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Abstract: Service quality with primary focus on Covenant University, Ota, in determining level of satisfaction amongst end users of the university’s lecture theatre formed the crux of the present study. The study entailed review of literature on service quality and customers’ satisfaction with emphasis on the application of SERVQUAL. Three sets of questionnaires with over 77% response rate cutting across the three focus groups - students, faculties who have offices in the lecture theatre and faculties who lecture in the lecture theatre - were administered. The SERVQUAL Model utilized ten (10) questions each for the seven (7) services peculiar to the lecture theatre. From gap analysis carried out service quality performance (perception) against the service quality needs (expectation) for each of the focus group based on the five dimensions of service quality on a five point likert scale, indicates need for improvement in the operation of these services. Its perceptions appeared below expectations thereby placing the respective end users’ in an unsatisfactory position most especially decoration and furnishing (-2.208); acoustic system (-1.946); and lavatory system (-2.167). The researchers hereby make a wakeup call for all facilities provided to integrate the feelings of end users for their satisfaction as that justifies its provision.
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1. Introduction

Service quality is paramount from the stance of the customer who happens to be the target of services provided before, during and after a contractual arrangement resulting to their satisfaction (Munusamy, Chelliah & Mun, 2010). This term has become germane in today’s business and workplace due to increasing market competition. Asubonteng, McCleary, and Swan (1996) affirmed that due to intense competition and the hostility of environmental factors, service quality is now a cornerstone marketing strategy for companies. Organizations are aware of the strategic competitiveness in a dynamic business environment and therefore heed to service quality to be on edge. It is becoming globalised irrespective of ownership, size, and organizational mode of operation. For instance the appearance of web presence in today’s business has also been studied with respect to service delivery on such platform, all in a bid to satisfying customers (Zeithaml, Parasuraman & Malhotra, 2002). Organisations are looking up to the satisfaction of customers, as such results to higher customer loyalty in form of patronage and long term business relationship (Yi, 1991; Anderson & Sullivan, 1993; Boulding et al., 1993; Zeithami et al., 1996; McColl-Kennedy & Scheider, 2000). This in return enhances the customer base culminating to higher economic/financial returns (Fornell, 1992; Bolton, 1998; Yeung et al., 2002). Successes of businesses are also reported to be hinged on this (Iacobucci et al., 1994). The importance of service quality cannot be over-emphasized as researchers have proven that providing good service quality to customers retains them, attracts new ones, enhances corporate image, positive word-of-mouth recommendation and above all guarantees survival and profitability (Negi, 2009; Ladhari, 2009).

2. Service Quality

In a bid to avoiding prejudice, service quality which is best judged by customers’ (Berry et al (1992; Cited in Kaunda, 2013) is not determined by just a particular customer’s experience with a particular product or service, rather measurement of service quality is an amalgamation of experiences with products and services amongst customers over time (Johnson, Anderson & Fornell, 1995). Hence, organizations have to be constantly updating their understanding of customer needs and expectations (Kaunda 2013). Even though service quality should naturally be synonymous with service provided/delivered in line with determination of customers’ satisfaction (Shahab, Arslan, Kanwal & Shujah, 2012), it has been seen in relation to satisfaction of newly invented products. This is experienced in a study carried out on the satisfaction of customers in the usage of Automated Teller Machine (ATM) in Nigeria notwithstanding its introduction for ease in banking services (Adeniran & Junaidu, 2012). The positive results gotten which were not all significant buttresses once again the import of research in service quality. In mobile telecommunication industry, Nimako (2012) empirically examined the extent to which service quality affects customer satisfaction and behaviour intention in Ghana. The study which involved a cross-sectional survey of 1000 respondents using structured questionnaire personally administered and analysed using Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) method revealed that
Tangibles, Customer Relations, Real Network Quality and Image quality aspects of service quality positively affect customer satisfaction, which in turn affects behaviour intention. More so, Best and Purdey (2012) notwithstanding the iconic status of a sustainable education building, went ahead to conduct a post-occupancy evaluation study to determine the level of satisfaction from the viewpoint of the users’ of the building that houses the Mirvac School of Sustainable Development at Bond University being the first educational building to achieve a six Green Star rating from the Green Building Council of Australia amongst other notable applause. Findings from the study reveal that although users’ derive satisfaction in the use of the building, intrusive noise in some part of the building was evident, a feature common with most green buildings. Hence, where service quality is upheld by organization, literature has supported a positive correlation existing amongst customers’ satisfaction and financial performance, customer loyalty, and market share (Beerli et al., 2004; Wood, 2008). In the banking sector a study was conducted in Greece investigating the relationship between service quality and loyalty amongst banks (Kranias & Bourlessa, 2013). The study revealed that more modern approach to offering service and interior design will attract customers while convenience of proximity of banks to workplace and city centres would make customers more loyal. Shahab, Arslan, Kanwal and Shujah (2012) in a bid to examining in Pakistan the relationship among service quality, customer satisfaction and behavioral responses as a comparison between public and private sector banks discovered that the tendency for customers to recommend banks were directly related to their level of satisfaction while no significant relationship existed between level of satisfaction and change in banks patronage. Even though, earlier on Cronin, Brady and Hult (2000) had argued that a more pragmatic approach to determining customers’ behavioural responses would be a comprehensive study relating service quality, service value, and customers’ satisfaction as direct influences on customers’ behavioral intentions. This is not playing down on the significance of each factor rather accentuating a more holistic approach. In the health sector, Çaha (2007) based on the health reforms in turkey over the years tried to discover the level of satisfaction of patients who were enjoying social security. The study involved a survey of 100 patients in 4 private hospitals in Istanbul where there are concentrations of most private hospitals. The use of a dynamic model reveals amongst others that although private hospitals are striving in seeing to the satisfaction of their patients on a competitive manner, there is need for reduction in waiting time before patients are attended to and an increase in consultation time given to each patient. 

2.1 Service Quality in Educational Setting
The educational sector is not neglected while carrying out study of service quality even though William (2002) cited in Hassan et al. (2008) conceive it risky to observe students as customers. However, given the current atmosphere of particularly higher education marketplace, there is envisaged consensus that students are “customers” owing to the fact that as fee payers, it is morally reasonable that their interest has
to be considered. More so, Williams (1994) opined that the working environment is related to building facilities that contribute to achieving the intended use of the business future functions. These working environments can either be offices, homes, schools or even health institutions. The service and environment aspects of the building where people spend most of their time and such period tend to affect their physical activities by way of either creating a comfortable living and working environment or even discouraging them from using such buildings. Johns (1999) also described service to mean an industry, a performance, an output, an offering or a process which could be defined differently from one service industry to another. Thus since customers are the users of services provided one can view students and lecturers in an educational setting as customers, thus the raison d’etre of their establishment. More so, Badri, Abdulla and Al-Madani (2005) underscore some services in which the SERVQUAL model can be applied, consequentially, the Higher education service were part of them. Hence, the practicable bases for this present study.

2.2 Service Quality and Customers’ Satisfaction

Customers’ satisfaction is considered more as an attitudinal disposition (Yi, 1990). It is regarded as a function of service quality (Spreng & Maccloy, 1996; Cronin & Taylor, 1992; Spreng & Maccloy, 1996; Caruana, 2002; Yavas et al., 2004) and as such researchers have resulted to viewing service quality as a juxtaposition of customer’s perceived quality and expected quality being provided (Oliver, 1981; Brady & Robertson, 2001; Lovelock, Patterson and Walker, 2001). This is an aftermath of Parasuraman, Zeithaml and Berry (1988) five-dimensional SERVQUAL model constructed in terms of tangibles; reliability; responsiveness; assurance; and empathy. The expectations of customers are yardsticks set for minimum service delivery (Zeithaml et al., 1993). Hence service quality is measured as the difference between expectations of customers and their perception of services provided. Shahin (2006) declares the importance of measuring service quality since it allows for comparisons before and after changes, identifies quality related problems and helps in developing clear standards for service delivery. Tucker and Smith (2008) argued that user’s perception can be analysed through a twofold approach. One is through input and functionalities in the workplace, and consequent application of workplace productivity; while the other is through strategic Facility Management delivery and the achievement of customer satisfaction. An intrinsic linkage between the two was identified forming an integral overall strategic Facility Management process. Placing users’ perception along side their expectations, service quality could either be judged high or low according to the service quality theory (Oliver, 1980) when perception exceeds expectation or vice versa.

Nitecki (1996) had acceded that service quality has become an interesting issue in the study of library (an educational service) literature. Subsequently in order to get relevant feedback on the performance of instituted libraries, Filiz (2007) advocated the measurement of satisfaction gotten by users’. In an ever increasing competitive academic environment, institutions of learning particularly Universities are becoming
more aware of the importance of students’ satisfaction (Altbach, 1998; Arambewela & Hall, 2009; Usman, 2010). Universities most especially the private institutions have therefore device means of monitoring the actualization of meeting a benchmark in students’ satisfaction (O’Neill, 2003). Hence, many Universities have used student satisfaction as an avenue for gaining competitive advantage in their day-to-day dealings so as to attract patronage (Kevin & Dooyoung, 2002). However, the concept of students’ satisfaction has been viewed in varying dimensions. Petruzzeilis et al. (2006) have seen that students’ base their satisfaction assessment as a comparison of the perception of service delivered with their prior expectations of such services. On the other hand student see satisfaction as a subjective evaluation of the favorability of the various outcomes and experiences associated with their education (Oliver & Desarbo, 1989). Borden (1995) discovered that students’ satisfaction can be attained when their priority matches the academic environment. Wiers-Jessen et al. (2002) have considered “student satisfaction approaches as a tool for building a bridge between more traditional and academic views in a bid to improving higher education, and more market-orientated perspectives”. Malik, Danish and Usman (2010) analyzed the impact of different quality services on student satisfaction in both public and private higher educational institutes of a big division of Punjab province of Pakistan. Data was collected from 240 students of business courses either enrolled in master program or graduation program in provincially chartered universities of the Gujranwala region. The results showed that students were overall satisfied with services of Tangibility, Assurance, Reliability and Empathy but not much satisfied with parking facilities, computer labs, cafeteria services and complaint handling system. Al Khattab and Fraij (2011) measured the satisfaction of the students at Al-Hussein Bin Talal University, Jordan, with the quality of e-services developed in-house known as the Student Information System (SIS). The result of the analysed questionnaire distributed reveal that the students were satisfied by the transition to e-services and the SIS has a positive impact on the students’ satisfaction. Sumaedi, Bakti and Metasari (2011) examined the effects of students’ perceived quality and students’ perceived price on students’ satisfaction through students’ survey of two Indonesia public universities. From result gotten using multiple regression analysis it was observed that students’ perceived quality and perceived price have positive influence on the student satisfaction with students’ perceived quality more affected to student satisfaction than perceived price. From a random selection of 190 students cutting across degree, masters and PhD programs, Jalali and Jaafar (2013) were geared towards determining factors affecting students’ satisfaction in a higher learning Institution. Gender, race, student status and CGPA were chosen as independent variables while results gotten revealed that the overall services offered by the university did not match standards placed side by side students’ perspective. Discovering that race and status had great influence on students’ satisfaction, it was believed that such satisfaction can be enhanced by delivering standard services relating to academic life. These can be classified...
as implicit, explicit and physical services. Coskun (2014) identified students’ satisfaction in a private university in Albania by considering six major factors. Based on classroom administration, a ‘77-item’ survey was conducted to identify factors most prioritized by students for fruitful outcome. Most importantly it was revealed that satisfaction model of education gives a ground to student-centered learning thereby causes effective teaching/learning, improves communication skills, and supportive learning environment. The six factors under study were seen to be germane for allocation of existing resources in satisfying student expectation as well as competing with the challenging educational world. However, amongst these factors academic staff, teaching, and relationships were upheld more by respondents as determinants of their satisfaction as against technology, administration, and campus facilities. Kundi, et al. (2014) studied the impact of service quality on customer satisfaction in education sector using nearly 200 students of Gomal University DIKhan of Pakistan. The researchers adopted customers’ satisfaction as dependent variable while responsiveness, reliability, assurance, Empathy and tangibility were the independent variables. The Pearson correlation and regression was applied on data, and results obtained revealed a positive and significant relationship between the variables. Amongst these the study reveals tangibility and assurance as being considered most important, hence a need for improvement in the university for maximum satisfaction.

In Nigeria, Adeniran (2011) buttressed the infusion of information Technology with the services being carried out in the Library thereby making operation of Libraries more competitive. In order to determine the satisfaction of users’ of Redeemers University Library in Ogun State, the paper examined the relationship between service quality and users’ satisfaction of the library by the use of questionnaires in collecting data from seven (7) academic staff and one hundred and seventy-nine (179) students of the University who form the major users of this academic facility. Based on the findings of this study, it was discovered that users of Redeemers’s University library were satisfied with the library services, however, there was need for improvement in the services provided by the library as the study revealed that users’ satisfaction is a function of the quality of staff and services of library.

2.3 Servqual Application in Educational Setting

The application of SERVQUAL evident for about three decades has spanned varieties of industrial service settings. These ranges from hotel hospitality (Akan, 1995); Resort Centre (Kaewkungwal, 2011); evaluation in local government council (Mokhlis, 2012); drug enforcement (Gibson, 2009); hospital/health care delivery (Babakus & Mangold, 1989; Andaleeb, 2001; Caha, 2007); banking sector (Stafford, 1996; Munusamy, Chelliah & Wai-mun, 2010); in Information Technology (IT) Centre (Badri et al., 2005; Negi, 2009); in the context of grocery stores (Daniel & Berinyuy, 2010; Magi & Julander, 2009). SERVQUAL has also been applied in educational setting. Wang and Shieh (2006) investigated the Chang Jung Christian University (CJCU) Library’s degree of importance and performance...
from the users’ stance so as to explore overall user’s satisfaction. From a questionnaire response to reveal their perspective on service quality, a test of the five dimensions of tangibles, responsiveness, reliability, assurance, and empathy reveals that the overall service quality apart from responsiveness has a significantly positive effect on overall user satisfaction. The study also revealed collections, loaning and returning service, overall atmosphere, electronic database system, and online reservation and renewal as the top five importance service quality as ranked by users. In addition perceived importance of service quality dimension showed no significant difference among institutes and status. On the contrary, Landrum, Prybutok, Zhang and Peak (2009) discovered that responsiveness and also reliability, regarded as the performance dimensions, were the most rated users’ service quality dimensions while the more emotive dimensions of tangibility, assurance and empathy varied in level of importance depending on the user’s state of mind and the circumstances. These were findings from service quality perceptions of professional information system users of a library information system in an engineering research environment. Somaratna, Peiris and Jayasundara (2010) measured the desired service expectations and actual service performance of the users of the University of Colombo Library System. Of the 116 different service quality attributes identified from literature 35 found to be most appropriate to the Sri Lankan University Libraries were utilized though incorporated with the SERVQUAL model and a robust instrument was developed to ascertain the views of library users about service levels. From an overall response rate of 74% achieved represented by a total of 614 duly filled and retrieved questionnaires, the adoption of Gap analysis was used to determine the service quality gap between desired service expectations and actual service performance. The result indicates that the most important expectation to users’ were relevance of information received followed by access to electronic journals and adequate lighting in reading areas, whereas the highest performance area was accuracy of information received followed by the security in the library amongst others. However, Hsu, Cummings and Wang (2014) in a bid to examining the college students’ perception of library services, and the extent to which the quality of library services influences students’ satisfaction discovered tangibility to be the most important service quality dimension amongst college students enrolled in an accredited college of business in a university located in the Midwest region of the United States. This assessment of relationship between service quality and users’ satisfaction has been advocated on a continuous basis perhaps every two years as feedbacks gotten will aid as a management tool in decision making, long term planning, budgeting, employee training and development in addition to being a mechanism for continually enhancing and improving the relationship between Library Service and its users (Kaunda, 2013). Users’ perceptions and expectation studies have been regarded as one of the most popular studies in service quality in many academic libraries (Jayasundara, 2008). Hence, apart from SERVQUAL other measuring models used particularly in the developed nations
most and especially in North-America where they were developed include LibQUAL and SERVPREF (Rehman and El Hadi, 2012)

Hassan, Ilias, Rahman and AbdRazak (2008) examined the relationship between service quality dimensions and overall service quality (tangibility, responsiveness, reliability, assurance and empathy) and students’ satisfaction. The study further examined the critical factors in service quality dimensions (tangibility, responsiveness, reliability, assurance and empathy) contributing most to the satisfaction of the students. A set of questionnaire was administered to Bachelor Degree students from Kuala Lumpur Infrastructure University College (KLiUC) and Kolej Universiti Teknologi dan Pengurusan Malaysia (KUTPM). A response rate of about 87% representing 200 duly filled and returned questionnaire confirms earlier researchers’ (Ruyter, et al, 1997; Brady, et al. 2001; Sureshchandar, et al. 2002; Fen & Lian; 2005) findings that service quality has significant positive relationship with customers’ satisfaction in this case that of students. The researchers also discovered that two dimensions in service quality, empathy and assurance, were the most critical factors in explaining students’ satisfaction.

Oliveira (2009) adopted the SERVQUAL measuring model in higher education service sector and presenting the main results of its application in students of the production engineering program at São Paulo State University (UNESP) in Brazil. Thirty-eight questionnaires were applied to measure perception in entering students and twenty-eight used to measure expectations in graduating students. Findings reveal that all dimensions showed an overall negative average starting with promptness, empathy, reliability, security and tangibility in a decreasing order of magnitude. This invariably implies that perceptions were below expectations. Evidence does exist of faults in services engendering unsatisfactory outcome among the students.

Asaduzzaman, Hossain, and Rahman (2013) examine the relationship between service quality dimensions and overall service quality (tangibility, responsiveness, reliability, assurance and empathy) and students satisfaction. The study further examined critical factors in service quality dimensions which contribute most to students’ satisfaction. From a survey of 550 distributed questionnaires to Business students from Private University institutions, Dhaka City, Bangladesh, it was discovered that a significant correlation does exist among all the constructs with student satisfaction particularly tangibility.

Notwithstanding various criticism of SERVQUAL (Buttle, 1996; Van Dyke et al., 1997, 1999; Ladhari, 2008), it is ubiquitous in application cutting across various service setting, nations and cultural background (Ladhari, 2008). While the development of industry-specific scales for measuring service quality is welcomed (Caro & Garcia, 2007; Ekiz & Bavik, 2008), the criticism of peculiarity within organisation, locational confines and cultural disparities might still need to be tackled. Hence, the application of SERVQUAL which has an extensive acceptance, adoption and modification (Seth et al. 2005; Kundi et al., 2014) is therefore utilized in measuring service delivery in Covenant University, Ota
amongst concerned stakeholders of this private institution.

3. Methodology

In order to obtain information about customers’ satisfaction in the Lecture Theatre of Covenant University, a cross-sectional survey was conducted involving the major stakeholders: students and faculty (lecturers). The survey questionnaire designed was distributed randomly amongst stakeholders (students and faculties) who make use of the facility. However, for faculties an initial purposive selection was considered for faculties who make use of the facility. All together three groups of respondents were identified, students, since all students at a point in time do take lectures in the lecture theatre; faculties who have offices in the lecture theatre and faculties who lecture in the lecture theatre.

In a bid to obtaining a realistic result, the questionnaire, which had to be delivered by hand for proper monitoring, was distributed to an appropriate sample calculated using Kothari (2004; 179) model after taking cognizance of difference in gender, age groups, then also marital status, level of academic qualification and designation particularly amongst faculty. Having in mind that socio-economic and cultural characteristic could influence respondents’ level of expectations and needs; the mix intends to produce a more reasonable result. The sample size derived from a total student population of 7571 @ a 95% confidence level and an acceptable error margin of ±5% as stipulated by the model was 323. This number was carefully selected through stratified random sampling technique. The entire lecturers who lecture in the lecture theater at any point in time and those having offices in the facility were 42 and 31 respectively. The researchers decided to study the entire lecturers in both categories as they appeared too little for sampling. This is to conform to the suggestion of Denscombe (2003).

The primary source of data collection for this research was the administration of questionnaire to the respondents. The questionnaire was designed using the SERVQUAL format developed by Parasuraman, Zeithaml and Berry at Texas and North Carolina in 1985. The original SERVQUAL scale actually makes use of 22 questions in measuring the five dimensions of service quality: reliability, tangibility, security, empathy and responsibility on a seven point linkert scale. However, the use of a single measuring scale for all service setting has been criticised (Carman, 1990; Brown et al., 1993; Van Dyke et al., 1997; Jabnoun & Khalifa, 2005; Akbaba, 2006; Caro & Garcia, 2007). There is therefore the recommendation for an adoption of specific measures that suits various organisations (Dabholkar et al., 1996; Ladhari, 2008). On this premise, the SERVQUAL Model adopted which was considered apt for this research made provision for ten (10) questions each for the seven (7) services studied having two (2) questions each of perception and expectation for the five (5) dimensions of service quality on a 5-point linkert scale. The services considered which cuts across the three (3) response groups include: Ventilation and Air Conditioning; Information and Communication System; Decoration and Furnishing; Lighting; Lavatory System; Acoustic System and Emergency Escape Channel.

A gap analysis was done on each of the University Lecture Theatre’s service quality performance (perception)
against the service quality needs (expectation) for each of its customers’ (students and lecturers). Thereafter an average gap score for each of the dimension was obtained by assessing the gap scores for each of the statements that constitute the dimension and dividing the sum by the number of statements making up the dimension.

4. Data Analysis and Discussion

A total of three hundred and twenty three (323) questionnaires were administered to the students of Covenant University. These students were stratified based on their current year of study taking into consideration the proportion of students in each level to the total students’ population thereafter a random selection of students was made. Thus, seventy-six (76) questionnaires were distributed to 100 level students, sixty-four (64) questionnaires were distributed to 200 level students, sixty-two (62) questionnaires were administered to 300 level students while fifty (50) and forty-eight (48) questionnaires were administered to 400 and 500 level students respectively. Out of the total sum administered a total of two hundred and sixty-five questionnaires (265) were retrieved representing a response rate of 82.04%. Out of the forty-two (42) questionnaires distributed to the lecturers who do at any point in time deliver lecture(s) in the facility, a total of thirty-three (33) of such questionnaires were retrieved while twenty-four (24) of the thirty-one (31) questionnaires distributed to lecturers who have offices in the facility were retrieved. This represents a response rate of 78.6% and 77.4% respectively.

One hundred and seventeen (117) representing (44.2%) of the students were male while one hundred and forty-eight (148; 55.8%) were female. This perhaps may be due to the ease in accessing and persuading the female students in filling the questionnaires as against their male counterparts. Nigerian students sampled were two hundred and thirty seven (237; 89.5%) whereas twenty-eight (28; 10.5%) were non-nationals. Seventeen (17 students; 2.6%) were below the age of 16 years, one hundred and eighty (180 of the students; 67.9%) were between the ages of 16 and 20 years while seventy-eight (78 students; 29.4%) were between the ages of 21 and 25 years. Forty-one students (41; 15.5%) were in 100 level, sixty-four students (64; 24.2%) in 200 level, sixty-two (62 students; 23.4%) in 300 level, fifty (50; 18.9%) in 400 level and forty-eight (48; 18.1%) were in 500 level. From the response of sixteen (16; 66.7%) male and eight (8; 33.7%) female lecturers, cutting across the cadre of Assistant Lecturer to Senior Lecturer, who have offices in the Lecture Theatre, two (2; 8.3%) were below 31 years of age, eleven (11; 45.8%) were between 31-35yrs, four (4; 16.7%) of the lecturers were between 36–40yrs, those within the age limit of 41–45yrs were two (2; 8.3%) while five (5; 20.8%) of the respondents were above 45yrs. Of the thirty-three (33) questionnaires retrieved from twenty-one (21, 63.6%) male and twelve (12, 36.4%) female lecturers also cutting across the cadre of Assistant Lecturer to Senior Lecturer, who at any point in time lecture in lecture theatre, twelve (12, 36.4%) are below 31 years; fourteen (14, 42.4%) are between 31-35 years; two (2, 6.1%) are between 36-40 years; four (4, 12.1%) are between 41-45 years while one (1, 3%) respondent is above 45 years. Twenty seven of this respondents (27, 81.8%) hold a Master’s
degree in their various field while Six (6, 18.2%) have obtained a doctorate degree.

4.1 Analysis of students’ response
In a bid to determining the satisfaction of students in usage of the facilities in the lecture theatre the SERVQUAL Model as adopted, which was used for the other two categories of respondents, compared the expectations and perceptions of the students in the usage of the Seven (7) facilities peculiar to the edifice.

Ventilation and air-condition facility gave the following breakdowns: Average Tangible - 1.575; Average Reliable -1.575; Average Responsive -1.445; Average Assurance -1.705; Average Empathy -1.71; having an overall average of -1.602

Information and communication system gave the following breakdowns: Average Tangible -1.705; Average Reliable -1.76; Average Responsive -1.515; Average Assurance -1.745; Average Empathy -1.475; having an overall average of -1.64

Decoration and furnishing gave the following breakdowns: Average Tangible -2.185; Average Reliable -2.295; Average Responsive -2.14; Average Assurance -2.27; Average Empathy -2.15; having an overall average of -2.208

Lightening gave the following breakdowns: Average Tangible -1.27; Average Reliable -1.095; Average Responsive -1.465; Average Assurance -1.45; Average Empathy -1.39; having an overall average of -1.334

Lavatory System gave the following breakdowns: Average Tangible -1.81; Average Reliable -1.74; Average Responsive -1.635; Average Assurance -1.645; Average Empathy -1.565; having an overall average of -1.679

Acoustic System gave the following breakdowns: Average Tangible -1.475; Average Reliable -1.625; Average Responsive -1.43; Average Assurance -1.52; Average Empathy -1.35; having an overall average of -1.48

Emergency Escape Channel gave the following breakdowns: Average Tangible -1.62; Average Reliable -1.64; Average Responsive -1.665; Average Assurance -1.675; Average Empathy -1.61; having an overall average of -1.642

From analysis it is obvious that there are differences in the expectations and perceptions of students concerning the quality of the services provided in the Lecture Theatre. Most of the students either strongly agreed or agreed with all questions asked in the five dimensions of the expectations section. However the perceptions section showed a contrast response as most students either strongly disagreed or disagreed with questions asked in the five dimensions. Although all facilities, recorded poor satisfactory response, YET the decoration and furnishing facility had the least value of (-2.208) in comparison between the expectation and perception of its service quality.

4.2 Analysis of response of lecturers who have offices in the lecture theatre
Based on the SERVQUAL Model as adopted for all categories of respondents, responses of lecturers who have offices in the lecture theatre gave the following results:
Ventilation and air-condition facility gave the following breakdowns: Average Tangible = 0.14; Average Reliable = 1.21; Average Responsive = 1.00; Average Assurance = 1.25; Average Empathy = 1.40; having an overall average of 1.00

Information and communication system gave the following breakdowns: Average Tangible = 1.21; Average Reliable = 1.61; Average Responsive = 0.93; Average Assurance = 1.08; Average Empathy = 1.38; having an overall average of 1.242

Decoration and furnishing gave the following breakdowns: Average Tangible = 1.56; Average Reliable = 1.565; Average Responsive = 1.285; Average Assurance = 1.31; Average Empathy = 1.665; having an overall average of 1.477

Lightening gave the following breakdowns: Average Tangible = 0.54; Average Reliable = 0.665; Average Responsive = 0.77; Average Assurance = 0.665; Average Empathy = 0.815; having an overall average of 0.691

Lavatory System gave the following breakdowns: Average Tangible = 1.955; Average Reliable = 1.77; Average Responsive = 1.165; Average Assurance = 1.775; Average Empathy = 1.625; having an overall average of 1.658

Acoustic System gave the following breakdowns: Average Tangible = -2.145; Average Reliable = -2.23; Average Responsive = -1.525; Average Assurance = -1.955; Average Empathy = -1.875; having an overall average of -1.946

Emergency Escape Channel gave the following breakdowns: Average Tangible = -2.34; Average Reliable = -2.02; Average Responsive = -1.605; Average Assurance = -1.935; Average Empathy = -1.79; having an overall average of -1.938

The results from analysis as displayed reveals that there were as in the case of the students, differences in what the lecturers who have offices in the Lecture Theatre expected and perceived concerning the quality of the services provided in the Lecture Theatre. Most of the lecturers either strongly agreed or agreed with the questions asked in the five dimensions of the expectations section while the perceptions section revealed that the lecturers either strongly disagreed or disagreed with the questions asked in the five dimensions. The findings shows that lecturers who have offices in the Lecture Theatre had the least comparison of expectation and perception in the acoustic system (-1.946) and Emergency Escape Channel (-1.938) service compared to decoration and furnishing facility as attested by students. This invariably can be inferred as lack of soundproofed fortifications and emergency exit in case of emergency around the lecture theatre.

4.3 Analysis of response of lecturers who lecture in lecture theatre

For the last group of respondents who are lecturers having any of their lectures in the lecture theatre, the following results were obtained:

Ventilation and air-condition facility gave the following breakdowns: Average Tangible = 1.895; Average Reliable = 1.835; Average Responsive = 1.525; Average Assurance = 1.955; Average Empathy = 1.875; having an overall average of 1.946
Empathy -1.665; having an overall average of -1.758

Information and communication system gave the following breakdowns: Average Tangible -1.805; Average Reliable -2.165; Average Responsive -1.665; Average Assurance -2.08; Average Empathy -1.85; having an overall average of -1.913

Decoration and furnishing gave the following breakdowns: Average Tangible -1.91; Average Reliable -1.95; Average Responsive -1.465; Average Assurance -1.815; Average Empathy -1.605; having an overall average of -1.749

Lightening gave the following breakdowns: Average Tangible -1.865; Average Reliable -1.755; Average Assurance -2.08; Average Empathy -1.985; having an overall average of -1.904

Lavatory System gave the following breakdowns: Average Tangible -2.26; Average Reliable -2.23; Average Responsive -2.035; Average Assurance -2.165; Average Empathy -2.145; having an overall average of -2.167

Acoustic System gave the following breakdowns: Average Tangible -1.85; Average Reliable -1.985; Average Responsive -1.82; Average Assurance -1.685; Average Empathy -1.955; having an overall average of -1.859

Emergency Escape Channel gave the following breakdowns: Average Tangible -1.94; Average Reliable -1.955; Average Responsive -1.91; Average Assurance -1.845; Average Empathy -1.91; having an overall average of -1.912

Just like the response of the earlier two respondents it is obvious that differences exist between the expectations and perceptions on all concerned facilities by lecturers who at any time deliver lecture at the lecture theatre. However, the lavatory system had the least value (-2.167) indicating the least satisfaction of this facility amongst this group of respondents. Perhaps this might be due to the distance of this facility from the lecture halls.

4. 4 Users’ Assessment of Facilities in Lecture Theatre
To get a more holistic view of responses amongst the three groups of respondents, the analysis was also done together. This is with the intent of having satisfaction indicator that can be attributed to users’ generally. The following results were gotten from the analysis:

Ventilation and air-condition facility gave the following breakdowns: Average Tangible -1.27; Average Reliable -1.275; Average Responsive -1.185; Average Assurance -1.405; Average Empathy -1.405; having an overall average of -1.308

Information and communication system gave the following breakdowns: Average Tangible -0.528; Average Reliable -1.37; Average Responsive -1.20; Average Assurance -1.38; Average Empathy -1.175; having an overall average of -1.331

Decoration and furnishing gave the following breakdowns: Average Tangible -1.81; Average Reliable -1.895; Average Responsive -1.775;
Average Assurance -1.865; Average Empathy -1.775; having an overall average of -1.824

Lightening gave the following breakdowns: Average Tangible -1.295; Average Reliable -1.13; Average Responsive -1.49; Average Assurance -1.445; Average Empathy -1.985; having an overall average of -1.469

Lavatory System gave the following breakdowns: Average Tangible -1.535; Average Reliable -1.465; Average Responsive -1.355; Average Assurance -1.355; Average Empathy -1.205; having an overall average of -1.383

Acoustic System gave the following breakdowns: Average Tangible -1.415; Average Reliable -1.47; Average Responsive -1.30; Average Assurance -1.05; Average Empathy -1.17; having an overall average of -1.281

Emergency Escape Channel gave the following breakdowns: Average Tangible -1.32; Average Reliable -1.33; Average Responsive -1.38; Average Assurance -1.38; Average Empathy -1.31; having an overall average of -1.344

From analysis it is shown that users of facilities in the lecture theatre had different expectations from what they perceived about the quality of services provided in the lecture theatre. Having negative values all through particularly decoration and furnishing with the least satisfactory quality for users (-1.824) indicates need for the improvement in the operation of this service.

If client satisfaction is the ultimate for delivery of services then facilities of the lecture theatre should be improved to meet clients’ expectation particularly in the area of decoration and furnishing. Other areas to consider improvements particularly in meeting the needs of targeted end users such as lecturers who have offices in the lecture theatre and those who lecture in the theatre are the acoustic system together with emergency escape route and the lavatory system respectively.

5. Conclusion

This paper has looked into the service quality of facilities provided in the lecture theatre of Covenant University, Ota Ogun State Nigeria. In a nutshell findings have revealed that all dimensions showed an overall negative average; tangibles, reliability, responses, assurance and empathy. This signifies perceptions being below expectations thereby placing the end users’ in an unsatisfactory position. Notwithstanding that the University has been rated tops in most categories of awards in the country and even beyond amongst which is best Maintained Institution Award by the Nigerian Chapter of the International Facility Management Association (IFMA), she still needs improvement in the operation of the services provided in the multipurpose academic structure so as to be satisfactory to users. This study has serious implications for Tertiary Institutions in Nigerian. The gap between the provision of facilities and the perception of such facilities amongst users should be bridged. This might lead to another issue where connectivity between well perceived facilities and academic performance can be established. This is a wakeup call for all providers of facility, no matter how sophisticated facilities may seem to appear it has to integrate the feelings of end users as that can only be when such
facilities would have rightly fulfilled its purpose.
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