

Service Delivery and Students Satisfaction in Obio Akpa Campus of Akwa Ibom State University

Abasiama Asuquo Mfon
Department of Marketing
Akwa Ibom State University
Obio Akpa Campus
amamfon@yahoo.com

&

Justina Ekong
Department of Marketing
Akwa Ibom State University
Obio Akpa Campus
tinafidus@yahoo.com

Abstract

Exploratory research indicated that although the Akwa Ibom University Management had put many measures in place to assure students' satisfaction at the Obio Akpa campus of the University, there were still complaints. Thus, the main thrust of this study was to determine the effect of service delivery on students' satisfaction with Akwa Ibom State University services. The research design adopted was the cross sectional survey. Respondents were selected randomly through the hat and draw method to supply primary data through an adapted service delivery questionnaire. Five hypotheses were raised, analysed and tested statistically using the simple regression analytical tool. The results of the analysis revealed statistically significant and positive effect of all the independent variables (lecturers teaching styles, administrative service, infrastructure and academic resources, students' welfare services and examination/evaluation system) on students' satisfaction with the services offered by the University. Thus, contrary to the result of the exploratory research, all the indicators of service delivery affected students' satisfaction positively, suggesting that the students were satisfied. Based on these findings, it was recommended that Akwa Ibom State University Management should inculcate a comprehensive and continuous culture of quality services through the academic staff pursuing their task with passion and dedication; administrative staff continuously delivering quality services to promote students' satisfaction; students welfare being upheld and students union government continuously operating independently and freely; infrastructural and academic facilities being invested in and examination/evaluation system being qualitative and fair enough, across board.

Keywords: Quality service, Service delivery, Infrastructure, Students' satisfaction.

Introduction

In recent years, there has been growing interest across many governments in looking beyond formulation of best practices and policies to implementation of these policies and practices in Nigerian universities (Akpoiroro & Okon, 2015; Awolabi, 2010; Ayodele, 2014). At the heart of this interest is the phenomenal focus on quality service delivery which is deemed to be the panacea for most of the problems and challenges of the educational system, in order to make it work (Akpoiroro & Okon, 2015; Awolabi, 2010; Ayodele, 2014). Education as the bedrock of societies has been neglected. Development in any form is impossible without a sound and functional educational system. The level of development of any nation in terms of the economy, infrastructure, politics, social life, global relations and inter-connectedness, depends to a great extent on the level of educational development of its citizenry. It is consequent on this, that nations make educational policy and investment a topmost priority in their development plans (Gowan,

Seymour, Ibarreche & Locky, 2001). Yet, as experienced over the years, educational policies no matter their loftiness, cannot transform themselves into educational outcomes without effective machinery of delivery being put in place. Thus, service delivery calls for the attention of the stakeholders to consider how services are delivered in higher institutions in congruence with educational development goals.

Service delivery is simply service performance (Lovelock & Wirtz, 2011). Service delivery, unlike the delivery of physical goods, cannot be disassociated from the human elements, that is, the people that are responsible for performing the service who are, most times, adjudged as the service itself especially for high contact services (Bhandari & Sharma, 2011; Lovelock & Wirtz, 2011; Zeithaml & Bitner, 2000). Characteristics of services require that quality of the people element and the quality of the service delivery facilities must be taken into cognizance in service delivery. This will make for provision of clear dimensions for judging service quality. Zeithaml & Bitner (2000) identified these dimensions as responsiveness, reliability, assurance, empathy and tangibles.

In the educational sector, the services provided include academic programmes, administrative services, educational facilities/resources, students' welfare and support services. Academic programmes are the various courses and curricula run by higher institutions at the undergraduate and postgraduate levels whether as full time or part time programmes which are provided by the academic units of the university. Administrative services are the back up of academic programmes that enable these programmes to run. Administrative services are provided by the administrative staff members of universities. Educational facilities and resources are infrastructure put in place by school management to enhance both teaching and learning by the students and lecturers. Students' welfare and support services are services offered by the school to students to make life worthwhile while in school. These services make up the service offers of any university. The quality of any institution is usually assessed based on how these services are provided by different people authorized to provide them.

The customers of higher institutions are students as the significant stakeholders (Olalekan, 2017). Their satisfaction is paramount to the achievement of organizational goals since returns spring from satisfying them and keeping them satisfied. Satisfaction is an overall attitude of the customer towards a service provider, or an emotional reaction to specific service performance or assessment of whether the service provides a pleasurable level of consumption related fulfillment (Lovelock & Wirtz, 2011; Hansemark & Albinsson, 2004; Zeithaml & Bitner, 2000; Oliver, 1997). Satisfaction with a service provider is seen as antecedent to repetitive attitude without which customers will not hold a favourable attitude towards the service provider (Palmer, 2005). In higher education or university settings, students' satisfaction would be measured by their contentment with the provided services, referrals and positive word of mouth about the services received (Kara, Tanui & Kalai, 2016).

The central role that quality service delivery and customer satisfaction occupy in businesses has attracted wide interest of researchers from all fields of human endeavour. Unfortunately, in Nigeria, there are scanty and inadequate researches conducted on quality service delivery and customer satisfaction in the educational sector at the primary, secondary and university levels in few state-owned, federal and private schools (Akpoiriro & Okon, 2015). More so, educational service quality in universities is seen as a multidimensional construct with many indicators (Firdaus, 2005). The dimensions that are significant to students' satisfaction vary from university to university (Kara, Tanui & Kalai, 2016). Thus, it is important to investigate the effect of service delivery on students' satisfaction, using Akwa Ibom State University (AKSU) as the focus.

Statement of the Problem

Application of marketing principles in public organizations in Nigeria is a 21st century development. This became necessary because of the huge failure of the public sector to deliver on the public service needs of the citizenry. Marketing orientation is being promoted by marketing professionals as the panacea for the huge ineffectiveness and inefficiencies of systems. Today, marketing is applied across all sectors of the public service, the educational sector being a key sector. This is because of the need to solve problems of consumers, in order to achieve long term relevance in a competitive society.

Existing studies are in agreement that educational service quality is related to students' satisfaction (Arokiasamy and Abdullah, 2012, Yadav, 2012). But there is no consensus among researchers on the dimensions of educational services that significantly contribute to students' satisfaction in universities (Douglas, Douglas and Barnes, 2006; Khan, Ahmed and Nawaz, 2011; Wei and Ramalu, 2011). For instance, Manzoor's (2013) and Voss and Gruber's (2006) studies revealed that the dimensions of quality of academic resources, teaching quality, administrative service quality and quality of student support services have been consistently applied in higher education. While the study of Encabo (2011) concluded that the quality of academic resources was the most influential factor in students' satisfaction, that of Arambewela and Hall (2009) in Australia, found that teaching quality was most significant in students' satisfaction and Tuan's (2012) study of universities in Vietnam found that administrative service quality was the most significant. Kara, Tanui and Kalai's (2016) study of eight public universities in Kenya found that whereas 10 dimensions reliably determined service quality, only six- quality of teaching facilities, availability of textbooks in libraries, administrative service quality, reliability of university examination, perceived learning gains and quality of students' welfare services were significantly and directly related to students' satisfaction.

Akwa Ibom State University (AKSU) management has taken positive strides to ensure quality service delivery in the university through its quality assurance division - which ensures that lecturers attend to lectures/students promptly, admin staff are seated to render their duties and that infrastructural facilities are in place for proper learning; and Students Affairs Division and Security – ensure that welfare services are promptly and appropriately delivered. Despite all these measures, students' complaints persist. Unofficial reports of continued attacks on students by unscrupulous elements in the school community in form of intimidations, threats, theft/armed robbery, raping, which cause students' unrest, abound. All these issues border on quality service delivery to the students which affects their satisfaction and wellbeing. Unfortunately, most studies on service delivery and customer satisfaction have been directed at the manufacturing sector and profit oriented service institutions with very minimal or no research in the educational sector. This study is therefore an attempt to fill this gap.

Objectives of the Study

The objectives include: to -

- i. determine the extent to which lecturers and their teaching styles affect students' satisfaction in Obio Akpa Campus of Akwa Ibom State University.
- ii. examine the extent to which administrative service affect students' satisfaction in Obio Akpa Campus of Akwa Ibom State University.
- iii. ascertain the extent to which quality of students' welfare services affect students' satisfaction in Obio Akpa Campus of Akwa Ibom State University.
- iv. determine the extent to which quality of infrastructural and academic resources affect students' satisfaction in Obio Akpa Campus of Akwa Ibom State University.
- v. examine the extent to which quality of examination/evaluation system affect students' satisfaction in Obio Akpa Campus of Akwa Ibom State University.

Research hypotheses

- HO₁ Lecturers and their teaching style do not significantly affect students' satisfaction in Obio Akpa Campus of Akwa Ibom State University.
- HO₂ There is no significant effect of administrative service on students' satisfaction in Obio Akpa Campus of Akwa Ibom State University.
- HO₃ Quality of students' welfare services does not significantly affect students' satisfaction in Obio Akpa Campus of Akwa Ibom State University.
- HO₄ There is no significant effect of infrastructural and academic resources on students' satisfaction in Obio Akpa Campus of Akwa Ibom State University.
- HO₅ Quality of examination/evaluation system does not significantly affect students' satisfaction in Obio Akpa Campus of Akwa Ibom State University.

Overview of Quality Service Delivery and Satisfaction

Service quality in connection to higher education has attracted the attention of researchers in the past few years (Wright, 1989; Reinhart, 1993; William, 1993; Lewis & Smith, 1994; Tapper & Satter, 1998; Randal, 2002; Alderman & Brown, 2005). Organisations in the service industry that desire a level of relevance and competitiveness must focus on service quality (Arokiasamy, 2012; Dotchin & Oakland, 1994b). Farahmandian, et. al., (2013) and Edvardsson (1998) asserted that service quality is both the cornerstone of marketing and a significant indicator of a firm's success because of its ability to create sustainable competitive advantage and boost the bottom-line (Hon, 2004). Zeithaml & Bitner (2000), defined service quality as a focused evaluation that reflects the customer's perception of specific dimensions of service, such as reliability, responsiveness, assurance, empathy and tangibles. McGoldrick and Greenland (1994), added that it essentially has to do with meeting customer's needs and requirements and how well service level delivered matches customers' expectations.

In universities, educational service quality is a multidimensional construct comprising a range of indicators which vary in significance from university to university (Firdaus, 2005). Existing studies show a relationship between educational service quality and students satisfaction (Ariokasamy & Abdullah, 2012; Yadav, 2012). Although the dimensions have not received a general consensus, lecturer's quality, teaching quality, quality of infrastructure/academic resources, administrative service quality and quality of students' welfare services have had wide application in the conceptualization of higher education service quality and students' satisfaction (Firdaus, 2006; Manzoor, 2013; Voss & Gruber, 2006). Thus, these dimensions should be explored in order to gain a deeper understanding of the educational service dimensions embraced by students and how they influence their satisfaction in specific higher education contexts (Chua, 2004).

Saif (2014) described satisfaction as a feeling of happiness resulting from the fulfillment of a person's needs and desires. It is a state felt by a person who has experienced performance or an outcome that fulfilled his or her expectations (Ilyas & Arif, (2013); Rad & Yarmohammadian, 2006; Petruzzellis, 2006; Hon, 2002). Again, Elliot & Shin (2002) defined students' satisfaction as students' disposition by subjective evaluation of educational outcomes and experience. Therefore, students satisfaction can be defined as a function of relative level of experiences and perceived performance about educational service (Weerasinghe, Lalitha & Fernando 2017) during the study period (Carey, Cambiano & De Vore , 2002). Weerasinghe & Fernando (2017) summarised students' satisfaction as a short-term attitude resulting from an evaluation of students' educational experience, services and facilities.

Lecturers and their Teaching Styles

The rising unemployment levels globally are imperatives for countries to improve employment skills through quality teaching in higher institutions (Kara, Tanui & Kalai 2016; Hasan, Razak &

Ilias, 2009; Menon, 2015). Essentially, quality teaching has been widely researched by stakeholders in educational development (Hasan, Razak & Ilias, 2009; Menon, 2015). Quality teaching is first described as the schemes, tools and policies aimed at enhancing the capacity of the teachers to provide the best teaching and hence ensure the best learning of the students (Hasan, Razak & Ilias, 2009; Menon, 2015). Second, quality teaching may also refer to any student-focused support like learning environment or tutorship. Society has become increasingly concerned about the quality of programmes and teachings in universities (www.oecd.org: 2009). Since no education system may rise above the quality of its teachers, the National Policy on Education has placed major emphasis on the quality of teachers in terms of qualification, motivation and commitment to ensure high productivity (Federal Government of Nigeria 2004). As teaching, research and community service are the basic functions of higher education, quality must be integrated into the process so as to ensure that what is produced conforms to predetermined specifications (Bua & Ada, 2013). Thus, the achievement of the above goals of higher education depends on the quality of academics who impart the higher knowledge they possess to the students, disseminate their research findings to improve products, services and people and transmit societal values to the students (www.oecd.org: 2009; Agabi & Uche 2000; Nwagwu, 2001).

Administrative Services

The word “administration” refers to staff involved in non-academic affairs who provide support to the academics and who regulate students' life at the institution. It includes librarians and technical staff (Weerasinghe & Fernando, 2017). Administrative service consists of those services offered to students outside their academic course content (Weerasinghe & Fernando, 2017). The quality of administrative service has been found to be significant and positively related to students' satisfaction (Tuan, 2012). Two dimensions stand out when considering quality of admin services. These dimensions are the attitude of the staff and the process of rendering services to students (Weerasinghe & Fernando, 2017). Essentially, knowing how the university system functions, the skills and service attitudes of administrative staff are paramount in determining students' satisfaction.

Infrastructural and Academic Resources

The provision of adequate infrastructure, facilities, equipment, and instructional materials will definitely enhance the quality of any institution if properly managed (Awe 2009). Infrastructure provides tangible cues that people use to evaluate the quality of higher institutions (Barret, 2018); Isa & Yusoff, 2015; Adeniran, 2011). Infrastructure refers to basic facilities and equipment needed for the functioning of university. The facilities include lecture theatres, auditoria, class rooms, libraries, studios, laboratories, administrative blocks, workshops, sport centers, clinics, hostels, staff quarters, toilets, cafeteria, shops etc. (Ebehikalu & Dawam, 2017). Barret, (2018) listed infrastructure as including power point presentation, textbooks, computer aided instruction, projectors and slides, boards (interactive, magnetic, screen and chalk), ICT (computer laboratories and services, network connectivity, multi-media system, public address system, slide and video projectors) and Ergonomics furnishing in laboratories, libraries, and lecture rooms/theaters, moot courts and studios etc.

Likoko, Mutsotso & Nasongo (2013) asserted that lack of adequate physical facilities for teaching and learning have negative effect on students' satisfaction and the quality of graduates produced. They are of the opinion that these facilities are educational inputs that have strong relationship with students' satisfaction and ultimately, high academic performance of students.

Quality of Examination/Evaluation System

The issue of evaluation of students is of paramount importance for higher education institutions. Evaluation is the essence of examination which is vital to assessment (Aithal & Kumar, 2016). Aithal & Kumar (2016) stated that one of the purposes of evaluation is to provide development-

inducing feedback. It is also aimed at helping the teacher plan appropriate activities for enhancing student performance. The qualitative dimension of evaluation is in its use for enhancing the competence of students. Evaluation process is intended to gauge the knowledge and skills acquired at various levels of the programmes. Evaluation covers the following areas: computerization of examination, early announcements of results, timely conduct of examination, precaution against malpractice, field work, project work, seminar, industry visit. For quality evaluation, examination questions should be spread across course content; examination supervision/invigilation should be adequate; grades awarded by lecturers should reflect individual student's ability and the university should release examination results on time (Kara, Tanui & Kalai, 2016; Agu, Okpara & Ogwo, 2017).

Students' Welfare Services

The welfare of students as significant stakeholders in higher institutions is important (Olalekan, 2017). Since the university serves as the students' in-loco parents, it must ensure that students are adequately taken care of to enhance satisfaction and avoid students' unrest (Olalekan, 2017). Components of students' welfare services are health services, accommodation, transportation, cafeteria services, sports/games, banking/shopping facilities, welfare of international students, special-crèche, disable care, etc. (Olalekan, 2017). The provision, adequacy, and quality of these services are paramount to students' satisfaction (Olalekan, 2017; Kara, Tanui & Kalai 2016).

Theoretical Literature

The study was anchored on the theory of human service delivery through the perspectives of Casey Reader and Greene R. R.

Casey Reader propounded the theory of human service delivery in 2017. This theory tackles building the best system for the best services because people that are involved in service delivery are invaluable resource whose value and availability is difficult to quantify. It stresses positive and effective interaction between the service provider and the customer due to the intangibility of services, a concerted effort to obtain customer feedback due to variability of service, the limits of service providers which could affect the quality and quantity of services and strong internal service ideologies that will inspire and motivate service providers.

Greene's (2011) perspective of the theory of human service delivery high point is that service providers need some critical skills such as good commitment skills, patience, understanding, caring and a sense of responsibility to help customers adopt the problem solving approach that they can apply in the events of the unavailability of the services provider. It classifies human service delivery as a variety of systems such as education, social welfare services and health care and mental health services that require professional management of services that depend on direct contact between the service provider and the customer (Greene, 2011).

Research Design

The survey research design was adopted for this study.

Population, Sample Size and Sampling Procedure

The total population of final year (400) level students in the 16 departments of the four faculties (Management Sciences, Social Sciences, Arts and Agricultural Sciences) is 887. Taro Yamene formula for sample size determination was applied to the study population to obtain a sample size of 276. The proportionate sampling technique was used to draw proportionate number of respondents based on the population distribution of each department and faculty to make up the sample size. The procedure used for the selection of the respondents was the Hat and Draw method where ballot papers carrying 'Yes' for the required draws and 'No' for those not to be included were used to draw the required sample size. The respective participants were called out before the draw to ensure they existed. The questionnaire materials were administered on a pick and drop method. Thereafter, they were collated and sorted. A total of 211 copies of questionnaire were deemed as correctly filled and adequate for analysis.

Data Source/Collection Method and Instrumentation

Primary data were used which were sourced through administration of an adapted and adjusted questionnaire from the work of Kara, Tanui & Kalai (2016) which used an extract of the Principal Component Analysis Rotation Method of Varimax and Kaiser Normalisation. The research instrument was divided into two sections A and B. Section A solicited the biometrics of respondents. Section B dealt out statements on educational services namely lecturers/teaching styles, administrative services, welfare services, infrastructural/academic resources, and examination system as independent variables and satisfaction as dependent variable to which respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement in an adjusted 4-point Likert scale.

Validity and Reliability of the Study

Validity of the instrument was established by passing it through the scrutiny of two professors in the department and an expert in test and measurement in the faculty of education who helped to refine the instrument. Reliability of the instrument was authenticated through a test-retest reliability that yielded a coefficient of 0.96 considered as high and adequate for the purpose of collating data for the study

Data Analysis and Test Statistics

The null hypotheses were tested using the regression and ANOVA at 0.05 level of significance and SPSS package was used to generate the results. Model specification was given as

$$y = a + bx$$

Where y = the dependent variable, students satisfaction

a = the intercept

b = the slope

x = the independent variable.

Acceptance/Rejection Criterion

The criterion was to accept the null hypothesis if the computed f- ratio is less than the tabulated f value at 0.05 level of significance and reject the null hypothesis in favour of the alternate if the computed f- ratio is higher than the tabulated f- value at 0.05 level of significance.

Data Analysis and Findings

This section covered the analysis and discussion of findings.

Research hypothesis 1

Lecturers and their teaching styles do not significantly affect students' satisfaction in Obio Akpa Campus of Akwa Ibom State University.

Table 4.1: Model summary of linear regression analysis of lecturers and their teaching styles against students' satisfaction in Obio Akpa Campus of Akwa Ibom State University

Variables	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
Lecturers & teaching styles	.595 ^a	.355	.352	1.65283
Students' satisfaction				

a. Predictors: (Constant), Lecturers & teaching styles

Table 4.2: Analysis of Variance of the effect of lecturers' and teaching styles on students' satisfaction in Obio Akpa Campus of Akwa Ibom State University

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	313.705	1	313.705	114.832	.000 ^a
	Residual	570.959	209	2.732		
	Total	884.664	210			

*P< 0.05; df = 1 and 209; critical F- value = 3.84

Testing the relationship between lecturers' teaching styles and students' satisfaction (Table 4.1), we obtained $r = 0.595$ and adjusted $r^2 = 0.355$. The r of 0.595 measures the average change in students' satisfaction as a result of a unit change in lecturers' teaching styles. It indicates that as lecturers' teaching styles increase by 1%, there is a corresponding increase of 6% in students' satisfaction in Obio Akpa Campus of Akwa Ibom State University. The adjusted r^2 of 0.352 indicates that 35.2% of the students' satisfaction can be explained by the lecturers and their teaching styles. Thus, the remaining proportion (64.8%) of the variation in students' satisfaction is caused by factors other than lecturers and their teaching styles. The computed F- ratio is 114.832 which is higher than the critical f-ratio of 3.38. By our acceptance/rejection criterion, we reject the null hypothesis in favour of the alternate hypothesis implying that there is a statistical significant effect of lecturers and their teaching styles on students' satisfaction with educational services in Akwa Ibom State University.

Research Hypothesis 2

There is no significant effect of administrative service on students' satisfaction in Obio Akpa Campus of Akwa Ibom State University.

Table 4.3: Model summary of linear regression analysis of Administrative Service against students' satisfaction in Obio Akpa Campus of Akwa Ibom State University

Variables	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
Administrative Service	.761 ^a	.415	.412	1.71575
Students' satisfaction				

a. Predictors: (Constant), Administrative services

Table 4.4: Analysis of Variance of the effect of Administrative service on students' satisfaction in Obio Akpa Campus of Akwa Ibom State University

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	282.804	1	282.804	96.068	.000 ^a
	Residual	615.253	209	2.944		
	Total	898.057	210			

*P< 0.05; df = 1 and 209; critical F- value = 3.84

Testing the relationship between administrative services and students' satisfaction (Table 4.3), we obtained $r = 0.761$ and adjusted $r^2 = 0.412$. The r of 0.761 measures the average change in students' satisfaction as a result of a unit change in administrative services. It indicates that as administrative services increase by 1%, there is a corresponding increase of 8% in students' satisfaction in Obio Akpa Campus of Akwa Ibom State University. The adjusted r^2 of 0.412 indicates that 41.2% of the students' satisfaction can be explained by administrative services. Thus, the remaining proportion (58.8%) of the variation in students' satisfaction is caused by factors other than administrative services. The computed F- ratio is 96.068 (Table 4.4) is higher than the critical f-ratio of 3.38. By our acceptance/rejection criterion, we reject the null hypothesis in favour of the alternate hypothesis, implying that there is a statistical significant effect of administrative services on students' satisfaction with educational services in Akwa Ibom State University.

Research Hypothesis 3

There is no significant effect of the quality of students' welfare service on students' satisfaction in Obio Akpa Campus of Akwa Ibom State University

Table 4.5: Model summary of linear regression analysis of quality of students' welfare service against students' satisfaction in Obio Akpa Campus of Akwa Ibom State University

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
Quality of students' welfare service				
students' satisfaction	.807 ^a	.657	.653	1.95668

a. Predictors: (Constant), Quality of students' welfare service

Table 4.6: Analysis of Variance of the effect of quality of students' welfare service on students' satisfaction in Obio Akpa Campus of Akwa Ibom State University

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	228.020	1	228.020	72.236	.000 ^a
	Residual	659.724	209	3.157		
	Total	887.744	210			

*P < 0.05; df = 1 and 209; critical F- value = 3.84

Testing the relationship between quality of students' welfare service and students' satisfaction (Table 4.3), we obtained $r = 0.807$ and adjusted $r^2 = 0.653$. The r of 0.807 measures the average change in students' satisfaction as a result of a unit change in quality of students' welfare service. It indicates that as quality of students' welfare service increase by 1%, there is a corresponding increase of 8% in students' satisfaction in Obio Akpa Campus of Akwa Ibom State University. The adjusted r^2 of 0.653 indicates that 65.3% of the students' satisfaction can be explained by quality of students' welfare service. Thus, the remaining proportion (34.7%) of the variation in students' satisfaction is caused by factors other than quality of students' welfare service. The computed F-ratio is 72.236 (Table 4.4) is higher than the critical f-ratio of 3.38. By our acceptance/rejection criterion, we reject the null hypothesis in favour of the alternate hypothesis implying that there is a statistical significant effect of quality of students' welfare service on students' satisfaction with educational services in Akwa Ibom State University.

Research Hypothesis 4

There is no significant effect of infrastructural/academic resources on students' satisfaction in Obio Akpa Campus of Akwa Ibom State University.

Table 4.7: Model summary of linear regression analysis of infrastructural/academic resources against students' satisfaction in Obio Akpa Campus of Akwa Ibom State University.

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
Infrastructural/academic resource	.691 ^a	.471	.443	1.98893
Students' satisfaction				

a. Predictors: (Constant), quality of infrastructural/academic resources

Table 4.8: Analysis of Variance of the effect of infrastructural/academic resources on students' satisfaction in Obio Akpa Campus of Akwa Ibom State University

	Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
	Regression	239.777	1	239.777	83.327	.000 ^a
1	Residual	601.408	209	2.878		
	Total	841.185	210			

*P< 0.05; df = 1 and 209; critical F- value = 3.84

Testing the relationship between infrastructural/academic resources and students' satisfaction (Table 4.7), we obtained $r = 0.691$ and adjusted $r^2 = 0.443$. The r of 0.691 measures the average change in students' satisfaction as a result of a unit change in infrastructural/academic resources. It indicates that as infrastructural/academic resources increase by 1%, there is a corresponding increase of 7% in students' satisfaction in Obio Akpa Campus of Akwa Ibom State University. The adjusted r^2 of 0.443 indicates that 44.3% of the students' satisfaction can be explained by infrastructural/academic resources. Thus, the remaining proportion (55.7%) of the variation in students' satisfaction is caused by factors other than infrastructural/academic resources. The computed F- ratio is 83.327 (Table 4.8) is higher than the critical f-ratio of 3.38. By our acceptance/rejection criterion, we reject the null hypothesis in favour of the alternate hypothesis implying that there is a statistical significant effect of infrastructural/academic resources on students' satisfaction with educational services in Akwa Ibom State University.

Research Hypothesis 5

Quality of examination/evaluation system does not significantly affect students' satisfaction in Obio Akpa Campus of Akwa Ibom State University.

Table 4.9: Model summary of linear regression analysis of Quality of examination/evaluation system against students' satisfaction in Obio Akpa Campus of Akwa Ibom State University

Variables	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
Quality of examination				
Students' satisfaction	.571 ^a	.327	.323	1.64033

a. Predictors: (Constant), examination/evaluation system.

Table 4.10: Analysis of Variance of the effect of Quality of examination/evaluation system on students' satisfaction in Obio Akpa Campus of Akwa Ibom State University

	Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	272.683	1	272.683	101.344	.000 ^a
	Residual	562.350	209	2.691		
	Total	835.033	210			

Testing the relationship between quality of examination/evaluation system and students' satisfaction (Table 4.9), we obtained $r = 0.571$ and adjusted $r^2 = 0.323$. The r of 0.571 measures the average change in students' satisfaction as a result of a unit change in quality of examination/evaluation system. It indicates that as quality of examination/evaluation system increase by 1%, there is a corresponding increase of 6% in students' satisfaction in Obio Akpa Campus of Akwa Ibom State University. The adjusted r^2 of 0.323 indicates that 32.3% of the students' satisfaction can be explained by quality of examination/evaluation system. Thus, the remaining proportion (67.7%) of the variation in students' satisfaction is caused by factors other than Quality of examination/evaluation system. The computed F-ratio is 101.344 (Table 4.10) is higher than the critical f-ratio of 3.38. By our acceptance/rejection criterion, we reject the null hypothesis in favour of the alternate hypothesis implying that there is a statistical significant effect of quality of examination/evaluation system on students' satisfaction with educational services in Akwa Ibom State University.

Discussion of Findings

Lecturers and their teaching styles and students' satisfaction

Statistical analysis using regression shows that at less than 5% significant level, lecturers and their teaching styles are a significant factor in students' satisfaction with educational services offered by Akwa Ibom State University, Obio Akpa Campus. This result is in agreement with the findings of Suarman (2015) who conducted a study on teaching quality and students' satisfaction: the intermediating role of relationship between lecturers and students of the higher learning institutes. The results showed that the relationship between lecturers and students determines the lecturers' teaching quality and students' satisfaction. The finding confirms the role theory of relationship between lecturers and students and the impact of teaching quality in enhancing students' satisfaction. Also, Ahmed & Masud's (2014) research in Malaysia on lecturer quality had a direct and significant relationship with students' satisfaction. Arambewela & Hall's (2009) study in Australia concluded that teaching quality impacts students' satisfaction in universities. Students' satisfaction was significantly related to the university having lecturers who are knowledgeable in their field of specialisation, lecturers who are accessible to students for consultation, and lecturers who provide feedback to students. However, Farahmandian, Minavand & Afshardost's (2013) study in universities in Malaysia found that teaching quality was not significantly related to students' satisfaction.

Administrative Service and Students' Satisfaction

Statistical analysis using regression shows that at less than 5% significant level, administrative services affect students' satisfaction. This finding is in consonance with the findings of Ibrahim (2014), who conducted a study on the effect of administrative service quality on student satisfaction: a field study for health services administration students. The finding of the study revealed that administrative service quality influenced students' satisfaction. Other findings

showed that administrative quality standards stipulate the recruitment of a sufficient number of professionally qualified workers and technicians who possess the skills necessary to fulfill their career responsibilities which have been clearly and accurately identified. Additionally, these quality standards necessitate learning about student needs, communicating with students, helping solve students' problems, and responding to students' demands. Also, in Tuan's (2012) study in universities in Vietnam, administrative service quality was significantly and positively related to students' satisfaction. The finding showed that the knowledge of the functioning of a university, skills and service attitude of admin staff play a very important role in increasing students' satisfaction. Contrary to this finding, Ahmed and Masud's (2014) study in universities in Malaysia found that admin services were not significantly related to students' satisfaction.

Quality of Welfare Service and Students Satisfaction

Statistical analysis deployed to test this hypothesis showed that quality of students' welfare service affects students' satisfaction. This finding is in consonance with the findings of Manzoor's (2013) study in universities in Pakistan which showed that students' welfare services had significant positive effect on students' satisfaction ratings; Gibson (2010) who examined students' welfare satisfaction and included some non-academic aspects e.g. university reputation, contact personnel, quality in administrative departments, acknowledgements and services, quality of teaching and IT facilities and student body diversity found significant relationships; Simomu & Dahl (2012) who based more on welfare analysis and the effect on students' satisfaction and found significant relationships. Existing empirical research in universities in South Africa, Ghana and Ethiopia revealed that students were not satisfied with the quality of university experience (Ghadamosi & De Jager, 2009; Gyamfi, Agyeman and Otoo, 2012; Takaro, 2014)).

Infrastructure/Academic Resources and Students Satisfaction with Educational Services

Statistical analysis deployed to test this hypothesis showed that infrastructure and academic resources affect students' satisfaction. This finding is in consonance with the findings of Encabo's (2011) study in Brokenshire College in Philippines who found quality of academic resources to be the most influential factor of students' satisfaction. Ahmed & Masud's (2014) work in Malaysian universities established significant relationships between quality of academic resources and students' satisfaction. However, Douglas et al (2006) study at Liverpool John Moores University in England found that quality of academic resources was not important in determining students' satisfaction.

Quality of Examination/Evaluation System and Students' Satisfaction with Educational Services

Statistical analysis showed that quality of examination/evaluation system is a significant factor in students' satisfaction with educational services offered by Akwa Ibom State University in Obio Akpa Campus. This finding is in line with the findings of Thurmond, Wambach, Connors & Frey (2010) who conducted a study on the influence of quality test evaluation on students' satisfaction. They found out that the quality of test was related to students' satisfaction level. The finding of this study indicates that quality examination evaluation conducted significantly influence the students' satisfaction. If students' examination/evaluation is not properly conducted, students tend to lose confidence in the said evaluation.

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to determine the effect of quality service delivery on students' satisfaction in Obio Akpa Campus of Akwa Ibom State. The following conclusions were drawn from the results of the study. The dimensions of educational service of quality of lecturers/teaching styles, administrative service, quality of students' welfare service, infrastructure/academic resources and quality of examination/evaluation system significantly affect students' satisfaction in Obio Akpa Campus of Akwa Ibom State University. These dimensions have been found to be generally used in the conceptualisation of service quality in

Universities all over the world (Manzoor, 2013; and Voss & Gruber, 2006).

Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusion of this study, the following recommendations were proffered:

1. Akwa Ibom State University's Management should inculcate a comprehensive and continuous culture of quality services. Hence, one of the crucial values that should be integrated in the culture of quality is enhancing quality in the teaching and learning process. Lecturers should possess both academic and professional qualifications. They should continuously attend training and conferences to enhance their teaching effectiveness. Lecturers should improve on excellent communication skills, passion, commitment and enthusiasm, punctuality and regularity to enhance students' satisfaction. They should prepare lecture notes with clear objectives and make teaching both creative and fun-filled.

2. Administrative staff should continuously deliver quality services to promote students' satisfaction. They must know and uphold school policies while relating to students in firm but friendly manner.

3. Students welfare should continuously be upheld by school management. The students' union government should be allowed to operate independently and freely. Students' hostel accommodation, cafeteria services, transportation, health care and security services should be given top priority by the state government and school management. The Students Affairs Unit should effectively handle students' matters and ensure that efficient counseling system for students is in place. Hence, a well-structured welfare system would spur the students to learn effectively.

4. Infrastructural and academic facilities that would enhance learning by the students should be in place. School infrastructure constitutes a large component of educational investment. The World Bank Development Report (2018) titled "Learning to Realize Education's Promise" stresses the importance of making school work for all learners and focusing on provision of adequate ICT facilities to students, functional library, ventilated classrooms, adequate desks in lecture halls, adequate lecture halls and rooms, internet centres, etc.

5. Finally, examination/evaluation system should be transparent and efficient to earn students' confidence and boost their satisfaction.

References

- Adebimpe, O. A. (2017). Students welfare and support. Retrieved from <https://oer.unimed.edu.ng/lecturenotes>.
- Adeniran, P. (2011). User satisfaction with academic libraries services: Academic staff and students perspectives. *International Journal of Library Information Science*, 3(10): 209 – 216.
- Agu, G. A., Okpara, G. S. & Ogwo, E. (2007). Service quality in non-regular undergraduate programmes in Nigeria Universities (A survey of students in the South-East). Service delivery for a new Nigeria. *The Academy of Management Nigeria*, 409-425.
- Ahmed, S. & Masud, M. M. (2014). Measuring service quality of a higher educational institute towards student satisfaction. *American Journal of Educational Research*, 2(7): 447-455.
- Aithal, P. S. & Kumar, P. M. S. (2016) Student evaluation and reforms in higher education institutions. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Modern Education (IJMRME)*, 2 (1): 2454 – 6119.
- Akpoiroro, R. M. & Okon, J. E. (2015). Students' satisfaction with service delivery in Federal Universities in south-south geopolitical zone Nigeria. *International Journal of Educational Administration and Policy Studies*, 7 (5): 110-113
- Arambewela, R. & Hall, J. (2009). An empirical model of international student satisfaction. *Asian Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, 21 (4): 555-569.
- Arokiasamy, A. & Abdullah, A. (2012). Service quality and students' satisfaction at higher learning institutions: A case study of Malaysian university competitiveness. *International Journal of Management and Strategy*, 3 (5): 1-16.
- Ayodele, K. & Ezeokoli, R. N. (2014). Dimensions of service quality encountered by students on sustainability of Higher Education in Nigeria. *Developing Country Studies*, 4 (6): 147-156
- Bhandria, D. & Sharma, A. (2011). *Marketing of services*. (2nd ed.), Delhi: Vrinda Publications Ltd.
- Bua, F. T. & Ada, J. N. (2013). Impact of total quality management (TQM) on secondary school education for national transformation: The case of Benue North West Senatorial District of Benue State, Nigeria. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 4 (20): 68-75.
- Chua, C. (2004). Perception of quality in higher education. *AUQA Occasional Publication*. Proceedings of the Australian Universities Quality Forum 2004. School of Business Management, Ryerson University, Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5B 2K3 M
- Dotchin, J. A., & Oakland, J. S., (1994). Total quality management in services: Service quality. *International Journal of Quality and Reliability Management*, 11 (3): 27-42.
- Douglas, J., Douglas, A. & Barnes, B. (2006). Measuring student satisfaction at a UK university. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 14(3): 251-267.
- Ebehikhalu, N. O. & Dawam, P. (2017). Inadequacy of teaching and learning infrastructure: Reason Nigeria Universities cannot drive innovations. *Australian Journal of Education and Learning Research*. https://www.academia.edu/9630396/Inadequacy_of_Teaching_and_Learning_Infrastructure_Reason_Nigerian_Universities_cannot_Drive_Innovations.

- Edvardsson, B. O. (1998). Service quality improvement: Managing service quality. *An International Journal*, 8 (2): 142-149.
- Elliott, K. & Shin, D. (2002). Student satisfaction: An alternative approach to assessing this Important Concept. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 24 (2): 197-209.
- Encabo, H. C. (2011). Canonical correlation analysis of student perception on instructional quality and Satisfaction. *JPAIR Multidisciplinary Journal*, 6 (1): 1-16
- Farahmandian, S., Minavand, H. & Afshardost, M. (2013). Perceived service quality and student satisfaction in higher education. *Journal of Business and Management*, 12 (4): 65-74.
- Firdaus, A. (2006). The development of HEdPERF: A new measuring instrument of service quality for the higher education sector. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 30 (6): 569–581.
- Garcl a-Aracil, A. (2009). European graduates' level of satisfaction with higher education. *Journal of Higher Education*, 57 (1):1-21.
- Ghadamosi, G. & de Jager, J. (2009). What you see is what you get: Service quality, students' perceptions and satisfaction at South African universities. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 23 (5): 877-893.
- Gibson, A. (2010). Measuring business student satisfaction: A review and summary of the major predictors. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 32 (3): 251- 259.
- Gyamfi, D. A., Agyeman, A. & Otoo, B. (2012). Assessing the provision of quality students' service and satisfaction in tertiary institution in Ghana: Using Cape Coast Polytechnic as case study. *Asian Journal of Business and Management Sciences*, 1 (12): 20–32.
- Hansemark, O. C. & Albinsson, M. (2004). Customer satisfaction and retention: The experiences of individual with employees. *Managing Service Quality*. 14 (1): 40-57.
- Hasan, H. F. A., Razak, M. Z. A. & Ilias, A. (2009). Enhancing Service Quality in Higher Education. *Journal of Research and Method in Education*, 5 (5): 55-60.
- Hon, W., (2002). Applying customer satisfaction theory to Community College planning of student services. *Insight in Student Service*. 2 (5): 47-59.
- Ilias, A., Hasan, H., Rahman, R. & Yaso, M. R. (2008). Student satisfaction and service quality: Any differences in demographic factors? *International Business Research*, 1 (4): 131 – 143.
- Ilyas, M. & Arif, S., 2013. Quality of work-life model for teachers of private universities in Pakistan. *Quality Assurance in Education*. 21 (3): 282-298.
- Isa, A. and Yusoff, N. Z. W. (2015). State of physical facilities of Higher Education Institution in Nigeria. *International Journal of scientific and Research Publication*, 5(4). Ret. From <https://www.ijsrp.org/research-paper-0415>
- Kara, A.M., Tanu, E. & Kalai, J. M. (2016). Educational service quality and students' satisfaction in public universities in Kenya. *International Journal of Education and Social Science*, 3 (10): 37-48

- Likoko S., Mutsosto S., & Nasongo J. (2013). The adequacy of instructional materials and physical facilities and their effects on quality of teacher preparation in emerging private primary teacher training colleges in Bungoma County, Kenya. *International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)*, 2 (1): 403-408.
- Lovelock, C. & Wirtz, J. (2011). *Services Marketing: People, technology, strategy* (7th ed.). New Jersey: Pearson Education Ltd.
- Manzoor, H. (2013). Measuring student satisfaction in public and private universities in Pakistan. *Global Journal of Management and Business Research Interdisciplinary*, 13 (3): 5 – 17.
- Menon, S. A. (2015). Enhancing service quality in Higher Education. *Journal of Research and Method in Education (IOSR-JRME)*, 5(5): 55-60
- Oliver, R. L. (1997). *Satisfaction: A behavioural perspective on the customer*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Owolabi (2010). Repositioning for quality service delivery in tertiary institutions: The role of accountants. *African Research Review. An Int. Multi-Disciplinary Journal*, 4 (2): 335-354.
- Palmer, A. (2005). *Principles of services marketing* (4th ed.) Berkshire: McGraw Hill Education.
- Petruzzellis, L., D'Uggento, A. M. & Romanazzi, S. (2006). Students' satisfaction and quality of service in Italian Universities. *Managing Service Quality*, 16 (4): 349-364.
- Rad, A. & Yarmohammadian, M., (2006). A study of relationship between managers' leadership style and employees' job satisfaction. *Leadership in Health Services*, 19 (2): 11-28
- Saif, N. I. (2014). The effect of service quality on student satisfaction: A field study for health services administration students. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 4 (8): 172-181
- Weerasinghe, I. M. S., Lalitha, R. & Fernando, S. (2017). Students' Satisfaction in Higher Education: Literature review. *American Journal of Educational Research*, 5 (5): 533-539
- Suarman, G. (2015). Lecturers quality and satisfaction: A review of related empirical studies. *Journal of Management and Environmental Studies*, 2 (3):78-79.
- Suarman, S. (2015). Teaching quality and students satisfaction: The intermediary role of relationship between lecturers and students of the higher institutes. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 6 (2): 626-632
- Takaro, G. S. (2014). Measuring service quality and students' satisfaction: A case study on Hawassa University. *International Journal of Business and Management*. 2 (3): 1 – 16.
- Thurmond, V. A., Wambach, K. A., Connors, H. & Frey, B. (2010). Evaluation of student satisfaction: Determining the impact of a web-based environment by controlling for student characteristics. *American Journal of Distance Education*, 16 (3): 169-190
- Tuan, N. (2012). Effects of service quality and price fairness on students' satisfaction. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 3 (19): 132-150.

- Voss, R. & Gruber, T. (2006). The desired teaching qualities of lecturers in higher education: a means end analysis. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 14 (3): 217 – 242.
- Weerasinghe, I. M. S. & Fernando, R. L. (2017). Students' satisfaction in Higher Education. *American Journal of Educational Research*, 5 (5) 533-539.
- Zeithaml, V. A. and Bitner, M. J. (2000). *Services Marketing: Integrating customer focus across the firms*. New York: McGraw Hill.