbia”, *Human Capital without Borders: Knowledge and Learning for Quality of Life*.
- Mohd, A., Odai F. and Alaa M. (2013) SERVQUAL and SERVPERF: A review of Measures in Services Marketing. *Research, Global Journal of Management and Business Research Marketing*. Vol. 13, Issue 6.
- Mwongoso, A. Kazungu, I. and Kiwa R. (2015) Measuring Service Quality Gap in Higher Education Using ‘SERVQUAL’ Model at Moshi University College of Co-operative and Business Studies (Mucc. BS): Implications for Improvement, *International Journal of Economics, Commerce and Management* Vol. 3, 6.
- Ndik, C. Gantasala S. and Prabhakar, G. (2010) Service Quality (SERVQUAL) and its Effect on Customer Satisfaction in Retailing. *European Journal of Social Sciences – Volume 16, Number 2*.
- Oldfield, M. and Baron, S. (2000). Student Perception of Service quality in a UK University Business and Management faculty. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 8 (2).
- Palmer, A. (2011). Principles of Services Marketing 6<sup>th</sup> ed. Mardenhead: Mc Graw-hill Education.
- Parasunaman, A., Zeithml, V., and Berry (1988)” SERVQUAL: A Multi-Item Scale for Measuring Consumer Perception of Service Quality”, *Journal of Retailing*, 64(1).
- .....(1994), “Re-assessment of Expectation as a Comparison Standard in Measuring Service Quality: Implications for Further Research, *Journal of Marketing* 58(1).
- Rejasekhar, M. Munirayanappa M. and Reddy, S. (2009) The Gap Model Analysis of Service Quality in Indian Higher education, *Asian –*

Pacific Journal of Social Sciences, Vol. 1, No. 2.

Smith, G. Smith, A. and Clarke, A. (2007), Evaluating Service Quality in Universities: A Service Department Perspective. Quality Assurance Education, 15(3).

Snipes, R., Thomson, N. and Oswald, S. (2006) Gender Bias in Customer Evaluation of Service Quality: An Empirical Investigation. Journal of Services marketing 20(4).

Tan, K., and Kek, S. (2004). Service Quality in Higher Education using an Enhanced SERVQUAL approach, Quality in higher Education, Vol.10, No.1., Carfax Publishing, Taylor and Francis Group.

Yarimoglu, E. (2014) A Review on Dimensions of Service Quality Models, Journal of Marketing Management, American Research Institute for Policy Development.

Yeo, R. (2008), Brewing Service Quality in Higher Education – Characteristics of Ingredients that Make up the Recipe, Quality Assurance in Education, 16 (3).

Zeithaml, V, Gremier, D. and Bitner, M. (2009). Services Marketing: Integrating Customer Focus across the Firm. 5<sup>th</sup> ed. London: McGraw-Hill.

**APPENDIX**

**SERVPERF QUESTIONNAIRE, adapted to the higher education sector**

Gender Male  Female

Type of Program Undergraduate  Post-Graduate

Year of Study 1  2  3  4

**INDICATE THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE WITH THESE STATEMENTS, AS THEY RELATE TO YOUR EXPERIENCE IN OUR INSTITUTION OF HIGHER LEARNING**

	<b>TANGIBLES</b>	<b>SA</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>U</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>SD</b>
1.	Our institution is equipped with modern academic equipment and facilities.					
2.	The physical facilities at our academic institution enhance and sustain the students’ interest in learning.					
3.	Employees at our institution of higher learning are well-dressed and attractive in their appearance.					
4.	The modern facilities associated with learning in our institution are visually appealing.					
<b>EMPATHY</b>		<b>SA</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>U</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>SD</b>
5.	When students have challenges, the academic staff of our institution show sincere interest in providing the needed assistance.					
6.	The staff of our institution performs required services right, the first time.					
7.	Our university provides timely services, as promised.					
8.	Our lecturers are willing and available at convenient office-hours to advice and assist students.					
<b>RESPONSIVENESS</b>		<b>SA</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>U</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>SD</b>
9.	The workers at our institution strive to provide personalized attention to every student, as the need arises.					
10.	When students encounter challenges, our institution’s workers are dependable, friendly and polite, even if they are unable to help.					
11.	Employees of our institution create time to respond to students’ interests and requests.					

12.	The employees / staff of our institution understand the specific needs of their students.					
<b>ASSURANCE</b>		<b>SA</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>U</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>SD</b>
13.	The workers of our institution are usually courteous in their dealings with students.					
14.	Students of our institution feel safe in their learning environment.					
15.	Our institution and its staff have their students’ best interests at heart.					

<b>RELIABILITY</b>		<b>SA</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>U</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>SD</b>
16.	The behaviour of employees in our institution instills confidence in the students.					
17.	The staff of our institution are knowledgeable and experienced in the performance of their duties towards the students.					
18.	Our institution insists on and maintains error-free records.					
19.	Our institution ensures that its learning and studying hours are convenient to all their students.					
<b>SUMMARY OF SERVICE QUALITY ASSESSMENT</b>		<b>SA</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>U</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>SD</b>
20.	Our institution is committed to the provision of a high quality of education.					
21.	Our institution provides a conducive learning environment for its students.					
22.	Our institution provides overall superior service to its students.					
23.	The students are happy and satisfied with the value they are offered at our institution.					
24.	Based on their experiences, students are likely / willing to recommend our institution to others.					

25. What are the major challenges you encounter in this institution?  
 .....  
 .....

26. What suggestions can you offer to improve the quality of service you receive in this institution?  
 .....  
 .....

**THANK YOU**