

Student Satisfaction, Needs, Learning Outcome and Motivation: A Case Study Approach at A See-University

Halil SNOPCE
SEE-University

Sadri ALIJA
SEE-University

Abstract: In this paper we deal with the factors which are related to student satisfaction concerning their needs, satisfaction of learning outcomes and motivation factors. The analyses shows that the academic quality of teaching is very important factor of the student satisfaction. Except the quality of teaching methods, one can conclude that the social climate, social conditions offered from the University should be taken into the consideration as very important factor of their motivation for study. We analyze the relationship between student satisfaction factors with student performance and student persistence. We examined how the variables as personality, cognitive and achievement-related variables (academic achievement), as well as various motivational constructs were associated with different forms of satisfaction (satisfaction with study program, satisfaction with the conditions of the academic program, satisfaction with the environment, satisfaction with the stress factors, etc.). The research involved both qualitative and quantitative methodologies. The results are obtained from a survey realized with students of the SEE-University. The results were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences.

Keywords: Student satisfaction, Satisfaction with academic studies, Teacher quality, achievement, motivation, University environment

Introduction

In this research we deal with overall student satisfaction, motivation and basic needs in the SEE-University. Understanding and managing students' satisfaction and their perception about the services offered from the University is important for the University. It gives very useful information in order to plan and develop corresponding market oriented activities.

The importance of offering the quality teaching, quality programs and quality service is one of the basic interests of the educational institutions. Increasing the number of students entering the University is closely connected with these three above mentioned factors (Shago, N. E., 2005). Different evaluation methods have been used in order to find out the needs of students. It was done with the aim to improve the quality of teaching and learning (Jannecke Wiers-Jenssen, at et. al 2010). At (Edens, D., 2012) one can find the research that students who are satisfied with their experiences on campus tend to make bigger effort to graduate. Many studies have shown that a knowledgeable and skillful teacher can increase student motivation and achievement (Cawelti, G., 2004). At (Huitt, W., at et. al 2009) one can find the study about the debates on how to best prepare youth for adult success. The Universities should take care about the student satisfaction as very important factor because of its impact to their motivation, retention, recruitment efforts and fundraising (Schreiner, L.A., 2009). The investigation concerning how students perceive the services they are offered at a German university and how satisfied they are with them one can find at (Thorsten G., 2010). In (Appleton-Knapp, S.L. & K.A. Krentler, 2006) one can find the suggestion that students' satisfaction with their educational experience should be a desired outcome in addition to learning. Based on finding in the service quality literature, in (Martin A. O'Neill & Adrian Palmer, 2004) the service quality in the higher education is defined as "the difference between what a student expects to receive and his perception of actual delivery". Student satisfaction

- This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial 4.0 Unported License, permitting all non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

- Selection and peer-review under responsibility of the Organizing Committee of the Conference

has also a positive impact on fundraising and student motivation (Kevin M. Elliot & Dooyoung Shin, 2004). Motivational variables are strongly associated with student's satisfaction with their academic studies (Kaub, K., at et. al 2012). On the other hand at (Zeithaml, V.A., at et. al, 1990) one can find the research that students' perceived service quality is an antecedent of student satisfaction. On the other hand student satisfaction is an important indicator related to their academic goal (Liao, P. & Hsieh, J, 2011) academic performance (Graunke, S. S., & Woosley, S. A., 2005) and their job satisfaction after graduation (Nauta, M.M., 2007). As student becomes more as a consumer, universities have to take into the consideration the student satisfaction. So, the only one focus is not more teaching and research (Gruber, T., at et. al, 2010). Being involved in social aspects is also very important and the social dimension in learning activities is critical (Machado, M. L., at et. al, 2011). Learning process goes beyond classroom interactions between students and professors, teaching and exams (Bateson, R., & Taylor, J., 2004). Student's satisfaction with their academic studies, as well as job satisfaction is considerably related to global life satisfaction (Lounsbury, J. W., at et. al, 2005).

In this research we investigate how student perceive the services they are offered at a South East European University. The consensus concerning the "best way to define and measure service quality" does not exist (Debbie Clewes, 2003). Everyone who takes part in this process has its own view depending of their needs. This paper deals with the most important stakeholder on this process: students. So, we are investigating students' satisfaction, the factors of their motivation, needs as well as clarifying the latent elements of student satisfaction in the context of achieving the learning outcomes. In (Akil, M. , 2011) one can find the research that 80% of surveyed students indicated that the availability of services were either very important or partly important in their final decision about where to study. The interaction with faculty outside the classroom and quality academic advising is also very important (Machado, M. L., at et. al, 2011). Therefore we analyze all these aspects and tend to identify the actual position at the SEE-University in order to make conclusions and give recommendations for making decisions about the institutional strategy of the university in the future.

Method

The population of the study is consisted from the students of SEE-University in Tetovo, Republic of Macedonia. During the academic year 2016-2017 we surveyed 79 randomly chosen students. For this purpose we have prepared the questionnaire consisted of questions concerning some aspects of descriptive statistics, as well as questions concerning the quality of the life in the campus, the quality of the offered services, the academic quality, the motivation aspects, the satisfaction etc. There were also questions about the encouragement and help that they take from the University. For some aspects of their satisfaction concerning services as well as for some motivational aspects the five point Liker scale was used in the questionnaire. In order to get a clear illustration concerning the interpretation of the gathered data, making conclusions and decisions, we have used the Statistical Analysis Software SPSS. At the beginning we have analyzed some elements from the descriptive statistics concerning some characteristics such as e sex, age, year of study, their department etc. Then we continued with an analysis concerning some other statistical values and dependencies. For analyzing the obtained data in this research we have used Cross Tabulations. This is done with the purpose to get the clearer picture for the topic of discussion. We have used the chi-square test, the so called Pearson value in order to find the significant dependencies between different factors.

Results and Discussion

In table 1 are given some results from the descriptive statistics, concerning the percentage participation in the survey depending of some factors. One can see that majority of the surveyed students are males, basically from the second year of studies. Also the majority of the surveyed students are from the Computer Science Faculty. And the average of their success is distributed such that there is no domination of some average group although the biggest percentage of students is with average between 7 and 8.

Table 1. Quantitative survey

Gender (%)	
Female	38
Male	62
Study Year	
I year	17
II year	60
III year	23
Average success	
Between 6 and 7	22.4
Between 7 and 8	29.9
Between 8 and 9	19.4
Between 9 and 10	28.4
The Faculty	
Computer Sciences	44.3
Languages	7.6
Law	26.6
Public administration	5.1
Business Administration	16.5

At the table 2, means and standard deviations were used to identify the student's satisfaction with some parameters regarding the academic issues. One can see that the total mean scores of students' satisfaction concerning the academic parameters of the University is 3.5, which is relatively high value of satisfaction in the range from 1 which means week satisfaction and 5 which means excellent satisfaction. The parameter with which are most satisfied is the registering of subject and the parameter of weakest satisfaction is offers of study program. But our opinion is that each parameter has a satisfactory ranking because the mean is 3.09.

Table 2. Overall of Student's Satisfaction concerning some academic parameters

Student's Satisfaction	mean	S.D.
1. The quality of the teaching process	3.53	1.072
2. Registration of the subject	4.13	1.079
3. Advices from the responsible	3.56	1.152
	3.41	1.056
4. Administrative issues	3.28	1.143
5. Academicals level of professors	3.09	1.232
6. The reputation of University		
7. The offered study programs		
Total	3.5	1.115

At the table 3, means and standard deviations were used to identify the student's satisfaction with some of services offered in the University. One can see that the total mean scores of students' satisfaction concerning the offered services is 3.61, which is also relatively high value of satisfaction in the range from 1 which means week satisfaction and 5 which means excellent satisfaction. The biggest value of satisfaction is about the library conditions and the least value of satisfaction is about the services of carrier center.

Table 3. Overall of student's satisfaction concerning the services offered by university

Student's Satisfaction	Mean	S.D.
1. University campus	3.95	1.108
2. Classrooms	4.05	1.011
3. Library	4.10	1.226
4. Parking	4.04	1.160
5. Internet	3.65	1.340
6. Student convict	3.13	1.390
7. The quality of food	3.25	1.418
8. The sport activities	3.25	1.436
9. The carrier center	3.11	1.476
Total	3.61	1.285

At the table 4, means and standard deviations were used to identify the student's satisfaction concerning some other aspects of students' life. One can see that the total mean scores of students' satisfaction concerning these aspects is 3.287, which is also relatively high value of satisfaction in the range of 1 which means week satisfaction and 5 which means excellent satisfaction. The biggest value of satisfaction is about the security on the campus and the least value of satisfaction is about the nonteaching activities and students organization.

Table 4. Overall of Student's Satisfaction concerning some other aspects of student life

Student's Satisfaction	Mean	S.D.
1. The different recreate activities	3.09	1.146
	2.94	1.264
2. Student organization	3.23	0.947
3. Student diversity	3.78	1.04
	2.90	1.297
4. Security on the campus	3.73	1.059
	3.34	1.142
5. Nonteaching activities		
6. Student security		
7. Social life		
Total	3.287	7.901

Some Important Dependences

Concerning the dependence between the satisfaction and recommendation to others we get the following table:

Table 5. the dependence between satisfaction and recommendation

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	51.619 ^a	12	.000
Likelihood Ratio	48.392	12	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	28.588	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	79		

From the table 5 one can see that the Pearson coefficient is 0.000. This number is less than the reference value 0.05. From this result one can conclude that there is a significant dependence between these two factors. This means that the student's satisfaction is very closely related to giving recommendations to other students.

In the same way we have got that the Pearson value between the achieved success and the Faculty from where they come, is 0.03, which is also less than the reference value of 0.05. This means there is dependence between the study program and achieved success. This is probably because the best students choose to study informatics, economics and law Faculty. The Pearson value between the motivation and study program they chose is 0.035. This means that students are better motivated if they like the study program that they choose. The same is between the motivation and grade (with Pearson value of 0.02), the satisfaction from the campus and achieved grade etc.

On the other hand there is no dependence between satisfaction from the University and satisfaction from the offered programs. The Pearson value in this case is 0.823 which is very bigger than the reference value of 0.05 (table 6).

Table 6. Dependence between satisfaction from University and study programs

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.129 ^a	9	.823
Likelihood Ratio	6.530	9	.686
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.235	1	.267
N of Valid Cases	67		

The same is between the study program and the recommendation (the value 0.981), the Faculty they choose and the satisfaction from the University (the value 0.71), etc.

Conclusion

From the obtained results we can conclude that in general student's are satisfied with academic offers and services in the South East European University. Administrative aspects and academically level of professors is satisfactory. The University should give bigger effort in proposing an acceptable and more attractive programs to students. Satisfaction with the University campus is on a big level. There should be given effort in improving the quality of food, conditions in the students convict, to increase the sport activities and to improve the functionality of carrier center. The biggest remark is about nonteaching activities. So, the recommendation is that the University should find methods and ways on how to increase the nonteaching activities in the University campus. Also we have analyzed some dependences among different factors which can be seen in the paper. As one can see, the conclusions are mentioned in the part of results as well

References

- Shago, N. E. (2005). *Student Satisfaction Survey as a Quality Improvement Tool at Tshwane University of Technology*. A Dissertation from Faculty of Education, Tshwane University of Technology. Retrieved from http://libserv5.tut.ac.za:7780/pls/eres/wpg_docload.download_file?p_filename=F1398256005/shago.pdf.
- Jannecke Wiers-Jenssen, Bjorn Stensaker and Jens B. Groggaard (2010). *Student Satisfaction: Towards an Empirical deconstruction of the concept*. Journal of quality in higher education. Volume 8, pp. 183-195, 2002. Online publication.
- Edens, D. (2012) *The value of student satisfaction assessment for profit-higher education institutions*. Retrived from https://www.ruffalonl.com/documents/shared/Papers_and_Research/2012/Career_School_Assessment_Edens.pdf
- Cawelti, G., (2004) *handbook of Research on Improving Student Achievement*.
- Huitt, W., Huit M, Monetti, D., and Hummel, J. (2009). A system based Synthesis of Research Related to Improving Student Academic Performance. Retrived from <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download;jsessionid=4AAB864F3D828A8B3D563A254B4D20C6?doi=10.1.1.187.1654&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Schreiner, L.A. (2009) *Linking Student Satisfaction & retention. Research Study*. California: noel-Levitz, Inc Azusa Pacific University. Retrived from <http://learn.ruffalonl.com/rs/395-EOG-977/images/LinkingStudentSatis0809.pdf>

- Thorsten G., Stefan F., Roediger V., & Michaela G. (March, 2010) *Examining Student Satisfaction with Higher Education Services: Using a New Measurement Tool*. In International Journal of Public sector Management.
- Appleton-Knapp, S.L. and K.A. Krentler (2006). *Measuring Student Expectations and their Effects on Satisfaction: The Importance of Managing Student Expectation*. Journal of Marketing Education, 28 (3), 254-264.
- Martin A. O'Neill, Adrian Palmer (2004), "*Importance-performance analysis: a useful tool for directing continuous quality improvement in higher education*", Quality Assurance in Education, Vol. 12 Issue: 1, pp.39-52, <https://doi.org/10.1108/09684880410517423>
- Kevin M. Elliot & Dooyoung Shin (2004), "*Student Satisfaction: An Alternative Approach to Assessing this Important Concept*", Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, volume 24, issue 2, pp. 197-209.
- Kaub, K., Karbach, J., Biermann, A., Friedrich, A., Bedersdorfer, H. W., Spinath, F.M. (2012), *Vocational interest and cognitive ability of first-year teacher candidates as a function of selected study mayor*. Z. Pedagogische Psychol. 26, p.p. 233-249.
- Zeithaml, V.A., Berry, L.L., Parasuraman, A. (1990) *Delivering service quality*. New York : Free Press.
- Liao, P., Hsieh, J. (2011), "*What influences internet based learning?*" Social Behavior and personality: An international journal, 39, p.p. 887-896.
- Graunke, S. S., & Woosley, S. A., (2005), "*An exploration of the factors that affect the academic success of college sophomores*". College student journal, 39, 367-376.
- Nauta, M.M. (2007), "*Assesing College Students' satisfaction With Their Academic Majors*". Journal of Career Development, 15(4), p.p. 446-462.
- Gruber, T., Fus, S., Voss, R., & Glaser-Zikuda, M (2010), *Examining student satisfaction with higher education services: Using a new measurement tool*. The international Journal of Public Sector Management, 23, pp. 105-123.
- Machado, M. L., Brites, R., Magalhaes, A., & Sa, M.J. (2011), *Satisfaction with higher education: Critical data for student development*. European Journal of Education, 46, pp.415-432.
- Bateson, R., & Taylor, J. (2004), *Student involvement in university life-Beyond political activism and university governance: A view from Central and Eastern Europe*. European Journal of Education, 39, pp. 471-483.
- Lounsbury, J. W., Saudargas, R. A., Gibson, L. W., and Leong, F. T. (2005), *An investigation of broad and narrow personality traits in relation to general and domain-specific life satisfaction of college students*. Res. Higher Educ. 46, pp. 707-729.
- Debbie Clewes (2003), *A Student-centered Conceptual Model of Service Quality in Higher Education*. Quality in Higher education, Vol. 9, No. 1.
- Akil, M. (2011), *International student support in European high education (Review of the ACA Papers on International Cooperation in education)*. International review of Education, 58, pp. 297-300.

Author Information

Halil Snopce

South East European University
Ilindenska 335, 1200 Tetovo, R. Macedonia
Contact e-mail: h.snopce@seeu.edu.mk

Sadri Alija

South East European University
Ilindenska 335, 1200 Tetovo, R. Macedonia
