LECTURER SATISFACTION SURVEY REPORT

Biology Education Study Program

Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences

Universitas Negeri Surabaya (Unesa)

Academic Year 2023/2024

Preface

All praise and gratitude are due to Allah SWT, through whose grace the preparation of this *Lecturer Satisfaction Survey Report* for the Biology Education Study Program, Universitas Negeri Surabaya, has been successfully completed. The committee extends sincere appreciation to all parties who contributed to the implementation of this survey and the completion of this report for the 2023/2024 academic year.

This report has benefited from the support, appreciation, and constructive feedback of various stakeholders. Therefore, we would like to express our deep gratitude to:

1. The Rector and all administrative leaders of Universitas Negeri Surabaya for their moral and material support to the Quality Assurance Agency (LPM Unesa).
2. The Dean, Vice Deans, and Quality Assurance Team (GPM) of the Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences.
3. The Head of the Biology Education Study Program.
4. All lecturer respondents within the Biology Education Study Program who took the time to fill out the satisfaction questionnaire and provide valuable suggestions and feedback.

Despite our efforts to ensure accuracy and completeness, this report may still contain shortcomings. Therefore, we warmly welcome input and constructive feedback from all members of the academic community of the Biology Education Study Program as part of continuous improvement in future evaluation cycles.

Surabaya, August 31, 2023

Quality Assurance Unit (UPM), Biology Education Study Program

Chapter I – Introduction

1.1 Background

The Data and Survey Center under the Quality Assurance Agency (LPM) of Universitas Negeri Surabaya plays a key role in supporting the implementation of quality assurance through the cycle of Planning, Implementation, Evaluation, Control, and Improvement (PPEPP). One of its main tasks is conducting *Customer Satisfaction Surveys*, which are essential components in both program and institutional accreditation processes.

The survey serves as a systematic evaluation of the university's operational quality through periodic measurement of satisfaction levels toward various services. The survey was conducted online at the end of each academic semester and its results were subsequently reviewed through evaluative meetings aimed at formulating improvement strategies for the following academic year.

As the need for quality improvement continues to rise due to both internal and external factors, the survey becomes increasingly vital in capturing lecturer, student, and staff satisfaction levels. These data inform strategic decisions to enhance well-being and institutional performance across Unesa. The 2023 survey consisted of multiple statements assessing the *expectations* and *perceptions* (reality) of lecturers regarding university services.

1.2 Legal Basis

The implementation of this survey refers to the following regulations:

1. Law No. 20 of 2003 on the National Education System.
2. Law No. 12 of 2012 on Higher Education.
3. Government Regulation No. 4 of 2014 on the Administration and Governance of Higher Education.
4. Minister of Education and Culture Regulation No. 50 on the Quality Assurance System in Higher Education.
5. Minister of Education and Culture Regulation No. 87 of 2014 on Program and Institutional Accreditation.

6. Minister of Research, Technology, and Higher Education Regulation No. 13 of 2015 on the Strategic Plan 2015–2019.
7. Minister of Research, Technology, and Higher Education Regulation No. 44 of 2015 on National Standards for Higher Education.
8. Minister of National Education Regulation No. 7 of 2007 on the Organization and Work Procedures of the Quality Assurance Agency.

1.3 Problems

1. Is there a statistically significant difference between lecturers' expectations and perceived realities in the 2023 Unesa Lecturer Satisfaction Survey?
2. What is the comparison between expectations and actual satisfaction levels based on Gap Analysis?
3. How do expectation–reality differences map according to the *Importance–Performance Analysis (IPA)* approach?

1.4 Objectives

This survey aims to evaluate the level of lecturer satisfaction at Universitas Negeri Surabaya in 2023 using statistical difference testing, gap analysis, and IPA. The report serves as a reference for quality enhancement in subsequent academic years.

1.5 Structure of the Report

The report consists of four chapters:

- Chapter I – Introduction: Presents the background, legal basis, research problems, objectives, and report structure.
- Chapter II – Survey Methodology: Describes the survey design, operational definitions, instruments, methods, and data processing techniques including gap analysis, suitability index, normality tests, Wilcoxon tests, and Cartesian diagrams.
- Chapter III – Results and Discussion: Provides findings from statistical analysis, gap and suitability analysis, and quadrant (IPA) analysis.

- Chapter IV – Conclusions and Recommendations: Summarizes key insights and provides actionable recommendations for future quality evaluation.

Chapter II – Survey Methodology

2.1 Type and Design of the Survey

This study employed a quantitative descriptive survey method, designed to provide a numerical depiction of trends, attitudes, and opinions of a population through a selected sample (Creswell & Creswell, 2018; Johnson & Christensen, 2014). A cross-sectional design was utilized to measure the relationship between independent and dependent variables at a single point in time (*point-time approach*). Each participant was observed once, and all variables were measured simultaneously through a questionnaire instrument.

2.2 Operational Definitions

1. Respondents (Consumers): All lecturers utilizing Unesa's academic and administrative services in 2023.
2. Expectations: The ideal level of service that lecturers anticipate receiving from Unesa.
3. Perceived Satisfaction: Lecturers' evaluation of the actual service performance experienced.
4. Service Quality Dimensions: The attributes assessed include *reliability*, *responsiveness*, *assurance*, *empathy*, and *tangibility* (Parasuraman et al., 1985).

2.3 Survey Instrument

The instrument used was a structured questionnaire, consisting of statements that capture both expectation and perception responses. It covered five major dimensions:

- Reliability (dependability of services),
- Responsiveness (promptness of service),
- Assurance (trust and security in service),
- Empathy (personalized attention), and
- Tangibility (physical facilities and communication materials).

2.4 Method

The survey applied the SERVQUAL (Service Quality) model (Parasuraman et al., 1985), which measures perceived service quality based on five core dimensions:

1. Tangibles: Physical appearance of facilities, staff, and communication tools.
2. Reliability: The ability to provide promised services accurately and dependably.
3. Responsiveness: Willingness to help and provide prompt service.
4. Assurance: Employee competence, courtesy, and credibility ensuring safety and trust.
5. Empathy: Accessibility, communication, and personalized understanding of customer needs.

In addition, the Importance–Performance Analysis (IPA) model (Martilla & James, 1977) was employed to assess the relationship between consumer perceptions and priority areas for service improvement.

2.5 Data Processing

a. Gap and Conformity (Tki) Analysis

The level of satisfaction was determined through Gap Analysis, comparing the mean values of expectation and perception (reality) across the five service dimensions. Formulas used:

$$Gap = Perception - Expectation$$

$$Tki = \frac{Perception}{Expectation} \times 100\%$$

A **positive gap** indicates service performance exceeding expectations, while a **negative gap** implies underperformance (Parasuraman et al., 1988). According to Wahyuni (2014):

- $Tki > 100\%$: Highly satisfactory service.
- $Tki = 100\%$: Satisfactory service.
- $Tki < 100\%$: Service below expectation.

b. Normality Test

Data normality was assessed using the Kolmogorov–Smirnov or Shapiro–Wilk tests, depending on the sample size:

- $p > 0.05$: Data normally distributed → *Paired t-test* used.
- $p < 0.05$: Data not normally distributed → *Wilcoxon test* used.

c. Wilcoxon Test

This non-parametric test compared expectation and perception values to determine significant differences.

- H_0: No difference between expectations and perceptions.
- H_1: Significant difference exists.

  If $p < 0.05$, $H_0$is rejected.

d. Cartesian Diagram

A Cartesian (IPA) diagram classified service items into four quadrants representing performance priorities:

1. Quadrant I: High importance–low performance (*priority for improvement*).
2. Quadrant II: High importance–high performance (*maintain performance*).
3. Quadrant III: Low importance–low performance (*low priority*).
4. Quadrant IV: Low importance–high performance (*possible overperformance*).

Chapter III – Results and Discussion

3.1 Statistical Analysis

The survey involved 11 lecturers selected randomly from a total population of 17 lecturers, satisfying sample adequacy based on Slovin's formula with a 5% margin of error.

The normality test indicated $p < 0.05$, implying that data were not normally distributed. Consequently, the Wilcoxon test was applied. Results revealed a significant difference between lecturers' expectations and perceived satisfaction levels, indicating that service performance has not fully met expectations.

3.2 Gap and Conformity Analysis

Overall satisfaction across dimensions recorded a negative mean gap of −0.36 and a Tki of 90.40%, indicating that perceived service quality remains below expectations. The largest negative gaps (−0.45) were found in:

- P20: Timeliness of research and community service (PKM) outputs,
- P8: Promotion and career development processes,
- P16: Responsiveness of LPPM administrative services,
- P9, P14, P17: Fairness and transparency in remuneration and involvement in budgeting,
- P19: Consistency of monitoring and evaluation (Monev) regulations.

These dimensions reflect areas that lecturers perceive as needing immediate quality improvement.

3.3 Quadrant (IPA) Analysis

Using the Cartesian diagram:

- Quadrant I (Priority): P8, P14, P17, P19, P20 – aspects requiring urgent managerial attention.
- Quadrant II (Maintain): P4, P5, P12, P13, P18, P21 – already high in performance and importance.
- Quadrant III (Low Priority): P2, P3, P7, P9, P15, P16 – satisfactory but not critical.
- Quadrant IV (Overperformance): P1, P6, P10, P11 – performed very well but considered less essential by respondents.

Chapter IV – Conclusions and Recommendations

Conclusions

1. There is a significant difference between expectations and perceptions, as confirmed by the Wilcoxon test ($p < 0.05$).
2. The overall service quality recorded a negative gap (-0.36) and a Tki of 90.40%, indicating that lecturers' expectations have not yet been fully met.
3. The key improvement priorities are related to career advancement processes, transparency in remuneration, participation in budgeting, and the consistency and timeliness of research and community service outcomes.

Recommendations

- The university should focus on improving management transparency, particularly regarding financial, research, and promotion processes.
- Feedback mechanisms from lecturers should be institutionalized to ensure periodic monitoring and responsive policy adjustments.
- The Quality Assurance Agency (LPM) is encouraged to conduct follow-up evaluations every academic year to track improvement trends and maintain accountability in academic service quality.