A Comparison between the Importance and Satisfaction Level of Services in Private Universities of Bangladesh- Students' View

Afreen Ahmad Hasnain
Lecturer, School of Business, Southeast University, Dhaka, Bangladesh
Email: hasnainafreen@gmail.com
Phone: 55034135. Ext: 324

Tahsin Farzana Jisun
Lecturer, School of Business, Southeast University, Dhaka. Bangladesh
Email:jisun535@yahoo.com
Phone: 55034135. Ext: 324

Abstract
The study aims to identify the influential dimensions of students in terms of their expectation and satisfaction services provided by their educational respective institutions. Both primary and secondary data were used for this study. A sample of 100 business students from private universities in Dhaka and Chittagong who pay their tuition fees in installment were selected using purposive sampling. Through this study, the service gap between their level of importance and level of satisfaction was identified through descriptive statistic and then the most influential dimensions were determined using factor analysis. The research assessed the most influential dimension is 'Efficiency and sincerity of lecturers', which has the highest explanatory power in measuring students level of satisfaction. However, the most dominant dimension in determining students' level of importance of having services from their universities is 'Facilities provided by the University'.

Keywords: level of satisfaction; level of importance, dimensions, private universities; factor analysis; influential

Introduction
The education sector of Bangladesh has experienced many changes since 1971. In past, it had strong link with British education system and followed an UK model (Middlehurst and Woodfield, 2004).In 1921 the British establishes the first public university, Dhaka University based on the Oxbridge model. Later five more universities were established in the 1950's and 1960's. During the 70s the tertiary education experienced a wide range of problems mostly political violence leading to session jams. In the year 1992 there were only eight public universities which were unable to cope with the higher demand of student. (Hopper, 1998). With the enactment of The Private Universities ACT of 1992, the tertiary education system was allowed to establish private university. This allowed higher education to be accessed by more people, reduced the financial burden on the public sector, and developed a skilled manpower base meeting the labor market needs. According to recent data, the University Grant Commission (UGC), a statutory apex body in the field of higher education in Bangladesh, listed 92 private (as of February 2016) universities among them 80 universities are operating while 12 universities are approved by UGC but yet to start their operation and 37 public universities operating within the national boundary. (Umemiya, 2008; See Also UGC 2012).

Recent trend in the world suggests that countries are transforming from an industry based society to knowledge based society, accordingly higher education institutions can help to play

an imperative role in creating, disseminating and applying knowledge for a country or region to survive in the knowledge-based society. (Umemiya, 2008).

The emergence of private universities in Bangladesh started with a vision of providing higher quality education for increasing number of students, timely completion of degree , safe and politics –free environment, modern physical facilities and program and chose from wider selection of university.. However critics argue that private university is a profit maximizing enterprise catering to affluent society and effecting quality education. In an annual report publish by UGC in 2012 quoted "University is a place for creation of knowledge and assimilation of knowledge but the quality of education is deteriorating day by day". The major problems cited by UGC are lack of full time teachers, permanent campus, inadequate laboratory and library facilities, lack of research and development, limited course options, inefficiency in internal governance and most importantly extreme profit making attitude of university promoters (entrepreneur, Chowdhury, Iqbal and Miah, 2010) .Although some private universities are able to provide better services majority are still lagging behind.

The challenge of attracting potential students and retaining current students remains a challenge. Private universities use innovative business models to attract students and remain competitive. The notion that private university is expensive and only caters to affluent society is opposed by university providing education at minimal cost and allowing students to pay their tuition fee in installment throughout the semester.

This study is undertaken among the students of selected private universities who pays the tuition fees in an installment basis. The aim of the study is to determine which areas (professor, curriculum, university resources and extracurricular activities) students have high expectations, and whether or not they are being met. The paper sheds light to students' experience and their expectation from the services of their respective university. To undertake the study Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI) is employed as it is a valid instrument to assess students' insights into factors where, intuitions are failing to meet their expectations. (Richardson, 2005; cited Mazumder 2013). The instrument allows to determine four areas of interface between importance and satisfaction namely "high importance/ low satisfaction" and "low importance /high satisfaction" (Mazumder, 2013). This allows management in particular institute to focus on their strengths and weakness and also to take actions against those areas where "high/importance/low satisfaction" persists.

Literature Review

Higher education is regarded as "pure" service and educational service is a subset of service marketing (Oldfield and Baron (2000); Henning – Thurau et al (2001); See Also Gruder et al (2010). This service is intangible, perishable, heterogeneous and it is produced and consumed simultaneously. However authors argued that educational services differs from service marketing in several ways. Unlike customer satisfaction, the importance of student satisfaction has been ignored in ensuring higher education quality assurance. The inputs of ensuring quality in higher education relied heavily on the inputs from the academic insider than those who actually consume the service, the "students". Oldfield and Baron (2000) emphasized that universities should focus their attention to what students want instead of what "management" perceives to be important. However the notion of student as customer was not well accepted by educators (Griffts, 2011). Nevertheless, the service play an integral role in the lives of the "customer", as in the students, and student require huge amount of motivation and intellectual skills to attain their goal. (Gruder et al 2010).

Mazumder (2013) argued that in order to maintain quality in higher education students' are to be consider as customer and their level of satisfaction must be taken into account through the student feedback questionnaire. The result can help to determine the relationship between expectation and level of satisfaction of the service received. Li-Wei-Mai (2005) highlighted that expectation indicates outcome of service and understanding of expectation is compulsory. Word –of- mouth, personal needs, past experience of the service, external communication and price were seen to be influencing expectation (See Also Zeithaml et al (1990). Understanding the relationship between expectation and satisfaction can bridge the gap of dissatisfaction. While many researcher argue that good quality directs satisfaction while others differentiate quality from satisfaction. Quality is said to be a "general perception while satisfaction is linked to specific transaction" (Bitner, 1990; See Also Li-Wei-Mai (2005). Perceived quality is determined by comparing between expectations with perception of actual performance (Zeithaml et al 1990). However, the literature of understanding quality in higher education and measuring quality is complex and absent(Harvey and Green 1993; Clewes,2003; see Also Gruder et al 2010) and different stakeholders namely, students, government, educator, professional bodies, of higher education defines quality in their own ways.(Gruder et al 2010).

A study conducted by Athiyaman,1997 highlighted that "perceived quality is attitude that is defined as an overall evaluation of a product and service and satisfaction is similar to attitude but it is short term and results from evaluation of a specific consumption experience"(pg 157). The study examined eight educational services, exclusively, teaching students, availability if staff for consultation, library service, computing facilities, class size, level and difficulty of subject content and student workload. Hence, student's assessment suggest that good quality education influences better learning opportunities and the level of satisfaction affect student's success or failure of learning. (Aldridge and Rowley 1998)

The perception of quality and satisfaction is also influenced on by the teaching and delivery and management's and administrative staffs role in delivering the service. (Gruder et al 2010) In service and consumer marketing satisfaction is defined as consumption fulfils some need, desire, goal and that fulfillment is pleasurable.(Oliver,1997) However satisfaction of students in higher education is still limited, complex and consists of several dimensions.(Ricardson 2005; See Also Marzo- Navarro et al 2005a). According to Elliot and Shin (2002) student satisfaction is " the favorability of a student's subjective evaluation of the various outcome and experiences associated with education" (Pg 198)According to Hatcher et al 1992 student satisfaction is the assessment of the services provided by universities and colleges. It is an overall response to a students' learning experience. Danielson (1998) defined student satisfaction as the attraction, pride or positive feeling that the students develop toward the program or institution. Researchers like Aitken (1982); (1971); Tinto (1993) emphasized students' satisfaction and positive feeling is reliant on the students' academic and social experience at their universities. (See Also Danielson (1998); Hatcher at al (1992).

Aitken (1998) articulated that key factors determining student satisfaction are academic performance, quality of curriculum, quality of instruction, quality of academic advising, satisfaction with major courses, and the level of inclusion with the university. Teacher and student relationship as well as interaction between peers is also found to be key factors determining student satisfaction (Allen 1987; See Also Tinto 1993;). Research suggests that student satisfaction is influenced by both intangible and tangible aspects. According to Aldridge and Rowley (1998) improving education quality and assessing "total student

experience" confirms high satisfaction among students. Physical facilities like libraries, IT facilities and lecture room plays and important role in determining satisfaction level among students. (Li-Wei-Mai (2005)

To ascertain total student satisfaction all internal stakeholders namely, front-line contact, teaching and administrative staff and non –contract staff in management and administration, need to provide quality service. (Gruder et al 2010) .A study conducted by Sohail and Shaikh(2004) heighted that along with "contact personnel" , physical environment, layout, lighting, classroom and building appearance grounds and overall cleanliness influences student's evaluation of quality.

Reseracher like Petruzzellis, D'Uggento and Romanazzi (2006) commented that students are customer of universities and it is important that university authority implement customer centric approach to provide the service. Several factors such as lecture halls, laboratories, scholarship, internet access, contacts with teachers, administrative services, tutoring, counseling, internship and international credit transfer were cited to be influencing student's satisfaction. Until recently service performance has not been considered to be a direct influence of satisfaction. (Galina Stoltenberg, 2010). But in higher education context, service performance, the implicit quality of educational service, includes two factors namely, professor and course content. As mentioned earlier the higher education service has both tangible and intangible aspects. The tangible element of service includes educational technology and computers, class rooms and library facilities where the intangible elements such as quality of teaching and learning make it difficult to evaluate. Haque et al (2001) documented several factors provided by institutions influencing satisfaction among students. Factors such as quality of teaching, student research facilities, library books collection and services, sport programs, PC and internet facilities. (Cites Galina Stoltenberg, 2010).

Understanding and examining student satisfaction at tertiary level has several implication in social, institutional and individual level. At an individual level a satisfied alumni can become a public relation agent and can reduce cost of attracting new students. A "Highly satisfied student" will indulge in word of mouth publicity and will enhance university reputation. At institution level satisfied student will do better academically and will return as a graduate students or recommend to peers .This also will lower the cost of university publicity and cost of attracting new students.

Objectives of the Study:
The objectives of the report are determined in two folds:
1. To determine the level of importance and level satisfaction of services provided by the university
2. To find the influential dimensions of students in terms of their expectation and satisfaction with services provided by their educational institutions

Methodology
To conduct this study primary data were collected using the Noel Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI) which was internally and externally reliable.
The structured questionnaire was employed to collect data from different Private Universities in Bangladesh. The study is aimed at understanding level of satisfaction of services provided by their institutions in accordance with the level of importance of those services. They survey was conducted among undergraduates students enrolled in School of Business of university where tuition fees can be paid in installment basis. Three installments at 30%, 30% and 40

% of the tuition fees can be paid within the four months semester. From those students, 100 students were selected using Purposive sampling technique.

After examining the literature, 28 questions have been developed (Appendix 1) under three dimensions. The first dimension is "Facilities provided by the University" which includes the variables namely-The equipment of computer labs is appropriate for studies; Lecture rooms are fully furnished with modern equipment, The campus is safe and secure for students; There are various extracurricular activities available, The University operates an excellent counseling service; Financial aid is available to most students; Library service and resources are available; Class rooms are well lit and comfortable; Career service is helpful and Campus is fully equipped with internet facility. The second dimension is "Efficiency and sincerity of lecturers" consists of nine variables namely-Instructor allocate sufficient time for consultation; Teaching methodology is appropriate; Academic advisor/coordinator are approachable and helpful; When I have a problem, lecturers show a sincere interest in solving it; Instructor communicates well in the classroom; Instructors provide feedback about my progress; Lecturers are fair and unbiased towards all students; Lecturers are available after class and during office hours and All faculties are knowledgeable in their respective field. The third dimension is called "Academic administrative support" also comprises of nine variables namely- When I have a problem, administrative staff show a sincere interest in solving it; Inquiries are dealt with efficiently by administrative staff; The campus staff are caring and helpful' The content of the course is valuable and appropriate; Administrative staff have good knowledge of the systems; Student disciplinary procedures are fair; New student orientation program is thorough and covers academic and administrative information; Channels for student complaints are readily available and Online registration facility is prompt and hassle free. Then, students were asked to rate their level of importance and level of satisfaction of receiving some services from their Universities. For example, one student was asked to rate how important the lecture rooms are fully furnished with modern equipment to them and their level of satisfaction of having the service. A 6-point likert scale has been employed for both cases. For students level of satisfaction, in Likert scale, 1=Very dissatisfied, 2=Dissatisfied, 3=Neutral, 4= Satisfied, 5= Very Satisfied, 6= Not applicable. Likewise and for level of importance, in likert scale, 1= Not important, 2=somewhat important, 3= Neutral, 4=Important, 5= Very Important, 6= Not Applicable.

All the analyses have been performed by SPSS 16.0. We try to enlighten what students expect from the University in contrast to their satisfaction level by comparing means. Finally, factor analysis was conducted to find out the most influential factors in determining the students 'level of satisfaction' and 'level of importance' towards different services of their institutions.

Data Analysis and Findings

Reliability:
Here, Cronbach's Alpha coefficient was used to test the reliability and internal consistency among the variables in the sample.(Cronbach,1951)

Table1: Result of Cronbach's Alpha

Dimensions(Satisfaction level)	No. of items	Cronbach's Alpha	Dimensions(level of importance)	No. of items	Cronbach's Alpha
Facilities provided by University	10	0.766	Facilities provided by University	10	0.827

Efficiency of Lecturer	9	0.765	Efficiency of Lecturer	9	0.793
Administration	9	0.725	Administration	9	0.780

The values of Cronbach's Alpha for both the 'level of Satisfaction and 'level of importance' are greater than 0.70 implying the survey has good internal consistency. (Pallant, 2013)

Descriptive Statistics:

The students were asked about their importance and level of satisfaction towards different services of their respective Universities. There were 10 questions under

Table 2: Frequency Distribution of gender

Gender	No. of students	Percent
Male	62	62.0
Female	38	38.0
Total	100	100.0

Table 3: Frequency Distribution of Year

Year	No. of students	Percent
1st	0	0.0
2nd	7	7.0
3rd	46	46.0
4th	47	47.0
Total	100	100.0

From the table 2, we can see that 62% interviewed students are male and 38% are female. In table 3, we can see that most of the interviewed students are from 3rd and 4th year. We tried not to include first year students as they do not have enough experience with the services provided by the University.

Table 4: Overall mean of level of satisfaction and importance

Variables	Mean(level of satisfaction)	S.d(level of satisfaction)	Mean (Importance)	S.d (Importance)
Facilities provided by the University				
The equipment of computer labs is appropriate for studies	2.49	1.00	4.44	0.820
Lecture rooms are fully furnished with modern equipment	2.56	1.007	4.34	1.027
The campus is safe and secure for students	3.59	1.164	4.65	0.869
There are various extracurricular activities available	2.61	1.143	4.43	0.902
The University operates an excellent counseling service	2.72	1.198	4.33	0.995
Financial aid is available to most students	3.02	1.287	4.36	0.990
Library service and resources are available	2.58	1.148	4.59	0.767
Class rooms are well lit and comfortable	2.80	1.206	4.45	0.833
Career service is helpful	3.01	1.251	4.60	0.888
Campus is fully equipped with internet facility	2.19	1.368	4.56	1.018

Efficiency and sincerity of lecturers				
Instructor allocate sufficient time for consultation	3.38	1.162	4.35	0.978
Teaching methodology is appropriate	3.52	0.892	4.75	0.642
Academic advisor/coordinator are approachable and helpful	3.76	1.093	4.61	0.803
When I have a problem, lecturers show a sincere interest in solving it	4.03	0.870	4.74	0.712
Instructor communicates well in the classroom	3.68	0.973	4.54	0.822
Instructors provide feedback about my progress	3.46	1.184	4.52	0.847
Lecturers are fair and unbiased towards all students	3.64	0.459	4.48	0.822
Lecturers are available after class and during office hours	3.89	1.109	4.50	0.859
All faculties are knowledgeable in their respective field	3.51	1.049	4.67	0.897
Academic Administrative Support				
When I have a problem, administrative staff show a sincere interest in solving it	2.89	1.399	4.40	0.995
Inquiries are dealt with efficiently by administrative staff	2.71	1.018	3.98	1.146
The campus staff are caring and helpful	3.14	1.155	4.17	0.995
The content of the course is valuable and appropriate	3.84	0.982	4.44	0.903
Administrative staff have good knowledge of the systems	2.97	1.291	4.29	0.913
Student disciplinary procedures are fair	3.21	1.140	4.48	0.775
New student orientation program is thorough and covers academic and administrative information	3.53	1.029	4.23	0.874
Channels for student complaints are readily available	2.88	1.289	4.28	0.954
Online registration facility is prompt and hassle free	2.77	1.705	4.45	0.978

From table 4, it can be articulated that all the facilities provided by the University, efficiency of lecturers and academic administration (except efficiency of administrative staff in dealing with inquiries is neutral) are important to them. However, by analyzing the means of satisfaction level, students are mostly dissatisfied with the equipment of computer labs, lecture rooms, involvement of extracurricular activities, counseling service, library service, internet facility, sincerity of administrative staffs, online registration procedure and channels for student complaints. In addition, students are satisfied with the lecturers' sincere attitude of solving their problems. So, there is a visible difference between what they are expecting and what they are getting from their respective private Universities.

Factor Analysis:

Table 5: Result of KMO test

KMO Test	
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy	0.753

The value of KMO test is 0.753, which is greater than 0.5. Therefore, factor analysis is appropriate here (Malhotra and Dash, 2010)

A Principal Component factor analysis was directed on the 28 variables related to the level of satisfaction and the level of importance of different services of private universities. Nevertheless, factor analysis determines the factors and describes the pattern of correlation with the variables. Also, orthogonal varimax rotation was applied as it reduces the number of variables that have high loadings on each factor.(Pallant,2013). According to Kaiser Criterion, we will consider variables having Eigen values greater than or equal to 1(Pallant, 2013).

Table 6: Extracted variables (level of satisfaction)

Dimensions(level of satisfaction)	Variables	Initial Eigen values	
		Total	Variance Explained (%)
Facilities provided by the University	Career service is helpful	1.574	5.623
	Financial aid is available to most students	1.387	4.952
	Library service and resources are available	1.103	3.939
Efficiency and sincerity of lecturers	Instructor communicates well in the classroom	6.774	24.194
	Lecturers are fair and unbiased towards all students	1.335	4.768
	Lecturers are available after class and during office hours	1.183	4.224
Academic Administrative Support	The campus staff are caring and helpful	1.959	6.996
	New student orientation program is thorough and covers academic and administrative information	2.197	7.848
	Inquiries are dealt with efficiently by administrative staff	1.042	3.722

From table 3, we can imply that the first most dominant variable (Instructor communicates well in the classroom) explained 24.194%, the second most dominant variable (Inquiries are dealt with efficiently by administrative staff) explained 7.848% of the total variance and the third most dominant variable in deciding the students level of satisfaction (The campus staff are caring and helpful) explained 6.996% of the total variance. Nevertheless, all the 9 variables explained 66.267% of the total variance. Therefore, students' level of satisfaction can be influenced by these nine variables.

The most important dimension is 'Efficiency and sincerity of lecturers (Instructor communicates well in the classroom; Lecturers are fair and unbiased towards all students; Lecturers are available after class and during office hours) which accounted for 33.186% of the total variance. The second most essential dimension 'Academic administrative support' (The campus staff are caring and helpful; New student orientation program is thorough and covers academic and administrative information; Inquiries are dealt with efficiently by

administrative staff) explained 18.566% of the total variance. The third most important dimension called 'Facilities provided by the University' (Career service is helpful; Financial aid is available to most students; Library service and resources are available) explained 14.514% of the total variance.

Table 7: Extracted variables (level of importance)

Dimensions(level of importance)	Variables	Initial Eigen values	
		Total	Variance Explained (%)
Facilities provided by the University	The Campus is safe and secure for students	8.875	31.697
	The University operates an excellent counseling service	2.495	8.911
Efficiency and sincerity of lecturers	Academic advisor/coordinator are approachable and helpful	1.738	6.206
	When I have a problem, lecturers show a sincere interest in solving it	1.303	4.654
Academic Administrative Support	The campus staff are caring and helpful	1.516	5.415
	Online Registration facility is prompt and hassle free	1.077	3.845

Of the 28 variables, 6 variables were extracted for the level of importance of getting those services.

From table 4, we can examine that the first variable (The Campus is safe and secure for students) explained 31.697%, the second variable (The University operates an excellent counseling service) explained 8.911% of the total variance and all the 6 variables explained 60.729% of the total variance. Therefore, students' level of importance of receiving the mentioned services from the Universities can be influenced by these six variables. The first most necessary dimension in determining the students level of importance is 'Facilities provided by the University (The campus is safe and secure for students; The University operates an excellent counseling service) accounted for 40.608% of the total variance. The second most important dimension which is 'Efficiency and sincerity of lecturers' (Academic advisor/coordinator are approachable and helpful; When I have a problem, lecturers show a sincere interest in solving it) explained 10.86% of the total variance. The third most important dimension called 'Academic Administrative support' (The campus staff are caring and helpful; Online Registration facility is prompt and hassle free) explained 9.26% of the total variance.

Conclusion
The role of private universities of Bangladesh in providing higher quality education is undeniable. Nonetheless, most of the private universities have not paid enough attention to satisfy their student's expectation. This study revealed a noticeable difference between what the students expect in terms of services provided by the private universities and what they actually get by comparing their means. The findings demonstrated that students are not satisfied with the equipment of computer labs, lecture rooms, involvement of extracurricular

activities, counseling service, library service, internet facility, sincerity of administrative staffs, online registration procedure and channels for student complaints, though these services are important to them. We also conduct factor analysis using the principal component technique which produced the most powerful three factors in deciding the students 'level of satisfaction' and 'level of importance' towards different services of their institutions. We discovered that the first most important dimension is 'Efficiency and sincerity of lecturers (Instructor communicates well in the classroom; Lecturers are fair and unbiased towards all students; Lecturers are available after class and during office hours), the second most essential dimension 'Academic administrative support'(The campus staff are caring and helpful; New student orientation program is thorough and covers academic and administrative information; Inquiries are dealt with efficiently by administrative staff) and the third most important dimension called 'Facilities provided by the University'(Career service is helpful; Financial aid is available to most students; Library service and resources are available). Therefore, all these nine variables under the three dimensions were extracted in measuring the students 'level of satisfaction'. On the other hand, the first most important dimension in determining the students level of importance is 'Facilities provided by the University (The campus is safe and secure for students; The University operates an excellent counseling service), the second most important dimension which is 'Efficiency and sincerity of lecturers' (Academic advisor/coordinator are approachable and helpful; When I have a problem, lecturers show a sincere interest in solving it) and the third most important dimension called 'Academic Administrative support'(The campus staff are caring and helpful; Online Registration facility is prompt and hassle free). Hence, all these six variables under the three dimensions were extracted for deciding the 'level of importance' of having those services from their institution.

Despite the continuous effort of private Universities, the quality has not been upgraded that much and for this reason students are not satisfied with the facilities and academic support provided by their institutions. Private Universities can adopt some strategies based on the finding of this study. Like, every University should prepare a crucial plan for their academic staff to provide them with necessary training so that they can serve students properly. Lecturers should update and change their curriculum more often according to global acceptability. They should also upgrade their professional skill and knowledge by involving themselves more research activities. Most importantly, private universities should enhance the facilities such as well-equipped classrooms, libraries and computer labs. Each university should also keep their campus secure and politics free.

The main constraint of this study is small sample size. Nevertheless, a more comprehensive study can be made by considering a larger sample size and including more private universities of Bangladesh.

References

1. Athiyaman, A. (1997) Linking student satisfaction and service quality perceptions: the case of university education. *European Journal of Marketing*. 31(7), pp.528-540.
2. Aldridge, S. and Rowley, J. (1998) Measuring customer satisfaction in higher education, *Quality Assurance in Education*. 6(4). pp. 197-204.
3. Aitken, N.D. (1982) College student performance, satisfaction and retention: Specification and estimate of a structural model. *Journal of Higher Education.* 53(1), pp. 32-50.
4. Ashraf, M.A. (2009) Quality Education Management at Private Universities in Bangladesh: An Exploratory Study, Journal *Pendidik dan Pendidikan*, 24(1), pp. 17-32.

5. Allen, W.R. (1987) From the 'Black colleges vs. White colleges', *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning* [online]. 19(3), pp.28-34. Available from: http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/00091383.1987.9939144?needAccess=true

6. Bitner, M.J., Booms, B.H. and Tetreault, M.S., (1990) The service encounter: diagnosing favorable and unfavorable incidents. *The Journal of Marketing*. 54(1) pp.71-84.

7. Betz, E.L., (1971) A Dimensional Analysis of College Student Satisfaction. *Measurement and evaluation in guidance* 4(2), pp.99-106.

8. Chowdhury, A.H., Iqbal, T. and Miah, K. (2010) A Study of Service Quality Determinants of Private Universities in Bangladesh using SERVQUAL. *Journal of Knowledge Globalization*. 3(1), pp 49-74.

9. Clewes, D. (2003). A student-centred conceptual model of service quality in higher education. *Quality in Higher Education*. *9*(1), pp.69-85.

10. Cronbach, L.J. (1951) Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*. 16(3), pp.297-334.

11. Danielson, C. (1998). Is Satisfying College Students the Same as Decreasing Their Dissatisfaction? AIR 1998 Annual Forum Paper.

12. Elliott, K.M. and Shin, D. (2002), Student satisfaction: an alternative approach to assessing this important concept. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*. 24(2), pp. 197-209.

13. Elliott, K.M. and Healy, M.A. (2001) Key factors influencing student satisfaction related to recruitment and retention. *Journal of marketing for higher education*. 10(4), pp.1-11.

14. Gruber, T., Fuß, S., Voss, R. and Gläser-Zikuda, M. (2010) Examining student satisfaction with higher education services: Using a new measurement tool. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*. 23(2), pp.105-123.

15. S. Griffith. "Using the National Survey of Student Engagement as a Tool to Help Determine Influences of Overall Student Satisfaction with the College Experience and Help Define Student Centeredness." Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Toledo, Ohio, 2011.

16. Hopper, R (1998). Emerging Private Universities in Bangladesh: Public Enemy or Ally? International Higher Education, Winter 1998.

17. Hennig-Thurau, T., Langer, M.F. and Hansen, U. (2001) Modeling and managing student loyalty an approach based on the concept of relationship quality. *Journal of service research*. 3(4), pp.331-344.

18. Harvey, L. and Green, D. (1993) Defining quality. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*. Vol 18(1), pp:9-34.

19. Hatcher, L., Kryter, K., Prus, J.S. and Fitzgerald, V. (1992) Predicting college student satisfaction, commitment, and attrition from investment model constructs. *Journal of applied social psychology*. 22(16), pp.1273-1296.

20. Haque, J. H. M., Das D., Farzana, R. (2001) Satisfaction of Student Services in Tertiary Level: Perspective Bangladesh. *European Journal of Social Sciences.* 19(2), pp. 286.

21. Law D.C.S. "Quality assurance in post-secondary education: the student experience," Quality Assurance in Education, vol. 18, 2010, pp. 250-251.

22. Levitz, R.S., Noel, L. and Richter, B.J. (1999) Strategic Moves for Retention Success. New Directions for Higher Education, pp. 31–49.

23. Malhotra, N.K. and Dash, S., 2010. Research Methodology. Pearson Education.

24. Mazumder, Q.H. (2013) Student Satisfaction in Private and Public Universities in Bangladesh. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE)*, *2*(2), pp.78-84.

Australian Journal of Business Science Design & Literature
ISSN: 2414-3284 (Paper) ISSN: 2414-2962 (Online)
Volume: 09, No: 02, 2016

www.raoaustralia.org

25. Marzo-Navarro, M., Pedraja-Iglesias, M. and Rivera-Torres, M.P. (2005a), "Measuring customer satisfaction in summer courses", Quality Assurance in Education. 13(1), pp. 53-65.

26. Middlehurst, R. and Woodfield, S., 2004. The role of transnational, private, and for-profit provision in meeting global demand for tertiary education: Mapping, regulation and impact.

27. Roszkowski M. K. (2009) The Nature of the Importance-Satisfaction Relationship in Ratings: Evidence from the Normative Data of the Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory. J*ournal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction, and Complaining Behavior.* 16, p. 211.

28. M.A. May. "A Comparative Study of Student Satisfaction with the Provision of Student Services in Traditional and Web-Based Environments." Doctoral Dissertation, Kent State University Graduate School of Education, Ohio, p. 8, 2002.

29. Mazumder, Quamrul H, Karim ,Rezaul Md., Bhuiyan, I. Serajul" Higher Education Quality Improvement in Bangladesh, Paper no: AC2012-5127, 119th ASEE Annual Conference, June 10-13, 2012, San Antonio, TX, USA .

30. Mazumder, Quamrul H, Karim, R. Md." Comparative Analysis of Learning Styles of Students of USA and Bangladesh, Paper no: AC2012-5075, 119th ASEE Annual Conference, June 10-13, 2012, San Antonio, TX, USA.

31. Mai, L.W. (2005) A comparative study between UK and US: The student satisfaction in higher education and its influential factors. *Journal of Marketing Management*. 21(7-8), pp.859-878.

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

33. Oliver, R.L. (1997) Satisfaction: A Behavioral Perspective on the consumer. New York: McGraw- Hill Education.

34. Petruzzellis, L., D'Uggento, A.M. and Romanazzi, S. (2006) Student satisfaction and quality of service in Italian universities. *Managing Service Quality: An International Journal.* 16(4), pp.349-364.

35. Pallant, J., (2013). SPSS survival manual. UK: McGraw-Hill Education.

36. Richardson, J.T. (2005) Instrument for obtaining student feedback: a review of literature. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher education.* 30(4), pp-387-415.

37. Starr, A., Betz, E.L. and Menne, J. (1972) Differences in college student satisfaction: Academic dropouts, nonacademic dropouts and nondropouts. *Journal of Counseling Psychology.* 19(4), p.318.

38. SadiqSohail, M. and Shaikh, N.M. (2004) Quest for excellence in business education: a study of student impressions of service quality. *International Journal of Educational Management*. 18(1), pp.58-65.

39. Stoltenberg, G., 2011. Investigating the Concept of Student' Satisfaction: The Case of International Students at the UiO.

40. Tinto, V. (1993), Leaving College: Rethinking the Causes and Cures of Student Attrition, 2nd ed., University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL.

41. UGC (2012) "List of Private Universities," University Grants Commission of Bangladesh. www.ugc.gov.bd. 3 Dec. 2012.

42. Umemiya, N. (2008) Regional quality assurance activity in higher education in Southeast Asia: Its characteristics and driving forces. *Quality in Higher Education*,.14(3), pp.277-290.

43. Zeithaml, Valerie A., Parasuraman, A. & Berry, Leonard L. (1990) Delivering Quality Service, The Free Press, New York, N.Y.

Appendix -1

STUDENT SURVEY

This questionnaire is designed to determine quickly and simply your current level of satisfaction with the many aspects of your experience and education at this institute. The focus is on identifying what aspects are performing effectively and which aspects need improvement. The results of your feedback will help us to improve the quality of our services to you.

Your responses are a critical part of this research. Please answer all the questions as candidly and completely as possible. This survey is completely anonymous and confidential.

Thank you

What is your course of study (e.g. BBA)?
What is your year of study? (e.g. 3rd)

Gender: | Male | | Female |

CGPA:

Each item below describes an expectation about your experiences on this campus.
On the *left*, tells how <u>important</u> it is for your institution to meet this expectation.
On the *right*, tells how <u>satisfied</u> you are that your institution has met this expectation
If a question does not apply to you, tick **Not Applicable** circle

Importance	Satisfaction
1- Not important	1-Very Dissatisfied
2- Somewhat Important	2- Dissatisfied
3- Neutral	3-Neutral
4- Important	4-Satisfied
5- Very Important	5-Very Satisfied
6- Not Applicable	6-Not Applicable
Please Tick	

Importance to me		My level of satisfaction
1 2 3 4 5 6	1.The equipment of computer labs is appropriate for studies	1 2 3 4 5 6
1 2 3 4 5 6	2.Lecture rooms are fully furnished with modern equipment	1 2 3 4 5 6
1 2 3 4 5 6	3.When I have a problem, administrative staff show a sincere interest in solving it	1 2 3 4 5 6
1 2 3 4 5 6	4.Inquiries are dealt with efficiently by administrative staff	1 2 3 4 5 6
1 2 3 4 5 6	5. Instructor allocate sufficient time for consultation	1 2 3 4 5 6
1 2 3 4 5 6	6. Teaching methodology is appropriate.	1 2 3 4 5 6
1 2 3 4 5 6	7. The campus staff are caring and helpful	1 2 3 4 5 6
1 2 3 4 5 6	8.Academic advisor/coordinator are approachable and helpful	1 2 3 4 5 6

Scale	Question	Scale
1 2 3 4 5 6	9. The campus is safe and secure for students	1 2 3 4 5 6
1 2 3 4 5 6	10. The content of the course is valuable and appropriate	1 2 3 4 5 6
1 2 3 4 5 6	11. There are various extracurricular activities available	1 2 3 4 5 6
1 2 3 4 5 6	12. Administrative staff have good knowledge of the systems	1 2 3 4 5 6
1 2 3 4 5 6	13. The university operates an excellent counseling service	1 2 3 4 5 6
1 2 3 4 5 6	14. When I have a problem, lecturer shows a sincere interest in solving it.	1 2 3 4 5 6
1 2 3 4 5 6	15. Instructor communicate well in classroom	1 2 3 4 5 6
1 2 3 4 5 6	16. Instructor provide feedback about my progress	1 2 3 4 5 6
1 2 3 4 5 6	17. Library service and resources are adequate	1 2 3 4 5 6
1 2 3 4 5 6	18. Financial aid is available to most students	1 2 3 4 5 6
1 2 3 4 5 6	19. Class rooms are well lit and comfortable	1 2 3 4 5 6
1 2 3 4 5 6	20. Lecturers are fair and unbiased towards all students`	1 2 3 4 5 6
1 2 3 4 5 6	21. Career service is helpful	1 2 3 4 5 6
1 2 4 5 6	22. Student disciplinary procedure are fair	2 3 4 5 6
1 2 3 4 5 6	23. New Student Orientation program is thorough and covers academic and administrative information	1 2 3 4 5 6
1 2 3 4 5 6	24. Lecturers are available after class and during office hour	1 2 3 4 5 6
1 2 3 4 5 6	25. All faculties are knowledgeable in their respective field	1 2 3 4 5 6
1 2 3 4 5 6	26. Channels for students complaints are readily available	1 2 3 4 5 6
1 2 3 4 5 6	27. Campus is fully equipped with internet facility	1 2 3 4 5 6
1 2 3 4 5 6	28. Online Registration facility is prompt and hassle free	1 2 3 4 5 6

29. How important were each of the following factors in your decision to enrol in this institution

Scale	Factor
1 2 3 4 5	Cost
1 2 3 4 5	Financial Aid
1 2 3 4 5	Recommedation from family/friends
1 2 3 4 5	Geographical setting
1 2 3 4 5	Availibility of subject/course
1 2 3 4 5	Reputation and employability

① ② ③ ④ ⑤	Other (Please specify)	
30. Overall satisfaction with the university		① ② ③ ④ ⑤

What is your best experience at this university?

Will you recommend this university to others'?

Please take a moment to make further comments or suggestions for improvement