4-16-2019

Measuring undergraduate student satisfaction as an indicator of customer service in higher education

Sanaz Shahi
Rowan University

www.manaraa.com

MEASURING UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT SATISFACTION AS AN INDICATOR OF CUSTOMER SERVICE IN HIGHER EDUCATION

by

Sanaz Shahi

A Thesis

Submitted to the
Department of Educational Services and Leadership
College of Education
In partial fulfillment for the requirement
For the degree of
Master of Arts in Higher Education
at
Rowan University
August 28, 2018

Thesis Chair: Burton R. Sisco, Ed.D.

Dedications

I would love to dedicate this study to my parents, Maryam

Meisami, and Mohsen Shahi, to my sister and my brother, Soulmaz and

Alisina Shahi.

Acknowledgments

Abstract

Sanaz Shahi
MEASURING UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT SATISFACTION AS AN
INDICATOR OF CUSTOMER SERVICE IN HIGHER EDUCATION
2018-2019
Burton R. Sisco, Ed.D.
Master of Arts in Higher Education

The primary purpose of this study was to measuring undergraduate students'
satisfaction at Rowan University. The theoretical framework that guided this study was
Tinto's Theory, Astin's IEO Model, and Hezberg's Theory. This study use the
quantitative method, which includes a survey focused on students' satisfaction of seven
areas including: university staff, services provided by the university, academic advisor,
class availability, academic major, and campus safety. One hundred seventy nine subjects
completed a Likert-type survey using a five-point scale to assess their satisfaction in the
seven focus areas. The Statistical Program for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to
input all quantitative data for the purpose of descriptive statistics. The finding of the
study determine that undergraduate students who enrolled at Rowan University main
campus on spring 2018 felt satisfied with the quality of services provided to the students.
It is recommended that Rowan University provide more resources at the library,
implement culture of customer service, increase marketing concept, and encourage
students to be more involved on campus.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents (Continued)

Table of Contents (Continued)

List of Tables

Chapter I

Introduction

In the technology age and the competitive environment in higher education, customer expectations are more challenging. Customer service standards do not change when customers are students, or parents of students. Higher educational institutions' departments, such as student affairs, must strive to meet good customer service standards similar to those in the private sector. In industry, good customer service is vital as it directly impacts the bottom line.

There is difference between traditional customer service and today's customer service in this high-tech and competitive environment at academic institutions. Traditional customer service used to be believed and trusted as interactions with a human instead of the technology. But younger generations are looking at and dealing directly with technology in this digital environment. Globalization and the digital evolution have increased competition among higher education institutions. Students can get information easily and instantly through advancements in technology and globalization.

Today, students have more choices than ever before when applying to higher education institutions. Nowadays, students expect more from higher education institutions and they expect a high level of customer service. Students that receive a high level of customer service are more likely to continue their study in that institution. This retention could highly impact institutional operations. In 1997, Plank and Chiagouris stated that students in higher education are looking to meet their expectations about programs and services, so students who are dissatisfied with an institution's services will

leave or transfer to more competitive institutions. In 1989, Lewis and Smith suggested that academic institutions should measure service quality and student satisfaction in order to retain students (as cited in Kelso, 2008).

Helping and handling students and their families efficiently creates an optimal customer service environment for higher education institutions. Higher education institutions should support good customer relationships by showing students that they understand their needs. In addition, institutions should listen to their customers' complaints, and let them know that they appreciate their feedback. Leading with good customer service creates a long-lasting relationship between students and higher education institutions. An important component of good customer service is building good relationships; however, retention of students goes beyond good customer service.

One valuable source of information is students' expectations. Students may have idealistic expectations, and higher education institutions must know and manage these expectations in order to bring them to reality. In addition, understanding students' expectations could help higher education institutions design teaching programs that achieve good customer service (Voss, Gruber, & Szmigin, 2007).

Traditional higher education institutions are dealing with reduced revenues and are searching for different ways to do more with less. One way for higher education institutions to achieve this objective is to focus on the expectations of their customers, which include students and their families.

Student retention can easily be adapted to the regulation of relationship marketing. Marketing is making long-term relationships with customers. Customer

Relationship Management is not just like a business tool but, based on the marketing concept, is a business philosophy. Also, the future of higher education is making long-term relationships with students. Student Relationship Management is more than a retention tool based on the marketing concept; it is an institutional philosophy (Ackerman & Schibrowsky, 2007). Retention of students in higher education is like the retention customer in business; likewise using a relationship marketing approach has benefits for student retention, which are threefold. First, it is important to decrease the attrition in higher education and increase the graduation rate. "Everyone agrees that persistence and educational retention rates, as well as the quality of student learning, must improve if post secondary education is to meet the needs of our nation and the world" (Kuh, Kinzie, Schuh, & Whitt, 2005, p. 7). Second, investing in retention is financially prudent. Third, creating strong relationships with students has the potential to influence graduates to become loyal alumni. The key feature of relationship marketing is focusing on student expectations. Higher education institutions need to treat students as a business treats its best customers. Improving student retention is a valuable goal for a variety of individual, social, and economic reasons (Ackerman & Schibrowsky, 2007).

Higher education institutions should change the culture of customer service to one focused on serving students. Providing good customer service and effective communication to students have become the expectation in the digital age. This study sought to investigate the role of student affairs' offices at Rowan University in promoting good customer service and to measure this institution's undergraduate students' satisfaction with customer service quality.

Statement of the Problem

In 1993, Harvey and Green noted that, in higher education, quality is a complex and multifaceted concept. As a consequence, there is no good way to define and measure service quality in higher education. Based on the specific needs of students, government, and staff in higher education, each has a particular perspective of quality. Similarly, Guolla (1999) identified the service quality for students as a priority in promoting student satisfaction. (Voss, Gruber, & Szmigin, 2007)

Improving the quality of services and customer satisfaction play an important role in higher education. In the technology age, customer service expectations are rising as student demands for quality and satisfaction increase. Thus, there is greater reason to change the customer service culture, offering clearer communication that is informative and preventative. The expectation of immediate reaction to customer satisfaction is new and, in the technology age, higher education institutions should expect a response to a customer request immediately. The customer service culture change is a firm statement about students' expectations and the importance of service excellence in higher education institutions (Khan, & Matlay, 2009).

Higher education institutions may feel pressure to lower their standards to compete to attract students and maintain their enrollment. Higher education institutions should avoid dismissing important customer experiences since they can improve the service to retain students. Turban, King, Lee, and Viehland (2002) suggest, "Customer service is a series of activities designed to enhance the level of customer satisfaction that

is, the feeling that a product or service has met the customer's expectation" (Turban, King, Lee, and Viehland, 2002, p. 87).

Purpose of the Study

The general purpose of this study was to examine undergraduate students' satisfaction with and rating of the importance of customer services at Rowan University, a Carnegie-classified doctoral research public university. It also provides recommendations for providing exceptional service quality and maintaining positive customer satisfaction.

Significance of the Study

In recent years, the higher education environment has become increasingly competitive. This competitive environment is driven by growth in higher education institutions, buyers-market for students, and the high technology era. In this competitive environment, higher education institutions which provide more funding, and good quality of education to their customers can have a large share of the market (Kumar & Reinartz, 2017). Also, due to having a declining share of the market, higher education institutions must increase their student retention rates.

During the past three decades an issue of concern in higher education institutions is student attrition. Some reasons of student attrition are financial, academic, and personal. Students who leave university before degree completion can expect to experience the costs of dreams delayed and income lost. Also students, who do not continue to degree completion, do not benefit society. This is because society depends on an educated workforce. Because of overlapping social, human, and economic costs to

society, to higher education, and to individuals, significant attention has been devoted to improving higher education institution student retention rates (Ackerman & Schibrowsky, 2007).

In the academic environment, it is important that customer service be organized and integrated in more than one department. The department should increase the number of individuals who are part of customer service. The ratio of retaining students and graduating students influences a new student's choice of admission. Also, satisfied students positively impact the ratio of retained students and graduated students and, thus, positively impact new students' decisions to attend a higher education institution (Tinto, 2012).

Higher education institutions are increasingly being identified as a service industry. Higher education institutions must emphasize meeting students' expectations and their needs since they are operating in a competitive marketplace in the United States. The main reason for the existence of higher education institutions is enhancement of students' education and successful completion (DeShields, Kara, & Kaynak, 2005). The importance of customer satisfaction in higher education is retaining students for profit making. Also students' satisfaction is important for student retention. The quality of experience and relationship has benefits both in higher education and society. Students who have a positive experience are more likely be satisfied and complete their degrees (DeShields, Kara, & Kaynak, 2005).

Assumptions and Limitations

There are some limitations regarding this study that should be acknowledged. First, the findings of this study are limited to the freshmen student population at Rowan University. The results of this study may not be generalizable and applicable to students at another institution. In addition, the study was limited based on the scope of the population. The participants were randomly selected from a list of all freshmen enrolled during spring 2018 semester at a Carnegie-classified doctoral research public university. Another limitation is related to validity and reliability of the online, self-reported survey instrument.

In addition, this study begins with some assumptions that the goal is to meet customer expectations completely, and could enhance the level of customer services at Rowan University. Assumptions deal with conceptual understanding of the topic under investigation and the problem solving process. Finally, there is no mechanism to distinguish between a satisfied customer and a loyal customer.

Operational Definitions

1. Competitive Environment: The dynamic external system, which in higher education institutions compete.

2. Customer: A student that buys educational services from the university.

3. Customer Dissatisfaction: A feeling of unhappiness or disapproval with university services.

4. Customer Satisfaction: A feeling of happiness or approval of the quality of the university services.

5. Customer Services: The assistance and facilities provided by the university to a student who come to the university.

6. Customer Relationship Management: CRM is a term that refers to practices, strategies and technologies that academic institutions use to manage and analyze student interaction with the goal of managing a higher education institution's relationships with students and families.

7. Deposit: Sum of money placed or kept in the financial department when a student enrolls at the university.

8. Freshman: A student in the first year of study at the university.

9. Higher Education Institution: A level of education that is offered by Rowan University.

10. Loyalty: A strong feeling of support.

11. Service Quality: A service that is provided to a student or family by the university or college to improve customer satisfaction.

12. Student Affairs: The Division of Student Affairs, located at Savitz Hall, that provides and supports a student's learning environment and also actively engages students by encouraging healthy life choices.

13. Student Expectation: A belief that a student will or should achieve during the academic year that he or she gets from customer services.

14. Student Experience: Encompasses many aspects of academic and intellectual development at the university.

15. Student Retention: Definition of a graduate, a student who has completed college or university.

Research Questions

The study sought to answer the following research questions:

1. What is the level of satisfaction with the quality of services among selected freshmen at Rowan University?

2. What is the level of importance with the quality of services among selected freshmen at Rowan University?

3. What are the differences in satisfaction and importance among selected freshmen student towards the subgroups of service quality at Rowan University?

Overview of the Study

Chapter II of this research study contains a review of the literature of customer service in higher education. The literature review dissects contents of customer service and customer satisfaction that relate to the topic under investigation. This chapter also focuses on Tinto' s theory, Astin's IEO Model, and Herzbergs' theory.

Chapter III describes the methods used in this study, the survey instrument, population and sample selection, data collection methods, and data analysis.

Chapter IV describes the finding and the results of this study. This chapter also addresses the researches questions identified in Chapter I.

Chapter V provides a summary of the research, discussion of the findings, and the conclusion. It also provides some recommendation for practice and future research.

Chapter II

Literature Review

Introduction

In higher education institutions, customer service has expanded. Customer support service now makes an extremely significant difference in this high-tech and competitive age and environment.

Higher education institutions must focus on students' expectations and needs in order to serve them at the highest level. Students' expectations have extensive impact on students' college life. Providing customer service to students in higher education has become an expectation in the academic environment. Expectations are based on an understanding of past experiences and of the expectations students have about college life. Psychologists have discussed the anticipated outcomes of an individual's behavior as part of expectations. Expectations are influenced by experiences and may change based on new experiences, and new information or conflicting experiences. Expectations are not always rational and serve as mental representations of past experiences (Miller, Bender, & Schuh, 2005).

In addition, Malaney and Shively (1995), noted that expectations have a powerful effect on students' performance, which depends on what they expect of themselves and what they need to do to be successful. Similarly, Tinto (2012) noted that students' retention and graduation are shaped and influenced by their expectation of being successful in higher education.

Organizations that provide a positive customer service experience earn greater loyalty. A positive customer service experience includes complaint handling, which is one of the most important components that affects customer satisfaction, resulting in organizational improvement and investment (Anderson, Pearo, & Winder, 2008).

Bolton (1998) studied the relationships between customer retention and satisfaction, and noted that changes in customer satisfaction can have financial effects for the organizations. Seymour (1993) noted that developing the level of satisfaction is a primary goal in higher education institutions for students, students' families, and alumni (DeShields, Kara, & Kaynak, 2005).

Without measurable goals in customer satisfaction, it is impossible to know the level of customer satisfaction in the organization. The goal of customer satisfaction should be the customer coming back to the organization (Boyd, 2002). Kan (1995) compared a dissatisfied customer with a satisfied customer, noting that a dissatisfied customer will tell more individuals regarding their negative experience than a satisfied customer tells others about their positive experience (Boyd, 2002).

For the best customer experience, the organization should provide tools to increase levels of satisfaction. One of the critical things for having a positive customer service experience is managing complaints in a scientific and professional approach. For handling the complaint, the International Organization for Standardization (ISO 10002: 2014) developed and issued a standard guideline for customer satisfaction. By emerging and developing ISO 10002: 2014 as a tool for measuring the satisfaction, organizations could achieve their customer service goals.

ISO 10002:2014 provides guidance on the process of complaints handling related to products within an organization, including planning, design, operation, maintenance, and improvement. The complaints-handling process described is suitable for use as one of the processes of an overall quality management system. (p. 9)

ISO 10002:2014 is not applicable to disputes referred for resolution outside the organization or for employment-related disputes. ISO 10002:2014 addresses the following aspects of complaints handling:

1. Enhancing customer satisfaction by creating a customer-focused environment that is open to feedback (including complaints), resolving any complaints received, and enhancing the organization's ability to improve its product and customer service,

2. Top management involvement and commitment through adequate acquisition and deployment of resources, including personnel training,

3. Recognizing and addressing the needs and expectations of complainants,

4. Providing complainants with an open, effective, and easy-to-use complaints process,

5. Analyzing and evaluating complaints in order to improve the product and customer service quality,

6. Auditing of the complaints-handling process, and

7. Reviewing the effectiveness and efficiency of the complaints-handling process. (ISO 10002:2014, 2018, p. 9)

Universities and colleges should see students as customers in order to improve their customer service performance. They should also market the implementation of the customer satisfaction process. Each student is an advertiser for universities or colleges in this competitive environment.

Customer Service

A supplier of a product or service assigns the "customer" name to a person or organization that obtains the products or services. In colleges and universities, the customer concept addresses the person or organizations that makes a direct or indirect payment in exchange for implementing and earning direct services or indirect services. Therefore, the customer concept in higher education is similar to all other businesses (Marzo, Pedraja, & Rivera, 2007).

"The business as seen from the customer's point of view," is a sentence that defines the marketing concepts (Kumar & Reinartz, 2017, p. 3). This means the customer puts a set of beliefs and values in the center of organization's thinking about strategy and operations that becomes a distinct organizational culture. When the customers' needs segments become fulfilled, the marketing concept appears.

Customer service is about knowing more about customers and understanding what they want. In the technology age and in a competitive environment, understanding and meeting individual customer needs are the key dimensions for success. In fact, to achieve

the customer concept, there is a need for the marketing concept (Kumar & Reinartz, 2017).

Customer Satisfaction

Satisfaction can be described in various ways. Satisfaction has been known as the major goal of reaction experience and perception of reaction. Satisfaction explains the grade of congruence between ambitions and the observed reality of experiences (Graefe & Burns, 2013). Customer satisfaction is a post purchase evaluation based on the disconfirmation paradigm. The psychological state of a person's emotions shows disconfirmation or confirmation of the product or service as satisfaction in the customer experience after consuming (Binsar & Panjaitan, 2014).

In 1997, Oliver described satisfaction as a pleasing level of usage of the products and services that related to achievement. More and Buhyoff (1979) also cited satisfaction as a measure of recreation quality (as cited in Graefe & Burns, 2013). Service concept is a package of products or services, and satisfaction has been displayed by satisfaction with basic service components, but Oliver noted in 1997 that an analysis of these attribute models of customer satisfaction is difficult to build the theories about customer satisfaction (Anderson, Pearo, & Winder, 2008).

Customer service satisfaction is a level of service quality that provides to the customer and principle product of the service quality assessment. So, for this reason, some authors believed that satisfaction and service quality is the same, with no contrast between them (Graefe & Burns, 2013). Customer satisfaction is one of the primary goals

15

of any organization because customers can build market share by preserving the loyalty in the competitive environment (Innis & La londe, 1994).

Total Quality Service

Total quality service (TQS) is a strategic and integrated management system to increase and develop the process of organization for desires, customer expectations and needs. The major goal of total quality service is to achieve customer satisfaction. In this matter, total quality service focuses on five areas noted below:

1. Customer focus,

2. Total involvement,

3. Measurement,

4. System support, and

5. Continuous improvement. (Binsar & Panjaitan, 2014, p. 2)

Thus, total quality service is formed by commitment response, product improvement, process improvement, human resource excellence, customer orientation response, and economic advantage. Total quality service effects customer satisfaction by focusing on the desire of customer needs (Binsar & Panjaitan, 2014).

Total Quality Management

In 1996, Collin mentioned that total quality management (TQM) is a management philosophy that improves the quality of goods and services and offers the opportunity to contribute, participate and develop a sense of ownership (Seetharaman, Sreenivasan, & Boon, 2006). Many companies focused on total quality management for making more

profit, as well as increasing market share, quality improvement, customer satisfaction, quality cost reduction, and competitiveness (as cited in Seetharaman, Sreenivasan, & Boon, 2006).

A mission of many higher education institutions is improving their institution's quality in order to remain viable and thrive in this competitive environment. So many US universities use total quality management to improve their quality (Aly & Akpovi, 2001). In 1993, Bresler described that the "TQM practical process-based approach is attractive to many higher education administrators who find themselves increasingly challenged to offer a higher quality 'product' at a more affordable price" (Aly & Akpovi, 2001, p. 127).

Customer Relationship Management

"Customer Relationship Management (CRM)" is the process of creating and supporting profitable relations with customers by providing products and services and creating customer satisfaction. In fact, customer relationship management is the way that organizations build relationships with customers for preserving customer loyalty in the business environment (Binsar & Panjaitan, 2014).

Customer relationship management could provide an associated view of customer across all business areas to make sure that each customer gets the highest level of service. In higher education institutions the benefits of implementing customer relationship management include, improved customer data and process management, increased student loyalty, retention, and satisfaction with academic programs and services (Seeman & O'Hara, 2006).

In today's competitive educational market, in order to offer different services and

understand their target markets to contrast with their competitors, higher education institutions have to use a market orientation strategy. Higher education institutions need to assess the target market, modify their offers for meeting the students' needs, and enhance customer satisfaction (Davidson, Keegan, & Brill, 2004).

In higher education environments, customers that are students can choose between four-year colleges, technical schools, or community colleges in a face-to-face or online learning environment. In this environment, a critical performance measure is satisfaction with higher education institutions' programs and their services. So, in a competitive environment, customer relationship management can play a significant role by providing interactions with all student touch points, admissions, registrations, and financial aid (Seeman & O'Hara, 2006).

In this area, the student system and higher education institutions' programs and services should use a customer relationship management to support the students' satisfaction goals, improved customer data and process management, increased student loyalty, and retention students (Seeman & O'Hara, 2006). In 2005, Bejou suggested to adopt customer relationship management as a way for maintaining and creating the relationship between students and higher education institutions (Seeman & O'Hara, 2006).

Customer Satisfaction in Higher Education

Based on the meaning of education, which is bringing out the ideas of universal validity, it's possible to create changes in higher education with aim and purpose. The central issue in higher education is always linked to perceived quality. Institutions'

history, culture, organizational structure, students, faculty, and education process all help to define the quality of institutions. Quality in higher education is dependent on efficient administration and effective management (Janardhana & Rajasekhar, 2012).

A student is a customer in higher education, who receives the services provided by a university or college. So, the student's satisfaction should be identified as the main component of satisfaction (Janardhana & Rajasekhar, 2012).

In higher education, customer satisfaction is linked to service quality. In order to keep pace with market developments, higher educational institutions must evaluate the customers' needs and begin by listening to the customer's voice (Gallagher & Mishra, 2013).

In the age of technology, the components of the enhanced technology and students' satisfaction are: modes of discussion, modes of research, modes of submitting assignments, modes of testing, types of learning activities, and course materials' format (Brotz, 2006). Indeed, in higher education environments, the focus on enhancing customer satisfaction is essential for customer value development (DeShields, Kara, & Kaynak, 2005).

A student's educational experience is more important in influencing student satisfaction. In today's competitive environment, higher education institutions must distinguish the important aspects for students, and inform students that they are focused to deliver these aspects (Elliott, & Healy, 2001).

Tinto's Departure Theory

In the past several decades, federal and state governments as well as a range of organizations for increasing access to higher education have invested heavily in educational programs. The United States has experienced success in increasing access to higher education institutions and rearranges the gap in access between both socioeconomic statuses, low and high-income students (Tinto, 2012).

Student retention is sometimes referred to as persistence. To describe the character of student retention in higher education, one must first define the meaning of the terms student retention and student persistence. Student retention is the institutional view of students who continue programs in higher education. Student persistence is focused on the student's view, which is of increasing importance to college administrators as higher education institutions try to improve their graduation rates (Tinto, 2012).

Some retention factors that institutions focus on in higher education organizations include academic abilities, social adjustment of students, integration into the social environment, and attitudes before enrollment (DeShields, Kara, & Kaynak, 2005).

Tinto's departure theory mentioned the critical role of student involvement in positive educational outcomes for students. In higher education institutions, there is a need to better understand the relationship between student involvement and the involvement's impact on students (Tinto, 1975).

Tinto's student integration theory of retention notes in the relationship between students and institutions. Based on this theory retention involved two commitments,

which are the goal commitment to successful completion, and the decision to obtain that degree at institutional commitment. It means that the student's goal and institutional commitments both have an influence on a student's retention in higher education institutions (DeShields, Kara, & Kaynak, 2005).

A critical element for engagement to a higher education institution is integration with in the social environment. In 1982, based on the relationship between students and higher education institutions, Tinto defined the student integration theory of persistence or retention (Tinto, 1982).

Tinto believed that retention involves two obligations for students, the first one being the goal of obtaining a college degree and the second one is the decision to obtain a degree from a specific institution. As a result at a specific institution, the combination of the student's goal and institutional guarantee has an effect on students' retention. So in order for higher education institutions to meet the students' expectations, they must match the students' motivations and institution's abilities (Tinto, 1982).

Increasing the level of market share in higher education, profitability, and customer retention is dependent on customer satisfaction. Customer satisfaction is also influenced by customer characteristics, such as gender, age, and income (Anderson, Pearo, & Widener, 2008). In order to retain students in higher education institutions, important factors for consideration include profit-making, customer satisfaction and satisfied admitted students (Anderson & Sullivan, 1993).

The three most important components that influence students' experience and students' satisfaction are faculty performance, advising staff performance, and classes. In

21

addition, student satisfaction has an influence on the students' intentions for staying in the higher education institutions (DeShields, Kara, & Kaynak, 2005). In 1998, Bolton mentioned that customer retention, intention, and satisfaction are all related. He specified that the important factor in financial influences is customer satisfaction changes (as cited in DeShields, Kara, & Kaynak, 2005).

Astin's IEO Model

In 1999, Cross pointed out the importance of assessment in higher education and she cited that information gathered during the assessments can be used for learning in a specific class (as cited in Messick, 2013). Furthermore, Astin mentioned that assessment in higher education is illustrated by gathering the information from students, staff, and function of institutions. Astin developed the Input-Environment-Outcome (IEO) model based on an effective assessment for delivering better understanding of connection between the education's outcomes and the practice (Thurmand & Popkess, 2003).

The three elements on Astin's IEO model are inputs, environment, and outputs. This model is used as a framework to develop the assessments and also evaluate the activities in the classroom. In fact, the IEO model evaluates the input effects and environment effects on the student's outcome. There are two components that have a positive effect on student satisfaction, and they are learning activities and social involvement (Thurmand & Popkess, 2003).

A learning environment supports academic success and affects student satisfaction. A learning environment has some elements such as an atmosphere that students could adopt responsibility for learning. These elements are linked to better

22

student learning and students' satisfaction (Lo, 2010).

In 1999, based on the IEO model, House cited that student characteristic and the environment both have an effect on student achievement and student satisfaction (House, 1999). Student involvement theory or theory of student development also offers educators a tool for designing more effective learning environments. The quantity and quality of the physical and psychological time and energy that students spent to gain experiences in higher educational institutions refers to student involvement. Both promoted educational policy and practice for increasing student involvement. Astin's IEO model highlighted the need to have an understanding of student qualities and their characteristics, into and out of the higher educational institutions, and the nature of the educational environment (Astin, 1984).

Herzberg's Theory

In 1959, Herzberg considered non-traditional motivation hygiene in two distinct sets of factors for job satisfaction and job performance in organizations (DeShields, Kara, & Kaynak, 2005). Hezberg's two-factor theory cites two distinct sets of factors for job satisfaction in organizations for employees, or in this case students, which are satisfiers or motivators and dissatisfiers or hygiene factors. The first set, satisfiers, are intrinsic factors and the second set, dissatisfiers, are extrinsic factors that affect job satisfaction. The important point in this theory is that it did not describe satisfaction and dissatisfaction as opposites, rather it described the opposite of satisfaction as no satisfaction and the opposite of dissatisfaction as no dissatisfaction. (DeShields, Kara, & Kaynak, 2005)

23

Due to this theory, faculty performances and classes are directly related to the outcome from a college experience and may be considered motivators or satisfiers (DeShields, Kara, & Kaynak, 2005). The most important adjustable encouragement factors for students' experiences and students' satisfaction are faculty performances, advising staff performance, and classes in higher education. Students with positive college experiences will be more satisfied (DeShields, Kara, & Kaynak, 2005).

Summary of the Literature Review

This chapter reviewed the importance of customer service in higher education institutions and the impact of a customer's positive experience in organizations. This includes an overview of the concepts of customer service and customer satisfaction. In addition, this chapter focused on implementing efficiency of the total quality service, total quality management, and customer relationship management in higher education organizations.

In higher education institutions, great importance is placed on customer support services. Customer support services include who the customers are, what expectations the customers have, how the customers interpret their experience, and what customer support and satisfaction looks like in a higher education institution. The measurement, qualification, management and theorization of customer support service in higher education institutions determine the way an institution will support its customers.

In order to support the obligation of customer service in higher education institutions, this chapter used Tinto's theory, Astin's IEO model, and Hezbergs' two-factor model. The main goal of this study was to demonstrate the role of student

satisfaction and retention in higher education institutions in today's very competitive, technology-based world.

Chapter III

Methodology

Context of the Study

This quantitative study was conducted during spring 2018 at Rowan University, located in Glassboro, New Jersey. Rowan University was established in 1923 and developed from a teacher preparation institution to a bustling regional comprehensive research university. Rowan University is ranked among the best public research universities in the 2018 edition of *U.S. News Best Colleges* in *National Universities*. Rowan University is a Carnegie-classified doctoral research public university with satellite campuses in Camden and Stratford, New Jersey. It has more than 80 bachelor's degree and 60 master's degree programs, and five doctoral programs. A total of 52.6% of Rowan University students are female and 47.4% are male (Rowan University, 2017).

Population and Sample

The target population of this study consisted of a random sample of the freshmen students who were enrolled at Rowan University's main campus in spring 2018. For this study, a freshman is defined as an individual as a student who is living on Rowan University's Glassboro campus. A random sample was used to reach the available population. A total of 2330 undergraduate freshmen were enrolled at Rowan University in spring 2018. The target population was 732. This number was obtained using sample size calculator set at a confidence level of 95%, with a 3% error rate. The desired response rate is 239.

Instrumentation

The instrument used in this study to evaluate student's satisfaction was a survey based on the research of Stuart (2007). This survey is a web-based, cross-sectional survey (see Appendix B) used to collect indirect data on students' satisfaction and level of importance for each statement. The survey was designed purposefully to address student satisfaction and level of importance towards the quality of services at Rowan University. An incentive was provided to boost the response rate and to encourage students to completed the online survey in the form of five $ 20 Barnes & Noble's gift cards with a raffle to receive for five students.

The online survey was collected in April and May 2018. The instrument includes of three sections. The first section collected demographics, the second measured student satisfaction and level of importance of each section with university services, and the third one is dedicating to capturing students' experiences. The demographic section included gender, age, ethnicity/race, and working or non-working. The second section evaluated both students' satisfaction and level of importance of services provided by different offices in the Division of Student Affairs, evaluate their academic advisor, classes, and academic major at Rowan University. Participants were asked to choose student satisfaction response using scale form Not Satisfied, Somewhat not Satisfied, Neutral, Somewhat Satisfied, or Satisfied. Also participants were asked to choose level of importance of each section with Rowan University services response using scale from Not Important, Somewhat not Important, Neutral, Somewhat Important, or Important. The third section asked students about their experiences at the university. The survey

reviewed by Dr. Sisco, and the IRB.

Data Collection

After receiving approval from the Institutional Review Board of Rowan
University (Appendix A), a letter was sent via email to the selected student sample.
Permission to conduct the survey was also obtained by Dr. Burton Sisco, Professor and
Program Coordinator of the Master of Arts in Higher Education at Rowan University. For
this qualitative survey emails were sent several times during the month of April to remind
students to complete the online survey. In the email, I provided the URL to the online
questionnaire administered through Qualtrics ®. I also explained the rationale behind the
study and requested their participation and consent form was included at the email to be
signed and returned to the researcher to demonstrate voluntary and 18 years old or older
participation in the study (Appendix C). The survey data were then analyzed and the
findings were reported.

Data Analysis

I utilized the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) computer
software program to analyze the quantitative data collected from the survey. Based on the
self-design instrument adopted from *Student Satisfaction Inventory* (SSI) form B was
used by Schreiner and Juillerat in 2006 (http://www.noellevitz.com).

The survey items were summarized. Demographic information were also
collected and summarized to better describe the subjects and divide them into
comparative subgroups for further analysis. The independent variables for this study
included gender, age, race/ethnicity, major, working/non-working, and enrollment status.

The dependent variables were students' satisfaction and level of importance towards quality services offered by the institution. The impact of the independent and dependent variables was investigated through the cross-tabular analysis delivered by SPSS. Results from the survey were tabulated to provide an understanding of emerging themes and results.

Chapter IV

Findings

Quantitative Profile of the Sample

Subjects in this study were freshmen student who were enrolled at Rowan University main campus in spring 2018. A total of 2330 freshmen student were identified via the Division of Information Resources & Technology (IRT) and random sample population of 732 was determined using a sample population calculator. Subjects from the sample population were determined by weekly mass email was sent that included the survey instrument. Out of the 732 random sample population freshmen students who enrolled at Rowan University, 179 completed the online survey, yielding a return rate of 24.45%.

A total of 179 students responded to the survey during May and June 2018. The majority of the students that responded were female, 59.77% (104); sixty-six were male (37.93%); and four were transgender (2.30%). The main age of the participants was 19-24, 60.34% (105); sixty-five were 18 and under years of age (37.36%); three were 25-34 years of age (1.72%); and one was 44 and over years of age (0.57%). The majority of the students that responded were White/Caucasian, 60.92% (106); 19 were Hispanic or Latino (10.92%); 18 were African American (10.34%); 15 were Multi-Racial (8.62%); 10 were Asian (5.75%); four were other race (2.30%); and two were American Indian (1.15%). Sixty-nine were not employed (39.66%); 57 were employed Part-time off campus (32.76%); 17 were employed full-time on campus (9.77%); 16 were employed

full-time off campus (9.20%); and 15 were employed Part-time on campus. Demographic

information was captured for those who participated in the survey (Table 4.1).

Table 4.1

Demographic Information (N=179)

Variable	f	%
Gender:		
Male	66	37.93
Female	104	59.77
Transgender	4	2.3
Age:		
18 and under	65	37.36
19-24	105	60.34
25-34	3	1.72
35-44	0	0.0
44 and over	1	.57
Ethnicity/Race:		
Alaskan Native	0	0
African American	18	10.34
American Indian	2	1.15
Asian	10	5.75
Hispanic or Latino	19	10.92
Native Hawaiian	0	0.0
White/Caucasian	106	60.92
Multi-Racial	15	8.62
Other	4	2.33
Employment:		
Full-time off Campus	16	9.2
Part-time off Campus	57	32.76
Full-time on Campus	17	9.77
Part-time on Campus	15	8.62

Table 4.1 (Continued)

Variable	*f*	*%*
Not Employed	69	39.66

Analysis of the Data

Research question 1. What is the level of satisfaction with the quality of services among selected freshmen at Rowan University?

Table 4.2 contains the results of 7 survey items describing level of satisfaction with the availability of staff to freshmen students. The Likert-type survey items are arranged from not satisfied, somewhat not satisfied, neutral, somewhat satisfied, and satisfied. Mean scores are arranged from highest to lowest. A mean score below 3.8 indicates a level of not satisfied in response to a survey item and mean of 3.8 and above indicates a level of satisfied in response to a survey item.

The highest ranked item, "Campbell Library Staff," had a mean score of 4.07 with 81 subjects satisfied with Campbell library staff (47.93%); two subjects not satisfied (1.18%); four somewhat not satisfied (2.37%); 56 neutral (33.14%); 26 somewhat satisfied (15.38%).

The second item, "Admission's Office," had a mean score of 3.89 with 66 subjects satisfied with this office (38.60%); three not satisfied (1.75%); 10 somewhat not satisfied (5.85%); 55 neutral (32.16%); 37 somewhat satisfied (21.64%).

The third item, "Register's Office," had a mean score of 3.89 with 65 subjects satisfied with this office (38.01%); eight not satisfied (4.68%); six somewhat not satisfied (3.51%); 48 neutral (25.73%); 44 somewhat satisfied (25.73%).

The fourth item, "Bursar's Office," had a mean score of 3.87 with 63 subjects satisfied with this office (36.84%); six not satisfied (3.51%); six somewhat not satisfied (3.51%); 46 neutral (32.75%); 40 somewhat satisfied (23.39%).

The fifth item, "Financial Aid's Office," had a mean score of 3.71 with 57 subjects satisfied with this office (35.53%); eight not satisfied (4.71%); 11 somewhat not satisfied (6.47%); 61 neutral (35.88%); 33 somewhat satisfied (19.41%).

The sixth item, "Residential Life Staff," had a mean score of 3.62 and with 51 subjects satisfied with this staff (29.82%); 11 not satisfied (6.43%); nine somewhat not satisfied (5.26%); 65 neutral (38.01%); 35 somewhat satisfied (20.47%).

The seventh item, "Wellness Center Staff," had a mean score of 3.60 with 48 subjects satisfied with this office (28.07%); eight not satisfied (4.68%); 14 somewhat not satisfied (8.19%); 64 neutral (37.43%); 37 somewhat satisfied (21.64%).

Table 4.2

Evaluate the Availability of University Staff (N=179)
(1=Not Satisfied, 2=Somewhat Satisfied, 3=Neutral, 4=Somewhat Satisfied, 5=Satisfied)

Item	Not Satisfied		Somewhat Not Satisfied		Neutral		Somewhat Satisfied		Satisfied	
	f	*%*	*f*	*%*	*f*	*%*	*f*	*%*	*f*	*%*
Campbell Library Staff. *n*=169, *M*=4.07, *SD*=1.00, Missing=10	2	1.18	4	2.37	56	33.14	26	15.38	81	47.93
Admission's Office. *n*=171, *M*=3.89, *SD*=1.04, Missing=8	3	1.75	10	5.85	55	32.16	37	21.64	66	38.60
Register' Office. *n*=171, *M*=3.85, *SD*=1.10, Missing=8	8	4.68	6	3.51	48	28.07	44	25.73	65	38.01
Bursar's Office. *n*=171, *M*=3.87, *SD*=1.13, Missing=8	6	3.51	6	3.51	56	32.75	40	23.39	63	36.84

Table 4.2 (Continued)

Item	Not Satisfied		Somewhat Not Satisfied		Neutral		Somewhat Satisfied		Satisfied	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Financial Aid's Office. *n*=170, *M*=3.71, *SD*=1.14, Missing=9	8	4.71	11	6.47	61	35.88	33	19.41	57	33.53
Residential Life Staff. *n*=171, *M*=3.62, *SD*=1.15, Missing=8	11	6.43	9	5.26	65	38.01	35	36.1	51	29.82
Wellness Center Staff. *n*=171, *M*=3.60, *SD*=1.00, Missing=8	8	4.68	14	8.19	64	37.43	37	21.64	48	28.07

Table 4.3 contains the results of 8 survey items describing level of satisfaction with the quality of services provided to freshmen students. The Likert-type survey items are arranged from not satisfied, somewhat not satisfied, neutral, somewhat satisfied, and satisfied. Mean scores are arranged from highest to lowest. A mean score below 3.87

indicates a level of not satisfied in response to a survey item and mean of 3.87 and above indicates a level of satisfied in response to a survey item.

The highest ranked item, "Campbell Library," had a mean score of 4.13 with 83 subjects satisfied with Campbell library (48.82%); four participants not satisfied (2.35%); one somewhat not satisfied (0.59%); 47 neutral (27.65%); 35 somewhat satisfied (20.59%).

The second item, "Rec Center Staff," had a mean score of 4.01 with 74 subjects satisfied with Rec Center staff (44.05%); two not satisfied (1.19%); four somewhat not satisfied (2.38%); 59 neutral (35.12%); 29 somewhat satisfied (17.26%).

The third item, "Register's Office," had a mean score of 3.95 with 68 subjects satisfied with this office (40.00%); five not satisfied (2.94%); four somewhat not satisfied (2.35%); 54 neutral (31.76%); 39 somewhat satisfied (22.94%).

The forth item, "Admission's Office," had a mean score of 3.92 with 79 subjects satisfied with this office (41.18%); four not satisfied (2.35%); 10 somewhat not satisfied (5.88%); 52 neutral (30.59%); 34 somewhat satisfied (20.00%).

The fifth item, "Bursar's Office," had a mean score of 3.89 with 72 subjects satisfied with this office (42.35%); 10 not satisfied (5.88%); three somewhat not satisfied (1.76%); 54 neutral (31.76%); 39 somewhat satisfied (18.24%).

The sixth item, "Financial Aid's Office," had a mean score of 3.78 with 66 subjects satisfied with this office (38.82%); nine not satisfied (5.29%); eight somewhat not satisfied (4.71%); 60 neutral (35.29%); 27 somewhat satisfied (15.88%).

The seventh item, "Wellness Center Staff," had a mean score of 3.66 with 57 subjects satisfied with this office's staff (34.13%); 11 not satisfied (6.59%); 14 somewhat not satisfied (8.38%); 52 neutral (31.14%); 33 somewhat satisfied (19.76%).

The eighth item, "Residential Life Staff," had a mean score of 3.65 with 51 subjects satisfied with this office's staff (30.36%); 12 not satisfied (7.14%); seven somewhat not satisfied (4.17%); 60 neutral (35.71%); 38 somewhat satisfied (22.62%).

Table 4.3

Evaluate the Quality of Services Provided to Freshmen Students (N=179)
(1=Not Satisfied, 2=Somewhat Satisfied, 3=Neutral, 4=Somewhat Satisfied, 5=Satisfied)

Item	Not Satisfied		Somewhat Not Satisfied		Neutral		Somewhat Satisfied		Satisfied	
	f	*%*	*f*	*%*	*f*	*%*	*f*	*%*	*f*	*%*
Campbell Library. *n*=170, *M*=4.13, *SD*=.99, Missing=9	4	2.35	1	0.59	47	27.65	35	20.59	83	48.82
Rec Center Staff. *n*=168, *M*=4.01, *SD*=1.00, Missing=11	2	1.19	4	2.38	59	35.12	29	17.26	74	44.05

Table 4.3 (Continued)

Item	Not Satisfied		Somewhat Not Satisfied		Neutral		Somewhat Satisfied		Satisfied	
	f	%	*f*	%	*f*	%	*f*	%	*f*	%
Register' Office. *n*=171, *M*=3.89, *SD*=1.10, Missing=8	5	2.94	4	2.35	54	31.76	39	22.94	68	40.00
Bursar's Office. *n*=170, *M*=3.89, *SD*=1.15, Missing=9	10	5.88	3	1.76	54	31.76	31	18.24	72	42.35
Financial Aid's Office. *n*=170, *M*=3.78, *SD*=1.17, Missing=9	9	4.71	8	4.71	60	35.29	27	15.88	66	38.82
Residential Life Staff. *n*=168, M=3.65, *SD*=1.16, Missing=11	11	6.43	9	5.26	65	38.01	35	36.1	51	29.82
Wellness Center Staff. *n*=167, *M*=3.66, *SD*=1.21, Missing=12	11	6.59	14	8.38	52	31.14	33	19.76	57	34.13

Table 4.4 contains the results of 3 survey items describing the level of satisfaction with an academic advisor. The Likert-type survey items are arranged from not satisfied, somewhat not satisfied, neutral, somewhat satisfied, and satisfied. Mean scores are arranged from highest to lowest. A mean score below 4.13 indicates a level of not satisfied in response to a survey item and mean of 4.13 and above indicates a level of satisfied in response to a survey item.

The highest ranked item, "Is Knowledgeable," had a mean score of 4.27 with 109 subjects satisfied with the academic advisor knowledge (64.50%); 10 participants not satisfied (5.92%); four somewhat not satisfied (2.37%); 25 neutral (14.79%); 21 somewhat satisfied (12.43%).

The second item, "Is Concerned about My Success as an Individual," had a mean score of 4.14 with 99 subjects satisfied with this item (58.93%); 10 not satisfied (5.95%); nine somewhat not satisfied (5.36%); 28 neutral (16.67%); 22 somewhat satisfied (13.10%).

The third item, "Is Available," had a mean score of 3.99 with 92 subjects satisfied with the academic advisor availability (54.44%); 12 not satisfied (7.10%); 15 somewhat not satisfied (8.88%); 27 neutral (15.98%); 23 somewhat satisfied (13.61%).

Table 4.4

Evaluate Following Items Regarding Your Advisor (N=179)
(1=Not Satisfied, 2=Somewhat Satisfied, 3=Neutral, 4=Somewhat Satisfied, 5=Satisfied)

Item	Not Satisfied		Somewhat Not Satisfied		Neutral		Somewhat Satisfied		Satisfied	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Is Knowledgeable. n=169, M=4.27, SD=1.16, Missing=10	10	5.92	4	2.37	25	14.79	21	12.43	109	64.50
Is Concerned About My Success as an Individual. n=168, M=4.14, SD=1.22, Missing=11	10	5.95	9	5.36	28	16.67	22	13.10	99	58.93
Is Available. n=169, M=3.99, SD=1.30, Missing=10	12	7.10	15	8.88	27	15.98	23	13.61	92	54.44

Table 4.5 contains the results of 3 survey items describing the level of satisfaction with class availability. The Likert-type survey items are arranged from not satisfied, somewhat not satisfied, neutral, somewhat satisfied, and satisfied. Mean scores are arranged from highest to lowest. A mean score below 3.74 indicates a level of not

40

satisfied in response to a survey item and mean of 3.74 and above indicates a level of satisfied in response to a survey item.

The highest ranked item, "Class Change (drop/add) Policies are Reasonable," had a mean score of 3.91 with 81 subjects satisfied with the drop and add class's policies (48.21%); 11 participants not satisfied (6.55%); 15 somewhat not satisfied (8.93%); 33 neutral (19.64%); 28 somewhat satisfied (16.67%).

The second item, "Classes are available (drop/add)," had a mean score of 3.71 with 70 subjects satisfied with this item (42.17%); 14 not satisfied (8.43%); 26 somewhat not satisfied (15.66%); 24 neutral (14.46%); 32 somewhat satisfied (19.28%).

The third item, "No Conflict for Registering Classes," had a mean score of 3.62 with 71 subjects satisfied with this item (42.26%); 20 not satisfied (11.90%); 26 somewhat not satisfied (15.48%); 23 neutral (13.69%); 28 somewhat satisfied (16.67%).

Table 4.5

Evaluate Following Items Regarding Your Advisor (N=179)
(1=Not Satisfied, 2=Somewhat Satisfied, 3=Neutral, 4=Somewhat Satisfied, 5=Satisfied)

Item	Not Satisfied		Somewhat Not Satisfied		Neutral		Somewhat Satisfied		Satisfied	
	f	*%*	*f*	*%*	*f*	*%*	*f*	*%*	*f*	*%*
Class Change (drop/add) Policies are Reasonable. *n*=168, *M*=3.91, *SD*=1.27, Missing=11	11	6.55	15	8.93	33	19.64	28	16.67	81	48.21
Classes are Available (drop/add). *n*=166, *M*=3.71, *SD*=1.37, Missing=13	14	8.43	26	15.66	24	14.46	32	19.28	70	42.17
Not Conflict for Registering Classes. *n*=168, *M*=3.62, *SD*=1.45, Missing=11	20	11.90	26	15.48	23	13.69	28	16.67	71	42.26

Table 4.6 contains the results of 2 survey items describing the level of satisfaction

with academic major. The Likert-type survey items are arranged from not satisfied,

somewhat not satisfied, neutral, somewhat satisfied, and satisfied.

The highest ranked item, "I don't have any issues for applying my academic

major to my career goals," had a mean score of 3.95 with 79 subjects satisfied with this

item (47.02%); 10 participants not satisfied (5.95%); 11 somewhat not satisfied (6.55%); 35 neutral (20.83%); 33 somewhat satisfied (19.64%).

The next item, "Courses' content is available based on my major," had a mean score of 3.92 with 78 subjects satisfied with this item (46.71%); eight not satisfied (4.79%); 18 somewhat not satisfied (10.87%); 22 neutral (19.16%); 31 somewhat satisfied (18.56%).

Table 4.6

Evaluate the Following Items in Regards to Academic Major (N=179)
(1=Not Satisfied, 2=Somewhat Satisfied, 3=Neutral, 4=Somewhat Satisfied, 5=Satisfied)

Item	Not Satisfied		Somewhat Not Satisfied		Neutral		Somewhat Satisfied		Satisfied	
	f	*%*	*f*	*%*	*f*	*%*	*f*	*%*	*f*	*%*
I do not have any issues for applying my academic major to my career goals. *n*=168, *M*=3.95, *SD*=1.21, Missing=11	10	5.95	11	6.55	35	20.83	33	19.64	79	47.02
Courses' content is available based on my major *n*=167, *M*=3.92, *SD*=1.23, Missing=12	8	4.79	18	10.78	32	19.16	31	18.56	78	46.71

Table 4.7 contains the results of 3 survey items describing the level of satisfaction with campus safety. The Likert-type survey items are arranged from not satisfied, somewhat not satisfied, neutral, somewhat satisfied, and satisfied. Mean scores are arranged from highest to lowest. A mean score below 4.17 indicates a level of not satisfied in response to a survey item and mean of 4.17 and above indicates a level of satisfied in response to a survey item.

The highest ranked item, "Security Staff are Available Always," had a mean score of 4.19 with 88 subjects satisfied with security staff availability (53.66%); one participants not satisfied (0.61%); eight somewhat not satisfied (4.88%); 38 neutral (23.17%); 29 somewhat satisfied (17.68%).

The second item, "The Campus is Secure," had a mean score of 4.18 with 87 subjects satisfied with this item (52.10%); five not satisfied (2.99%); eight somewhat not satisfied (4.79%); 26 neutral (15.57%); 41 somewhat satisfied (24.55%).

The third item, "The Campus is Safe," had a mean score of 4.17 with 88 subjects satisfied with this item (53.33%); four not satisfied (2.42%); 12 somewhat not satisfied (7.27%); 24 neutral (14.55%); 37 somewhat satisfied (22.42%).

Table 4.7

Evaluate the Following Items in Regards to Campus Safety (N=179)
(1=Not Satisfied, 2=Somewhat Satisfied, 3=Neutral, 4=Somewhat Satisfied, 5=Satisfied)

Item	Not Satisfied		Somewhat Not Satisfied		Neutral		Somewhat Satisfied		Satisfied	
	f	*%*	*f*	*%*	*f*	*%*	*f*	*%*	*f*	*%*
Security Staffs are Available Always. *n*=164, *M*=4.19, *SD*=.99, Missing=15	1	0.61	8	4.88	38	23.17	29	17.68	88	53.66
The Campus is Secure. *n*=167, *M*=4.18, *SD*=1.05, Missing=12	5	2.99	8	4.79	26	15.57	41	24.55	87	52.10
The Campus is Safe. *n*=164, *M*=4.17, *SD*=1.08, Missing=15	4	2.42	12	7.27	24	14.55	37	22.42	88	53.33

Research question 2. What is the level of importance with the quality of services among selected freshmen at Rowan University?

Table 4.8 contains the results of 8 survey items describing level of importance. The Likert-type survey items are arranged from not important, somewhat not important,

neutral, somewhat important, and important. Mean scores are arranged from highest to lowest. A mean score below 4.15 indicates a level of not satisfied in response to a survey item and mean of 4.15 and above indicates a level of satisfied in response to a survey item.

The highest ranked item, "Financial Aid's Office," had a mean score of 4.48 and standard deviation of 0.94. One hundred twenty- two participants responded the financial aid's office's staff availability is important (70.62%); five participants responded as not important (2.89%); one somewhat not important (0.58%); twenty-two neutral (12.72%); twenty-three somewhat important (13.29%).

The second item, "Bursar's Office," had a mean score of 4.43 with 109 subjects indication the bursar office's staff availability is important (63.74%); one not important (0.58%); two somewhat not important (1.17%); 28 neutral (16.37%); 31 somewhat important (18.13%).

The third item, "Wellness Center," had a mean score of 4.32 with 104 subjects indication the wellness center's staff availability is important (60.47%); five not important (2.91%); three somewhat not important (1.74%); 28 neutral (16.28%); 32 somewhat important (18.60%).

The forth item, "Register's Office," had a mean score of 4.30 with 99 subjects indication this office's staff availability is important (57.23%); two not important (1.16%); three somewhat not important (1.73%); 35 neutral (20.23%); 34 somewhat important (19.65%).

The fifth item, "Admission's Office," had a mean score of 4.13 with 92 subjects indication this office's staff availability is important (53.18%); six not important (3.47%); five somewhat not important (2.89%); 41 neutral (20.70%); 29 somewhat important (16.76%).

The sixth item, "Residential Life Staff," had a mean score of 3.97 with 72 subjects indication this office's staff availability is important (41.62%); six not important (3.47%); 10 somewhat not important (5.78%); 40 neutral (23.12%); 45 somewhat important (26.01%).

The seventh item, "Campbell Library Staff," had a mean score with 62 subjects indication this office' staff availability is important (35.84%); nine not important (5.20%); 10 somewhat not important (5.78%); 35 neutral (20.23%); 57 somewhat important (32.95%).

The final item, "Rec Center Staff," had a mean score of 3.71 with 53 subjects indication this office's staff availability is important (30.64%); six not important (3.47%); 16 somewhat not important (9.25%); 54 neutral (31.21%); 44 somewhat important (25.43%).

Table 4.8

Evaluate the Availability of University Staff (N=179)
(1=Not Important, 2=Somewhat Important, 3=Neutral, 4=Somewhat Important,
5=Important)

Item	Not Important		Somewhat Not Important		Neutral		Somewhat Important		Important	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Financial Aid's Office. *n*=173, *M*=4.48, *SD*=.94, Missing=6	5	2.89	1	0.58	22	12.72	23	13.29	122	70.52
Bursar's Office. *n*=171, *M*=4.43, *SD*=.84, Missing=8	1	0.58	2	1.17	28	16.37	31	18.13	109	63.74
Wellness Center Staff. *n*=172, *M*=4.32, *SD*=1.00, Missing=7	5	2.91	3	1.74	28	16.28	32	18.60	104	60.47
Register's Office. *n*=173, *M*=4.30, *SD*=.93, Missing=6	2	1.16	3	1.73	35	20.23	34	19.65	99	57.23

Table 4.8 (Continued)

Item	Not Important		Somewhat Not Important		Neutral		Somewhat Important		Important	
	f	*%*	*f*	*%*	*f*	*%*	*f*	*%*	*f*	*%*
Admission's Office. *n*=173, *M*=4.13, *SD*=1.09, Missing=6	6	3.47	5	2.89	41	23.70	29	16.76	92	53.18
Residential Life Staff. *n*=173, *M*=3.97, *SD*=1.09, Missing=6	6	3.47	10	5.78	40	23.12	45	26.01	72	41.62
Campbell Library. *n*=173, *M*=3.88, *SD*=1.12, Missing=6	9	5.20	10	5.78	35	20.23	57	32.95	62	35.84
Rec Center Office. *n*=173, *M*=3.71, *SD*=1.10, Missing=6	6	3.47	16	9.25	54	31.21	44	25.43	53	30.64

Table 4.9 contains the results of 8 survey items based on the importance of service quality provided by some offices at Rowan University. The Likert-type survey items are arranged from not important, somewhat not important, neutral, somewhat important, and important. Mean scores are arranged from highest to lowest. A mean score below 4.09 indicates a level of not satisfied in response to a survey item and mean of 4.09 and above indicates a level of satisfied in response to a survey item.

The highest ranked item, "Financial Aid's Office," had a mean score of 4.31 with 106 subjects indication the financial aid's office's quality is important (61.63%); five participants responded as not important (2.91%); two somewhat not important (1.16%); 34 neutral (19.77%); 25 somewhat important (14.53%).

The second item, "Bursar's Office," had a mean score of 4.27 with 100 subjects indication the bursar office quality is important (57.80%); one not important (0.58%); five somewhat not important (2.89%); 41 neutral (23.70%); 26 somewhat important (15.03%).

The third item, "Register's Office, had a mean score of 4.21 with 92 subjects indication the register's office staff quality is important (53.18%); one not important (0.58%); three somewhat not important (1.73%); 46 neutral (26.59%); 31 somewhat important (17.92%).

The forth item, "Wellness Center," had a mean score of 4.18 with 94 subjects indication this office's staff quality is important (54.65%); six not important (3.49%); six somewhat not important (3.49%); 33 neutral (19.19%); 33 somewhat important (19.19%).

The fifth item, "Admission's Office," had a mean score of 4.16 with 91 subjects indication this office's staff quality is important (52.30%); two not important (1.15%); four somewhat not important (2.30%); 50 neutral (28.74%); 27 somewhat important (15.52%).

The sixth item, "Campbell Library Staff," had a mean score of 3.99 with 71 subjects indication this office's staff quality is important (41.04%); six not important (3.47%); nine somewhat not important (5.20%); 37 neutral (21.39%); 40 somewhat important (28.90%).

The seventh item, "Residential Life Staff," had a mean score of 3.85 with 68 subjects indication this office' staff quality is important (39.53%); seven not important (4.07%); eight somewhat not important (4.65%); 56 neutral (32.56%); 33 somewhat important (19.19%).

The final item, "Rec Center Staff," had a mean score of 3.76 with 62 subjects indication this office's staff quality is important (35.84%); seven not important (4.05%); 15 somewhat not important (8.67%); 53 neutral (30.64%); 36 somewhat important (20.81%).

Table 4.9

Evaluate the Quality of Services Provided to Freshmen Students (N=179)
(1=Not Important, 2=Somewhat Important, 3=Neutral, 4=Somewhat Important,
5=Important)

Item	Not Important f	%	Somewhat Not Important f	%	Neutral f	%	Somewhat Important f	%	Important f	%
Financial Aid's Office. *n*=172, *M*=4.31, *SD*=1.01, Missing=7	5	2.91	2	1.16	34	19.77	25	14.53	106	61.63
Bursar's Office. *n*=173, *M*=4.27, *SD*=.95, Missing=6	1	0.58	5	2.89	41	23.70	26	15.03	100	57.80
Register's office. *n*=173, *M*=4.32, *SD*=.93, Missing=6	1	0.58	3	1.73	46	26.59	31	17.92	92	53.18
Wellness Center Staff. *n*=172, *M*=4.18, *SD*=1.08, Missing=7	6	3.49	6	3.49	33	19.19	34	19.65	94	54.65

Table 4.9 (Continued)

Item	Not Important		Somewhat Not Important		Neutral		Somewhat Important		Important	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Admission's Office. n=174, M=4.16, SD=.99, Missing=5	2	1.15	4	2.30	50	28.74	27	15.52	91	52.30
Campbell Library Staff. n=173, M=3.99, SD=1.07, Missing=6	6	3.47	9	5.20	37	21.39	50	28.90	71	41.04
Residential Life Staff. n=172, M=3.85, SD=1.12, Missing=7	7	4.07	8	4.65	56	32.56	33	19.19	68	39.53
Rec Center Office. n=173, M=3.76, SD=1.15, Missing=6	7	*4.05*	15	8.67	53	30.64	36	20.81	62	35.84

Table 4.10 contains the results of 3 survey items describing level of importance with the academic advisor. The Likert-type survey items are arranged from not important, somewhat not important, neutral, somewhat important, and important. Mean scores are arranged from highest to lowest. A mean score below 4.59 indicates a level of not important in response to a survey item and mean of 4.59 and above indicates a level of important in response to a survey item.

The highest ranked item, "Is Knowledgeable," had a mean score of 4.60 with 131 subjects indicating it was important to have a knowledgeable academic advisor (76.61%); three participants not important (1.57%); two somewhat not important (1.17%); sixteen neutral (9.36%); nineteen somewhat important (11.11%).

The second item, "Is Concerned about My Success as an Individual," had a mean score of 4.56 with 128 subjects indicating this item is important (74.85%); three responded not important (1.75%); three somewhat not important (1.75%); 17 neutral (9.94%); 20 somewhat important (11.70%).

The third item, "Is Available," had a mean score of 4.45 with 121 subjects indicating that the academic advisor availability is important (71.60%); six responded is not important (3.55%); six somewhat not important (3.55%); 15 neutral (8.88%); 21 somewhat important (12.43%).

Table 4.10

Evaluate Following Items Regarding Your Advisor (N=179)
(1=Not Important, 2=Somewhat Important, 3=Neutral, 4=Somewhat Important,
5=Important)

Item	Not Important		Somewhat Not Important		Neutral		Somewhat Important		Important	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Is Knowledgeable. n=171, M=4.60, SD=.84, Missing=8	3	1.75	2	1.17	16	9.36	19	11.11	131	76.61
Is Concerned About My Success as an Individual. n=171, M=4.56, SD=.87, Missing=8	3	1.75	3	1.75	17	9.94	20	11.70	128	74.85
Is Available. n=169, M=4.45, SD=1.03, Missing=10	6	3.55	6	3.55	15	8.88	21	12.43	121	71.60

Table 4.11 contains the results of 3 survey items describing level of importance
with class availability. The Likert-type survey items are arranged from not important,
somewhat not important, neutral, somewhat important, and important. Mean scores are
arranged from highest to lowest. A mean score below 4.45 indicates a level of not

important in response to a survey item and mean of 4.45 and above indicates a level of important in response to a survey item.

The highest ranked item, "Class Change (drop/add) Policies are Reasonable," had a mean score of 4.53 with 118 subjects indicating the drop and add class's policies is important (67.82%); one participant responded this item is not important (0.57%); three somewhat not important (1.72%); 16 neutral (9.20%); 36 somewhat important (20.69%).

The second item, "Classes are available (drop/add)," had a mean score of 4.47 with 119 subjects indicating this item is important (69.19%); four participants responded this item is not important (2.33%); six somewhat not important (3.49%); 14 neutral (8.14%); 39 somewhat important (16.86%).

The third item, "No Conflict for Registering Classes," had a mean score of 4.36 with 119 subjects indicating this item is important (64.94%); six participants responded this item is not important (3.45%); seven somewhat not important (4.02%); 18 neutral (10.34%); 30 somewhat important (17.24%).

Table 4.11

Evaluate Following Items Regarding to Class Availability (N=179)
(1=Not Important, 2=Somewhat Important, 3=Neutral, 4=Somewhat Important,
5=Important)

Item	Not Important		Somewhat Not Important		Neutral		Somewhat Important		Important	
	f	*%*	*f*	*%*	*f*	*%*	*f*	*%*	*f*	*%*
Class Change (drop/add) Policies are Reasonable. *n*=174, *M*=4.53, *SD*=.78, Missing=5	1	0.57	3	1.72	16	9.20	36	20.69	118	67.82
Classes are Available (drop/add). *n*=172, *M*=4.47, *SD*=.95, Missing=7	4	2.33	6	3.49	14	8.14	29	16.86	119	69.19
Not Conflict for Registering Classes. *n*=174, *M*=4.36, *SD*=1.05, Missing=5	6	3.45	7	4.02	18	10.34	30	17.24	131	64.94

Table 4.12 contains the results of 2 survey items describing level of importance with academic major. The Likert-type survey items are arranged from not important, somewhat not important, neutral, somewhat important, and important.

The highest ranked item, "Courses' content is available based on my major," had a mean score of 4.58 with 127 subjects indicating this item is important (73.84%); two participants responded this item is not important (1.16%); three somewhat not important (1.74%); 15 neutral (8.72%); 25 somewhat important (14.53%).

The next item, "I don't have any issues for applying my academic major to my career goals," had a mean score of 4.45 with 118 subjects indicating this item is important (68.21%); four not important (2.31%); five somewhat not important (2.89%); 18 neutral (10.40%); 28 somewhat important (16.18%).

Table 4.12

Evaluate the Following Items in Regards to Academic Major (N=179)
(1=Not Important, 2=Somewhat Important, 3=Neutral, 4=Somewhat Important,
5=Important)

Item	Not Important f %	Somewhat Not Important f %	Neutral f %	Somewhat Important f %	Important f %
Courses' content is available based on my major. n=172, M=4.58, SD=.81, Missing=7	2 1.16	3 1.74	15 14.53	25 14.53	127 73.84
I do not have any issues for applying my academic major to my career goals. n=173, M=4.45, SD=.95, Missing=6	4 2.31	5 2.89	18 10.40	28 16.18	118 68.21

Table 4.13 contains the results of 3 survey items describing level of importance with campus safety. The Likert-type survey items are arranged from not important, somewhat not important, neutral, somewhat important, and important. Mean scores are arranged from highest to lowest. A mean score below 4.51 indicates a level of not important in response to a survey item and mean of 4.51 and above indicates a level of important in response to a survey item.

The highest ranked item, "Security Staff are Available Always," had a mean score of 4.55 with 125 subjects indicating the security staff availability is important (71.84%); nobody responded this item is not important (0.0%); four somewhat not important (2.30%); 21 neutral (12.07%); 24 somewhat important (13.79%).

The second item, "The Campus is Safe," had a mean score of 4.51 with 119 subjects indicating this item is important (69.19%); three participant responded this item is not important (1.74%); one somewhat not important (0.58%); 21 neutral (12.21%); 28 somewhat important (16.28%).

The final item, "The Campus is Secure," had a mean score of 4.48 with 120 subjects indicating this item is important (68.97%); four not important (2.30%); two somewhat not important (1.15%); 20 neutral (11.49%); 28 somewhat important (16.09%).

Table 4.13

Evaluate the Following Items in Regards to Campus Safety (N=179)
(1=Not Important, 2=Somewhat Important, 3=Neutral, 4=Somewhat Important,
5=Important)

Item	Not Important f %	Somewhat Not Important f %	Neutral f %	Somewhat Important f %	Important f %
Security Staffs are Available Always. n=174, M=4.55, SD=.79, Missing=5	0 0	4 2.30	21 12.07	24 13.79	125 71.84
The Campus is Safe. n=172, M=4.51, SD=.86, Missing=7	3 1.74	1 0.58	21 12.21	28 16.28	119 69.19
The Campus is Secure. n=174, M=4.48, SD=.91, Missing=5	4 2.30	2 1.15	20 11.49	28 16.09	120 68.97

Research question 3. What are the differences in satisfaction and importance among selected freshmen student towards the subgroups of service quality at Rowan University?

Table 4.14 contains information describing average level of freshmen student satisfaction towards the subgroups of service quality. The subgroups included in the

61

survey were university staff availability, quality of service, academic advisor, class availability, academic majors, and campus safety. These subgroups evaluated level of satisfaction of freshmen students with Admission's Office staff, Register's Office staff, Bursar's Office staff, Financial Aid's Office staff, Residential Life staff, Wellness Center staff, and Campbell Library staff.

The first item, "Availability of University Staff," had on average of 37.04 % satisfaction with 62 students participating.

The second item, "Quality of Service," had on average of 40.7 % satisfaction with 68 students participating.

The third item, "Academic Advisor," had on average of 59.57 % satisfaction with 100 students participating.

The fourth item, "Class Availability," had on average of 44.4 % satisfaction with 74 students participating.

The fifth item, "Academic Majors," had on average of 46.86 % satisfaction with 79 students participating.

The final item, "Quality of Service," had on average of 53.03 % satisfaction with 88 students participating.

Table 4.14

Average Level of Satisfaction with Following Subgroups.

Variable	*f*	*%*
Availability of University Staff	62	37.04
Quality of Service	68	40.7
Academic Advisor	100	59.57
Class Availability	74	44.40
Academic Majors	79	46.86
Quality of Service	88	53.03

Table 4.15 contains information describing average level of importance towards the subgroups of service quality. The subgroups included in this survey were university staff availability, quality of service, academic advisor, class availability, academic majors, and campus safety. These subgroups evaluated level of satisfaction of freshmen students with Admission's Office staff, Register's Office staff, Bursar's Office staff, Financial Aid's Office staff, Residential Life staff, Wellness Center staff, and Campbell Library staff.

The first item, "Availability of University Staff," had on average of 55.03 % indicating important with 90 students participating.

The second item, "Quality of Service," had on average of 51.06 % indicating important with 86 students participating.

The third item, "Academic Advisor," had on average of 74.25 % indicating important with 127 students participating.

The fourth item, "Class Availability," had on average of 69.05 % indicating important with 117 students participating.

The fifth item, "Academic Majors," had on average of 71.12 % indicating important with 123 students participating.

The final item, "Quality of Service," had on average of 70.02 % indicating important with 122 students participating.

Table 4.15

Average Level of Importance with Following Subgroups.

Variable	f	%
Availability of University Staff	90	55.03
Quality of Service	86	51.06
Academic Advisor	127	74.25
Class Availability	117	69.05
Academic Majors	123	71.12
Quality of Service	122	70.02

Chapter V

Summary, Discussion, Conclusion, and Recommendations

Summary of the Study

This study investigated the level of satisfaction of freshmen students enrolled in spring 2018 at Rowan University. By use a sample size calculator, it was determined that of the 2330 target population, 732 students chosen at random would receive the online survey. Of the 732 students who received the online survey, 179 responded. Overall the study subjects indicated that 41% were satisfied, 2% not satisfied, 9% somewhat dissatisfied, 18% neutral, and 30% somewhat satisfied based on their experience at Rowan University.

The online survey also asked freshmen the question, "Would you enroll at Rowan University if you had to do it again?" A total of 150 subjects responded to the question with 56% indication definitely yes, 6% definitely no, 8% maybe not, and 31% maybe yes.

Discussion of the Findings

Research question 1. What is the level of satisfaction with the quality of services among selected freshmen at Rowan University?

The focus of this research question was to gather information measuring the level of students' satisfaction as an indicator of customer service in higher education at Rowan University. Overall, based on the students' survey results, 46% were satisfied with quality of services provided at Rowan University. The online survey data indicated that students were most satisfied with Campbell Library staffs' availability and also services provided to students by the library staff. Also the students were satisfied with their

academic advisor's knowledge. They were satisfied with the drop and add policy for classes, and do not have any issues applying their knowledge based on their academic major. The students were satisfied with availability of security staff at Rowan University.

Since the students have more choices for applying to higher education institutions, they expect greater of levels of customer service. Plank and Chiagouris (1997) stated that students are looking to meet their expectations about services provided by institutions. DeShields, Kara, and Kaynak (2005) suggested that student satisfaction has an influence on the students' intentions for staying in higher education and graduating from the attending institutions.

According to the findings of this study, Rowan University should focus more on customer service. Moreover the university should seek to enhance the levels of satisfaction of students by aligning faculty and staff responsibilities with a clearly defined customer service culture on campus. Rowan University can take their service levels to higher levels as the customer service culture grows.

Research question 2. What is the level of importance with the quality of services among selected freshmen at Rowan University?

These findings support that the quality of services provided to students are important to students. In the digital age, delivering good customer service is valid in meeting students' expectations. Based on the survey results, the students rated the following services provided by Rowan University: 71% Financial Aid's staff availability is important, 62% of Financial Aid's quality services is important, 77% of Academic

Advisors knowledge is important, 68% of class change policies is important, and 74% of course availability based on their major is important.

Retention of students goes beyond good customer service in higher education. The foundation of good customer service is marked by meeting students' expectations. Voss, Gruber, and Szmigin (2007) stated that students might have idealistic expectations, so higher education institutions must know and manage these expectations.

Research question 3. What are the differences in satisfaction and importance among selected freshmen student towards the subgroups of service quality at Rowan University?

This study found that Academic Advisor knowledge, availability, and advisor's concern about students' success are most important for students. Also the study found that freshmen students' satisfaction at Rowan University is generally positive. DeShields, Kara, And Kaynak (2005) found that the most important adjustable components for students' expectation and student's satisfaction are faculty performance, academic advisor performance, and stimulating classes.

By comparing levels of importance and levels of satisfaction among freshmen students towards the subgroups of service quality at Rowan University, it is possible to use gap analysis for identifying priorities and improvement. Based on the gap analysis results of this study, the data indicate that levels of satisfaction are lower than the levels of importance. So Rowan University may not be meeting the student's expectations.

Conclusions

This study sought to understand the level of satisfaction with the quality of services among selected freshmen at Rowan University. The results indicated that student expectations with Rowan University are being met. Based on the students' experiences at Rowan University, they are satisfied, and will continued to enroll at the university. Student satisfaction influences not only how much students enjoy their time at university, but also how well they perform academically. Thus student satisfaction is fundamental for promoting a healthy experience at the university, and generating positive impact on the university's standing in global rankings in the competitive environment. It can be concluded that marketing perspectives designed to improve Rowan's reputation may not be possible without enhancing students' satisfaction. By focusing on students' expectations and satisfaction, retention of students will increase. The research findings of this study conclude that freshmen students who enrolled in spring 2018 at Rowan University perceive that they do feel satisfied with the availability of university staff, quality of services, academic advisor, class availability, academic majors, and campus safety.

Recommendations for Practice

1. More resources should be invested at Rowan University's library.

2. Implement culture of customer service in different departments.

3. Increase marketing concept at Rowan University.

4. Encourage students to be involved on campus.

Recommendations for Future Research

1. Further studies should be conducted with larger populations to confirm the findings of this study.

2. Conduct surveys at different universities to compare the results with Rowan University.

3. Conduct surveys at different times to understand how satisfaction levels might change.

References

Ackerman, R., & Schibrowsky, J. (2007). A business marketing strategy applied to student retention: A higher education initiative. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice, 9*(3), 307-336.

Aly, N., & Akpovi, J. (2001). Total quality management in California public higher education. *Quality Assurance in Education, 9*(3), 127-131. doi:10.1108/09684880110399077

Anderson, E. W., & Sullivan, M. W. (1993). The antecedents and consequences of customer satisfaction for firms. *Marketing Science, 12*(2), 125-143. doi:10.1287/mksc.12.2.125

Anderson, S., Pearo, L. K., & Widener, S. K. (2008). Drivers of service satisfaction: Linking customer satisfaction to the service concept and customer characteristics. *Journal of Service Research, 10*(4), 365-381. doi:10.1177/1094670508314575

Astin, A. W. (1984). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 25*(4), 297-308.

Binsar, F., & Panjaitan, H. (2014). Analysis of customer loyalty through total quality service, customer relationship management, and customer satisfaction. *international journal of evaluation and research in education (IJERE), 3*(3).

Boyd, A. (2002). The goals, questions, indicators, measures (GQIM) approach to the measurement of customer satisfaction with e-commerce web sites. *Aslib Proceedings, 54*(3), 177-187. doi:10.1108/00012530210441728

Brotz, W. J. (2006). Components Associated with Perceived Student Satisfaction in a Technology- Enhanced Secondary Astronomy Course-*DScholarship@Pitt.* Retrievedfrom http://d-scholarship.pitt.edu/7938/

Davidson, J. H., Keegan, W. J., & Brill, E. A. (2004). *Offensive marketing: An action guide to gaining competitive advantage.* Londen: Routledge.

DeShields, O. W., Kara, A., & Kaynak, E. (2005). Determinants of business student satisfaction and retention in higher education: Applying Herzberg's two-factor theory. *International Journal of Educational Management, 19*(2), 128-139. doi:10.1108/09513540510582426

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.

Gallagher, S., & Mishra, S. (2013). Your customer's voice: An innovation roadmap for professional education. *Continuing Higher Education Review*, 77, 77-85.

Graefe, A. R., & Burns, R. C. (2013). Testing a mediation model of customer service and satisfaction in outdoor recreation. *Journal of Outdoor Recreation and Tourism, 3-4*, 36-46. doi:10.1016/j.jort.2013.09.006

Guolla, M. (1999). Assessing the teaching quality to student satisfaction relationship: Applied customer satisfaction research in the classroom. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice, 7*(3), 87-97. doi:10.1080/10696679.1999.11501843

House, J. D. (1999). The effect of entering characteristics and instructional experiences on student satisfaction and degree completion and degree completion: An application. *International Journal of Instructional Media, 26*(4), 423.

Innis, D. E., & La Londe, B. J. (1994). Customer service: The key to customer satisfaction, customer loyalty, and market share. *Journal of Business Logistics, 15*(1), 1.

ISO 10002:2014 (2018) Retrieved from https://www.iso.org/standard/65712.html

Janardhana, G., & Rajasekhar, M. (2012). Customer satisfaction versus infrastructural facilities in the realm of higher education A case study of Sri Venkateswara University Tirupati.*I-Manager's Journal on Educational Psychology, 6*(1), 53.

Kan, S. H. (2002). *Metrics and models in software quality engineering*. Boston: Addison-Wesley Longman Publishing Co., Inc.

Kelso, R. S. (2008). *Measuring undergraduate student perceptions of service quality in higher education*. University of South Florida.

Khan, H., & Matlay, H. (2009). Implementing service excellence in higher education.*Education + Training, 51*(8/9), 769-780. doi:10.1108/00400910911005299

Kuh, G. D., Kinzie, J., Schuh, J. H., & Whitt, E. J. (2005). *Student success in college: Creating conditions that matter*. San Francisco, Calif : Chichester: Jossey-Bass.

Kumar, V., & Reinartz, W. (2017). *Customer relationship management concept, strategy, and tools*. Berlin: Springer Berlin.

Lo, Celia, C., (2010). How student satisfaction factors affect perceived learning. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 10* (1) (2010), pp. 47-54

Malaney, G. D., & Shively, M. (1995). Academic and social expectations and experiences of first-year students of color. *NASPA Journal, 33*(1), 3-18.

Marzo, M., Pedraja, M., & Rivera, P. (2007). The customer concept in university services: A classification. *International Review on Public and Non Profit Marketing, 4*(1), 65-80. doi:10.1007/BF03180755

Messick, S. J. (Ed.). (2013). *Assessment in higher education: Issues of access, quality, student development and public policy.* London: Routledge.

Miller, T. E., Bender, B. E., & Schuh, J. H. (2005). *Promoting reasonable expectations: Aligning student and institutional views of the college experience.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Noel-Levitz, Inc. (1994). *Student Satisfaction Inventory.* Retrieved form https://survey.ruffalonl.com/#/survey/questions

Plank, R., & Chiagouris, L. (1997). Perceptions of quality of higher education: An exploratory study of high school guidance counsellors. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education, 8*(1), 55-67.

Rowan University (2017). Retrieved from http://www.rowan.edu/home/about.

Seeman, E. D., & O'Hara, M. (2006). Customer relationship management in higher education: Using information systems to improve the student-school relationship. *Campus-Wide Information Systems, 23*(1), 24-34.

Seetharaman, A., Sreenivasan, J., & Boon, L. P. (2006). Critical success factors of total quality management. *Quality & Quantity, 40*(5), 675-695. doi:10.1007/s11135-005-1097-2

Thurmond, V. A., & Popkess-Vawter, S. (2003). Examination of a middle range theory: Applying Astin's input-environment-outcome (IEO) model to web-based education. *Online Journal of Nursing Informatics, 7*(2), 1-11.

Tinto, V. (2012). *Completing college: Rethinking institutional action.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Tinto, V. (1975). Dropout from higher education: A theoretical synthesis of recent research. *Review of Educational Research, 45*(1), 89-125.

Tinto, V. (1982). Limits of theory and practice in student attrition. *The Journal of Higher Education, 53*(6), 687-700.

Turban, E., King, D., Lee, J., & Viehland, D. (2002). *Electronic commerce:* A managerial perspective. Prentice Hall: *ISBN 0, 13*(975285), 4.

Voss, R., Gruber, T., & Szmigin, I. (2007). Service quality in higher education: The role of student expectations. *Journal of Business Research, 60*(9), 949-959.

Institutional Review Board Disposition Form

** This is an auto-generated email. Please do not reply to this email message.
The originating e-mail account is not monitored.
If you have questions, please contact your local IRB office **

DHHS Federal Wide Assurance Identifier: FWA00007111
IRB Chair Person: Harriet Hartman
IRB Director: Sreekant Murthy
Effective Date:

eIRB Notice of Approval

STUDY PROFILE

Study ID:	<u>Pro2018002347</u>
Title:	Measuring Undergraduate Student Satisfaction as an Indicator of Customer Service in Higher Education

Principal Investigator:	Burton Sisco	**Study Coordinator:**	None
Co-Investigator(s):	Sanaz Shahi	**Other Study Staff:**	There are no items to display
Sponsor:	Department Funded	**Approval Cycle:**	Not Applicable
Risk Determination:	Minimal Risk	**Device Determination:**	Not Applicable
Review Type:	Exempt	**Exempt Category:**	2
Subjects:	366		

CURRENT SUBMISSION STATUS

Submission Type:	Research Protocol/Study	Submission Status:	Approved
Approval Date:	4/26/2018	Expiration Date:	

Pregnancy Code:	No Pregnant Women as Subjects	Pediatric Code:	No Children As Subjects	Prisoner Code:	No Prisoners As Subjects

Protocol:	Alt Consent/Survey Survey Permission Protocol	Consent:	There are no items to display	Recruitment Materials:	Invitation Survey

* Study Performance Sites:

Glassboro Campus 201 Mullica Hill Road • Glassboro, New Jersey 08028 • 856-256-4000

There are no items to display

ALL APPROVED INVESTIGATOR(S) MUST COMPLY WITH THE FOLLOWING:

1. Conduct the research in accordance with the protocol, applicable laws and regulations, and the principles of research ethics as set forth in the Belmont Report.

2. **Continuing Review:** Approval is valid until the protocol expiration date shown above. To avoid lapses in approval, submit a continuation application at least eight weeks before the study expiration date.

3. **Expiration of IRB Approval:** If IRB approval expires, effective the date of expiration and until the continuing review approval is issued: **All research activities must stop unless the IRB finds that it is in the best interest of individual subjects to continue. (This determination shall be based on a separate written request from the PI to the IRB.) No new subjects may be enrolled and no samples/charts/surveys may be collected, reviewed, and/or analyzed.**

4. **Amendments/Modifications/Revisions:** If you wish to change any aspect of this study, including but not limited to, study procedures, consent form(s), investigators, advertisements, the protocol document, investigator drug brochure, or accrual goals, you are required to obtain IRB review and approval prior to implementation of these changes unless necessary to eliminate apparent immediate hazards to subjects.

5. **Unanticipated Problems:** Unanticipated problems involving risk to subjects or others must be reported to the IRB Office (45 CFR 46, 21 CFR 312, 812) as required, in the appropriate time as specified in the attachment online at: http://www.rowan.edu/som/hsp/

6. **Protocol Deviations and Violations** : Deviations from/violations of the approved study protocol must be reported to the IRB Office (45 CFR 46, 21 CFR 312, 812) as required, in the appropriate time as specified in the attachment online at: http://www.rowan.edu/som/hsp/

7. **Consent/Assent:** The IRB has reviewed and approved the consent and/or assent process, waiver and/or alteration described in this protocol as required by 45 CFR 46 and 21 CFR 50, 56, (if FDA

regulated research). Only the versions of the documents included in the approved process may be used to document informed consent and/or assent of study subjects; each subject must receive a copy of the approved form(s); and a copy of each signed form must be filed in a secure place in the subject's medical/patient/research record.

8. **Completion of Study:** Notify the IRB when your study has been stopped for any reason. Neither study closure by the sponsor or the investigator removes the obligation for submission of timely continuing review application or final report.

9. The Investigator(s) did not participate in the review, discussion, or vote of this protocol.

10. Letter Comments: *There are no additional comments.*

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email communication may contain private, confidential, or legally privileged information intended for the sole use of the designated and/or duly authorized recipients(s). If you are not the intended recipient or have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately by email and permanently delete all copies of this email including all attachments without reading them. If you are the intended recipient, secure the contents in a manner that conforms to all applicable state and/or federal requirements related to privacy and confidentiality of such information.

Survey Used on Qualtrics ®

Customer Service in Higher Education

Consent. **Measuring Undergraduate Student Satisfaction as an Indicator of Customer Service in Higher Education**   You are invited to participate in this online survey for my mater's thesis entitled "Measuring Undergraduate Student Satisfaction as an Indicator of Customer Service in Higher Education" You are invited because you are enrolled as a Rowan University freshman student during the spring 2018 semester. The number of subjects to be enrolled in the study is 732.   The survey may take approximately 10 minutes to complete. Your participation is voluntary, if you do not wish to participate in this survey, do not respond to this online survey.   The purpose of this research study is to examine undergraduate students' satisfaction and importance with the customer services at Rowan University. It also provides recommendations for providing exceptional service quality and maintaining positive customer satisfaction.   There are no risks or discomforts associated with this survey. There may be no direct benefit to you, however, by participating in this study, you may help us understand how the Rowan University customer service can provide better services based on your expectations.   Your response will be kept completely confidential and your responses are anonymous as there is no way of connecting your completed survey with your name or identification number. We will store the data in a secure computer file and the file will destroyed once the data have been published. Any part of the research that is published as part of this study will not include your individual information. If you have any questions about the survey, you can contact my thesis advisor, Dr. Burton Sisco at 856-256-3717, sisco@rowan.edu at the email address provided, but you do not have to give your personal identification.   Please complete the checkbox below.

○ To participate in this survey, you must be 18 years old or older . Please a check box here. (1)

○ Completing this survey indicates are voluntarily consent to participate in the survey. (2)

Section I Please provide some background information.

Q1 Gender:

    ◯ Male (1)

    ◯ Female (2)

    ◯ Transgender (3)

Q2 Age:

    ◯ 18 and Under (1)

    ◯ 19 to 24 (2)

    ◯ 25 to 34 (3)

    ◯ 35 to 44 (4)

    ◯ 44 and over (5)

Q3 Ethnicity/Race:

○ Alaskan Native (1)

○ African American (2)

○ American Indian (3)

○ Asian (4)

○ Hispanic or Latino (5)

○ Native Hawaiian (6)

○ White/Caucasian (7)

○ Multi-Racial (8)

○ Other (9)

Q4 Employment:

○ Full-time off campus (1)

○ Part-time off campus (2)

○ Full-time on campus (3)

○ Part-time on campus (4)

○ Not employed (5)

End of Block: Section I

Start of Block: Section II

Q5 Each item below describes an expectation on this campus.
Please tell us how important it is for Rowan University to meet this expectation.

1 Please evaluate the availability of following university staff:

	Not Important (1)	Somewhat not Important (2)	Neutral (3)	Somewhat Important (4)	Important (5)
Admissions' Office (1)	○	○	○	○	○
Registar's Office (2)	○	○	○	○	○
Bursar's Office (3)	○	○	○	○	○
Financial Aid's Office (4)	○	○	○	○	○
Residential Life Staff (5)	○	○	○	○	○
Wellness Center Staff (6)	○	○	○	○	○
Rec Center Staff (7)	○	○	○	○	○
Campbell Library Staff (8)	○	○	○	○	○

2 Please evaluate the quality of services provided by the following:

	Not Important (1)	Somewhat not Important (2)	Neutral (3)	Somewhat Important (4)	Important (5)
Admission's Office (1)	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Registar's Office (2)	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Bursar's Office (3)	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Financial Aid's Office (4)	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Residential Life Staff (5)	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Wellness Center Staff (6)	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Rec Center Office (7)	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Campbell Library Staff (8)	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

3 Please evaluate the following items regarding your academic advisor:

	Not Important (1)	Somewhat not Important (2)	Neutral (3)	Somewhat Imprtant (4)	Important (5)
Is Knowledgeable (1)	○	○	○	○	○
Is Available (2)	○	○	○	○	○
Is Concerned about My Success an Individual. (3)	○	○	○	○	○

4 Please evaluate the following items regarding to class availibility.

	Not Important (1)	Somewhat not Important (2)	Neutral (3)	Somewhat Important (4)	Important (5)
No conflict for registering classes. (1)	○	○	○	○	○
Classes are available (drop/add) (2)	○	○	○	○	○
Class change (drop/add) policies are reasonable. (3)	○	○	○	○	○

5 Please evaluate the following items in regards academic majors:

	Not Important (1)	Somewhat not Important (2)	Neutral (3)	Somewhat Important (4)	Important (5)
Courses' content is available based on my major (1)	○	○	○	○	○
I do not have any issue for applying my academic major to my career goals (2)	○	○	○	○	○

6 Please evaluate the following items in regards to campus safety:

	Not Important (1)	Somewhat not Important (2)	Neutral (3)	Somewhat Important (4)	Important (5)
The campus is safe. (1)	○	○	○	○	○
The campus is secure (2)	○	○	○	○	○
Security staffs are available always (3)	○	○	○	○	○

Q 6 Each item below describes an expectation on this campus.
Please tell us how satisfied you are that Rowan University has met this expectation..

1 Please evaluate the availability of following university staff:

	Not Satisfied (1)	Somewhat not Satisfed (2)	Neutral (3)	Somewhat Satisfied (4)	Satisfied (5)
Admission's Office (1)	○	○	○	○	○
Registar's Office (2)	○	○	○	○	○
Bursar's Office (3)	○	○	○	○	○
Financial Aid's Office (4)	○	○	○	○	○
Residential Life Staff (5)	○	○	○	○	○
Wellness Center Staff (6)	○	○	○	○	○
Campbell Library Staff (7)	○	○	○	○	○

2 Please evaluate the quality of services provided by following:

	Not Satisfied (1)	Somewhat not Satisfied (2)	Neutral (3)	Somewhat Satisfied (4)	Satisfied (5)
Admission's Office (1)	○	○	○	○	○
Registar's Office (2)	○	○	○	○	○
Bursar's Office (3)	○	○	○	○	○
Financial Aid's Office (4)	○	○	○	○	○
Residential Life Staff (5)	○	○	○	○	○
Wellness Center Staff (6)	○	○	○	○	○
Rec Center Staff (7)	○	○	○	○	○
Campbell Library (8)	○	○	○	○	○

3 Please evaluate following items regarding your academic advisor:

	Not Satisfied (1)	Somewhat not Satisfied (2)	Neutral (3)	Somewhat Satisfied (4)	Satisfied (5)
Is Knowledgeble (1)	○	○	○	○	○
Is Available (2)	○	○	○	○	○
Is concerned about my success as an individual. (3)	○	○	○	○	○

4 Please evaluate the following items in regards to class availability:

	Not Satisfied (1)	Somewhat not Satisfied (2)	Neutral (3)	Somewhat Satisfied (4)	Satisfied (5)
No conflict for registering classes. (1)	○	○	○	○	○
Classes are available (drop/add) (2)	○	○	○	○	○
Class change (drop/add) policies are reasonable. (3)	○	○	○	○	○

5 Please evaluate the following items in regards to academic majors:

	Not Satisfied (1)	Somewhat not Satisfied (2)	Neutral (3)	Somewhat Satisfied (4)	Satisfied (5)
Courses' content is available based on my major (1)	○	○	○	○	○
I do not have any issue for applying my academic major to my career goals (2)	○	○	○	○	○

6 Please evaluate the following items in regards to campus safety.

	Not Satisfied (1)	Somewhat not Satisfied (2)	Neutral (3)	Somewhat Satisfied (4)	Satisfied (5)
The campus is safe. (1)	○	○	○	○	○
The campus is secure. (2)	○	○	○	○	○
Security staffs are available always. (3)	○	○	○	○	○

End of Block: Section II

Start of Block: Section III

Section III Choose the one response that best applies to you for each of the questions below.

Q6 Did you meet your expectations with here at Rowan University?

○ Much worse than I expected (1)

○ Worse than I expected (2)

○ About what I expected (3)

○ Better than I expected (4)

○ Much better than I expected (5)

Q7 Would you please rate your satisfaction based on your experience at Rowan University?

○ Not Satisfied at all (1)

○ Somewhat dissatisfied (2)

○ Netural (3)

○ Somewhat satissfied (4)

○ Satisfied (5)

Q8 Would yo enroll at Rowan University if you had to do it again?

○ Definitely not (1)

○ Maybe not (2)

○ I don't know (3)

○ Maybe Yes (4)

○ Definitely yes (5)

End of Block: Section III

Consent Form

PAPER SURVEY (ALTERNATE CONSENT)

Rowan University

Measuring Undergraduate Student Satisfaction as an Indicator of Customer Service in Higher Education

I am inviting you to participate in a research survey entitled "Measuring Undergraduate Student Satisfaction as an Indicator of Customer Service in Higher Education" I am inviting you because you are enrolled with the Rowan University's freshman on spring 2018, In order to participate in this survey, you must be 18 years or older.

The survey may take approximately 10 minutes to complete. Your participation is voluntary. If you do not wish to participate in this survey, do not respond to this paper survey. The number of subjects to be enrolled in the study will be 732.

The purpose of this research study is to examine undergraduate students' satisfaction and importance with the customer services at Rowan University, a Carnegie-classified doctoral research public university. It also provides recommendations for providing exceptional service quality and maintaining positive customer satisfaction.

Completing this survey indicates that you are voluntarily giving consent to participate in the survey.

There are no risks or discomforts associated with this survey. There may be no direct benefit to you, however, by participating in this study, you may help us understand how the Rowan University customer service can provide better services based on your expectations.

Your response will be kept confidential. We will store the data in a secure computer file and the file will destroyed once the data has been published. Any part of the research that is published as part of this study will not include your individual information. If you have any questions about the survey, you can contact my advisor, Dr. Burton Sisco at 856-256-3717, sisco@rowan.edu at the address provided below, but you do not have to give your personal identification.

Sincerely,
Sanaz Shahi
Shahis7@rowan.edu

This survey is being administered for thesis project at Rowan University. The study explores students' satisfaction with the customer services at Rowan University. If you choose to participate, please understand that all responses are strictly confidential and no personally identifiable information is being requested.
Thank you for taking the time to complete the survey.

Section I

Please provide some background information.

Gender:

- Female
- Male
- Transgender

Age:

- 18 and under
- 19 to 24
- 25 to 34
- 35 to 44
- 44 and over

Ethnicity/Race:

- Alaskan Native
- African American
- American Indian
- Asian
- Hispanic or Latino
- Native Hawaiian
- White/Caucasian
- Multi-Racial
- Other

Employment:

- Full-time off campus
- Part-time off campus
- Full-time on campus
- Part-time off campus
- Not employed

Section II

Each item below describes an expectation on this campus. Please tell us how important it is for Rowan University to meet this expectation. Tell us how satisfied you are that Rowan University has met this expectation.

	Important to me					My level of Satisfaction				
	Not Important	Somewhat not Important	Neutral	Somewhat important	Important	Not Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Satisfied
Please evaluate the availibility of following university staff:										
Admission's Office										
Registar's Office										
Bursar's Office										
Financial Aid's Office										
Residential Life Staff										
Wellness Center Staff										
Rec Center Staff										
Campbell Lobrary Staff										
Please evaluate the quality of services provided by the following:										
Admission's Office										
Registar's Office										
Bursar's Office										
Financial Aid's Office										
Residential Life Staff										
Wellness Center Staff										
Rec Center Staff										
Campbell Lobrary Staff										
Please evaluate the following items regarding your academic advisor:										
Is Knowledgeable										
Is Available when I need help										
My academic advisor is concened about my success as an individual.										
My academic advisor helps me set goals to work toward.										
Please evaluate the following items regarding to class availibility:										
I am able to register for classes I need with few conflicts.										
Classess are avalible (drop/add)										
Class change (drop/add) policies are reasonable.										
Please evaluate the following items in regards to academic majors:										
The content of the courses whitin major is valuable.										
I receive the help I need to apply my academic major to my career goals.										
I receive ongoing feedback progress toward my academic goals.										
Please evaluate the following items in regards to campus saftey:										
The campus is safe.										
The campus is secure for all students.										
Security staff respond quikly to calls for assistance.										

Section III

Choose the <u>one</u> response that best applies to you for each of the questions below.

So far, how has your college experience met your expectations?
- o Much worse than I expected
- o Worse than I expected
- o About what I expected
- o Better than I expected
- o Much better than I expected

Rate your overall satisfaction with your experience here thus far.
- o Not satisfied at all
- o Somewhat dissatisfied
- o Neutral
- o Somewhat satisfied
- o Satisfied

All in all, if you had it to do over again, would you enroll here?
- o Definitely not
- o Maybe not
- o I don't know
- o Maybe yes
- o Definitely yes