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ABSTRACT

Service quality and user satisfaction are often treated together as functions of user’s perceptions and expectations. To encompass various aspects of service quality SERVQUAL model has been adopted in this study. The objective of this study was to measure the service quality of three Primary Schools at Yeka Sub City from the parent’s perspectives and discuss the overall schools performance towards meeting user’s expectations. Both primary and secondary data were collected; the instrument for primary data collection was modified SERVQUAL questionnaire. The respondent of the questionnaire were student parents who are the main customers of the teaching service of primary schools. The selections of the respondents were carried out by using simple random sampling research technique. A set of questionnaire were prepared and given to 118 student parents. Then these collected data were sorted and registered in SPSS version 20 statistical software to analyzing the data. After analyzing the data the study provides results.

The study has two variables dependent and independent. In dependent variable there is the customer satisfaction while in independent variable there are service quality dimensions. The Pearson correlation was applied on data, and results exposed that there is a strong positive and a significant relationship between the variables. The findings of the study revealed that respondents were unsatisfied with the service quality provision by the schools; parents’ expectations were more than their perceptions. The school service provisions do not meet the expectation of its users as gaps were observed negatively almost in all service dimensions. The research showed that the highest gap was occurred in Responsiveness followed by Assurance. The most important dimension identified from parents’ perspective was Assurance, followed by Responsiveness, and Reliability. The study recommends school services in all aspects be improved and user’s expectations have be realized to ensure their customer satisfaction.

Key words – Service Quality, Customer Satisfaction, SERVQUAL, Private Elementary Schools
CHAPTER ONE

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

“Education is the most powerful weapon which we can use to change the world” Nelson Mandela’s famous quotes on education (Brainy Quote.com) a change that is potentially undergone on social, political and economic sector. For the economic shift from agricultural sector to industrial sector and the recent shift from industrial sector to service sector education plays an important role; as by itself education is one of a service sector (Hanushek and Wobmann, (2007) :10). That is why the attention of most researchers focuses on the educational sector.

Much of the gap in living standards between developed and developing countries may be due to wide gaps in education. Thus, efforts to raise enrolment rates and to increase student learning could greatly improve living standards in developing countries. Despite other factors formal and informal educations helps to become more productive, hence increase individual incomes, and simply attain countries economic development (Hanushek, (2010): 132-136). The above statements shows that expanding access to education is a widely accepted priority in the fight against poverty, drives productivity and participation which in turn results economic growth(Cohn and Geske, 1990: 143) that means expanding access of private primary schooling sector plays an essential role in the economic growth of Ethiopia.

Extending quality education, delivering relevant primary education to all school age children and expanding standardized training programs at all level is one of the major ways that take the country to the development and prosperity. Quality education creates quality man power that paves way to quality life and working against short comings in life. (ESDP III, 2005/6). Expanding access of quality service in educational sector and customer satisfaction are terms that one often comes across the other especially in business research (kassim and Abdullah, 2010: 351-371). At international level and institutionally different researches are undertaken related to service quality and customer satisfaction in education sector (Chala, 2015; Quinn, Lemay, Larsen and Johnson, 2009) but still it is not resolved within the past decades.
Now a day in Addis Ababa majority of educational sectors are owned by private investors and it increases from time to time; for instance pre-primary, primary and secondary schools under the ownership of private investors cover 75.5%, 61.31% and 41% respectively from the total coverage in Addis Ababa. At the time, the share of government was only 7%, 15.03% and 27% respectively. The left few are shared among local community, foreign community, mission, mosque, church and others. And also the demand for private primary schools has increased (AAEB annual report, 2011/12: 16).

In cognizance of the increasing demand and importance of quality service in private primary education sectors in Addis Ababa researchers, school providers and professionals provided a definition and developed service quality standards for primary education (AAEB, 2014/2015: 29). However the voices of parents who are key stakeholders in primary education were often less attention in these deliberations and processes of service quality in the sector. This raises the question on how parents perceive the service quality of private elementary educational sectors and whether they are satisfied with the service quality of the schools or not.

Despite parents are still enrolling their children in these schools, the aim of this study is to assess and measure the determinants of parent’s satisfaction with the quality of service provided by the schools in the case of three selected private elementary schools of Yeka sub city. And also the study tries to answer what are the qualities of these services provider provided to customers? Are the customers satisfied with these services? What measures should have to take to compromise the gaps?

There is a widely held belief that customers are important stakeholders in organizations and their satisfaction is a priority to management (Cohn and Geske, 1990: 143). One of the core activities in service provider business organization to stay in business is having a well satisfied customer as customers are source of profit. This indicates the ultimate success or failure of a service sector is depends on their customer satisfaction (Zeithaml, 2006: 106-107). So they should satisfy their customer effectively to achieve the organization objectives; and the service quality they provide is a key driver for customer satisfaction. (Gera, 2011: 20). That means satisfaction is the key building block which will be able to retain the firm customers, or students or their parents in reference to education institutions (Tuan, 2012; Rahman et al., 2012). Retention of customers has strong effect on the particular education institution’s profitability (Lee, 2013; Tuan, 2012). In this context Danjuma
and Rasli (2012) posits that satisfaction is an essential element for customer attachment this will lead to continuity of the student in the educational institutions.

To measure the service quality offered at the educational sector, there are many practical techniques and metrics are applied depend on the technology availability in the environment. Among this method service quality model given by Parasurman et al., (1988) SERVQUAL is one of the most common and widely accepted method for measuring the subjective elements of service quality as many marketing researches illustrated; this paper apply too this model of measurement. SERVQUAL has been widely acknowledged and applied in various service settings for variety of industries in the past decade. Examples include health care setting, dental school patient clinic, business school, placement center, tire store, actual care hospital, large retail chains, banking, pest control, dry cleaning, fast food restaurants, and so forth (Ladhari, 2008; Munusamy et al, 2010).

1.2 Statements of the Problem

As it is proven by different researchers, early primary level education has profound effect on academic progression, performance/achievement and completion. However, in developing countries, rapid expansion education sector has been a huge impediment in the realization of quality education, just sharing the limited resources (input), and getting them incapable. Ethiopia is one of the countries that are experiencing this gap relatively in the past decade (AAEB, 2012). At present there are more than200 private primary education sectors operating in Addis Ababa market and there is fierce competition among the schools with the increasing demands of customer for private primary education sector.

As competition increases in the current turbulent education business environment and with the emergence of knowledge as a driver of economic development; education institutions and business industry worldwide encounter growth rate, price pressures which has brought serious attention on customer satisfaction and service quality (Danjuma & Rasli, 2012; Rahman et al., 2012). In the construct of quality is conceptualized based on perceived service quality (Hishamuddin et al., 2008), perceived service quality is defined as “global judgment, or attitude, relating to the superiority of the service” (Parasuraman et al., 1988). In the education industry of learning the embracement students’
satisfaction and education quality concepts are viewed as a crucial point for their success and survival (Vatta & Bhatara, 2013).

In addition to this customers are becoming increasingly aware of their expectations, and demand higher standards of services (Zeithaml, 2006: 106), therefore, to sustain in the market, service quality becomes the most critical component of competitiveness for education service sectors in Ethiopia and focusing on improving service quality and customer satisfaction of in this service sectors is a priority task so all this get the study timely, and important.

In this sector studies area, many studies were made though the level and location varies. For instance, Tigist (2009) on Private Higher institution in Addis Ababa, Sime (2004) on Preparatory School in Oromia Region, Desta (2005) Private Higher institutions of Ethiopia, and Yohannes (2005) on Secondary Schools in Oromia. The findings were unqualified and inexperienced teaching staff that does not fit the level, high teachers’ turnover, and lack of full time teaching staff in higher institution, untrained librarians and laboratory technicians in higher institutions. In schools also, inappropriate curriculum, shortage of materials such as inadequate reference materials in library, chemicals and apparatus in laboratory, and functioning computers in IT center. Facility also such as lack of internet service for teachers, technology to be used in the class, insufficient taps for water service; toilets etc. were the major findings.

But, limited studies have been done to document how parents satisfy with the delivery of service quality in private elementary schools. Therefore, this study investigates the extent the service quality provided by the schools and the level of their customer satisfactions in the case of three private elementary schools in Addis Ababa. And also suggest possible improvement in recommendations. As the problem was not yet well addressed in the city the gap identified by this study is very essential, and the research will be the base for those who want to study the situation further.

1.3 Research Questions

This study is expected to answer the following basic research questions:

1. What is the overall service quality of the private primary schools at Yeka Sub City using SERVQUAL gap analysis model from the parents perspective?

2. What are the basic weaknesses and strengthens of the private primary schools services?
3. Which dimension is most important to the parents?

4. What problems did parents encounter when seeking the schools service and affect their satisfaction?

1.4 Objective of the Study

1.4.1 General Objective

The general objective of the study is measuring the service quality of private primary education on selected private primary schools in Yeka Sub City.

1.4.2 Specific Objectives

- To assess the overall service quality of private primary schools using SERVQUAL gap analysis model from the parents’ perspectives
- To identify strengths and weaknesses of the service quality of the private primary schools services;
- To assess the most important dimensions of service quality for educational service;
- Identify the problems users have encountered when involved in the school service and affect their satisfaction.

1.5 Significance of the Study

The private primary schools at Yeka Sub City will increase their performance and meet the expectation of parents when this study is implemented. The findings of this study could be useful to other institutions and researchers working on service quality of primary schools. The findings of the study would also enable the primary schools to make regular assessments to enhance the improvements of the service quality. At national level in Ethiopia, SERVQUAL gap analysis model would provide primary schools a new assessment method for service quality and parents satisfaction.

Beside reason why I selected this topic I believe that education leads to empowerment: a process of strengthening individuals, organizations and communities so they get more control over their own situations and environments. Quality education is a crucial factor in combating poverty and inequality in society. Providing quality services is one of the main targets when it comes to
management with respect of customer satisfaction in the business environment of today, meaning it is a very vital topic.

1.6 Scope of the Study

It is important to study the practices of action research in the whole primary school in Addis Ababa city. However, a large scale study requires much resources, time, and human power. Therefore, the scope of this study is limited at three randomly selected private primary schools in Yeka sub city administration in order to make the study manageable and complete it within a given time. In addition, this area is selected based on convenience and availability of much number of school and decline the school number in the previous three to five consecutive years. The sample sizes from each school are limited to 59 parents from Hillside School, 32 parents from Abunegorgorios School and 27 parents from Kidus Michael School.

1.7 Limitation of the Study

Due to time and financial constraints, the study is limited to selected primary schools which are located at Yeka Sub City. The researcher is unable to incorporate more schools and try to cover wide areas and get in depth information. Therefore, the information obtained from this study might not be sufficient to generalize about service quality of primary schools in general in Ethiopia. The other limitation of the study is the broad nature of this area of study; I could not access all the literature concerning customer satisfaction and service quality because it would have been very voluminous. The above limitations however are less significant compared to the importance of carrying out this type of study. Such study should be carried out frequently in order to monitor service quality and satisfaction levels of customers and hence apply necessary adjustments for addressing the prevailing weaknesses. Further research should be carried out in order to enhance the understanding of the concepts of service quality and customer satisfaction, how they are measured because they are very important for service organizations in terms of profitability and growth.
1.8 Organization of the Study

The thesis is organized into five chapters. In chapter one, introduction of the study which includes background of the study, statement of the problem, objective of the study, research questions, significance of the study, scope and limitation. In chapter two, review of theoretical and empirical works related to the study will be presented. Chapter three discusses the research methodology used in the study. Results and discussions are presented in chapter four. Chapter five summarizes the findings of the study and presents implications for the stakeholders on private elementary schools.
CHAPTER TWO
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Theoretical Literature Review

2.1.1 Concept and Historical Development of Quality views

Quality is a 20th century phenomena that has its roots in the industry and management. It became with an issue with the advent of industrialization, and adoption of new scientific approach to management based on strict division of labor as propounded by F.W. Taylor. With mass-production and breaking down of work into smaller and repetitive tasks handled by machines, the role of workers for self-checking of quality was reduced. In the days of craftsmanship, the responsibility of quality remained with the workers. The latter stage necessitated the need for inspection of the products to ensure they meet specifications before they left the factory, which came to be known as “quality control” (Mishra, 2006:16). As Mishra expresses, United State and Japan played a leading role in the process of quality development because of the two great contributors such as Shewhart and Deming, although some more very influential people came later. Especially Deming, the father of quality movement, contributed a lot, just moving idea of quality from industry to management in post-World War II. Therefore, quality was not born at once being advanced in size and standard as it is nowadays. But, through process, it grew from very narrow area, industry, to all aspect of human activities, through various evolutionary processes quality management which is from “inspection” to the highly advanced one, “Total Quality Management” at present.

Quality is highly an enigmatic concept that is only felt but could not go past feeling, and can’t be put in an agreed formal meaning or definition.

Quality ... you know what it is, yet you don’t know what it is. But that is self-contradictory. But something is better than others, that is, they have more quality. But when you try to say what the quality is, a part from the things that have it, it all goes proof! There is nothing to talk about it. ... But for all practical purpose, it really does exist ... (Pirsing, 1974:171, in Mishra, 2007:11)

It really exists, that is why things are compared, and even is the top of most agendas in the world as it is the ultimate goal of any service provider or production maker. But no one could give a definite

Also, the concept of quality ranges from quality as a measure for excellence to quality as a perfection, quality as customer satisfaction, quality as fitness for purpose, quality as value for money and quality as transformation in learners (SAUVCA, 2002, cited in world Bank, 2007:1). It is associated with distinctiveness, meeting standard set, meeting stated purpose, return on investment and empowering learners respectively. According to the idea have been listed, meaning of quality seem to be dependent on policy and purpose of the organization or a country, and the extent to which the service or production meet the intended objective. This could be backed up by Sallis (2002) which states “… quality makes difference between success and failure”. The success and failure is juggled depending on the intention or objective set prior set in the policy.

**2.1.2 Approaches to Quality**

Countries choose an approach to quality that seem to them to best fit to their own context, and also adopt to their system if it seem to deviate, just to encourage quality, and meet the intended objective. The approaches are quality control, quality assurance, quality improvement and total quality management (Blom and Meyers, 2003:11).

**Quality control:**- this means it is typically implemented at state and institute levels. It is made after the event process to detect defective products. But within education, no matter how widely quality control is pursued within institute or across entire state, there is one dimension over which provider has no control, which is opposite to industrial context. “After all, training and education are intangible services, with the customers themselves being partially responsible for the result” (Berghe, 1996), which means, the customer is also accountable in insuring quality.

**Quality assurance:**- it assumes greater importance as an organization moves from focusing on product to focusing on process (Berghe, 1996). Quality assurance is itself a process that requires standards to be defined, procedures to be monitored and nonconformance to be analyzed and
remedied. External processes are applied by external agencies such as auditors or accreditation agencies to determine the organizations compliance with externally imposed quality criteria. A system of internal quality assurance is generally assumed to precede the application of an external one (Nielsen and Visser, 1997).

**Quality improvement**:- it is an organizational strategy and a management approach, under pinned by a philosophical commitment to continuous improvement. It requires the involvement of all employees, and is focused on increasing the organization’s effectiveness in achieving customer satisfaction by working towards the improvement of those areas and processes which have been identified as needing to be improved.

**Total quality management**: is the best known of the quality improvement approaches. Its five underlying concepts comprise: a clear customer focus; continuous improvement; quality assurance of internal process; process orientation; and prevention instead of inspection (Berghe 1977). The European foundation for quality management (2001) has adopted the following quality management principles: Result orientation, customer focus, leadership and constancy of purpose, management by processes and facts, people development and involvement, continuous learning, improvement and innovation, partnership development, public responsibility.

In general, the evolution of quality has gone through various developmental processes, and has reached where it is now, which is highly advanced and top productive. According to Berghe (1996), quality control, was not much successful as it was increasing wastage of resource. Because, the defective products were being avoided as they were identified after the completion of the process. But, this did not work in education as it works on human being. Then, the solution was thought to be prevention of the defects, and it caused the birth of quality assurance that works on the process of production which enables eliminate the opportunity of defective product formation as. This action definitely minimized the wastage of resource. After that, the advancement of quality strode forth and quality improvement came that put focus on organizational commitment to continuous quality production (Meyers, 2003). It inspired the employee to put their eyes on development of their organization, satisfying the costumer. Finally, the best advanced approach of all, total quality management, has been introduced that works on the overall quality aspect.
2.2 Methodological Literature Review

2.2.1 SERVQUAL as Instrument to Evaluate Service Quality

The SERVQUAL instrument easily identifies service quality from the customer Perspective (Sahu, 2007). The SERVQUAL model has been widely used to study the service industry in general and education customer service, in particular. The SERVQUAL method is a technique that can be used for performing a gap analysis of an organization’s service quality performance against customer service quality needs (Yu, 2008). SERVQUAL is a multi-item scale developed to assess customer perceptions of service quality in service and retail businesses. Originally developed from the gap model, SERVQUAL took shape and was developed during the 1980s. The scale contains a pair of 22-items that are grouped into two statements, one to measure expectations concerning general factors about the service-providing center while the other measures perception about the particular firm whose service quality was being evaluated (Stromgren, 2007). He also described the purpose of SERVQUAL as to serve as a diagnostic methodology for uncovering wide areas of an organization’s service quality weaknesses and strengths.

Quality is a set of features of the product or service, which is capable of complying with the explicit or implicit needs. In most of the definitions, the most important factor is the customer’s satisfaction and meeting their demands (Enayati et al., 2001). Measuring the quality of a service is a very difficult exercise. Unlike products, which have specific specifications such as length, depth, width, weight, a service can have numerous intangible or qualitative specifications. In addition, there is the expectation of the customer with regard to the service, which can vary considerably based on a range of factors such as prior experience, personal needs and what other people may have told them. Managers in the service sector are under increasing pressure to make their services user focused and to check continuous performance improvement is being delivered. Given the financial and resource constraints under which service organizations must manage, it is essential that customer expectations are properly understood and measured and from the customers’ perspective any gaps in service quality are identified.

White (1998) suggested that SERVQUAL is a survey instrument that supports to measure the quality of service rendered by an institution along five dimensions: Tangibles, Reliability, Responsiveness,
Assurance, and Empathy. In particular, it measures what the customer expects from the institution in relation to these dimensions against what the customer perceives the institution performs along these dimensions. Defining the gap between two measures, (the discrepancy between what the patron expects in service quality and the service quality he or she perceived or received) is intended to assist the institution in prioritizing corrective actions.

SERVQUAL is based on the proposition that service quality can be measured as the gap between the service that customers expect and the performance they perceive to have received. Respondents rate their expectations of service from an excellent organization, and then rate the performance they perceive they received from a specific organization. Service quality is calculated as the difference in the two scores where better service quality results in a smaller gap (Landrum, 2009). Service quality has been determined by measuring the difference between perceptions and expectations, and it can be best described by those who use the services and not the service providers. Discrepancy was found between users’ perceptions and expectations of all 22 questionnaire statements regarding different attributes of service quality (Arshad and Ameen, 2010).

SERVQUAL has been widely acknowledged and applied in various service settings for variety of industries in the past decade. Examples include health care setting, dental school patient clinic, business school, placement center, tire store, actual care hospital, large retail chains, banking, pest control, dry cleaning, fast food restaurants, and so forth (Ladhari, 2008 and Munusamy et al., 2010).

As the service sector of the global economy grows, the study of services and innovation are becoming increasingly important. Service products distributed regionally, nationally, and globally have become larger portions of company revenue streams; knowledge-intensive business services aimed at enhancing performance require reliable methods of measurement, assessment, and improvement. As a result, accurate and reliable instruments that assess service quality are of great interest to companies whose revenues come from service delivery. Perhaps, the most popular and widely used service quality instrument is SERVQUAL (Landrum et al., 2009).

Kim et al. (2003), define quality as fitness for use. They asserted that the product or service must confirm to the needs and expectations of end users. In the service setting, there are no guidelines for measuring quality and, SERVQUAL was developed to measure service quality based on input from
focus groups. Although SERVQUAL was developed within the marketing sector, it is also used in a variety of organizational settings.

2.2.2 The SERVQUAL Gaps

The most commonly used and valuable analysis that SERVQUAL provides is the gap analysis. Gaps are examined across five dimensions: Tangibles, Reliability, Responsiveness, Assurance and Empathy (Chatzoglou, 2013). The SERVQUAL Scale, customers’ perceptions of service quality, is influenced by five gaps; and Ladhari (2009) described the five gaps:

1. Gap between Consumer Expectation and Management Perception,
2. Gap between Management Perception and Service Quality Specification,
3. Gap between Service Quality Specification and Service Delivery,
4. Gap between Service Delivery and External Communication, and the
5. Gap between Expected Service and Experienced Service
Fig. 2.1. SERVQUAL Gap Analysis

Gap 1-Gap between consumer expectation and management perception

Stromgren (2007) stated that the knowledge gap is the difference between guest’s expectation and management’s perceptions of those expectations, i.e., not knowing what consumers expect. It is about managers’ perceptions of customers’ expectations on service quality. Managers think they know what customers really want, but actually, there is a gap between customers’ expected service and management perceptions of customers’ expectations. This gap arises when the management does not correctly perceive what the customers want. Key factors leading to this gap are insufficient marketing research, poorly interpreted information about the audience’s expectations, research not
focused on demand quality, too many layers between the front line personnel and the top level management.

**Gap 2-Gap between management perception and service quality specification**

The standard gap is the difference between management’s perceptions of guest’s expectations and service quality specification, i.e. improper service-quality standards. It is about service quality standards. Because there is no clear-cut approach that managers can use to translate their perceptions into service quality standards, a gap is inevitable. Here the management might correctly perceive what the customer wants, but may not set a performance standard. Gap 2 may occur due to the following reasons: insufficient planning procedures, lack of management commitment, unclear or ambiguous service design, and unsystematic new service development process (Stromgren, 2007).

**Gap 3-Gap between service quality specification and service delivery**

The delivery gap is the difference between service quality specifications and service actually delivered, i.e. the service performance gap. It is the difference between service quality standards and the level of service actually delivered. This gap may arise owing to the service personnel. The reasons are being poor training, incapability or unwillingness to meet the set service standard. The possible major reasons for this gap are deficiencies in human resource policies such as ineffective recruitment, role ambiguity, role conflict, improper evaluation and compensation system, ineffective internal marketing, failure to match demand and supply, lack of proper customer education and training (Stromgren, 2007).

**Gap 4-Gap between service delivery and external communication**

The communication gap is the difference between service quality and the communications to guests about service delivery, i.e. whether promises match delivery? It is the difference between service providers’ service delivery and service providers’ promises through external communications; Consumer expectations are highly influenced by statements made by company representatives and advertisements. The gap arises when these assumed expectations were not fulfilled at the time of delivery of the service. The discrepancy between actual service and the promised one may occur due
to the following reasons: over-promising in external communication campaign, failure to manage customer expectations, failure to perform according to specifications (Stromgren, 2007).

**Gap 5-Gap between expected service and experienced service**

The overall gap is the difference between user’s expectation and perceived service. This gap depends on the size and directions of the four previous mentioned gaps associated with the delivery of service quality on the provider’s side. It is the difference between expected service and perceived service from users’ points of view (Stromgren, 2007).

**2.2.3 Expectation versus Perception**

SERVQUAL aims to measure the gap between customer expectations and perceptions in terms of five dimensions, namely Tangibles, Reliability, Responsiveness, Assurance, and Empathy. The most often used approach for measuring service quality has been to compare a customer’s expectations before a service encounter and their perceptions of the actual service delivered (Kang, 2002). Customers’ expectations are desires or wants of consumers, that is, what they feel a service provider ‘should’ offer rather than ‘would’ offer, whereas customer’s perception of service quality is based on the comparison of their expectations (what they feel service providers should offer) with their perceptions of the performance of the service provider. It is important to understand and measure customer’s expectations in order to identify any gaps in delivering services with quality that could ensure satisfaction. Perceptions of customers are based solely on what they receive from the service encounter (Daniel and Berinyuy, 2010). Expectation is the services provided by an ideal service-providing center, perception is the actual services delivered to users (Abili et al., 2012).

This study was mainly based on this discrepancy of expected service and perceived service from the customer’s perspective. This is in order to obtain a better knowledge of how users perceive service quality in the schools. The study was not focusing on the first four gaps because they are mainly focused on the organization’s perspective even though they have an impact on the way customers perceive service quality of schools and thus help in closing the gap, which arises from the difference between customer’s expectation and perception of service quality dimensions.
2.2.4. SERVQUAL Dimension

The problem in managing service companies is that quality is not easily measurable. Even if an employee or product performs exactly as intended, a consumer may be dissatisfied for another reason. Keeping this in mind, to solve this problem, different scales for measuring service quality have been put forward and SERVQUAL is one of the most famous instrument which have been modified over the years to become more adaptable to a variety of situations and enables to measure the service quality based on the five dimensions that have been found to be reliable indicators of customer satisfaction. Abili et al. (2012) listed them as Reliability, Responsiveness, Assurance, Empathy, and Tangibles. Each dimension is measured by four to five items with a pair of 22 items measuring the expectations of customers concerning the service and also the perceived level of service actually provided. Then the gap score is calculated as the difference between the perception score’ and the expectation score.

2.2.4.1 Reliability

Reliability is about the accuracy and timeliness in the service provided. It is also the ability of service providing organization to perform the promised service dependably and accurately. It means that the service organization performs the service right the first time and honors all its commitments (Manjunatha and Shivalingaiah, 2004; Munusamy et al., 2010 and Abili et al., 2012).

2.2.4.2 Assurance

Assurance is the knowledge, attention and skills shown by the employees that inspire credibility and trust. It is a means of being safe. It is the knowledge, competence and courtesy of employees, and their ability to convey trust and confidence in the customer towards the service providing institution. Competency refers to the possession of required skills and knowledge to perform the service. Courtesy involves politeness, respect, friendliness, honesty and trustworthiness of contact personnel (Manjunatha and Shivalingaiah, 2004; Munusamy et al., 2010 and Abili et al., 2012).
2.2.4.3 Tangible

Tangibles encompass organization’s physical facilities, their equipment’s, appearance of their personnel and appearance of communication materials used to promote their products/services (Manjunatha and Shivalingaiah, 2004; Munusamy et al., 2010 and Abili et al., 2012).

2.2.4.4 Empathy

Empathy is the caring, individualized attention the firm provides its customers; it includes the approachability, ease of contact of service providers and making of efforts to understand the customer needs. It is an effort to understand the perspective of the user through individual attention (Manjunatha and Shivalingaiah, 2004; Munusamy et al., 2010 and Abili et al., 2012).

2.2.4.5 Responsiveness

Responsiveness is the disposition of the staff to help users and provide them with quick service; it is the timely reaction towards the customers' needs; it is the willingness of organization’s staff to help customers and provide them with prompt service; this refers timeliness and promptness in providing the service (Manjunatha and Shivalingaiah, 2004; Munusamy et al., 2010 and Abili et al., 2012).

2.2.5 Criticisms of SERVQUAL

Notwithstanding its widespread impact on business and academia, SERVQUAL has been subjected to number of criticisms as well. But what is to be reexamined is the verity that in spite of disagreements over use of both the expectations and performance measures and the dimensionality of the SERVQUAL instrument across different industrial settings, researchers and practitioners seem to generally agree that the 22 items are good predictors of overall evaluation of service quality by consumers (Sureshchandar, 2002).

Buttle (1996) criticizes SERVQUAL in the article SERVQUAL; review, critique, research agenda and comes up with these three key criticisms: Perception and expectation are very subjective and thus not good measures, there is not necessarily a direct relationship between service and quality, and the measures in the model are not necessarily the right things to be measured.
The fact that SERVQUAL has critics that does not render the measuring tool moot. Rather, the criticism received concerning SERVQUAL measuring tool may have more to do with how researchers use the tool.

Nyeck et al. (2002) reviewed 40 articles that made use of the SERVQUAL measuring tool and discovered that few researchers concern themselves with the validation of the measuring tool. They also stated that the SERVQUAL measuring tool appears to remain the most complete attempt to conceptualize and measure service quality. SERVQUAL measuring tool has been used by several researchers to examine numerous service industries such as healthcare, banking, financial services, and education.

Ladhari (2009) reviewed 20 years (1988-2008) of research on the SERVQUAL scale for measuring service quality. Ranges of studies that have applied the SERVQUAL scale in this 20-year period were examined in a non-exhaustive review of the literature. These studies were selected from well-known databases. The paper identifies and summarizes numerous theoretical and empirical criticisms of the SERVQUAL scale. Despite these criticisms, the paper concludes that SERVQUAL remains a useful instrument for service-quality research.

Chatzoglou et al. (2013) stated that the use of the SERVQUAL instrument has been a subject of critique by various authors. Its ability to measure service quality has been supported by many and disputed by few. The present study analytically examines the validity and reliability of the instrument, to ensure that its use successfully fits the public service environment SERVQUAL is the most widespread service quality measurement tools developed to date.

Despite the above criticism to the original SERVQUAL instrument, various recent studies continue to use it in its original form (five dimensions with 22 items in total), without serious adjustments. These studies advocate that the original SERVQUAL instrument is more solid, valid and reliable. According to Chatzoglou, the main advantage of SERVQUAL is the fact that it is a tried and tested instrument that can be used for comparisons and other benchmarking purposes. Moreover, it benefits from being a statistically valid instrument, because of its extensive test on the field. Therefore, it escapes the pitfall of being perceived as something that has been skewed to elicit certain types of response Chatzoglou et al. (2013).
2.2.6 Service quality versus user satisfaction

Customer satisfaction and service quality are inter-related. The higher the service quality, the higher is the customer satisfaction (Munusamy, 2010). Service quality and customer satisfaction have been proven from past researches to be positively related (Agbor, 2011).

2.2.6.1 Service quality

Khalid et al. (2011) defined service as a process consisting of a series of intangible activities that normally, but not necessarily always, take place in interactions between the customer and service employees and/or physical resources or goods and/or systems of service provider, which provides as solutions to customer problems. Arshad and Ameen (2010) indicated that quality has no single accepted definition because it has multiple perspectives and has been defined differently under different conditions. Customers’ perceptions of service quality result from a comparison of their before-service expectations with their actual service experience. The service will be considered excellent if perceptions exceed expectations; it will be regarded as good or adequate if it only equals the expectations; the service can be classed as bad, poor or deficient, if it does not meet those (Naik et al., 2010). Different scholars have identified four dimensions of quality: Excellence (the mark of uncompromising standards and high achievement, but there may be measurement difficulties, the attributes of excellence may change, and a sufficient number of customers must be willing to pay for excellence); value (although value incorporates multiple attributes, it is difficult to extract individual components of value judgment. Besides, value and quality are not synonymous; conformance to specifications is based on reducing errors, defects, or mistakes to improve quality. It facilitates precise measurement and leads to increased efficiency. Nonetheless, consumers do not know or care about internal specifications and such a perspective is internally focused’ and inappropriate for services); meeting and/or exceeding expectations (this perspective focuses on expectations and evaluates service from the customer’s perspective. Yet, customers may not know their expectations, and there may be confusion between customer service and customer satisfaction) (Hernon and Nitecki, 2001).
Service quality is defined as the global evaluation or attitude of overall excellence of services. Therefore, service quality is the difference between customers’ expectation and perceptions of services delivered by service firms (Heron and Nitecki, 2001).

In today’s world of intense competition, the key to sustainable competitive advantage lies in delivering high quality service that will in turn result in satisfied customers. Service quality in the management and marketing literature is the extent to which customers' perceptions of service meet and/or exceed their expectations (Agbor, 2011). Overall, service quality level acts as an antecedent for customer satisfaction (Kumar, et al., 2010). Perceived service quality is an antecedent of customer satisfaction (Lee et al., 2000).

2.2.6.2 Users Satisfaction

Khalid et al. (2011) defined satisfaction as a person’s feelings of pleasure or disappointment resulting from comparing a product or service perceived in relation to his or her expectations. Hoyer and MacInnis (2001) said that satisfaction could be associated with feelings of acceptance, happiness, relief, delight, and excitement.

Customer satisfaction is defined, as the level of a person’s feelings resulting from comparing a product’s or service’s perceived or outcome in relation to his/her own expectations. Therefore, customer satisfaction could consider a comparative behavior between inputs beforehand and post attainments. As the study focused on investigating user satisfaction of libraries, customer satisfaction is defined as the levels of service quality performances that meets users’ expectations (Wang and Shieh, 2006).

Customer satisfaction is viewed as a multi-dimensional construct and the measurement items generated with the same dimensions of service quality (Wang and Shieh, 2006). When a consumer/customer is contented with either the product or service, it is termed satisfaction. Satisfaction can also be a person’s feelings of pleasure or disappointment that results from comparing a product perceived performance or outcome with their expectations (Agbor, 2011). Mohammad and Alhamadani (2011) stated that user satisfaction is influenced by users’ perceptions of quality. Service quality is an antecedent of the broader concept of user satisfaction. User satisfaction is the users' evaluation of services after served as opposed to their expectation.
2.3 Empirical Literature Review

2.3.1 Service quality and customer satisfaction in education sector

Satisfaction is an internal feeling of a person that is resulted by comparing the quality of a perceived performance or a delivered good to what extend he or she expected before. Customers can be dissatisfied, satisfied and delighted if the performance they receive falls matches or exceed their expectations, respectively (Kotler, 2006).

Satisfaction has been a subject of great interest to organizations and researchers alike. In recent years, organizations are obliged to render more services in in addition to their offers. The quality of service has become an aspect of customer satisfaction. In the same trait currently in education service sector service quality and customer satisfaction have become great important. In the education industry of higher learning the embracement students” satisfaction and education quality concepts are viewed as a crucial point for their success and survival (Vatta & Bhatara, 2013).

Most of empirical studies in education institutions have produced evidence that service quality leads to students” satisfaction (Long et al., 2014; Talmacean et al., 2013; Lee & Ryu, 2013; Odeh, 2012; Alnaser & Al-Alak, 2012; Bergamo et al., 2012; Nesset & Helgesen, 2009). Basically most of the models of satisfaction often compares students” expectations to the observed service quality encounter that are referred as service quality gap but evidence has made certain that in application of performance only paradigm minus the expectation has given positive effect to students” perceptions of service quality and with that, satisfaction directly affects students intention to evaluate the education institution favourably (Tuan, 2012; Alnaser & Al-Alak, 2012; Abdullah, 2005, 2006a).

Education institution seek to provide high service quality in every part of its process in order to be in favour of student as primary consumer’s fulfillment response; reason being satisfaction is indicated as the consumer’s fulfillment response and service quality is considered as the key performance measurement for excellence in the education industry (Talmacean & Domnica, 2013; Alnaser & Al-Alak, 2012; Ferguson & Phau, 2012; Iuliana & Mihai, 2011; Wei, 2011; Oliver, 1997; Tuan, 2012).
Overall perceived service quality is an antecedent to satisfaction and it is also a major prerequisite for establishing and sustaining students’ satisfaction and retention and also students’ future referrals (Vatta & Bhatara, 2013; Talmacean & Domnica, 2013; Zabadi, 2013; Danjuma & Rasli, 2012).

2.3.2 Parents’ Satisfactions with the Quality of Education and Type of School

Parents’ satisfaction levels depend on different experiences about school. According to Friedman, Bobrowski, and Markow (2007) parents evaluate their children’s school on a number of variables including teachers, administrators, curriculum, technology, facilities, involvement, transportation, and budget. These variables may influence the parents’ satisfaction with their children’s schools. The study by Jinnah and Walter (2008) found parents’ level of satisfaction to be a useful measure of evaluation which implied that parents have to continue being involved in evaluating their child care programs. Parents are transferring their children from public to private schools due to perceived low quality of education in public schools in terms of good discipline, physical facilities, better teacher performance and higher quality output (Adebayo, 2009; Oketch, Mutisya, Ngware, Ezrah, and Epari, 2010). On the other parents’ levels of education have been reported to influence their satisfaction with the quality of education provided to their children. For example, Badri, Mason and Mourad (2010) examined predictors of parents’ satisfaction with subject taught in their children’s schools.

2.3.3 Relationship between Parents’ Perceived Quality and Satisfaction with Quality of Education

Mixed conclusions exist regarding the causal direction between perceived service quality and satisfaction (Lee, Lee, and Yoo, 2000). The question is, does perceived service quality lead to satisfaction or vice versa? Lee et al. (2000) found that perceived service quality is an antecedent of the broader concept of customer satisfaction; and the relationship between perceived service quality and trust is mediated by satisfaction (Omar, et al., 2009). If perceived service quality exceeds customer expectation, their loyalty, trust and retention increases.

The relationship among perceived service quality and customer satisfaction has received considerable attention in the field of marketing. Within this research area, numerous empirical studies have revealed a significant relationship between perceived service quality and customer satisfaction (Lee et
Meanings that an organization that provides better service quality also have more satisfied customers.

İncesu and Aşıkgil (2012) conducted a study in Turkey to investigate the effect of the five dimensions of service quality in primary education on parent satisfaction. These included reliability, tangibility, responsiveness, assurance and empathy. The research involved 293 randomly selected parents who responded to a five-point Likert scale. The results revealed that four dimensions in service quality namely; tangibility (equipment, teaching materials), reliability (consistency in service provision), empathy (personal care and individualized attention) and assurance (teachers’ kindness and knowledge) were the critical factors in explaining parents’ satisfaction. However, the study was limited to only one public primary school.

In another study Jang (2008) investigated the relationship between parental perception of importance of quality and satisfaction with child care programs in Taiwan. Data were collected using a 5-point Likert scale questionnaire from 810 parents of the three to five-year-old children enrolled in one of 20 pre-schools. Results revealed that there was significant difference between parental perception of importance of quality and satisfaction with child care programs.

2.4 Gap Identification

The literature revealed that quality and satisfaction in primary education are subjective and context determined concepts that vary from population to population (Dahlberg, Moss & Pence, 1999). Parents from different settings have displayed different perceptions of quality and satisfaction with education provided to their children. On satisfaction with the quality of education based on type of school and parents’ demographic characteristics empirical evidence revealed contested findings which vary according to settings, and perspectives of stakeholders. In addition, research evidence has revealed a significant relationship between perceived service quality and parents/customers satisfaction.

Majority of the reviewed studies however, were conducted in other countries. But in Ethiopia similar or related studies appear to be very limited. Very little attention has been given to parents’
satisfaction with primary school service quality and satisfaction in the primary education field. This research attempted to fill this gap.

2.5 Conceptual Framework of the Study

The conceptual framework of the study, which deals with the determinants of service quality and the users’ satisfaction of the Ethiopia, is shown in the figure. The SERVQUAL model lists the proximate determinant variables, the independent variables expected to affect and influence the dependent variable, service quality and then users’ satisfaction. This conceptual framework was constructed based on the literature review, empirical studies and personal observation of the researcher.

![Fig.2.2. the Research Conceptual Frame Work of the Study](image)

**Fig.2.2. the Research Conceptual Frame Work of the Study**

*Source: Daniel and Berinyuy (2010)*
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

The purpose of the research design is to provide information for collection of relevant evidence with minimal expenditure of efforts, time and money. Hence, this research has been a descriptive research. Descriptive research uses a set of scientific methods and procedures to collect raw data and create data structures that describe the existing characteristics of a defined target population or market structure. Descriptive research designs are appropriate when the research objectives include determination of the degree to which marketing variables are related to actual market phenomena.

In fact, descriptive studies are very common in marketing research and make up a large part of the studies that are conducted by either in-house research departments or commissioned to outside marketing research companies. Since the aim of this study is to measure determinant factors of service quality towards meeting user’s expectation, descriptive study design is the appropriate one. Accordingly, survey has been used to collect quantitative data. Thus, the study design has been predominately be quantitative-survey research.

3.2 Description of the Study Area

Addis Ababa the capital city of Ethiopia have area coverage of 527 km$^2$ located at $9^\circ1'48''$ N and $38^\circ44'24''$ E with a population size of 3,384,569 in an annual growth rate of 3.8% according to the estimation of The Central Statical agency of Ethiopia censuses undertaken in 2007. The city has ten main sub cities and 99 wards (kebele); among others Bole, Akakykaliti, and yeka sub cities share 23.17%, 22.41% and 16.22% of the city geographical territory respectively which is the largest portion of Addis Ababa. The city has an educational system structure of pre-primary, first and second cycle primary, secondary first cycle and secondary preparatory, and higher education with a total number of 1108 pre-primary schools, 814 primary school, and 310 secondary and preparatory schools in 2014/2015 G.C. Public schools share only 18.68% of pre-primary, 26.91% of primary, and 25.16%

The primary level students officially aged from 7 to 14 years of students which is about 735562 children’s are ready for this level of education (AAEB Educational Study, Plan, and Budget Support process 2014/2015: 15). According to 2014/2015 census. Yeka sub city take the highest number of elementary school of the city in the previous three to five consecutive years that the sub city concentrated with a number of schools and that of the population size which is become the best areal advantage for researchers sample analysis (AAEB Educational Study, Plan, and Budget Support process, 2014/15: 29). As a result a case study on selected private elementary schools found in Yeka sub city is undertake to analyze their customers satisfaction and service quality with SERVQUAL model to help every stake holders of the sector.

3.3 Data Types and Sources

The primary data has been collected through modified SERVQUAL questionnaire method. The qualitative data are used to fill the gap in quantitative data. Quantitative data are collected from both primary and secondary sources. Primary data are collected directly from the selected sample parents focus on the information about their satisfaction of the service quality provided by their children schools and demography, Education, socio-economic characteristics of parents and also other vital information related to the research objectives.

In support of the primary sources, it is enrich by secondary data obtained from different sources such as online journals, books, newspaper, Yeka sub city schools concerned government offices, the city of Addis Ababa administration sector especially from educational bureau, Internet sources and other relevant sources. Using a combination of qualitative and quantitative data can improve an evaluation by ensuring that the limitations of one type of data are balanced by the strengths of another.

3.4 Sample Design and Sampling Procedure

3.4.1 Sampling Design

Three private elementary schools have been select to draw sample size by using simple random sampling technique to represent the whole Yeka sub city private elementary school as their
experience and because of diverge number of their students. The sources of the population are parents who are the main customers of the teaching service of primary schools. The number of students enrollment primary education in Addis Ababa 1st Cycle (grade 1-4) 247368 and 2nd Cycle (grade 5-8) 258251 total 505619 and when I come to Yeka sub city private primary school the total number of the school 132 and the total number of students of these schools are 24,628. The name of the school selected for sample population (Hill side, KidusMicael and AbuneGorgorios schools) who have long time experience in the field and vary number of students comparing with the school found in Yeka sub city.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Number of student in Yeka sub city :69,146</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of student in Yeka sub city government schools;36806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of student in Yeka sub city private school: 24,628 and others 5889.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### 3.4.2 Sample Size Determination

As sources of the population are parents who are the main customers of the teaching service of primary schools 118 respondents chosen from three private schools found in Yeka sub city to include statically in this study. These respondents are an important feature of this study in which the goal is to make an inference about a population from the sample.

The determination of sample size was based on of Yamane’s (1967) sampling formula with 90 percent confidence level.

\[
n = \frac{N}{1+N(e)^2}
\]

Where,

- \( n \): sample size for the researcher use.
- \( N \): total number of student in three schools= 2650
- \( e \): designates maximum variability or margin of error = 0.05-0.1% (for this research=0.09 was used).
- $e = 0.09$ was taken as margin error. It was taken because, as “$e$” gets approach 0.05 the sample size get larger and larger and as a result it becomes difficult to manage it.

Using the above formula, the total sample size of the parents from the three schools will be 118 which are determined as follows:

$$n = \frac{2650}{1+3,169 (0.09)^2} = 118$$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name of the school</th>
<th>Total number of student in each school</th>
<th>Sample population in each school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hill side</td>
<td>1316</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Abune Gorgorios</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Kidus Michael</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2650</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table-3.1 sample population of selected private elementary schools

### 3.5. Data Collection Methods

The instrument used in the study is a modified SERVQUAL survey (Ahmed and Shoeb, 2009). The original SERVQUAL instrument is specifically designed to assess organizations and businesses in the service area. Some changes were made to adapt it to an academic setting. The questionnaire was constructed based on the three SERVQUAL dimensions with a pair of 11-items each for both desired or expectations and received or perceived services. The scores for expectation and perception items were obtained on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

The questionnaire is used to measure the expectations and perceptions of service quality of three private primary school services as perceived by its users. In this survey, parents are asked to rate statements that would measure their expectations of the services provided by the schools. Then they
are also requested to rate another set of statements that would measure their perception of the actual services delivered to them. Generally, the instrument comprises three sections: statements focused on user expectations of the school up to the standard in general; statements focused on user perceptions of service quality at three private primary schools, where parents are required to indicate the importance by allocating a total of 100 points to the three dimensions.

3.6. Methods of Data Analysis

The gap scores analyses enable the study to find out how users perceive service quality in the school environment and try to identify what dimensions of service quality satisfy or do not satisfy them. Pearson correlation were used to measures the strength or closeness of the variables.

After questionnaires are collected, the survey data is encoded to MS-Excel file. Before transferring to SPSS version 20.0 for windows, the procedures of data classifications and organizations are set to validate the data for further analysis. After data classification and organization, the data is transferred to the SPSS and done statistical analysis in order to accomplish the purpose of the study. Correlation analysis uses to come up with the model express relationship between the independent variable and the dependent variable.

According to Kim et al. (2003), un-weighted and weighted data are collected. Un-weighted scores are those scores calculated without taking into account the relative importance that respondents attached to a dimension. They were calculated by averaging respondents’ SERVQUAL scores on the statements comprising a dimension. The 118 respondents responded to a SERVQUAL survey, the average SERVQUAL score along with dimensions were obtained.

\[
\text{SERVQUAL SCORE} = \text{Perception score} - \text{expectation score}
\]

3.7 Variable Measurements

3.7.1 Dependent variable

Customer satisfaction is the dependent variable that the study measure with the independent variables. The customer satisfaction is an indicator of customers being satisfied with the services
rendered by the schools. Customer satisfaction indicators include repeat use of the service, referrals by the customers as well as the customer’s preference of the school to others.

3.7.2 Independent variables

The independent variables are the SERVQUAL dimensions: Reliability, Responsiveness, and Assurance developed by Parasuraman et al. (1988). These dimensions measure customer satisfaction by taking into account the performance of the service and the expectations of customers on the service provided. Several varying number of items were developed to measure each dimension.

3.8 Pilot Study

A pilot study was carried out in one primary school of Abune Gorgorios. The aim of pilot study was to ensure validity and reliability of the instrument. The instrument was administered to the same group of respondents after a period of two weeks. After pilot study minor corrections were made. Some items were removed. It was also necessary to carry out the pilot study to ensure that the items in the questionnaire were clearly stated and can be understood by parents.

3.9 Validity and Reliability

This study used the most popular test of inter-item consistency reliability that is the Cronbach’s Coefficient alpha. This is a test of the consistency within the items and among the respondents’ response. Table 3.2 below presents the Cronbach’s Coefficient alpha for the sample population. The internal consistency was found to be Reliable (α = 0.715), Assurance (α = 0.658), and Responsiveness (α = 0.890), which was internal consistency among each items of the SERVQUAL dimensions in the study, and the internal consistency of the entire inventory was found to be α = 0.887, which is said to be excellent. The items total correlation coefficient also ranges from 0.658 to 0.890 (Table 4.6). Thus, SERVQUAL is a reliable instrument to be used in this research.
### Table 3.2: Cronbach’s Alpha for Reliability Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
<th>Cronbach's alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVQUAL SQ</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.887</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to wikipedia.com (2013), reliabilities Cronbach $\alpha < 0.5$ is unacceptable, $0.5 \leq \alpha < 0.6$ is poor, $0.6 \leq \alpha < 0.7$ is acceptable, $0.7 \leq \alpha < 0.9$ is good and $\alpha \geq 0.9$ is excellent. Alpha coefficient ranges in value from 0 to 1. The higher the score, the more reliable the generated scale is. The statistical package SPSS 16.0 for windows was employed for conducting the test analysis. As noted from Table 4.6 that most of the variables are well above 0.6 with the lowest Cronbach $\alpha = 0.658$ at the Assurance variable, implying that Responsiveness coefficient for study tool was high (0.890) which is a high and acceptable stability for the study purposes. The results are supported by the study made by Alamerew Gedif (2014).
CHAPTER FOUR
RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

In this section, the data collected through questionnaire were analyzed using tools mentioned in the methodology section. After each analysis, discussion and interpretations were made. The questionnaire was administered to 118 parents of three schools in Yeka sub city. Out of the 118 questionnaire administered, 105 were obtained and is valid for analysis. The valid questionnaires which formed the analysis yielded 89% response rate.

4.1 Demographic Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-45</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-60</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employee</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pensioner</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second degree and above</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First degree</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>56.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 demographic information of the respondents
Source: own survey, May 2017
From 118 questionnaires distributed 105 are returned from whom 59 representing 56.2% were female and the remaining 46 respondents representing 44.8% were male. The educational level of the sampled population explained 3% of respondents hold second degree and above, 46% hold first degrees, 30% have a Diploma, 11% completed secondary school, 10% were primary school Education and the majority of the respondents are well educated making a total of 79% of the total number of respondents were diploma and above.

The occupation of the respondents shows that 61 (58.1%) were Employees of organizations, 37 (35.2%) were Self Employees, and only 7 (6.7%) were pensioners. Apart from 6.7% of the respondents (retired) and are not actively working, the rest constituting 93.3% are actively working and visit the school regularly and can really give good assessment of the level of quality of the services delivered by the three schools to its customers.

**Figure 4.1 Schools Proportion in the Analysis**

![Schools Proportion Chart]

Source: Own Survey, May 2017

**4.2 SERVQUAL Gap Score Analysis**

The gap scores analyses enable us to find out how users perceive service quality in the school environment and try to identify what dimensions of service quality satisfy or do not satisfy them. The higher the difference between perception score and expectation score, the higher is the service quality and thereby the higher the level of user satisfaction. In this regard, the gap scores were calculated based on the difference between the users’ perceptions and expectations of services offered by the school.
### Table 4.2: SERVQUAL Descriptive Gaps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Expectation</th>
<th>Std. D</th>
<th>Mean Perception</th>
<th>Std. D</th>
<th>Mean Gaps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reliability</strong></td>
<td>RE1</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>4.0381</td>
<td>.81952</td>
<td>3.4095</td>
<td>1.18236</td>
<td>-0.62857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RE2</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>4.2190</td>
<td>.63520</td>
<td>3.6952</td>
<td>.99154</td>
<td>-0.52381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RE3</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>4.1143</td>
<td>.85838</td>
<td>7.3714</td>
<td>39.09241</td>
<td>3.25714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RE4</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>3.9810</td>
<td>.84331</td>
<td>3.5524</td>
<td>1.05594</td>
<td>-0.42857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RE5</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>4.0190</td>
<td>.88775</td>
<td>3.6190</td>
<td>1.05047</td>
<td>-0.40000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
<td>4.0743</td>
<td>.80883</td>
<td>4.32952</td>
<td>8.67454</td>
<td>0.25524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsiveness</strong></td>
<td>RS1</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>3.9333</td>
<td>1.05854</td>
<td>3.5429</td>
<td>1.02871</td>
<td>-0.39048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RS2</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>3.9619</td>
<td>.93976</td>
<td>3.6286</td>
<td>.98310</td>
<td>-0.33333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RS3</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>4.0095</td>
<td>.87151</td>
<td>3.5333</td>
<td>1.11861</td>
<td>-0.47619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RS4</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>4.0381</td>
<td>.90855</td>
<td>3.4952</td>
<td>.99154</td>
<td>-0.54286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
<td>3.9857</td>
<td>.94459</td>
<td>3.5500</td>
<td>1.03049</td>
<td>-0.43571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assurance</strong></td>
<td>AS1</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>3.8190</td>
<td>1.09878</td>
<td>3.4286</td>
<td>1.19982</td>
<td>-0.39048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AS2</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>4.0769</td>
<td>.96232</td>
<td>3.4952</td>
<td>1.25670</td>
<td>-0.58168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
<td>3.9480</td>
<td>1.03055</td>
<td>3.4619</td>
<td>1.22826</td>
<td>-0.48608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SERVQUAL Gap</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
<td>3.9429</td>
<td>.95905</td>
<td>3.5333</td>
<td>1.09252</td>
<td>-0.40952</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own survey May 2017

As it has been observed from Table 4.2 above, parents’ perceptions of service quality offered by the school did not meet their expectations. All gaps were marked as negative except reliability where schools are performing services at a time user’s request. However; the highest gap observed in the Responsiveness (-0.43571) dimension that refers to the school staffs are always ready to respond to school users request.

The second largest gap was Assurance (-0.48608) that refers to the level of the service delivered by schools in relation to the standard of expectations delivered to parents dependably and accurately.

The service gap which is positive was Reliability (0.25524), which is related to only one factor of the school, is performing services immediately at the time of user’s request. The four factors of Reliability indicate there is a negative gap of user’s expectations and perceptions. The result in Table 4.2 indicates that the school services do not meet the expectation of its users.
The gap scores marked as negative results as the school users were not satisfied with the services the school provides. This implies that the school management at different levels have to see the gaps closely and give due attention to fill the gaps observed to improve the school service continuously. The results also indicate a great opportunity for the schools to improve the entire service providing mechanism.

4.3 Gap Analysis of Dimensions and Items

4.3.1 Reliability dimension gap analysis

Reliability is the ability to perform the promised service dependably and accurately by the parents in a consistent manner. The mean of the gaps of the Reliability dimension was 0.255, which means users were satisfied on average with the reliability service quality as depicted in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3: Descriptive Statistics for the Reliability dimension Gap Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Reliability Items</th>
<th>Mean Gaps</th>
<th>Std. Deviation Gaps</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RE1</td>
<td>School is providing services up to the standard</td>
<td>-0.62857</td>
<td>0.36285</td>
<td>-0.926</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>-0.278</td>
<td>.236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE2</td>
<td>School staffs are showing a sincere interest in solving users’ problems</td>
<td>-0.52381</td>
<td>0.35634</td>
<td>-0.217</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>-0.438</td>
<td>.236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE3</td>
<td>School is performing services immediately at the time of users’ request</td>
<td>3.25714</td>
<td>38.23403</td>
<td>-1.804</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>10.236</td>
<td>.236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE4</td>
<td>School staffs are consistent in rendering services up to the standard reliably and carefully</td>
<td>-0.42857</td>
<td>0.21263</td>
<td>-1.336</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>-0.315</td>
<td>.236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE5</td>
<td>School automation system enables users to access information and gets services remotely (online).</td>
<td>-0.40000</td>
<td>0.16272</td>
<td>-1.299</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>-0.398</td>
<td>.236</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability Dimension Mean: 4.0743

Table 4.3 reveals that the highest gap indicated in the Reliability items was that the three Schools in Yeka Sub city enables users to School is performing services immediately at the time of users’ request. However, the gaps for the four items of Reliability are below zero (negatively marked).
### 4.3.2 Responsiveness dimension gap analysis

Responsiveness is the disposition and willingness to help users and provide them with quick service. Table 4.4 below indicates that averagely parents were unsatisfied with the level of services offered by the schools as the gap of -0.43571 for this dimension. The standard deviation of the responsibility dimension is 0.03912, which indicates that the gap is deviated from the mean.

**Table 4.4: Descriptive Statistics for the Responsiveness dimension Gap Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Reliability Items</th>
<th>Mean Gaps</th>
<th>Std. Deviation Gaps</th>
<th>Skewness Statistic</th>
<th>Skewness Std. Error</th>
<th>Kurtosis Statistic</th>
<th>Kurtosis Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RS1</td>
<td>School is providing current information to its users</td>
<td>-0.39048</td>
<td>-0.02983</td>
<td>-.857</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>-0.225</td>
<td>.236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS2</td>
<td>School staffs are providing prompt services to users</td>
<td>-0.33333</td>
<td>0.04334</td>
<td>-915</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>-0.553</td>
<td>.236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS3</td>
<td>School staffs are always willing to help school users</td>
<td>-0.47619</td>
<td>0.24710</td>
<td>-.818</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>-0.505</td>
<td>.236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS4</td>
<td>School staffs are always ready to respond to school users’ request</td>
<td>-0.54286</td>
<td>0.08299</td>
<td>-1.095</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>-0.228</td>
<td>.236</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responsiveness Dimension Mean -0.43571**

Table 4.4 reveals that the highest gap indicated in the Responsiveness items is that the School staffs are always ready to respond to school users’ request. School staffs are providing prompt services to users are the least gap observed.

### 4.3.3 Assurance dimension gap analysis

Assurance is the possession of the required skills and knowledge (competence) by the school staff to perform the service; politeness, respect, consideration, and friendliness of contact personnel (courtesy); the trustworthiness, believability, honesty of the service providers or school staff (credibility); freedom from danger, risk, or doubt (security); and keeping users informed in language they can understand and listening to them (communication).

As clearly seen in Table 4.5 below, the average gap for this dimension is -0.48608 depicting dissatisfaction. The standard deviation is 0.01539 showing little deviation from the mean.
Table 4.5: Descriptive Statistics for the Assurance dimension Gap Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Reliability Items</th>
<th>Mean Gaps</th>
<th>Std. Deviation Gaps</th>
<th>Skewness Statistic</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Kurtosis Statistic</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AS1</td>
<td>School staffs are instilling confidence in their users</td>
<td>-0.39048</td>
<td>0.10103</td>
<td>-0.962</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>-0.305</td>
<td>.236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS2</td>
<td>School users feel safe in their transactions</td>
<td>-0.58168</td>
<td>0.29438</td>
<td>-0.956</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>-0.271</td>
<td>.236</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assurance Dimension Mean -0.48608

Table 4.5 above reveals that the highest gap indicated in the Assurance items is that the School users feel safe in their transactions. The least was that School staffs are instilling confidence in their users.

4.3.4 SERVQUAL Expectations and Perceptions Analysis

Expectations and perceptions are both measured using the 5-point Likert scale whereby the higher numbers indicate higher level of expectation or perception. In general, users’ expectation exceeds the perceived level of service shown by the perception scores. This as indicated in Table 4.6 below, results in a negative gap score: (Perception (3.5333) – Expectation (3.9429) = (-0.40952). It is, however, common for user’s expectation to exceed the actual service perceived and this signifies that there is always needs a continuous improvement.

Table 4.6: Descriptive Statistics for Expectations and Perception

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Statistic</th>
<th>Std. Deviation Statistic</th>
<th>Skewness Statistic</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Kurtosis Statistic</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expectation Total</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>3.9429</td>
<td>.95905</td>
<td>-1.151</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>1.372</td>
<td>.467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception Total</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>3.5333</td>
<td>1.09252</td>
<td>-0.380</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>-0.733</td>
<td>.467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaps</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>-0.40952</td>
<td>0.13346</td>
<td>0.771</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2.1047</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own Computation from SPSS

As observed from Table 4.2 above, the items with the highest expectation scores are Reliability (4.3295), Responsiveness (3.550), and Assurance (3.462). The items rated the items with the highest expectation scores are Reliability (4.0743), Responsiveness (3.9857), and Assurance (3.9490) respectively.
The more perceptions are close to expectations, the higher is the perceived level of quality. The largest gaps scores are, the Responsiveness dimension (-0.4357), Assurance (-0.4095).

4.4 Weighted scores for dimension importance

To determine the importance of each of the service dimension, respondents were asked to divide 100 points and allocate the most points to the most important dimension and fewer points to the least important dimensions among Reliability, Assurance, and Responsiveness. Accordingly, the result in Table 4.7 below shows that Assurance dimension with a mean score of (21.88) is ranked first in the weighted SERVQUAL score followed by the Responsiveness dimension at (19.97) and the least weighted dimensions are Reliability with a mean score of (19.33).

Table 4.7: SERVQUAL Importance Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Averaged Dimension</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>19.33</td>
<td>3.904</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness</td>
<td>19.97</td>
<td>5.459</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance</td>
<td>21.88</td>
<td>7.764</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own Computation from SPSS

4.5 Correlation Analysis

In correlation analysis, the purpose is to measure the strength or closeness between the variables. In other words, regression analysis asks, “What is the pattern of the existing relationship?” and correlation analysis asks, “How strong is the relationship described in the regression equation?” Pearson correlation measures the correlation between two or more variables. Correlation coefficients can range from the value of -1.00 to +1.00. The value of -1.00 represents a perfect negative correlation while a value of +1.00 represents a perfect positive correlation (Sanders, 1995).

As shown in Table 4.8 below all service quality factors (Reliability, Responsiveness and Assurance) were supporting and correlated positively with the dependent variables, which was the service quality. Reliability has the highest correlation value (r = 0.984) and was about the trust and confidence towards receiving services from the school which positively correlated with service quality.
quality, followed by Assurance (r = 0.931) the level of the service provided to school users up-to-the
standard of expectations delivered dependable and accurately. Responsiveness (r = 0.885) the
willingness and ability of the school staff to provide prompt service to meet the users’ needs. The
correlation coefficients were between 0.984 and 0.812. As a result, there was a strong correlation
between the independent and dependent variable in this study.

Table 4.8: Correlation Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>REP</th>
<th>RESP</th>
<th>RES</th>
<th>REE</th>
<th>REAE</th>
<th>REAS</th>
<th>Expectation</th>
<th>Perceived Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reliability Perception</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness Perception</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.979**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance Perception</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.931**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability Expectation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.812**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness Expectation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.885**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance Expectation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.884**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.880**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.984**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

This chapter briefly presents summary of the objectives, research methodology, key findings of the model, conclusion and suggests useful recommendations.

5.1. SUMMARY OF THE MAJOR FINDINGS

The main objective of this study was assessing and measuring the service quality of the Private primary Education on selected three schools in Yeka Sub city from the users’ perspectives and determines the overall schools performance towards meeting users’ expectations. The respondents proportion were 59 (56.2%) female and 46 (44.8%) were male, and majority of the respondents were graduate parents 79%, followed by secondary schools 11% and then primary school parents 10%.

The data were collected from 105 parents of students, in the three selected primary schools. The research was undertaken specifying to investigate the overall service quality of the schools from the users’ perspectives; identify the strengths and weaknesses of the quality of the schools services; assess the dimensions of quality most important to school users; and identify the problems users had encountered when involved in school service. Random probability sampling was employed to select 118 (but only 105 returned) sample users for the study area. The necessary information was obtained by a modified SERVQUAL questionnaire.

In all the service quality dimensions, averages (means) of parents’ expectations were more than that of their perceptions. The highest mean related to expectation is the Reliability dimension (4.32952), followed by Responsiveness (3.5500), and Assurance (3.4619); and the highest mean related to perception was also Reliability dimension (4.0743), followed by Responsiveness (3.9857), and Assurance (3.9480). The overall means of parents’ expectation is more than the mean of perception, which is (3.9429) and (3.5333) respectively.

The findings revealed that the schools services do not meet the expectation of its parents as gaps were marked as negative in all service dimensions except reliability; however, the highest gap observed
was in Responsiveness (-0.43571) followed by Assurance (-0.40952). The study summarized that when presented in sequential order the most problematic dimensions were Responsiveness (-0.436), and then Assurance (-0.486).

The overall assessment of the weighted SERVQUAL score Assurance dimension with a mean score of (21.88) is ranked first in the weighted SERVQUAL score, followed by the Responsiveness dimension at (19.97) and the least weighted dimensions are Reliability (19.33). There were a positive relationship within people between items, and all variables have a significant effect on the service quality and thereby user satisfaction at p<0.001 except the Assurance dimension, which is p=0.832 (p>0.05).

5.2 Conclusion

Assessing quality education in private elementary schools in Addis Ababa Yeka sub city is the main objective of this study that is an implication of the management of schools; the paradigm of quality is mainly relies on the services literature, is based on the perceived quality by comparing the expectations from the actual experience of the service. That means the definition of quality revolves around the idea that quality has to be judged on the assessment of the user or consumer of the service. Service quality was determined by measuring the difference between perceptions and expectations.

The study was conducted to address four basic questions (specific objectives). In line with those research questions investigations were made and the conclusions reached are dealt with in this section.

The first research question was what is the overall service quality of the private primary schools at Yeka Sub City using SERVQUAL gap analysis model from the parents perspective?

The first question was answered through the SERVQUAL gap analysis model, as it can be seen from (Table 4.2 and Table 4.6), the results revealed that users’ expectations were high as compared to their perceptions, and a discrepancy was found between expectations and perceptions of all 11 SERVQUAL statements. With the exception of School staffs are showing a sincere interest in solving users’ problems, all respondents were unsatisfied with the service provision and service quality of the school; this in turn shows that there are gaps in service provision as service quality is equal to
perceived service quality minus expected service quality, and in the case the three schools, services do not meet the expectation of its users as gaps observed negatively in all service dimensions.

The next question was what are the possible weaknesses and strengths of the private primary schools services?

Discrepancy was found between users’ perceptions and expectations in all 11 questionnaire statements, on the three dimensions and on the overall SERVQUAL instrument in general. The finding revealed that no strengths indicated. As indicated on Table 4.2, all results are marked as negative except School is performing services immediately at the time of users’ request. The research shows that the highest gap is observed in Responsiveness, followed by Assurance, and Reliability. The study also examined the overall service quality of the three schools and the gap differences between parents’ desired expectations and perceived service levels. The result from the study indicates that all gaps are negatively marked (Table 4.2). The largest gaps occur mainly due to School is providing services up to the standard. The research also shows that though there is a lack of understanding, knowledge and confidence in what they were providing, there were strong sides related to Reliability School is performing services immediately at the time of users’ request. Ahmed and Shoeb (2009) support this study.

The third question was which dimension is most important to the parents?

As indicated in Table 4.7, the most important dimension from the parents’ perspective is the Assurance dimension with a mean score of (21.88), followed by the Responsiveness dimension at (19.97) and Reliability with a mean score of (19.33).

The final question was what problems did users encounter when involved by schools service?

The responses to questionnaire part III indicates, the respondents need more an effort to understand the perspective of the user through individual attention. The respondents’ expectations from staff-related items suggest that they expected to be treated in a more professional service that; recruit professional teachers provide training. They also expected knowledge, attention and skills shown by the School staffs that inspire credibility and trust. Respondents also expected the appearance of the physical facilities, equipment, personnel and communications materials, etc. The schools management also expected for consistency in rendering the service promised reliably and carefully.
5.3 Recommendation

Service sector quality measurement is more complicated and stranger than measuring goods mainly because of its intangible nature and more of its complicated nature to set standards. From different perspectives SERVQUAL model identified as the best instrument to evaluate the service sector quality including the educational sector. From the outcomes of randomly selected private elementary schools found in Addis Ababa Yeka sub city, the following points are recommended.

The findings of the study were very important for the users, Schools and students. Schools have an inherent obligation to provide quality service to support the teaching-learning, activities and appropriate to the schools’ missions. Therefore, based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations are made:

1. Schools should anticipate as well as meet parent’ needs. It should encourage user awareness of the potential of information resources to fulfill individual information needs.

2. Schools should strive to provide users with complete, accurate answers to information queries regardless of the complexity of those queries.

3. Schools should provide access to the most current reference sources available in order to assure the accuracy of information.

4. Schools should provide appropriate equipment in adequate quantities and in good working order for the convenient, efficient consultation of local and remote information resources.

5. Schools should make available sufficient qualified personnel during the hours that best meet the information needs and expectations of the parents. The most important issue to win customer’s trust is to focus on quality education such as outstanding teachers, high moral value, excellent examination result, support of parents, plenty of resources, the application of latest technology, strong and purposeful leadership, care and concern for children, developing customer complaint resolution system and a well – balanced challenging curriculum etc. fulfillments can build customers trust and their loyalty to the school

6. Schools staffs must have knowledge and preparation appropriate to meet the information needs of the parents. Personnel responsible for information technology services should be familiar and competent in using information technology and should possess effective interpersonal communications skills too.
7. Schools should regularly evaluate its information services using SERVQUAL gap analysis model to ensure that the service furthers the institution’s goals and that the goals reflect the needs, interests of the community served, and should evaluate resources within the collection based upon professional standards and users’ needs.

8. Schools should work hard on customer satisfaction. Customer satisfaction is an end by itself for every quality service and it is a means to take successive competitive advantage in the market which maximizes profit. As a result every staff members and administrative bodies of the schools should focus on the service quality they provide drive customers satisfaction.

In general different practices are used both in academic and industry to improve quality internally and externally in the organization. It was found that quality can be improved on consistent basis through constant monitoring and evaluating all the aspects that directly or indirectly affect the customer. Based on the analysis all schools including elementary and other higher educational institutions should implement a system that helps to carry out continuous monitoring and evaluating the school and its staff.

Service quality management gap can be removed by planning the activities, through research and analysis and by arranging the staff properly schools can analyze and predict customer expectations. Also it is important to develop data base analysis, customer general mapping, capacity planning , emphasizing on marketing research and analysis to gather information about latest market trends; when we are asking for school administration about such kind of studies none of these three schools undertake this research. Therefore every private educational institution including elementary schools is recommended to make detail researches and analysis with regard to customer satisfaction and expectation

The study had the following limitations. First, the study was conducted in Addis Ababa yeka sub-city only hence its findings might not be generalized to the whole country, for every elementary school neither for Addis Ababa city. Thus future studies should consider examining the same variables using more elementary schools owned by different bodies (private, government, public, NGO’s, church,
mosque etc.) by Continuous use of SERVQUAL in the evaluation of service quality with both quantitative and qualitative methodology perspectives of both service providers and customers side.
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Annex -1

QUESTIONNAIRE
ST.MARY’S UNIVERSITY
DEPARTMENT OF MARKETING MANAGEMENT

Hi Dear Respondent

As part of my graduate studies in St. Mary’s University, Department of Marketing Management, I am currently conducting a research on “Measuring Service Quality of four private Schools Using SERVQUAL Gap Analysis Model”.

Hence, I would be happy if you could spare your precious time in rating this questionnaire, which is attached hereunder, and your feedback is important for improving the service provision of the schools.

The information you provide is highly appreciated and the researcher would like to thank you for your time, consideration and valuable information in advance.

Directions:

The questionnaire is prepared in three part columns:

I. Desired/Expected Service and Received/Perceived Service;
II. Prioritizing factors of service quality and satisfaction; and
III. Supplementary questions.

 Desired/Expectation Service: The level of service representing what you as customer of the school believe, “can be” and “should be” provided.

 Received/Perception Service: is the actual service that you get from the school.

Please rate the statements (1-Strongly Disagree, 2-Disagree, 3-Neutral, 4-Agree, and 5-Strongly Agree)

Demographic Information

 Address, Email, -------------------------------Telephone----------------------------------------

Please, put (x) in the square bracket provided

 Sex      Male [ ]   Female [ ]
 Age      < 30 [ ]   31—40 [ ]   45—60 [ ]   > 60 [ ]
- Education Level: High school Graduate [ ] Diploma [ ] Degree [ ] Masters [ ] Ph.D. [ ]
- Occupation: Employee [ ] Self employee [ ] Retire [ ] other--------------------------
- How many school age children do you have? 1 [ ] 2-3 [ ] 4-6 [ ] > 6 [ ]
- How many years being customer of service? 1 [ ] 2-3 [ ] 4-6 [ ] >6 [ ]
- The name of the school where your child learn-------------------------------

Part I Table: SERVQUAL Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Desired Service (Expected Service)</th>
<th>Received Service (Perceived Service)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Reliability (consistency in rendering the service promised reliably and carefully)</td>
<td>(1-Strongly Disagree, 2-Disagree, 3-Neutral, 4-Agree, and 5-Strongly Agree)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE1</td>
<td>School is providing services up to the standard</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE3</td>
<td>School is performing services immediately at the time of users’ request</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE5</td>
<td>School automation system enables users to access information and gets services remotely (online).</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II | Responsiveness (disposition of the staff to help users and provide them with quick service) | (1-Strongly Disagree, 2-Disagree, 3-Neutral, 4-Agree, and 5-Strongly Agree) |                                     |
| RS1 | School is providing current information to its users | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| RS2 | School staffs are providing prompt services to users | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| RS3 | School staffs are always willing to help library users | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| RS4 | School staffs are always ready to respond to library users’ request | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 |

III | Assurance (knowledge, attention and skills shown by the employees that inspire credibility and trust) | (1-Strongly Disagree, 2-Disagree, 3-Neutral, 4-Agree, and 5-Strongly Agree) |                                     |
| AS1 | School staffs are instilling confidence in their users | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| AS2 | School users feel safe in their transactions | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 |

Part II

Listed below are the three dimensions, which are extracted from the table above, pertaining to School and its services? I would like to know how much each of these dimensions is important to you. Please
allocate 100 points among these dimensions according to how important it is to you and you think it affects the overall library service qualities. Make sure the points add up to 100.

**Table - Dimension Importance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Assurance (knowledge, attention and skills shown by the School staffs that inspire credibility and trust)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reliability (consistency in rendering the service promised reliably and carefully)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Responsiveness (disposition of the School staff to help users and provide us with quick service)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex – 2

In 1975 E.C Students in the Class
Currently Students in the Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub City</th>
<th>Gov’t</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Church</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>NGO</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Mission</th>
<th>Mosque</th>
<th>Int’l</th>
<th>Comm.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addis ketema</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akaki</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arada</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bole</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulela</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkos</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolfå</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ledeta</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nefasilkafto</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeka</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>