



ACADEMIC SERVICES' INFLUENCE ON STUDENT SATISFACTION IN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

D. Rajasekar*, Harikumar Pallathadka** & Yuhlung Cheithou Charles***

* Post Doctoral Research Scholar, Manipur International University, Imphal, Manipur, India

** Senior Professor & Vice Chancellor, Manipur International University, Imphal, Manipur, India

*** Professor, Manipur International University, Imphal, Manipur, India

Cite This Article: D. Rajasekar, Harikumar Pallathadka & Yuhlung Cheithou Charles, "Academic Services' Influence on Student Satisfaction in Institutions of Higher Education", Indo American Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Review, Volume 9, Issue 2, July - December, Page Number 54-57, 2025.

Copy Right: © IAJMRR Publication, 2025 (All Rights Reserved). This is an Open Access Article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.16716792>

Abstract:

Student satisfaction has emerged as a crucial metric for evaluating the accomplishments and standards of higher educational institutions. The study examines how academic services such as teaching quality, curriculum design, academic advising, library resources, and administrative support impact student happiness. A quantitative survey is used to identify the essential academic service components that influence student satisfaction with higher education. The findings reveal that faculty adaptability, curriculum relevance, and institutional support systems are the most influential factors in student happiness. This study also provides strategies for expanding academic services to boost education and institutional credibility.

Key Words: Student Satisfaction, Higher Education & Academic Services

Introduction:

Student satisfaction has recently emerged as an important performance metric for Higher Education Institutions (HEIs). With growing competition, evolving quality assurance practices, and increasing student expectations, academic services have become central to how higher education institutions function. Higher education institutions (HEIs) are increasingly being evaluated based on student satisfaction and success rates. Student satisfaction reflects not only academic accomplishment, but also the institution's general learning environment and support services. Academic services, ranging from curriculum quality to access to digital learning platforms, are important predictors of student satisfaction. With increased student and stakeholder expectations, higher education institutions must guarantee that their academic services are responsive, inclusive, and outcome-focused. This study aims to examine the impact of academic services on student satisfaction, with a specific focus on higher education institutions (HEIs) in India.

Review of Literature:

Gurung S. K., Chapagain R., and Thapa K. (2023). "Business Student Satisfaction: The Role of Academic and Non-Academic Services in Higher Education Institutions" examines how both academic and non-academic services contribute to student satisfaction in higher education. Despite this, institutions often overlook students' perspectives when evaluating these service areas. According to the respondents, 255 business students were purposefully selected for this research, which used purposive sampling. Ultimately, these qualities have a direct impact on how students view and rate the educational institution.

Elliott and Shin (2002), in their paper "Student Satisfaction: An Alternative Approach to Assessing This Important Concept," emphasized that student satisfaction reflects short-term attitude based on students' direct experiences within their educational environment. They identified that academic services, such as instruction quality, accessibility, responsiveness, and support, play a key role. The authors found that academic services are crucial for enhancing students' educational experiences and fostering institutional loyalty. In their study "Measuring student satisfaction at a UK university," Douglas, Douglas, and Barnes (2006) investigated numerous service touch points, including academic delivery and administrative support. Their findings revealed a strong link between teaching quality, access to library resources, effective academic administration, and student satisfaction. They conclude that institutions must adopt a multidimensional approach to evaluating service quality in order to effectively meet student needs. Alves and Raposo (2007) suggested a "Conceptual model of Student Satisfaction in Higher Education" that connects academic services and institutional performance. Their findings revealed that, while physical infrastructure has some influence, academic services such as counseling, library help, and ICT integration have a greater impact on student happiness. They concluded that fostering a service-oriented culture in academic institutions improves overall happiness and loyalty.

Sumaedi, Bakti, and Metasari (2012) conducted a study named "The Effect of Students' Perceived Service Quality and Value on Student Satisfaction" and discovered that students' views of the quality of

teaching and information services had a substantial impact on their satisfaction levels. Their findings indicated that the perceived value of academic services fostered good student sentiments. They find that value-based service quality in academics leads significantly to student retention and institutional performance.

Dhamija, Bag, and Gupta (2019) conducted a "systematic literature review" titled "Measuring student satisfaction," which analyzed global studies to find main contributing elements. They discovered that the most consistent variables were academic services, including teaching effectiveness, administrative responsiveness, and the use of digital tools in learning. The authors concluded that using a student-centered approach to providing academic assistance significantly increases satisfaction outcomes.

Sahney, Banwet, and Karunes (2004) used a Total Quality Management (TQM) framework in their study "Student satisfaction in higher education: A TQM perspective." Their findings highlighted the importance of curriculum design, instructional delivery, and institutional support systems in increasing satisfaction. They found that ongoing quality improvement in academic services is required to develop confidence and happiness among students.

Objectives of the Study:

- To identify major academic service components that impact student satisfaction.
- To assess student satisfaction with present academic services.
- To investigate how academic services affect student happiness.

Research Methodology:

The current study utilizes both primary and secondary data. Primary data was collected through a structured questionnaire administered to students at business schools. Secondary data was sourced from a variety of materials, including periodicals, journals, books, newspapers, websites, blogs, and other online resources. The questionnaire focused on aspects of academic services and overall student satisfaction. Responses were measured using a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 'strongly agree' to 'strongly disagree'.

Data Analysis and Interpretation:

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics showing Mean and Standard Deviation of Academic Facilities

Academic Facilities	Mean	SD
The library and computer labs would be well-equipped and maintained to my expected standards.	3.73	0.92
Academic facilities (e.g., internet access, specialized software, printing services) would be consistently available and functional.	3.68	0.94
The university would be responsive to requests for maintenance or improvements in academic facilities.	3.57	1.098
I would be confident that the academic facilities would support my learning and research needs effectively.	3.55	0.993
The university would consider diverse student needs when providing academic facilities.	3.47	1.008

According to the mean score, library and computer labs (3.73) are the most important component, followed by academic facilities (3.68) and maintenance or enhancements to academic facilities (3.57). According to the mean score, learning and research needs are appropriately met (3.55), with the least component being that universities address various student needs while offering academic facilities.

Null hypothesis H_1 : There is no significant difference in academic facilities and overall satisfaction or appraisal of service quality.

Table 2: Paired Sample Statistics of Academic Facilities and Satisfaction

Factors	Mean	SD	T-Value	P Value
Academic Facilities	17.28	5.236	14.131	<0.001**
Overall Satisfaction	19.07	4.165		

The null hypothesis is rejected at the 1% level for criteria such as academic facilities, overall satisfaction, and service quality assessment since the P value is less than 0.01. As per the projected table, the mean score for academic facilities is 17.28, while overall satisfaction is 19.07. This number indicates that students have the highest level of satisfaction with higher education institutions.

T-Test Analysis of Demographic Profile:

Null Hypothesis H_2 :

There is not significant difference between male and female with respect to variables such as academic facilities.

Factors	Gender				T-Value	P-Value
	Male		Female			
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
The library and computer labs would be well-equipped and maintained to my expected standards.	20.73	3.54	17.42	4.23	8.158	<0.001**

Academic facilities (e.g., internet access, specialized software, printing services) would be consistently available and functional.	19.62	4.49	15.23	4.74	8.415	<0.001**
The university would be responsive to requests for maintenance or improvements in academic facilities.	22.58	2.14	21.69	2.34	3.885	<0.001**
I would be confident that the academic facilities would support my learning and research needs effectively.	19.41	4.84	18.73	5.67	1.137	<0.001**
The university would consider diverse student needs when providing academic facilities.	51.33	9.16	45.24	7.93	6.682	<0.001**

Findings of the Study:

The study revealed several key insights regarding students' perceptions of academic facilities and their relationship with overall satisfaction. Descriptive statistics indicated that among the listed academic facilities, students rated "library and computer labs being well-equipped" the highest (Mean = 3.73), highlighting its perceived importance. This was closely followed by the availability and functionality of general academic facilities (Mean = 3.68). Conversely, the lowest-rated factor was the consideration of diverse student needs (Mean = 3.47), suggesting potential gaps in inclusive planning. A paired sample T-test further examined the relationship between academic facilities and overall satisfaction, revealing that the mean satisfaction score (19.07) was significantly higher than the score for academic facilities (17.28). With a T-value of 14.131 and a P-value of less than 0.001, the null hypothesis (H1) was rejected, confirming a statistically significant relationship between academic facilities and students' overall satisfaction and service quality assessment. Additionally, a gender-based T-test analysis showed significant differences between male and female perceptions across all academic facility variables (P-values < 0.001). Males consistently reported higher mean scores than females in all areas, particularly in perceptions of library facilities, availability of academic resources, and diversity consideration. The largest disparity was observed in the perception of diverse student needs, with males scoring a mean of 51.33 compared to females' 45.24. These findings underscore the varying perspectives between genders and the need for targeted improvements in academic facilities to enhance student satisfaction.

Suggestions:

To enhance academic facilities and overall student satisfaction, institutions should prioritize responsiveness and inclusivity by addressing maintenance requests promptly and actively involving students in feedback mechanisms. Additionally, efforts should be made to accommodate diverse student needs through accessible infrastructure for differently-abled individuals, language support services, and culturally relevant learning materials. Given the gender disparities in satisfaction levels, universities should adopt gender-sensitive infrastructure planning by assessing female students' specific concerns, such as secure access, ergonomic setups, and inclusive facility design. Furthermore, continuous upgrades to digital resources-including internet connectivity, software, and printing services-should be conducted to keep pace with evolving academic and research demands. These measures will help bridge existing gaps, promote equity, and ensure a more conducive learning environment for all students.

Conclusion:

The study underscores the significant impact of academic facilities on overall student satisfaction in higher education institutions. While core services-such as libraries and laboratories-receive generally positive evaluations, concerns remain regarding the responsiveness to facility-related issues and the accommodation of diverse student needs. Notably, gender-based differences in perceptions indicate that a one-size-fits-all approach may be inadequate. As such, implementing a more inclusive and responsive infrastructure strategy is essential for enhancing both student satisfaction and academic performance.

References:

1. Gurung, S. K., Chapagain, R., & Thapa, K. (2023). Business Student Satisfaction: The Role of Academic and Non-Academic Services in Higher Education Institutions. *Journal of Business and Management*, 7(02), 125-139. <https://doi.org/10.3126/jbm.v7i02.62591>
2. Amoako, G. K., Ampong, G. O., Gabrah, A. Y. B., de Heer, F., & Antwi-Adjei, A. (2023). Service quality affecting student satisfaction in higher education institutions in Ghana. *Cogent Education*, 10(2). <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2023.2238468>
3. Athiyaman, A. (1997). Linking student satisfaction and service quality perceptions: The case of university education. *European Journal of Marketing*, 31(7), 528-540.
4. Douglas, J., Douglas, A., & Barnes, B. (2006). Measuring student satisfaction at a UK university. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 14(3), 251-267.
5. Elliott, K. M., & Healy, M. A. (2001). Key factors influencing student satisfaction related to recruitment and retention. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, 10(4), 1-11.
6. Hill, F. M., Lomas, L., & MacGregor, J. (2003). Students' perceptions of quality in higher education. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 11(1), 15-20.
7. Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1985). A conceptual model of service quality and its implications for future research. *Journal of Marketing*, 49(4), 41-50.

8. Tinto, V. (1993). Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition (2nd ed.). University of Chicago Press.
9. Alves, H., & Raposo, M. (2007). Conceptual model of student satisfaction in higher education. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, 18(5), 571-588. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14783360601074315>
10. Dhamija, P., Bag, S., & Gupta, S. (2019). Measuring student satisfaction: A systematic literature review. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 33(5), 1023-1036. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-10-2018-0320>
11. Sumaedi, S., Bakti, G. M. Y., & Metasari, N. (2012). The Effect of Students' Perceived Service Quality and Perceived Value on Student Satisfaction. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 7(12), 1-8.
12. Sahney, Banwet, and Karunes (2004) "Student satisfaction in higher education: A TQM perspective", *International Journal of Educational Management*, 18 (4), 326-336.