

Study of The Relationship between Student's Satisfaction as Universities' Customers and Academic Performance

Leila Soltanilorestani

M.A "GOVERNMENTAL MANAGEMENT", IRAN

Received: March 19, 2015

Accepted: May 2, 2015

ABSTRACT

One of the most important issues which organizations deal with in the current competitive situation is level of customer satisfaction, customer's ideas about organizational performance, products and services. Monitoring customer satisfaction will provide relevant policies for survival in a competitive environment and gain a greater share of the market. Many organizations have developed ways to gather information about their customers' opinions and ideas. Using a system which is able to obtain numerical index for customer satisfaction is important. This issue is so important for service organizations which provide intangible products to their customers. Statistical population includes 1500 students of Azad university- Khoram Abad Branch. In this study, 338 students were selected randomly. Data was gathered by a questionnaire which its Validity and reliability has been confirmed. Cronbach Alpha was 79%. Methodology of this study is descriptive- correlation and applicative. According to results rate of student's satisfaction as university customer was 62% which shows minimum average of customer-orientation. It is suggested Azad university- Khoram Abad Branch to respect customer orientation questions always to achieve their goals and increase student satisfaction as a customer.

KEYWORDS: Satisfaction, Academic Performance, Customers

INTRODUCTION

Satisfaction is defined as creating happiness and desirable pleasure as a result of meeting needs and demands of clients by service provider [1]. Satisfaction is defined as Clients' perceptions of organizational performance and services as well as meeting their needs and demands. Satisfaction is defined as customer's peace of mind response [2]. Quality of services is a key to customer satisfaction [3].

From Cutler prospective, if performance of company meets customer's expectation, customer is satisfied, unless customer is not satisfied [4].

Customer satisfaction is defined as buyer happiness toward performance of product and services which meets customer satisfaction after comparing performance. Many experts believe that higher education has entered to a new era which competition, quality and accountability is its main characteristic [5].

Performance is divided into two components: 1) efficiency which describes how to use the resources of the organization's products or services; i.e. the relationship between the real and the ideal combination of inputs to produce specific outputs, and 2) efficiency which describes the degree of organizational goals. Job performance is defined as efficiency and effectiveness of assigned tasks. Performance in this definition refers to the obtained ratio of efficiency to applied resources and efficiency is defined as Achievement of predetermined objectives [6]. Performance is a real work which is done in order to guaranty achievement of organization to predetermined mission [7].

Higher education is one of the most important institutions for training and development of human resources and key elements in the development in each country. This institute has main performance and major tasks in line with sustainable development and as a structured entity requires consideration of all sectors and aspects of it. Universities and higher education institutions are the center of thought and knowledge production and plays important role to develop science and thought, cultural and political movement in the society [8].

According to mentioned situation, process of structural changes has started in higher education over the past few decades. Increasing population and developing primary and secondary education have increased along with growing middle level and demand to enter to university have increased. Especially by increasing technology in the field of communication and information, human society is faced with new requirements. In these circumstances, the role of the university is expected to respond to these needs [9]. Accountability has complex principles and below questions spring to the mind: why higher educational institute should be accountable? Who makes them accountable? Why some evidences should be provided in context of accountability of higher education? In higher education system, quality has different interpretations depending on mentality and valuation system of individuals. Quality is major factor for faculty member, students, managers and universities' responsibilities to select and competition of university system.

From UNESCO prospective, quality in higher education has multidimensional concept and abundance of quality depends on ecological status of the university, mission or condition and standards of academic field.

In this regard, Harvey and Green have expressed five approaches corresponding to quality includes exceptional perspectives and corresponding perfectionism to purposes [10]. Studies of Mirvisi[11], NikNejad[12], Shafiei[13] and etc.

Hypotheses of study are as follows:

- There is relationship between students' satisfaction as university customers and number of their absence.
- There is relationship between students' satisfaction as university customers and their GPA.
- There is relationship between students' satisfaction as university customers and level of participation in class activities (presentation, conference etc.....)
- There is relationship between students' satisfaction as university customers and their midterm grades.
- There is relationship between students' satisfaction as university customers and interested in subjects of lessons.
- There is relationship between students' satisfaction as university customers and educational motivation.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

This study describes the current situation and also pays attention to relationship between variables. Methodology of this study is descriptive-correlation and applicative. Statistical population includes 1500 students of Azad university-Khoram Abad Branch. In this study, 375 students were selected as sampling volume by Morgan and Korjes table. Given high sampling volume, just 338 questionnaires have been replied and were analyzed by researchers.

Data collecting tools

In this study, field method is used to collect data and a questionnaire is used as a tool. There are 25 questions in the Questionnaire. In order to analyze questionnaire, five item measurement scale (Likert) is used and is specified from very low to very high (very weak to very strong).

Reliability and Validity: Fifteen questionnaires were distributed among several faculty members and their validity was confirmed. In order to evaluate reliability, twenty questionnaires were distributed among sampling size members and Cronbach Alpha was measured by SPSS software. Obtained Cronbach Alpha for 25 questions was 0.79. Relevant amount of Cronbach Alpha for this study is 0.7, so obtained Cronbach Alpha is relevant.

Tests and Computer Software

In this study, Spearman correlation test was used to introduce correlation among variables and Freidman test was used to in intergroup ranking of variables. Excel software was used to initial processing of data and SPSS 18 software was used to analyze data.

FINDINGS

H1: There is relationship between students' satisfaction as university customers and number of their absence.

Table 26-4.Spearman test for H1

Significant level	Spearman amount	Number
0.000	-0.521	338

Results: spearman test is significant in 1% level (0.000), so there is relationship among variables of this hypothesis in 99% of confidence level. In other word, there is relationship between students' satisfaction as university customers and number of their absence. Negative amount of Spearman (-0.521) shows reverse relationship among two variables, so students' satisfaction is decreased by increasing number of their absence. In order to specify importance of this question in this hypothesis, Freidman test was used, results of this test showed question number 4 had high score. Sampling members believe there is closed relationship between habitat and absence, So H1 is confirmed.

H2: There is relationship between students' satisfaction as university customers and their GPA.

Table 27-4.Spearman test for H2

Significant level	Spearman amount	Number
0.000	0.384	338

Results: spearman test is significant in 1% level (0.000), so there is relationship among variables of this hypothesis in 99% of confidence level. In other word, there is relationship between students' satisfaction as university customers and their GPA. Positive amount of Spearman (0.384) shows direct relationship among two variables, so students' satisfaction is increased by increasing their GPA. In order to specify importance of this question in this hypothesis,

Freidman test was used, results of this test showed question number 5 had high score. Sampling members believe there is closed relationship between continuous evaluation and GPA, So H2 is confirmed.

H3: There is relationship between students' satisfaction as university customers and level of participation in class activities (presentation, conference etc.....)

Table 28-4.Spearman test for H3

Significant level	Spearman amount	Number
0.000	0.199	338

Results: spearman test is significant in 1% level (0.000), so there is relationship among variables of this hypothesis in 99% of confidence level. In other word, there is relationship between students' satisfaction as university customers and level of participation in class activities (presentation, conference etc.). Positive amount of Spearman (0.199) shows direct relationship among two variables, so students' satisfaction is increased by increasing level of participation in class activities (presentation, conference etc.). In order to specify importance of this question in this hypothesis, Freidman test was used, results of this test showed question number 10 had high score. Sampling members believe there is closed relationship between availability of information resource and participation in class activities, So H3 is confirmed.

H4: There is relationship between students' satisfaction as university customers and their midterm grades.

Table 29-4.Spearman test for H4

Significant level	Spearman amount	Number
0.044	0.110	338

Results: spearman test is significant in 5% level (0.044), so there is relationship among variables of this hypothesis in 99% of confidence level. In other word, there is relationship between students' satisfaction as university customers and their midterm grades. Positive amount of Spearman (0.110) shows direct relationship among two variables, so students' satisfaction is increased by increasing their midterm grades. In order to specify importance of this question in this hypothesis, Freidman test was used, results of this test showed question number 14 had high score. Sampling members believe midterm grade is science grade of student form master prospective, So H4 is confirmed.

H5: There is relationship between students' satisfaction as university customers and interested in subjects of lessons.

Table 30-4.Spearman test for H5

Significant level	Spearman amount	Number
0.000	0.584	338

Results: spearman test is significant in 1% level (0.000), so there is relationship among variables of this hypothesis in 99% of confidence level. In other word, there is relationship between students' satisfaction as university customers and interested in subjects of lesson. Positive amount of Spearman (0.584) shows direct relationship among two variables, so students' satisfaction is increased by increasing interested in subjects of lesson. In order to specify importance of this question in this hypothesis, Freidman test was used, results of this test showed question number 18 had high score. Sampling members believe there is closed relationship between proper information resources to more studies and interested in subjects of lesson, So H5 is confirmed.

H6: There is relationship between students' satisfaction as university customers and educational motivation.

Table 31-4:Spearman test for H6.

Significant level	Spearman amount	Number
0.000	0.651	338

Results: spearman test is significant in 1% level (0.000), so there is relationship among variables of this hypothesis in 99% of confidence level. In other word, there is relationship between students' satisfaction as university customers and educational motivation. Positive amount of Spearman (0.651) shows direct relationship among two variables, so students' satisfaction is increased by increasing educational motivation. In order to specify importance of this question in this hypothesis, Freidman test was used, results of this test showed question number 25 had high score. Sampling members believe there is closed relationship between proper training environment and educational motivation, So H6 is confirmed.

B. Freidman test to compare questions of each variable.

Table 32-4.Ranking Freidman intergroup test For H1

Nvtqdih.gRanks	
	Average of score
1. Is there any relationship between scheduling class program and absence in the classroom?	1.92
2. Is there any relationship between presenting lesson in each section regularly by master and absence in the classroom?	1.95
3. Is there any relationship between professional knowledge of master and absence in the classroom?	2.75
4. Is there any relationship between your habitat and absence in the classroom?	3.39

Table 33-4. Freidman intergroup test For H1

Test Statistics	
Number	338
Chi-square	410.278
Freedom Degree	3
Significance Level	0.000

Given table above, Freidman test is significant in 1% level, so there is significant difference between questions in H1 in 1% level. Question number 4 had highest score. So, sampling members believe habitat is most effective in absence.

Table 34-4.Ranking Freidman intergroup test For H2

Nvtqdih.gRanks	
	Average of score
5. Is there any relationship between continuous evaluation and your GDP?	4.61
6. Is there any relationship between efficiency of training material and instrument (Internet, Library, Chari etc..) and you GDP?	2.86
7. Is there any relationship between classroom discussion about lesson and your GDP?	2.66
8. Is there any relationship between owning professional and experienced master and your GDP?	2.21
9. Is there any relationship between personal idea of master and student GDP?	2.66

Table 35-4.Freidman intergroup test For H2

Test Statistics	
Number	338
Chi-square	588.481
Freedom Degree	4
Significance Level	.000

Given table above, Freidman test is significant in 1% level, so there is significant difference between questions in H2 in 1% level. Question number 5 had highest score. So, sampling members believe there is closed relationship between continuous evaluation and GDP.

Table 36-4.Ranking Freidman intergroup test For H3

Nvtqdih.gRanks	
	Average of score
10. Is there any relationship between availability of information resource in universities and level of participation in classroom activities?	2.80
11. Is there any relationship between training facilities (Internet, Library et...) and level of participation in classroom activities?	2.32
12. Is there any relationship between proper space to active participation of students by masters and your level of participation in classroom activities?	2.55
13. Is there any relationship between motivation by master and your level of participation in the classroom?	2.33

Table 37-4.Freidman intergroup test For H3

Test Statistics	
Number	338
Chi-square	45.579
Freedom Degree	3
Significance Level	.000

Given table above, Freidman test is significant in 1% level, so there is significant difference between questions in H3 in 1% level. Question number 10 had highest score. So, sampling members believe there is closed relationship availability of information resources and level of participation in the classroom activities.

Table 38-4.Ranking Freidman intergroup test For H4

Nvtqdih,gRanks	
	Average of score
14. Is master evaluation about midterm grade according to science grade of students?	2.13
15. Is there any relationship between science level of classroom and midterm grade?	2.04
16. Is there any relationship between related index to valuation of academic performance and midterm grade?	1.83

Table 39-4.Freidman intergroup test For H4

Test Statistics	
Number	338
Chi-square	25.905
Freedom Degree	2
Significance Level	.000

Given table above, Freidman test is significant in 1% level, so there is significant difference between questions in H4 in 1% level. Question number 14 had highest score. So, sampling members believe master evaluation about midterm grade is according to science grade of students

Table 40-4.Ranking Freidman intergroup test For H5

Nvtqdih,gRanks	
	Average of score
17. Is there any relationship between proper assignments and interested to lessons?	2.10
18. Is there any relationship between proper information resources to more studies and interested in lessons?	3.44
19. Is there any relationship between academic guidance of master and interested in lesson?	2.28
20. Is there any relationship between introduced books of master in academic units and interested in lesson?	2.17

Table 41-4. Freidman intergroup test For H5

Test Statistics	
Number	338
Chi-square	315.809
Freedom Degree	3
Significance Level	.000

Given table above, Freidman test is significant in 1% level, so there is significant difference between questions in H5 in 1% level. Question number 18 had highest score. So, sampling members believe there is closed relationship between availability of information resource and interested in lesson.

Table 42-4.Ranking Freidman intergroup test For H6

Nvtqdih,gRanks	
	Average of score
21. Is there any relationship between knowledge of lesson purpose and educational motivation?	2.28
22. Is there any relationship between new methods and educational motivation?	1.88
23. Is there any relationship between on time feedback and educational motivation?	2.58
24. Is there any relationship between verbal encouragement and educational motivation?	4.01
25. Is there any relationship between proper training space and educational motivation?	4.24

Table 43-4.Freidman intergroup test For H6

Test Statistics	
Number	338
Chi-square	732.002
Freedom Degree	4
Significance Level	.000

Given table above, Freidman test is significant in 1% level, so there is significant difference between questions in H6 in 1% level. Question number 25 had highest score. So, sampling members believe there is closed relationship between desirable facilities and training space and educational motivation.

CONCLUSION

In this study, six hypotheses have been studied. In first hypothesis, there was reverse relationship between students satisfaction and number of absence, but there is not in other hypothesis and there was direct relationship between satisfaction and GDP, level of participation in lesson activities, midterm grade, interested in lesson content and educational motivation. Results of this study are not consistent to results of Mazandaran University. Average of customer-orientation in Mazandaran University is 49.11 and has not reached to least level of 60%, while Average of customer-orientation in Khoram- Abad University is 62%. Also, there is not consistent to results of Khozestanin 2008, results of study in Khozestan province were not desirable about customer-orientation or students satisfaction of faculty members of training services quality in both universities. This undesirable situation includes technical and performance quality. In other word, object and methods of quality is not desirable.

In other studies by Mirvisi[11] in banking industries, results are consistent to these studies. Also, studies of NikNejad[12] in banking industries, Shafiei[13] in hotel industries at Mashhad city and Taktom Saghafi (2007) in banking services at Tejarat Bank in Khorasan Razavi Province are consistent to results of this study.

4. Recommendation

Below recommendation is presented to increase satisfaction and promotion of Khoram-Abad universities:

Main question in researcher mind have eliminated due to lack of sufficient time and expensive cost which was comparing Native and non-Native. So, satisfaction of Native and non-Native students are compared.

Given variable of study (satisfaction and GDP, level of participation in lesson activities, midterm grade, interest to lesson article and educational motivation), it is recommended to provide necessary facilities by university to promote science information of students (level of participation in lesson activities, midterm grade, interest to lesson article and educational motivation)

Several factors have known as satisfaction factor of students as Customer University, in this study relationship between student's satisfaction as Customer University and academic performance [14] is studied. It is recommended to other researches to investigated efficiency on other behavioral and science factors (history of educational, students stress, Disappointment over the future career of students etc...)

5.5. Research limitations

- Due to several researches in recent years to fulfill questionnaire, students don't tend to fulfill questionnaire and researcher suffered difficult problems and this is one of research limitation.
- Lack of standard questionnaire to investigate research variable is other research limitation.
- limited resource and internal research and not accessing to external resource about students satisfaction is other research limitation.
- Depending on the non-flexible nature of the questions in the questionnaire, respondent was limited in specific framework and this effect on results of studies.

REFERENCES

1. Rishal, M, A. (2002). *Writing Humor: Creativity and the Comic Mind*. Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press.
2. Anderson, E. W. and V. Mittal (2000). "Strengthening the Satisfaction-Profit Chain." *Journal of Service Research* 3(2): 107.
3. Guskey, TR and Kwang Suk, Y. (2009). What works in professional development? *PhiDeltaKappan*, 90(7): 495-500.
4. DivAndari, Ali And Delkhah, Jalil, *Compilation And Design Model For Measuring Customer Satisfaction In The Banking Industry, According To The Bank's Customer Satisfaction Measurement"*, *Journal Of Business Research*, No. 37, Winter 2005, Pp. 223-185
5. Feigenbaum, AV. (1983). *Total Quality Control*, McGraw-Hill, New York.
6. Sistani, Hossein, *Study of the Relationship between Organizational Culture and Employee Performance*, Isfahan, MS Thesis. Isfahan: State Management Training Center, 2001.
7. Langdon D.G; *Aligning performance, Improving people, systems and organizations*; jossey bas / Pfeiffer, 2000, 27
8. Council of Cultural Revolution (2004), *Assessment of Higher Education*, Tehran, Secretariat of The Council Of The Cultural Revolution.

9. Farasatkah, Maghsoud (1998), "Higher Education In The Twenty-First Century", *Journal Of Research And Planning In Higher Education*, 17, 119-130
10. Bazargan, Abas. (2007) *Quality Assessment in Higher Education: Review Of National and International Experience*, Vol.1, Tehran, AllamehTabatabai University Press.
11. Azar, Adel. And Momeni, Mansour. (2004): *Statistics And Its Applications In Management*, Volume II, Eighth Edition: Samt Publication
12. Rahnavard, Farajollah (2008), *Related Factors To Improve The Performance Of Public Sector Organizations In Iran*, *Journal Of Management*, Year VIII, No. 4, Pp. 79.
13. Kotler, Philip & Gary Armstrong & Saunders, & Wong, Veronica (2001), *Principles Of Marketing*, Third Edition, Pentice Hall UK.
14. Walker K, Satterwhite T. (2009). *Academic Performance Among African American And Caucasian College Students: Is The Family Still Important?* *Coll Stud J* [Updated Mar 1; Cited, Apr 9]. Available From: [Http://Findarticles.Com/P/Articles/Mi_M0fcr/Is_1_36/Ai_85007775?Tag=Artbody;Col1](http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m0fcr/is_1_36/ai_85007775?tag=artbody;col1)
15. Macaulay, Steve & Clark, Graham. (1998). "Creating A Customer Focused Culture: Some Practical Frameworks And Tools", *Managing Service Quality*, MCB University Press, Vol.8, NO.3.
16. Paul, Hersey & Kenneth H. Blanchard & Dewey E. Johnson. (2009). "Management of Organizational Behavior" *Phi Learning*.
17. Philip, George And Hazlett, Shirly – Ann (1995), "The Measurement Of Service Quality: A New P-C-P Attributes Model", *International Journal Of Quality & Reliability Management*, Vol.14.No.3, Pp6.
18. Parker GB. *On Our Selection: Predictors Of Medical Success*. *Med J Aust*. 1993; 158 (11): 747-51.
19. Rhonda, Abrams "Successful Business Research "(2007) Prentice Hall Of India.
20. Winer, Russell (2001), *Customer Relationship Management*, University Of California At Berkeley.
21. Neely, A.D., Adams, C. and Kennerley, M.(2002) *The Performance Prism: The Scorecard for Measuring and Managing Stakeholder Relationships*, Financial Times/Prentice Hall, London
22. Treasury Board of Canada a Secretariat (2001), *Quality Services Guide – Measuring Client Satisfaction*, Canada.