The factor affecting student's Satisfaction level in Management Institutions

Dr. Romi Sainy
(Corresponding Author)
Associate Professor Marketing
Jaipuria Institute of Management Indore
Email : romi.sainy@jaipuria.ac.in

Mr. Khushal Solanki
PGDM Student
Jaipuria Institute of Management Indore
Email : khushal.solanki.18i@jaipuria.ac.in

ABSTRACT

Management institutions must recognize the importance of satisfied students and understand how satisfaction arises. Thus, this paper seeks to explore the factors affecting satisfaction level of students in management institutions. Study indicates that there is considerable homogenity among the gender, age, educational background and the year of study among the student towards the satisfaction by various components of the services. The student satisfaction is factored into academics, external exposure for academics and general services. Mess and Transportation services are act as a different entity.

Key words : Student satisfaction, management institutes, demographics.

Introduction

Higher education in India specifically management has witnessed a significant change in the last few years. Management education services are shifting to market oriented approach with increasing number of the private B school. According to the ministry of human resource development department of school education & literacy, there was total 451 stand-alone institutes of PGDM in 2014-15. Increasing number of institutes leads to the competition in the education industry, the management institutions are more focusing on the student satisfaction. The strategic orientation of the government to improve the level of higher education leads to expansion of Indian Institute of Management, equity, and the inclusion of excellence and quality. This has resulted in additional infrastructure and creating new IIMs, there were only 7 IIMs till 2007 and government developed 13 IIMs between 2010-16.

This increasing competition in the management institutions enforces to focus more on the student satisfaction for better quality intake and student retention. These management institutions are not only worried about the educational quality until and unless the student does not feel good about their learning experience, as a result B-schools fail to attract quality students. Due to increasing complexity, competitive nature of the business, the requirement of emerging technologies an innovation, changing needs of customers, changing life styles, knowledge outburst and population explosion calls for improvement in the quality of services in the higher education sector. Higher education as a service can be said to be fulfilling the need for learning, acquiring knowledge and providing an intangible benefit (increment in aptitude, professional expertise, skills) produced with the help of a set of tangible (infrastructure)and intangible (faculty expertise and learning).

Understanding customer satisfaction is a central objective of organizations. Satisfaction is an indicator of how customers perceive the quality of an offered product or service. Relating to the literature, the customer satisfaction of international students has become increasingly important for higher educational institutions in recent years due to globalization and the development and distribution of the internet.

Educational institutions must recognize the importance of satisfied international students and understand how satisfaction arises. Thus, this thesis seeks to explore the needs of international master students and knowledge about the indicators that are used to judge the service quality of educational units. It needs to adopt techniques that help measure the quality of services and customer satisfaction. Service quality has become a predominant focus of an advanced organization's strategic plan. Increasing attention paid to service quality has resulted in more progress and profit in organizations. However, there is also an attempt to look upon the administrative side of higher education institutions as done in the study by Kamal and Ramzi (2002), which attempts to measure student perception of registration and academic advising across different faculties and other administrative services to assure positive quality service that compliments the academic.

Objectives of the Study

1.   To identify the factor affecting the student satisfaction in the higher educational institutions.

2.   To find out the student satisfaction difference between first and second-year student about the services provided by their Institute.

3.   To find out the role of demographics in determining the student satisfaction level in the management institutes.

Review of Literature

1.   It is difficult to measure the quality of services in comparison to products as the specific standards cannot be determined due to the involvement of human behavior and characteristics of service like intangibility, heterogeneity, and inseparability. This is the key decider in terms of higher educational institutes because student are highly co-producer of the services and their role plays an important part for being the success of the colleges (Fischer & Suwunphong, 2015).

2.   (Lai & QStated that Factors to student satisfaction towards the educational activities – A case study in Vietnam. The purpose of this study is to identify the factors affecting the student's satisfaction in Ho chiMinhcity. The results of this describe five factors such as education programs, lecturer quality, service competence, and university policy and education programs. Majorly lecturer quality and education programs affect the student satisfaction.

3.   (Baron & Oldfield, 2000) Stated that Student perceptions of service quality in a UK university business and management faculty. This research was conducted on 333 undergraduate business and management students which suggest about the three dimensions which are essential: Requisite elements, acceptable elements, and functional elements. A comparison between first and final year students which implied that perceptions of service quality elements change over a time.

4.   (Giannakis & Bullivant, 2015)Stated that the massification of higher education in the UK: Aspects of service quality. This explores several aspects of service quality for higher education Institutions are required to review qualituang, 2017) y based on outputs. The increase in a number of students leads to deterioration of higher education service quality.

5. (Chopra, Chawla, & Sharma, 2014) Stated that a large number of institutions has given students more options which allow them to evaluate these institutes before taking admissions. They expect outstanding educational quality.

6. (Gruber T. , 2010) Stated that satisfaction of students with their respective university is based on relatively stable person-environment relationship. So, the satisfaction of students reflectsquitewell-perceivedquality difference of offered services and wider environment.

7. (Ondity, 2017) Stated that there is no consensus among authors to define service qualities to evaluate the quality of Institute. The evaluation should include both academic and non-academic parameters that students are exposed to when studying in the institute.

8. (Abdullah, 2006) Stated that the measurement of service quality by means of Hed PERF method resulted in more reliable estimation greater criterion and construct validity, greater explained variance and better fit the other two instruments SERVPERF and Hed PERF-SERVPERF.

9. (Farahmandian, Minavand, & Afsardost, 2013) Stated that students' satisfaction is based on the factors like advising, curriculum, teaching quality, financial assistance and tuition cost and facilities. So, there is a positive and significant correlation between these factors and satisfaction.

10. (Deshields Jr, Kara, & Kaynak, 2005) Stated that the path coefficient from faculty and class to student's partial college experience are consistent. Also, the students, who have apositive experience are more satisfied with college.

11. (Joseph & Yakhou, 2005) Stated that the current group does not satisfied with the current facilities of the Institute. This result into dissatisfaction among the students.

12. (Jenessan, J.B., & B., 2002) Stated that how services offered at the university may impact on the satisfaction level of students. Students are mostly dissatisfied with Institute building and quality of lecture theatre.

13. (Gruber, Lowrie, & Brodowsky, 2012) Stated that there is a set of multiple attributes that a professor need to possess for satisfying student-professor classroom service encounters.

14. (Rodney & John, 2009) Stated that service quality in organization can help to attract new customers and also retain the existing customers because service quality can lead to satisfaction. So, understanding of association between customer satisfaction and service quality is always at forefront.

15. (Clinton & Susan, 2004) Stated that one of the factors which can lead to satisfaction is the positive perception of service quality. Satisfied students can absorb new students by engaging in the affirmative word of mouth connection. It may lead to return previous students to take a course in their previous university.

16. (Brenda & Steve, 2000) Stated that for delivering high quality and attracting students, the higher education institute must focus on what their students want instead of agathered data base on what institute consider their students regard as important.

17. (Ahmadreza, Amran, & Huam, 2011) Stated that the satisfaction can be shown when asked this question: What are the consequences of students who are dissatisfied? The institutes must aware that students who are dissatisfied tend to withdraw or transfer. Because of lack of options, these dissatisfied students are being forced to stay there but they may never have positive word of mouth.

18.   (Adee, 1997) Stated that other dimension of student perceived service quality such as library facilities, level of curriculum, leisure facilities, computing facilities, availability of academic personnel and quality of teaching.

19.   Based on the studies of (Geoffrey & Margaret, 1996) there are two types of parameters for student perceived quality levels which are academic and non-academic.

20.   (Abu hasan, Ilais, Rahman, & Razak, 2008) Stated that Service Quality and Student Satisfaction: A Case Study at Private Higher Education Institutions. This study talks about the relationship between service quality dimensions and overall service quality that is tangibility, responsiveness, reliability, assurance and empathy and student's satisfaction.

21.   (Walfried M., Chris, & Robert D., 2000) Stated that organizations have to focus on perceived quality determinants for the quality which is antecedent to customer satisfaction.

After going through above literature it was concluded that customer satisfaction is imperative for any service provider and Education institutes are no different than a service provider, therefore we found a research gap and decided to identify the factors which results in student satisfaction at management institutes.

Methodology

As the study involved students from various MBA/PGDM in India, the results cannot be generalized to higher education student population as a whole. The universe of the study is the student'svarious management institute pursuing their higher education degrees (MBA/PGDM).

We have done explorative research for review of literature by analyzing various research papers related to customer satisfaction in higher education studies. We included 17 questions to study the student satisfaction and to conclude the study, we applied factor analysis to reduce the dimension and reduce the complexity. We applied T test on the factors that are determined by the factor analysis. Self-administered questionnaires using Likert scales were distributed in the form of a survey. We approached around 800 students and collected response from 180 students from both first and second year students selected in terms of willingness to participate in the survey.

Analysis and Findings

Descriptive analysis was done by computing the mean, standard deviation, and percentages of the variables of the study. The differences between the variables of perceptions were found out with the help of t-test. Factor analysis was used to reduce and summarize data by taking a smaller set of factors or components.

A reliabilty test was conducted on the self designed quessionnaire. The Cronbach's alpha was greater than 0.88 (table 1) thus the item chosen for anlalysis are highly reliable.

Table 1: Reliability test

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.884	.890	16

Table 2a: Factor Analysis

Communalities

	Initial	Extraction
Infrastructure	1.000	.634
Academic_Engagement	1.000	.668
Assignment	1.000	.554
Guest_Lecture	1.000	.472
Industry_Visit	1.000	.460
Classroom_Delivery	1.000	.653
Classroom_Engagement	1.000	.505
Digital_Learning	1.000	.602
Mentorship	1.000	.601
Placement_Training	1.000	.725
Transportation	1.000	.300
Mess	1.000	.485
Hostel	1.000	.512
Sports	1.000	.448
WIFI	1.000	.512
Canteen	1.000	.419

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

As per information given in table 2a, extraction level below 0.5 should be excluded from the analysis,'So, we have excluded canteen, transportation, guest lecture, industry visit, sports and café from the further determination of the factors.

After the exclusion of these items, KMO-Barlett test was performed again on the remaining items. KMO measure of sampling adequacy is 0.885 which is more than 0.80 so, sample size is sufficient to perform the factor analysis. According to Bartlett's test, P value is 0.000 that give the strong proof of having convariance among the items. So, factor analysis is applicable on this data.

Table 2b: KMO and Bartletts Test

KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.885
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	1191.552
	df	55
	Sig.	.000

Table 3: Rotated Component Matrix

	Component	
	1	2
Training for Placement	**.839**	.116
Mentorship	**.787**	-.008
Academic Engagement	**.786**	.233
Digital Learning	**.785**	.041
Classroom Delivery	**.779**	.310
Assignment	**.746**	.005
Classroom Engagement	**.739**	.070
Infrastructure	**.736**	.296
Hostel	.140	**.799**
Mess	.136	**.758**
WIFI	.025	**.719**

Table three extracted total two factors as given below:

Factor 1 Academics & Learning Interface with total factor load of 6.2 including items on placement training, mentorship, academic engagement, digital learning, classroom delibvery, assignment, classroom engagement, infrastructure. Factor1 is included all the services provided by PGDM institute related to academics and placements only.

Factor 2 Residential Facility with a factor load of 2.28 including items on hostel, mess, wifi. The factor is included external exposure provided by MBA/PGDM institutes.

To see the impact of demographic variables we compared the means, we have applied indepdent sample T test on two factors.

Significant level for each factor is above 0.05 so, null hypothesis cannot be rejected. We can conclude that there is no significant difference between male and female of their satisfaction level in higher educational studies. We can conclude that there is no significant difference among the services provided to both male and female as well as male and female's expectations are at same level. Further concluding that gender does not play a significant role in determining satisfaction level at a Management institute.

We divided sample into two different *education background* based upon their under graduation studies, one is technical students such as engineers, and B. Sc. Students, second is non technical students such as commerce and arts students.

Significant level for each factor is above 0.05 so, null hupothesis cannot be rejected. We therefore conclude that there is no significant diffrence between varied education background on their satisfaction.

We divided student in two group. One was *first group contains first year students and second group* constitutted of second year studnets. Significant level for Academics & Learning Interface is below 0.05 i.e. 0.001 so, there is a significat difference of satisfaction between 1st year and 2nd year students.

Table 4a: Independent T test

Independent Samples Test				
		t-test for Equality of Means		
		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Academics & Learning Interface	Equal variances assumed	3.145	221	0.002
	Equal variances not assumed	3.253	209.293	0.001
Residential Facility	Equal variances assumed	-0.738	221	0.461
	Equal variances not assumed	-0.743	219.005	0.458

To identify the difference level, we analyzed the means for both the group.

Table 4b: Satisfaction level of first vs second year students

Group Statistics

	Yearofstudy	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Academicsand_Learning_Interface	1st_Year	102	32.2157	4.72329	.46768
	2nd_Year	121	29.6033	7.18039	.65276
Residential_Facility	1st_Year	102	8.8824	2.57287	.25475
	2nd_Year	121	9.1488	2.77687	.25244

Comparatively 1st year students are more satisfied in terms of Academics and Learning Interface compared to 2nd year students this could because in second year the student focus tend to shift more towards placements.

Conclusion and Future Research:

The student satisfaction level is factored into academics, external exposure for academics and general services. Mess and Transportation services were not the prime items which resulted in satisfaction level.

Study indicates that there is considerable homogenity among the gender, age, educational background and the year of study among the student towards the overall satisfaction level. There is a significant difference of academics parameter between 1st year and 2nd year student comparitevely. The findings of the results can be extended to more higher education institutes to develop a broad framework and model creation.

References

Abdullah, F. (2006). Measuring Service Quality in Higher Education HEDPERF versus SERVPERF. *Emerald Marketing Intelligence & Planning, 24*, 31-47.

Abu hasan, H. F., Ilais, A., Rahman, R. A., & Razak, M. Z. (2008). Service Quality and Student Satisfaction: A Case Study at Private Higher Education Institutions. *1*(3).

Adee, A. (1997). Linking Student Satisfaction and Service Quality Perceptions: The Case of University Education. *European Journal of Marketing, 31*(7), 528-540.

Ahmadreza, S., Amran, R., & Huam, H.-T. (2011). SERVQUAL in Malaysian Universities: Pperspectives of International Students. *Business Process Management Journal, 17*(1), 67-81.

Baron, S., & Oldfield, B. M. (2000). Student perceptions of service quality in a UK university business and management faculty. *8*(2), pp. 85-95.

Brenda, O., & Steve, B. (2000). Student Perceptions of Service Quality in a UK University Business and Management School. *Quality Assurance in education, 8*(2), 85-95.

Chopra, R., Chawla, M., & Sharma, T. (2014, April-May). Service Quality in Higher Education: A comparative Study Of Management and Education Institutions. *NMIMS Management Review*, 59-72.

Clinton, S., & Susan, S. (2004). Student Satisfaction and Retention: A Conceptual Model. *Journal of Marketing, 14*(1), 79-91.

Deshields Jr, O., Kara, A., & Kaynak, E. (2005). Determinants of Business Student Satisfaction and Retention in Higher Education: Applying Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory. *International Journal of Educational Management, 19*(2), 128-139.

Farahmandian, S., Minavand, H., & Afsardost, M. (2013). Perceived service quality and student satisfaction in higher Education. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management, 12*(4), 65-74.

Fischer, A.-C., & Suwunphong, P. (2015). *Customer Satisfaction in the Higher Education Industry.* Lund University- School of Economics and Management.

Geoffrey, S., & Margaret, M. (1996). Measuring Service Quality in a Tertiary Institution. *Journal of Educational Administartion, 34*(1), 72-82.

Giannakis, M., & Bullivant, N. (2015). he massification of higher education in the UK: Aspects of service quality. *40*(5), 630-648.

Gruber, T. (2010). Examining Students Satisfaction With Higher Education Services using a new measurement tool. *Emerald Group Publishing Limited*, 1-35.

Gruber, T., Lowrie, A., & Brodowsky, G. (2012, July 6). Investigating the Influence of Professor Characteristics on Student Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction. Manchester, Manchester, UK. doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/0273475312450385

Jenessan, W., J.B., G., & B., S. (2002). Student Satisfaction Towards an Empirical Deconstruction of Concept. *Quality in Higher Education, 8*(2), 183-195.

Joseph, M., & Yakhou, M. (2005). An Educational Institution's Quest For Service Quality: Customers' Perspective. *Quality Assurance in Education, 13*(1), 66-82.

lai, C. S., & Quang, V. n. (2017, july). FACTORS TO STUDENT SATISFACTION TOWARDS THE EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES -- A CASE STUDY IN VIETNAM. *Vol.10*(1), pp. p 27-37.

Ondity, E. O. (2017, July). Service Quality and Student Satisfaction in Higher Education Institutions: A Review of Literature. *Intternational Journal of Scientific and Research Publication, 7*(7), 328-335.

Rodney, A., & John, H. (2009). An Empirical Model of International Student Satisfaction. *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Research, 21*(4), 555-569.

Walfried M., L., Chris, M., & Robert D., W. (2000). Service Quality Perspectives and Satisfaction in Private Banking. *Journal of Services Marketing, 14*(3), 244-271.

Walfried, L., Chris, M., & Robert D., W. (2000). Service Quality Perspectives and Satisfaction in Private Banking. *Journal of Services Marketing, 14*(3), 244-271.