IJAAR PUBLISHING®

Research Journal of Management Practice | ISSN: 2782-7674
Vol. 5, Issue 11 (2025) | www.ijaar.org/rjmp

QUALITY EDUCATION SERVICES DELIVERY AND STUDENTS' SATISFACTION IN PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES IN RIVERS STATE

BY

DR. COLLINS OKECHUKWU AMADI
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY, FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
UNIVERSITY OF PORT HARCOURT
otukiri63@gmail.com

AND

DR. NWORGU, KELECHI GODSON
DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS AND HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT,
FACULTY OF SOCIAL AND MANAGEMENT SCIENCES
KINGSLEY OZUMBA MBADIWE UNIVERSITY, IDEATO, IMO STATE
nworgugodson10@gmail.com

Abstract

The paper investigated quality education services delivery and students' satisfaction in public universities in Rivers State. Objectives of this study include to investigate the influence of lecturers teaching style on students' satisfaction in public universities in Rivers State, and to ascertain the influence of administrative services on students' satisfaction in public universities in Rivers State. The expectancy disconfirmation theory, and cross-sectional design were adopted. The purposive sampling technique was used in collecting data, with the aid of questionnaires designed in four Likert format. The data retrieved were analyzed in percentage and presented on tables. The findings of the paper indicate that quality lecturing styles and services of university teachers influence students feeling of satisfaction, and that the administrative services by administrative staff influence students feeling of satisfaction in public universities in Rivers State. Based on the findings, the study recommends that university management should organize forums and seminars for training and retraining of lecturers to adapt to effective teaching styles that provide quality services and innovative knowledge to students of public universities in Rivers State, and that administrative heads of public universities in Rivers State should periodically conduct enquiry among university students to ascertain the quality of administrative services offered to them as to discover how they feel about the service provided to them whenever they seek clarifications and other services from the administrative staff.

Keywords: Quality Education, Service Delivery, Students Satisfaction, Public Universities.

Amadi, C. O. & Nworgu, K. G. (2025). Quality Education Services Delivery and Students' Satisfaction in Public Universities in Rivers State. *Research Journal of Management Practice. 5*(11), 28-39. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18133000

Introduction

Quality education services in universities are the arrowhead of a country's future and present progress. This is because no nation that values education can be stranded technologically, economically, developmentally, and socially. As a result, the government of such nations will continue to prioritize the services and quality of education to produce satisfactory, excellent and productive human resources which are the complimentary effects of education. Education is termed as the most powerful investment in our future UNICEF (2020). Educational institutions have the responsibility of offering students and undergraduates thorough quality educational services before graduation. With the perception and reception of a high-quality education services and discipline, undergraduates of public universities become satisfied with the dynamic, innovative, motivating and driving force of quality educational services provided (Levent & Pehlivan, 2017).

In order to properly satisfy students' academic quest, management and teachers must regularly seek to improve their resources in terms of offering high-quality educational services (Ali & Raza, 2017). Public educational institutions are set up to provide quality services, and they need to advance in their resources, improve their service environment and equipment, even the role of servants. These services are common actions taken within the education system to provide students the needed academic and administrative services (Draganchuk, 2020). In addition, the educational services provided also come in form of infrastructure (conducive learning environment) and facilities. Therefore, educational institutions must take steps toward improving such services, and they are to optimize the utilization of their human resource abilities to improve existing facilities and infrastructure that are wearing away for effective running, and provision of educational services to promote students' satisfaction with their activities (Siswanto & Hidayati, 2020).

Service delivery refers to service performance (Lovelock & Wirtz, 2011). More so, in educational institutions, the services offered consist of academic services, administrative services, educational resources, infrastructure and facilities services, welfare and support services for students. Academic services are the different courses, such as undergraduate degrees and post graduate degree programmes as well as the curricula run by the institutions. Administrative services are the management activities and processes that aid the smooth running of academic programmes. These services are daily offered by the team of administrative employees of universities. Educational resources and facilities are the infrastructure such as building, lighting system, seats, and equipment provided by school management to encourage both teaching and learning relationship between the students and lecturers. Furthermore, students' welfare, and other support services are those services put in place by the school management for students' satisfaction with the school academic and management system. Hence, quality educational services of any institution are often evaluated on the basis of how these services are regularly available and provided to students from time to time since they are the major beneficiaries of the services.

Students' satisfaction on educational services from public institutions is of importance. It is one of the paramount outcomes of management goals. The achievement of institutional goals depends on students' academic performance and satisfaction derived on the overall services efficiently provided to them. Satisfying and always keeping students satisfied with offered educational, administrative and welfare services are the responsibility of university management and employees. Satisfaction signals the overall attitude of students in relation to the kind of services received. It is also the perceived reaction toward a specific service performance that is emotionally expressed to adjudge that a service provided is pleasurable in relation to the fulfillment of the service providers obligation (Lovelock & Wirtz, 2011).

Satisfaction in university settings can be determined by students' positive attitude. It can be measured by regular solidarity of students, and unflinching contentment in co-operation with the service provider and the services provided. In addition, several referrals may be made to potential students, and through positive word of mouth in regard to the services received can be alarmed all over (Kara, Tanui & Kalai, 2016). The pivotal role of quality education service delivery and students' satisfaction occupy a paramount area in universities. This has also attracted collective interest of scholars from all aspects of disciplines. However, in Nigeria universities, it has been observed that only few researches have been conducted on quality educational service delivery and students' satisfaction in either the public primary and secondary schools as well as university institution (Akpoiriro & Okon, 2015).

Many studies have been conducted to ascertain student's satisfaction of educational services across the globe. Encabo (2011) studied universities in Philippines and observed that the quality of educational resources was found to be an indicator of students' satisfaction. Furthermore, Arambewela & Hall (2009) carried out a study on educational resources and found that teaching pattern of lecturers had effect on university students' satisfaction. More so, it was further observed that students' satisfaction also had a positive relationship to services provided, such as innovative knowledge, willingness of lecturers to complete the course outline, as well as their readiness to assist students at all times, and feedback from students after each learning period. Meanwhile, Tuan (2012) studied quality assurance strategies in Vietnam universities. It was found that services delivered by administrative employees were positively linked to students' satisfaction.

Razinkina et. al., (2018) examined students' satisfaction as major factor of delivering quality education service in Russia. The study discovered that awareness of innovative changes made students become satisfied with the services provided. The findings of Osman & Saputra (2019) revealed that lecturers teaching method was seen as an indicator of educational service delivery with a significant influence on student satisfaction. Furthermore, researchers have observed that administrators and management of universities are prioritizing the implementation of quality assurance policies to ensure that university students are satisfied with service delivered. It is against this backdrop that the study seeks to investigate the influence of lecturers' style of teaching and administrative services impact students' satisfaction in public universities.

Research Objectives

The objectives of the study are:

1. To investigate the influence of lecturers teaching style on students' satisfaction in public universities in Rivers State.
2. To ascertain the influence of administrative services on students' satisfaction in public universities in Rivers State

Research Questions

1. What is the influence of lecturers teaching style on students' satisfaction in public universities in Rivers State?
2. What is the influence of administrative services on students' satisfaction in public universities in Rivers State?

Quality of Education Service and Teaching Style of Lecturers in University

Education service describes the academic activities that are rendered to students for their benefit at a particular time, place, and for the realization of desired changes in knowledge on the individuals that are recipient of the services such as teaching, examination and evaluation among others (Wirtz & Jochen, 2021). Meanwhile, it is imperatives for governments to endeavour to support the improvement of lecturers teaching skills for quality teaching in universities (Kara, Tanui & Kalai 2016; Menon, 2015). Quality teaching in universities has attracted more attention of recipients of educational service delivery and educational development researchers (Menon, 2015). Furthermore, quality teaching refers to the styles, tools, schemes, and facilities aimed at improving the capacity of lecturers to provide students with the best teaching methods for effective assimilation and understanding of subject matters in the course's structures, and enhance students learning capacity (Menon, 2015).

The teaching abilities of a lecturer are related to the teaching skills of such lecturer, and it can also be measured based on the composure, comprehension, idea, and transformation of the knowledge ideology to be offered to students (Ganyaupfu, 2013). More so, teaching usually requires teachers to be conversant with the specific objectives and outcomes of the courses, and the structures of the subject matter. In line with Shulman (1992), the purpose for educational engagement is to assist students to have understanding of the subjects, develop skills as well as to have knowledge of societal values, become equipped with opportunity for more acquisition, understandings of new facts, enjoy learning experiences, discover new knowledge, enhance students' responsibility to become very productive in supporting the growth and development of the economy, and contribute to the well-being of the society at large.

Research suggests that both teaching and learning styles should be twined together in order to encourage students' motivation throughout the learning process and period Yassin & Almasry (2015). Teaching styles and learning styles are very critical in the academic world. The styles of teaching and learning are determined by the various reactions of students on the basis of their capacities to comprehend to the teaching styles usually demonstrated by various lecturers. These varieties of reaction can deeply affect students' learning style decisions (Jepsen et. al., 2015). Meanwhile, the differences in teaching or learning styles decisions may obviously have mismatched tendencies on both the lecturers' teaching styles and also the students' learning styles.

The teaching styles are methods and approaches that are used by lecturers to deliver knowledge as well as facilitate learning more effectively. More so, teachers often organize, prepare, present and deliver concepts, contents, build relationships with students as well manage classroom environment. Furthermore, lecturing is mostly shaped by teachers' personality, experiences, value and perceived educational philosophy. Teaching styles are of various categories. They are:

1. Authority Style: This style positions the teacher as the main source of educative information, and the structures, organizes, and delivers contents as an expert. In this condition, the teacher is faced with a large group student having authority over the group or groups.
2. Coaching/Demonstration Style: in this scenario, the teacher as a coach handles the learning process by encouraging students' involvement, guiding the learning process, demonstrating to students, and organizing physical activities for learning.

3. Facilitator Styles: the teacher here takes the role of guiding, ask questions, facilitates discussions, and encourage students to discover new knowledge and explore to know more through accessing useful educative materials.
4. Delegation Style: the method or style is where the teacher delegates students to write term papers, projects and assignment in groups or independently, while the teacher acts a facilitator or mentor.
5. Hybrid Styles: this style is a combination of various approaches in teaching that involves incorporating technology and other mediums to apply different learning demands.
6. Flipped Classroom Style: the methods include the traditional learning approach, and the use of videos, readings, and practical classroom discussions and activities.
7. Inquiry-Based Learning: this style allows students to ask questions, encourage the exploring of ideas, and an avenue for problems solving guided by the teacher.
8. Project-Based Learning: this is the learning style that allows students to engage in in-depth projects that require the application of knowledge and skills.
9. Socratic Teaching Style: the approach is student-centered allowing the teacher to ask questions to guide students in understanding contents as well as guiding them into critical thinking.
10. Collaborative Teaching: in this situation, students are made to work together as a learning group, complete assigned tasks, encourage teamwork as well as having good communication skills.
11. Paired Teaching Style: this approach allows teachers to deliver contents instruction, share workload and offer different perspectives in the teaching process. Students learn from each of the paired teachers.

The preferred and most efficient style is determined on the basis of the need of the students, course, and the learning objectives. Therefore, teaching is the transmitting of knowledge, and skills to a student or large audience in an educational institution, which is also part of the wider concept of education.

Public and private universities are purposed to generate valuable and qualified academic individuals through quality education and services. Quality of individuals in this instance, can be measured in tandem with acquired knowledge in science, technology, arts, attitude, behaviour, ethics, innovation, creativity and in solving of societal problems. However, achieving this goal might become frustrating because it faces various declining factors from both students and administrative services providers. A major pitfall to realizing these goals can be the presumed dissatisfaction of university students with the administrative services offered. This can also be as a result of students not knowing the institution provisions as well as their rights and obligations to the institution in getting the provision of good services. Hence, such failure can be caused by administrative personnel and lecturers. To this end, realizing these goals, public universities need provide services that are able to encourage students as well as lecturers and administrative personnel. A good service to students is described as excellent education service. This significant service remains the best service that is offered in accord with the provision of the university's standard practices to satisfy all students (Windasuri, 2017).

Administrative Services in University

The term administration in university refers to the formal activities of employees involved in non-academic or non-teaching affairs in providing support that regulate students and academics activities at the institution. This includes hostel allocators, transport system handlers, librarians, facility operators, as well as technical personnel (Weerasinghe &

Fernando, 2017). Moreover, administrative service connotes special services provided to students that excludes academic courses (Weerasinghe & Fernando, 2017). Quality administrative services are pivotal in university settings for enhancing students' satisfaction at the institution (Tuan, 2012). However, there are key dimensions to focus on when considering quality of administrative services. These may include the attitude of employees that offer students specific services (Weerasinghe & Fernando, 2017). Therefore, the non-academic functions, the skills as well as service attitudes of administrative employees in universities are critical in determining students' satisfaction.

Most universities across the globe seem to have interest on engaging in fast and radical transformation in academic-based administrative systems applications. In an era of scarce resources, administrators are left with few resources to deliver services (Shaw, Chapman, & Rumyantseva, 2013). Hence, the availability and provision of resources for administrative services in higher institutions are an essential part of institutional management planning and development of effective academic activities in universities. However, services provided by administrative employees must focus on quality (Arena, Arnaboldi, & Azzone, 2010). According to Agasisti et. al., (2019) emphasis must be placed on the experiences of students who receive services from non-academic staff of public universities. Administrative employees must understand that students are significant stakeholders in universities. Also, more consideration must be given to students that seek high-quality administrative services, since they have a strong relationship with the university, and since the administrative services remains their rights as students (Kitchroen, 2004).

In present days, the major administrative services sought by students in universities include, allocation of bed space, class rooms/halls, scheduling and cleaning of rooms, continuous academic records keeping, issuance of diplomas, degree and higher certificates, payment of suppliers, (Arslanagić-Kalajdžić, Kadić-Maglajlić, & Čičić, 2014). It is necessary for university management to provide guidance and advice to students as part of administrative concerns that are also considered vital services in the university (Tsinidou, Gerogiannis, & Fitsilis, 2010). Furthermore, it is pivotal for the administrative team to receive frequent training in other to meet expectations (Icli & Anil, 2014), as well as to take proactive steps in solving students' administrative problems promptly as well as to respond to students demands in an appropriate way. According to Wiers-Jenssen Stensaker & Grøgaard, (2002) quality administrative services is a necessity even as teaching is essential. Arslanagić-Kalajdžić, Kadić-Maglajlić & Čičić (2014) posited that even if the academic services are of high quality, the standard of the quality may not resonate when the administrative services are allowed to decline due to lack of quality.

According to Sadiq, Sohail & Shaikh (2004), there is need to maintain balance between teaching and administrative services in universities as to have substantial or significant results in the overall assessment of quality improvement. Therefore, the promotion of quality academic and administrative services can contribute to the university's advantage (Icli & Anil, 2014). Furthermore, it may be difficult for university management to strike such balance between the two perspectives, neither can it be able to identify the suitable way for these balance (Arslanagić-Kalajdžić, Kadić-Maglajlić, & Čičić, 2014). Hence, further studies on service quality delivery in public universities are to consider the entirety of educational context, and to distinguish between the services offered in departments and faculties by the department and faculty members respectively, being the services delivered by both administrative and academic teams.(Icli & Anil, 2014). Thus, understanding the expectation of educators may be vital toward the delivering of quality services at the university Ramseook-Munhurrun, Naidoo, & Nundlall (2010). More so, the administrative employee's

perception can also reveal more knowledge about the university as well as its administrative services being delivered (Agasisti et. al., 2019).

For Kotler & Armstrong (2018) service is described as any activity or series of activities that are offered directly or indirectly to a person, group of persons, and machines that physically provides solution and satisfaction to the individuals. Therefore, service can be any activity that can meet needs as well as give satisfaction to individuals that are offered intangible products by service deliverers (Tjiptono & Tjiptono, 2012). Service perspective must also include the perception of customer satisfaction. Service is viewed as an extra action that compliments either tangible or intangible products. Hence, services have competitive advantages in making room for friendliness and readiness of administrators paid to provide essential services to recipients. Furthermore, services can be organized and structured.

Satisfaction of Students in University

Satisfaction comes from the Latin term 'satis' which means good or adequate enough. While 'facio' refers to making. Therefore, satisfaction can be defined as the attempt to make something good or adequate enough. The concept of satisfaction is a major concept in human resources management, and marketing, both in theory and practice. It is the essential goal for every business activity (Hamzah & Shamsudin, 2020). The process of achieving satisfaction may be complex or simple depending on the activity. Hence, there are roles in service delivery which individuals need to play to trigger student's satisfaction. Sometimes, individuals are disappointed with the service they receive. The reason is because they are not involved in the process of creating those services. Satisfaction is perceived as the level of a person's feeling after a critical comparison between the reality and his felt expectations (Yussoff & Nayan, 2020). According to Kotler & Armstrong (2018), satisfaction is an individual's feeling of acceptance, pleasure or disappointment on the experiences from an action, in comparison the perceived expectations or results of an activity.

In most institutions, the key to friendly environment is the ability of employees to deliver high-quality services to students (Giannakis & Bullivant, 2016; Silva et al., 2017). This is because service quality is seen as a very strong and powerful force in educational institutions (Dlačić et. al., (2014).A perceived service quality can relatively affect students' satisfaction value in universities. Sadeh & Garkaz (2015) further posited that the role students occupy in university call for the provision of highest level of service quality to them to avert potential disruption of academic activities when they become dissatisfied and embark on protest. Teeroovengadum et. al., (2016) argued that more support and quality service improvement must be taken very seriously by university management because it remains an absolute requirement. Sahney (2016) claim that universities should give priority to service quality, and there must be an overall strategy for its actualization. For Sahney (2016), understanding service quality and satisfaction mainly depends on the perceiver or receiver, and on the perception.

Each individual's experience of service reception in education system can be unique and specific (Santos et. al., 2015). Service quality and satisfaction has more variability in education due to the different types of stakeholders and consumers involved, such as the society, academics, administration, students, and families (Gupta & Kaushik, 2018). To this end, the services cover research, examinations, certificates, counseling, lectures, laboratory, internet and accommodation, to undergraduates, postgraduates, and part time student. According to Markus & Hendry (2015), students' feeling of satisfaction come in relation to the service quality identified in comparison with reality of service they received. According

to Gregory (2019) the adoption of a service quality tactics in universities can enhance student satisfaction.

Theoretical Framework

The study adopts expectancy disconfirmation theory by Oliver (1980) which emphasizes that satisfaction is the outcome of the variance between individuals' expectations and their actual experience. Therefore, a positive disconfirmation usually leads to satisfaction, whereas, a negative disconfirmation falls short of expectation and leads to dissatisfaction. The expectation is the pre-exposure belief about the service. The perceived performance of service is the actual experience of service, while the disconfirmation is the difference between expectations and actual experience of service. In connection to the study, the main recipients of administrative and academic services are students who should be given the room to evaluate the academic and administrative services they receive on the basis of their perceptions and expectations. Students in university system come with much expectations from the quality of teaching, learning and administrative support. They hang their values and beliefs on university education and on their career goals. As a result, students in the university can form opinions or have perceptions about the different services offered by the university on the basis of their experiences.

Materials and Methods

The cross-sectional study design was adopted for the study. Using the purposive sampling technique, data was collected from the sample size of 180 undergraduates of 300 level in three departments, which includes the departments of economics, sociology and political sciences of Ignatius Ajuru university of education, Rivers State university and university of Port Harcourt. The 180 respondents were the representative sample of the population of study. 60 copies of questionnaires designed in four Likert format were distributed to 60 respondents from each of the mentioned departments of the universities, and the total copies of questionnaires retrieved after administering were 174 copies in number.

Results and Discussion

Table 1: summary of responses that lecturers teaching style have influence on students' satisfaction in public universities in Rivers State

Variables	Frequency	Per cent
Strongly agree	78	44.8
Agree	76	43.7
Strongly disagree	14	8.0
Disagree	6	3.4
Total	174	100

Source: Amadi & Nworgu, (2025)

Table 1 reveals that 78 (44.8%) and 76 (43.7%) respondents strongly agree and agree respectively that lecturers teaching styles have influence on satisfaction in public universities. Whereas, 14 (8%) and 6 (3.4%) respondents strongly disagree and disagree to the stated opinion. Therefore, the study stands to accept that lecturers teaching style have influence on students' satisfaction in public universities. This agrees with the findings of Suarman (2015) that lecturer's style and quality of teaching influences students' satisfaction in universities.

Table 2: summary of responses that administrative services influence students' satisfaction in public universities in Rivers State

Variables	Frequency	Per cent
Strongly agree	64	36.8
Agree	72	41.4
Strongly disagree	22	12.6
Disagree	16	9.2
Total	174	100

Source: Amadi & Nworgu, (2025)

Table 2 indicates that 64 (36.8%) and 72 (41.4%) respondents strongly agree and agree respectively that administrative services influence students' satisfaction in public universities. But 22 (12.6%) and 16 (9.2%) respondents strongly disagree and disagree respectively that administrative services influence students' satisfaction in public universities. The research stands to agree that administrative services influence students' satisfaction in public universities. The finding agrees with Tuan (2012) that administrative services were significant to students feeling of satisfaction in the university.

Conclusion

In the university environment, students expect to receive quality services both in academics and administratively. The lecturers are expected to use their expertise to impart knowledge to students just as the students also expect to have satisfactory experiences with administrative staff of universities. Therefore, it is established that teaching styles of lecturers really influences students' satisfactory feelings about the university. In addition, quality administrative services make student feel satisfied with the institution, and poor administrative services makes students feel dissatisfied with the university's administrative services.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, these recommendations are provided:

1. University management should organize forums and seminars for training and retraining of lecturers to adapt to effective teaching styles that provide quality services and innovative knowledge to students of the university.

2. Administrative heads of public universities should periodically conduct enquiry among university students to ascertain the quality of administrative services offered to them as to discover how they feel about the service provided to them whenever they seek clarifications and other services from the administrative staff.

References

Agasisti, T., Giovanni, B., Martina, D. M. & Matteo, T. (2019). Internal Quality Assurance in Universities: Does NPM Matter? Studies in Higher Education 44 (6), 960–77.

Akpoiroro, R. M. & Okon, J. E. (2015). Students' satisfaction with service delivery in Federal Universities in south-south geopolitical zone Nigeria. International Journal of Educational Administration and Policy Studies, 7 (5), 110-113

Ali, M. & Raza, S. A. (2017). Service quality perception and customer satisfaction in Islamic banks of Pakistan: the modified SERVQUAL model. Total Quality Management & Business Excellence, 28(5–6), 559–577.

Arambewela, R. & Hall, J. (2009). An empirical model of international student satisfaction. Asian Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics, 21 (4), 555-569.

Arena, M., Michela, A. & Giovanni, A. (2010). Student Perceptions and Central Administrative Services: The Case of Higher Education in Italy. Studies in Higher Education 35 (8), 941–59.

Arslanagić-Kalajdžić, M., Selma, K.& Muris, C. (2014). Students' Perceptions About Role of Faculty and Administrative Staff in Business Education Service Quality Assessment. Market-Tržište 1, 93–108.

Yassin, B. M. & Mohammad, A. A. (2015). How to accommodate different learning styles in the same classroom: Analysis of theories and methods of learning styles, Can. Social. Science., 11(3), 26-33.

Jepsen, D. M., Varhegyi, M. M.& Teo. S. T. (2015). The association between learning styles and perception of teaching quality, Education and Training, 57(5), 575-587.

Dlacic, J., Arslanagic, M., Kadic-Maglajlic, S., Marković, S. & Raspor, S. (2014). Exploring perceived service quality, perceived value, and repurchase intention in higher education using structural equation modelling. Total Quality Management and Business Excellence, 25(1-2), 141-157.

Draganchuk, L. (2020). Consumer evaluation of quality of education services in higher education. Proceedings of the 16th European Conference on Management Leadership and Governance, ECMLG.

Encabo, H. C. (2011). Canonical correlation analysis of student perception on instructional.

Ganyaupfu, E.M. (2013). Factors Influencing Academic Achievement in Quantitative Courses among Business Students of Private Higher Education Institutions, Journal of Education and Practice, 4(15), 57-65.

Giannakis, M. & Bullivant, N. (2016). The massification of higher education in the UK: Aspects of service quality. Journal of Further and Higher Education, 40(50), 630-648.

Gregory, J. L. (2019). Applying SERVQUAL: Using service quality perceptions to improve student satisfaction and program image. Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education, 11(4), 788-799.

Gupta, P. & Kaushik, N. (2018). Dimensions of service quality in higher education – critical review (students' perspective). International Journal of Educational Management, 32(4), 580-605.

Hamzah, A. & Shamsudin, M. (2020). Why customer satisfaction is important to business? Journal of Undergraduate Social Science and Technology, 2(1).

Icli, G. E., & N. K. Anil. 2014. The HEDQUAL Scale: A New Measurement Scale of Service Quality for MBA Programs in Higher Education. South African Journal of Business Management 45 (3), 31–43.

Kara, A.M., Tanu, E. & Kalai, J. M. (2016). Educational service quality and students' satisfaction in public universities in Kenya. International Journal of Education and Social Science, 3 (10), 37-48.

Kitchroen, K. (2004). Literature Review: Service Quality in Educational Institutions.

Kotler, P. & Armstrong, G. (2018). Marketing: Creating Customer Value and Engagement. In Principles of Marketing (17th ed.). Pearson/Prentice Hall.

Levent, F. & Pehlivan, M. (2017). Confucianism's influence on ethics education in South Korea. Journal of Human Sciences

Lovelock, C. & Wirtz, J. (2011). Services Marketing: People, technology, strategy (7th ed.). New Jersey: Pearson Education Ltd.

Markus, H. & Hendry, R. (2015). Exploring the mediating role of affective and cognitive satisfaction on the effect of service quality on loyalty. Total Quality Management & Business Excellence, 26(9-10), 971-985.

Menon, S. A. (2015). Enhancing service quality in Higher Education. Journal of Research and Method in Education (IOSR-JRME), 5(5), 55-60.

Osman, A. R. & R. S. Saputra. 2019. A pragmatic model of student satisfaction: A viewpoint of private higher education. Quality Assurance in Education 27(2), 142–165.

Ramseook-Munhurrun, P., Perunjodi, Naidoo. & Pushpa, N. (2010). A Proposed Model for Measuring Service Quality in Secondary Education. International Journal of Quality and Service Sciences 2 (3), 335–51.

Razinkina, E., Pankova, L., Trostinskaya, L., Pozdeeva, E., Evseeva, L. & Tanova, A.(2018). Student satisfaction as an element of education quality monitoring in innovative higher education institution E3S Web of Conferences, 33, 30-43.

Sadeh, E. & Garkaz, M. (2015). Explaining the mediating role of service quality between quality management enablers and students' satisfaction in higher education institutes: The perception of managers. Total Quality Management & Business Excellence, 26(11–12), 1335– 1356.

Sadiq, S. M. & Nassar, M. S. (2004). Quest for Excellence in Business Education: A Study of Student Impressions of Service Quality. International Journal of Educational Management 18 (1), 58–65.

Sahney, S. (2016). Use of Multiple Methodologies for Developing a Customer-Oriented Model of Total Quality Management in Higher Education. International Journal of Educational Management 30 (3), 326–53.

Santos, C. R., Contreras, A. M., Faúndez, C. & Palomo-Vélez, G. F. (2015). Adapting the SERVQUAL model to a physical activity break satisfaction scale. International Journal of Workplace Health Management, 8(1), 34-45.

Shaw, M. A., David, W., Chapman, W.& Nataliya, L. R.(2013). Organizational Culture in the Adoption of the Bologna Process: A Study of Academic Staff at a Ukrainian University. Studies in Higher Education 38 (7), 989–1003.

Shulman, L. (1992). Ways of Seeing, Ways of Knowing, Ways of Teaching, Ways of Learning about Teaching. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 28, 393-396.

Silva, D. S., Moraes, G. H. S. M., Makiya, I. K. & Cesar, F. I. G. (2017). Measurement of perceived service quality in higher education institutions: A review of HEDPERF scale use. Quality Assurance in Education, 25(4), 415-439.

Siswanto, E. & Hidayati, D. (2020). Management Indicators of Good Infrastructure Facilities to Improve School Quality. International Journal of Educational Management and Innovation, 1(1), 69–81.

Teeroovengadum, V. T., Kamalanabhan, J. & Ashley, K. S. (2016). Measuring Service Quality in Higher Education. Quality Assurance in Education 24 (2), 244–58.

Tjiptono, F. & Tjiptono, F. (2012). Service Management. quality and Satisfaction. JPAIR Multidisciplinary Journal, 6 (1), 1-16.

Tsinidou, M., Vassilis, G. & Panos, F. (2010). Evaluation of the Factors That Determine Quality in Higher Education: An Empirical Study. Quality Assurance in Education 18 (3), 227–44.

Tuan, N. (2012). Effects of service quality and price fairness on students' satisfaction. International Journal of Business and Social Science, 3 (19), 132-150.

Weerasinghe, I. M. & Fernando, R. L. (2017). Students' satisfaction in Higher Education. American Journal of Educational Research, 5 (5), 533-539.

Windasuri, H. (2017). Excellent Service. In E. Sem Bodo (Ed.), Angwantibo Chewie International Edition, 6(11), 951–952.

Yussoff, N. M. & Nayan, S. M. (2020). Review on customer satisfaction. Journal of Undergraduate Social Science and Technology, 2(2).