

Measuring the Satisfaction Level of Students in University Education

Dr.Osman Sahin¹

Business and Management, Faculty of Administrative Sciences and Economics, Tishk

International University

Erbil, Kurdistan in Iraq

osman.sahin@tishk.edu.iq

Abstract

This is a study to determine and satisfy student satisfaction in University. The focus groups are primarily used to identify factors (standards) that change the quality of service and to increase perception of the university education. The questionnaire created to change student satisfaction and determine what was important specially to check the level of satisfaction in university education. The analysis of different attempts to consider a set of criteria in the same way. Therefore, it is possible to agree on using the set to measure student satisfaction. This study focuses on subsequent research and the development of procedures for evaluating student satisfaction between tertiary institutions, their dynamic development, global competition, and tertiary institutions of higher education.

Keywords: Education, Satisfaction level, University Education, Development

Introduction

Educational sector is an important sector which plays a significant role in the development of human capital and ultimately in the economic development of the country. Educational organization is one of the most important institutional organizations of a nation. Specifically, higher education plays an important role of socio-economic development of a country (Jover & Ones, 2009).

Education sector has become an industry in many countries of the world especially in UK, Malaysia, U.A.E etc., and this factor is also influencing in other parts of the world especially the countries with tuition based systems (DeShields et al., 2005). Like the manufacturing and service organizations, concept of quality has also evolved among the educational institution and it helps to develop a competitive environment which ultimately raises the importance of measuring quality of services among the business schools (Gbadamosi et al., 2008).

Today the organizations are facing challenges from their customers and these challenges have created a cutthroat business environment which ultimately creates challenges for the managers to find the best and ways to meet the need and wants of their stakeholders. It has also set challenges for the universities to develop a human capital with the latest management knowledge and skills and enables students to become a change agent for the industry. Now the universities are making efforts to cope with the challenges of varied learning styles, cultural diversity, and changing student demands with more choices of study which includes; destinations, educational programs and study environment than before (Arambewela & Hall, 2009).

Cheng and Tam (1997) found that there are seven models for quality education, namely 1) satisfaction, 2) goal, 3) absence of problems, 4) resource-input, 5) organizational learning, 6) legitimacy, and 7) process. Student satisfaction has become a major challenge for the universities and it has been recognized that student satisfaction is the major source of competitive advantage and this satisfaction also leads towards student retention, attraction for new students and positive word of mouth communication, as well (Arambewela & Hall 2009). Student satisfaction can be gained by delivering

superior customer values and it had become essential in creating a sustainable advantage in this competitive international education market (Kotler & Fox, 1995). Student satisfaction is the subjective perceptions, on students' part, of how well a learning environment supports academic success. Strong student satisfaction implies that appropriately challenging instructional methods are serving to trigger students' thinking and learning. Important elements in student satisfaction are likely to concern the role of the instructor and of the students; these elements may be central to student learning. The present study explored some of these elements, in an effort to begin identifying the ones most helpful for ensuring students' academic success (Winberg and Hedman, 2008). The study hypothesized that several distinct student satisfaction indicators would be positively related to student learning. It employed a survey, administered in spring 2009, through which enrolled students rated how strongly they agreed with statements describing environmental features of a particular redesigned course at a large research university. Education institutions consider student satisfaction to be one of the major elements in determining the quality of open programs in today's markets (Kuo, Walker, Belland, & Schroder, 2013).

Customer satisfaction has been positioned as a central issue in the marketing literature (Churchill and Suprenant, 1982). Academics and practitioners have studied and developed strategies to maintain strong relationships with customers, as satisfied customers usually results in customer retention and customer loyalty (Zeithaml, Parasuraman, and Berry, 1996). One strategy is to offer high quality products and this strategy has been commonly deemed to be a competitive advantage that leads to success for many organizations (Sureshchander, Chandrasekharan, and Anantharaman, 2002). Crosby (1991) maintains that providing a high level of quality lowers costs and retains satisfied customers, and ultimately generates higher profit margins for an organization. The satisfaction concept is another explanation to analyze international student perspective and requirement toward Karlstad University. This concept will be the one important implement to find out the solution and problem which come from international student's perspective toward education institution. This can be used to update institution for future development to provide quality of people knowledge skill to serve society. Satisfaction is to measure customer whether product or service meets with their expectations. Expectation usually comes from many

features of product or service activities. Satisfaction measures about psychological of people toward experiences in product and service. Satisfaction measures emotion and it is the outcome of customer opinions toward product or service experience. Satisfaction and attitude concept are linked together. The satisfaction concerns to the human "post experience" which has been built by product or service quality or value (Smith 2007). As previous article has mentioned that, satisfaction concept is to measure that product or service meets expectation or not. It can be described that after student has an experience with education institution for a while, then students can perceive and recognize and they could have their opinion toward education service. Education service in the opinion of researcher is considered such as teaching, time learning schedule, education system, etc.

Student satisfaction refers to the attraction, pride, or positive feeling that the students develop toward the program or institution (Danielson, 1998; Hatcher, et al., 1992). Strike (1984) indicated that the level of students' positive feeling or satisfaction is associated with students' being able to find adequate resources to meet their academic and social interests. The students' ability to project and implement their self-concepts as a students or viewing themselves as part of the institution is also

related to their positive feeling of satisfaction (Sedlacek, 1987). The students' positive feeling and satisfaction is also contingent to the students' academic and social experiences obtained at the particular. The academic and social experiences of students are the vehicles that drive students into the life of the institution. In his Interaction theory into argues that student persistence can be predicted by their degree of integration. He refers to two kinds of integration; academic and social integration. Academic integration refers to how students perform academically (grades) and social integration is how the students interact with faculty.

Literature Review

Student satisfaction is being shaped continually by various outcomes and their experiences in campus life. The studies of the factors influencing satisfaction of higher education students can provide relevant information about how students are thinking and what the most important areas to consider are, when it comes to student satisfaction (Pop, Bacila, Moisescu, & Tirca, 2008). Sinclaire (2011) showed that there are three reasons for interest in student satisfaction: 1) the most important key to continuing learning, 2) positively related to retention and a

decision to take one or more additional courses, and 3) represent a public relations asset for higher education institutions. Student satisfaction is considered an important factor in measuring the quality of learning approach and a key factor in the success of learning programs. Student satisfaction is an important part of the effort to market higher education successfully (Hermans, Haytko, & Mott-Stenerson, 2009).

Student satisfaction in higher education approaches may be a tool for building a bridge between more traditional and academic views on how to improve higher education institutions, and more market-orientated perspectives (Wiers-Jenssen, Stensaker, & Groggaard, 2002). The studies of Arambewela and Hall (2009) and Usman (2010) showed that due to an increasingly competitive, dynamic, and challenged educational environment, universities are becoming more aware of the importance of student satisfaction. Research of student satisfaction in higher education, therefore, not only enables universities to re-engineer their organizations to adapt to student needs, but also allows them to develop a system for continuously monitoring how effectively they meet or exceed student needs (O'Neill, 2003). Students' needs and expectations allow educational institutions to attract,

retain quality students, and improve the quality of their programs (Elliott & Shin, 2002). Sandhu and Kapoor (2014) recognized that student satisfaction is important and needs to be continuously assessed to assure quality of education experiences for students. Student satisfaction is important because it influences the student's level of motivation (Chute, Thompson, & Hancock, 1999), which is an important psychological factor in student success (American Psychological Association, 1997).

Student satisfaction is a complex concept consisting of several dimensions (Marzo-Navarro, Iglesias, & Torres, 2005; Richardson, 2005). Student satisfaction in higher education is influenced by a number of variables. Several past studies show that there were related factors influencing student satisfaction namely the quality of courses (Arif, Ilyas, & Hameed, 2013; Wilkins & Balakrishnan, 2013), effectiveness of instructional process (Elliot & Healy, 2001; Helgesen & Nasset, 2007), course organization (Navarro, Iglesias, & Torres, 2005), interaction with students (O'Driscoll, 2012), the focus on student's needs (Elliot & Healy, 2001) and campus climate (Sojkin, Bartkowiak, & Skuza, 2012). According to DiBiase (2004) and Garcia-Aracil (2009), student satisfaction is a complex yet poorly articulated notion. Smith (2007) believed

that, in this type, sometimes dissatisfaction is considered of being as a disappointment at the same time satisfaction is related to the positive attitude such as "it was a good choice" (Smith 2007). As mention from literature review, after "post experience" student perspective can be both positive and negative attitudes. Since Cardozo (1965) proposed that the concept of customer satisfaction was an important marketing activity outcome, numerous researchers have attempted to develop a consensus definition of the construct (Giese and Cote, 2000). Customer satisfaction was traditionally conceptualized as a cognitive construct (Westbrook, 1987), but others have argued that customer satisfaction was involved in customers' affective responses (Yi, 1990). Hunt (1977) described customer satisfaction as stepping away from an experience and evaluating it. Oliver (1981) suggested that customer satisfaction was an evaluation of the surprise inherent in a product acquisition and/or consumption experience.

Interest in factors affecting satisfaction has increased in both academic and non-academic settings. This is mainly due to the fact that satisfaction (motivation) affects both individual and organizational performance (Cranny et al., 1992; Decenzo & Robbins, 2010). In the workplace, scholars have defined

satisfaction in a number of ways. The central theme across studies involves a positive feeling of one's job resulting from an evaluation of its characteristics. Satisfaction in work environment has been studied both as an independent and a dependent variable. As an independent variable, satisfaction explains outcomes such as performance, absenteeism, and turnover (e.g., Cranny et al., 1992; Ramayah&Nasurdin, 2006). As a dependent variable, satisfaction is explained by factors such as salary, benefits, and recognition (Ramayah&Nasurdin, 2006; Tessema, Ready and Embaye, 2011). In academic settings, satisfaction has been defined as the extent to which students are satisfied with a number of college-related issues such as advising, quality of instruction, course availability, and class size. According to Elliott and Healy (2001), student satisfaction is a short-term attitude based on an evaluation of their experience with the education service supplied. Just like in the workplace, satisfaction in academic settings is also treated as both an independent and dependent variable. For instance, satisfaction, as an independent variable, explains college outcomes such as GPA, retention rates, and graduation rates. As a dependent variable, satisfaction is explained by a number of academic-related factors such as advising, quality of

instruction, and class size. Several researchers have identified and empirically tested factors affecting or that are correlated with students' satisfaction. Since students' satisfaction has been conceptualized in a variety of ways by researchers, several factors have been examined that affect college students' satisfaction.

Organizations need to retain existing customers while targeting non-customers. Measuring customer satisfaction provides an indication of how successful the organization is at providing products and/or services to the marketplace. An organization should give a special attention to its service quality which can help its organization to differentiate itself from other organization, and results to long term competitive advantage. Delighting the customer" is the core message of the total quality approach. A university is an institution of higher education and of research, which grants academic degrees at all levels (bachelor, master and doctor) in a variety of subjects. Students are the "customers" of a university". In the UK, Higher Education (HE) students were considered to be the "primary customers" of a University, even before they were liable for the payment of "upfront" tuition fees. But Waugh suggested that viewing students as customers created some tensions in

universities seem to be too aligned with business. The student could be treated like a customer or a client within the college and in that case, the college serve the students on a better priority to fulfill their expectations and needs. “Unlike other service industries, which hold satisfaction as a goal in and of itself, colleges and universities typically perceive satisfaction as means to end. Higher education tends to care about student satisfaction because of its potential impact on student motivation, retention, recruitment efforts, and fundraising”. Student satisfaction is a short-term attitude, derived from the evaluation of the received education service (Elliot and Healy, 2001). Student satisfaction plays a crucial role for the success of a university. As argued by Berry , service is one of the important factors enhancing value, and can positively influence a college’s success.

The student perception about satisfaction can act as an essential tool to enhance the universities service quality. According to Kottler (2000) “satisfaction is a person’s feelings of pleasure or disappointment resulting from comparing a product perceived performance or outcome in relation to his or her expectations”. Early concept of satisfaction research has typically defined satisfaction as a post choice evaluation judgment concerning a specific purchase decision discussed and

found that in the college, student satisfaction was driven by evaluating the quality of coursework and other curriculum activities and other factors related to the university. Lecturers should treat students with sensitivity and sympathy, and assistance should be provided when necessary. Even simple listening is appreciated. In order to achieve satisfaction, Universities should measure it because cannot manage something that you cannot measure it. There are two principal interpretations of satisfaction within the literature, satisfaction as a process and satisfaction as an outcome. Solomon recognizes customer satisfaction as the overall attitude of the individual toward the bought product. Also, customer satisfaction is defined as a customer’s overall evaluation of the performance of an offering to date.

Research Problem and Objectives

- 1)What are the differences in the satisfaction with theonline collaborative learning between the Chinese and Flemish students?
- 2) What are the differences in studentlearning performance between Chinese and Flemish groups?
- 3) Are there cultural differences in the level of studentknowledge construction

through social interaction in online discussions?

The purpose of this research is to gain an empirical understanding of students' overall satisfaction in a university in New Zealand's higher education sector. In particular, this research will identify the dimensions of service quality as perceived by university students. The relationship between students' overall satisfaction with influential factors such as tuition fees (prices), and university's image is also examined.

In addition, students' overall satisfaction will be compared using demographic factors such as gender, age, and ethnicity. Finally, the impact of students' overall satisfaction on favorable future behavioral intentions will be analyzed.

This research uses a hierarchical model structure proposed by Brady and Cronin (2001) as a framework. The research has five main objectives:

- (1) To identify the service quality dimensions as perceived by students in the New Zealand higher education sector.
- (2) To determine the effects of the dimensions of perceived service quality and other influential factors on students' overall satisfaction.
- (3) To examine the relationship of students' overall satisfaction with favorable future behavioral intentions.

(4) To identify the least and most important service quality dimensions as perceived by students in higher education in New Zealand.

(5) To examine the effects of demographic factors on students' satisfaction and related constructs.

Research Methodology

A large-scale study designed to measure student satisfaction levels in university campuses. The questionnaire consists of 60 questions from previous surveys, divided into product groups, including training and education facilities, site communication, simple tools, clear service, and clear service. After all, students generally asked for a satisfactory grade, and the university can recommend six students. The question of satisfaction precedes the number of questions that allow the classification of the whole population. Includes questions about gender, gender, age, research status, research methods, and country of origin. Participation in the studies is voluntary and voluntary. The length and difficulty of the questionnaire upset the balance between asking for information and keeping students. The questionnaire is surrounded by 100 volunteer graduates. The time taken to complete the study was recorded and then all questions were asked about the accuracy and reliability of each question. They were also asked if anything was missing from the question. Based on the feedback received, some questions have changed and the questionnaire has changed slightly. The question lasted an average of 12 minutes.

In order to have a larger and more representative sample size, the number of core modules should range from five business concepts and a sense of governance to three higher levels. These methods contacted teachers who asked for permission to speak for 15 minutes to find out the reason for the study and to agree

with students who were studying in the classroom. This "personal touch" usually gives positive feedback. The survey was conducted within two weeks and only one person refused to complete the questionnaire.

Data Analysis

Rotated Component Matrix^a						
	Component					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
The lecturer’s knowledge of their subject.	-.104	-.229	-.338	-.235	.155	-.354
The willing of my teachers to give me academic help outside class.	.039	-.052	-.671	-.078	.045	-.159
The quality of teaching I have received from faculty.	.064	-.357	-.137	.303	-.030	.016
The class size helps student better understand in the university	.038	-.111	.583	-.088	.139	.167
The overall academic experience at university	-.034	-.025	.416	-.101	.292	-.257
University is preparing you for future academic studies?	.279	.038	-.120	.291	.087	-.572
My course at university have helped me further develop my critical thinking skills	.287	.011	-.347	-.074	-.177	.101
University academic work will prepare me to get a good job after	.173	.010	-.089	-.173	-.030	.675
You to recommend this university to others?	.135	.117	.583	.012	-.020	-.060
How healthy is the food served at this university?	.020	.222	.396	.413	.202	-.130

When I have a problem, Instructor shows a sincere interest in solving it	.149	.494	.143	.090	-.060	-.077
How well diverse groups interact on campus.	.028	.315	-.062	-.567	.190	.120
The library collection for my program of study.	.114	.079	-.442	-.192	.247	.164
How easy is it to register for courses at this university?	.263	.024	-.172	.303	.317	-.161
Information provided about job and career opportunities by career service	.107	.223	.183	.626	.046	.011
Administrative staff shows positive work attitude towards students	.516	.059	.137	.297	-.176	-.307
Extra campus facilities (e.g., banks, cafes, childcare, parking, bookshop, etc.).	.514	.079	.133	-.155	.093	-.055
The number of students enrollment in a class	.274	-.052	.061	-.217	.612	-.092
Teaching assignments are not fully explained for	-.125	.183	.125	.057	.408	-.289
I have achieved the objectives that I set for my learning in the university	-.365	.333	-.065	.530	.106	.025
Teaching groups are small enough for my learning.	.144	.548	-.197	.202	-.140	.147
My interest in studying foreign language and culture has.	.682	.217	-.125	-.026	-.121	.057
The relationship among students in out-of-class time.	.599	-.403	.191	.154	.274	.191

How easy is it to obtain the resources you need from the university library system?	-.065	-.016	.057	.070	.720	.103
Administrative staff shows positive work attitude towards students	-.315	.696	.031	.050	.197	-.027
Availability of computers & IT	.316	.610	-.003	-.063	.176	-.094
How safe do you feel on campus?	.399	.011	-.122	.144	.176	.132
How easy is it to obtain the resources you need from the university library system	-.032	-.102	.073	.377	.215	.617
How healthy is the food served at this university?	.050	.291	-.057	.103	.379	.219
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.						
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.						
a. Rotation converged in 12 iterations.						

Conclusion and Recommendation

Based on the responses of all the students, Table shows the most important (i.e., the list of estimates starting with the highest value) and the most important (i.e., the list of estimates starting with low quality). As shown in Table II, the main activities of the university are areas related to teaching and learning. In line with the recommendations of the White Paper that all new university professors admitted in 2006 should be qualified teachers according to professional standards, the most important part of the event is that respondents also believe that the quality of teaching It recognizes that the quality of teaching can vary. Students also understand the importance of language and training, which is not surprising because it

is still a core process at many universities and is closely linked to staff training and educational experience.

Teaching and learning materials, especially supplementary materials and the use of tablets to improve students' knowledge, are also highly appreciated. This is usually due to special services and products offered to students. In terms of materials, students explored the value of information technology tools, which show the importance of the internet for research and software for the production of high-tech products. high-quality documents designed for lectures and discussions. Access to information technology resources is closely linked to the higher education institution, and books and magazines are published on paper or

electronically. The table shows the functional areas that students consider to be the most important. They are particularly concerned with educational and training institutions and other services such as the planning and establishment of language and teaching aids, restaurant services and vending machines. Ongoing assessment was conducted in the various categories of respondents to see if they had the same or different sequence in terms of the importance and insignificant characteristics of university activities.

The table shows the status of full-time university students according to the type of education. Considering that 80 percent of the choices are full-time students, the level of service points is very similar to the general type, the only difference being that "Additional Learning Materials "replaces" Employee Availability ". It should be noted that many of the issues are related to the service and there are many interesting factors that change the value of communication from the point of view of part-time students. The categories of student services are listed in Table decimal, which could indicate their access to IT equipment at work and / or at home. this makes it less important than other aspects of the process, as opposed to the spreadsheet (a real learning environment that allows teachers to make learning materials and other resources available online) it rises from ten to seventeen and shows its importance of teaching. as a tool for out-of-university students. daily with those who may leave the classroom for work or family responsibilities. Interestingly, "professional help" is considered useless and demonstrates their ability to help in the workplace or in everyday media.

References

1. American Psychological Association. (1997). *Learner-centered psychological principles: A framework for school redesign and reform*. Washington, DC.
2. Arambewela and John Hall (2009). An empirical model of international student satisfaction, *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, 21(4), 555-569.
3. Arif, S., Ilyas, M., & Hameed, A. (2013). Student satisfaction and impact of leadership in private universities. *The TQM Journal*, 25(4), 399-416.
4. Brady, M. K., & Cronin Jr, J. J. (2001). Some new thoughts on conceptualizing perceived service quality: a hierarchical approach. *Journal of marketing*, 65(3), 34-49.
5. Cardozo, R. N. (1965). An experimental study of customer effort, expectation, and satisfaction. *Journal of marketing research*, 2(3), 244-249.
6. Cheng, Y. C., & Tam, W. M. (1997). Multi-models of quality in education. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 5(1), 22-31.
7. Churchill, O. A., Jr., & Surprenant, C. (1982). An investigation into the determinants of customer satisfaction. *JMR, Journal of Marketing Research*, 19(4), 491-504.
8. Chute, A. G., Thompson, M. M., & Hancock, B. W. (1999). *The McGraw-Hill handbook of distance learning*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
9. Cranny, C. J., Smith, P. C., & Stone, E. F. (Eds.). (1992). *Job satisfaction: How people feel about*

- their jobs and how it affects their performance. New York: Lexington Books.
10. Crosby, L. (1991). Expanding the role of CSM in total quality. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 2(2), 5-19.
 11. Smith, A. M. (2007). Measuring service quality: Is SERVQUAL now redundant? *Journal of Marketing Management*, 11, 257-276.
 12. Danielson, C. (1998). Is satisfying college students the same as decreasing their dissatisfaction? (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 422812).
 13. DeCenzo, D. A., & Robbins, S. P. (2010). *Fundamentals of human resource management* (10th ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
 14. DeShields, 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), 128-39.
 15. DiBiase, D. (2004). The impact of increasing enrolment on faculty workload and student satisfaction over time. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, 8(2), 45-60.
 16. Elliott, K. M., & Healy, M. A. (2001). Key factors influencing student's satisfaction related to recruitment and retention. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, 10(4), 1-12.
 17. Elliott, K. M., & Shin, D. (2002). Student satisfaction: An alternative approach to assessing this important concept. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 24(2), 197-209.
 18. Garcia-Aracil, A. (2009). European graduates' level of satisfaction with higher education. *Higher Education*, 57, 1-21.
 19. Gbadamosi, Gbolahan & De Jager, Johan. (2008). Measuring Service Quality in South Africa Higher Education: Developing a Multidimensional Scale. *Global Business and Technology Education Institutes of Punjab. Journal of Management Research*, 2(2).
 20. Giese, J. L., & Cote, J. A. (2000). Defining consumer satisfaction. *Academy of Marketing Science Review*, 2000, 1.
 21. 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.
 22. Helgesen, O., & Nettet, E. (2007). What accounts for students' loyalty? Some field study evidence. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 21(2), 126-143.
 23. Hermans, C. H., Haytko, D. L., & Mott-Stenerson, B. (2009). Student satisfaction in Hunt, H. K. (1977). *CS/D- Overview and future research directions*. In H. K. Hunt (Eds.) *Conceptualisations and measurement of consumer*

- satisfaction* (455-488) Cambridge, MA:Marketing Science Institute.
24. Jover, J. N., & Ones, I. P. (2009). Higher education and socio-economic development in Cuba: high rewards of a risky high-tech strategy. *Science and Public Policy*, 36(2), 97-101.
 25. Kotler, P. (2000). Marketing management millennium edition. *Marketing Management*, 23(6), 188-193.
 26. Kotler, P. and Fox, K.F. (1995). Strategic Marketing for Educational Institutions, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
 27. Kuo, Y. C., Walker, A. E., Belland, B. R., & Schroder, K. E. E. (2013). A predictive study of student satisfaction in online education programs. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, 14(1), 16-39.
 28. Marzo-Navarro, M. M., Iglesias, M. P., & Torres, M. P. R., (2005). A new management element for universities: satisfaction with the offered courses. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 19(6), 505-526.
 29. Navarro, M. M., Iglesias M. P., & Torres P. R. (2005). A New Management Element for Universities: Satisfaction with the Offered Courses. *International Journal of Education Management*, 19(6), 505-526.
 30. O'Neill, M. (2003). The influence of time on student perception of service quality: the need for longitudinal measures. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 41(3), 310-324.
 31. O'Driscoll, F. (2012). What matters most: An exploratory multivariate study of satisfaction among first year hotel/hospitality management students. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 20(3), 237-258.
 32. Oliver, R. L. (1981). Measurement and Evaluation of Satisfaction Processes in Retail Settings. *Journal of Retailing*, 57(3), 25-48.
 33. Pop, M. D., Bacila, M. F., Moisescu, O. I., & Tirca, A. M. (2008). The impact of educational experience on students' satisfaction in the Romanian higher education system. *International Journal of Business Research*, 8(3).
 34. Ramayah, T., & Nasurdin, A.M. (2006). Integrating importance into the relationship between job satisfaction and commitment: A conceptual model. *The ICFAI Journal of Organization Behavior*, 5(2), 20-27.
 35. Richardson, J. T. E. (2005). Instruments for obtaining student feedback: A review of the literature. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 30(4), 387-415.
 36. Sandhu, D., & Kapoor, A. (2014). Determinants of students' satisfaction towards hybrid distance learning. *Indian Journal of Applied Research*, 4(8), 127-128.
 37. Sedlacek, W. E. (1987). Black students on White campuses: 20 years of research. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 28(6), 484-495.
 38. Sinclair, J. K. (2011). Student satisfaction with online learning: Lessons from organizational

- behavior. *Research in Higher Education Journal*, 11, 1.
39. Sojkin, B., Bartkowiak, P., & Skuza, A. (2012). Determinants of higher education choices and student satisfaction: the case of Poland. *High Education*, 6(5), 565-581.
 40. Stikes, C. S. (1984). *Black students in higher education*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
 41. Sureshchandar, G. S., Chandrasekharan, R., & Anantharaman, R. N. (2002). The relationship between service quality and customer satisfaction - A factor specific approach. *The Journal of Services Marketing*, 16(4), 363-379.
 42. Tessema, M., Ready, K., and Embaye, A. (2011). The Effects of Employee Recognition, Pay, and Benefits on Job Satisfaction: Cross Country Evidence. Paper presented at MBAA conference, Chicago March 23-25, 2011.
 43. Usman, A. (2010). The Impact of Service Quality on Students' Satisfaction in Higher Web-enhanced learning environments. *Journal of Instructional Pedagogies*, 1, 1-19.
 44. Westbrook, R. A. (1987). Product/consumption-based affective responses and postpurchase processes. *JMR, Journal of Marketing Research*, 24(3), 258-270.
 45. Wiers-Jenssen, J., Stensaker, B., & Groggaard, J. (2002). Student satisfaction: towards an empirical deconstruction of the concept. *Quality in Higher Education*, 8(2), 183-195.
 46. Willkins, S., & Balakrishnan M. S. (2013). Assessing student satisfaction in transnational higher education. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 27(2), 143-156.
 47. Winberg, T. M., and Hedman, L. (2008). Student attitudes toward learning, level of preknowledge and instruction type in a computer-simulation: effects on flow experiences and perceived learning outcomes. *Instructional Science*, 36(4), 269-287.
 48. Yi, Y. (1990). Cognitive and affective priming effects of the context for print advertisements. *Journal of Advertising*, 19(2), 40-48.
 49. Zeithaml, V. A., Berry, L. L., & Parasuraman, A. (1996). The behavioral consequences of service quality. *Journal of Marketing*, 60(2), 31-46.