STUDENT SATISFACTION SURVEY REPORT

Undergraduate Biology Education Study Program

Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences

State University of Surabaya (UNESA)

Year: 2024

APPROVAL PAGE

This report, titled *Student Satisfaction Survey Report of the State University of Surabaya*, has been truthfully prepared.

Surabaya, 18 September 2024

Acknowledged by:

Head of Undergraduate Biology Education Study Program

Dr. Rinie Pratiwi Puspitawati, S.Pd., M.Si.

NIP 196601121991032001

Quality Assurance Unit (UPM)

Reni Ambarwati, S.Si., M.Sc.

NIP 197707222006042001

PREFACE

All praise be to Allah S.W.T. for His blessings that enabled the completion of this *Student Satisfaction Survey Report* for the Undergraduate Biology Education Study Program, State University of Surabaya. The authors extend their deepest gratitude to all parties who have provided valuable support and contributions, making it possible to compile this report for the 2024 period.

This report has benefited from the appreciation and feedback of various stakeholders. Therefore, the authors would like to express special thanks to:

1. The Rector and all university leadership for their moral and material support to the Quality Assurance Agency (LPM) of UNESA.
2. The Dean, Vice Deans, and Quality Assurance Managers (GPM) of the Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences.
3. The Head of the Undergraduate Biology Education Study Program.
4. The respondents — students of the Undergraduate Biology Education Study Program — who have kindly taken the time to complete the satisfaction questionnaire and provide constructive feedback.

We are aware that the implementation and presentation of this report are not without shortcomings. Therefore, we welcome suggestions and input from the entire academic community of the Biology Education Study Program to improve future evaluations and reporting.

Surabaya, 18 September 2024

Quality Assurance Unit

Undergraduate Biology Education Study Program

CHAPTER I – INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

The Data and Survey Center of the Quality Assurance Agency (LPM) at the State University of Surabaya is responsible for implementing quality assurance using the PPEPP model: Planning, Implementation, Evaluation, Control, and Improvement of Quality. One of its main functions is to conduct *Customer Satisfaction Surveys*, which have become an essential requirement for both program and institutional accreditation.

These surveys are carried out online (digitally) at the end of each academic semester to evaluate the performance and quality of services provided by UNESA. The results are then discussed in evaluation meetings and serve as a basis for improving services in subsequent years.

With the increasing demand for quality improvement, both internal and external factors have necessitated more systematic evaluations of service satisfaction across the university — particularly from the perspectives of students, lecturers, and education staff. The survey helps identify variables that need enhancement or maintenance to ensure continuous improvement in academic service quality.

1.2 Legal Basis

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 Implementation and Management of Higher Education.
4. Ministerial Regulation No. 50 on the Higher Education Quality Assurance System.
5. Ministerial Regulation No. 87 of 2014 on Study Program and Institutional Accreditation.
6. Ministerial Regulation No. 13 of 2015 on the Strategic Plan of the Ministry of Research, Technology, and Higher Education 2015–2019.

7. Ministerial Regulation No. 44 of 2015 on National Standards for Higher Education.
8. Ministerial Regulation No. 7 of 2007 on the Organization and Working Procedures of Quality Assurance Institutions.

1.3 Research Problems

1. Is there a statistically significant difference between students' expectations and actual experiences in the 2024 UNESA Student Satisfaction Survey?
2. What is the result of the *Gap Analysis* comparing expectations and reality in student satisfaction?
3. How does the *Importance–Performance Analysis (IPA)* reflect the alignment between expectations and performance?

1.4 Objectives

This survey aims to determine the quality of student satisfaction in 2024 based on statistical difference testing, gap analysis, and IPA. The findings are expected to serve as an evaluative reference for enhancing academic and administrative quality in the following academic year.

1.5 Report Structure

The report is organized into four chapters:

1. Chapter I – Introduction: Presents the background, legal framework, problem statements, objectives, and report structure.
2. Chapter II – Survey Methodology: Describes the survey design, operational definitions, instruments, data analysis methods, and analytical approaches used.
3. Chapter III – Results and Discussion: Explains statistical findings, gap and conformity analysis, and quadrant analysis using IPA.
4. Chapter IV – Conclusions and Recommendations: Summarizes key findings and provides recommendations for future improvement.

CHAPTER II – SURVEY METHODOLOGY

2.1 Research Type and Design

This study employs a quantitative descriptive survey method, which aims to provide a quantitative depiction of trends, attitudes, and perceptions of a population through a representative sample (Creswell & Creswell, 2018; Johnson & Christensen, 2014). A cross-sectional design was used, meaning all variables were measured simultaneously at one point in time. Data were collected using a structured questionnaire.

2.2 Operational Definitions

- Consumers: Students utilizing UNESA services in 2024.
- Expectations: The level of service quality students anticipate receiving.
- Satisfaction: The students' perception of service performance delivered by UNESA.
- Service Quality Dimensions: Reliability, Responsiveness, Assurance, Empathy, and Tangibles.

2.3 Instrumentation

A structured questionnaire was used to collect responses regarding students' expectations and perceptions of service performance. The instrument was divided into five core dimensions following the SERVQUAL model: *reliability, responsiveness, assurance, empathy,* and *tangibles.*

2.4 Methods

The analysis was based on the SERVQUAL model (Parasuraman et al., 1985) and further examined using Importance–Performance Analysis (IPA) (Martilla & James, 1977).

Data were processed through:

- Gap and Conformity Analysis (Tki)
- Normality Testing (Kolmogorov–Smirnov / Shapiro–Wilk)

- Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test (for non-parametric data)
- Cartesian Diagram (Quadrant Analysis)

CHAPTER III – RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Statistical Analysis

A total of 443 valid respondents participated in the survey (from 631 enrolled students), ensuring sufficient sample representation.

Normality tests revealed p-values < 0.05, indicating non-normal distribution. Therefore, the Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test was applied. Results showed a significant difference between expectations and perceived performance ($p < 0.05$), meaning that students' actual experiences generally fell below their expectations.

3.2 Gap and Conformity Analysis

Across all five SERVQUAL dimensions, *gap scores* were negative, indicating that performance did not meet expectations. The largest gap (–0.25) occurred in Item P15 (Assurance): "Ease of tuition fee processing (payment, delay, or reduction requests)", with the lowest conformity rate of 92.8%.

Overall, the grand mean conformity level was 94.65%, suggesting moderate satisfaction but room for improvement.

3.3 Importance–Performance Analysis (IPA)

Four indicators fell into Quadrant I (Priority for Improvement):

- P14: Clarity of SOPs for tuition processing (Reliability)
- P15: Ease of tuition processing (Assurance)
- P18: Availability and adequacy of academic facilities (Tangibles)
- P23: Accessibility and quality of academic infrastructure (Tangibles)

Six indicators were placed in Quadrant II (Maintain Performance):

P1, P2, P19, P20, P21, and P22, representing areas that met or exceeded expectations.

CHAPTER IV – CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 Conclusions

1. There is a statistically significant difference between expectations and actual satisfaction ($p < 0.05$).
2. The greatest dissatisfaction was identified in tuition payment procedures (Item P15).
3. Overall conformity between expectations and actual performance was 94.65%.
4. Improvement should prioritize indicators in Quadrant I (P14, P15, P18, P23).

4.2 Recommendations

The study suggests focused enhancement of administrative transparency, procedural efficiency, and infrastructural adequacy in the Undergraduate Biology Education Study Program to elevate overall student satisfaction.

References

- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches.* SAGE Publications.
- Johnson, R. B., & Christensen, R. (2014). *Educational Research: Quantitative, Qualitative, and Mixed Approaches.* SAGE Publications.
- Martilla, J. A., & James, J. C. (1977). *Importance–Performance Analysis. Journal of Marketing*, 41(1), 77–79.
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1985). *A Conceptual Model of Service Quality and Its Implications for Future Research. Journal of Marketing*, 49(4), 41–50.
- Supranto, J. (2001). *Pengukuran Tingkat Kepuasan Pelanggan untuk Menaikkan Pangsa Pasar.* Rineka Cipta.