

The Satisfaction Spectrum: A Comprehensive Examination of Student Experiences in the Arts, Sciences, and Engineering

OPEN ACCESS

Manuscript ID:
MGT-2026-130410368

Volume: 13

Issue: 4

Month: April

Year: 2026

P-ISSN: 2321-4643

E-ISSN: 2581-9402

Received: 08.03.2026

Accepted: 23.03.2026

Published Online: 01.04.2026

Citation:

Sugin Raj, M. "The Satisfaction Spectrum: A Comprehensive Examination of Student Experiences in the Arts, Sciences, and Engineering" *Shanlax International Journal of Management*, vol. 13, no. 4, 2026, pp. 60–68.

DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.34293/management.v13i4.10368>



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

M. Sugin Raj

Assistant Professor, Department of Management
Kristu Jayanti (Deemed to be) University Bengaluru, India
 <https://orcid.org/0009-0003-2663-3383>

Abstract

This study investigates the level of satisfaction among Arts, Science, and Engineering students with respect to campus facilities and the overall learning environment. It specifically examines how faculty teaching, academic programs, infrastructure, and extracurricular provisions influence students' academic experience and perceived learning effectiveness.

Primary data were collected using a structured questionnaire consisting of closed-ended items measured on a Likert scale. The sample included 111 students from Government, Government-aided, and self-financed colleges in the Kanniyakumari district. The data were analyzed using SPSS, employing descriptive statistics such as mean scores and inferential techniques, including one-way ANOVA, to examine differences across student groups.

The results indicate that students generally reported favorable perceptions across all major dimensions, with mean values exceeding 3.5 for most variables, reflecting a satisfactory level of experience. However, the item relating to faculty industrial exposure recorded comparatively lower mean scores (Arts: 3.43; Engineering: 3.49), suggesting a neutral stance among these groups. In addition, ANOVA results demonstrated statistically significant differences in satisfaction levels among Arts, Science, and Engineering students regarding academic programmes and institutional facilities ($p < 0.05$).

The findings suggest that while institutions are largely effective in delivering quality education and support services, there is a need to strengthen the practical orientation of teaching through increased industry engagement. Addressing these gaps can further improve student satisfaction and academic outcomes.

Future research may extend this work by incorporating larger and more diverse samples, as well as additional variables such as digital learning systems, employability skills, and institutional support mechanisms to provide deeper insights into student satisfaction in higher education.

Keywords: Student Satisfaction, Student Amenities, Teaching, Facilities, and Programs.

Introduction

Higher-education institutions are increasingly operating in a competitive and quality-driven environment, where meeting student expectations has become a central concern. Beyond academic delivery, institutions are expected to provide supportive learning conditions, adequate infrastructure, and meaningful engagement opportunities that contribute to students' success and retention. Consequently, student satisfaction has become an essential benchmark for evaluating institutional performance and long-term sustainability.

Student satisfaction is closely linked to outcomes such as academic achievement, continuation rates, and institutional reputation. When students perceive that teaching quality, academic support, and campus facilities meet their expectations, they are more likely to remain engaged and perform academically better. Prior research highlights that the availability and quality of educational resources, faculty effectiveness, and campus environment significantly shape students' overall perceptions of their institutions.

Research Gap

While existing studies have explored student satisfaction in higher education, there is limited comparative evidence examining differences across academic streams, such as Arts, Science, and Engineering, within a single regional context. In particular, there is a lack of focused analysis on how specific dimensions, such as faculty's practical exposure and opportunities for student interaction, vary in influencing satisfaction levels. This study addresses this gap by offering a structured comparison across streams and identifying areas in which student perceptions diverge.

Objectives of the Study

This study was designed with the following objectives:

- To evaluate students' satisfaction with faculty teaching across the Arts, Science, and Engineering streams.
- To analyze students' perceptions of academic programs and institutional facilities.
- To assess satisfaction with campus infrastructure, amenities, and extracurricular opportunities.
- To examine whether significant differences exist in satisfaction levels among students from different academic streams.

Review of Literature

Student satisfaction has emerged as a central indicator of the effectiveness and success of higher education institutions. Early conceptualization by Zeithaml (1988) positioned satisfaction as a key outcome of service quality, emphasizing its role in evaluating the overall educational experience of students. In the context of higher education, satisfaction extends beyond academic delivery to include infrastructure, facilities and support services.

Several studies have highlighted that student satisfaction is strongly influenced by the availability of infrastructural and extracurricular facilities. Rahman et al. (2020) argue that higher education institutions must provide opportunities for extracurricular and sports participation, as these contribute significantly to holistic development. This view is supported by Collins et al. (2021), who found that extracurricular activities enhance students' overall experiences

and quality of life. However, while these studies emphasize the importance of non-academic factors, they often underplay the variability in student preferences across demographic groups, indicating a gap in contextual understanding of the subject.

The relationship between student satisfaction and academic performance has been widely explored in the literature. Pheunpha (2019) suggested that satisfied students are more likely to persist in their studies and achieve academic success. Similarly, Oliso et al. (2024) demonstrated that educational service quality explains a significant proportion (71.2%) of the variance in student satisfaction and indirectly influences academic performance through satisfaction. While these findings establish a strong linkage, they also raise questions about causality—whether satisfaction leads to performance or vice versa—indicating the need for longitudinal research.

Student satisfaction also plays a strategic role in institutional outcomes, such as retention, loyalty, and enrollment. Upcraft and Schuh (1996) first recognized satisfaction as a tool for improving student retention, while Tinto (1993) and Elliott and Shin (2002) established its positive relationship with persistence. More recent studies (Bui et al., 2023; Achmad Supriyanto et al., 2024) confirm that satisfaction is a mediating variable between service quality and student loyalty. However, contrasting findings by Sharma et al. (2024) indicate that satisfaction may not always function as a mediator, suggesting inconsistencies in empirical models and highlighting the need for further theoretical refinements.

The determinants of student satisfaction are multifaceted and encompass academic, administrative, and environmental factors. Nguyen et al. (2024) identify five key dimensions—academic aspects, non-academic services, institutional programs, facilities, and industry interaction—as critical drivers. Similarly, Poon (2019) emphasized teaching quality, course organization, and feedback mechanisms as significant predictors. Although these studies provide comprehensive frameworks, they often treat these factors independently, overlooking possible interaction effects among them.

Faculty-related variables have been consistently identified as crucial determinants of satisfaction.

Rogers and Smith (2011) found that perceived care and concern from faculty significantly predicted student satisfaction. Arif et al. (2013) and Bilal et al. (2021) further emphasized the roles of teaching quality, leadership, and instructor engagement. However, these studies tend to focus heavily on teaching aspects, potentially neglecting the growing importance of technological integration and digital learning environments, as highlighted by Wilkins and Balakrishnan (2013).

Institutional image and reputation also play significant roles. Al Hassani and Wilkins (2022) and Chandra et al. (2019) demonstrate that institutional reputation positively influences both satisfaction and loyalty. Nguyen et al. (2024) further argue that reputation moderates the relationship between satisfaction and loyalty. However, the influence of reputation may vary across regions and institutional types, suggesting that contextual factors should be more explicitly incorporated into future research.

Despite extensive research, certain contradictions and gaps still remain. For instance, while most studies confirm a positive relationship between service quality and satisfaction, some (Chandra et al., 2019) find no direct impact of service quality on loyalty, indicating the presence of mediating or moderating variables. Additionally, Oke et al. (2017) highlight dissatisfaction with accommodation among diverse student groups, pointing to inequalities in service delivery that are often overlooked in generalized models.

Overall, student satisfaction is a complex, multidimensional construct influenced by academic quality, infrastructure, faculty engagement, institutional reputation, and support service. While significant progress has been made in identifying its determinants and outcomes, inconsistencies in findings and limited consideration of contextual and demographic variations indicate the need for more integrated and longitudinal approaches to understand student satisfaction in higher education.

Research Hypotheses

H1: There is no significant difference between the satisfaction level with faculty teaching and the students of the College of Arts, Science, and Engineering.

H2: There is no significant difference between the satisfaction level with College Academic programmes cum Facilities and the students of Arts, Science, and Engineering College.

H3: There is no significant difference between the satisfaction level with various facilities/infra structures and extra-curricular activities provided by the college and the students of Arts, Science, and Engineering College.

Research Methodology

This study follows an empirical approach to analyze college students' satisfaction levels with respect to campus facilities and academic support systems. Data were obtained from primary and secondary sources. Primary data were collected using a structured questionnaire, and secondary information was drawn from scholarly books, journals, and credible online materials.

A probability-based sampling method was adopted, specifically simple random sampling, to ensure an unbiased selection across the Arts, Science, and Engineering streams. The final sample consisted of 111 students from Government, Government-aided, and self-financed colleges in the Kanniyakumari district of Tamil Nadu. The sample size was considered adequate for the study as it satisfied the minimum requirement for applying statistical techniques such as ANOVA and enabled meaningful comparison across three academic streams within the defined scope and time constraints.

The research instrument included closed-ended statements measured on a five-point Likert scale to capture student perceptions of faculty effectiveness, academic programmes, infrastructure, and extracurricular activities. The reliability of the scale was tested using Cronbach's alpha, which yielded a value of 0.964, indicating a high level of internal consistency. Content validity was ensured through expert evaluation, and a pilot study was conducted to refine the questionnaire.

Data analysis was performed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Descriptive measures, particularly mean scores, were used to assess satisfaction levels, while inferential techniques such as one-way ANOVA and the F-test were applied to identify significant differences among students from different academic streams.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

Gender-wise classification of the Respondents

This study focused on both male and female students studying in arts, science, and engineering colleges.

Table 1 Gender-wise Classification of the Respondents

Sl. No.	Gender	No of Respondents	Percentage
1	Male	43	38.74
2	Female	68	61.26
	Male	43	38.74

Source: Primary Data

Table 1 shows that 61.26 percent of the respondents are female and 38.74 percent of the respondents are male. Hence, the majority of the respondents were female (61.26%).

Classification based on the Area of study of the Respondents

Data were collected from students based on their areas of study, such as Arts, Science and Engineering.

Table 2 Area of Study of the Respondents

Sl. No.	Gender	No of Respondents	Percentage
1	Arts (B.A, BBA M.A, B.Com)	35	31.5
2	Science(Bsc)	43	38.7
3	Engineering	33	29.7
	Total	111	100.0

Source: Primary Data

Table 2 indicates that 38.7 percent of the students have chosen Science as their major field of studies, 31.5 percent of the students have chosen Arts, and 29.7 percent of the students have chosen Engineering.

Classification based on the Preferred College of the Respondents

This study focused on students from government colleges, government-aided colleges, and self-financed colleges.

Table 3 Classification Based on the Preferred College of the Respondents

Sl. No.	Gender	No of Respondents	Percentage
1	Government College	26	23.4
2	Government Aided College	24	21.64
3	Self Financed College	61	54.96
	Total	111	100.0

Source: Primary Data

The Table 3 infers that 54.96 percent of the respondents are from Self Finance College, 23.4 percent of the respondents are from Government college and 21.64 percent of the students are from Government Aided college.

Satisfaction Level with Faculty and their Teaching

Students Satisfaction level is been analyzed to know the about the faculties teaching and their helping students in various aspects.

Table. 4 Satisfaction Level with Faculty and their Teaching

S.No	Factors	Arts	Science	Engg	Total	F	Sig
1	Teachers make use of modern technology that helps us get real-time exposure	3.83	3.91	3.70	3.82	4.576	0.031
2	Teachers are so helpful	4.23	4.42	4.24	4.31	4.877	0.021
3	Teachers are available when I am needful	4.29	4.21	4.15	4.22	4.285	0.041
4	Teachers help to develop a career plan	3.94	4.14	3.91	4.01	4.783	0.026
5	Teachers have business/ industrial exposure	3.43	3.60	3.39	3.49	4.547	0.032

Source: primary Data

Table 3 shows that 54.96 percent of the respondents are from self-finance colleges, 23.4 percent of the respondents are from government colleges, and 21.64 percent of the students are from government-aided colleges.

Satisfaction Level with Faculty and their Teaching

The students Satisfaction level was analyzed to understand the faculties' teaching and their helping students in various aspects.

The results of the analysis in Table 5.4 indicate that students from the Arts, Science, and Engineering colleges generally exhibit a high level of satisfaction with faculty-related factors. In particular, respondents strongly agreed that teachers effectively use modern technology for real-time learning, are helpful in their approach, and are accessible when needed, as reflected by mean scores above 4.

Moderate levels of agreement were observed regarding teachers' support in career planning, with

mean values ranging from 3.51 to 4.50. However, students from the Arts and Engineering streams expressed a neutral perception of teachers' business or industrial exposure, indicating a potential area for improvement.

The ANOVA test revealed that the p-value was less than the significance level ($p < 0.05$), leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis. This confirms that there is a statistically significant difference in the level of satisfaction with faculty among students of the colleges of Arts, Science, and Engineering. Overall, while students were largely satisfied with faculty performance, enhancing industry exposure among teachers could further improve student perceptions.

Satisfaction Level with College Academic Programmes Cum Facilities

This study analyzes students satisfaction levels with college academic programs and the facilities provided.

Table 5 Satisfaction Level with College Academic Programmes Cum Facilities

S.No	Factors	Arts	Science	Engg	Total	F	Sig
1	Extra –curricular activities provides additional knowledge/ skill/ exposures	4.31	4.33	4.06	4.24	4.196	0.012
2	Learning equipment like projector, computer, lab equipment and other practical equipment are adequate	4.17	4.23	3.70	4.05	4.701	0.011
3	Available equipments are advanced equipments	4.00	4.16	3.79	4.00	3.986	0.024
4	The quality of equipments is good and maintained well	4.03	4.14	3.85	4.02	4.152	0.014
5	Learning class room spaces, lab, learning equipments are sufficient to carry out practical	3.86	4.09	3.91	3.96	4.775	0.009
6	The library is well furnished and has more book collections	4.26	4.47	4.09	4.29	3.890	0.028
7	Every year, the institution conducts College day, Arts day, Graduation day	4.09	4.09	4.18	4.12	4.131	0.017
8	Celebrations and functions are enjoyable in our institution	4.03	4.05	3.97	4.02	4.076	0.022
9	All cultural / religious functions like Diwali, Christmas, and Pongal are celebrated regularly in our institutions	3.83	3.77	3.85	3.81	4.055	0.021

Source: Primary Data

Table 5 results indicate that students across Arts, Science, and Engineering streams report a satisfactory level of perception towards college academic programs and facilities, as reflected by moderate to high mean scores. This suggests that institutions are effectively meeting students' academic and infrastructural expectations. The ANOVA results show that the p-value is less than the significance level ($p < 0.05$), leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis. This confirms that there is

a statistically significant difference in satisfaction levels among students of different streams with respect to academic programs and facilities.

Overall Satisfaction of Students with Various Facilities/ Infra Structures and Extra-Curricular Activities Provided by the College

This analysis is to know about the students satisfaction level with various facilities/infrastructure and extracurricular activities provided by the college.

Table 6 Overall Satisfaction of Students with Various Facilities/ Infra Structures and Extra-Curricular Activities Provided by the College

S. No	Factors	Arts	Science	Engg	Total	F	Sig
1	I interact and network with students of their colleges	3.54	3.23	3.15	3.31	3.877	0.030
2	I participate in skill/ knowledge developing competitions	3.97	3.93	3.79	3.90	3.745	0.034
3	I participate in events of Sports/ Arts/ other cultural activities	3.97	4.09	3.55	3.89	3.304	0.040
4	I participate in various extracurricular courses conducted by college in our campus	4.09	4.19	3.64	3.99	4.399	0.015
5	I am given feedback on learning subjects and tests.	3.86	4.00	3.79	3.89	3.555	0.038
6	I can express my doubts openly in the class room	4.14	4.23	3.91	4.11	4.349	0.018
7	The learning tasks like projects/ assignments/ practical are interesting	4.06	4.16	3.67	3.98	3.253	0.042
8	The teachers and students rapport is well and easily can interact with teachers.	3.97	4.07	3.91	3.99	4.321	0.020
9	I have participated and enjoyed in celebrated events and functions	3.91	4.09	3.91	3.98	4.658	0.012
10	The classmates are interested in learning and helps for my learning	3.94	3.95	3.64	3.86	4.024	0.029
11	I have celebrated and enjoyed all events or functions with full freedom in our institution	3.43	3.58	3.55	3.52	4.145	0.024
12	I am satisfied with the entire course subjects	3.86	4.00	3.97	3.95	4.273	0.021
13	I am satisfied with the decision of selecting this institution	3.74	3.88	3.67	3.77	3.392	0.032
14	I recommend this college to relatives/ friends/ neighbors	3.74	3.72	3.61	3.69	4.160	0.021
15	I am satisfied on college because it provides better education	3.97	4.21	3.79	4.01	4.420	0.014
16	I am satisfied with college staff and infrastructure facility	4.00	4.16	3.79	4.00	4.660	0.010

Source: Primary Data

Table 6 shows that students from Arts, Science, and Engineering colleges generally express a satisfactory level of perception of campus facilities, infrastructure, and extracurricular activities, as indicated by moderate mean scores. This indicates that colleges are largely successful in providing supportive environments beyond academics.

However, comparatively lower mean values were observed among Science and Engineering students regarding interaction and networking with peers, indicating a neutral perception and highlighting a potential gap in fostering inter-student engagement.

Results and Discussion

Students reported a high level of satisfaction with faculty teaching, with mean scores above 3.5, reflecting their positive perceptions of teaching effectiveness and support. However, Arts and Engineering students expressed a neutral opinion regarding teachers' business or industrial exposure, indicating scope for improvement in practical and industry-oriented knowledge of the latter. The ANOVA results further confirmed a statistically significant difference in satisfaction levels among the three streams.

With respect to academic programmes and institutional facilities, students demonstrated moderate to high satisfaction levels (mean scores between 3.51 and 4.50), suggesting that colleges effectively meet academic expectations. Nevertheless, the presence of significant differences among streams highlights the need for customized improvements in the model.

Similarly, students showed satisfactory perceptions of infrastructure, facilities, and extracurricular activities (mean scores between 3.5 and 4.00). However, Science and Engineering students reported relatively lower satisfaction in terms of interaction and networking opportunities, indicating a gap in student engagement initiatives. The ANOVA results again revealed significant differences across streams.

Suggestions

The analysis showed comparatively lower mean scores for the items related to faculty industrial exposure (Arts: 3.43; Engineering: 3.49), indicating only a neutral perception among students. In

response, institutions should formalize faculty–industry engagement by introducing measurable requirements, such as minimum interaction hours with the industry per semester, participation in consultancy, or involvement in live projects. Embedding such criteria in performance appraisal systems can ensure consistent implementation.

The presence of statistically significant differences in satisfaction levels across streams ($p < 0.05$) suggests that a uniform approach may not effectively address students' expectations. Therefore, colleges should design stream-specific academic and career development frameworks, including tailored training modules, internships, and skill-building initiatives, aligned with the distinct needs of Arts, Science, and Engineering students.

The findings also revealed relatively lower mean values for student interaction and networking, particularly among the Science and Engineering students (mean range: 3.15–3.23). To address this, institutions should introduce structured and continuous engagement mechanisms, such as interdisciplinary group projects, peer mentoring systems, and credit-based collaborative learning activities, rather than relying solely on occasional events.

Given that variations were observed across multiple factors and supported by ANOVA results indicating significant differences, institutions should implement periodic factor-wise satisfaction assessments. These evaluations should focus on the specific dimensions identified in this study, and the outcomes should be translated into actionable improvement plans to ensure responsiveness to student feedback.

The overall variation in satisfaction levels across the streams highlights the need for a differentiated institutional strategy. Data-driven decision-making approaches can be adopted to segment students based on their academic backgrounds and preferences, allowing institutions to design targeted interventions that more effectively enhance student satisfaction and academic experience.

Conclusion

The study concludes that students across the Arts, Science, and Engineering streams generally exhibit a

satisfactory level of perception of faculty teaching, academic programmes, and campus facilities. This indicates that higher education institutions are largely successful in creating a supportive and student-centered learning environment that contributes to both academic performance and overall well-being of the students.

However, certain gaps that require attention were identified. The neutral perception of Arts and Engineering students regarding teachers' industrial exposure highlights the need to strengthen industry-academia linkages and incorporate more practical, real-world insights into teaching. Similarly, the relatively lower satisfaction among Science and Engineering students in terms of interaction and networking suggests the need for enhanced collaborative and engagement opportunities on campus.

These findings have important implications for educational institutions, emphasizing the need to move beyond basic satisfaction and focus on enriching the quality of learning through experiential teaching methods, industry integration, and improved student engagement strategies. Addressing these areas can significantly enhance students' holistic development and better prepare them for future professional challenges.

Future research can expand this study by including a larger sample size across multiple regions, incorporating longitudinal analyses, and examining additional factors such as digital learning environments, employability skills, and student support services. Comparative studies between rural and urban institutions or across different educational systems may also provide deeper insights into improving student satisfaction in higher-education.

References

- Arif, S., Ilyas, M., & Hameed, A. (2013). Student satisfaction and the impact of leadership in private universities. *The TQM Journal*, 25(4), 399–416.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/17542731311314881>
- Al Hassani, A. A., & Wilkins, S. (2022). Student retention in higher education: The influences of organizational identification and institution reputation on student satisfaction and behaviors. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 36(6), 1046–1064.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-03-2022-0123>
- Bilal, B., et al. (2020). I am engaged, therefore my students are satisfied: Unleashing the role of teachers' interaction and sensitivity based on self-determination perspective. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 35(1), 341–361.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-05-2020-0258>
- Bui, H. T. M., et al. (2023). Assessing the relationship between service quality, satisfaction and loyalty: The Vietnamese higher education experience. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 31(2), 197–214.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/QAE-01-2022-0015>
- Chandra, T., et al. (2019). The influence of service quality and university image on student satisfaction and student loyalty. *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, 26(5), 1533–1549.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/BIJ-07-2018-0212>
- Collins, A., et al. (2021). The qualitative study of factors influencing international students' satisfaction: The case of a private university in Turkey. In B. Shneikat, C. Cobanoglu, & C. Tanova (Eds.), *Global perspectives on recruiting international students: Challenges and opportunities* (pp. 155–172). Emerald Publishing Limited. <https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-83982-518-720211010>
- El-Hilali, N., Al-Jaber, S., & Hussein, L. (2015). Students' satisfaction and achievement and absorption capacity in higher education. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 177, 420–427.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.02.384>
- James, M., & Yun, D. (2018). Exploring student satisfaction and future employment intentions: Is there a link between satisfaction and getting a job? *Higher Education, Skills and Work-Based Learning*, 8(2), 117–133. <https://doi.org/10.1108/HESWBL-03-2017-0019>
- Kalam, A., & Mahonta, H. C. (2017). Measuring service gap in higher education in Bangladesh: A comparative study between public and private universities. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, 19(11), 49–55.

- Lodesso, S. L., et al. (2018). Student satisfaction regarding service quality at Ethiopian public higher education institutions: A case study. *Journal of Student Affairs in Africa*, 6(2), 51–64.
- Nguyen, H. V., et al. (2024). The influence of service quality on student satisfaction and student loyalty in Vietnam: The moderating role of university image. *Journal of Trade Science*, 12(1), 37–59. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JTS-12-2023-0032>
- Oliso, Z. Z., et al. (2024). The impact of educational service quality on student academic performance in Ethiopian public universities: The mediating role of students' satisfaction. *Journal of International Education in Business*, 17(2), 340–370. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JIEB-07-2023-0042>
- Oke, A. E., et al. (2017). Students' satisfaction with hostel accommodations in higher education institutions. *Journal of Engineering, Design and Technology*, 15(5), 652–666. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEDT-04-2017-0036>
- Poon, J. (2019). Postgraduate student satisfaction in the UK. *Property Management*, 37(1), 115–135. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PM-07-2017-0041>
- Pheunpha, P. (2019). A factor analysis of students' perceived service quality in higher education. *ABAC Journal*, 39(4), 90–110.
- Rahman, S. M., Mia, M. S., Ahmed, F., Thongrak, S., & Kiatpathomchai, S. (2020). Assessing satisfaction of students in public universities in Bangladesh: An empirical study. *The Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business*, 7(8), 323–332.
- Rogers, J., & Smith, M. (2011). Demonstrating genuine interest in students' needs and progress. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*, 3(1), 6–14. <https://doi.org/10.1108/17581181111150865>.
- Sharma, R., et al. (2024). Sustainable development goals: The impact of sustainability measures on wellbeing. In *Contemporary studies in economic and financial analysis* (Vol. 113A, pp. 17–39). Emerald Publishing Limited. <https://doi.org/10.1108/S1569-37592024000113A002>
- Subrahmanyam, A. (2017). Relationship between service quality, satisfaction, motivation and loyalty: A multidimensional perspective. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 25(2), 171–188. <https://doi.org/10.1108/QAE-04-2013-0016>
- Supriyanto, A., Burhanuddin, B., et al. (2024). Academic service quality, student satisfaction and loyalty: A study at higher education legal entities in Indonesia. *The TQM Journal*, 37(5), 1364–1384. <https://doi.org/10.1108/TQM-10-2023-0334>
- Tan, A. H. T., et al. (2022). The effect of service quality on behavioural intention: The mediating role of student satisfaction and switching barriers in private universities. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*, 14(4), 1394–1413. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JARHE-03-2021-0122>
- Weerasinghe, I. M. S., et al. (2018). Student satisfaction in higher education: A literature review. *American Journal of Educational Research*, 2017, Vol. 5, No. 5, 533–539.
- Wilkins, S., & Balakrishnan, M. S. (2013). Assessing student satisfaction in transnational higher education. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 27(2), 143–156. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09513541311297568>
- Zeithaml, V. A. (1988). Consumer perceptions of price, quality, and value: A means-end model and synthesis of evidence. *Journal of Marketing*, 52(3), 2–22. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1251446>

Author Details

M. Sugin Raj, Assistant Professor, Department of Management, Kristu Jayanti (Deemed to be) University Bengaluru, India, **Email ID:** sugin.r@kristujayanti.com.