

(SERVPERF)

* . 2012/11/22

(Service Performance)

(ServPerf)

(40)

(380)

: (spss)

-1

-2

.()

-)

-3

(

.()

($\alpha =0.05$)

-4

.()

-5

(-)

.()

. - - *

....

Abstract

The current study aims at measuring the quality level of the university services as it is recognized by Al Aqsa university students' in Gaza based on the service performance. The researcher conducted a measure concerning the service quality. It consisted of six domains containing 40 items. The sample of the study was 380 male and female students from Al Aqsa university in Gaza. The results were analyzed by SPSS. The study findings revealed the following: 1. the quality level of the university services, as it is recognized by Al Aqsa University students, was low and medium in all the domains.

2. there are statistical significant differences attributed to the gender variable in favour of the females in all the variables except (security domain), 3. there are statistical differences in the total degree in the following domains: (touched elements – response) in favour of the applied majors whereas there are no statistical differences in the following domains: (security, sympathy, reliability, university privacy), 4. there are no statistical differences at ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the recognized university services based on the educational level variable (first level- fourth level), 5. there are statistical differences in the quality of the university services attributed to the university branch variable (Gaza branch- Khanyounis branch) in favour of Khanyounis branch in the total degree and in all the domains except the (security) domain.

The researcher recommends that there is a necessity to improve the level of the university services which are presented to Al Aqsa university students in all the domains. In addition, there should be a hard work to satisfy the students about the performance quality which is presented to the students through confirming the university privacy.

:

2013

(12: 2002)

Time Based

"

Competition

"

(**Firdaus** 2006, p. 31)

)

(37:2006

(3)

"

....

(205 -204 :)

.

:

(Cronin & Taylor) servperf

:

:

-1

(SERVPERF)

(SERVPERF)

-2

(-)

(SERVPERF)

-3

()

(SERVPERF)

-4

)

(-

2013

.

(SERVPERF) -5
-)

(
:

) (SERVPERF)
.() (:
:

($\alpha = 0.05$) -1

.() (SERVPERF)
($\alpha = 0.05$) -2

.() (SERVPERF)
($\alpha = 0.05$) -3

.() (SERVPERF)
($\alpha = 0.05$) -4

.() (SERVPERF)
:
:
-1

....

-2

(16)

2012-2011

-3

-1

-2

-3

(SERVPERF)

-4

-

(SERVPERF)

2013

-2011

" (39 :2003)

"

:

(4:)

)

.(

:(Service Performance)

(SERVPERF)

(Cronin & Taylor)

(SERVPERF)

The gaps model

:

....

(2005:17)

"

(112: 2007) (39 :2003)

"

:

: -1

: -2

)

(1999:29

.

: -3

.

: -4

(...)

: -5

"

(29:)

2013

.

.

:

-6

.

:

(Lee J and Ritzman, 2000)

(Christopher, & Wright,2002: 18)

"

(2006:19)

)

.

" (15 :2002

(Zero Defect)

(5 :2009) "

(143 : 2001)

....

(Gronroos,)

-: 1984:35

:(technical quality) -

:(fuctional quality) -

-: (9 : 2006)
:(will expectations) -

:(Should expectations) -

:
(Osborne & Gaebler) -

Obsborne)

(& Gaebler 1992.p.p 146-154

(16-15: 2010)

-:

:The gaps model -

: (Parasuraman et al)

(Servqual) (SERVQUAL of Quality Gaps)

2013

Quality service

)

Parasuraman) (

(22)

(etal,146, 1985

"

"

(Lesley, 1998, p22-23)

-(Nitecki and Danu p 693.2001)

:tangibles -1

.(15 2005 :)

:Reliability -2

:responsiveness -3

....

:assurance -4

:empathy -5

:servperf -

(Cronin & Taylor)

):

(Cronin & Taylor)

(8 :2009) (

servperf (297 :)

(Karami and Olfati:2012.p661)

SERVQUAL

SERVPERF

()

()

2013

:Education Service Quality

Customer focus

ISO:2008

:2009)

(Total Quality)

(27

(12 :2000)

(Taylor and Bogdan, 1997)

(5 :2007)

()

)

(

:

(Design Quality)

(Performance Quality)

(Output Quality)

.(607-608: 2011

)

:

....

(Harvey, L., Green,. 1993.p.26)

-:

(1993 : Sallis)

-

(Perception)

-

.(16-) (

):

:

:

"

(2003 :)

-1

"

2%

20 %

50 %

2013

" (2007:) -2
- QFD-

/

()

(13) -QFD-

() (12)

)

(

....

() " (2007) -3

"

()

(348)

)

: " (2007 :) -4
" MBA

(Parasuraman)

(0.7021)

(0. 8900)

(.5725)

(%83)

" (2009 :) -5

"

2013

()
(- -)

300

) :

(
-
(0.05)
(0.05)

" (2009 :) -6

" :

290

" (2010 :) -7

"

....

(127)

(88)

(215)

(Parasuraman et al.,)

(SERVQUAL)

:

:

:

-:

" (2011 :) -8

"

SPSS

OMOS 7

Path Analysis

2013

:

" (2012 :) -9

"

(837)

(927)

:

(Luca Petruzzellis and Others :2006) -1

:

(servqual)

....

:		"	(Firdaus Abdullah:2006)	-2
		" SERVPERF	HEdPERF	
HEdPERF	SERVPERF			
			2005	
		()	
		SERVPERF		
		HEdPERF		
(Higher Education			PERFromance-only)	
			(Lomas: 2007)	-3
:				
	(292: 2009 :)	(Juwaheer,2007)	-4
300				

2013

SERVQUAL

" (Hishamuddin Fitri Abu Hasan and Others:2008) -5

" :

)

(

200

)

(

(100 :2009) (Chienh Hsiung Wan: 2009) -6

200

....

" (Ismail and Abiddin.2009) -7
"

(148) (341)

" (hodayari and hodayari:2011) -8
":

(384) (22)

SERVQUAL

SERVPERF HEdPERF

2013

:

:

:

):

(

:

(380)

2012-2011

(1)

(1)

(

)

190		190		190		190	
190		190		190		190	
380		380		380		380	

(40)

:

(SERVPERF)

....

:

-

2009 : 2010 2011 :)
:2012 2007 2007 : 2009 : 2009 :
Choon Ling Kwek and Others:2010 Masoud Karami and Omid Olfati
.Ghobadian et.al , 1994 ,Firdaus , 2006 ;Bigne

-

-

-:

:Tangibles -1
)

. (14) (:Reliability -2

. (6) :Responsiveness -3

. (4)

2013

:Assurance -4

. (4)

:Empathy -5

. (6)

:Characteristics of the university -6

. (6)

:

. %80 –
. %70 - %79.9 –
. %60 - %69.9 –
. %50 - %59.9 –
. 50 % –
:_____

(40)

(60)

:

....

(2)

.778**	-1
.600**	-2
.505**	-3
.377**	-4
.470**	-5
.458**	-6

0.01

**

(0.01)

:

(3)

"	"		
.590	:		1
.652	.	:	2
.735	.	:	3
.580	.	:	4
.683	.	:	5
.625	:		6
.690			

(3)

.

2013

:

:

(SERVPERF)

:

(4)

1	%71	6.374	49.821		1
2	%70	3.881	21.121		2
5	%65	3.434	13.447		3
3	%69	2.808	13.950		4
4	%68	3.408	20.618		5
6	%64	3.974	19.334		6
	%69	13.502	138.285		

"

"

(%70)

"

"

(%71)

"

"

(%69)

"

"

(%65)

"

"

(%68)

(%64)

"

"

(%69)

:

				
					-
		.			-
			.		-
					-
				.	
"	"				-
		.			-
			.		
				:	-
:					
	:		:	:	-
		.			

2013

(5)

()

	%71	1.366	3.57			
	%82	1.131	4.10			
	%72	1.368	3.6184			
	%65	1.540	3.2500)		
	%65	1.389	3.2763	(
	%63	1.498	3.1316			
	%62	1.473	3.1105	- - - "		
	%78	1.116	3.9316			
	%80	1.078	3.9974			
	%61	1.457	3.0526			
	%78	1.157	3.9026			

....

	%60	1.502	2.9895			
	%79	1.066	3.9474			
	%78	1.106	3.9395			
1	%71	6,37480	49,8211			

()
" (2) (%71)
" (9) %82 "
%80 "
" (10)
(12) %60 "
%61 " "
-: (2) -
(9) -

2013

(10)

(12)

%61

2011 2012)
Luca Petruzzellis Ismail and Abiddin.2009•Khodayari,2011•2010
(2006

(2009 :)

....

: : :

(6)

	%64	1.3736	3.2105		15	
	%75	1.1768	3.7816		16	
	%78	1.1105	3.9314		17	
	%61	1.5431	3.0632		18	
	%77	1.2281	3.8816		19	
	%65	1.3163	3.2474		20	
2	%70	3.881	21.121			

()

(17)

(%70)

%77

(19)

%78

%61

(18)

%64

(15)

:

(17)

-

2013

.

: (19) -
"

: (15) -

%64

: %61 (18) -

: 2012 :) -

Ismail and Khodayari:2011 2003 : 2009 : 2011

(Luca Petruzzellis and Others 2006، Abiddin.2009

....

.

: : :

.

(7)

	%63	1.3621	3.1684		21	
	%66	1.3311	3.3263		22	
	%69	1.2644	3.4474		23	
	%70	1.3925	3.5053		24	
5	%65	3.4342	13.4474			

()

(24) (23)

%65

(22) (21)

(%70) (%69)

-:

(%66) (%63)

-

2013

.

-

(2007 :)

-

(0.8900)

(2003: 2009 : 2009 : 2010 :)

: : : -

(8)

	%76	1.1850	3.8026		25	
	%72	1.2711	3.6316		26	
	%75	1.1608	3.7526		27	
	%55	1.3885	2.7623	.	28	
3	%69	3.8097	13.9500			

....

(%69) ()

(27) (25)

(%72) (28) (26) (%75) (%76)

-: (%55)

-

-

" " (21)

(26) -

(28) -

(%55)

-:

-

-

-

-

(2007 :) -

(Khodayari:2011 2010)

2013

: : -

(9)

	%69	1.3598	3.4816		29	
	%68	1.3481	3.4237		30	
	%68	1.2529	3.3974		31	
	%78	1.1606	3.8921		32	
	%67	1.3778	3.3421		33	
	%61	1.4295	3.0816		34	
4	%68	3.4086	20.6184			

()

(%68)

(%69) (%78)

(29) (32)

(%61) (%67)

(34) (33)

:

....

-

.

-

.

-

:

(34)

-

: 2009 :)

-

Hishamuddin Fitri Abu Hasan and Ismail and Abiddin.2009 ‘2009
(Luca Petruzzellis and Others :2006 ‘ Others:2008

()

.

:

:_____

.

2013

(10)

	%65	1.4826	3.2711		35	
	%64	1.3783	3.2053		36	
	%63	1.4091	3.1658		37	
	%61	1.3904	3. 0579		38	
	%64	1.4002	3. 2289		39	
	%68	1.3508	3.4053		40	
6	%64	3.9743	19.3342			

()

(%64)

:

....

(%68) (35) (40) -
(38) (37) (%65)
-:
(%61) (%63)
:
(40) -
:
(35) (%68)
(%65)

.
:
(37) -
(38) (%63)
:
(%61)

.
":
:
(SERVPERF)
(-)
()
.

2013

(11) :

	" "					
**0.01	7.311	5.856	52.195	6.0775	47.70	
**0.01	5.398	3.799	22.224	3.695	20.144	
**0.01	3.552	3.517	14.100	3.258	12.865	
	1.169	2.561	14.128	3.011	13.791	
**0.01	3.592	3.230	21.273	3.464	20.034	
**0.01	3.037	3.946	19.983	3.918	18.756	
**0.01	8.297	12.811	143.915	12.088	133.298	

0.05*

0.01

**

(11)

(2007)

()

(2010 :)

-:

-

....

-

.

" :

(SERVPERF)

(-)

:

()

(12)

	" "					
0,05*	1.96	6.167	50.419	6.513	49.211	
	0.61	3.756	21.248	3.998	21.005	
0,01	3.36	3.378	14.060	3.397	12.889	
	1.72	2.844	14.209	2.764	13.713	
	0.63	3.154	20.502	3.629	20.723	
	0.24	4.052	19.281	3.911	19.381	
0,05*	2.09	12.741	139.795	14.053	136.904	

0.05*

0.01

**

(12)

(-)

()

(2009 :)

(0.05)

(2010 :)

2013

)

(

" :

(SERVPERF)

(-)

:

()

(13)

	" "					
	1.732	5.955	50.416	6.699	49.285	
	1.118	3.763	21.355	3.982	20.909	
	0.344	3.446	13.383	3430	13.505	
	0.804	2.644	14.072	2.952	13.840	
	1.015	3.195	20.805	3.589	20.450	
	0.546	3.973	19.216	3.981	19.440	
	1.325	12.284	139.250	14.492	137.412	

0.05*

0.01

**

(α =0.05)

)

....

(2009 :) ((0.05)

:

-

" :

(SERVPERF)

(-)

:

()

(14)

	" "					
0.01 **	6.828	5.829	51.941	6.207	47.722	
0.01 **	4.826	3.864	22.063	3.677	20.193	
0.01 **	3.033	3.462	13.978	3.332	12.921	
	0.856	2.550	14.074	3.046	13.827	
0.01 **	3.046	3.241	21.148	3.496	20.094	
0.05 *	2.544	3.939	19.851	3.952	18.822	
0.01 **	7.292	13.044	143.063	12.264	133.581	

0.05*

0.01

**

2013

(-)
()

(2007 :

: _____

: _____

(SERVPERF)

• • • •

—

—

—

—

—

•

•

2003

.1

()

2003/10/23_21

2006

.2

2007

.3

- QFD-

(TQM)

2006

.4

.16-6

2013

.

2012 .5

.44-11 (2010) (4)2

2012 .6

-4

. 368-354 2012/4/5
2004 .7

.240-203

2009 .8

.108 – 92 (4)

2009 .9

:

.312-258 - 2009 25 -

2002 .10

-

2007 .11

:

"

"

.

2001 .12

-

		
	2009	.13	
	. 2009 24-1		
	2011	.14	
	1446 -1432		
	2011/5/12-10		
	2003	.15	
:	2009	.16	
-7			
		.28	
-	2005	.17	
	.		
	2007	.18	
	. 16-15 16		
	2007	.19	
	MBA :		
. 128-98			
	2011	.20	
27 - -			
	. 645-589 +		
	2000	.21	
	: "	-	
. 26-27	-		

2013

() 2007 .22
93-49 (2) 23

2010 .23

1999 .24

2002 .25

. 2002-8-22

: _____ : —

1. Affero , Ismail and Abiddin, Norhasni (2009) **service attributes of Graduate Research Students Needs In Malaysian University** , The Journal Of International Social Research , Volume 2-6 Winter 2009 .
2. Faranak Khodayari and Behnaz Khodayari(2011) **Service Quality in Higher Education Case study: Measuring service quality of Islamic Azad University**, Firoozkooh *branch*.Interdisciplinary Journal of Research in Business Vol. 1, Issue. 9, (pp.38- 46) September, October, 2011.
3. Firdaus Abdullah(2006) **Measuring service quality in higher education: HEdPERF vs SERVPERF**, Marketing Intelligence & Planning ,Vol. 24 No. 1, 2006 , pp. 31-47
4. Gronroos, C.A, (1984). **Service Quality Model and Its Marketing Implications. Europium Journal of Marketing**, 18:31-44
5. Harvey, L., Green, D. (1993). **Assessing quality in higher education: a trans-binary research project. Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education**, Vol. 18, No. 2, pp. 143-9.
6. Hishamuddin Fitri Abu Hasan AND AUTHER (2008) **Service Quality and Student Satisfaction: A Case Study at Private Higher Education Institutions** , International Business Research , Vol.1,no.3.pp,163-175.

....

7. Krajewski, Lee J. , and Larry P. Ritzman, (2000) **Operations Management: Strategy and Analysis** (Don Mills, Ontario, New York: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
8. Lovelock, Christopher, and Lauren Wrigt,(2002), **Principles of Service Marketing and Management**, (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall International.
9. Luca Petruzzellis and author (2006) **Student satisfaction and quality of service in Italian universities**, *Managing Service Quality* , Vol. 16 No. 4, pp. 349-364 ,<http://www.emeraldinsight.com/0960-4529.htm>
10. Lomas, Laurie, (2007), "Are **Students customers? Perception of academic staff**,"*Quality in Higher Education*, Vol.13, No. 1: 31-44.
11. Masoud Karami and Omid Olfati(2012) **Measuring service quality and satisfaction of students:A case study of students' perception of service quality in high-ranking business schools in Iran**. *African Journal of Business Management* Vol. 6(2), pp. 658-669, 18 January, 2012
12. Osborne D, and, Ted Geebler (1992), **Reinventing Government "How the Entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector**, New York: Prentice Hall PP.146-154
13. Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry (1985) - **A conceptual model of service quality and its implications for future research** - *Journal of marketing* 49 (4) ,pp. 41-50
14. Parasuraman, Berry, and Zeithaml (1988) - **SERVQUAL: A multiple-item scale for measuring customer perceptions of service quality** - *Journal of retailing* 64 (1) spring. pp12-40
15. Parasuraman A., Berry L., and Zeithaml V. (1991) , **Refinement and Reassessment of the SERVQUAL Scale**, *Journal of retailing*, vol. 67(4) , pp420-450
16. Peter heron A. nitecki and Danu (2001) **Service Quality: A Concept Not Fully Explored**) . *LIBRARY TRENDS*, Vol. 49, No. 4, Spring 2001, pp. 687-708 .2001 .
17. Sallis, E. **Total Quality Management in - Education**. London: Kogan page,(1993). p 22
18. Sheppard Lesley, (1998), **Some Background Information on Customer Satisfaction Measurement, a division of Sheppard Consulting**. URL. <http://www.trainquest.com>
19. Taylor, Steve and Bogdan, Robert (1997), **Introduction to Qualitative Research Methods** , new York : John Wiley sons.