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ABSTRACT

This study is about service quality issue by students and the purpose of the study is to examine the students’ view, as a ‘user’ at higher education, about the attributed of quality in higher education and services, which the students are experiencing. It has three main objectives. The first objective is to study the perception of students at public and private universities in Malaysia about service quality on their institutions. The second objective is to study the expectation of students about service quality at public and private universities provided by their institution, while the third objective is examine the comparison on service quality provided by both public and private higher institutions. This study is based on SERVQUAL models. The study is focus on population at students currently available at UUM and MMU. There are 400 respondent selected as a sample in this study based upon a simple random sampling. From the study the main finding had found is both of university do not achieve service quality standard expected by the students.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

During the 1990's 'quality' involved from a marginal position to being the foremost concern in higher education alongside funding issues. The evolution of quality has been one from vague concept to articulated procedures. Like other industrial age institutions from an industrial, mechanistic age model to an information age model (Dolence et. al., 1997; Senge, 2000). Simplify focusing energies on quality assurance programs that are predominantly concerned with process improvement confines the effort of higher education to the domain of adaptive learning.

After the General Election in 2004, the Ministry of Education was revamped so that a new Ministry for Higher Education was created. This was a clear sign that higher education in Malaysia be given special attention so that the country's aspirations to make the country a centre of excellence for education are given fresh impetus and direction. This clearly necessitated the information of a very high level committee to study the current status of higher education, identify its strengths and weaknesses, and maker recommendations that would take tertiary education to new levels of quality, achievement and recognition.
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5.6 Summary of the Study

The review in the literature and recommendation show that there are still more work to be explored and discovered should be done to find a suitable measure for service quality with regard to a Malaysian perspective.
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