



Analisis of student satisfaction on lecturers performance in Management Study Program Terbuka University

Dodi Rustandi¹, Engkus Kusnadi², Suntoro³, Suwardi⁴, Mawan⁵
^{1,2,3,4,5} Manajemen, Universitas Pelita Bangsa, Bekasi, Jawa Barat, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received Feb 25, 2024

Revised Mar 12, 2024

Accepted Mar 15, 2024

Keywords:

Higher education development;
Lecturer quality;
Student satisfaction.

ABSTRACT

The development of higher education today is extremely rapid, moreover the need for education is urgently needed by student, so it is obligatory for all tertiary institutions to really pay attention to the quality of lecturers who will provide maximum service to student. In this study, what kind of lecturers who will provide maximum service to student. In this study, what kind of lecturer performance has an impact on the level of student satisfaction in the Management Study Program at Terbuka University. This research is classified as a quantitative type, so the discussion carried out is data obtained from research which is the result of SPSS 25.0 analysis, observations, interviews, and questionnaires. The type of sample used is purposive sampling. From the research, the results were obtained, namely based on SPSS 25.0 data, we can conclude of management lectures with the highest score, namely Tangible 64.4% and Responsiveness 35.6%.

This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC license.



Corresponding Author:

Dodi Rustandi,
Manajemen,
Universitas Pelita Bangsa,
Jl. Inspeksi Kalimalang No.9, Cibatu, Cikarang Sel., Kabupaten Bekasi, Jawa Barat 17530, Indonesia.
Email: inidodiemail@gmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

The view of education is now more advanced and deeper towards the outside community, especially from the view of the quality and competence of a college itself such as quality and competence. When from the performance system of educators and education personnel in a college. There are internal and external factors that affect the achievement of optimal student academic achievement. Internal factors that affect academic achievement while external factors in the form of environmental conditions around students. In line with the opinion of Wicaksono, Dani Agung, and Trias Ayu Laksanawati (2020), which suggests that internal factors that can affect student learning achievement are physical factors, psychological factors and fatigue factors. Then external factors that can affect learning achievement are family factors, school factors, and community factors (Murti & Prasetyo, 2018; Oktafiyani, 2022; Takrim & Mikkael, 2020). One of the important external factors in the education system is the teacher or lecturer.

The rapid growth of higher education is coupled with the emergence of many competitors from the world of education, namely the establishment of new campuses with various kinds of facilities and quality (Prabowo & Sitio, 2020; Prasilowati et al., 2021; Purwati et al., 2020). The quality of an educational institution can be seen from the quality of the graduates it produces (Cardoso et al., 2016; Tam, 2001). Student achievement as a graduate from college will later be considered important as a provision for entering the world of work because of the increasingly dynamic needs of companies by demanding college graduates to have a superior level of education (Floris et al., 2023; Teichler, 2019). Therefore, the higher the student achievement, the higher the quality of graduates.

Behind it all, to get the best graduates, it is not only measured by academic achievement, but universities must also have quality service quality, one of which is the performance of lecturers or teachers in it (Dill & Soo, 2005; Goldhaber & Anthony, 2003). Performance itself is a description

of the level of achievement or implementation of an activity program or policy in realizing the goals, vision and mission outlined through planning (Iskandar et al., 2022; Wiggins & McTighe, 2007). With the performance of qualified lecturers, students will get satisfaction in the learning process. (Ostroff, 1992)states that satisfaction is the level of a person's feelings after comparing the performance / results he feels with his expectations. Student satisfaction is essential in TQM (Total Quality Management), therefore a university must carefully identify the needs of students and try to satisfy them by seeing students as the main customers to be served (Lawrence & McCollough, 2004; Psomas & Antony, 2017; Wani & Mehraj, 2014)

2. RESEARCH METHOD

The research approach used in this research is to use a quantitative approach (Sugiyono, 2015, 2019). Quantitative research can be done with SPSS calculations. This study aims to obtain an overview and analysis results of lecturer performance on student satisfaction. The data obtained from this study are the results of SPSS 25.0 analysis, observation, interviews, and questionnaires. The type of sample used at this time is purposive sampling.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Students who are satisfied with the performance of lecturers

Table 1. Student Satisfaction Level

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Tangible	11	12.2	12.2	12.2
	Reliability	13	14.4	14.4	26.7
	Responsiveness	16	17.8	17.8	44.4
	Assurance	23	25.6	25.6	70.0
	Empathy	27	30.0	30.0	100.0
	Total	90	100.0	100.0	

Based on the results above, it can be seen that the value of each is V Tangible of 12.2, Realibility of 14.4, Responsiveness of 17.8. Assurance of 25.6 and Empatty of 30.0 if all the results are 100.0 and it is known that the lowest percent is V Tangible 12.2 and the highest percent value is Empathy of 30.0.

Students who feel quite satisfied with the performance of lecturers

Table 2. Student Satisfaction Level

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Tangible	13	14.4	14.4	14.4
	Reliability	16	17.8	17.8	32.2
	Responsiveness	10	11.1	11.1	43.3
	Assurance	23	25.6	25.6	68.9
	Empathy	28	31.1	31.1	100.0
	Total	90	100.0	100.0	

Valid Tangible lowest percent Valid Tangible lowest percent 11 and highest percent 12.2. Based on the results above, it can be seen that the value of each is V Tangible of 14.4, Realibility of 17.8, Responsiveness of 11.1. Assurance of 25.6 and Empatty of 31.1 if all the results are 100.0 and it is known that the lowest percent is V Tangible 14.4 and the highest percent value is Empathy of 31.1.

Students who are dissatisfied with Lecturer Performance

Table 3. Student Dissatisfaction Level

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Tangible	58	64.4	64.4	64.4
	Responsiveness	32	35.6	35.6	100.0
	Total	90	100.0	100.0	

Based on the results above, it can be seen that the result of Tangible V is 64.4 and the result of Responsiveness is 35.6.

Discussion

Based on the data, we can conclude that students who are satisfied with the performance of management lecturers with the highest score is Empathy with a total of 30% and the lowest is tangible with 12.2%. Then in the moderately satisfied category, the highest value is still Empathy with 31.1% and the lowest is 11.1%, namely responsiveness. The category is not satisfied with 2 of the 5 indicators, namely Tangible 64.4% and Responsiveness 35.6%. This study discusses student satisfaction with the performance of management lecturers, where the research results obtained in general show that almost all aspects of students are satisfied. The aspects studied consist of tangible, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy aspects (Azkya et al., 2022). Describes student satisfaction with learning which can be seen from 5 dimensions of satisfaction, namely: (a) Tangible is the physical dimension. A service cannot be smelled, and cannot be touched, so physical evidence is important as a measure of service. Tangible is the ability to provide adequate physical campus facilities and lecture equipment regarding the appearance of lecturers and public facilities, for example: the availability of infrastructure. Students will assess the quality of learning from all existing facilities and facilities. (b) Reliability, which is a dimension that measures the reliability of higher education in providing services to students. There are two aspects of this dimension, namely 1) the ability of lecturers to provide learning methods as promised and, 2) how far lecturers provide learning accurately. Reliability is the ability of lecturers to provide learning as promised (on time), immediately, relevant and accurate so as to satisfy students. (c) Responsiveness is a dynamic dimension of service quality. Responsiveness is the willingness and responsiveness of lecturers to help and provide learning according to student needs. This dimension appears in situations where lecturers are easy to find for consultation purposes. Students' expectations of service accuracy will always change from time to time. (d) Assurance, which is a quality assurance dimension related to the behavior of teaching staff or lecturers in instilling trust and confidence in students. Assurance includes competence, knowledge, skills, politeness. There are four aspects of the assurance dimension, namely friendliness, competence, credibility, and security. (e) Empathy is the attitude of lecturers in providing wholehearted services, such as personal attention and understanding that each student has different abilities and need (Margono, 2005).

4. CONCLUSION

The conclusion of our research is that student satisfaction with lecturer performance in the management study program at Pelita Bangsa University can generally be said to be good because there are only 2 indicators out of 5 indicators that are felt to be unsatisfactory for students, namely tangible at 64.4% and responsiveness at 35.6%. The study on student satisfaction with management lecturers' performance reveals a generally positive perception across various dimensions, with empathy consistently emerging as a significant factor in satisfaction. Tangible aspects, such as physical facilities, and responsiveness also play crucial roles, albeit with lower satisfaction rates. However, limitations in the study include the potential for biases in self-reported satisfaction data and the need for a more diverse sample to ensure broader generalizability. Future research could explore the impact of specific interventions aimed at enhancing empathy and tangible elements in educational settings, as well as investigate the interplay between these dimensions and academic outcomes to provide a more comprehensive understanding of student satisfaction in higher education.

REFERENCES

- Azkya, N. I., DS, Y. R. R., & Saptono, E. (2022). Membangun Loyalitas Pelanggan Kopi Melalui Citra Merek dan Kualitas Produk Dimediasi Oleh Kepuasan Pelanggan Di Masa Pandemi Covid-19. *Jurnal Pelita Manajemen*, 1(01), 57–66.
- Cardoso, S., Rosa, M. J., & Stensaker, B. (2016). Why is quality in higher education not achieved? The view of academics. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 41(6), 950–965.
- Dill, D. D., & Soo, M. (2005). Academic quality, league tables, and public policy: A cross-national analysis of university ranking systems. *Higher Education*, 49, 495–533.
- Floris, M., Paganin, G., Guglielmi, D., & Mazzetti, G. (2023). Motivation is not enough: how career planning and effort regulation predict academic achievement. *Current Psychology*, 1–10.
- Goldhaber, D., & Anthony, E. (2003). *Teacher Quality and Student Achievement. Urban Diversity Series*.
- Iskandar, A., Rusydi, I., Amin, H., Hakim, M. N., & Haqq, H. A. (2022). Strategic Management in Improving the Quality of Education in Boarding School. *AL-ISHLAH: Jurnal Pendidikan*, 14(4), 7229–7238.
- Lawrence, J., & McCollough, M. (2004). Implementing total quality management in the classroom by means of student satisfaction guarantees. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, 15(2), 235–254.
- Margono, S. (2005). *Metodologi penelitian pendidikan*.

- Murti, R. W., & Prasetyo, A. P. (2018). Pengaruh Kompetensi Dosen terhadap Prestasi Akademik Mahasiswa Fakultas Ekonomi dan Bisnis Telkom University. *Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan*, 18(2), 94–102.
- Oktafiyani, T. N. (2022). *Pengaruh Kompetensi Dosen Terhadap Prestasi Akademik Mahasiswa (Studi Kasus Mahasiswa aktif Jurusan Pendidikan IPS UIN Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta)*. Jakarta: FITK UIN Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta.
- Ostroff, C. (1992). The relationship between satisfaction, attitudes, and performance: An organizational level analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77(6), 963.
- Prabowo, A. J., & Sitio, A. (2020). The Impact Of Brand Image, Sales Promotion, Service Quality Towards Customer Satisfaction And Its Implications On Customer Loyalty At X Department Store Kota Kasablanka Jakarta. *Dinasti International Journal of Education Management And Social Science*, 2(2), 267–278.
- Prasilowati, S. L., Suyanto, S., Safitri, J., & Wardani, M. K. (2021). The impact of service quality on customer satisfaction: The role of price. *The Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business*, 8(1), 451–455.
- Psomas, E., & Antony, J. (2017). Total quality management elements and results in higher education institutions: The Greek case. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 25(2), 206–223.
- Purwati, A. A., Fitriyo, T., Ben, F., & Hamzah, M. L. (2020). Product Quality and After-Sales Service in Improving Customer Satisfaction and Loyalty. *J. Econ*, 16(2), 223–235.
- Sugiyono, P. D. (2015). *Metode penelitian pendidikan (pendekatan kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R\&D)*(Vol. 21). Bandung, Indonesia: Alfabeta, CV.
- Sugiyono, P. D. (2019). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D* (Sutopo. Bandung: CV. Alfabeta.
- Takrim, M., & Mikkael, R. H. (2020). Pengaruh Kompetensi Dosen, Motivasi, dan Lingkungan Belajar terhadap Prestasi Belajar Mahasiswa pada Mata Kuliah Bahasa Inggris. *Economics and Digital Business Review*, 1(2), 100–111.
- Tam, M. (2001). Measuring quality and performance in higher education. *Quality in Higher Education*, 7(1), 47–54.
- Teichler, U. (2019). Higher education and the world of work: Conceptual frameworks, comparative perspectives, empirical findings. In *Higher Education and the World of Work*. Brill.
- Wani, I. A., & Mehraj, H. K. (2014). Total quality management in education: An analysis. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention*, 3(6), 71–78.
- Wicaksono, D. A., & Laksanawati, T. A. (2020). Pengaruh kompetensi dosen terhadap prestasi akademik mahasiswa di Politeknik Negeri Banyuwangi. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Terapan Riset Inovatif (SENTRINOV)*, 6(2), 488–494.
- Wiggins, G. P., & McTighe, J. (2007). *Schooling by design: Mission, action, and achievement*. Ascd.