



RESEARCH PAPER

Measuring Students' Satisfaction with the Quality of their Learning Services at University Level

¹Zainab Qamar* and ²Iffat Khalil

1. Research Associate, Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities, Minhaj University Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan & Ph.D. Scholar, Institute of Education and Research, University of the Punjab, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan
2. Ph.D. Scholar, Institute of Education and Research, University of the Punjab, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan

***Corresponding Author:** zainabqamar10@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted to assess the satisfaction of university students with the quality of their learning services. The objective was to explore potential variations in satisfaction levels based on gender, year of study, and their correlation with Cumulative Grade Point Average (CGPA). The research employed a cross-sectional survey design, with a random sample of 250 students selected from the IER, University of the Punjab, Lahore. A self-developed questionnaire served as the research instrument. Mean scores, ranging from 2.16 to 2.73, indicated varying degrees of student satisfaction. The findings indicated no significant gender-based differences in satisfaction scores. Additionally, there was no significant disparity in scores between middle-of-session and final-year students. However, a notable difference was observed between students with MA/M.Ed. and Ph.D. qualifications, while no significant distinction was found between those holding BA/B.Ed. and M.Phil. qualifications. The study also revealed both positive and negative correlations between different aspects of students' satisfaction and their academic performance measured by CGPA. It is recommended that university administrators focus on addressing the specific concerns identified among students with MA/M.Ed. and Ph.D. qualifications to further enhance overall satisfaction levels and consider implementing targeted interventions to support students in achieving their academic goals.

KEYWORDS Learning Services, Students' Satisfaction, University Level

Introduction

Students' satisfaction, characterized as a short-term attitude, is shaped by their educational experiences, the quality of services and facilities provided, and the subsequent evaluation of these elements. This contentment serves as a crucial indicator of student loyalty and reflects the overall effectiveness of an educational system. According to Elliot and Shin (2002), students' satisfaction is defined as their disposition towards education, influenced by a subjective evaluation of educational outcomes and experiences. This disposition is intricately linked to the perceived performance and exposure to educational services throughout their study period.

Students' satisfaction is contemplated as multifaceted procedure which is affect by various factors. The most effective component on student's satisfaction is (GPA) Grade Point Average (Iglesias, Marzo-Navarro & Torres 2005). Communicate with class mates, class rooms atmosphere, quality of feedback, student and professor relationship available learning components, facilities of library now days use digital library's and learning materials are the determinants that influenced the student contentment. Introduction to that, instructing skills, workable curriculum, university position and reputation self-determination, caring of capability, student broadening and progress student satisfaction, campus environment, institutional ability and social locution have been recognized as considerable decisive of student satisfaction in tertiary education.

The speculation theory of student's satisfaction of Hatcher Purs, Kryter and Fitzgerald (1992) delineate the expression of student's satisfaction with intellectual and scholastic presentation from speculation aspect. Following the theory, student become aware of their time, efficiency, and drill as speculation and they look forward to the results or reward from that. (Carter, Kakimoto, & Miura 2014). It calculates the collision of college acquaintance on satisfaction of the students' together with potential services provided by the staff, counseling staff and class type taking into consideration as a conciliate variable.

Douglas and Barnes (2006) progressed "service product Bundle" procedure to enquire into influences on satisfaction of the students' in tertiary education taking twelve extensions in to deliberation which were acknowledged and professional climate, student evaluation, learning evidences and classroom atmosphere, instructor and teaching facilitating materials, text books and academy fees, student games facilities, business method link with teaching staff, cultivated and commentative faculty, staff defenseless sentiment and number of students per class. The dimension was organized under four variables; physical goodness, facilitating goodness, implied services and direct services. "Service product bundle" procedure facilitates a wider range of variables and impact student satisfaction in tertiary education.

This portion commenced few representative frameworks exercised by researchers to uplift satisfaction of the students in literature of tertiary education. The structure and framework have been displayed on sequential order of years to recognize how focus has transformed from past to present.

SERVQUAL is a famous and broadly used service quality framework which has been applied to calculate the satisfaction of student around the world. SERVQUAL is a questionnaire which was construct and test in business field in order to judge the quality management and the satisfaction of the customer. There are five dimensions of customer satisfaction of a business accuracy, integrity, empathy, comprehension and affirmation. This tool was administered two times. One to calculate buyer apprehension and next to get customer intellection (Zeithaml, Berry, Parasuraman & 1996).

The college student satisfaction questionnaire (CSSQ) elaborated six dimensions of university satisfaction i.e. process and rules, working terms, reimbursement quality of study, social life and identification (Betz, Klingensmith, & Menne, & 1970). DeVore and Handal (1981) suggested a five-factor framework of satisfaction of a tertiary level student. These elements are working conditions (relating to university atmosphere), reimbursement (profit vs. cost) quality of study (linked to teacher capability), social life (participation in social activity), identification (relate to social life). A three-factor theory was suggested by Clemes with different sub factors more explains the satisfaction of a student that are quality of collaboration, effective quality, & physical atmosphere.

Kotler and Koshy (2009) clarified satisfaction as a person's affection of gladness that is the outcome from analyzing affects perceived attainment to their assumptions. It means if the attainment is similar to the expected assumptions, it leads towards the satisfaction of the buyer. In tertiary education, is what learners expect from their institutes in which they are studying. In reality everything that makes them qualified to become fruitful and victorious man in their practical life. Literature shows a great argument on expected assumptions of students generate before taking admission in any institute while their satisfaction endures during the session in his/her institute.

There is an interesting debate recommending that expectation of student in a college or institute, while his/her stay in institute or college. The link between learners learning experiences and development the satisfaction of a student has been explored by Martin, Hevel, Asel and Pascarella (2011). According to this framework, capability, teaching staff and class room's facilities usually student practical college experience and that's why considered key satisfaction and assimilation fundamentals.

Many studies have addressed the matter of quality of services and satisfaction of a student. A few service quality extensions for example plausibility, materials, sensitiveness, guarantee, and empathy as absolute contributor towards satisfaction of the students (Rasli, Danjuma, Yew & Igbal, 2011). Few other writers like Bigne, Moliner and Sanchez (2003), have announced significant link between quality of service for example empathy, assurance of services, sensitiveness, materialism and satisfaction in the tertiary education system.

Various models have been used by different scholars to assess the satisfaction of a student in the tertiary education system and scholars have criticized almost every framework. Finally, old models have been processed time by time with new ideas. It is reported that the observed service quality is a precursor to satisfaction (Estepa, Shanklin & Back, 2005).

Material and Methods

This quantitative research employed a cross-sectional survey design, with direct researcher interaction for data collection.

Population and Sampling

The study focused on public sector universities in Lahore as the target population. The specific sampling or accessible population for this research comprised all students enrolled at the Institute of Education and Research, University of the Punjab, Lahore. The total student enrollment in this institute was 2322. The sample was selected through simple random sampling, with 250 participants chosen from the entire population. The distribution of the sample included 75 students from B.A./B.Ed., 75 from M.A./M.Ed., 50 from M.Phil., and 50 from Ph.D. programs.

Research Instrument and Validation Process

Data collection for this study utilized a self-developed semantic differential scale, employing a 7-point semantic differential response format. Semantic differential scales are designed to measure the connotative meaning of objects, events, and concepts. The scale for all items featured a 7-point response ranging from 'satisfied' to 'unsatisfied.' Validation of the research instrument was undertaken by two experts, one being a PhD Scholar and the other an Assistant Professor at the Institute of Education and Research, University of the Punjab, Lahore. The instrument was refined based on the experts' feedback, ensuring all psychometric properties met their standards.

To administer the questionnaires, schedules were arranged for the target groups within the sampled sites. Cross-checks were performed to verify the accuracy of responses against ground realities.

Results and Discussion

An appropriate data analysis technique was used to analyze the data. The analysis included the use of mean, standard deviation, independent sample t-test, one-way ANOVA, and Pearson correlations to organize, summarize, and interpret the results obtained from the collected data.

Table 1
Satisfaction Level of Students'

Subscales	Min	Max	Mean	SD
Study arrangements	5	35	2.32	1.03
Organization of study	5	32	2.46	0.85
Library	5	28	2.34	0.88
Teaching and learning	5	35	2.16	0.94
Students assessment and self-assessment	5	35	2.73	1.12

In the results presented above, each of the variable is summarized. We have collected the information from 250 respondents for checking their level of satisfaction. For

the subscale study arrangements, the range of scores is from 5 to 35, with the mean 2.32 and standard deviation is 1.03. The mean value of subscale student’s assessment and self-assessment is 2.73, and value of standard deviation is 1.12, that is the greater value than all other subscales.

The mean scores of all the subscales ranges from 2.16 - 2.73 which shows that the students of Institute of Education and Research, University of the Punjab are satisfied with the quality of their learning services. The mean value (2.16) for the subscale teaching and learning is low which shows that students are comparatively less satisfied with this scale at Institute of Education and Research, University of the Punjab.

Table 2
Gender wise Difference in Students’ Satisfaction

Gender	N	Mean	SD	t	df	Sig.
Male	107	60.6	15.5			
Female	143	59.7	18.1	0.385	248	0.70

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the gender difference in the level of satisfaction of students’ in their learning services. Total number of males was 107 and number of females was 143. The value of $p > .05$ shows that there is no significant difference in scores for males ($M = 60.6, SD = 15.5$) and females ($M = 59.7, SD = 18.1; t(248) = 0.385, p = 0.70$, two tailed). The magnitude of differences in the means (mean difference = .84) was very small.

Table 3
Year of Study wise Difference in Students’ Satisfaction

Year of Study	N	Mean	SD	t	df	Sig.
Middle of Session	83	62.9	16.7			
Final year	167	58.7	17.1	1.83	247	0.067

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the year of study wise difference in the level of satisfaction of students’ in their learning services. Total number of middle of session students was 83 and number of final year students was 167. The value of $p > .05$ shows that there is no significant difference in scores for middle of session students ($M = 62.9, SD = 16.7$ and final year students ($M = 58.7, SD = 17.1; t(247) = 1.83, p = 0.067$, two tailed). The magnitude of differences in the means (mean difference = 4.21) was not small.

Table 4
Program wise Difference in Students’ Satisfaction (descriptive)

	N	Mean	SD	Std. Error
B.Ed.	75	58.9	14.4	1.66
MA/M.Ed.	75	64/3	17.7	2.04
M.Phil.	50	60.4	21.8	3.08
PhD	50	55.2	12.5	1.77
Total	250	60.1	17.0	1.07

The above table gives information about each group. Total number of B.Ed. and MA/M.Ed. students is 75, 75 respectively while the number of M.Phil. and PhD students is 50, 50 respectively. Total mean for all programs is 60.1, while SD is 17.0 with 1.07 standard error.

Table 5
Test of Homogeneity of Variance

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
1.738	3	246	.160

The significance value for Levene’s test is .160 which is greater than .05. The value $p > .05$ shows that test results are not violating the assumptions of homogeneity of variance.

Table 6
Analysis of Covariance

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	2590.923	3	863.641	3.046	.029
Within Groups	69758.453	246	283.571		
Total	72349.376	249			

The above table gives both between groups and within groups sums of squares and degree of freedom. The value of significance is .029 which means there is a significant difference among the mean scores of the variable for the groups.

Table 7
Multiple Comparisons (Post Hoc Tests)

(I) Program of Respondents	(J) Program of Respondents	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
B.Ed.	MA/M.Ed.	-5.33333	2.74989	.214
	M.Phil.	-1.50667	3.07447	.961
	PhD	3.69333	3.07447	.627
MA/M.Ed.	B.Ed.	5.33333	2.74989	.214
	M.Phil.	3.82667	3.07447	.599
	PhD	9.02667(*)	3.07447	.019
M.Phil.	B.Ed.	1.50667	3.07447	.961
	MA/M.Ed.	-3.82667	3.07447	.599
	PhD	5.20000	3.36791	.413
PhD	B.Ed.	-3.69333	3.07447	.627
	MA/M.Ed.	-9.02667(*)	3.07447	.019
	M.Phil.	-5.20000	3.36791	.413

Post Hoc tests results shows that where the difference among the groups occur. There is an asterisk value in the table which shows that the two group being compared are significantly different from one another at the $p < .05$ level. It indicates that the mean score of group 2 MA/M.Ed. (M=64.3, SD = 17.7) was significantly different from group 4 PhD. (M = 55.2, SD = 12.5). Group 1 BA/B.Ed. (M = 58.9, SD = 14.4) and group 3 M.Phil. (M = 60.48, SD = 21.8) did not differ significantly from group 2 and 4.

Table 8
Relationship between Satisfaction Level and Achievement

		CGPA	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5
CGPA	Pearson Correlation	1					
Study arrangements	Pearson Correlation	.004	1				
Organization of study	Pearson Correlation	.004	.649	1			
Library	Pearson Correlation	-.019	.500	.508	1		
Teaching and Learning	Pearson Correlation	-.005	.592	.655	.541	1	
Student assessment	Pearson Correlation	-.080	.093	.155	.146	.094	1

The relationship between students' satisfaction and their achievement (CGPA) was investigated using Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient. There was a strong positive correlation between CGPA and study arrangements, $r = .004$, $n = 250$, $p > .05$ high level of mean satisfaction. There was a strong positive correlation between CGPA and organization of study, $r = .004$, $n = 250$, $p > .05$ high level of mean satisfaction. There was a strong negative correlation between CGPA and student assessment, $r = -.080$, $n = 250$, $p >$

.05 low level of mean satisfaction. There was a strong negative correlation between CGPA and teaching and learning, $r = -.005$, $n = 250$, $p > .05$ low level of mean satisfaction. There was a strong negative correlation between CGPA and teaching and learning, $r = -.005$, $n = 250$, $p > .05$ low level of mean satisfaction.

Discussion

This study is all about to measure the students' level of satisfaction with their learning services which are studying arrangements, organization of study, library services, satisfaction with their teachers and learning and student's assessment or self-assessment at university level. In the studying arrangements the availability of teaching aids, equipment, technology and organization of the classrooms were focused. Organization of the study include teachers' feedback, various teaching methodologies and group learning. In library services, the supply of books, professional journals and library's opening hours were the main points of interest. Students assessment and self-assessment include assessment criteria and unbiased results.

The effect of some selected constructs on satisfaction of the students in Armenia is being studied by many experts. The results of that study showed that course and faculty services as key admitted the satisfaction of student. However, study found negative link of faculty learning style and graduate teaching assistant with satisfaction of students. The study also observed the effects of population variables on satisfaction of student. The University of Norwegian study greater identified social areas, halls and libraries are the physical factors that more strongly influence on satisfaction of student. It is also concluded non-academic aspect and academic aspect, and availability, status and program issues as further influencing factors of satisfaction of student (Hameed & Amjad 2011)

Satisfaction is confessed to be the most compulsory measures that determines the quality of net education and blended study. Inconsideration of which atmosphere is used, the quality of delivery of curriculum is essential and decisive. Satisfaction of student is basic demand in study process. Neither or five basis of Sloan Consortium framework of quality that could be used to higher quality of asynchronous learning network which is not occurring or existing at the same time or blended study atmosphere (Alzahrani, 2017).

The significance of student satisfaction with both tangible and intangible offerings within universities cannot be overstated, as it plays a crucial role in equipping students with the skills and abilities necessary to meet the needs of subsequent stakeholders, including the workforce and society at large. The insights gained from the aforementioned study are directly applicable to the current situation at the Institute of Education and Research (IER), University of the Punjab, Lahore. This study serves as a valuable tool for IER authorities to enhance the quality of learning services, aiming to ensure satisfaction among students and their parents.

Furthermore, exploring the impact of satisfaction on various aspects such as students' personalities, market performance, intellectual skills, and needed capabilities represents promising avenues for future investigation.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the research findings indicate no significant differences in satisfaction levels between male and female students, as well as between middle-of-session and final-year students. Noteworthy differences were observed between students with MA/M.Ed. and Ph.D. qualifications, while no significant distinctions were found between those with BA/B.Ed. and M.Phil. qualifications. The study also revealed positive correlations between certain aspects of students' satisfaction (study arrangements and organization of study) and their achievement scores (CGPA), while negative correlations were identified for other aspects (library, teaching and learning, and students' assessment).

The study emphasizes weaknesses in library and teaching and learning services, along with a lack of awareness and dissatisfaction regarding available resources like internet, labs, and other facilities, signaling potential mismanagement.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are proposed based on these findings:

- Extend the study to measure student satisfaction levels in other institutes.
- Generalize the results by expanding the scope of research to include more universities and disciplines.
- Improve teaching and learning services at IER for enhanced student satisfaction.
- Address deficiencies in library services.
- Prompt educational authorities, including the Vice Chancellor and concerned Deans, to focus on enhancing the quality and standards of higher education at IER, University of the Punjab, Lahore.

References

- Alzahrani, M. G. (2017). Student satisfaction with using online discussion forums at Saudi universities. *World Journal of Education*, 7(2), 1-10.
- Betz, E. L., Klingensmith, J. E., & Menne, J. W. (1970). The measurement and analysis of college student satisfaction. *Measurement and Evaluation in Guidance*, 3(2), 110-118.
- Bigne, E., Moliner, M. A., & Sánchez, J. (2003). Perceived quality and satisfaction in multiservice organizations: The case of Spanish public services. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 17(4), 420-442.
- Carter, P., Kakimoto, E., & Miura, K. (2014). Investigating student satisfaction in an English communication course: A pilot study.
- Devore, J. R., & Handal, P. J. (1981). The college student satisfaction questionnaire: A test-retest reliability study. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 22, 299-301.
- Douglas, J., Douglas, A. & Barnes, B., (2006). Measuring student satisfaction at a UK university. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 14(3), 251-267.
- Elliott, K., & Shin, D. (2002). Student satisfaction: An alternative approach to assessing this important concept. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 24(2), 97-109.
- Estepa, A. A. V., Shanklin, C., & Back, K. (2005). Students' perceived service quality and customer satisfaction in a Midwestern university foodservice operation. *Journal of Foodservice Management and Education*, 1, 40-61.
- Hameed, A., & Amjad, S. (2011). Students' satisfaction in higher learning institutions: A case study of COMSATS Abbottabad, Pakistan. *Iranian Journal of Management Studies*, 4(1), 63-77.
- Hatcher, L., Kryter, K., Prus, J. S., & Fitzgerald, V. (1992). Predicting college student satisfaction, commitment, and attrition from investment model constructs. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 22(16), 1273-1296.
- Kotler, P. K. L. Keller & Abraham, M. K. (2009). The determinants of students' perceived learning outcomes and satisfaction in university online education: An empirical investigation. *Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education*, 4(2), 215-235.
- Martin, G. L., Hevel, M. S., Asel, A. M., & Pascarella, E. T. (2011). New evidence on the effects of fraternity and sorority affiliation during the first year of college. *Journal of College Student Development*, 52(5), 543-559.
- Marzo-Navarro, M., Iglesias, M. & Torres, M. (2005). A new management element for universities: Satisfaction with the offered courses. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 19(6), 505-526.
- Rasli, A., Danjuma, I., Yew, L. K., & Igbal, M. J. (2011). Service quality, customer satisfaction in technology-based universities. *African Journal of Business Management*, 5(15), 6541-6553.
- Zeithaml, V. A., Berry, L. L., & Parasuraman, A. (1996). The behavioral consequences of service quality. *The Journal of Marketing*, 60, 31-46.