

## Analysis of University Student Satisfaction Levels with the Learning Process on Five Dimensions of Service Quality (SERVQUAL)

Rahmawati Rahmawati<sup>1</sup>, Johar Permana<sup>2</sup>, Diding Nurdin<sup>3</sup>, Cepi Triatna<sup>4</sup>, Fadhli Fadhli<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Universitas Almuslim, Indonesia ; [rahma09.wati.83@gmail.com](mailto:rahma09.wati.83@gmail.com)

<sup>2</sup> Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Indonesia ; [permanajohar@yahoo.com](mailto:permanajohar@yahoo.com)

<sup>3</sup> Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Indonesia ; [diding01nurdin@gmail.com](mailto:diding01nurdin@gmail.com)

<sup>4</sup> Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Indonesia ; [cepitriatna2015@upi.edu](mailto:cepitriatna2015@upi.edu)

<sup>5</sup> Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Indonesia ; [fadhlimdaud68@gmail.com](mailto:fadhlimdaud68@gmail.com)

---

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Keywords:

Satisfaction;  
Learning process;  
Service quality

#### Article history:

Received 2022-08-02

Revised 2022-10-18

Accepted 2023-05-04

### ABSTRACT

Each academic course must conduct a self-evaluation, one method of which is a survey of students' attitudes towards the teaching and learning they experienced. Service quality affects how satisfied students are with the institution. There are five service quality dimensions (SERVQUAL): Reliability, Responsiveness, Assurance, Empathy, and Tangible. The purpose of the study was to analyze students' level of satisfaction with the learning process on the 5 SERVQUAL Dimensions and evaluate which dimension had the highest level of satisfaction. The object of research is the active students of Almuslim University in the Odd Semester of the Academic Year 2021/2022 totalling 1,023 people. Quantitative research approach with the type of survey research. Data was collected using a Google form questionnaire which was distributed online. Analysis of the data by calculating the Percentage of Respondents' Achievement Level (RAL) followed by calculating the Community Satisfaction Index (CSI). The results showed that the highest RAL was in the Assurance Dimension, the average score was 3.23, and the RAL was 80.65% (excellent category), while the lowest RAL was in the Tangible Dimension, the average core was 3.06, and the RAL was 76.44% (excellent category). Analytical findings on a per-item basis There are five areas that need tweaking: The incorporation of e-learning technology and instructor feedback into the classroom setting. Hotspot facilities, as well as learning facilities in the lecture room, are readily available to accommodate the lecturers' high availability for academic consultations and/or Final Project discussions. The Assurance Dimension received the greatest CSI score (3.23), and the highest CSI conversion score (80.65), while the Tangible aspect received the lowest CSI score (2.94), and the lowest CSI conversion value (73.38). Overall, we received a CSI conversion score of 79.45, for a grand total of 3.18 (good).

*This is an open-access article under the [CC BY-NC-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/) license.*



### Corresponding Author:

Johan Permana

Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Indonesia ; [permanajohar@yahoo.com](mailto:permanajohar@yahoo.com)

---

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Service quality, such as customer quality, was rarely used in the higher education sector in the past. Service quality is only seen as one component that can add value to the university, but is not a necessity for the survival of the university. But in recent decades, there have been unprecedented changes in the higher education landscape (Teeroovengadu et al., 2019). Higher education is currently considered a business, and many business concepts and theories have been applied in the education sector (Khan et al., 2011). Therefore, as business organizations have an obligation always to satisfy their customers so that they can continue to grow (Calvo-Porrall et al., 2013), universities need to continue to satisfy their students (Srikanthan & Dalrymple, 2007) and provide high-quality educational services (Teeroovengadu et al., 2019). Currently, universities must compete to be able to attract students and seize market share. Only a few prestigious universities are still free to accept students of their choice, while most other universities need to compete in the open market with various options (Latif et al., 2017). Most universities have had to respond to market pressures by centralizing services, standardizing procedures, and strengthening management control of the teaching process (Temple et al., 2016).

Service quality is one of the key factors in getting customer satisfaction and will ultimately increase customer loyalty (Ajami et al., 2018). Customer satisfaction is a general assessment of services that have been provided based on experience during the service provided (Anderson et al., 1994). Satisfaction is a response to feelings that a person feels about expectations and the reality that has been experienced (Asmin et al., 2021). According to (Supriyono, 2018), satisfaction is a response to results and evaluation of performance discrepancies or actions felt by customers due to unfulfilled expectations. In other words, satisfaction will only be fulfilled if the performance produced by a company or an institution exceeds customer expectations.

The large number of students that universities must serve is a fact that universities must constantly improve the facilities offered to students if they want to maintain their position in the educational community (Asmin et al., 2021). One of them is the quality of service in the learning process. Learning is an important activity in life that involves most people to support themselves and their families, but satisfaction in learning will be different for each student. Some students are satisfied with treating personality, personal values, and fulfilling psychological needs (Siming et al., 2015). Learning is a process of changing student behaviour with a specific purpose designed interactively so that there is a paradigm shift from teaching to learning, meaning that both lecturers and students learn together so that, in the end, a learning community is created in the campus environment (N. R. Dewi & Asikin, 2009).

Higher Education Institutions need to collect information about student expectations (Gallifa, 2010). Service Quality (SERVQUAL) is very valuable when it measures service quality regularly, surveys employees three or four times a year, and systematically collects and analyzes customer suggestions and complaints (Parasuraman et al., 1988). (Shurair, 2019) states that SERVQUAL is the most widely used and superior method for measuring service quality because the scale used represents the customer's assessment of the service. Therefore, the SERVQUAL method was used in this study. The learning process at Almuslim University in the Odd Semester of the Academic Year 2021/2022 takes place in a blended learning manner which combines synchronous learning through direct face-to-face and asynchronous learning through a Learning Management System (LMS) called E-Learning Umuslim. The learning process at Almuslim University needs special attention. In the learning process, student satisfaction with the learning process is something that still needs to be improved. Several methods are used by Almuslim University to determine the level of student satisfaction with the learning process, one of which is through the distribution of student satisfaction survey questionnaires on the learning process at the end of each semester.

This study investigates five service quality dimensions, which are considered to be the main determinants of student satisfaction in the learning process in higher education: Reliability, Responsiveness, Assurance, Empathy, and Tangible. According to (Parasuraman et al., 1988), service quality consists of 5 dimensions, namely the Tangibles Dimension, related to physical facilities,

equipment, and personal appearance; Reliability, namely the ability of lecturers to carry out the promised services reliably and accurately; Responsiveness is the willingness of lecturers to help students and provide prompt service; Assurance is the knowledge and courtesy of lecturers and their ability to inspire with trust and confidence; and Empathy, is the individual attention given by lecturers to their students.

In essence, the concept of customer satisfaction is still abstract. The process of achieving satisfaction can take place in a simple, complex or complicated way. In this context, the role and influence of each individual on the satisfaction that is formed is very important. In order to understand the level of customer satisfaction well, it is necessary to understand the causes and consequences of the emergence of satisfaction (N. R. Dewi & Asikin, 2009). A number of studies have been conducted to examine the relationship between service quality and student satisfaction in the learning process. The results reported by (Bakrie et al., 2019), show that service quality greatly influences student satisfaction. Service Quality is the right instrument to measure quality in providing education services. All service attribute dimensions were positively correlated with customer satisfaction. (Le et al., 2021) believes that one of the important strategies to increase student satisfaction in order to succeed in quality competition with other universities is the quality of service provided. (Snipes & Thomson, 1999) has examined the factors that influence the quality perceived by students in higher education. The regression analysis results show that of the five components of SERVQUAL, there are three quite reliable components: 1) empathy, 2) competence and reliability, and 3) tangible.

This research was conducted to answer the question: How is the level of satisfaction of Almuslim University students with the learning process on the 5 dimensions of service quality, and which dimension of service quality has the highest level of satisfaction? This study aims to analyze the level of satisfaction of Almuslim University students with the learning process on the 5 Dimensions of Service Quality (Reliability, Responsiveness, Assurance, Empathy, and Tangible), and evaluate which dimensions of service quality have the highest level of satisfaction. The results of this study are expected to contribute to University's improvement of service-learning processes for all students.

## 2. METHODS

This research is a survey research with a quantitative approach. Survey research is a quantitative research procedure carried out to describe the attitudes, behaviours, and characteristics of the population obtained through a sample population (Cresswell, 2012). This research was conducted at the end of the Odd Semester of the Academic Year 2021/2022. The research population is all students of Almuslim University who are active during the learning process in the Odd Semester of the Academic Year 2021/2022, namely students who are taking Semesters 1, 3, 5, and 7.

Collecting data using the Accidental Sampling technique, which is a sampling technique based on chance, meaning that respondents who coincidentally/incidentally meet with the researcher or are willing to become respondents can be used as samples if it is deemed that the person is suitable as a data source (Sugiyono, 2016). Respondents in this study amounted to 1,023 people consisting of 818 women and 205 men. All respondents are from 20 Study Programs and 1 Diploma III Midwifery Program at Almuslim University.

The data collection method used a questionnaire in the form of a Google form (Figure 1) which was developed by the Almuslim University Quality Assurance Agency and distributed online. The research instrument is based on the theory of 5 Dimensions of Service Quality (SERVQUAL) which was developed by (Parasuraman et al., 1988). Service quality consists of 34 statements, namely the Tangibles Dimension, where there are 12 statements; the Reliability dimension consists of 12 statements; the Responsiveness dimension consists of 3 statements; the Assurance dimension consists of 4 statements; and Empathy consists of 4 statements. The questionnaire uses a Likert Scale consisting of 4 levels of answers: Excellent, Good, Average, and Poor.

Pertanyaan Jawaban 1.024 Setelan

**Instrumen Survey Kepuasan**

**Kampus Merdeka**  
INDONESIA JAYA

**UNIVERSITAS AL-MUSLIM**  
BADAN PENJAMINAN MUTU (BPM)

**SURVEY KEPUASAN MAHASISWA TERHADAP PROSES PEMBELAJARAN SEMESTER GANJIL TAHUN AKADEMIK 2021/2022**

Yang Terhormat Mahasiswa/i Universitas Al-Muslim.

PETUNJUK UMUM:

a. Dalam upaya untuk meningkatkan kualitas proses pembelajaran, Universitas Al-Muslim selalu melakukan perbaikan untuk meningkatkan kepuasan bagi seluruh stakeholders. Oleh karena itu, partisipasi Mahasiswa/i dalam mengisi kuesioner ini sangat kami harapkan.

**Figure 1.** Google Forms Used to Collect Data

Before the questionnaire was used, an instrument trial was conducted at the end of the Even Semester of the 2020/2021 Academic Year to 196 respondents who were Almuslim University students from 18 study programs and 1 Diploma III Midwifery Program at Almuslim University. Validity tests using Pearson Bivariate Correlation Test and Reliability Test using Cronbach's Alpha Test were tested using SPSS software version 16.0 (Santoso, 2008).

To see the level of student satisfaction with the learning process, first, calculate the percentage of Respondents' Achievement Level (% RAL) using the formula:

$$\% \text{ RAL} = \frac{R_s}{n} \times 100\%, \text{ where}$$

- RAL = Respondents' Achievement Level  
 Rs = Average score of respondents' answer  
 n = Maximum number of score (Pangaribuan & Ginting, 2021).

The rating scale is interpreted carefully, because, in addition to producing a rough picture, the answers from the respondents can not necessarily be trusted. In preparing the scale, what needs to be considered is how to determine the scale variable. What is asked is really something that the respondent can observe (Arikunto, 2010). This study uses Table 1 below to see the intervals of the RAL criteria:

**Table 1.** Intervals of Respondents' Achievement Level Criteria

RAL Interval	Description
76 – 100	Excellent
51 – 75	Good
26 – 50	Average
0 – 25	Poor

Furthermore, to find out how big the level of student satisfaction with the quality of learning process services at Almuslim University, the analysis was continued using the Community Satisfaction Index (CSI) method, which was calculated using the formula:

$$\text{Weighted Average Score} = \frac{\text{Number of Weight}}{\text{Number of Element(s)}}$$

$$\text{CSI} = \frac{\text{Total of Perception Score per Elements}}{\text{Total of Filled Elements}} \times \text{Weighing value (Hastowo, 2012)}$$

For the interpretation of the IKM assessment, the IKM value is converted to a basic value of 25, with the formula:

$$\text{CSI conversion} = \text{CSI service unit} \times 25$$

Next, to see the CSI conversion interval, use the following Table 2:

**Table 2.** Perception Score, CSI Interval, CSI Conversion Interval, Service Quality, and Service Unit Performance (Hastowo, 2012)

Perception Score	CSI Score Interval	CSI Score Conversion Interval	Service Quality	Service Unit Performance
1	1,00 – 1,75	25 – 43,75	D	Poor
2	1,76 – 2,50	43,75 – 62,50	C	Average
3	2,51 – 3,25	62,51 – 81,25	B	Good
4	3,26 – 4,00	81,26 – 100,00	A	Excellent

### 3. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This study uses 5 Dimensions of Service Quality (SERVQUAL): Reliability, Responsiveness, Assurance, Empathy, and Tangible. The five dimensions are derived into 34 statement items, which can be explained in Table 3 as follows:

**Table 3.** Research Service Quality (SERVQUAL) Variable

Dimensions	Item Code	Statements
<i>Reliability</i> (Lecturer Reliability in Lectures)	A1	Lecturer punctuality in starting lectures
	A2	Lecturer punctuality in ending lectures
	A3	The clarity of the lecturer conveying the lecture system, references, rules, and evaluation system and assignments at the first meeting
	A4	The clarity of the lecturer conveying the lecture rules
	A5	The lecturer gives a lecture contract at the beginning of the lecture
	A6	The clarity of the lecturer in delivering lecture material
	A7	Lecturers provide time for discussion and question-and-answer sessions during lecture hours and outside lecture hours
	A8	Lecturers use E-Learning in the learning process.
	A9	Lecturers provide teaching materials (handouts, e-modules, etc.) to complete the lecture materials.
	A10	Submission of evaluation results accompanied by feedback by the lecturer
	A11	Returning the results of the Mid-Semester and Final Semester Examinations to students by lecturers
	A12	The number of lecturer meetings in delivering lecture and evaluation materials (including mid and final semester exams) is 16 meetings.
<i>Responsiveness</i> (Lecturer	B13	Lecturers provide extra time for students to consult

Responsiveness)	B14	The intensity of lecturers to be met in the context of academic consultations and or final project consultations
	B15	Lecturer's response speed in responding to student questions/problems
Assurance (Assurance/Treatments towards the students)	C16	Lecturers and Students Implement Health Protocols during lectures during the Covid 19 Pandemic.
	C17	The ability of lecturers to use the "student-centred Learning" method/model
	C18	Lecturer's ability to use learning media
	C19	Lecturer's ability in delivering lecture material
Empathy (Understanding of Student Interests)	D20	The willingness of Academic Advisors to help students who are facing problems in the academic field
	D21	The convenience of lecturers to be contacted by phone, WhatsApp, email, and so on
	D22	Openness and cooperative attitude of lecturers with students
Tangible (Use of Educational Facilities and Infrastructure)	E23	Availability of Standard Handwashing Facilities during the Covid 19 Pandemic
	E24	Facilities for parking are available in a good, orderly and safe manner
	E25	Hotspot facilities are readily available
	E26	The canteen is neat, clean, and comfortable
	E27	Sports facilities are available and complete
	E28	Cleanliness, arrangement and comfort of the lecture room
	E29	Learning facilities available in the lecture room
	E30	Availability of laboratories (science, language, computers, etc.) that are relevant to the scientific needs of students
	E31	Availability of literature in the library reading room that supports courses
	E32	Availability of worship/prayer facilities that can be used by students
	E33	Availability of open space for discussion
	E34	Availability of adequate and clean restroom facilities

3. 1 Validity and Reliability Test

Test the validity and reliability test of Instruments of Student Satisfaction on the learning process by using SPSS software version 16.0. The number of respondents used in the validity and reliability test is 196 people. The validity test in this study used the Pearson Bivariate Correlation. The results of the validity test of each SERVQUAL dimension are shown in Tables 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8.

Table 4. Validity Test Results on Satisfaction Level of Reliability Dimension

	A1	A2	A3	A4	A5	A6	A7	A8	A9	A10	A11	A12
A1 Pearson Correlation	1	.750**	.714**	.649**	.543**	.680**	.552**	.547**	.558**	.557**	.537**	.586*
Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
N	196	196	196	195	196	196	194	195	196	196	196	196
A2 Pearson Correlation	.750**	1	.662**	.637**	.534**	.627**	.567**	.547**	.561**	.617**	.607**	.626*

	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	
	N	196	196	196	195	196	196	194	195	196	196	196	
A3	Pearson Correlation	.714**	.662**	1	.670**	.595**	.657**	.542**	.626**	.602**	.487**	.499**	.557*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	196	196	196	195	196	196	194	195	196	196	196	196
A4	Pearson Correlation	.649**	.637**	.670**	1	.621**	.631**	.612**	.519**	.608**	.443**	.433**	.577*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	195	195	195	195	195	195	193	194	195	195	195	195
A5	Pearson Correlation	.543**	.534**	.595**	.621**	1	.585**	.478**	.430**	.473**	.310**	.318**	.545*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	196	196	196	195	196	196	194	195	196	196	196	196
A6	Pearson Correlation	.680**	.627**	.657**	.631**	.585**	1	.716**	.587**	.536**	.446**	.502**	.662*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	196	196	196	195	196	196	194	195	196	196	196	196
A7	Pearson Correlation	.552**	.567**	.542**	.612**	.478**	.716**	1	.498**	.499**	.507**	.536**	.617*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	194	194	194	193	194	194	194	193	194	194	194	194
A8	Pearson Correlation	.547**	.547**	.626**	.519**	.430**	.587**	.498**	1	.716**	.501**	.479**	.509*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	195	195	195	194	195	195	193	195	195	195	195	195
A9	Pearson Correlation	.558**	.561**	.602**	.608**	.473**	.536**	.499**	.716**	1	.601**	.481**	.580*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000
	N	196	196	196	195	196	196	194	195	196	196	196	196
A10	Pearson Correlation	.557**	.617**	.487**	.443**	.310**	.446**	.507**	.501**	.601**	1	.688**	.512*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000
	N	196	196	196	195	196	196	194	195	196	196	196	196
A11	Pearson Correlation	.537**	.607**	.499**	.433**	.318**	.502**	.536**	.479**	.481**	.688**	1	.504*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000
	N	196	196	196	195	196	196	194	195	196	196	196	196
A12	Pearson Correlation	.586**	.626**	.557**	.577**	.545**	.662**	.617**	.509**	.580**	.512**	.504**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	
	N	196	196	196	195	196	196	194	195	196	196	196	196

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

**Table 5.** Validity Test Results on Satisfaction Level of Responsiveness Dimension

	B13	B14	B15
B13 Pearson Correlation	1	.702**	.627**
Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000
N	196	196	196
B14 Pearson Correlation	.702**	1	.547**
Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000
N	196	196	196
B15 Pearson Correlation	.627**	.547**	1
Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	
N	196	196	196

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

**Table 6.** Validity Test Results on Satisfaction Level of Assurance Dimension

	C16	C17	C18	C19
C16 Pearson Correlation	1	.682**	.624**	.602**
Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000
N	195	195	195	195
C17 Pearson Correlation	.682**	1	.746**	.704**
Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000
N	195	196	196	196
C18 Pearson Correlation	.624**	.746**	1	.785**
Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000
N	195	196	196	196
C19 Pearson Correlation	.602**	.704**	.785**	1
Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	
N	195	196	196	196

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

**Table 7.** Validity Test Results on Satisfaction Level of Empathy Dimension

	D20	D21	D22
D20 Pearson Correlation	1	.637**	.612**
Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000
N	196	196	196
D21 Pearson Correlation	.637**	1	.688**
Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000
N	196	196	196
D22 Pearson Correlation	.612**	.688**	1
Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	
N	196	196	196

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

**Table 8.** Validity Test Results on Satisfaction Level of Tangible Dimension

	E23	E24	E25	E26	E27	E28	E29	E30	E31	E32	E33	E34
E23 Pearson Correlation	1	.601**	.495**	.548**	.530**	.721**	.687**	.633**	.633**	.535**	.679**	.620**
Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
N	196	196	196	196	196	196	196	196	196	196	196	196
E24 Pearson Correlation	.601**	1	.505**	.647**	.518**	.662**	.748**	.659**	.761**	.632**	.700**	.688**
Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
N	196	196	196	196	196	196	196	196	196	196	196	196
E25 Pearson Correlation	.495**	.505**	1	.648**	.607**	.595**	.594**	.564**	.480**	.344**	.451**	.509**
Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
N	196	196	196	196	196	196	196	196	196	196	196	196
E26 Pearson Correlation	.548**	.647**	.648**	1	.759**	.729**	.679**	.612**	.674**	.600**	.582**	.650**
Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
N	196	196	196	196	196	196	196	196	196	196	196	196
E27 Pearson Correlation	.530**	.518**	.607**	.759**	1	.677**	.648**	.538**	.596**	.426**	.530**	.553**
Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
N	196	196	196	196	196	196	196	196	196	196	196	196
E28 Pearson Correlation	.721**	.662**	.595**	.729**	.677**	1	.844**	.710**	.705**	.602**	.677**	.755**
Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
N	196	196	196	196	196	196	196	196	196	196	196	196

E29	Pearson Correlation	.687**	.748**	.594**	.679**	.648**	.844**	1	.736**	.765**	.599**	.711**	.758**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	196	196	196	196	196	196	196	196	196	196	196	196
E30	Pearson Correlation	.633**	.659**	.564**	.612**	.538**	.710**	.736**	1	.700**	.556**	.617**	.714**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	196	196	196	196	196	196	196	196	196	196	196	196
E31	Pearson Correlation	.633**	.761**	.480**	.674**	.596**	.705**	.765**	.700**	1	.673**	.755**	.735**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000
	N	196	196	196	196	196	196	196	196	196	196	196	196
E32	Pearson Correlation	.535**	.632**	.344**	.600**	.426**	.602**	.599**	.556**	.673**	1	.617**	.642**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000
	N	196	196	196	196	196	196	196	196	196	196	196	196
E33	Pearson Correlation	.679**	.700**	.451**	.582**	.530**	.677**	.711**	.617**	.755**	.617**	1	.757**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000
	N	196	196	196	196	196	196	196	196	196	196	196	196
E34	Pearson Correlation	.620**	.688**	.509**	.650**	.553**	.755**	.758**	.714**	.735**	.642**	.757**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	
	N	196	196	196	196	196	196	196	196	196	196	196	196

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

Based on Tables 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 it appears that Pearson's Sig.(2-tailed) <0.05 means that all instrument items are valid, meaning that all statement items on the questionnaire can be used during research to measure the level of student satisfaction with the process of learning. Reliability testing can be carried out simultaneously on all question items or statements in the research questionnaire (Sujarweni, 2014). Reliable instruments can produce reliable data (Arikunto, 2010). The reliability test of this study used Cronbach's Alpha, where the results are presented in Table 9.

**Table 9.** Overall Reliability Test Result

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.976	34

From Table 9, it is known that there are 34 items in the questionnaire statement with Cronbach's Alpha of 0.976. Because the value of Cronbach's Alpha is  $0.976 > 0.60$ , it can be concluded that the 34 items of the student satisfaction questionnaire statement on the learning process are reliable.

### 3.2 Student Satisfaction with the Learning Process on the SERVQUAL Dimension

The results of data processing respondents' responses, namely Almuslim University students, towards the learning process on the 5 SERVQUAL Dimensions (Reliability, Responsiveness, Assurance, Empathy, and Tangible) are presented in Table 10.

**Table 10.** Respondent Achievement Level (RAL) Almuslim University Student Satisfaction with the Learning Process on the 5 Dimensions of SERVQUAL

Dimension	Item Code	Average	RAL (%)	Description
<i>Reliability</i>	A1	3,05	76,34	Excellent
	A2	3,13	78,15	Excellent
	A3	3,24	81,09	Excellent
	A4	3,31	82,84	Excellent
	A5	3,33	83,15	Excellent
	A6	3,17	79,36	Excellent
	A7	3,19	79,86	Excellent
	A8	2,94	73,60	Good
	A9	3,06	76,47	Excellent
	A10	3,02	75,59	Good
	A11	3,02	75,46	Excellent
	A12	3,20	80,06	Excellent
<i>Average Reliability</i>		3,14	78,50	Excellent
<i>Responsiveness</i>	B13	3,07	76,67	Excellent
	B14	3,04	75,93	Good
	B15	3,17	79,23	Excellent
<i>Average Responsiveness</i>		3,09	77,28	Excellent
<i>Assurance</i>	C16	3,21	80,37	Excellent
	C17	3,12	78,08	Excellent
	C18	3,26	81,45	Excellent
	C19	3,31	82,70	Excellent
<i>Average Assurance</i>		3,23	80,65	Excellent
<i>Empathy</i>	D20	3,17	79,28	Excellent
	D21	3,11	77,76	Excellent
	D22	3,11	77,69	Excellent
<i>Average Empathy</i>		3,13	78,24	Excellent
<i>Tangible</i>	D23	3,04	76,03	Excellent
	E24	3,26	81,50	Excellent
	E25	2,74	68,43	Good
	E26	3,01	75,15	Excellent
	E27	2,79	69,65	Excellent
	E28	3,06	76,56	Excellent
	E29	3,01	75,37	Good
	E30	3,12	77,96	Excellent
	E31	3,16	79,01	Excellent
	E32	3,26	83,97	Excellent
	E33	3,09	77,30	Excellent
	E34	3,05	76,32	Excellent
<i>Average Tangible</i>		3,06	76,44	Excellent
<i>Average 5 Dimensions</i>		3,13	78,22	Excellent

Based on Table 10, the average score of the five SERVQUAL dimensions is 3.13, with a Respondent Achievement Level (RAL) of 78.22%, which is included in the excellent category. The highest RAL is in the Assurance Dimension with an average value of 3.23 and a RAL of 80.65% is in the excellent category, while the lowest RAL is in the Tangible Dimension with an average value of 3.06 and a RAL of 76.44% and still in the excellent category.

SERVQUAL can be used to assess the quality of the company from the five service dimensions with the average score of the items that make up the dimensions. It can also provide a measure of overall service quality in the form of average scores for all of the five dimensions. A meaningful response to a perception statement requires that the respondent has current or past knowledge or experience of the company (Parasuraman et al., 1988).

The results of the study in Table 10 also illustrate that there are 5-dimensional items with a good RAL category. The rest are in the excellent category. The RAL Dimension of Reliability perceived by students in a good category is that the lecturer uses E-Learning in the learning process and submits evaluation results accompanied by feedback by the lecturer, while the Responsiveness Dimension with a good category TCR is the intensity of lecturers to be met in the context of academic consultations and or final project consultations. Furthermore, Tangible Dimensions with a good category RAL are hotspot facilities and learning facilities in the lecture room. Thus, items of excellent service quality need to be maintained, while items of service quality that are still low even in the good category need to be improved, especially with regard to systems such as hotspots that can be used by students, online learning technology by utilizing E-learning, as well as service quality of lecturer. This is in line with the opinion of Irwan in (A. P. Dewi & Sudarwati, 2020), the concept of service quality is very dependent on 3 factors, namely: system, technology, and people.

The biggest trait in determining a company's long-term position is its customers' opinion about the products and services they receive. Customers need to have a good opinion about the company to meet all their needs and expectations (Gallifa, 2010). According to the author, this also applies to students' opinions about the products and services they receive at University. This is in line with the opinion of (Bakrie et al., 2019), which states that in an effort to build student loyalty, which is the main concern of higher education management, it is necessary to continue and improve service quality in order to increase student satisfaction. Furthermore (Le et al., 2021) states that measuring student satisfaction with certain service elements can detect weaknesses and limitations in providing services to improve service quality.

### 3.3 Community Satisfaction Index (CSI)

The respondents of the Community Satisfaction Index in this study were students of Almuslim University. The following is a table of CSI scores on the learning process of the five SERVQUAL dimensions.

**Table 11.** CSI Results for Five SERVQUAL Dimensions

No	Dimensions	CSI Score	CSI Conversion Score	Service Quality	Service Unit Performance
1	Reliability	3,13	78,18	B	Good
2	Responsiveness	3,06	76,50	B	Good
3	Assurance	3,23	80,65	B	Good
4	Emphaty	3,10	77,46	B	Good
5	Tangible	2,94	73,38	B	Good
	Total	3,18	79,45	B	Good

Table 11 illustrates that the SEVQUAL dimension, which has the highest CSI value is the Assurance Dimension with an CSI value of 3.23 and a conversion CSI value of 80.65, while the lowest is in the Tangible aspect where the CSI value is 2.94 and the conversion CSI value is 73.38, with the

total CSI value is 3.18 and the total conversion value of the CSI is 79.45. The results obtained indicate the performance of the service unit, namely Almuslim University, in the learning process is in the good category. Based on the results of the research above, it appears that service quality is an important factor that can affect student satisfaction. This in line with the opinion of (Le et al., 2021) which states that there is a close relationship between service quality and customer satisfaction, where service quality includes 5 main factors (tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy) are important factors that affect customer satisfaction.

According to Han and Leong in (A. P. Dewi & Sudarwati, 2020), the Tangible Dimension is an important and first dimension that customers are aware of, so the advantages and disadvantages of this dimension will be seen quickly. The results of this study differ from the results of regression analysis for 4 companies (Banks, Credit Card Co., Repair & Maintenance Co., and L.D. Telephone Co.) in a study conducted by (Parasuraman et al., 1988), where the five dimensions of SERVQUAL in predicting overall quality results that reliability is consistently the most critical dimension. Furthermore, Assurance is the second most important dimension in the four cases. Tangible is more important in the case of banks than the other three companies, while Responsiveness is the opposite). Empathy is the least important dimension in this case.

#### 4. CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the study, it can be concluded that the Highest Respondent Achievement Level (RAL) is in the Assurance Dimension with an average value of 3.23 and a RAL of 80.65% is in the excellent category, the lowest RAL is in the Tangible Dimension with an average value of 3.06 and RAL of 76.44% and still in the excellent category. If analyzed per dimensions item, there are still 5 items that still need to be improved because they are in a good category, namely: Dimension of Reliability, where Lecturers use E-Learning in the learning process as well as submission of evaluation results accompanied by feedback by lecturers; Responsiveness dimension, the intensity of lecturers to be met in the context of academic consultations and/or Final Project consultations, as well as Tangible Dimensions, related to the well-available hotspot facilities and learning facilities available in the lecture room. Furthermore, for the Community Satisfaction Index (CSI) in this case, the highest CSI are in the Assurance Dimension with a CSI score of 3.23 and CSI conversion score of 80.65, while the lowest CSI is in the Tangible aspect where the CSI score is 2.94 and the CSI conversion score is 73.38, with a total CSI score of 3.18 and a total CSI conversion score of 79.45.

This research is only focused on the satisfaction of Almuslim University students, while the satisfaction of the other stakeholders, such as lecturers and education staff, is not yet available, so it is possible to carry out the same research by focusing on the responses procured from lecturers and education staff. In addition, other private universities can also carry out similar research, and future research can also include private universities in the field of religion, so that they can make comparative studies between private religious institutions and non-religious private institutions to see if they will get the same results.

#### REFERENCES

- Ajami, M. P., Elola, L. N., & Pastor, J. (2018). Validation and Improvement of the European Customer Satisfaction Index for the Spanish Wine Sector. *The TQM Journal*, 30(2).
- Anderson, E. W., Fornell, C., & Lehmann, D. R. (1994). Customer Satisfaction, Market Share, and Profitability: Findings from Sweden. *Journal of Marketing*, 58(3).
- Arikunto, S. (2010). *Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktik* (Revisi). PT Rineka Cipta.
- Asmin, A. I., Wahyono, E., & Hasby, M. (2021). Analisis Kepuasan Belajar Daring Mahasiswa Universitas Cokroaminoto Palopo. *Indonesian Journal of Learning Studies*, 1(2).
- Bakrie, M., Sujanto, B., & Rugaiah. (2019). The Influence of Service Quality, Institutional Reputation,

- Students' Satisfaction on Students' Loyalty in Higher Education Institution. *International Journal for Educational and Vocational Studies*, 1(5).
- Calvo-Porrá, C., Lévy-Mangin, J. P., & Novo-Corti, I. (2013). Perceived Quality in Higher Education: an Empirical Study. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 31(6).
- Cresswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research* (4th ed.). Pearson.
- Dewi, A. P., & Sudarwati, W. (2020). Strategi Peningkatan Kepuasan Mahasiswa terhadap Proses Pendidikan pada Program Studi Teknik Industri Universitas Muhammadiyah Jakarta. *JISI: Jurnal Integrasi Sistem Industri*, 7(1).
- Dewi, N. R., & Asikin, M. (2009). Kepuasan Mahasiswa terhadap Proses Perkuliahan di FMIPA Unnes. *Lembaran Ilmu Kependidikan*, 39(2).
- Gallifa, J. (2010). Student Perceptions of Service Quality in a Multi-Campus Higher Education System in Spain. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 18(2).
- Hastowo, H. (2012). *Pedoman Penyusunan Indeks Kepuasan Masyarakat (IKM) Unit Pelayanan di Lingkungan Batan*.
- Latif, K. F., Latif, I., Sahibzada, U. F., & Ullah, M. (2017). In Search of Quality: Measuring Higher Education Service Quality (HiEduQual). *Total Quality Management and Business Excellence*, 30(7).
- Le, T. M. H., Nguyen, V. K. L., Nguyen, T. S., Le, T. H. O., & Duong, T. N. M. D. (2021). Assessment of Students' Satisfaction of Facility Service Quality in Private Universities. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 9(5).
- Pangaribuan, R. M., & Ginting, K. B. (2021). Analisis Tingkat Kepuasan Mahasiswa terhadap Proses Pembelajaran dan Kualitas Layanan Akademik Masa Pandemi Covid-19. *Jurnal Differensial*, 03(02).
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1988). SERVQUAL: A Multiple-Item Scale for Measuring Consumer Perceptions of Service Quality. *Journal of Retailing*, 64(1).
- Santoso, S. (2008). *Panduan Lengkap Menguasai SPSS 16*. PT Elex Media Komputindo.
- Shurair, A. S. . (2019). Stakeholder's Perception of Service Quality: a Case in Qatar . *Quality Assurance in Education*, 27(4).
- Siming, L., Niamatullah, Gao, J., Xu, D., & Shafi, K. (2015). Factors leading to Students' Satisfaction in the Higher Learning Institutions. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6(31).
- Snipes, R. L., & Thomson, N. (1999). An Empirical Study of the Factors Underlying Student Service Quality Perceptions in Higher Education. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal*, 3(1).
- Srikanthan, G., & Dalrymple, J. F. (2007). A Conceptual Overview of a Holistic Model for Quality in Higher Education. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 21(3).
- Sugiyono. (2016). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif dan R&D*. PT Alfabet.
- Sujarweni, V. W. (2014). *SPSS untuk Penelitian*. Pustaka Baru Press.
- Supriyono. (2018). Deskripsi Tingkat Kepuasan dengan Tingkat Kepentingan Peserta Pelatihan pada Pelayanan Balai Pelatihan Kesehatan di Batam. *Jurnal Wacana Kinerja*, 21(2).
- Teeroovengadu, V., Nunkoo, R., Gronroos, C., Kamalanabhan, T. J., & Seebaluck, A. (2019). Higher Education Service Quality, Student Satisfaction and Loyalty: Validating the HESQUAL Scale and Testing an Improved Structural Model. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 27(04).
- Temple, P., Callender, C., Grove, L., & Kersh, N. (2016). Managing the Student Experience in English Higher Education: Differing Responses to market Pressures. *London Review of Education*, 14(1).