

Level of Student Satisfaction on Quality of Private Higher Education Service

Irsutami^{a*}, Apri^b

^a*Jurusan Manajemen Bisnis, Politeknik Negeri Batam, irsutami@polibatam.ac.id, Indonesia*

^b*Jurusan Manajemen Bisnis, Politeknik Negeri Batam, apri.cmb@gmail.com, Indonesia*

Abstract. The research examines the level of student satisfaction with quality of services of university. Quality of service is measured by the five dimensions namely Tangible, Reliability, responsiveness, Assurance and Empathy. The data used in this research is primary data therefore this research using a questioner. Distributed questioner to students as many as 80 active academic year 2014/2015. Successfully complete questionnaires and return as many as 80 questionnaires. Measuring the level of satisfaction by asking the perceptions and expectations of students against five dimensions of quality. In general, the results showed that the research feel quite satisfied with the service quality dimensions, but there are several indicators in the dimensions that should be of concern GBSB organizers to create better satisfaction.

Keywords: quality of teaching and learning, dimensions of service quality, perceptions and expectations

*Corresponding author. E-mail: irsutami@polibatam.ac.id

Introduction

The phenomenon that occurs in the world of education today is the existence of an increasingly high competition situation, so education providers do various ways to provide attraction to prospective students; for example, by offering a better quality competency curriculum, relatively affordable tuition fees, facilities that support the teaching and learning process, competent lecturers, fast service, or freedom of learning and non-solid curriculum. This effort sometimes affects the effectiveness of the learning process itself which causes the quality or quality not in accordance with expectations, so that the situation gives dissatisfaction for students. Therefore, universities should be able to formulate policies related to the dimensions of educational services to be provided.

Sabir *et al.* (2011) mentioned that student satisfaction can be measured from five dimensions of service quality such as tangible, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy, which the results of his research explain that business students in Afghanistan are satisfied with the five elements are shown with a significant level of 80% average.

According to Natajaya (2013) that the lack of authority in the university is due to the guarantee factors provided by the education organizer itself, in this case that the student is not satisfied with the curriculum that is not according to his needs, so that career guidance becomes an uncertain thing. The results of some of these studies indicate that there are still factors that cause dissatisfaction with the world of education today.

Sample is one of the universities in Batam that conducts Accounting Diploma program in its recovery. The college provides adequate facilities, a short lecture system as well as lecturers from the academy and practitioner, and currently the business school has successfully graduated 5 batches of the program. With the various resources provided should be able to give satisfaction for students that resulted in an increase in the number of students is quite significant. However, based on data that researchers get from one of the Local Daily in Batam that there is student dissatisfaction with GBSB which is shown from the student protests. Based on this it can be seen that there is still a gap between the perceptions and expectations of students when entering the university.

Literature Review

Customer Satisfaction

Satisfaction comes from the Latin, *satis* means enough, and *facere* means doing. So a satisfactory product or service is a product and service capable of delivering something that consumers are looking for at a sufficient level (Tjiptono & Chandra, 2005). This satisfaction theory bases its approach on the factors of individual needs and satisfaction that cause it to act and behave in a certain way.

According to Kotler & Keller (2007), consumer satisfaction is a feeling of happiness or disappointment that comes after comparing the performance (result) of the product with a thought to the expected performance.

Measurement of Customer Satisfaction

Some methods in measuring customer satisfaction as follows (Kotler & Keller, 2007): complaint and suggestion system; goest shopping; lost customer analysis; and customer satisfaction survey.

Service Quality

Quality of service is the level of expectation that is expected to meet consumer desires, Quality of service depends on three things, namely system, technology and human. According to Parasuraman *et al.* (1998) main factors in service quality are expected service (expectations) and perceived service (perception).

The important dimensions that determine the quality of service are (Parasuraman *et al.*, 2007):

- a. The tangible dimension (direct evidence) is the physical appearance, the equipment, and the means of communication.
- b. Reliability dimension (reliability) is the ability to perform services as promised accurately and reliably.
- c. Responsiveness dimension (responsiveness) is a willingness to help customers and provide services instantly.
- d. Assurance dimension (guarantee) is the knowledge, manners, and ability of employees to generate trust and confidence. For example employee courtesy, employee weakness, employee work, and supportive employee knowledge.
- e. Assurance dimension (guarantee) is the knowledge, manners, and ability of employees

to generate trust and confidence. For example employee courtesy, employee weakness, employee work, and supportive employee knowledge. Which, in accordance with the study of Ijaz *et al.* (2011) to business students in Pakistan concluded that the quality of service from dimensions of responsibility, reliability, assurance, responsiveness and empathy have a significant effect on student satisfaction.

Process Happening Level of Satisfaction

According Lovelock (2001), the process of consumer satisfaction levels based on customer satisfaction are as follows:

- a. If the perception is smaller than expectation ($P < E$), the consumer will give a negative assumption to the service it receives. this will cause dissatisfaction with the consumer
- b. If the perception is equal to expectation ($P = E$), the consumer will give a neutral assumption, in accordance with the service it receives. This will make consumers feel quite satisfied with the existing service
- c. If the perception is greater than expectation ($P > H$), then the consumer will give a positive assumption to the quality of service received. This will make consumers feel very satisfied.

Hypothesis

According Fitria (2012) tangible very closely related to student learning satisfaction, because the facilities are good and complete will support the spirit of student learning. In the research result of Rinala *et al.* (2013) concluded that tangible dimension is the satisfaction factor with the highest level of satisfaction value compared with other dimension, which means that the student in the college is now satisfied with the completeness of the available facilities so that the student's expectation is fulfilled. Based on that, H1 in this research is

H1: There is a difference of perception and expectation towards real quality dimension (tangible)

Sabir *et al.* (2011) concluded that the quality of service influence on student satisfaction, in research the quality of service is measured using five dimensions (tangible, reliability, responsiveness, assurance and empathy), and the result of measurement to five dimension is got significant

value with 80% five dimensions are assessed to have the same level of influence on student satisfaction, because then the other hypothesis in this study that are:

- H2: There is a difference of perception and expectation on quality dimension reliability
- H3: There is a difference of perception and expectation on the dimension of responsiveness
- H4: There is a difference of perception and expectation on the assurance dimension
- H5: There is a difference of perception and expectation on the dimension of empathy

Research Methods

The type of data used in this study is primary data collected through questionnaires with a sample of 80 respondents. The sample was obtained by using purposive sampling technique by choosing student as sample of this research.

Test validity is done by looking at the probability calculation $\text{Sig } (p) < 0.05$ or the value of $r_{\text{arithmetic}} > r_{\text{table}}$. Then it can be concluded data declared valid or valid. Test validity by using SPSS 20.0 program. From the results of validity tests that have been done, five dimensional quality obtained valid data.

Reliability test in this research shows that all service quality variables are reliable because Cronbach's Alpha > 0.6 . Data analysis method used is perception gap analysis of perception and expectation, which then conducted hypothesis test using Paired Sample t-Test method.

Results and Discussion

Characteristics of Respondents

All of the distributed questionnaires, all returned within a week with a 100% return questionnaire. After the selection of questionnaires with answers that are not complete or do not meet the criteria, it is not found an answer that is not complete or does not meet the criteria so as to generate 80 questionnaires that can be used for further data management.

a. Prodi

Based on the data obtained, the number of respondents who take the accounting program more when compared with the respondents who take

foreign language study that is as much as 56 respondents or 70%.

b. Age

Based on the results of data collection, it can be concluded that the largest respondents aged 17-25 years as many as 52 respondents with the percentage of 65% and the smallest respondents aged > 30 years as many as 7 respondents with a percentage rate of 9%, and others aged 17-25 years as many as 21 of respondents with a percentage of 26%.

c. Gender

The number of respondents who male sex numbered 33 respondents or 41% while female respondents amounted to 47 respondents or 59%

d. Job status

Based on the results of this study it can be concluded that most of the respondents are employees that is 60 respondents or 75% of the total respondents, respondents who do not work for 13 respondents with the percentage of 16% and the rest of 7 respondents with a percentage of 9%.

Validity and Reliability

Testing the validity of using the tool SPSS Windows 20.0 and obtained the results valid for all instruments. As for the test results Reliability can find at Table 1, in which case the value of alpha above 0.6 so that all questions are reliable.

Table 1
Reliability Test Results

Questions	Perception	Expectation	Result
Tangible	0.896	0.890	Reliable
Reliability	0.807	0.602	Reliable
Responsiveness	0.737	0.830	Reliable
Assurance	0.792	0.798	Reliable
Empthy	0.807	0.602	Reliable

Source: Primary data processed (2015)

Gap Analysis

Table 2
Perception and Expectations on Tangible

Indikator	Persepsi						Ekspektasi						GAP		
	SS	S	N	TS	STS	Total	Rata-rata	SS	S	N	TS	STS		Total	Rata-rata
A1	5	14	36	25	0	239	2,99	12	24	21	23	0	265	3,31	-0,33
A2	7	16	40	17	0	253	3,16	8	27	28	17	0	266	3,33	-0,16
A3	11	27	27	15	0	274	3,43	5	14	36	25	0	239	2,99	0,44
A4	6	16	33	25	0	243	3,04	7	16	40	17	0	253	3,16	-0,13
A5	12	15	29	24	0	255	3,19	11	27	27	15	0	274	3,43	-0,24
A6	5	23	34	18	0	255	3,19	6	16	33	25	0	243	3,04	0,15
A7	12	24	21	23	0	265	3,31	12	15	29	24	0	255	3,19	0,13
A8	8	27	28	17	0	266	3,33	5	23	34	18	0	255	3,19	0,14
A9	5	21	37	17	0	254	3,18	12	24	21	23	0	265	3,31	-0,14
A10	13	27	27	13	0	280	3,50	8	27	28	17	0	266	3,33	0,18
A11	5	42	17	16	0	276	3,45	5	21	37	17	0	254	3,18	0,28
A12	6	16	33	25	0	243	3,04	13	27	27	13	0	280	3,50	-0,46
A13	12	15	29	24	0	255	3,19	5	42	17	16	0	276	3,45	-0,26
A14	5	23	34	18	0	255	3,19	6	16	33	25	0	243	3,04	0,15

Table 2 shows the comparison of students' perceptions and expectations on the dimensions of tangible evidence (tangible). The tangible dimension of evidence is divided into two criteria, indicators A1 through A7 represent measurements of physical facilities while indicators A8 through A14 represent measurements of the curriculum or product. Based on Table 2, it can be seen that the difference between perception and expectation resulted in a low or insignificant difference, which means that the level of satisfaction of students to tangible evidence in the category is quite good. The negative gap in Table 2 means that the perception is smaller than expectation, it indicates that there is still dissatisfaction over certain indicators. So that based on Table 2 it can be seen that the negative gap happening indicator of comfortable lecture room, the completeness of library literature and toilet hygiene, and the curriculum occurs on the indicator available desirable majors, the course varies, the composition in the real world more than the theory, the indicator needs to be improved again.

Table 3
Perception and Expectations on Reliability

Indikator	Persepsi						Ekspektasi						GAP		
	SS	S	N	TS	STS	Total	Rata-rata	SS	S	N	TS	STS		Total	Rata-rata
B1	12	15	29	24	0	255	3,19	12	24	21	23	0	265	3,31	-0,13
B2	5	23	34	18	0	255	3,19	5	23	34	18	0	255	3,19	0,00

Comparison of student perception and expectation on the reliability dimension (reliability) is shown in Table 3. Based on the table shows that the difference between expectation and expectation value resulted in low or insignificant difference, which means the level of satisfaction of student's satisfaction on the reliability dimension (reliability) in either category. The negative gap in Table 3 is on a careful academic service indicator, thus the indicator needs to be improved again.

Table 4
Perception and Expectations on Responsiveness

Indikator	Persepsi						Ekspektasi						GAP		
	SS	S	N	TS	STS	Total	Rata-rata	SS	S	N	TS	STS		Total	Rata-rata
C1	5	23	34	18	0	255	3,19	4	7	43	26	0	229	2,86	0,33
C2	3	28	31	18	0	256	3,20	7	20	29	24	0	250	3,13	0,08
C3	2	16	42	20	0	240	3,00	6	16	33	25	0	243	3,04	-0,04
C4	3	20	41	16	0	250	3,13	12	15	29	24	0	255	3,19	-0,06
C5	1	26	32	21	0	247	3,09	5	23	34	18	0	255	3,19	-0,10

Comparison of student perception and expectation on dimension of responsiveness is shown in Table 4. Based on Table 4 shows that the total difference between perception and expectation value resulted in low or insignificant difference, which means the level

of satisfaction of student's satisfaction on the dimension of responsiveness in enough category good. Negative gap in Table 4 which still needs to be improved that is in the indicator of ease of communication with lecturers, employees quickly respond to serve the needs of students and obsession of office boys.

Table 5
Perception and Expectations on Assurance

Indikator	Persepsi						Ekspektasi						GAP		
	SS	S	N	TS	STS	Total	Rata-rata	SS	S	N	TS	STS		Total	Rata-rata
D1	12	24	21	23	0	265	3,31	6	16	33	25	0	243	3,04	0,28
D2	8	27	28	17	0	266	3,33	12	15	29	24	0	255	3,19	0,14
D3	5	21	37	17	0	254	3,18	5	23	34	18	0	255	3,19	-0,01
D4	13	27	27	13	0	280	3,50	12	24	21	23	0	265	3,31	0,19
D5	5	42	17	16	0	276	3,45	8	27	28	17	0	266	3,33	0,13

Comparison of student perception and expectation on Assurance dimension is shown in Table 5. Based on Table 5, it can be seen that the total difference between perception and expectation value resulted in the still quite low gap, which means that the satisfaction level of the students towards the Assurance dimension in sufficient category good. Negative gap in Table 5 that still need to be improved that is on employee indicator work with skilled.

Table 6
Perception and Expectations on Empathy

Indikator	Persepsi						Ekspektasi						GAP		
	SS	S	N	TS	STS	Total	Rata-rata	SS	S	N	TS	STS		Total	Rata-rata
E1	5	23	34	18	0	255	3,19	2	16	42	20	0	240	3,00	0,19
E2	3	28	31	18	0	256	3,20	6	16	33	25	0	243	3,04	0,16

Comparison of student's perception and expectation on Empathy dimension is shown in Table 6. Based on Table 6, it can be seen that the total difference between perception and expectation resulted in a low enough difference, which means that the level of satisfaction of students toward Empathy dimension in enough category good. Gap in table 6 is positive which means that the expectation value is higher than the perception, so the level of student satisfaction on all of these indicators is satisfied.

Test of Tangible Dimension Hypothesis

The result shows that the perception and expectation of tangible dimension has t_{count} equal to -0.269, while the t_{table} at 5% significance level is 2.160369 because $t_{count} < t_{table}$ (-0.269 < 2.160369) and significance level 0.792 > 0.05 then H1 not supported, so it can be concluded that there is no

significant difference between perception and expectation on tangible quality.

Test of Reliability Dimension Hypothesis

Based on the SPSS result, the average difference between perception and expectation is -0.06 and hypothesis test obtained t_{count} is -1 smaller than t_{table} equal to 12.7062, with significance level 0.5 > 0.05, hence H2 not supported, so concluded that there is no significant difference between perception and expectation to dimension reliability.

Hypothesis Test Dimension Responsiveness

Based on the results of the output shows that the average difference between perception and expectation of 0.04 and result of hypothesis test using paired simple t-test show that t_{count} 0.514 < 2.776 t_{table} with significance 0.634 > 0.05 then H3 in this research is not supported, so concluded that there is no significant difference between perception and expectation to dimension of responsiveness.

Dimensions Hypothesis Testing Assurance

The results of the output in the Paired Samples Correlations table show that the average difference between perception and expectation on Assurance dimension is 0.142, which in hypothesis testing is obtained that $t_{arithmetic}$ is 3.088 > 2.776 from t_{table} with result of significance 0.037 < 0.05 so that H4 in this research is supported, therefore it can be concluded that there is a significant difference of perception and expectation towards assurance dimension.

Empathy Dimension Hypothesis Test

The output results in the paired samples correlations show that the mean difference between perception and expectation of empathy dimension is -0.06 and in testing hypothesis show that t_{count} equal to -1 < 12,706 from t_{table} with result of significance 0.5 > 0.05 so that H5 in this research is not supported, because concluded that there is no significant difference between perception and expectation to dimension of empathy.

The hypothesis that is not supported in this research is due to the object and the characteristics of respondents in the form of age and job status that is different from previous research. The unsupported

hypothesis can be interpreted that there is no significant difference between the perception and expectation of tangible, reliability, responsiveness, and empathy dimensional qualities, then what is expected approaches the same value as perceived, in terms of if the perception equals the expectations, then the consumer will give a neutral assumption in accordance with what has been received, so this will make consumers quite satisfied with the service.

While for H4 is supported, which means that there is difference of perception and expectation to quality assurance dimension, if seen in perception and expectation gap on assurance dimension, it is found that the difference of value that is at lower expectation value compared with perception value, which in the research of Irsutami (2009) explains that if the value of perception is higher than expectation value, then the consumer will give a positive response to the value received, this will make the consumer very satisfied with the service received.

Conclusion

This study aims to determine the level of student satisfaction on the quality of service. Based on data analysis that has been done to the quality of service of five dimension (tangible, reliability, responsiveness, assurance and empathy), it is concluded that there is no significant difference between perception and expectation to service quality dimension tangible, reliability, responsiveness, and assurance. The meaning of the students feel quite satisfied with the quality of service dimension, whereas in empathy dimension, there is a significant difference between perception and expectation, the difference value is caused by higher perception compared to expectation so that the level of satisfaction to service quality assurance dimension very satisfied.

Based on the results of this study, researchers suggest several things as follows:

a. Educational providers need to improve the quality of existing services, especially on service indicators that are still not in accordance with expectations. The next research is recommended to expand the sample by using the employee population in other companies that are not similar to the population sample in this study.

b. The next researcher needs to develop statistical measurements to get more accurate results.

c. The next researcher needs to develop a wider population.

References

- Argote, L. & Ingram, P. (2000). Knowledge Transfer: A Basis for Competitive Advantage in Firms. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 82(1), 150-169.
- Crosby, P. (2001). *Developer of the Zero-Defects Concept*. The New York Times. New York.
- Deming, W. E., & Edwards, D. W. (1982). *Quality, Productivity, and Competitive Position*. (Vol. 183). Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Center for Advanced Engineering Study.
- Elmuti, D. & Kathawala, Y. (2001). An Overview of Strategic Alliances, *Management Decision*, 39(3), 205-217.
- Ernst, H., Hoyer, W.D., Krafft, M., & Krieger, K. (2011). Customer Relationship Management and Company Performance—the Mediating Role of New Product Performance. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 39(2), 290-306.
- Feigenbaum M. J. (1978). *Quantitative Universality for a Class of Non-Linear Transformations*. *J Stat Phys*.
- Fuentes, M. M. F., Montes, F. J. L., & Fernández, L. M. M. (2006). Total Quality Management, Strategic Orientation and Organizational Performance: The Case of Spanish Companies. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, 17(3), 303-323.
- Gotzamani, K. D., & Tsiotras, G. D. (2001). An Empirical Study of the ISO 9000 Standards' Contribution towards Total Quality Management. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 21(10), 1326-1342.
- Gruman, J. A., & Saks, A. M. (2011). Performance management and employee engagement. *Human Resource Management Review*, 21(2), 123-136.
- Hassan, M., Mukhtar, A., Qureshi, S. U., & Sharif, S. (2012). Impact of TQM Practices on Firm's Performance of Pakistan's Manufacturing Organizations.
- Heizer, J., & Render, B. (2004). *Principios de Administración de Operaciones*. Pearson Educación.
- Holweg, M. (2005). An investigation into Supplier Responsiveness: Empirical Evidence from the Automotive Industry. *The International Journal of Logistics Management*, 16(1), 96-119.
- Hurley, R. F., & Hult, G. T. M. (1998). Innovation, Market Orientation, and Organizational Learning: An Integration and Empirical Examination. *The Journal of Marketing*, 42-54.
- Inkpen, A. C., & Moffett, M. H. (2011). *The Global Oil & Gas Industry: Management, Strategy & Finance*. PennWell Books.
- Ishikawa, K. (1976). *Guide to Quality Control*. Asian Productivity Organization.

- Juran, J. M. (2004). *Architect of Quality: The Autobiography of Dr. Joseph M. Juran*, New York City: McGraw-Hill.
- Kanji, G. K. (1996). Can Total Quality Management Help Innovation?. *Total Quality Management*, 3-10.
- Kober, R., Subraamanniam, T., & Watson, J. (2012). The Impact of Total Quality Management Adoption on Small and Medium Enterprises' Financial Performance. *Accounting & Finance*, 52(2), 421-438.
- Krüger, V. (2001). Main Schools of TQM: The Big Five. *The TQM Magazine*, 13(3), 146-155.
- Li, S., Ragu-Nathan, B., Ragu-Nathan, T. S., & Rao, S. S. (2006). The impact of Supply Chain Management Practices on Competitive Advantage and Organizational Performance. *Omega*, 34(2), 107-124.
- Lieberson, S., & O'Connor, J. F. (1972). Leadership and Organizational Performance: A Study of Large Corporations. *American Sociological Review*, 117-130.
- Matsui, Y. (2002). An Empirical Analysis of Quality Management in Japanese Manufacturing Companies'. *Proceedings of the Seventh Asia-Pacific Decision Sciences Institute Conference, National Institute of Development Administration, Bangkok, Thailand*. McGraw-Hill.
- Medinschi, S. I., & Kamyanszky, T. M. (2010). The Need for a Model in TQM and Performance of Enterprises. *Annals of DAAAM & Proceedings* (2010).
- Milosan, I. (2011). Studies about the Total Quality Management Concept." *Acta Technical Corviniensis-Bulletin of Engineering*, 4, 43-46.
- Munizu, M. (2013). The Impact of Total Quality Management Practices towards Competitive Advantage and Organizational Performance: Case of Fishery Industry in South Sulawesi Province of Indonesia.
- Munizu, M. (2014). A Study on Relationship between TQM Practices and Competitive Advantage: Case at Basic Metal Industry in Indonesia. *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*, 8(13), 290-295.
- Overview: Indonesia's Downstream Oil and Gas Sector (2014). *Global Business Guide Indonesia: GBG*.
- Phan, A. C., Abdallah, A. B., & Matsui, Y. (2011). Quality Management Practices and Competitive Performance: Empirical Evidence from Japanese Manufacturing Companies. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 133(2), 518-529.
- Porter, M. E. (2001). *Competitive Advantage of Nations: Creating and Sustaining Superior Performance*. Simon and Schuster.
- Powell, T. C. (1995). Total Quality Management as Competitive Advantage: A Review and Empirical Study. *Strategic Management Journal*, 16(1), 15-37.
- PricewaterhouseCooper. (2014). *Oil and Gas Indonesia: Investment and Taxation Guide* (6th ed). Indonesia: PricewaterhouseCooper.
- Reed, R., Lemak, D. J., & Mero, N. P. (2000). Total Quality Management and Sustainable Competitive Advantage. *Journal of Quality Management*, 5(1), 5-26.
- Rodriguez, J. O., & Shaw, M. E. (2014). Leveraging Employee Engagement for Competitive Advantage. *Journal of Business*, 5.
- Sam, M., Fazli, M., Tahir, M. N. H., & Abu Bakar, K. (2012). Owner-Managers of SMEs in IT Sector: Leadership and Company Performance. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 3(14).
- Savolainen, T. I. (1999). Cycles of Continuous Improvement: Realizing Competitive Advantages through Quality. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 19(11), 1203-1222.
- Taguchi, G. (1986). *Introduction to Quality Engineering: Designing Quality into Products and Processes*.
- Thompson, V. A. (1965). Bureaucracy and innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 1-20.
- Tjiptono, F. & Anastasia Diana. (2003). Total Quality Management. Jogjakarta: Andi.
- Vesey, J. T. (1991). The New Competitors: They Think in Terms of 'Speed-to-Market'. *The Executive*, 5(2), 23-33.
- Yasin, G., Nawab, S., Bhatti, K. K., & Nazir, T., (2014). Relationship of Intellectual Stimulation, Innovations, and SME's Performance: Transformational Leadership a Source of Competitive Advantage in SMEs. *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research*, 19(1), 74-81.