

# Improving the Academic Services of As-Syafi'iyah Islamic University, Jakarta, Indonesia, through the Evaluation of Students' Satisfaction

Iffah Budiningsih<sup>1\*</sup>, Marliza Oktapiani<sup>2</sup>, Elly Soraya<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Faculty of Teaching and Educational Sciences, As-Syafi'iyah Islamic University, Jakarta, Indonesia

<sup>2</sup>Faculty of Islam Region, As-Syafi'iyah Islamic University, Jakarta, Indonesia

<sup>3</sup>Faculty of Business Economic, As-Syafi'iyah Islamic University, Jakarta, Indonesia

\*Corresponding Author

**Abstract:** The purpose of this evaluation research is to study and obtain empirical data about the level of satisfaction of students for academic services that have implications for efforts to improve academic services, which can improve the reputation of the university. The research method used survey methods with an affordable population of about 4000 students of As-Syafi'iyah Islamic University, Jakarta, Indonesia. The sampling was done randomly with 733 respondents. The results of the study showed: a) the average assessment of student satisfaction with the University's academic services in the category of 'satisfied' with an average assessment score = 3.8697 and this score still needs to be increased to 5.0 to improve the academic services of the University which have implications for improving the reputation of the university; b) The quality of academic services has a strategic role in meeting student satisfaction which has an impact on the emergence of high loyalty to the University, and it is expected that these students can be a 'mouth promotion' for the University; c) academic services that need to be improved include the ability and care of education personnel in providing quality & fast service; the ability and concern of the manager/leader and education staff of the Study Program/Faculty in providing quality academic services, and adequacy, accessibility & quality of supporting facilities of academic activities of students; d) The characters empathy, sympathy, and sharing must be strived to grow and develop into an inherent and settled character among education personnel or lecturers.

**Keywords:** academic services, evaluation, student satisfaction.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Globalization has drawn many universities to tight competition, looking for prospective students. Such a condition demands the institutions to come up with strategies to hook students as much as possible. Furthermore, universities are urged to provide quality and professional academic services to meet the needs of students/prospective students. By that, providing quality and competitive human resources is essential to boost academic services. Maximum services, without doubt, result in student satisfaction and the development and reputation of universities.

In general, student satisfaction refers to the feeling of pleasure of students when receiving academic services that

meet their expectations. Satisfied students are likely to stay in the university until the completion of their studies. Student satisfaction is one of the benchmarks of a successful university, which ultimately leads to a rise in the number of prospective students due to the academic institution's reputation. This notion emphasizes the necessity to evaluate student satisfaction with academic services and formulate effective strategies to increase the number of students significantly. Based on data on student admissions of As-Syafi'iyah Islamic University from 2017 to 2021 the increase is up and down or not significant, as presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Student Admission of University Th 2017 to Th 2021

| Year | Number of Student Admissions (persons) | Increased (persons) | Increased (%) | Description |
|------|--|---------------------|---------------|-------------|
| 2017 | 839                                    | -                   |               |             |
| 2018 | 1079                                   | 240                 | 28.60         |             |
| 2019 | 1004                                   | (-)75               | (-) 6.95      |             |
| 2020 | 919                                    | (-) 85              | (-) 8.45      | Covid 19    |
| 2021 | 1058                                   | 139                 | 15.13         |             |

Data source: HRD of As-Syafi'iyah Islamic University

Student admissions data for 5 (five) years as presented in Table 1 shows a fluctuating increase and decrease, and the University expects every year the number of new students to always rise significantly, so the evaluation research is needed to determine the level of student satisfaction with student academic services, and look for key factors that can significantly increase the number of admissions each year. Evaluation and assessment are a series of systematic activities aiming to identify significant differences between expected or planned goals and facts in reality. A model used in evaluating student satisfaction is an external model. In this model, the evaluation comes from the external side of the university, e.g., students or the users or customers expecting quality services from the academic institution.

The present work aims to examine the empirical data of student satisfaction regarding the academic services of a selected university; the data are also expected to impact the university's reputation. Moreover, the results of this research can serve as the basis to formulate human resource development policies, resulting in top academic services.

## II. LITERATURE REVIEW

### 2.1. Evaluation

Evaluation is a series of systematic activities covering the process of goal planning, designing and developing instruments, collecting data, and analyzing and interpreting a score based on the established assessment standard (Uno, Budiningsih, Panjaitan, 2012:101). Stoffebeam et al. (2007: 5-6) elaborate that the evaluation results serve as information required for authorities in taking any actions for addressing performance issues that do not meet a specific standard. Evaluation intends to spot significant differences between expected or planned goals and the actual conditions (Uno et al., 2012:101). The challenge in the evaluation is whether or not the evaluation outputs can provide the feedback needed for improving the effectiveness of academic services (Owston, as cited in Spector et al., 2008:605). Susilaningih (2012: 237-238) mention the characteristics of a standard evaluation mode: a) comprehensive, b) useful, c) practical, d) economic, and e) accuracy of data collection instruments. In conclusion, evaluation is a systematic process of assessing a particular object through steps, i.e., determining objectives, developing instruments, collecting data, analyzing data, and interpreting data based on the following criteria: comprehensive, useful, practical, efficient, and accurate data collection instruments.

### 2.2 Student Satisfaction

Central to the long-term management are tangible and intangible resources (intellectuality, reputation, student satisfaction, et cetera.). When it comes to satisfaction, Al-Sheeb et al. (2018:2) argue that this aspect is a short-term attitude that results from student educational experience and can only be achieved when the university can meet or surpass the students' expectations starting from their early academic journey. Furthermore, Al-Sheeb et al. pinpoint that satisfaction is the core element a university needs to be superior. This idea highlights that student satisfaction is the primary performance indicator for a university to gain reputation and ensure quality. From the consumer perspective, alumni and student satisfaction is determined by the students' perception regarding the performance quality and the academic output of the university (Hartman and Schmidt, as cited in Al-Sheeb et al., 2018:2). Understanding students' needs enable the university to continuously adapt and provide assistance for its students, culminating in satisfactory experience and educational journey (IELTS, 2019:8). In this context, satisfaction is defined as the core component that drives the motivation and engagement of a person, helping the individual attain long-term goals (IELTS, 2019:10). Coulter et

al. (as cited in Sofroniou et al., 2020:2) define satisfaction as a person's feeling that describes satisfaction or disappointment when comparing the perceived product performance with the expected product performance. Sembiring et al. (2017: 2) add that satisfaction is a function of a performance's relative level of expectations and feelings.

Satisfaction can be achieved by enhancing factors affecting the university students' attitudes and perceptions regarding their studies at the university. Kloter (as cited in Subandi), a management expert, states that consumer satisfaction can only be achieved when the individual receives more than s/he expects. Student satisfaction encompasses: a) satisfaction in academic services, b) satisfaction in administrative services, c) satisfaction in study support services, d) satisfaction in study facilities, and e) satisfaction with university/campus management (Annamdevula & Bellamkonda, as cited in Subandi, 2021:139). Redhana et al. (2019:102) further explain that customer satisfaction (students) is a customer's feeling or attitude towards the performance or service received; satisfied customers will repeat to use the service and spread positive messages to other customers (other prospective students). Indicators to measure the level of student satisfaction include a) teaching skills, b) learning activities, c) learning environment, and d) study room facilities (Al-Sheeb et al., 2018:3). These four indicators resonate with the results seen in Sembiring et al. (2017:7).

According to Subandi (2021:149) and Budiningsih et al. (2016:7), providing optimal service results in student satisfaction. Indicators measure the level of satisfaction: a) reliable, i.e., accuracy and constancy in providing services; b) responsibility, i.e., justifiable: a sense of responsibility for the quality of service (fast, easy, and sustainable); c) assurance, i.e., there is a guarantee that the services are risk-free; d) empathy and e) tangible services must be measurable and observable, and there is personal attention in providing services to each user/customer.

### 2.3. Academic Services

Academic services commonly stated in the curricular services encompass a) academic regulations, b) lectures, c) curriculum, d) academic guidance/consultation, e) practicum, f) final project & evaluation, and g) lecture aids (lecture facilities & infrastructure) (Tampubolon, as cited in Suhendar & Suroto, 2014:373). Marfuah and Puteri (2016:2) mention services provided to students, e.g., academic services, non-academic services, financial services, library services, et cetera. Bellamkonda (as cited in Subandi, 2021:139) develops six assessment indicators of academic services: a) quality of lecturers; b) administrative services; c) lecture facilities; d) campus infrastructure; e) support services (extracurricular), and e) international cooperation network services. Several internal aspects should be taken into account to maximize academic services, e.g., a) maintain the appearance, b) be proactive, c) creative, d) enthusiastic, d) be able to manage time well, f) sincere in serving, and g) empathize (Yoga, as cited in Sodik et al., 2013:2). Yunanto et al. (2012:196)

introduce several variables in maintaining service qualities, namely ability, attitude, appearance, attention, action, comfort, and accuracy in making a real contribution to the emergence of good service (excellent service), thereby providing customer satisfaction; the prominent variable among them is responsibility.

From the description above, evaluation of student satisfaction regarding academic services refers to the process of examining students' feelings of satisfaction or disappointment when comparing the perceived academic service between what is expected and the facts. Aspects of satisfaction evaluation involve a) reliability/accuracy, b) responsibility, c) assurance, d) empathy and, e) complexity or tangibility of lecture services (i.e., quality of lecturers, administrative services, lecture facilities, campus infrastructure, and academic support services, which are impactful to the reputation of the university).

### III. RESEARCH METHOD

The present work relied on a survey method. As many as 733 of 4,000 university students or the total population were selected randomly as the research respondent. All data of evaluation were collected using a Likert scale questionnaire with score: 5 = very high, 4 = high, 3 = moderate, 2 = low, and 1 = very low. A validity test and reliability test were performed before distributing the questionnaire. Furthermore, all data were examined descriptively using methods, such as measures of central tendency, mean, median, and mode and measures of dispersion, minimum score, maximum score, standard deviation. Programs, i.e., Excel and SPSS version 25 for Windows, were used in statistical data analysis processes.

#### 3.2 Variables and Indicators of Research

Provided in Table 2 are the variables and indicators of evaluating student satisfaction in College.

Table 2: Variable, Indicator, and Item of Response

| No. | Variable  | Indicator            | Item   |
|-----|---|----------------------|--|
| 1   | Student Satisfaction Regarding<br>UIA Academic Services | a. Reliability       | 1. <b>Lecturer's</b> abilities in providing services.  |
|     |   |                      | 2. The ability of <b>program managers</b> (head of the study program or faculty) in providing services.  |
|     |   |                      | 2. The ability of <b>education staff</b> (administrative staff of study program or faculty) in providing services.   |
|     |   | b. Responsibility    | 4. The willingness of <b>lecturers</b> to help students and provide services quickly.  |
|     |   |                      | 5. The willingness of <b>management</b> (head of study program/faculty) to help students and provide services quickly.   |
|     |   |                      | 6. The willingness of <b>education staff</b> (administrative staff of study program/faculty) to help students and provide services quickly.  |
|     |   | c. Assurance         | 7. The ability of <b>lecturers</b> to ensure all students that service provided is by the provisions   |
|     |   |                      | 8. The ability of <b>management</b> (head of a study program/faculty) to ensure all students that service provided is by the provisions  |
|     |   |                      | 9. The ability of <b>education staff</b> (administrative staff of study program/faculty) to ensure all students that service provided is by the provisions   |
|     |   | d. Empathy           | 10. Willingness/concern of <b>lecturers</b> to listen to students  |
|     |   |                      | 11. Willingness/concern of <b>management</b> (head of the study program/faculty) to listen to students   |
|     |   |                      | 12. Willingness/concern of <b>education staff</b> (administrative staff of study program/faculty) to listen to students  |
|     |   | e. Tangible Services | 13. Student assessment of the adequacy, accessibility, quality of learning facilities and infrastructure   |
|     |   |                      | 14. Tangible: student assessment of the adequacy, community, quality of facilities, and infrastructure for student extracurricular activities, e.g., student discussions, sports, arts, et cetera. |
|     |   |                      | 15. Student assessment of the adequacy, accessibility, quality of facilities, and infrastructure for relaxation, e.g., parks, canteens, prayer rooms, parking, et cetera.                          |
|     | SUM TOTAL   | 15 Item of responses |  |

### 3.2 Instrument Calibration

This study's student satisfaction evaluation instrument is a standard instrument from the Ministry of Education and Culture (National Accreditation Board for Higher Education). Validity and reliability tests were performed before the evaluation processes. Test the instrument's validity relied on the coefficient formula ( $r$ ) Cronbach's Alpha (the instrument is valid if  $r_{\text{count}} > 0.30$ ). Further, a coefficient formula ( $r$ ) Cronbach's Alpha was utilized to test the instrument's reliability (the instrument is reliable if  $r_{\text{count}} > 0.6$ ). Table 3 displays the results of the validity & reliability tests.

Table 3: Results of the Validity Tests of Student Satisfaction of Academic Services

| Number of Item in the Instrument | $r_{\text{table}}$ (Cronbach Alpha) | $r_{\text{count}}$ (Cronbach Alpha) | Description |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|
| Item 1                           | 0.30                                | 0.513                               | Valid       |
| Item 2                           | 0.30                                | .300                                | Valid       |
| Item 3                           | 0.30                                | .759                                | Valid       |
| Item 4                           | 0.30                                | .456                                | Valid       |
| Item 5                           | 0.30                                | .617                                | Valid       |
| Item 6                           | 0.30                                | .722                                | Valid       |
| Item 7                           | 0.30                                | .692                                | Valid       |
| Item 8                           | 0.30                                | .762                                | Valid       |
| Item 9                           | 0.30                                | .867                                | Valid       |
| Item 10                          | 0.30                                | .343                                | Valid       |
| Item 11                          | 0.30                                | .631                                | Valid       |
| Item 12                          | 0.30                                | .690                                | Valid       |
| Item 13                          | 0.30                                | .712                                | Valid       |
| Item 14                          | 0.30                                | .676                                | Valid       |
| Item 15                          | 0.30                                | .562                                | Valid       |
| <b>Statistical Reliability</b>   |                                     | .758                                | Reliable    |

Based on Table 3. above, it can be concluded that all 15 items of the instrument for evaluating student satisfaction of academic services are valid and reliable.

## IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### 4.1. Results

Table 4: Average Score of Student Satisfaction Regarding Academic Services on Each' Indicator

| No. | Variable   | Indicator   | Item/Response  | Score Average |
|-----|--|---|--|---------------|
| 1   | Student Satisfaction regarding UIA academic services | a. Reliability  | 1. Lecturers' abilities in providing teaching services.  | 4.19          |
|     |  |   | 2. The ability of <b>program managers</b> (head of the study program or faculty) in providing services.            | 3.99          |
|     |  |   | 2. The ability of <b>education staff</b> (administrative staff of study program or faculty) in providing services. | 3.73          |
|     |  |   | <b>AVERAGE SCORE</b>   | <b>3.97</b>   |
|     | b. Responsibility                                    | 4. The willingness of <b>lecturers</b> to help students and provide services quickly. | 4.04   |               |

All data were analyzed using descriptive analysis with the single variable of student satisfaction on UIA academic services. This process focused on measuring central tendency and measures of dispersion, namely: mean, median, mode, standard error of the mean, standard deviation, variance, range, minimum score, maximum score, and sum.

Table 3: Average Score of Student Satisfaction Assessment for Academic Services

| Statistics                                |         |               |
|---|---------|---------------|
| Student Satisfaction of Academic Services |         |               |
| N   | Valid   | <b>733</b>    |
|   | Missing | 0             |
| <b>Mean</b>                               |         | <b>3.8697</b> |
| Std. Error of Mean                        |         | .02718        |
| Median                                    |         | 3.9333        |
| <b>Mode</b>                               |         | <b>5.00</b>   |
| Std. Deviation                            |         | .73586        |
| Variance                                  |         | .541          |
| Range                                     |         | 3.79          |
| <b>Minimum</b>                            |         | <b>1.21</b>   |
| <b>Maximum</b>                            |         | <b>5.00</b>   |
| Sum                                       |         | 2836.50       |

Table 3 concludes that, in general, the results of descriptive analysis of the student satisfaction of academic/non-academic services scored **3.8097** with a mean std error of: 0.02718, rounded off to 4.0. This finding suggests that students are generally '**satisfied**' with the academic services provided by the university. Based on the mode and standard deviation at 5.0 and 0.73586, respectively, the dominant category of student satisfaction fell under a very high category. The maximum and minimum scores are at 5.0 and 1.21 (not satisfied), respectively.

Following the previous process was the analysis of the average score of student satisfaction based on the indicators, namely a) reliability, b) responsibility, c) assurance, d) empathy, and e) tangible. The data is provided in Table 4 below.

|   |  |                      |  |             |
|---|--|----------------------|--|-------------|
|   |  |                      | 5. The willingness of <b>management</b> (head of study program/faculty) to help students and provide services quickly.   | 4.01        |
|   |  |                      | 6. The willingness of <b>education staff</b> (administrative staff of study program/faculty) to help students and provide services quickly.                    | 3.68        |
|   |  |                      | <b>AVERAGE SCORE</b>   | <b>3.91</b> |
|   |  | c. Assurance         | 7. The ability of lecturers to ensure all students that service provided is by the provisions consistently   | 4.04        |
|   |  |                      | The ability of <b>management</b> (head of study program/faculty) to ensure all students that service provided is by the provisions                             | 3.97        |
|   |  |                      | 9. The ability of <b>education staff</b> (administrative staff of study program/faculty) to ensure all students that service provided is by the provisions     | 3.74        |
|   |  |                      | <b>AVERAGE SCORE</b>   | <b>3.92</b> |
|   |  | d. Empathy           | 10. Willingness/concern of <b>lecturers</b> to listen to students  | 4.10        |
|   |  |                      | 11. Willingness/concern of <b>management</b> (head of study program/faculty) to listen to students   | 3.98        |
|   |  |                      | 12. Willingness/concern of education staff (administrative staff of study program/faculty) to listen to students   | 3.69        |
|   |  |                      | <b>AVERAGE SCORE</b>   | <b>3.92</b> |
|   |  | e. Tangible Services | 13. Adequacy, accessibility, and quality of learning facilities and infrastructure   | 3.68        |
|   |  |                      | 14. Adequacy, accessibility, and quality of facilities and infrastructure for extracurricular activities: student discussions, sports, arts, et cetera.        | 3.54        |
|   |  |                      | 15. Adequacy, accessibility, and quality of facilities and infrastructure for student rest/relaxation: parks, canteens, prayer rooms, parking lots, et cetera. | 3.66        |
|   |  |                      | <b>AVERAGE SCORE</b>   | <b>3.63</b> |
| <b>SUM AVERAGE OF ALL FIVE INDICATORS</b> |  |                      |  | <b>3.87</b> |

Based on Table 4 above, all indicators of student satisfaction regarding the academic services, i.e., reliability, accountability/responsibility, assurance, d) empathy, and completeness of physical or tangible services. Other than the indicator of the completeness of physical or tangible services with an average score of **3.87** (rounded up to 4.0), the **high** category, four indicators score above 3.90, indicating the need to increase the score to 5 or **very high** category. The average score of each indicator is as follows.

- Reliability: 3.97 on average.
- Responsibility: 3.91 on average.
- Assurance: 3.92 on average.
- Empathy: 3.92 on average.

One indicator, i.e., **the completeness of physical/tangible services**, scored **3.63** on average, which falls under the moderate category (range from 3.00 to 3.60). This indicator requires **more strategic approaches** to achieve high or very high (scores 4.0 and 5.0). Five out of 15 items scored more than 4.0; those indicators are listed below.

- Pedagogic skills of the lecturers;
- Willingness of responsive lecturers;
- Lecturer service consistency;
- Willingness of the responsive head of study program/faculty;

e. Lecturers' concern for students.  
Fourth out of 15 items scored more than 3.60; those indicators are listed below.

- Adequacy, accessibility, and quality of learning facilities and infrastructure;
- Willingness/concern of education staff (administrative staff of study program/faculty) to listen to students
- Adequacy, accessibility, and quality of facilities and infrastructure for **extracurricular activities**: student discussions, sports, arts, et cetera.
- Adequacy, accessibility, and quality of facilities and infrastructure for student rest/relaxation: parks, canteens, prayer rooms, parking lots, et cetera.

#### 4.2. Discussion

The results of descriptive analysis of customer satisfaction data on academic service data for 733 student respondents indicate that, on average, students are satisfied with the academic services provided, both in offline services (face-to-face learning) and online learning. This notion is supported by research results seen in Allen and Seaman (2010), Allen, Bourhis, Burrell and Mabry (2002), Biner, Bink, Huffman, and Dean (1997), Brown and Liedholm (2002), and Johnson (2000) (as cited in Kuo et al., 2013:17).

Their research confirms that online learning has no significant differences from regular offline meetings. Similarly, Allen and Seaman (as cited in Kuo et al., 2013:17) claim that student satisfaction regarding online and offline learning is not that contrast.

Every tertiary institution needs information on student satisfaction with academic services. This is because such information is one of the benchmarks for success in education, which ultimately impacts the reputation of the university and the interest of prospective students. Such an idea is in line with a study by Kim (as cited in Bakrie et al., 2019:379) that the quality of its services determines a university's reputation. Saputra et al. (as cited in Budiningsih et al., 2020:431) explained that the quality of academic services has a strategic role in meeting student needs/expectations (student satisfaction), which affect the emergence of high loyalty to the institution (university) that provides the service. Students who have high loyalty can be expected to serve as a medium of promotion (or mouth promotion or viva voice).

Of the 15 statement items as predictors of student satisfaction regarding academic services, five statement items score below 4.0. Those items involve a) lecturer's pedagogic ability, b) responsiveness of lecturers' willingness, c) consistency of lecturer's services, d) responsiveness of department/faculty leaders, and e) lecturer's concern for students. Such results suggest the necessity to maintain the performance of the service and improve the score to 5.0. This is in line with the results seen in Butt and Rehman (2010: 5450), signifying that the pedagogic competence of the lecturer is central to student satisfaction. Douglas (as cited in Al-Sheeb et al., (2018:10) further adds that the prominent factor contributing to student satisfaction is the quality of learning provided to students. Gray and DiLoreto (2016:1) explain that the organization and structure of learning, student involvement, the interaction between students and lecturers considerably impact student satisfaction. They further explained that the opportunity for students to interact with each other and the presence of lecturers in the learning process contribute to students' satisfaction. Furthermore, Ilyas (2014:158) argues that academic services requiring improvement to improve satisfaction rate include a) the use of learning media, b) the provision of reference books, and c) conformity of lecture activities with the plan. Qadri (2017: 114-115) explains that the quality of academic information systems significantly affects student satisfaction. Learning using multimedia effectively provides student satisfaction in the online learning process (Choe R. C et al., 2019:1). Further, Daniel et al. (2017:119) concluded that most students studying at Dire Dawa University Ethiopia were satisfied with the learning facilities offered, except those related to computer and internet facilities. Kurniati and Kadarsih (2017:245) reported that the academic and student administration services at AKMI Baturaja, South Sumatra-Indonesia, were quite good, but the indicator of **empathy** (caring for others) and **assurance** of services needed improvement so that there was a match between results and service promises. Tabi'in (2017:39)

suggests that caring for others is an attitude and action that always wants to help others and communities in need; Therefore, it requires the ability to pay attention to the environment in which the community. Furthermore, Ilyas & Budiningish (2021:16) explained that to foster a caring attitude at least includes the following 3 (three) things: a) empathy is the ability to feel difficulties experienced by others; b) sympathy is moral and material support (helping hand to alleviate the hardships and sufferings of others), and c) the spirit of sharing/giving non-getting (giving not asking). The 3 (three) characters above (empathy, sympathy, and sharing) must be strived to grow and develop into an inherent and settled character among education personnel or lecturers. According to Utami et al (2019: 21) indications of caring for others (social care) include a) having empathy, b) a willingness to establish relationships with others, c) trying to help him when he sees others affected by the disaster. Furthermore, Alma (2010: 206) explained some things that can subtract a person's social care, among others: a) be a spectator in the event of a disaster, rather than help; b) Nonchalance to the environment. c) do not participate in activities in the community.

Recommendations from this study are the need to improve academic services to students to improve the student satisfaction rate to 5.0, as this is central to the university's reputation. Academic services requiring improvement involve: a) the ability and care of education personnel in providing quality & fast service; b) develop the caring character of the manager/head of the Study Program / Faculty in providing quality academic services; and c) adequacy, accessibility & quality of supporting facilities of student academic activities.

## V. CONCLUSION

The present work concludes that: a) the average assessment of student satisfaction regarding university academic services is in the high category with an average assessment score = 3.8697 4.0, implying the need to improve the score to 5.0 for the better reputation of the university. b) The quality of academic services has a strategic role in meeting student satisfaction, which contributes to the loyalty of the students to the university. It is expected that these students can be a 'mouth promotion' for the University c) Some services that need improvement are: a) adequacy, accessibility, and quality of learning facilities and infrastructure; b) the ability and concern of education personnel in providing quality and fast services, c) the ability and concern of the manager/leader of the study program/faculty in providing quality academic services, and d) adequacy, accessibility, and quality of supporting facilities for student academic activities. This study has potential limitations. One example is the scope that is only limited to one university. For this reason, conducting further research on other universities using the same questionnaires is recommended even though students' characteristics are not that significantly different.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Alma B. (2010). *Learning Social Studies*. Alfabeta.
- [2] Al-Sheeb, B, Hamouda, AM, and Abdella, GM. (2018). Investigating Determinants of Student Satisfaction in the First Year of College in a Public University in the State of Qatar. *Hindawi Education Research International*: 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2018/7194106>
- [3] Bakrie M, Sujanto B, and Rugaiyah. (2019). The Influence of Service Quality, Institutional Reputation, Students' Satisfaction on Students' Loyalty in Higher Education Institution. *International Journal for Educational and Vocational Studies*, 1 (5), 379-391. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.29103/ijevs.v1i5.1615>. <http://ojs.unimal.ac.id/index.php/ijevs>
- [4] Budiningsih, I. 2016. Quality evaluation of the Library Service of Syaifi'iyah Islamic University (UIA). *Academic journal Tekonologi Education*, MTP UIA, 5 (1): 1-14. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.34005/Akademika.v5i01.490>.
- [5] Budiningsih I, Lubis E, and Armiati R. (2020). Improvement of University Educational Staff's Strategic Roles in Digital Era Through Quality Service. *International Journal of Asian Social Science*, Vol. 10, No. 8, 426-433. DOI: 10.18488/journal.1.2020.108.426.433.
- [6] Butt BZ and Rehman K. (2010). A study examining student satisfaction in higher education. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2, 5446-5450. DOI: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.03.888.
- [7] Daniel D, Liben G and Adugna A. (2017). Assessment of Students' Satisfaction: A Case Study of Dire Dawa University, Ethiopia. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 8 (4), 111-120.
- [8] Kurniati E and Kadarasih. (2017). Mengukur Kepuasan Mahasiswa Terhadap Pelayanan BAAK AMK AKMI Baturaja (Measuring Student Satisfaction with BAAK AMK AKMI Baturaja Service). *Jurnal Ilmiah Matrik*, (3), 237-246.
- [9] Gray, J.A. and DiLoreto, M. (2016). The Effects of Student Engagement, Student Satisfaction, and Perceived Learning in Online Learning Environments. *NCEPA International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, 11 (1), 1-20. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1103654.pdf>.
- [10] IELTS. (2019). Student Satisfaction. A 2019 Global Overview. Study Portals, IELTS. <https://www.studyportals.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/Global-Student-Satisfaction-Report-A-2019-global-overview.pdf>
- [11] Ilyas. (2014). Tingkat Kepuasan Mahasiswa Terhadap Layanan akademik Dosen Pendidikan Agama Islam (Level of Student Satisfaction with Academic Services of Lecturers in Islamic Religious Education). *Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan*, 31 (2), 155-159.
- [12] Ismail, A.I. & Iffah Budiningsih, I. (2021). Strengthening Ihsan Behavior (Always do the Good Deeds). *Global Journal of Human Social Science: G Linguistics & Education*, Vol. 21, Issue 5, Version 1.0: 16. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.34257/GJHSSGVOL21IIS5PG13>.
- [13] Kuo Y-C, Walker AE, Belland BR, and Schroder KEE. (2013). Predictive Study of Student Satisfaction in Online Education Programs. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning (IRRODL)*, 14 (1), 16-39. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v14i1.1338>.
- [14] Marfuah U and Puteri RAM. (2016). Pengukuran Tingkat Kepuasan Mahasiswa Terhadap Pelayanan Fakultas X Universitas XYA (Measurement of Student Satisfaction Level of Fakultas X University XYA). *Prosiding SEMNASTEK Fakultas Teknik Universitas Muhammadiyah Jakarta*. <https://jurnal.umj.ac.id/index.php/semnastek>.
- [15] Qadri, MN. (2017). Pengaruh Kualitas Sistem Informasi Akademik (Berbasis Web) dan Kinerja Unnit layanan Terhadap Kepuasan Mahasiswa di Perguruan Tinggi Swasta (The Effect of Academic Information System Quality/Web-Based and Performance of Unnit Services to Student Satisfaction in Private Universities). Yogyakarta: CV. Adi Karya Mandiri.
- [16] Redhana IW, Sudria, IBN, Suardana IN, Suja, IW and Haryani S. (2019). Students' Satisfaction Index on Chemistry Learning Process. *Jurnal Pendidikan IPA Indonesia (JPII)*, 8 (1), 101-109. <http://journal.unnes.ac.id/index.php/jpi>.
- [17] Choe, R C. et al. (2019). Student Satisfaction and Learning Outcomes in Asynchronous Online Lecture Videos. Department of Integrative Biology and Physiology, Office of Instructional Development, Molecular Biology Institute, University of California, Los Angeles.
- [18] Sembiring P, Sembiring S, Tarigan G and Sembiring OD. (2017). Analysis of Student Satisfaction in The Process of Teaching and Learning Using Importance Performance Analysis. *International Conference on Information and Communication Technology (IconICT)*. IOP Conf. Series: Journal of Physics: Conf. Series 930. DOI:10.1088/1742-6596/930/1/012039.
- [19] Subandi. (2021). Student Satisfaction, loyalty, and motivation as observed from The Service Quality. *Journal of Management and Islamic Finance*, 1 (1), 136 - 153. <http://ejournal.iaim.surakarta.ac.id/index.php/jmif/index>. Suhendar E & Suroto (2014). Penerapan Metode Quality Function Deployment (QFD) Dalam Upaya peningkatan Kualitas pelayanan akademik Pada UB. *Faktor Exacta*, 7(4): 372-386.
- [20] Sofroniou A, Premnath B and Poutos K. (2020). Capturing Student Satisfaction: A Case Study on the National Student Survey Results to Identify the Needs of Students in STEM Related Courses for a Better Learning Experience. *Education Science*, 10 (37), 1-22. DOI:10.3390/educsci10120378.
- [21] Sodik, M.A, Suprpto I, Pangesti, D. (2013). Factors related to the implementation of PRIMA services officers in the Rsui Orpeha Tulungagung. *Strada Journal of Scientific Health*, 2 (1): 7. <https://www.sjik.org/index.php/sjik/article/view/40/44>.
- [22] Spector J.M, Merrill M.D, Merrienboer JV, and Driscoll MP. (2008). *Handbook of Research on Educational Communications and Technology*, Third Edition. New York - London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Subandi. (2021). Student Satisfaction, loyalty, and motivation as observed from The Service Quality. *Journal of Management and Islamic Finance*, 1 (1), 136 - 153. <http://ejournal.iaim.surakarta.ac.id/index.php/jmif/index>.
- [23] Tabi'in, A. (2017). Foster Child Care Attitude through Social Activity Interaction. *Ijtima'iyah Journal of Social Science Teaching*, 1(1), 40-59.
- [24] Stufflebeam, Daniel L. and Shinkfield AJ. (2007). *Evaluation Theory, Models, and Application*. San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass, John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- [25] Susilaningih, E. 2012. Model of Chemical Practicum Evaluation in Education Institution. *Journal of Education Research and Evaluation*, UNY, 16 (1): 234-248 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21831/pep.v16i1.1115>.
- [26] Uno, H., Budiningsih, I and Penjaitan, K. (2012). *Learning Model (2nd print)*. Gorontalo: BMT Nurul Jannah.
- [27] Utami, T., Alfiandra, Waluyati, S. H. 2019. Pengaruh Kecerdasan Emosional Terhadap Sikap Peduli Sosial Siswa Di SMP Negeri 1 Palembang (The Influence of Emotional Intelligence on The Social Care Attitude of Students in State Junior High School 1 Palembang). *Jurnal Bhineka Tunggal Ika, Universitas Sriwijaya*. 6 (1): 17-36.
- [28] Yunanto M., Setiono W., and Medyawati H. (2012). Responsibilities and Excellent Service on Customer Satisfaction: Case Study of DKI Islamic Bank. *International Conference on Management and Education Innovation IPEDR*, 196 IACSIT Press, Singapore, Vol. 37:196. <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Responsibilities-and-Excellent-Service-on-Customer-Yunanto-Setiono/e3c52797f1309f0246d9ffb12355ee2560f9e888>.