Survey of Customers Satisfaction at the College of Law and Governance in Hawassa University, Hawassa-Ethiopia

YalewEmagneAlemu[1], KedirDaroArerro[2]
[1](Lecturer in the School of Governance and Development Studies
[2](Lecturer in the School of Governance and Development Studies
August 2019
Hawassa, Ethiopia

Abstract: This study was conducted with the objective of examining the level of customer satisfaction experienced by the students and staffs of College of Law and Governance in Hawassa University by employing the SERVVQAL scale of satisfaction gap analysis. By quantitatively designing the study, and applying convenient sampling technique, the data were collected through survey questioners from about 233 students and 50 staffs of the college. To carry out the data analysis, IBM SPSS statistics 25 was used. The findings reveal that both students and staffs are dissatisfied in the services provided by the college though with differing degree of dissatisfaction. The overall satisfaction gap analysis justifies that there is a significant difference between expectations and perceptions of the customers. The study also assured as there is no significant difference of expectations and perceptions between the customers of the two schools. After all, this research justifies the fact that education quality is highly missing in the higher educations of developing countries like Ethiopia.
Key words: Hawassa University, Customer satisfaction, Service quality, SERVQUAL, Perception, expectation, Higher education institution

----

I. INTRODUCTION

Scholars define Customer Satisfaction in many ways: most, in one or another way, implyit as a term that measures the level to what extent products or services supplied by the institution met or surpass a customer's expectation. The focus on customer satisfaction as a key aspect of quality improvement in higher education is a relatively recent development. It is assumed that customer satisfaction positively influence graduation rates, students and employee retention, donation rates and its relationship with the community. In addition to this, the study of customer satisfaction draws considerable attention when the institution intends to improve or upgrade the quality of its services and provision mechanisms.

An overall bearing of such a study is that:"….those educational institutions that understand consumer oriented principles may have a better chance of satisfying the wants and needs of its customers more effectively." (Jain, Sinha, & De, 2010; Haywood, 1988).

College of Law and Governance is one of the lively colleges' of Hawassa University aspiring to be one of the preferred Colleges nationally, competitive in Africa and prominent in the World. It has been restructured and opened in 2011 by comprising the former Faculty of Law, and Governance and Developmental Studies, which were separately organized in different faculties. Currently, the two schools under the college (school of Law and the school of Governance and Development Studies) are effectively running the major tasks of teaching-learning, research and community services. These are said to be the prioritized missions of Hawassa University through which it is contributing to the development of the nation.

In order to realize these missions, the schools of the college are undertaking several measures. Three undergraduate, seven masters (MA) level and one doctoral degree programs are going on under the college of Law and Governance. In all the programs, thousands of students were enrolled and graduated since the establishment of the schools. The academic staffs in the college, comprising of multidisciplinary backgrounds, have conducted and also been conducting a lot of research and community service projects. The two basic courses (Civics and Ethics and Logic and Reasoning Skills) for all the undergraduate students of Hawassa University are being taught by the College of Law and Governance.

If the college is carrying out all these and many other academic and non-academic activities, conducting a survey of its customers' satisfaction was foundcompelling. No study has been done so far and, thereby, this survey may be the preliminary and essential one.

Accordingly, the objective of this survey was assessing the level of customer satisfaction generated by the services provided under the College of Law and Governance. Specifically, the attempt was made to find out if there are significant gaps between customers' expectations and perceptions in the College and also tried to identify services where there are areas of major satisfaction and dissatisfaction among customers in comparative perspective.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Several literature reveal that the study of customer satisfaction drawn considerable attention from researchers in the early 1980s due to the structural change from a production to a service dominated economy in the 1970s in developed countries (Gronroos, 2007; Tajeddini, 2011).

Many have researched the significance of service marketing and satisfied customers, showing how customer satisfaction is influenced, how it relates to service quality and how both concepts can be measured, evaluated and improved (Anderson et al, 1994; Bitner, 1990; Boltan& Drew, 1991;Cronin& Taylor, 1992; Lewis & Mitchell, 1990; Nitecki&Hernon, 2000).

Although several of these studies revolve around business and other government services, the relevance of customer satisfaction has increased in Higher Education sectors in the recent years due to factors putting universities under growing competition among each other (Aldridge & Rowley, 1998;Athiyaman, 1997; Fieger, 2010;Fischer and Suwunphong, 2015; Green, 2014; Mai, 2005; Hemsely-Brown &Oplatka, 2010).

The increasing competition among higher education institutions to attract highly qualified students toward achieving high academic profiles is forcing them to pay more attention to service quality issues (Hemsely-Brown &Oplatka, 2010). Higher education institutions across the world, including universities in Ethiopia (among which Hawassa University is the one), have established missions, visions and aims to provide quality or world class education, researches and community services within specified timeframe.

2.1 Customer, Service Quality and Customer Satisfaction

Anyone of who expecting, purchasing, utilizing and/or benefiting from the service you provide is said to be customer(Jain et al., 2010; Zeithaml, et al., 2006). Mostly known and studied are *external customers* (who are not the employee or service renderer of that organization). Those offering services to the external customers and receiving payment for their service from the employed institution are said to be *internal customers* that can be defined as any employee or servant who is receiving service/payments and protections from the organization that employed him/her to perform the assigned job effectively(Homburg & Jensen, 2007; Papasolomou-Doukakis, 2002).

Some researchers believe that internal customer is one of the most important concepts but least understood and utilized in contemporary business and service settings irrespective of keeping full concentration on external customers (Albrecht &Zemke, 1990; Berry, 1995; Cespedes, 1995; Homburg & Jensen, 2007; Marshall et al., 1998). People working in organizations have influence upon the quality of services, which leads to some vital changes for organizations. So, considering workers as customers give the firms competitive edge, and workers become organization's most respected asset and assumed as internal customers (Papasolomou-Doukakis, 2002).

Service quality on the continuum depends on the nature of discrepancy between the expected service and the service perceived by the customer. The notion of difference is the degree and direction of discrepancy or gap between customer expectations and perceptions of a service (Green, 2014; Parasuraman et al., 1985). On one hand, if expectations are greater than perceptions, the perceived service quality is less than being satisfactory and customer dissatisfaction is said to occur. On the other hand, if expectations are less than perceptions, perceived service quality is said to be satisfactory and will tend toward ideal quality with increased positive discrepancy between expected and perceived service quality (Schiffman and Kanuk, 2005).

Customer Satisfaction, therefore, is explained as the consumer's response to the evaluation of the perceived discrepancy between prior expectations and the actual performance of the product as perceived after its consumption (Bitner, 1990;Schiffman and Kanuk, 2005; Tse and Wilton, 1988). This is more illustrated as *SQ: P-E* (Where SQ denotes service quality, P represents service perception and E is what the customers expect to get satisfied (Youseff et al., 1995).

2.2 Models for Measuring Customer Satisfaction

In order to explain the relationship between customer satisfaction and perceived service quality, many researchers have constructed theoretical models, such as the servicequality model by Gronroos (1984), the GAP model by Parasuraman et al. (1985), the model of perceived service quality and satisfaction by Spreng and Mackoy (1996) and the service encounter model by Bitner (1990). These researchers critically appraised various service quality models with the aim of reviewing the growth of literature and developing a comprehensive overview of existing models in their study.

Among these many, the Gaps and SERVQUAL models, either complementing one another or independently used, are the most commonly applied ones, especially in relation to higher education customer satisfaction studies (Aldridge & Rowley, 1998; Athiyaman, 1997;Fieger, 2010; Fischer and Suwunphong, 2015; Hemsely-Brown &Oplatka, 2010; Mai, 2005; Paul, 2014).

The authors explained that the gap between the customer's expectation of the quality of the service and the perceived quality of the service received can be explained by *the Gaps Model*. The Model proposes that expectations of customers are a function of disconfirmation and that a customer makes a comparison between his/her experience with pre-consumption expectations (before-service consumption) and post-consumption experience (after-service consumption). Based on this comparison, a state of satisfaction or dissatisfaction toward specific services is surmised.

Parasuraman et al. (1988) originally proposed ten dimensions of service quality with five basic gaps to be analyzed - *tangibility, reliability, responsiveness, competence, courtesy, credibility, security, access, communication, and understanding the consumer.* Their research was later refined leading to the development of the *SERVQUAL* scale which measures customers' perceptions of service quality (Parasuraman, 2004). The original ten dimensions were later condensed into five:

 Tangibles: Appearance of physical facilities, equipment, personnel, and communication materials
 Reliability: Ability to dependably and accurately perform the promised service
 Responsiveness: Willingness to help customers and provide prompt service
 Assurance: Knowledge and courtesy of employees and their ability to convey trust & confidence
 Empathy: Caring, individualized attention that the firm provides its customers

Accordingly, the SERVQAL model is found appropriate to measure satisfaction levels of higher education customers in many of the above mentioned studies and the same was true for this one.

III. METHODOLOGY AND METHODS

As can be seen from the earlier studies,customer satisfaction is mainly measured through quantitative investigation,whereby respondents were asked to judge their expectations and perceptions of a given service on ratingscales (Parasuraman et al., 1994). This procedure also takes place in assessing satisfaction among students (Carman, 1990).

As such, this study employed quantitative approach in the process of gathering and analyzing data. Quantitative self-completion questioners were prepared and distributed to gather primary data from sampled customers of the college. Contents of the questioners were a little bit varied for the students and staffs depending on the type or nature of services they receive from the college. Respondents were sampled in a way that can appropriately represent the total study population.   About 290 participants from both schools of the College were involved as respondents.

Table 3.1. Study Population and Sample size

	Respondents					
	Staff			**Students**		
	Population	Sample		Population	Sample	
School of Law	36	25	69.4%	394	118	30%
School of GaDS*	43	28	65.1%	542	162	30%
Total	97	53	54.6%	936	280	29.9%

*GaDS➜Governance and Development Studies

3.1   Data Collection tools and Measurements

The survey questioners were designed with the purpose of measuring two aspects: Customer service expectations on the right margin and their perceptions on the left margin of the questioner table. The Expectation side measured the extent to which customers expect the quality service standard that an ideal school or college possesses as per the statements presented using seven-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly disagree 2= disagree, 3 = somewhat disagree, 4= neutral, 5 = somewhat agree, 6 = agree and 7 = strongly agree). Similarly, the Perception side required customers to indicate their actual extent of satisfaction using seven-point Likert scale (1=Not very satisfied, 2= Not satisfied, 3: Somewhat dissatisfied, 4= Neutral, 5= somewhat satisfied, 6= satisfied, 7= Very satisfied).

The questioner consisted of 27 statements under five of the measurements set by the SERVQUAL model. It is proved by different earlier studies that five of these measurements constituted the major standards to provide quality services to the customers in the academic institutions.

Table 3.2. The five measurements adopted by the SERVQUAL Model

Statements	Measurement	Elements included under each measurement	Remark
1 to 5	Tangibles	Teaching-learning facilities/Environment (Buildings, Class rooms, Laboratories, Libraries, offices, Internet access,...)	
6 to 10	Reliability	Mission oriented actions, consistency, trustworthiness, course applicability, disciplines, merit based assessment and rewards, etc	
11 to 16	Responsiveness	Interest to help, timeliness and clarity of information, availability at work, fairness, staff/students autonomy, handling of complaints, etc	
7 to 21	Assurance	Fitness to standards, management composition, competency, staff/student participation, teaching methods, error free records, etc	
22 to 27	Empathy	Caring, helpfulness, sociability, concern for staff/students' wellbeing, approachability, courtesy, etc	

Source: Compiled from Parasuraman (2004) and contextualized by the author

3.2   Data Analysis
In this study, computing the difference between the ratings assigned to the expectations (E) and perceptions (P) i.e. P – E, was employed as the simplest way of measuring satisfaction. An average score was calculated for each response on the statements in both the expectation and perception section of the SERVQUAL survey based on the seven-point Likert scale. The statistical tests were handled on IBM SPSS version 25.0. In order to compare the existence of expectation and satisfaction differences between staffs and students of the two schools under the college, the Mann-Whitney statistical test was used.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Written questioners were distributed to about 280 students and 53 staffs of the college. Among these, 233 questioner sheets from the students and 50 from the staff were collected back and marked as appropriately filled. About 30 student respondents from different sections and batches have not returned the questioner sheets and some 14 students' responded sheets were discarded due to errors in marking.
Accordingly, the study results are discussed as follows:

Table 4.1. Overall satisfaction Score

Measurements	Statement	Perception		Expectation		Differences		Average/ Factor Score	
		Students	Staff	Students	Staff	Students	Staff	Students	Staff
		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean				
Measurement 1	1	3.128	3.52	4.845	5.100	-1.717	-1.58		
	2	3.171	3.22	4.841	5.244	-1.67	-2.024		
	3	3.236	2.74	4.819	4.760	-1.583	-2.02		
	4	2.643	3.18	4.708	4.600	-2.065	-1.42		
	5	2.909	3.26	4.849	5.040	-1.94	-1.78	-1.795	-1.764
Measurement 2	6	3.403	3.84	4.867	5.060	-1.464	-1.22		
	7	3.326	2.82	4.819	4.480	-1.493	-1.66		
	8	3.545	3.78	4.939	5.060	-1.394	-1.28		
	9	3.364	4.04	5.236	5.340	-1.872	-1.3	-1.555	
	10		3.54		4.880		-1.34		-1.36
Measurement 3	11	3.437	3.66	5.257	4.880	-1.82	-1.22		
	12	3.248	3.76	5.163	5.060	-1.915	-1.3		
	13	3.824	3.32	5.635	5.120	-1.811	-1.8		
	14	3.356	4.36	5.171	5.540	-1.815	-1.18		
	15	3.266	3.60	5.171	4.840	-1.905	-1.24		

	No.								
	16	3.798	4.08	5.364	5.420	-1.566	-1.34	-1.805	-1.346
Measurement 4	17	3.751	3.96	5.356	5.380	-1.605	-1.42		
	18	3.639	3.22	5.347	4.880	-1.708	-1.66		
	19	3.545	3.70	5.330	5.360	-1.785	-1.66		
	20	3.725	3.92	5.356	5.420	-1.631	-1.5		
	21	3.909	4.18	5.437	5.280	-1.528	-1.1	-1.651	-1.468
Measurement 5	22	3.407	4.14	5.227	5.300	-1.82	-1.16		
	23	3.549	4.06	5.489	5.360	-1.94	-1.3		
	24	3.841	4.24	5.412	5.320	-1.571	-1.08		
	25	4.034	3.94	5.429	5.180	-1.395	-1.24		
	26	3.605	4.20	5.304	5.420	-1.699	-1.22		-1.2
	27	3.502		5.248		-1.746		-1.695	

Table 4.2. Overall SERVQAL Index

S.No.	Measurements	Score	
		Student	**Staff**
1	*Tangibles*/Teaching-learning environment/facilities	-1.795	-1.764
2	*Reliability/* ability to dependably and accurately perform the promised service	-1.555	-1.36
3	*Responsiveness*/Willingness to help customers and provide prompt service	-1.805	-1.346
4	*Assurance*/Knowledge and courtesy of the management and their ability to convey trust & confidence	-1.651	-1.468
5	*Empathy*/Caring, individualized/humanistic attention that the firm provides its customers	-1.695	-1.2
	Overall SERVQUAL	-1.7002	-1.4276

The satisfaction gap analysis clearly shows that there is a significant difference between expectations and perceptions of the respondents. Such significant level of negative discrepancy across all service aspects (with a mismatch between expected and perceived degrees) clearly signifies the fact that the teaching-learning conditions of the college are not satisfying its customers. Students are more dissatisfied than the staff with what the college is providing for them. An analytical discussion of each of the five measurements is presented as follows:

4.1   Analyzing the tangibles or the teaching-learning facilities
         The overall average satisfaction gap score for this measurement was -1.795 and -1.764 for students and staffs respectively. It was the highest scored gap for the staffs and higher for the students. Statements such as:*The School has modern library with complete collection; and The school has modern-looking equipment(teaching-learning aiding resources: PCs, LCDs, black/white boards, internet, lockers, TV, etc)* are found to be the biggest contributors for the staff dissatisfaction under this measurement; while for the students, statements which read as *the School has fully furnished and functional computer labs*; and *The school has active and fast flowing internet services*, are the biggest contributors of the dissatisfaction.
         From this, it can be learnt that the teaching-learning facilities provided by the college, both for the staffs and students, is below the expectation.   In order to satisfy its customers, the college should fully furnish (modernize) the teaching-learning environment.

4.2   Analyzing the Reliability(ability to dependably and accurately performthe promisedservice)
         Institutional competency today is not merely measured by designing SMART missions and visions or advocacies; rather, qualified outcomes of the missions by far demonstrate its celebrities.
         In the College of Law and Governance, the reliability aspects of the service among the five measurements seem good in relative terms. Even though the Customers' expectation and perception gap is still negative, its gap score is found to be the least one. The highest contributor for the disapproval of this measurement is the statement: *The school rewards merits/best performers*, which is found highly dissatisfying both by the staffs and students. It means that the schools are not properly assessing or evaluating performances (of the students as well as staffs') and are not motivating the best achievers regularly.

It is recommendable for any institution to regularly and properly follow up actual performances and provide acknowledgements and rewards to the extent possible.

4.3   Analyzing the Responsiveness (Willingness to help customers andprovide promptservice)
        For the students, this measurement is the highest dissatisfaction score gap with overall difference of -1.805. But for the staffs, it is found the 2nd least score gap with the average difference of -1.346. The implication of this finding can be generalized as the Schools' responsiveness to the students and staffs are discriminatory. The highest contributors for the dissatisfaction by the students are the statements: *the school provides quick and quality service*; and the next, *The school has appropriate internship arrangements*, with score gaps of -1.915 and -1.905 respectively. What is evident from such results is the fact that the Schools either have no appropriate internship periods or the condition of internship in the schools may not be properly managed.
        To be competent enough, students highly require internship arrangements as part of their learning curricula. The college has to devise an internship period for the programs with no such arrangements and also properly address challenges with the ongoing internship programs in the college.
        On the side of the staffs, the highest contributor (-1.34) for the dissatisfaction gap is implied in the statement:*The school provides adequate financial/material supports to run professional activities (researches/projects, community services, academic seminars, etc)*. It means, the schools are not responding at a satisfactory level of the staff demands made for supports to effectively undertake professional activities mentioned above.
        The college should conduct further study to investigate for why and how such supports are not satisfactory and respond as much as it can to satisfy its staffs.

4.4   Assurance (Knowledge and courtesy of the management and their abilityto conveytrust and confidence)
        Assurance is all about keeping the promise through fitting to the ideal standard ofquality service provision to its customers. In the college of Law and Governance, this measurement is found the 2nd highest (-1.468) and the 2nd least (-1.651) contributor for dissatisfaction gap of staffs and students respectively. Meaning, fulfilling what was promised and ability to fit to the standards is in a better condition in the eyes of the students than in the eyes of the staff.
        Conditions that have highly contributed for this gap are found in the statements:*Administrative services of the school are provided up to the standard*; *The school/college decision makings are participatory; and The registrar of the school provides error-free records*.
        These three service provision conditions are found the highest contributors of dissatisfaction both for the staffs and students. Administrative services expected to be given for both staffs and students include: course allocation and schedules, performance evaluation, coordination and information provision, invigilation assignments, supply of stationery and work enhancing equipment, printing/copying services, extra service payments, etc. If this condition is the highest contributor for the customers' dissatisfaction, it means schools are not properly carrying out such responsibilities. It is also depicted that decision makings are not participatory and the registrar office records are not error free. In the College of Law and Governance, the registrar case is frequently complained issue.
        After all, the college should examine the drawbacks of the above administrative elements and design appropriate mechanisms to give effective administration.

4.5   Analysis of Empathy (Caring, individualized/humanistic attention thatthe firmprovides its customers)
        In addition to the mechanical aspects of service provision, the humanistic element demonstrated by the institution in the process is valued as vital by the customers.
        The overall gap score for the empathy measurement is marked as the least dissatisfying (-1.2) for the staffs but the 3rd highest (-1.695) for the students.
        The biggest contributor (-1.94) to this difference between expectations and perceptions of the students in this measurement was the statement that reads *The school creates harmonious relationships among staff and students*. Another key contributor to this gap was the statement that *The school shows interest in solving students' problems(-1.82)*. This indicates that the college needs to work hard to bring its staffs' sociability towards students and should get concerned about and also handle problems faced by its students.
4.6   Comparison of Expectation and Perception Levels
In order to comparatively justify level of significance of differences regarding expectation and perception, the Mann-Whitney test was used both for the staffs and students. The comparison was held between the staffs of the two schools and between the students as well.
1.   Comparison of Expectations and Perceptions of Staffs of Law School Versus GaDSSchool

Table 4.3. The Comparison of differences of significance between the Staffs ofLaw School and School of GaDS

Statements	Expectation				Perception			
	Mann-Whitney U	Wilcoxon W	Z	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	Mann-Whitney U	Wilcoxon W	Z	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
The school has enough physical facilities	269.000	620.000	-0.099	0.921	255.000	486.500	-0.394	0.694
The School has modern library with complete collection	253.000	578.000	-0.230	0.818	211.000	442.000	-1.413	0.158
The school has modern-looking equipment	258.000	489.000	-0.425	0.671	194.000	425.000	-1.741	0.082
The school has fully furnished and functional computer labs	183.500	534.500	-2.155	0.031	175.500	526.500	-2.199	0.028
The school has active and fast flowing internet access/services	198.000	549.000	-1.706	0.088	206.500	557.500	-1.589	0.112
Actions of the school reflect the missions of the University	234.500	465.500	-1.024	0.306	235.000	466.000	-0.934	0.350
The school rewards merit/best performers	236.000	587.000	-1.112	0.266	210.500	561.500	-1.393	0.164
The school applies discipline to everybody	250.500	481.500	-0.520	0.603	268.500	499.500	-0.103	0.918
The school encourages employees to upgrade	270.000	621.000	-0.075	0.940	266.000	617.000	-0.172	0.864
The school provides adequate financial/material supports to run professional activities	227.000	458.000	-1.110	0.267	224.000	455.000	-1.169	0.243
The school shows interest/support in pursuing my individual goal	250.500	601.500	-0.549	0.583	248.500	599.500	-0.592	0.554
Important changes in policies, procedures and new activities are communicated on time & clearly	265.500	496.500	-0.171	0.864	270.000	501.000	-0.068	0.946

The school brings and fairly distributes opportunities for scholarship	270.000	621.000	-0.072	0.942	245.000	596.000	-0.617	0.537
The school protects and respects my academic autonomy	255.000	486.000	-0.447	0.655	259.500	490.500	-0.314	0.753
The school head is available in office at a time I need	207.000	558.000	-1.500	0.134	173.500	524.500	-2.202	0.028
The school has an appropriate complaint handling mechanisms	234.500	465.500	-0.921	0.357	227.000	458.000	-1.068	0.286
The school management/School Council is of appropriate composition	271.500	502.500	-0.036	0.971	249.000	480.000	-0.538	0.591
Administrative services of the school are provided up to the standard	249.000	480.000	-0.564	0.573	250.500	481.500	-0.498	0.619
The school decision makings are participatory	228.000	579.000	-1.118	0.263	190.000	541.000	-1.853	0.064
The school head is competent enough to lead the school	205.500	436.500	-1.643	0.100	256.500	487.500	-0.371	0.711
The college head is competent enough to lead the college	255.500	606.500	-0.420	0.674	273.000	504.000	0.000	1.000
The school shows interest in solving employees' problems	182.000	533.000	-2.156	0.031	185.000	536.000	-2.053	0.040
The school creates harmonious relationships among staff and students	181.000	532.000	-2.176	0.031	217.500	568.500	-1.268	0.205
The management of the school are caring, helpful and approachable	255.000	486.000	-0.421	0.674	252.500	483.500	-0.465	0.642
The school head prioritizes my safety/wellbeing than the profit of the institution	173.500	524.500	-2.325	.020	172.500	523.500	-2.323	0.020

Administrative Staffs of the school are approachable, caring and helpful	232.000	583.000	-0.980	0.327	218.000	569.000	-1.265	0.206

Note: at 95% Confidence level, when P (Asymp.Sig. or Significance level) is less than 0.05, the difference is statistically significant. But, if P is greater than 0.05, it means the difference is statistically insignificant.

Comparison of Staff Expectations: The Mann-Whitney test used for this analysis justifies that expectations of the Law School Staffs are not significantly different from the expectations of School of GaDS' staffs. The shaded (only very few) are where the differences are significant. Otherwise, the staffs of both schools have similar expectations regarding what will satisfy them.

Comparison of Staff Perception/satisfaction: From the above table, it is also notable that level of satisfaction by the staffs of both schools is not significantly different from each other.

2.   Comparison of Students of Law School Versus GaDSSchool

Table 4.4. The Comparison of differences of significance between the Students of School of Law and School of GaDS

Statements	Expectation				Perception			
	Mann-Whitney U	Wilcoxon W	Z	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	Mann-Whitney U	Wilcoxon W	Z	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
The school has enough physical facilities	5749.500	12190.5000	-2.141	0.032	5772.000	12213.000	-1.998	0.046
The School has modern library with complete collection	6270.500	12711.500	-1.057	0.291	5734.000	12175.000	-2.072	0.038
The school has modern-looking equipment	5607.500	12048.500	-2.443	0.015	6551.500	12992.000	-0.453	0.651
The school has fully furnished and functional computer labs	6668.000	13928.000	-0.237	0.813	5992.500	12433.500	-1.571	0.116
The school has active and fast flowing internet access/services	5957.500	12398.500	-1.708	0.088	6165.000	12606.000	-1.219	0.223
The school provides practical and applied oriented courses	6329.000	12770.000	-0.938	0.348	6063.000	12504.000	-1.419	0.156
The school consistently performs the service right the first time	6759.000	13200.000	-0.044	0.965	6360.000	12801.000	-0.832	0.405
The school applies discipline to everybody	6366.500	13626.500	-0.859	0.390	6401.000	13661.000	-0.749	0.454
The school rewards merit/best performers	5133.000	11574.000	-3.470	0.001	6350.000	12791.000	-0.852	0.394
Employees of the school are ready to help students	5281.000	11722.000	-3.206	0.001	6387.500	12828.500	-0.777	0.437
Employees of the school provide quick and quality service	4447.500	10888.500	-4.891	0.000	5716.500	12157.500	-2.107	0.035
The school provides accurate and timely information	5302.000	11743.000	-3.238	0.001	6583.500	13024.500	-0.390	0.697

The school has an appropriate complaint handling mechanisms	5051.000	11492.000	-3.613	0.000	6694.000	13954.000	-0.170	0.865
The school has appropriate internship arrangements	5130.500	11571.500	-3.446	0.001	6715.500	13975.500	-0.128	0.898
Lecturers are available in office as per their consultation hours	5842.000	12283.000	-2.071	0.038	6555.000	13815.000	-0.446	0.656
The school has qualified lecturers	5952.000	12393.000	-1.796	0.073	6468.000	13728.000	-0.618	0.536
Administrative services of the school are provided up to the standard	4610.500	11051.500	-4.668	0.000	6426.000	12867.000	-0.705	0.481
The registrar of the school provides error-free records	4933.500	11374.500	-4.028	0.000	5977.000	12418.000	-1.591	0.112
Lecturers of the school assess and evaluate students' achievement objectively	5188.000	11629.000	-3.427	0.001	6541.000	12982.000	-0.473	0.636
The lecturers' teaching methods of the school are active/learner centered	5153.500	11594.500	-3.616	0.000	6434.500	12875.500	-0.684	0.494
The school shows interest in solving students' problems	5681.000	12122.000	-2.324	0.020	6545.000	12986.000	-0.466	0.641
The school creates harmonious relationships among staff and students	5811.500	12252.500	-2.072	0.038	6455.000	13715.000	-0.645	0.519
Lecturers' of the school are approachable, caring and helpful	6097.000	12538.000	-1.500	0.134	5848.000	13108.000	-1.843	0.065
The librarians of the school are caring, helpful and approachable	5739.000	12180.000	-2.324	0.020	5964.000	13224.000	-1.615	0.106
Administrative Staffs of the school are approachable, caring and helpful	5571.000	12012.000	-2.577	0.010	6714.000	13974.000	-0.131	0.896
The registrar officers of the school are approachable, caring and helpful	4612.500	11053.500	-4.649	0.000	5036.500	11477.500	-3.452	0.001

Note: at 95% Confidence level, when P (Asymp.Sig. or Significance level) is less than 0.05, the difference is statistically significant. But, if P is greater than 0.05, it means the difference is statistically insignificant.

Comparison of Students Expectation: It is clearly observable that there are differences between the Law school students and students of School of GaDS with respect to their expectations. It is the students of Law school, whose expectation is relatively higher than what thestudentsofGaDS'school expect.

Comparison of Students Perception/satisfaction: However, students of both schools show no differences with respect to their satisfaction regarding services being provided to them.

V. CONCLUSION

In this study, satisfaction of the customers (students and staffs) against services provided by the College of Law and Governance in the Hawassa University is measured in terms of expectations and perceptions. The study also compared which of the service measurements are the most expected and/or satisfied

one and whether there are differences of expectation and perception between the schools under the college. The findings reveal that both students and staffs are dissatisfied by the services provided in all the five measurements of service quality (tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, assurance and empathy).

On average, the customers have high expectations in tangibles and responsiveness measurements while their high perceptions were experienced in assurance and reliability for students, and empathy and reliability for the staffs.

The overall satisfaction gap analysis clearly shows that there is a significant difference between expectations and perceptions of the respondents. Such significant level of discrepancy across all service measurements clearly signifies the fact that the teaching-learning conditions of the college are not at a level of satisfaction to its customers. Students are more expecting and also more dissatisfied than the staffs, with what the college is providing for them. Besides, the satisfaction and expectation of customers of both schools' are not significantly different from each other.

Finally, it is recommended that the college should improve level of its customers' satisfaction by working hard on the service aspects identified as highly contributing for customers' dissatisfaction under each of the five dimensions.

REFERENCES

[1].   Albrecht, K., &Zemke, R. (1990)*Service America!: Doing Business in The New Economy*.WarnerBooks, New York.

[2].   Aldridge, S. & and Rowley, J.(1998) Measuring customer satisfaction in highereducation. *Journal ofQuality Assurance in Education,*Vol. 6No.4, pp.197-204.

[3].   Anderson, E. W., Fornell, C. & Lehman, D. R.(1994) Customer Satisfaction, marketShare, and Profitability: Findings from Sweden. *Journal of Marketing,* Vol. 58No.2,pp.53-66.

[4].   Athiyaman, A.(1997) Linking student satisfaction and Service quality perceptions: thecase of university education. *European Journal of Marketing,* Vol. 31No.7, pp.528-540.

[5].   Berry, L. L. (1995) Relationship Marketing of Services—Growing Interest, EmergingPerspectives.*Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science,* Vol. 23 No. 4,pp.236-245.

[6].   Bitner, M. J.(1990) Evaluating Service Encounter.The Effects of PhysicalSurroundings and Employee Responses.*Journal of Marketing,* Vol. 54,pp.69-82.

[7].   Bolton, R. & Drew, J.(1991) A multistage model of customers' assessment of service quality and value.*Journal of Consumer Research,* Vol. 17, March,pp.375-384.

[8].   Carman, J. M.(1990) Consumer perceptions of service quality: an assessment of the SERVQUAL dimensions. *Journal if Retailing,* Vol. 66No. 1,pp.33-35.

[9].   Cespedes, F. V. (1995) *Concurrent Marketing: Integrating Product, Sales, and Service*: Harvard Business Press.

[10].   Cronin, J. J. & Taylor, S. A.(1992) Measuring Service Quality: A Reexamination and Extension. *Journal of Marketing,* Vol. 56No. 3, 55-68.

[11].   Elliott, K. M. & Shin, D.(2002) Student Satisfaction: an alternative approach to assessing this important concept. *Journal of Higher Education Policy andManagement,* Vol. 24No. 2, pp.197-209.

[12].   Fieger, Peter (2010) Measuring student satisfaction from the Student Outcomes Survey.Technical Paper of National Centre for Vocational Education Research (NCVER), Adelaide, Australia.

[13].   Fischer, Ann-Christin and PunyasooreeSuwunphong (2015) *Customer Satisfaction in the Higher Education Industry.*UnpublishedMaster Thesis, Lund University, Sweden.

[14].   Green, Paul (2014) Measuring Service Quality in Higher Education: A South African Case Study. J*ournal of International EducationResearch,*Vol. 10No. 2,pp.131-142.

[15]. Gronroos, C.(2007)*Service Management and Marketing - Customer Management in Service Competition.*Honolen, San Francisco, Weinheim, Queemsland, Jin XingDistripark, Mississauga: John Wiley & Sons.

[16]. Gronroos, C.(1984) A Service Quality Model and its Marketing Implication.*European Journal of Marketing,* Vol. 18No.4, pp.36-44.

[17]. Haywood, Farmer J.(1988) A Conceptual Model of Service Quality.*InternationalJournal of Operations & Production Managemen.*Vol. 8No.6,pp.19-29.

[18].   Hemsely-Brown, J.,andOplatka, I. (2006) Universities in a competitive global marketplace - A systematic review of the literature on higher education marketing.*International Journal of Public Sector Management,* Vol. 19No.4, pp.316-338.

[19].   Iacobucci, D.,&Ostrom, A.(1995) Distinguishing Service Quality and Customer Satisfaction: The Voice of the Consumer. *Journal of Consumer Psychology,*Vol.4No.3,277-303.

[20].   Homburg, C., & Jensen, O. (2007)The thought worlds of marketing and sales: which differences make a difference? *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 71(July 2007), pp.124-142.

[21]. Jain, R., Sinha, G., & De, S. K. (2010) Service quality in higher education: An exploratory study. *Asian Journal of Marketing,* Vol. 4No.3,pp.144-154.

[22]. Li-Wei, M. (2005) A Comparative Study Between UK and US: The Student Satisfaction in Higher Education and its Influential Factors. *Journal of Marketing Management,* Vol. 21No. 7-8, pp.859-878, DOI: 10.1362/026725705774538471, (Accessed June 20/2019)

[23]. Marshall, G. W., Baker, J., & Finn, D. W. (1998) Exploring Internal Customer Service Quality.*Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing,* Vol. 13 No.4/5, pp.381-392.

[24]. Molesworth, M., Nixon, Elizabeth & Scullion, R.(2009) Having, being and higher education: the marketization of the university and the transformation of the student into consumer. *Journal ofTeaching in Higher Education,*Vol. 14No.3, pp.277-287.

[25]. Nitecki, D. A., &Hernon, P. (2000) Measuring service quality at Yale University's libraries.*The Journal of Academic Librarianship,* Vol. 26 No.4,pp.259-273.

[26]. Papasolomou-Doukakis, I. (2002)The Role of Employee Development in Customer Relations: the Case of UK Retail Banks. *Corporate Communications: An InternationalJournal,* Vol. 7 No.1,pp.62-76.

[27]. Parasuraman, A. (2004) Assessing and improving service performance for maximum impact: Insights from a two-decade-long research journey. *Performance Measurements and Metrics,* Vol. 5 No. 2, pp.45-52.

[28]. Parasuraman, A.,Zeithaml, V. A. & Berry, L. L.(1994)Alternative Scale for Measuring Service Quality: A ComperativeAessessment Based on Psychometric and Diagnostic Criteria. *Journal of Retailing,* Vol. 70No.3, pp.201-230.

[29]. Parasuraman, A., Berry, L. L. &Zeithalm, V. A.(1991)Refinement and Reassessment of the SERVEQUAL Scale.*Journal of Retailing,* Vol. 67No.4,pp.420-450.

[30]. Parasuraman, A., Berry, L. L. &Zeithalm, V. A.(1988) SERVQUAL A Multipe- Item Scale for Measuring Consumer Perception of Service Quality. *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 68No.1, pp.12-40.

[31]. Parasuraman, A.,Zeithalm, V. A. & Berry, L. L.(1985) A Conceptual Model of Service Quality and Its Implications for Further Research. *Journal of Marketing,* Vol. *49*No.4,pp.41-50.

[32]. Schiffman, G.L. and L.L. Kanuk(2005)*Consumer Behavior.*Prentice-Hall of India Private Limited, New Delhi.

[33]. Seth, N., Deshmukh, S. G. &Vrat, P.(2005) Service quality models: a review. *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, Vol. 22No.9,pp.913-949.

[34]. Sevier, R. A.(1994) Image if everything: Strategies for measuring, changing, and maintaining your institution's image. *College and University,* Vol. 69No.3, pp.60-75.

[35]. Spreng, R. A. &Mackoy, R. D.(1996)AnEmircial Examination of a Model of Perceived Service Quality and Satisfaction. *Journal of Retailing,* Vol. 72No.2, pp.201-214.

[36]. Tajeddini, K.(2011) Customer Orientation, Learning Orientation, and new SweriveDevelopment: An Empirical Investigation of the Swiss Hotel Industry. *InternationalCouncil on Hotel, Restaurant and Institutional Education,* Vol. 35No.4, pp.437-468.

[37]. Tse, D. and P. Wilton (1988) Models of consumer satisfaction formation: An extension.*Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 25No.1,pp.204-212.

[38]. Youssef, F., Nel, D., &Bovaird, T. (1995) Service quality in NHS hospitals.*Journal of Management in Medicine,* Vol. 9 No. 1, pp.66-74.

[39]. Zeithaml, V. A., Bitner, M. J., &Gremler, D. D. (2006)*Services marketing. Integrating customer focus across the firm.*4th ed.McGraw-Hill/Irwin, USA.