

## Level Of Satisfaction Among Graduates

Ma. Erenita V. Bahian<sup>a</sup>, Gilbert Anthony O. Abañó<sup>b</sup>, Guillermo M. Sodomía<sup>c</sup>, Mary Joy B. Baltonado<sup>d</sup>,  
Lyra C. Rodríguez<sup>e</sup>

<sup>a,b,c,d,e</sup>Faculty of Education, Eastern Visayas State University – Ormoc City Campus

Email:<sup>a</sup>maerenita.bahian@evsu.edu.ph,<sup>b</sup>gilbertanthony.abano@evsu.edu.ph,<sup>c</sup>guillermo.sodomia@evsu.edu.ph,<sup>d</sup>maryjoy.baltonado@evsu.edu.ph,<sup>e</sup>lyra.rodriguez@evsu.edu.ph

**Article History:** Received: 10 January 2021; Revised: 12 February 2021; Accepted: 27 March 2021; Published online: 28 April 2021

**Abstract:** This study aims to determine the level of satisfaction among graduate students at Eastern Visayas State University-Ormoc Campus in Ormoc City. About 231 students are selected as samples using convenience sampling. The data is collected by the use of a survey questionnaire and analyzed using SPSS software. The findings reveal that students have a high level of satisfaction on Personal and Professional factors, and a moderate level of satisfaction on Student Support and Instruction-related factors. The younger group of both males and females enrolled in Education and Technology programs has a higher level of satisfaction than the older group enrolled in Engineering, which has a moderate level of satisfaction. There is no significant difference in personal and professional satisfaction levels by gender and age, but there is a significant difference by program. When compared to Technology and Engineering students, Education students are more satisfied. The relationship between variables is found to be moderately significant.

**Keywords:** Student's Satisfaction, Personal and professional satisfaction, Student Support satisfaction, Instruction-related satisfaction

### 1. Introduction

Student satisfaction metrics enable universities to define their strengths and the areas for improvement (O'Neill and Palmer 2004). This goes beyond simply examining teaching that has a limited emphasis to consider wider facets of the learning experience of students in and out of the classroom setting. To understand the complexity of satisfaction towards student learning experience, It is not enough to know the factors that lead to student satisfaction to recognize the dynamics of satisfaction with the student learning experience, but it is critical to note the degree to which students are satisfied (LeBlanc and Nguyen 1997, 1999).

Satisfaction as Webster defines it is anything that brings gratification, pleasure, or contentment. The challenge from a student's standpoint is that satisfaction is subjective and because of that, it is hard to measure satisfaction. The value from goods or services we grasp varies with each of us.

Also, student satisfaction is a subjective evaluation of students' experiences associated with their education that continuously being shaped by repeated experience in tenure inside the campus (Oliver and DeSarbo's (1989); Elliot and Shin (2002).

In addition, Ramsden 1991; Wilson et al . 1997; Richardson 2005, noted that the satisfaction of students with their higher education courses has been studied a lot and it was discovered that there is a strong relationship between the satisfaction of students and their performance in learning.

Douglas et al., 2008, said that students are considered "primary customers" of a university under a non-compulsory higher education system and therefore universities need to compete in identifying the level of satisfaction of students.

The level of student satisfaction is focused on the educational experience, programs and facilities enjoyed during the learning process by students (Elliott and Shin, 2002; Weerasinghe and Dedunu, 2017; Weerasinghe and Fernando, 2017); Weerasinghe and Fernando, 2017). The student satisfaction level is a function of the relative level of experiences and perceived performance of educational services provided by higher educational institutions (Mukhtar et al., 2015).

Eastern Visayas State University - Ormoc City Campus offers diversified degree programs at undergraduate under three major departments: Education, Engineering, and Technology. According to the EVSU-OCC registrar student's enrollment report, 4055 qualified for the university entrance in 2014 but only 800 graduated in April of 2018.

This study is anchored on the following assumptions:

- The respondent's level of satisfaction is very low.

- The respondent's level of satisfaction does not differ significantly by gender, age, and program.
- There is no significant relationship between the respondents' level of satisfaction in terms of instruction, facilities, services, and overall satisfaction.
- The respondent's level of satisfaction in terms of instruction, facilities, services, and overall satisfaction is not associated with their demographic variables

These conclusions are focused primarily on the research carried out to explore the relations between student retention and student satisfaction with the institution's services, facilities, and programs (Patti et al . 1993). By the same token, Hartman and Schmidt (1995) found that their degree of satisfaction is significantly influenced by the perception of students' institutional capacity to provide a favorable academic atmosphere for learning.

Higher educational institutions consider higher education as a part of the service industry. As a service organization, a similar situation is faced by higher education organizations that put greater focus on fulfilling their clients' desires and needs (Navarro et al, 2005).

The study sought to determine the level of satisfaction among graduate students of Eastern Visayas State University, Ormoc Campus, Ormoc City, school year 2017-2018. This endeavour sought to gauge how well the school is providing services to university graduates. The areas or services covered in this study include:

1. personal and professional satisfaction- the degree of students' satisfaction in the services offered by the school in terms of facilities like classrooms, science and computer laboratory, Library, restrooms, and gymnasium.
2. student-support satisfaction- the degree of students' satisfaction in the services offered by administrators, registrar, sports officer, librarian, school clinic, student affairs officer, guidance, and testing center, and canteens
3. Instruction-related satisfaction- the degree of students' satisfaction in the services offered by the instructors like effective teaching techniques, instructional materials, and assessment practices.

## **2. Research Questions**

1. What is the demographic profile of the respondents as to their gender, age, and program?
2. What is the respondents' level of satisfaction in terms of:
  - 2.1 Personal and professional satisfaction;
  - 2.2 Student Support satisfaction; and
  - 2.3 Instruction-related satisfaction?
1. Is there a significant difference in the respondents' personal and professional satisfaction, support satisfaction, and instruction-related satisfaction across variables?
2. Are there significant relationships between personal and professional satisfaction, student support satisfaction, and instruction-related satisfaction across variables?

## **3. Hypothesis**

Ho1: The respondents' personal and professional satisfaction, support satisfaction, and instruction-related satisfaction does not differ significantly across variables.

Ho2: There is no significant relationship between personal and professional satisfaction, support satisfaction, and instruction-related satisfaction across variables.

## **4. Methods**

A descriptive-cross sectional survey designed was utilized in the study. The sample consisted of 231 new graduates of Eastern Visayas State University-Ormoc campus, Ormoc City, in the year 2018; of which were chosen using convenience sampling.

A researcher's survey questionnaire was used to assess the students' level of satisfaction in terms of personal and professional, support on the school services which include instruction, support services, and facilities. Each of these key areas has corresponding statements regarding the services rendered or demonstrated by the staff member or the office as a whole. Some of the statements especially on the facilities involve the respondents' perception and knowledge on the existence of the same. Included demographics, introductory, and main questions. It has undergone validation. The reliability of the questionnaire was acceptable with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.87.

A researcher's survey questionnaire was used to determine students' levels of satisfaction with school services such as teaching, support services, and facilities on a personal and professional level. Statements relating to the services rendered or displayed by staff members or the office as a whole can be found in each of these key areas. Some of the statements, especially those about facilities, involve the respondents' perceptions and awareness of their availability. The questionnaire contained demographics, introductory, and main questions. The questionnaire has been validated, and its reliability is satisfactory, with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.87. It was given to students at random, and they rated their degree of agreement with their university experience on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) (strongly agree). The total score was calculated and rated as follows:

Variables		Interpretation
Personal and Professional satisfaction	1- 10	Low
	11- 20	Moderate
	21- 30	High
Student Support satisfaction	1 – 12	Low
	13 - 24	Moderate
	25 – 35	High
Instruction-related satisfaction	1 – 4	Low
	5 - 7	Moderate
	8 – 10	High

Data analyses were carried out statistically using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 23.0. Frequency count, simple percentages, mean and standard deviations were used for descriptive statics and Kruskal-Wallis H test and Pearson r for inferential statistics.

## 5.Result

**Table 1.** Demographic variables (N = 231)

Variables	Frequency	Percentage
Gender		
Male	95	41.1
Female	136	58.9
Age		
20 & below	86	37.2
21 – 25	130	56.3
26 & above	15	6.5
Program		
Education	100	43.3
Engineering	49	21.2
Technology	82	35.5

Table 1 showed that most respondents were females (136, 58.9%), belonged to the age group 21-25 years old (130, 56.3%), and taking Education programs (100, 43.3%).

On the overall level of satisfaction, more than half of the respondents (135, 58.4 %) have high level of satisfaction (M = 51.8; SD = 7.08) with 131 or 56.7 % rated **high** on Personal and Professional factors (M = 21.5; SD = 3.45); and 150 or 64.9%; 119 or 51.5% rated **moderate** on student support satisfaction (M =23.2; SD = 3.66) and instruction-related satisfaction (M = 7.07; SD = 1.21), respectively (Table 2).

The level of satisfaction across variables was presented in tables 3 to 5. On the level of satisfaction by gender, more than half of both males (51, 53.7%) and females (80, 58.8%) rated **high** on personal and professional satisfaction with a mean of (M=21.7, SD=3.57) and (M=21.7, SD=3.57), respectively (Table 3). On student support satisfaction, 64 or 67.4% males and 86 or 63.2 % females rated **moderate** with (M=22.9, SD=3.77) for males and (M=23.5, SD=3.58) for females. Likewise, 50 or 52.6% males and 69 or 50.7% of the females rated **moderate** with (M=6.9, SD=1.27) for males and (M=7.2, SD=1.16) for females on Instructional-related satisfaction. The mean difference in the level of satisfaction for all the factors between males and females were only very small (<.6 point) (Table 3)

**Table 2.** Overall Level of Satisfaction

Variable	Frequency	Percentage	Mean	SD	Level of Satisfaction
Personal and Professional satisfaction			21.5	3.45	High
1 – 10	1	0.43			
11 - 20	99	42.9			
21 – 30	131	56.7			
Student Support satisfaction			23.2	3.66	Moderate
1 – 12	3	1.30			
13 - 24	150	64.9			
25 – 35	78	33.8			
Instruction-related satisfaction			7.07	1.21	Moderate
1 – 4	7	3.03			
5 - 7	119	51.5			
8 – 10	105	45.5			
<b>Overall</b>	<b>231</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>51.8</b>	<b>7.08</b>	<b>High</b>

Legend: 1 -25 – Low; 26-50 – Moderate; 51-75 – High

**Table 3.** Level of Satisfaction by Gender

Variable		Male			Female		
		F (%)	Mean (SD)	Interpretation	F (%)	Mean (SD)	Interpretation
Personal and Professional Satisfaction	1 – 10	0(0.0)			1(0.7)		
	11 -20	44(46.3)	21.2	High	55(40.4)	21.7	High
	21 - 30	51(53.7)	(3.26)		80(58.8)	(3.57)	
Student Support Satisfaction	1 – 12	2(2.0)	22.9	Moderate	1(0.7)	23.5	Moderate
	13 - 24	64(67.4)	(3.77)		86(63.2)	(3.58)	
	25 –35	29(30.5)			49(36.0)		
Instruction-related Satisfaction	1–4	5(5.3)	6.9	Moderate	2(1.5)	7.2	Moderate
	5 - 7	50(52.6)	(1.27)		69(50.7)	(1.16)	
	8 - 10	40(42.1)			65(47.8)		
<b>Overall</b>		<b>95</b>	<b>51.0</b>	<b>High</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>52.4</b>	<b>High</b>

Legend: 1 -25 – Low; 26-50 – Moderate; 51-75 – High

As for age, mostly ages 25 and below (124, 93.9%) rated **high** and the rest of the percentages with ages 26 and above (8, 6.1%) rated **moderate** on the level of satisfaction in terms of personal and professional factors. On student support and instruction-related factors, all age groups reported having a **moderate** level of satisfaction. The mean difference in the level of satisfaction for all the factors for all age groups was only small (<1.2 points) (Table 4).

**Table 4.** Level of Satisfaction by Age

Variable		20 and below			21 – 25			26 and above		
		F (%)	Mean (SD)	Interpretation	F (%)	Mean (SD)	Interpretation	F (%)	Mean (SD)	Interpretation
Personal and Professional Satisfaction	1 – 10	0(0.0)			1(0.8)			0(0.0)		
	11 - 20	29(33.7)	22.2	High	62(47.7)	21.0	High	8(53.3)	21.1	High
	21 - 30	57(66.3)	(3.39)		67(51.5)	(3.51)		7(46.7)	(2.53)	
Student Support Satisfaction	1 - 12	0(0.0)	23.8	Moderate	3(2.3)	22.9	Moderate	0(0.0)	22.9	Moderate
	13 - 24	46(53.5)	(3.57)		91(70)	(3.84)		13(86.7)	(2.05)	
	25 – 35	40(46.5)			36(27.7)			2(13.3)		
Instruction-related Satisfaction	1 - 4	2(2.3)	7.1	Moderate	5(3.8)	7.03	Moderate	0(0.0)	7.13	Moderate
	5 - 7	39(45.3)	(1.15)		71(54.6)	(1.27)		9(60.0)	(0.99)	
	8 - 10	45(52.3)			54(41.5)			6(40.0)		
<b>Overall</b>		<b>86 (40.9)</b>	<b>53.1</b>	<b>High</b>	<b>130(59.1)</b>	<b>50.93</b>	<b>Moderate</b>	<b>15(7.1)</b>	<b>51.1</b>	<b>High</b>

Legend: 1 -25 – Low; 26-50 – Moderate; 51-75 – High

**Table 5.** Level of Satisfaction by Program

Variable	Education			Engineering			Technology			
	F(%)	Mean (SD)	Interpretation	F(%)	Mean (SD)	Interpretation	F(%)	Mean (SD)	Interpretation	
Personal and Professional Satisfaction	1 – 10 11 - 20 21 - 30	0(0) 31(31) 69(69)	22.4 (3.4)	High	0(0) 35(71.4) 14(28.6)	19.6 (2.9)	Moderate	1(1.2) 33(40.2) 48(58.5)	21.4 (3.3)	High
Student Support Satisfaction	1 – 12 13 - 24 25 – 35	0(0) 47(47) 53(53)	24.7 (3.0)	Moderate	2(4.0) 43(87.8) 4(8.2)	21.2 (3.7)	Moderate	1(1.2) 60(73.2) 21(25.6)	22.7 (3.7)	Moderate
Instruction-related Satisfaction	1 – 4 5 - 7 8 - 10	0(0) 43(43) 40	7.4 (1.1)	Moderate	3(6.1) 35(71.4) 11(22.4)	6.6 (1.3)	Moderate	4(4.9) 41(50) 37(45.1)	7.0 (1.2)	Moderate
<b>Overall</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>54.5</b>	<b>High</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>47.4</b>	<b>Moderate</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>51.1</b>	<b>High</b>	

Legend: 1 -25 – Low; 26-50 – Moderate; 51-75 – High

As for different programs, most of the Education (69, 69%) and Technology (48, 58.5%) students had a high level of satisfaction  $M = 22.4$  and  $21.4$ ;  $SD = 3.4$  and  $3.3$ ) while Engineering (35, 71.4%) students had a moderate level of satisfaction in terms of personal and professional factor  $M = 19.6$ ;  $SD = 2.9$ ). The three different programs rated moderate on both Student support ( $M = 24.7, 21.2$  and  $22.7$ ;  $SD = 3.0, 3.7$  and  $3.7$ ) and Instruction-related satisfaction ( $M = 7.4, 6.6$  and  $7.0$ ;  $SD = 1.1, 1.3$  and  $1.1$ ). The mean difference in the level of satisfaction for all the factors between males and females was only very small ( $<.7$  points) as shown in Table 5.

**Table 6.** Mean Ranks and Kruskal Wallis Test for Students' Level of Satisfaction

Characteristics	Category	N	Personal and professional satisfaction		Student-support satisfaction		Instruction-related satisfaction	
			Mean Rank	p	Mean Rank	p	Mean Rank	p
Gender	Male	95	109.7	.299	110.2	.266	109.6	.204
	Female	38	120.4		120.1		120.5	
Age	20 and under	86	129.8		127.8		119.5	
	21-25	10	107.6	.052	108.7	.115	113.7	.431
	26 and over	15	109.5		111.8		116.1	
Program	Education	100	134.5		145.3		130.2	
	Engineering	49	76.2	.000**	75.9	.000**	90.0	.000**
	Technology	82	117.2		117.2		114.2	

\*\*Significant at 0.01 and \*at 0.05

Tests of significance on the level of satisfaction were conducted using the Kruskal-Wallis H test (Table 7). Results showed no significant mean difference between genders and among age groups, there was, however, a statistically significant difference in the mean score between the three different programs. Personal and Professional satisfaction had  $X^2(2) = 25.3, p = .000$  with a mean rank of 134.5 for Education, 76.22 for Engineering, and 117.22 for the Technology program. Similarly, Student Support satisfaction had  $X^2 = 39.7, p = .000$  with a mean rank of 145.3 for education, 75.9, for Engineering and 117.2 for the Technology program. Likewise, Instruction-related satisfaction had  $X^2 = 13.2, p = .000$  with a mean rank of 130.2 for Education, 90.0 for the Engineering, and 114.2 for the Technology program (Table 6). Respondents from the Education program have a higher level of satisfaction than their counterparts.

Following the Kruskal-Wallis test, a Bonferroni post-hoc test was conducted to test which means pairs differ significantly from program to program. A significant mean difference in personal and professional satisfaction between two pairs, the Education Group and the Engineering Group ( $p = .000$ ), and the Engineering Group and Technology Group ( $p = .005$ ) resulted from post-hoc analysis. Educational students had higher levels of personal and professional satisfaction ( $M = 3.69$ ) than Engineering students ( $M = 3.17$ ), and Technology students had higher levels of satisfaction ( $M = 3.51$ ) than Engineering students ( $M = 3.17$ ). Similarly, there is also a significant

mean difference in student-support satisfaction between the three pairs of programs, the Education Group and the Engineering Group ( $p=.000$ ); the Education Group and Technology Group ( $p=.000$ ); and the Engineering Group and Technology Group ( $p=.042$ ). Education students had a higher level of student-support satisfaction ( $M=3.65$ ) compared to Engineering students ( $M=3.14$ ) and Technology students ( $M=3.38$ ), and Technology students had a higher level of satisfaction ( $M=3.38$ ) compared to Engineering students ( $M=3.14$ ). Finally, there is a significant difference in instruction-related satisfaction with the Education and Engineering students with Education having higher instruction-related satisfaction compared to the Engineering students.

As can be seen in Table 8, age showed a significantly negative correlation with personal and professional satisfaction. Likewise, the program is a significantly negative correlation to the three scales of satisfaction. Moreover, the correlation coefficient between personal and professional satisfaction and Student support satisfaction was  $r = .599$ ,  $p < .001$ ; between Personal and professional satisfaction and Instruction-related satisfaction,  $r = .487$ ,  $p < .001$ ; and Student support satisfaction and Instruction-related satisfaction,  $r = .484$ ,  $p < .001$ . These values indicate a moderately significant relationship between the variables.

**Table 8.** Pearson Correlations between Variables

Variables	Correlations					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Gender	1	-.108	-.113	.068	.074	.099
2. Age		1	.230**	-.150*	-.109	-.109
3. Program			1	-.143*	-.256**	-.133*
4. Personal and Professional satisfaction				1	.599**	.487**
5. Student-related satisfaction					1	.484**
6. Instruction-related satisfaction						1

\*\*Correlation is significant at .01

\*Correlation is significant at .05

## 6discussion

In this study, the respondents' overall level of satisfaction was high on the Personal and Professional factor, and moderate on student support satisfaction and instruction-related satisfaction. This implies that students were not fully satisfied with the school's facilities, services, and teachers' instruction. One way that universities can achieve a strategic edge in global competition is by providing their two key stakeholder groups with useful facilities and first-rate services: workers and students. University campuses are used for purposes related to universities and to support the core operations of universities, such as teaching, study, and learning. For these institutions and their stakeholders, such as students and staff, flexible facilities on university campuses play an important role in achieving institutional goals and thus have strategic values (denHeijer, 2011). More than half of the males and females with ages 25 and below rated **high** on personal and professional satisfaction and the rest of the percentages of both males and females with ages 26 and above rated moderate on student support and instructional-related satisfaction. The mean difference in the level of satisfaction for all the factors between males and females and age groups was only very small ( $<.6$  points and  $<1.2$ ). As for the three different programs, most of the Education and Technology students had a high level of satisfaction while Engineering students had a moderate level of satisfaction in terms of personal and professional factors. The three different programs rated moderate on both Student support and Instruction-related satisfaction. Elliott, K.M. and Shin, D. (2002) in their study on student satisfaction which covered variables that appear to directly impact overall customer satisfaction, discovered that excellent instruction, knowledgeable faculty, desired classes, fair and unbiased faculty, approachable advisor, overall quality of instruction and teaching techniques are significantly related to students' satisfaction.

Uh, Kok, H.B. Mobach, and M. And Onno, S.W.F. (2011) reported that the more the educational process is directly impacted by facility facilities, the greater their possible contribution to educational achievement. They therefore proposed and developed a typology of facilities management services focused on the impact of the services on the result of learning and added value in the educational environment. Facility management facilities such as lighting, heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) systems, acoustic systems, classroom architecture, audiovisual / information technology (IT) equipment, cleaning, and maintenance have, according to this typology, a clear and important impact on the educational outcome.

These results are the same as the study of Teeroovengadam, et al. (2016), the data revealed that in terms of physical environment quality in their universities, the lecture rooms got low scores in their conduciveness and availability of up-to-date teaching tools and equipment. Regarding support infrastructure, the cafeteria is the lowest rating. They, therefore, suggested that there is a need for the universities to improve the premises where foods and beverages are made available on the campus.

## 7. Conclusion

The findings suggest that the student's overall level of satisfaction was high on Personal and Professional factors, and moderate on student support and instruction-related satisfaction. The majority of males and females with ages 25 and below enrolled in Education and Technology programs had a high level of satisfaction on personal and professional factor while Engineering students had moderate. All respondents regardless of gender, age and program had a moderate level of satisfaction on student support and instruction-related factor. There was no significant difference in the level of satisfaction by gender and age but there was a significant difference by the program. The Education students had a high level of satisfaction compared to the Technology and Engineering students. There was a strong significant relationship for all variables. With these findings, it could be recommended that school administrators should exert efforts and strengthening their academic and social support to their students.

## References

1. M. A. O'Neill and A. Palmer, "Importance-Performance Analysis: A Useful Tool for Directing Continuous Quality Improvement in Higher Education," *Quality Assurance in Education*, Vol. 12, No. 1, 2004, pp. 39-52. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09684880410517423>
2. R. Jain, G. Sinha and S.K. De, 2010. *Service Quality in Higher Education: An Exploratory Study*. *Asian Journal of Marketing*, 4: 144-154.
3. Kevin M. Elliott & Dooyoung Shin (2002) Student Satisfaction: An alternative approach to assessing this important concept, *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 24:2, 197-209, DOI: 10.1080/1360080022000013518
4. Richardson, JTE., (2005): Instruments for obtaining student feedback: a review of the literature, *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 30:4, 387-415
5. Douglas, J., McClelland, R. and Davies, J. (2008), "The development of a conceptual model of student satisfaction with their experience in higher education", *Quality Assurance in Education*, Vol. 16 No. 1, pp. 19-35. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09684880810848396>
6. Weerasinghe, I., & Dedunu, H. (2017). University staff, image and students' satisfaction in selected state universities. *Journal of Business and Management*, 19(5), 34–37.
7. Weerasinghe, IMS and Fernando, R. Lalitha, *Students' Satisfaction in Higher Education* (May 28, 2017). *American Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. 5, No. 5, p. 533-539, 2017, Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2976013>
8. Herman Kok, Mark Mobach & Onno Omta (2015) Facility design consequences of different employees' quality perceptions, *The Service Industries Journal*, 35:3, 152-178, DOI: 10.1080/02642069.2014.990003
9. Teeroovengadam V, Kamalanabhan T, Seebaluck AK 2016. Measuring service quality in higher education: Development of a hierarchical model (HESQUAL). *Quality Assurance in Education*, 24(2): 244-258.

## Appendix

### Satisfaction Survey Questionnaire

Indicators	SD 1	D 2	N 3	A 4	SA 5
Item 1 The teachers and learning facilitators were competent in their field of specialization					
Item 2 The teaching and instruction of the university were effective.					
Item 3 The university canteen offers food which is affordable and nutritious as well.					
Item 4 The university's support staffs were friendly and accommodating towards their stakeholders.					
Item 5 The university offers a systematic enrolling system.					
Item 6 I feel the sense of safety and security in the university.					
Item 7 The university library is accessible in terms of the needed instructional					

resources.					
Item 8 I am satisfied with university support facilities.					
Item 9 The student's service support and its designed programs were very useful in our present work					
Item 10 The university clinic staffs as a support system are accommodating and hospitable.					
Item 11 I am contented and satisfied with the university's sponsored curricular activities.					
Item 12 I am fulfilled with the university's type of governance as evidenced by its policies and guidelines.					
Item 13 I am grateful to continue my educational life at the university through enrolling and post-graduate program offerings in the future.					
Item 14 I am recommending the university to other people who wish to acquire globally competitive education.					
Item 15 I am satisfied in my entire stay and experience in the university					

Personal and Professional Satisfaction items: 6, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16

Student-support Satisfaction items: 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, and 10

Instruction-related satisfaction items: 1 and 2

Scoring process:

Variables	Interpretation
Personal and Professional satisfaction	1- 10 11- 20 21- 30 Low Moderate High
Student Support satisfaction	1 – 12 13 - 24 25 – 35 Low Moderate High
Instruction-related satisfaction	1 – 4 5 - 7 8 – 10 Low Moderate High