

Assess Customer satisfaction for the educational elements from the graduates of private universities views

"An applied study on college of management and technology-Arab Academy for Science and Technology and Maritime Transport."

Dr.Mohamed Wahba

**Arab Academy for Science and Technology
and Maritime Transport**

Assess customer satisfaction for the educational elements from the graduates of private universities views

"An applied study on college of management and technology -Arab Academy for Science and Technology and Maritime Transport."

Mohamed.Wahba

Arab Academy for Science and Technology and Maritime Transport

mwahba@aast.edu

Abstract:

This study aims to measure the level of graduates' satisfaction about the educational process elements mainly in private universities "An applied study on college of management and technology- Arab Academy for Science and Technology and Maritime Transport." The study conducted by distributing a satisfaction measurement questionnaire on 60 graduates from College of Management and Technology (CMT) - Arab Academy for Science and Technology and Maritime Transport. The data obtained and analyzed .it concluded that there is a strong relation between the faculty mission and the performance, but in the recent case the relation is negative .So, the faculty must match between them in away reflect the mission in the educational policies.

Keywords: customer satisfaction (graduate satisfaction), graduate loyalty, perceived service quality, education, marketing relationship

1. Introduction

There is no doubt that the renaissance of any nation depends mainly on its educated citizens even economic, social and political .so, it is a great must to pay an attention to educational process quality assurance with its elements especially student, not from the academic aspect only but also from the process view. Palacio, et al (2002) pointed that the education is such a prestigious and fruitful investment that it always rewards in multiple ways. The strong and effective educational system results in the greater performance of the students. The educational institutions where the system is affective and administration is willing to provide the quality services always enjoy more incoming of brilliant and talented students. In order to make the institution progressive and effective the knowledge of students' expectations, academic preferences and quality perception about the educational environment should be kept by the higher authorities of the institute. Also we must pay a great concern to the higher education because is the critical stage which connect the graduates students with the labor market requirements, It is therefore, a great need for the student to be satisfied with the education process, system ,procedures of his faculty to build and develop his ability . The effectiveness of the administration and management of a higher educational institution that it facilitates the students with quality assurance and personality grooming so that the students can take maximum out of it (LeBlanc and Nguyen 1997). Tertiary education is an intangible and variable service in which production and consumption occur in an environment that requires students to

contribute to the service process. Such services can be difficult to evaluate as they can only be evaluated while they are being provided (Grönroos, 2000). Indeed, tertiary education is an ongoing and reciprocal series of interactions within the teaching and learning environment and within the university. These interactions form the basis of the relationships that develop between students, lecturers and the university and, subsequently, determine students' satisfaction (Raciti and Ward, 2003). Understanding how such processes work should provide insights into the ways universities might deal with students to ensure positive outcomes.

The idea of quality concern the human with the start of the consciousness of himself and its surroundings, and aware of the importance of the impact of improvement Constant in his life, work and production, in development, growth and happiness, for examples, Writing paper, and computer invention, and the issuance of laws that emphasize and protect quality and public safety, such as Hammurabi law, Roman law, consumer protection laws, and ISO standards. After the emergence of the modern economy and organizations specialized in producing goods and services, the concept of consumer behavior focusing appeared as a component of the economic theory (Encyclopedia, Britannica, 2006). The employee in the field of marketing such as Kotler employed their research results in improving customer relationship management, and it was the most prominent results of this employment is measuring customer satisfaction and their loyalty for the good or service or the organization. And after that the customer satisfaction interest had expanded, and that interest has been crowned by the spiritual father of Total Quality Management Edward Deming when concerned the trend towards the customer is one of the first principles of total quality management, whether on commodity or service level (Marilyn, 2006).

The primary goal of any organization is to achieve customer satisfaction, which pays the price of the commodity or service to satisfy his physical or social needs, the existence of organizations was originally to serve customers and meet their needs The existence of the organization depends on the presence of customers (there are no universities without students), as Kotler (2001) said *"the customer is the most important individuals of an organization, they rely on him before he depends on it"*.

As a result of this great importance of customers in the life of the organization emerged in recent decades, the idea of creation of departments and specialized courses in the customer relationship management, and in the universities, there are also specialized departments affairs of the students, but work in Syria, Egypt and others, is limited to the conduct of administrative affairs and documentary to students, not the study of the needs of the student and to achieve satisfaction and loyalty to his university and to highlight the value of his future as manager Or Chairman or potential minister (Elhosineiha,2009).

So, our study will assess the customer satisfaction (graduate satisfaction) of the private universities for the educational process and procedures by evaluating the educational process elements such as: faculty performance, mission, vision and values.....etc. By applying the study on College of Management and Technology (CMT) - Arab Academy for Science and Technology and Maritime Transport.

2. Literature Review:

2.1. Relationship Marketing:

Michael (1997) describes the university in the following way: "in its purest sense, a university is an assemblage of communities with different ideologies, agenda, and result, students can be and should be seen as customers and key stakeholders (Tonks & Farr, 1995). Hill (1995) suggests that the primary customers of the universities are the students and so Higher Education "is increasingly recognizing that it is a service industry and is placing greater emphasis on meeting the expectations and needs of students" (Elliott & Shin, 2002). Furthermore, researchers argue "that relationships are important and that the overall market orientation of organizations needs to be translated to a relationship level in order to be effective" (Helfert, et al, 2002). Conferring to Gronroos (1989), the marketing aim should be the development of long-term "customer" relationships because they are a university's most valuable resources. In the relationship marketing concept "satisfaction has developed extensively as a basic construct for monitoring and controlling activities and is therefore often viewed as a central determinant of customer retention" (Hennig-Thurau & Klee, 1997). Nevertheless, satisfaction appears to mean different things to different people (Giese, et al, 2001). Satisfaction can be viewed as an outcome of a consumption activity or experience (Hennig-Thurau & Klee, 1997; Parker & Mathews, 2001; Padilla, 1996). When universities accept the students as an important customer group a revolutionary change in the management in Higher Education will be in place (Owlia & Aspinwall, 1997). Especially when a relationship management approach is adopted, the basic understanding of what the students want is vital (Petry, 1996). It is obvious that student satisfaction in the university context is central for the students and the providers. Only a few universities routinely measure satisfaction. Additionally, most of those measurements are not used for marketing planning, evaluation and controlling (Piercy, 1995). According to Elliott & Shin (2002, p. 197) "focusing on student satisfaction not only enables universities to re-engineer their organizations to adapt to student needs, but also allows them to develop a system for continuous monitoring of how effectively they meet or exceed student needs". So, the student satisfaction approach is important for the development of a culture of continuous quality improvement (Aldrige & Rowley, 1998).

2.2. Graduate Satisfaction:

Kotler and Clarke (1987) define satisfaction as the desirous outcome of a task or job that pleases one's esteem. Rad & Yarmohammadian (2006) defined it as the willful accomplishment which results in one's contentment. The satisfaction plays a major role in the determining the originality and accuracy of a system especially the educational system as higher the level of satisfaction the higher will be the level of students' grooming their skill development, course knowledge and mentality. According to Zeithaml (1988) satisfaction is the resultant outcome of an institution's administrative as well as educational system's coherent performance. Because the students will be more satisfied and motivated for completing their studies if the institution provides an environment which facilitates learning i.e. the institution contains proper infrastructure for educational utility accumulated with essential parameters of professional and academic development. (Rodie and Kleine 2000)

posited a view that the students will be more motivated, loyal and good performers if their institution holds essential educational facilities with affective staff of teaching and training. The teachers' performance in the class and outside the class is a significant feature of enhancing students' impartiality, motivation and satisfaction. According to Wachtel, (1998) the students' rate their course instructors' performance and his methodology of teaching as the prime indicators in their educational development and successful completion of their studies because higher the intellectual ability of the instructor the better will be the students' evaluation (Edstrom, 2008) and consequently more will be the reliability on the teaching staff (Sproule, 2000). Teachers' ability, excellence, coordination and reasonability greatly influence students' class performance. The students are greatly influenced by the educational activities their teacher or instructor coordinates for them. Shevlin, Banyard, Davies and Griffith (2000) stated that the teachers who teach with punctuality, accuracy, reasonability and logical approach in a student friendly manner are more popular. (Elliot and Shin, 2002). Because students level of satisfaction increases by working with those course instructors and lecturers who properly handle the assignments, projects, exams and facilitate students' logical reasoning and aptitude development (Dalton & Denson, 2009). Universities have exhibited their commitment to student satisfaction through mission statements, goals/objectives, marketing strategies, and promotional themes. Peterson and Wilson (1992) argue that "virtually all company activities, programs, and policies should be evaluated in terms of their contribution to satisfying customers." Understanding the consequences of student satisfaction has been a concern of marketing researchers and practitioners for many years. The concern is derived from the generally accepted philosophy that for an organization to be successful it must satisfy customers. Patterson, Johnson, and Spreng (1997) demonstrate empirically a very strong link between customer satisfactions and repurchase intentions. Student retention is seemingly related to student satisfaction. Students who are dissatisfied with their educational experience are the ones that do not return to college. Student learning cannot occur if the student is not in college. Therefore, retention of a student is a critical step in the student's continual learning process. The relative costs of customer retention and customer acquisition have enhanced the desire to build and maintain long term relationships with customers. This is especially true in the service sector (such as education) where customer acquisition costs are generally higher than customer retention costs (Ennew, et al, 1994). For many firms, customer retention is an avenue through which a competitive advantage can be gained. Successful universities have come to realize that it is better to invest now (retain students) than to invest later (attract new students).

2.3. Graduate Loyalty:

Loyalty, has been defined as "a deeply held commitment to rebuy or repurchase a preferred product/service consistently in the future, thereby causing repetitive same-brand or same brand-set purchasing, despite situational influences and marketing efforts having the potential to cause switching behavior" (Oliver, 1999). There are two possible ways to conceptualize customer loyalty, namely; *behavioural*, which is based on repeat purchase behavior; and, *attitudinal*, which reflects the affective and cognitive components inherent in customer loyalty. There is a significant difference between satisfaction, which is the result of several service encounters, and loyalty, which is an on-going relationship with a specific service provider. The concept of student loyalty implies a rejection of other educational services and suggests students

believe a chosen university is superior to other education institutions. In order to identify the links between satisfaction and loyalty, satisfaction can be defined as a customer's post-consumption evaluation of a service, which includes cognitive and affective components, while loyalty is a customer's commitment to a service, which develops from satisfaction and includes cognitive, affective and cognitive (intention) components that lead to repeat purchase. Hennig-Thureau, Langer and Hansen (2001) and Raciti and Ward (2003) have argued that student loyalty should be examined from a relationship marketing perspective as students are engaged in on-going service transactions with their university and their satisfaction arises in part from their participation in those service encounters.

Chitty and Soutar (2004) presented study to examine the student satisfaction in Tertiary education by collecting relevant data from a sample of undergraduate business students and estimating a revised version of the ECSI model (European Customer Satisfaction Index). And the results suggested that not all of the model's paths were significant, although the model fitted the data reasonably well and explained most of the variance in the model's endogenous constructs. Interestingly, image was the major influence on loyalty and the suggested path from satisfaction to loyalty was not significant. It would seem that universities need to manage image effectively if they are to create student loyalty.

2.2. Perceived Service Quality

The perceived quality is defined as the ones' justification about the excellence of a product or service (Zammuto et al. 1996). According to Dyson et al., 1996 the service quality is so called the better and standardized output delivered by a service. The service quality in the educational sector particularly in the higher educational institutions is the fundamental aspect of educational excellence. According to (Alridge and Rowley, 2001) when students perceive the institution's quality and standardized learning environment facilitated with intellectual faculty, appropriate facilities of learning and infrastructure, their interest in their organization will explicitly be retained. The students are motivated from the academic as well as the administrative efficiency of their institution. Spoorren, et al (2007) posited a view that the organizational harmony, teachers' intellectual ability, professional development, transparency in students' evaluation, feedback and training are the important features that mentally develop the students. The maintenance of other essentials of quality service in education i.e. well managed and updated libraries, security systems, medical facilities, class decoration and facilitation with multimedia and sitting arrangements along with administrative staff's cooperation play a vital role in educational support and development (Dick and Basu 1994). According to Soutar and McNeil (1996) both academic and administrative issues of an institution are extremely important in determining the performance of students, development of organizational image and quality assurance. Elliot and Shin (2002) found that the highly significant variables in the model that appear to directly impact on overall customer satisfaction with university performance are: Excellence of instruction in major, able to get desired classes, knowledgeable advisor, knowledgeable faculty, Overall quality of instruction, tuition paid is a worthwhile investment, approachable advisor, Safe and secure campus, clear and reasonable requirements for major, availability of advisor, adequate computer labs, fair and unbiased faculty and access to information. Where the students also get motivated from the reliability of the facilities they are provided with, as higher the quality they perceive the higher will be their attraction and affiliation (Keller, 1993). The availability of other academic

facilities like intellectual faculty, advisors, career counseling department are the features that an institution needs for its students' better performance and satisfaction (Bolton and Drew 1991). The services quality is mostly recognized by the cooperation of the administrative staff well as the faculty staff with the students. Majority of the students get de-motivated if they found that the staff is not compassionate and kind. According to (Hassan, et.al, 2008) for quality assurance an institution must train its staff members in a way that it may create a sense of facilitation by means of coordination, cooperation, compassion and empathy (Jacoby and Chestnut 1978). In previous study done by (Ziaa, et.al, 2004) To evaluate medical students' satisfaction with clinical education during medical internship and the effects of variables in the organizational domain on satisfaction. It conclude that clinical education should be reevaluated in our university with the specific attention to the class size, variety of diseases and course planning considered for each session in clinical education.

3. Research methodology and design:

3.1 Research Importance:

Most educational institutions interested in education in terms of academic only, without focusing on education outputs and the quality of the educational process elements. So it must be measuring the level of the educational process output quality by measuring the level of graduate's satisfaction from the educational process view in the private universities, so the importance of the study can be summarized in the following points:

First: measuring the degree of graduates satisfaction about the quality of the educational process elements

Secondly: this research will contribute to raising the quality of the educational elements of the service provided

3.2 Research Objectives:

- To evaluate the level of graduates satisfaction about the educational process elements in private universities.
- To determine the nature of the relation between educational process elements and level of satisfaction.

3.3 Research Question:

Is there a relationship between educational process elements and level of graduate's satisfaction?

3.4 Study Hypothesis's:

H1: There is a relationship between educational process elements and level of graduate's satisfaction.

H2: There is no relationship between educational process elements and level of graduate's satisfaction.

3.5 Study Variables:

There are two variables in the present study, independent variable is level of graduate's satisfaction and dependent variable is educational process elements. This study will find out the relationships between them.

Table (3.4) Study variables

Variable	Type	Measurement
level of graduate's satisfaction	Independent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Satisfaction degree
Educational process	dependent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty mission, vision and values • Quality of management and operational performance • Faculty performance quality • Satisfaction of the students themselves, and rendered services • Satisfaction with the ability of the parties • Satisfaction for scientific research • Satisfaction with respect for the system and campus life. • Facilities • Library • financial resources and spending

3.6 Questionnaire:

The study instrument a questionnaire consists of three parts: 1st part: personal information, 2nd part satisfactions measure which consists of 35 statements that cover all student satisfaction aspects. The statements are assessed by Likert-measure of five points scale ranging from (1) "Highly dissatisfied" to (5) "Highly satisfied".

The graduate satisfaction criteria: The faculty mission, vision and values, the quality of management and operational performance, the Faculty performance quality, the satisfaction of the students themselves, and rendered services, the satisfaction with the ability of the parties, the level of satisfaction for scientific research, the satisfaction with respect for the system and campus life, the facilities, the library and the financial resources and spending. The 3rd part of the questionnaire is for recommendations and open opinions.

3.7 Sample:

Convenience sample of 60 graduates from College of management and Technology (CMT) - Arab Academy for Science and Technology and Maritime Transport. The sample classified as follows: 15 graduates from Business Information System (MIS), 15 graduates Finance and Accounting (F&A), 10 graduates from Marketing and international Business (MIB), 10 graduates from Hotel and tourism and 10 graduates from Media management departments. The sample was surveyed by using the questionnaire. The data were obtained and analyzed as we will see in the next section.

3.8 Data analysis technique:

In the present study it used two analysis techniques:

First each graduate overall satisfaction is determined by calculating the total average of the responses for each item, the average scale is: if average satisfaction is less than 50% the level of satisfaction will be weak, average satisfaction more than 50% and less than 60% the level of satisfaction will be poor, average satisfaction more than 60% and less than 80% the level of satisfaction will be good, average satisfaction is more than 80% the level of satisfaction will be excellent. By using excel spread sheets.

Second: correlation analysis to find the relations between all variables.

Third: CHI-Square test

Fourth: ANOVA Table

4. Results:

4.1 Descriptive Analysis

As mentioned in table (1) 1st field "faculty mission, vision and values" the satisfaction level to that field was good with rate 68.8% which means that the faculty plan, curriculum and philosophy meet the students and graduates needs with a good rate.

Table (1) Faculty mission, vision and values

Code	Criteria (1) Faculty mission, vision and values	Average	%Average	Satisfaction level
1.1	Educational systems are adequate with the regulations	3.55	71.0%	Good
1.2	Philosophy and strategies, such as: student's admission terms, selection of courses.	2.7167	54.3%	pass
1.3	Effectiveness of plans and curriculum, books, the number of teaching hours	4.05	81.0%	Good
	Average	3.4389	68.8%	Good

Table (2) 2nd field "the quality of management and operational performance "the satisfaction level to that field was weak with low rate 49.4%, but inside that field, it was found that the performance of information system criteria has the pass level of satisfaction with rate57%, and scientific departments performance criteria has the weak satisfaction level with rate 43.3%.

Table (2) Quality of management and operational performance

Code	Criteria (2) Quality of management and operational performance	Average	%Average	Satisfaction level
	Description			
2.1	The scientific departments performance quality	2.1667	43.3%	weak
2.2	Faculty leading performance	2.4	48.0%	weak
2.3	The performance of information systems used	2.85	57.0%	pass
2.4	Performance quality of operational management	2.85	49.4%	weak
	Average	2.5667	49.4%	weak

Table (3) 3rd field "Faculty performance quality "the satisfaction level to that field was good with rate 66.8%, but inside that field, it was found that the teaching staff performance quality criteria has the highest level of good satisfaction with rate72.3%, and technical staff performance criteria has the good satisfaction level with low rate 61.3%

Table (3) Faculty performance quality

Code	Criteria (3) Faculty performance quality	Average	%Average	Satisfaction level
	Criteria Description			
3.1	Technical staff performance quality	3.0667	61.3%	Good
3.2	Teaching staff performance quality	3.6167	72.3%	Good
	Average	3.3417	66.8%	Good

As mentioned in table (4) 4th field "the satisfaction of the students themselves, and rendered services "the satisfaction level to that field was good with high rate 72.2%, but inside that field, it was found that the personal performance80%, graduates follow-up criteria's have the highest level of good satisfaction with rate80% and also personal performance satisfaction 90%, as ASSTMT has a strong Alumni presenting social and career services for the graduates and has a strong database for following them-up , student union services, peer performance criteria have pass level of satisfaction with rate 59.3%.

Table (4) Satisfaction of the students themselves, and rendered services

Code	Criteria (4) Satisfaction of the students themselves, and rendered services	Average	%Average	Satisfaction level
	Criteria Description			
4.1	Personal performance satisfaction	4	80.0%	Good

4.2	Student union services	2.9667	59.3%	pass
4.3	Peer performance	2.9667	59.3%	pass
4.4	graduates follow-up and communication	4.5	90.0%	excellent
	Average	3.6083	72.2%	Good

As mentioned in table (5) 5th field "the satisfaction with the ability of the parties" the satisfaction level to that field was good with low rate 54.6%, but inside that field, it was found that the teaching staff 63.6%, departments chairmen and members, college dean, board and agents, directors and heads of departments and staff criteria have the highest level of good satisfaction with rate 62%, Student Committees criteria has the lowest level of satisfaction with weak rate 35.7%.

Table (5) Satisfaction with the ability of the parties

Code	Criteria (5) Satisfaction with the ability of the parties	Average	%Average	Satisfaction level
	Criteria Description			
5.1	Teaching staff	3.1667	63.3%	Good
5.2	Departments chairmen and members	3.1	62.0%	Good
5.3	College dean, board and agents	3.1	62.0%	Good
5.4	Directors and Heads of Departments and staff	3.1	62.0%	Good
5.5	Student Committees	1.7833	35.7%	weak
5.6	Justice of the conviction results	1.95	39.0%	weak
5.7	Teaching methods	2.9	58.0%	pass
	Average	2.7286	54.6%	pass

As mentioned in table (6) 6th field "the satisfaction for scientific research" the satisfaction level to that field was good with low rate 63.6%, but inside that field, it was found that High studies system criteria has the highest level of good satisfaction with rate 84.3%, Seminars and scientific conferences item has the lowest level of satisfaction with good rate 58.7%, the only criteria with weak rate is Promoting scientific research 47.7%.

Table (6) Satisfaction for scientific research

Code	Criteria (6) Satisfaction for scientific research	Average	%Average	Satisfaction level
	Criteria Description			
6.1	High studies system	4.2167	84.3%	Good
6.2	Seminars and scientific conferences	2.9333	58.7%	pass
6.3	Promoting scientific research	2.3833	47.7%	weak
	Average	3.1778	63.6%	Good

As mentioned in table (7) 7th field "satisfaction with respect for the system and campus life" the satisfaction level to that field was pass with low rate 49.3%, but inside that field, it was found that Administration criteria has the highest level of

pass satisfaction with rate 54.3%, Teaching staff criteria has the lowest level of satisfaction with weak rate 39.0%.

Table (7) Satisfaction with respect for the system and campus life

Code	Criteria (7) Satisfaction with respect for the system and campus life	Average	%Average	Satisfaction level
	Criteria Description			
7.1	Teaching staff	1.95	39.0%	weak
7.2	Dean	2.3333	46.7%	weak
7.3	Administration	2.7167	54.3%	pass
7.4	Students	2.55	51.0%	pass
7.5	Organizational and social interaction	2.77	55.3%	pass
	Average	2.4633	49.3%	weak

As mentioned in table (8) 8th field "Facilities" the satisfaction level to that field was good with rate 65.6%, but inside that field, it was found that Buildings and squares 72.3% and physical learning environment criteria's have the highest level of good satisfaction with rate 76.7%, Teaching supplies availability criteria has the lowest level of satisfaction with weak rate 47.7%.

Table (8) Facilities

Code	Criteria (8) Facilities	Average	%Average	Satisfaction level
	Criteria Description			
8.1	Physical learning environment	3.8	76.7%	Good
8.2	Buildings and squares	3.6	72.3%	Good
8.3	Teaching supplies availability	2.3	47.7%	weak
	Average	3.2778	65.6%	Good

As mentioned in table (9) 9th field "Library" the satisfaction level to that field was good with low rate 60.3%, but inside that field, it was found that References and sources availability criteria has the highest level of good satisfaction with rate 69.7%, Services criteria has the lowest level of satisfaction with pass rate 51%.

Table (9) Library

Code	Criteria (9) Library	Average	%Average	Satisfaction level
	Criteria Description			
9.1	Services	255%	51.0%	pass
9.2	References and sources availability	348%	69.7%	Good
	Average	3.0167	60.3%	Good

As mentioned in table (10) 10th field "Financial resources and spending" the satisfaction level to that field was pass with rate 54.8%, but inside that field, it was found that Equitable distribution of resources on the scientific departments and administrative criteria has the highest level of good satisfaction with rate 66.3%.

Facilities in the payment of tuition fees criteria has the lowest level of satisfaction with weak rate 43.3%.

Table (10) financial resources and spending

Code	Criteria (10) financial resources and spending	Average	%Average	Satisfaction level
	Criteria Description			
10.1	Equitable distribution of resources on the scientific departments and administrative	3.3167	66.3%	Good
10.2	Facilities in the payment of tuition fees	2.1667	43.3%	pass
	Average	2.7417	54.8%	pass

4.2. Correlation Analysis

As mentioned in table (11) there is a significant negative relation between faculty performance and faculty mission valued -1, which means from the graduate point of view the level of teaching performance is far from the faculty mission.

Table (11) Correlations between faculty performance and mission

		Faculty Performance	Mission
Faculty Performance	Pearson Correlation	1	-1.000**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	60	60
Mission	Pearson Correlation	-1.000**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	60	60

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

As mentioned in table (12) the correlation value between graduates satisfaction and teaching performance valued 0.151 which means there is no significant relation which indicates that the graduate may be highly satisfied despite the fact that he is not strongly accepting the level of teaching performance or the graduate may be unsatisfied despite the fact that he strongly convinced with the level of teaching performance.

Table (12) Correlations between graduate satisfaction and teaching performance

		Graduates Satisfaction	Teaching Performance
Graduates Satisfaction	Pearson Correlation	1	.151

	Sig. (2-tailed)		.250
	N	60	60
Teaching Performance	Pearson Correlation	.151	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.250	
	N	60	60

As mentioned in table (13) the correlation value between scientific research and library valued 0.924 which means there is highly positive and strongly significant relation which indicates that the graduate is highly satisfied with a scientific research level due to high quality level of library services provided for them.

Table (13) Correlations between scientific research and library

		Scientific Research	Library
Scientific Research	Pearson Correlation	1	.924**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	60	60
Library	Pearson Correlation	.924**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	60	60

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table (14) Correlations for all variables

		Correlations										
		Mission	MGT_Quality	Faculty_Performance	Graduates_Satisfaction	Parties_Abilities	Scientific_Research	System	Facilities	Library	Financial	Teaching_Performance
Mission	Pearson Co	1	-0.911707	-1	-0.797102	0.2267181	0.9671673	0.5370304	0.867899	0.9907474	-0.103201	-0.717217
	Sig. (2-tailed)		4.469E-24	0	2.549E-14	0.0815136	3.362E-36	9.701E-06	2.838E-19	5.192E-52	0.4326428	1.143E-10
	N	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60
MGT_Quality	Pearson Co	-0.911707	1	0.9117066	0.4786391	0.1934433	-0.986184	-0.143043	-0.587187	-0.847512	0.5027376	0.9401865
	Sig. (2-tailed)	4.469E-24		4.469E-24	0.0001096	0.1386299	5.464E-47	0.2755728	8.162E-07	1.356E-17	4.249E-05	8.295E-29
	N	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60
Faculty_Perf	Pearson Co	-1	0.9117066	1	0.7971024	-0.226718	-0.967167	-0.53703	-0.867899	-0.990747	0.1032014	0.7172168
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0	4.469E-24		2.549E-14	0.0815136	3.362E-36	9.701E-06	2.838E-19	5.192E-52	0.4326428	1.143E-10
	N	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60
Graduates	Pearson Co	-0.797102	0.4786391	0.7971024	1	-0.768838	-0.61747	-0.937449	-0.991758	-0.87168	-0.518358	0.1509064
	Sig. (2-tailed)	2.549E-14	0.0001096	2.549E-14		7.314E-13	1.48E-07	2.924E-28	1.837E-53	1.291E-19	2.211E-05	0.2497603
	N	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60
Parties_Abil	Pearson Co	0.2267181	0.1934433	-0.226718	-0.768838	1	-0.028248	0.9433514	0.6805742	0.3568049	0.9453623	0.5160984
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.0815136	0.1386299	0.0815136	7.314E-13		0.8303512	1.792E-29	2.2E-09	0.0051355	6.459E-30	2.435E-05
	N	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60
Scientific_R	Pearson Co	0.9671673	-0.986184	-0.967167	-0.61747	-0.028248	1	0.3050147	0.7131616	0.923727	-0.352597	-0.870766
	Sig. (2-tailed)	3.362E-36	5.464E-47	3.362E-36	1.48E-07	0.8303512		0.0178023	1.622E-10	7.594E-26	0.0057256	1.565E-19
	N	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60
System	Pearson Co	0.5370304	-0.143043	-0.53703	-0.937449	0.9433514	0.3050147	1	0.8851202	0.6465486	0.7836364	0.2026697
	Sig. (2-tailed)	9.701E-06	0.2755728	9.701E-06	2.924E-28	1.792E-29	0.0178023		6.328E-21	2.401E-08	1.343E-13	0.1204197
	N	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60
Facilities	Pearson Co	0.867899	-0.587187	-0.867899	-0.991758	0.6805742	0.7131616	0.8851202	1	0.9272856	0.4045199	-0.276318
	Sig. (2-tailed)	2.838E-19	8.162E-07	2.838E-19	1.837E-53	2.2E-09	1.622E-10	6.328E-21		1.997E-26	0.0013474	0.0325878
	N	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60
Library	Pearson Co	0.9907474	-0.847512	-0.990747	-0.87168	0.3568049	0.923727	0.6465486	0.9272856	1	0.0327473	-0.616005
	Sig. (2-tailed)	5.192E-52	1.356E-17	5.192E-52	1.291E-19	0.0051355	7.594E-26	2.401E-08	1.997E-26		0.8038326	1.614E-07
	N	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60
Financial	Pearson Co	-0.103201	0.5027376	0.1032014	-0.518358	0.9453623	-0.352597	0.7836364	0.4045199	0.0327473	1	0.7671471
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.4326428	4.249E-05	0.4326428	2.211E-05	6.459E-30	0.0057256	1.343E-13	0.0013474	0.8038326		8.807E-13
	N	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60
Teaching_Perf	Pearson Co	-0.717217	0.9401865	0.7172168	0.1509064	0.5160984	-0.870766	0.2026697	-0.276318	-0.616005	0.7671471	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	1.143E-10	8.295E-29	1.143E-10	0.2497603	2.435E-05	1.565E-19	0.1204197	0.0325878	1.614E-07	8.807E-13	
	N	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
 * . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

4.3CHI-square Test

Test Statistics

As mentioned in tables (15), (16) all variables are highly significant positive satisfaction regarding different department providing services in the faculty of management

	Mission	MGT_Quality	Faculty_Performance	Graduates_Satisfaction	Parties_Abilities
Chi-Square	7.9	7.9	7.9	7.9	7.9
df	2	2	2	2	2
Asymp. Sig.	0.019255	0.01925	0.01925	0.019255	0.019255

Table (15)

	Scientific Research	System	Facilities	Library	Financial
Chi-Square	3.266667	27.06667	0.6	7.9	26.6667
df	1	3	1	2	1
Asymp. Sig.	0.070701	5.7E-08	0.43858	0.01925	2.4E-07

Table (16)

- a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected frequencies less than 5. The minimum expected cell frequency is 20.0.
- b. 0 cells (.0%) have expected frequencies less than 5. The minimum expected cell frequency is 30.0.
- c. 0 cells (.0%) have expected frequencies less than 5. The minimum expected cell frequency is 15.0.

4.3 ANOVA Table

As mentioned in table (17) relation between graduate satisfaction and faculty mission, performance, teaching performance and library services value of test equals 6.273 which refers to there is a significant relation between mission and graduate satisfaction. There is no significant relation between graduate satisfaction and other mentioned variables. This reflects that the graduates are highly concerned with the faculty mission. Whenever missions are clear to graduates, they are highly satisfied with the faculty even if other variables are not highly achieved at desirable level.

Table (17) Relation between graduate satisfaction and faculty mission, performance, teaching performance and library services

		ANOVA				
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Mission	Between Groups	12.554	2	6.277	6.273E32	.000
	Within Groups	.000	57	.000		
	Total	12.554	59			
Faculty_Performance	Between Groups	28.246	2	14.123		
	Within Groups	.000	57	.000		
	Total	28.246	59			
Teaching_Performance	Between Groups	7.546	2	3.773		
	Within Groups	.000	57	.000		
	Total	7.546	59			
Library	Between Groups	111.900	2	55.950		
	Within Groups	.000	57	.000		
	Total	111.900	59			

5. Findings and conclusions:

5.1 Conclusions

From the result analysis, it is concluded the following:

- There is a strong relation between the faculty mission and the performance, but in the recent case the relation is negative. So, the faculty must match between them in away reflect the mission in the educational policies.
- The total average level of satisfaction for the faculty as whole is good. The highest level of satisfaction is for "faculty performance quality" and the lowest level of satisfaction is for "financial resources and spending".
- The main strength points of the faculty its teaching staff and methods, office hours systems, and credit hours system.
- The main weakness point is the faculty labs which need improvements. So the faculty must set an improvement plan for developing the computer lab to meet the student's needs.
- The faculty must set development plan for its technical and administration staff to be aware how to deal with the students and provide fast and high quality service.

5.2 Recommendations

- In educational system the main focus must be on student's satisfaction.
- The university administrations at all levels must understand the importance of responding quickly to increase the quality of the education process.
- Human resources training, particularly for administrators on the origins of dealing with students to satisfy their needs.

5.3 Future research points

For the future research point it suggested that after implementing the development plan, the satisfaction level can be assessed again to measure the difference before and after. Also a study can be compared to other private universities

**Assess customer satisfaction for the
educational elements from the
graduates of private universities
views
Questionnaire**

2011

Section 1: Background Information

Name:

Gender:

Male

Female

Age range:

20-25

26-30

Educational status

fresh graduate

Final year student

Graduation year:

Department:

Business information system

Marketing and international business

Finance and accounting

Media management

Hotel and tourism

Section 2: Satisfaction Measurement

How satisfied are you with the aspects you considered to get enrolled in to this faculty? Please circle/tick your satisfaction level by using the following scale:

5-Highly satisfied

4-satisfied

3-Not sure whether satisfied or not satisfied

2-Dissatisfied

1-Highly dissatisfied

Criteria	Satisfaction Level				
	1	2	3	4	5
First: faculty mission, vision and values:					
• educational systems are adequate with the regulations					
• Philosophy and strategies, such as: student's admission terms, selection of courses.					
• Effectiveness of plans and curriculum, books, the number of teaching hours					
Second : Quality of management and operational performance					
• The scientific departments performance quality					
• Faculty leading performance					
• The performance of information systems used					
• Performance quality of operational management					
Third : Faculty performance quality					
• Technical staff performance quality					
• Teaching staff performance quality					
Fourth : The satisfaction of the students themselves, and rendered services					
• Personal performance satisfaction					
• Student union services					
• Peer performance					
• graduates follow-up and communication					
Fifth : Satisfaction with the ability of the parties					
• Teaching staff					
• Departments chairmen and members					
• College dean, board and agents					
• Directors and Heads of Departments and staff					
• Student Committees					
• Justice of the conviction results					
• Teaching methods					
Sixth : Level of satisfaction for scientific research					
• High studies system					
• Seminars and scientific conferences					
• Promoting scientific research					
Seventh: Satisfaction with respect for the system and campus life by					
• Teaching staff					
• Dean					
• Administration					
• Students					
• Organizational and social interaction					
Eighth: Facilities					
• Physical learning environment					
• Buildings and squares					
• Teaching supplies availability					
Ninth: Library					
• Services					
• References and sources availability					

Tenth: Financial resources and spending					
▪ Equitable distribution of resources on the scientific departments and administrative					
▪ Facilities in the payment of tuition fees					

Section 3: Open questions

Please specify the main strength points in the faculty educational system :

-
-
-
-

Please specify the main strength points in the faculty educational system:

-
-
-

Please for any suggestion write them down here:

-
-
-
-
-

Thanks for your time

Ref:

Bolton, R.N. and Drew, J.H. (1991). A multistage model of customer's assessment of service quality and value. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 17(4), 365-84.

Dalton, H. & Denson, N. (2009). Student evaluation: what predicts satisfaction? in *The Student Experience. Proceedings of the 32nd HERDSA Annual Conference*, Darwin, 100-110.

Dyson, P., Farr, A. and Hollis, N.S. (1996). Understanding, measuring, and using brand equity. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 36(6), 9-21.

Edstrom, K. (2008). Doing course evaluations as if learning matters most. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 27, 95-106.

Elhusinia ,Damascus magazine for economic science(2009)

Elliot, K. & Shin, D. (2002). Student satisfaction: An alternative approach to assessing this important concept. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 24, 197-209.

Giese, J.L. and Cote, J.A. (2002) *Defining Customer Satisfaction*, Academy of Marketing

Gronroos, C. (1989) "Defining Marketing: A Market-oriented approach", *European Journal of*

Helfert, G., Ritter, T. and Walter, A. (2002) "Redefining market orientation from a relationship perspective – Theoretical considerations and empirical results",

European Journal of Marketing, volume 36, number 9/10, pp. 1119-1139.

Hennig-Thurau, T. and Klee, A. (1997) "The Impact of Customer Satisfaction and Relationship Quality on Customer Retention: A Critical Reassessment and Model Development", *Psychology & Marketing*, volume 14, number 8, pp. 737-764.

Hill, F.M. (1995) "Managing service quality in Higher Education: the role of the student as primary consumer", *Quality Assurance in Education*, volume 3, number 3, p. 10-21.

Kotler, P. & Clarke, R.N. (1987). *Marketing for health care organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Kotler, P. (2001): *Marketing Management: Analysis Planning Implement and Control*, India ·Prntice Hall, Inc.

LeBlanc, G., & Nguyen, N. (1997). Searching for excellence in business education: an exploratory study of customer impressions of service quality. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 11(2), 72-79.

- Marilyn M. H. (2006): Encyclopedia of Management, 5th ed., New York, Thomson Gale. Marketing, volume 23, number 1, pp. 52-60.
- Michael, S.O. (1997) "American Higher Education system: consumerism versus professorialism", The International Journal of Educational Management, volume 11, issue 3, p. 117.
- Palacio, A. B., Meneses, G. D. & Perez, P. J. P. (2002). The configuration of the university image and its relationship with the satisfaction of students. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 40(5), 486-505.
- Rad, A. M. M. & Yarmohammadian, M. H. (2006). A study of relationship between managers' leadership style and employees' job satisfaction. *Leadership in Health Services*, 19(2), 11-28.
- Risch, R. A. & Kleine, S. S. (2000). Customer Participation in Service Production and Delivery. In *Handbook of Services Marketing and Management*. Eds. Teresa A. Swartz and Dawn Iacobucci. Thousand Oaks: Sage, 111-125.
- Science Review, volume 2000, number 1, [Online], Available at <http://www.amsreview.org/articles/giese01-2000.pdf> [20 January 2004]
- Silke Jurkowitsch, et al (2006) "A STUDENT SATISFACTION MODEL FOR AUSTRIAN HIGHER EDUCATION PROVIDERS CONSIDERING ASPECTS OF MARKETING COMMUNICATIONS" *Innovative Marketing*, Volume 2, Issue 3
- Spooren, P., Mortelmans, D. & Denekens, J. (2007). Student evaluation of teaching quality in higher education: development of an instrument based on 10 Likert-scales. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 32, 667-679.
- Sproule, R. (2000). Student evaluations of teaching: A methodological critique of conventional practices. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 8(50), 125-142
- Tonks, D. and Farr, M. (1995) "Market segments for Higher Education: using geodemographics", *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, volume 13, number 4, pp. 237.
- Zammuto, R. F., Keaveney, S. M. & O'connor, E. J. (1996). Rethinking student services: assessing and improving service quality. *Journal of Marketing in Higher Education*, 7(1), 45-69.
- Zeithaml, V.A. (1988). Consumer perceptions of price, quality, and value: a means-end model and synthesis of evidence. *Journal of Marketing*, 52, 2-22,
- Wachtel, H. K. (1998). Student evaluation of college teaching effectiveness: A brief review. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*. 23(2), 191-212