

A STUDY OF STUDENT SATISFACTION IN AUTONOMOUS AND NON-AUTONOMOUS INSTITUTES IN INDORE CITY

Rahul Deo* and Namrata Kohli**

Global, political, economic, cultural and social developments have enforced changes in higher education which inevitably lead to changing expectations of students entering higher education. Student satisfaction is an important measure of service quality in institutes. The assessment of service quality provides an important feedback for the institutes to assess and improve its service to students pursuing higher education. The aim of this study is to compare student satisfaction in Autonomous and Non- Autonomous Institutes. A self designed questionnaire to measure the service quality of Autonomous and Non- Autonomous Institutes was used with the sample size of 100 students. The present study provides insights to the researchers and academicians who wish to study student satisfaction along with service quality of Institutes. This paper suggests ongoing developments in academic institutes and their provision in order to improve student satisfaction and service quality in educational institutes.

Keywords: *Higher Education, Students' Satisfaction, Students' Expectation*

*Associate Professor, Shri Vaishnav Institute of Management, Indore, India

**Assistant Professor, Shri Vaishnav Institute of Management ,Indore ,India

INTRODUCTION

Knowledge is the driving force in the rapidly changing globalised economy and society. Quantity and quality of highly specialized human resources determine their competence in the global market. Institutions for higher education are increasingly realizing that they are part of the service industry and are putting greater emphasis on student satisfaction as they face many competitive pressures. Number of higher education institutions and the number of students enrolled have tremendously increased which is growing many folds, as the benefits of earning a college degree become more evident, especially in the business and high tech sectors. Higher learning institutions are also considering this as a business like service industry where objective is to satisfy customers in order to retain and increase profit. Likewise satisfying admitted students are important for the institutions existence, trying to meet the needs of this ever-increasing number of students as well as the quality they are demanding at this level of education (DeShields et al., 2005).

The sustainability and the success of these institutions are highly dependent on the student satisfaction and this satisfaction helps the institutions to find out their strengths and the areas where they need improvement. Student satisfaction is not merely dependent on the teaching assessments, but a deep analysis should be there to find out all the factors that contribute to the student satisfaction. The rapid expansion of colleges and universities, significant increases in college education costs combined with demographic shifts in the population may force colleges to think differently about the role of student satisfaction for their survival (Kotler and Fox, 1995).

Even though the successful completion and enhancement of students' education are the reasons for the existence of higher educational institutions, college administrators tend to focus disproportionately more time on programs for attracting and admitting students rather than enrolment management. Similar to the importance of satisfying customers to retain them for profit-making institutions, satisfying the admitted students is also important for retention. On the one hand, student satisfaction has been related to recruitment and retention and academic success (Athiyaman, 1997; Elliott and Healy, 2001; DeShields et al., 2005; and Helgesen andNesset,

2007) which has led university administrators to pay great attention to those factors that help them to more effectively attract students and create a supportive learning environment.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Autonomy has also been defined as a capacity or behaviour, as learner responsibility or learner control, as a psychological phenomenon or political notion, and as a developmental skill that depends on teacher autonomy (Benson, 2001). Most researchers agree, however, that autonomous learners know the purpose for their learning, accept responsibility for it, set their own goals, initiate their learning activities, and are involved in the on-going revision and evaluation of their work (Holec, 1981 and Little, 1991). Holistically, learner autonomy can be viewed as a combination of cognitive, metacognitive, affective, and social dimensions of language learning that are in constant interaction with one another (Little, 2001; Benson, 2001; and La Ganza, 2001, 2004).

Kotler et.al (1995) revealed that the most students are satisfied with their academic programs but less satisfied with support services such as academic advising and career counselling. Athiyaman (1997) noted that negative disconfirmation of a student's expectations produces short-term dissatisfaction focused on a specific transaction or experience (e.g., a bad class, an unpleasant exchange with a staff member or a classmate), and that dissatisfaction leads to attitudes and behaviours that are different from those derived from satisfaction. Bernstein et al., (1979) suggested that product service failures will generally be attributed to external causes, i.e., the student might blame the professor, the university or the fellow student, while positive disconfirmations have a higher likelihood to be attributed to the self (i.e., I worked harder, I made a smart choice, or I am able to take it to the next level). On the one hand, positive satisfaction is expected to be associated with self confidence in the short-term and only with perceived quality if positive satisfaction is prolonged, pervasive, and sustained.

Aldridge et al., (1998) revealed that dissatisfaction with one incident leads to dissonance and to complaints, while dissatisfaction with repeated incidents leads to disconfirmation (change of expectations and perceived quality), to disaffection and to withdrawal. Ratelle et al., (2007)

investigated students' profiles regarding autonomous, controlled, and a motivated regulation and tested whether profile groups differed on some academic adjustment outcomes. Studies revealed 3 profiles: (a) students with high levels of both controlled motivation and amotivation but low levels of autonomous motivation, (b) students with high levels of both controlled and autonomous motivation but low levels of amotivation, and (c) students with moderate levels of both autonomous and controlled motivations but low levels of amotivation. The study also revealed that students in the high autonomous/high controlled group reported the highest degree of academic adjustment. Third study performed on college students revealed 3 profiles: (a) students with high levels of autonomous motivations but low levels of controlled motivation and a motivation, (b) students with high levels of both autonomous and controlled motivation but low levels of a motivation, and (c) students with low to moderate levels of the various motivational components.

OBJECTIVE

- To compare the student satisfaction of autonomous institutions and non-autonomous institutions.

HYPOTHESIS

Following hypotheses have been framed for the purpose of the study

H₀: There is no significant difference between the satisfaction level of autonomous institute students and non-autonomous institute students.

H₁: There is significant difference between the satisfaction level of autonomous institute students and non-autonomous institute students.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The Study: The present study is an exploratory study and is based on primary data.

The Sample: In the present study, convenience sampling method has been used. The questionnaire has been distributed to 100 respondents (students) of autonomous and non-autonomous institute.

Tools for Data Collection: A self designed structured questionnaire has been used to measure satisfaction level among students of autonomous institutes and non-autonomous institute in Indore city. The questionnaire was on 5-point Likert Scale, where 1 indicated high level of dissatisfaction and 5 indicated high level of satisfaction, consisting of 23 items has been used.

Tools for Data Analysis: Z-test and mean has been used to compare the satisfaction level between students of autonomous and non-autonomous institutes.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Z-test has been applied to check whether there is significant difference between the student satisfaction of autonomous and non-autonomous institute. Table-1 and Table-2 reveal result of Z- test.

The calculated value of Z is **2.0054** which is greater than the standard value i.e. 1.96 at 5percent level of significance. It shows that there is a significant difference between the student satisfaction in autonomous and non-autonomous institutes.

$$Z_{cal} (2.0054) > Z_{std} (1.96)$$

Thus, H_0 is rejected, and it indicates that students of autonomous institutes are more satisfied as compared to non-autonomous institutes. The reason could be the timely examination conducted, evaluation process adopted and overall system followed by the Autonomous Institutes.

CONCLUSION

From the mean scores of autonomous and non-autonomous institutes, it can be said that student of autonomous institutes are more satisfied as compared to non-autonomous institutes. The reason could be that autonomous institutions are rated and recognized with respect to faculty, facilities, curricula and academic program, and administrative system. The autonomy used to control examinations, admission process and deciding fee structure also leads to difference in satisfaction level of students among these institutes. In autonomous institutes, students are assured of good education and training due to availability of competent people, program and

process. Autonomous institutes have a greater responsibility and hence, the institutions always remain sensitive and alert to take care of the needs of students. They also offer flexibility in academic curricula and hence, there lies a scope to effect quick changes in teaching methodology and training students to the latest developments. In autonomous institutions, a continuous evaluation system promotes effective learning as the students remain generally more focused on their academics on a regular basis. In autonomous institutions, a lot of focus is given to continuous commitment to institutional image building in order to improve student placement.

References

- Aldridge, S., And Rowley, J. (1998). Measuring Customer Satisfaction in Higher Education. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 6(4), 197-204.
- Alves, H.,And Raposo, M. (2007). Conceptual Model of Student Satisfaction in Higher Education. *Total Quality Management*, 18(5),571-588.
- Appleton-Knapp, S. L., And Krentler, K. A. (2006). Measuring Student Expectations and their Effects on Satisfaction: the Importance of Managing Student Expectations. *Journal of Marketing Education*, Dec, 28(3), 254-264.
- Athiyaman, A. (1997). Linking Student Satisfaction and Service Quality Perceptions: The Case of University Education. *European Journal of Marketing*, 31(7), 528-540.
- Benson, P. (2001). *Teaching and Researching Autonomy in Language Learning*. Harlow, England: Pearson Education Limited.
- Bernstien, W. M., Stephan, W. G., and Davis, M. H. (1979). Explaining Attributions for Achievement: A Path Analytic Approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37(10), 1810-1821.
- Browne, B. A., Kaldenberg, D. O., Browne, W. G., and Brown, D. J. (1998). Student as Customer: Factors Affecting Satisfaction and Assessments of Institutional Quality. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, 8(3), 1-14.
- Coaldrake, P. (2002). *Institutional Responses to Changing Student Expectations: Project Overview in Responding to Student Expectations*. Paris: OECD Publications.

Deshields, O. W., Kara, A., and 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.

David W. Letcher and Joao S. Neves. *Determinants of Undergraduate Business Student Satisfaction*. Research in Higher Education Journal.

Elliott, K. M., and Healy, M. A. (2001). Key Factors Influencing Student Satisfaction Related to Recruitment Retention. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, 10(4), 1-11.

Elliott, K. M. and Shin, D. (2002). Student Satisfaction: An Alternative Approach to Assessing This Important Concept. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 24(2), 197-209.

Eom, S. B., Wen, H. J., and Ashill, N. (2006). The Determinants of Students' Perceived Learning Outcomes and Satisfaction in University Online Education: An Empirical Investigation. *Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education*, 4(2), 215-235.

Helgesen, Ø., and Nettet, E. (2007). What Accounts for Students' Loyalty? Some Field Study Evidence. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 21(2), 126-143.

Holec, H. (1981). *Autonomy in Foreign Language Learning* (first Published 1979, Strasbourg: Council of Europe). Oxford: Pergamon.

Kotler, P., And Fox, K. F. M. (1995). *Strategic Marketing for Educational Institutions*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Little, D. (1991). *Learner Autonomy: Definitions, Issues and Problems*. Dublin: Authentic Language Learning Resources Limited.

Little, D. (2001). *How Independent can Independent Language Learning Really be?*. J.Coleman, D. Ferney, D. Head and R. Rix (Eds), *Language-Learning Futures: Issues and Strategies for Modern Languages Provision in Higher Education*, 30-43.

Mai, L. (2005). A Comparative Study Between UK and US: The Student Satisfaction in Higher Education and its Influential Factors. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 859-878.

Rapert, M. I., Smith, S., Velliquette, A. And Garretson, J. A. (2004). The Meaning of Quality: Expectations of Students in Pursuit of an MBA. *Journal of Education for Business*, Sep/Oct, 80(1), 17-24.

Tirthajyoti Sarkar (2007). Higher Educational Reforms for Enhancing Youth Employment Opportunity in India. CIPE *International Essay Competition, Essay category: Educational Reform and Employment Opportunities*

Yrd.Doç.Dr. Zeynep Filiz (2007). *Service Quality of University Library: A Survey amongst Students at Osmangazi University and Anadolu University.*

Table-1

Institute	Mean
Autonomous	85.65
Non-Autonomous	79.99

Table-2

S Value	14.0974
Z Value	2.0054