

## Students' quality of life in a public university in Malaysia

Hamidah Maidinsah, Maznita Mak Sari @ Md Sari

Faculty of Computer and Mathematical Sciences, University Technology Mara, 40450 Shah Alam, Selangor, Malaysia.

Copyright © 2016 Hamidah & Maznita. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

*Quality of University Life (QUL) has been defined as students' perceived life satisfaction or general well-being pertaining to their university experience. It measures what university students expect, need and want focusing on many aspects of their campus life. This study was carried out to investigate the QUL of undergraduates having at least six months experience of life in one of the public university in Malaysia. QUL was assessed according to affective and cognitive domains. The QUL instrument comprised of 122 items and had reliability index of 0.98. Overall results showed that students were slightly satisfied with their lives at the university with a mean score of 6.7. The affective domain scored 6.4 and cognitive domain scored 6.8. For cognitive domain, students were most satisfied with education services with a mean score of 7.6. There were significant differences between genders in terms of academic performance and satisfaction towards lecturers and facilities.*

**Keywords:** Life satisfaction, Quality of University Life (QUL), general well-being, affective domain, cognitive domain.

### Introduction

The termed Quality of Life (QoL) has a variety of definitions. It is defined as an individual's perceived life satisfaction or general well-being. Essentially it refers to the degree of a person's judgement on the quality of one's overall life that stems from satisfaction and dissatisfaction with areas of life that are important to one self (Diener, 1985; Nausbaum et. al, 1993; Nordenfelt, 1993; Ren, 2009). QoL has been used in various contexts across many disciplines from health to social sciences. Many researchers have developed QoL specifically for college (QCL) or university students (QUL). Sirgy et. al (2007) defined it as the overall life satisfaction that students feel at college/university. QUL measures what university students expect, need and want focusing on students' total experiences at the campus and is not confined to classroom environment only.

QUL is gaining more importance due to the role it plays in ensuring expectations of students on every possible aspect of their life as students at campus are realised. Many universities especially in the west are using QUL indicators to assess students' satisfaction. In fact, in some surveys of university rankings, QUL is taken as one of its categories (Telegraph, 2013). A measure of QUL is not only seen as a platform of providing baselines for students' satisfaction but can assist the management of institutions to identify policies as well as areas and aspects about the students' lives that need attention and require improvements. A good quality university will have the ability to meet students' expectations and definitely will attract more students to enrol.

The objective of this study was to investigate the QUL of students at one of the public university in Malaysia. The study was basically an extension to the study done by Hamidah et. al (2014). QUL was assessed based on two domains: affective and cognitive. Affective refers to one's emotions or overall

feelings of satisfaction experienced during the last several months while cognitive refers to satisfaction according to three components of university services: educational services, administrative services and facilities provided. The study also attempted to examine whether there exist significant differences in academic performance and QUL of students between genders.

### **Literature Review**

Studies on quality of university life assess many dimensions that concern students. In determining life satisfaction of students researchers varies in their definitions of the term quality of student's university life. Numerous other findings have been reported from studies on quality of university life. Quality of life survey in United Kingdom considered factors such as living costs, employment hope, salary upon graduation, students' satisfaction, social life, mental health and funding (Telegraph, 2013). Several researchers measure quality of student's university life by assessing the affective domain and cognitive domain (Robert & Clifton, 1992; Yu & Lee, 2008). Affective refers to the pleasantness experience in feelings, emotions and moods and perceived satisfaction on social interactions or attitude (Robert & Clifton, 1992). Cognitive refers to satisfaction with basic human needs and are more judgemental (Sirgy et. al, 2007; Cohen et. al, 2001; Deiner, 1985). Low (2000) assessed students' quality of university life based on what she termed as institutional performance and students' expectations.

Even though those studies varies in their definitions of quality, terminologies, dimensions, its compositions, as well as measurement standards, many agree that probing into students' perceptions on their university experiences is crucial in determining the students' quality of university life (Deiner, 1985; Roberts & Clifton, 1992; Low, 2000; Cohen et. al; Cha, 2003; Clifton et. al, 2004; Peng et. al, 2006; Michalos et. al, 2006; Sirgy et. al, 2007; Yu & Lee, 2008; Kurdip, 2010). In this case quality is assessed based on the difference between expectation and service performance or in other words, perceived value versus perceived performance, from the standpoint of the students. Yu & Lee (2008) refer to it as the perceived discrepancy between aspiration and achievement. Sirgy et. al (2007) conceptualized QUL as significantly and positively correlated to students' satisfaction with academic aspects and students' satisfaction with social aspects and in turn the two were characterised by satisfaction with university services and facilities. Yu & Lee (2008) extended Sirgy's model by conceptualizing QUL in terms of needs satisfaction and affect balance and confirmed Sirgy's finding that education services, administrative services and facilities positively influence QUL.

Roberts and Clifton (1992) who developed QoL measuring the affective domain of university students found that positive affect, negative affect, identity and professors have positive correlations with overall students' satisfaction. Cha (2003) found positive relationships between subjective well-being and personality constructs such as self-esteem, collective self-esteem, and optimism. Roberts and Clifton (1992) recounted from Levitz and Noel (1989) that students' perceptions of the quality of their university experiences have a significant impact on academic achievement. For instance Low (2000) and Chow (2005) found that the higher the CGPA the higher the level of student satisfaction. Chow also found strong relationship between QoL of students with relationships, friendships and living conditions.



With respect to gender, Low (2000) and Ren (2009) found that females generally have higher level of satisfaction than males.

## **Methodology**

The sample of this case study consisted of 969 undergraduate students from University Teknologi MARA (UiTM) in Shah Alam, Malaysia, having at least six months experience of life at campus selected at random from 12 faculties. In this study QUL is defined to be the overall feelings of satisfaction students experience with life at the university. Following that, QUL is characterised as a composite of the cognitive and affective domains. The affective domain refers to the overall feelings of satisfaction (Roberts and Clifton, 1992) and the cognitive domain refers to satisfaction of basic human needs (Yu & Lee, 2008). Measures on the affective domain were adopted and adapted from Roberts & Clifton (1992) where as measures on the cognitive domain were taken and adapted from Yu & Lee (2008).

The survey questionnaire comprised of four parts. Part I was used to gather demographic information about the respondents. The core of the survey instrument (Part II & Part III) involved a total of 122 items using Likert scales of 1 to 10 as in Appendix (Hamidah et. al, 2014). Part II involved a formative measure of the affective domain (1=strongly disagree to 10=strongly agree) which consisted of four dimensions namely positive affects, negative affects, interaction with students and interaction with lecturers. Part III captured the formative measure of cognitive domain (1=strongly dissatisfied to 10=strongly satisfied) which in turn comprised of satisfaction with components of (i) education services (lecturers, coursework) (ii) administrative services (admin office, academic office, library, healthcare, food, security/parking/transport, other campus services) and (iii) facilities (classroom, ICT, social, convenient, campus environment, housing). Part IV of the survey consisted of an open-ended questions used to gather additional area/matter worth attention. The overall index of reliability (Cronbach's Alpha) of the QUL questionnaire was 0.982. The reliability index for affective domain with 40 items was 0.936. The three components in cognitive domain have reliability index of 0.926 for education (9 items), 0.977 for administration (40 items) and 0.973 for facilities (33 items).

In analyzing the quantitative data, all the negative statements in affective domain (negative affect) were rescaled in reversed order. The scales were regrouped into three categories: less than 5 (Disagree/Dissatisfied), 5 to 7 (slightly Agree/Satisfied), greater than 7 (Agree/Satisfied). A few methods were employed to achieve the study objectives. Descriptive statistics of mean scores were used to assess student's satisfaction level. T-tests were used to investigate significant differences in the mean of academic performance and satisfaction scores between males and females.

## **Result and Discussions**

### **Respondents' profile**

The samples involved in this study were 67% female and 33% male with an average age of 22 years old. Most of them were the university residents, contributing 65% of the samples and the rest were the non-residents (35%). Basically, 45% keep their own transport such that 17% possessed a car and 28% possessed a motorcycle. In terms of academic performance, the average student's CGPA was 3.17. The average weekly contact hour for classes per week is 20 hours as in Table 1.

Table 1. The mean and standard deviation for CGPA, age and contact hours/week of students

Information	Sample size	Mean
Age	966	22
CGPA	790	3.17
Contact hour	815	20
Contact hour_CGPA		
<12	14	2.92
12 – 18	272	3.21
>19	524	3.16

### Analysis of students' satisfaction

For the affective domain, there were 40 items constructed to assess the students' feelings and emotions pertaining to their lives at the university. Generally, the students were slightly agreeable to the items with mean score of 6.44. The mean score indicates that students had slightly pleasant feeling and emotionally happy while living and studying in the university. Out of the four components in the affective domain, only negative-affect scored below 6.0 (Table 2). The other three components (positive-affect, interaction with lecturers, interactions with students) scored above 7.0. The finding implies that even though the students were fairly happy or satisfied, at the same time some of the students were worried and restless.

Table 2: Mean and standard deviation of affective domain

Affective	Component	mean	S.D.	Agreement	domain mean
	Affect_positive	7.39	1.07	agree	6.43 Slightly agree
	Affect_negative	5.49	1.57	Slightly agree	
	Affect_interaction_lecturer	7.18	1.27	agree	
	Affect_interaction_students	7.16	1.59	agree	

There were 26 items in the affective domain which the students agreed with (Table 3). Students were slightly agreed with 13 items and disagree with only one item.

Table 3: Distribution of items in affective domain

Mean score	< 5	5-7	>7
Agreement	disagre	slightly agree	agre
Item	22	1,3,4,7,8,12,15,16,18 21,26,32,37	2,5,6,9,10,11,13,14,17,1 20,23,24,25,27,28,29,30, 31,33,34,35,36,38,39,40
Total	1	13	26

The mean score for each item in affective domain is depicted in Table 4. Six items with score more than 8.0 were items 2, 11, 19, 20, 35 and 40. Item 2 “*I enjoy being myself*” was the highest mean with score of 8.26, followed by item 19 “*the things I learn are important to me*” with score of 8.17. Among the lowest in the rank with score less than 6.0 were item 3, 7, 15 and 16. Item 22 “I feel worried” was the lowest mean with score of 4.38 and the next lower item was “I feel restless” with score of 5.41.

Table 4: Mean score for items in affective domain

Item	Stateme	Mean	S.D.
1	I find it easy to get know other people.	6.81	1.70
2	I enjoy being myself.	8.26	1.68
3(-)	I feel depressed.	5.86	2.39
4	I really like to go to class every day.	6.85	1.96
5	I find that learning is a lot of fun.	7.15	1.75
6	Colleagues are very friendly.	7.41	1.73
7 (-)	I feel restless.	5.41	2.32
8	I am given the chance to do work that really	6.80	1.82
9	I feel important.	7.03	1.75
10	I learn to get along with other people.	7.57	1.52
11	I feel proud to be a student.	8.02	1.73
12	People look up to me.	6.76	1.77
13	Lecturer gives me the marks I deserve.	7.28	1.69
14	I am treated with respect.	7.37	1.60
15	People think a lot of me.	5.99	1.87
16 (-)	I get upset.	5.70	2.22
17	I feel proud of myself.	7.34	1.99
18	Lecturers listen to what I say.	6.64	1.81
19	The things I learn are important to me.	8.17	1.66
20	Mixing with other people helps me to understand	8.05	1.64
21	I am a success as a student.	7.00	1.78
22(-)	I feel worried.	4.38	2.30
23	Other student accepts me as I am.	7.55	1.63
24	I have learned to work hard.	7.94	1.62
25	Lecturers treat me fairly.	7.57	1.69
26	People care about what I think.	6.86	1.68
27	The things I am taught are worth-while learning.	7.45	1.65
28	Lecturers help me do my best.	7.80	1.63
29	I know how to cope with work.	7.27	1.59
30	I get on well with other students in my class.	7.62	1.60
31	I really get involved in my work.	7.62	1.54
32	Lecturers take a personal interest in helping me with	6.65	1.98
33	I have acquired skills that will be useful for me.	7.37	1.63
34	I achieve a satisfactory standard in my work.	7.09	1.59
35	The things I learn will help me in my life.	8.09	1.58
36	Lecturers are fair and just.	7.54	1.81
37(-)	I feel lonely.	6.09	2.81
38	I know I can do well enough to be successful.	7.85	1.67
39	I like studying here.	7.76	1.83
40	The work I do is good preparation for my future.	8.02	1.64
	Overall	6.44	0.96

Further investigation revealed that almost 63% of the students had a total of more than 19 contact hours weekly. This revealing fact may suggest that despite admitting what they learned were rewarding, on the other hand, there were things which bothered the students. The heavy workload could most likely have contributed to an unwarranted psychological effect and the students were worried about their academic achievement. As proposed by Selye (1974), there is a correlation between stress and CGPA. There might also be other elements from the cognitive components which could have interfered with the students' emotions.

Table 5 shows overall mean for cognitive domain is 6.71, which means students were *slightly satisfied* with their lives at the university. Among the attribute components in cognitive domain, education scored the highest with an overall mean score of 7.59 indicating that generally students were *satisfied* with the education services. Education services refer to satisfaction towards lecturers and satisfaction in regards to the courses they were taking. Academician scored the highest (7.79), suggesting that students were *satisfied* with their lecturers in terms of quality of teaching (including lecturer's communication skills, interactions in class and the use of technology) as well as satisfied with the value of courses (syllabus, overall course workload and level of course difficulty).

Mean for the overall administration was 6.46 indicating that students were *slightly satisfied*. Administration services include administrative and academic offices, library, healthcare, food, security, parking, transportation and on-campus activities. Students were satisfied with healthcare (7.29) and library services (7.34). However, security, parking and transportation (5.38) were the *least satisfied* in the administration items after other services (5.64) and food services (6.13). From the result it is obvious that transportation and parking are areas that should be looked into. Besides, as far as food is concerned, there are rooms for improvement.

Most students were *slightly satisfied* with overall facilities with a mean score of 6.36. Facilities being provided were classroom, the use of technology, services for social activities, prayer room, surrounding environment and housing (or in house residential services). Further analysis with respect to facilities indicates that students' satisfaction towards the classrooms was the highest (6.78) and for all the components in facilities, the students were *slightly satisfied*. In-depth analysis unveiled that students were unhappy with the convenient facilities (6.02). Through the open ended questions of the questionnaire, result suggests that some students were not happy with the prayer's room in certain faculties due to its size, specifically during Zohor prayer. This finding may suggest that the prayer's room is an aspect in facilities that needs immediate attention.

Table 5: Mean and standard deviation of QUL components

Cognitive	Components	Mean	S.D	Satisfaction	Overall Mean (satisfaction)
Education	Education_lecturer	7.79	1.27	satisfied	7.59 Satisfied
	Education_coursework	7.39	1.59	satisfied	
Administration	Admin_office	6.67	1.78	slightly	6.46 Slightly satisfied
	Admin_academic	6.79	1.75	slightly	
	Admin_library	7.34	1.51	satisfied	
	Admin_healthcare	7.29	1.90	satisfied	
	Admin_food	6.13	1.68	slightly	
	Admin_transport	5.38	2.04	slightly	
	Admin_other services	5.64	1.46	slightly	
Facilities	Facility_classroom	6.78	1.75	slightly	6.36 Slightly satisfied
	Facility_technology	6.12	1.72	slightly	
	Facility_social activities	6.55	1.87	slightly	
	Facility_convenient	6.02	1.83	slightly	
	Facility_environment	6.36	1.80	slightly	
	Facility_housing	6.30	1.86	slightly	
	Overall_mean	6.71	0.99	slightly satisfied	

### Comparison analysis between genders

The results of the t-test provide evidence that a *significant difference* in mean scores between male and female with respect to their *academic performance or CGPA* ( $p = 0.000$ ) with female having a higher CGPA mean score of 3.20 (Table 6). In-depth analysis reveals that there were no significant differences in the QUL mean scores between genders with respect to all the four main components of QUL except on facilities ( $p=0.014$ ). Further inspection on each individual item in the affective domain indicates that the female scored significantly higher mean than male in two items with the following statements, “*Lecturers treat me fairly*” ( $p=0.004$ ) and “*Other students accept me as I am*” ( $p=0.035$ ). The finding appears to suggest that female students were generally more satisfied with their lecturers than their male counterpart. In terms of facilities, female students appear to be less satisfied, with mean score of 6.28 compared to male students (6.52).

Table 6: Comparison of satisfaction and CGPA between genders

	FEMALE			MALE			t-test
	size	mean	S.D.	size	mean	S.D.	p-value
CGPA	650	3.20	0.347	318	3.00	0.359	0.000*
Affective	650	6.43	0.95	318	6.45	0.97	0.730
Education	650	7.56	1.27	318	7.63	1.31	0.438
Administration	650	6.42	1.33	318	6.53	1.42	0.287
Facilities	650	6.28	1.44	318	6.52	1.54	0.014*
OVERALL	650	6.67	0.97	318	6.79	1.04	0.109

## Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to investigate the QUL of students in one of the public university. In general, students were quite satisfied with their well-being and emotionally they were slightly happy with their lives. With respect to education aspects, most students were relatively satisfied with the quality of academicians since the rating of lecturers was the highest. Student's satisfaction with academicians and instruction is a strength that the university may wish to promote in an effort to attract more potential students.

In view of the administration services the results suggest that students were satisfied with healthcare and library management. Students were especially not satisfied with transportation and parking. Transportation is a factor deem problematic to some students especially non-residence and hence need urgent attention and improvement. Students who possessed own transport such as car complained of inconvenient parking and students who used public transport criticised on having to wait long period for certain buses at certain time. In this regards, perhaps the institution may implement in-house bus services which are more frequent and schedules be made available at many places for students to refer to. This study was consistent with (Kuldip, 2010) which found majority of UiTM students were more satisfied with their campus experience compared to resources. As far as facilities are concerned, the findings illustrate that overall and for each individual facility mentioned, students were slightly satisfied. These findings ascertain students' dissatisfaction especially on the facilities.

The increase concern in university's ranking has encouraged educational institutions to utilise a more customer oriented philosophy in delivering services. As mentioned by Low (2000), successful institution share three basic attributes: focus on the needs of the students, continually improve the quality of educational experience and use student satisfaction data to shape future directions. Hence, it is only imperative that educational institutions continually apply student-oriented principles to have better chance of satisfying the needs, wants and expectations of students effectively. This is a preliminary attempt of assessing QUL for the institution. This study was confined to a particular university and thus, future studies may want to include students from other universities as well. With regards to the affective domain, it may be timely to add more items or modify the items so that measurements on the spiritual aspects such as religion are also included.

## References

1. Cha, K.H. (2003). Subjective well-being among college students. *Social Indicators Research* 62(1), 455-477.
2. Chow, H.P.H. (2005). Life satisfaction among university students in a Canadian Prairie City: A multivariate analysis. *Social Indicators Research* 70(2), 139-150.
3. Clifton, R. A., Perry, R.P., Stubbs, C.A., Roberts, L.W. (2004). Faculty Environments, Psychosocial Dispositions and The academic achievement of college students. *Research in Higher Education* 45(8), 801-828.
4. Cohen, E.H., Clifton, R.A., Roberts, L.W. (2001). The cognitive domain of the quality of life of university students: A re-analysis of an instrument. *Social Indicators Research* 53(1), 63-77.
5. Diener, E., Emmons, R.A., Larsen, R.J., Griffin, S. (1985). The Satisfaction with life scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment* 49(1), 71-75.
6. Haron, H. et. al (2015). Determinants of quality of life and quality of university life in Malaysia public university. *AIP Conference Proceeding: 1643, 505-511*. doi:10.1063/1.4907486
7. Kuldip, S., Augustine, E. C. & Mahar S. B. S. (2010). Quality of University Life for UiTM students. 2010 International Conference on Science and Social Research (CSSR) 978-1-4244-8986-2/10 ©2010 IEEE
8. Low, L. (2000). *Are college students satisfied? A national analysis of changing expectations. New agenda series [TM]*. Indianapolis: USA Group Inc.
9. Maidinsah, H. et. al (2014). Quality of university life (QuL): A case study of Malay students. *Journal of Discovering Mathematics* (34)2, 15-21.
10. Michalos A.C. & Orlando, J.A. (2006). A note on student quality of life. *Social Indicators Research* 79, 51-59.
11. Nordenfelt, L. (1993). *Quality of life, health and happiness*. Vermont: Ashgate Publishing Company.
12. Nussbaum, M.C. & Sen., A.K. (1993). *The quality of life*. World Institute for Development Economics Research. Oxford (England): Clarendon Press.
13. Peng, P.J. & Abu Samah, A.J. (2006). Measuring students' satisfaction for quality education in Learning University. *UNITAR E-Journal* 2(1), January, 11-21. doi:10.1.1.512.7710
14. Ren, W. (2009). A research on the subject well-being of regional college students. *International Journal of Psychological Studies* 1(1), 51-53.
15. Roberts, L.W. & Clifton, R.A. (1992). Measuring the affective quality of life of university students: The validation of an instrument. *Social Indicators Research* 27(2), 113-137.
16. Seyle, H. (1974). *The Stress of life*. New York: Mc Graw Hill.
17. Sirgy, M.J., Grzeskowiak, S., Rahtz, D. (2007). Quality of college life (QCL) of students: Developing and validating a measure of well-being. *Social Indicators Research* 80(2), 343-360.
18. Telegraph (2013). *Top 10 universities for quality of student life*. [Online] Available: [Online] Available: [www.telegraph.co.uk/education/universityeducation/student-life](http://www.telegraph.co.uk/education/universityeducation/student-life) (Mac 30, 2016)
19. Yu, G. & Lee, D.J. (2008). A Model of quality of college life (QCL) of students in Korea. *Social Indicators Research* 87(2), 269-285.



<i>PART II</i>											
<b>Instruction:</b> Please circle at the appropriate response on the given scale regarding your level of agreement <b>1 = Strongly Disagree 10 = Strongly Agree</b>											
1.	I find it easy to get to know other people	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
2.	I enjoy being myself.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
3.	I feel depressed.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
4.	I really like to go to class everyday.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
5.	I find that learning is a lot of fun.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
6.	Colleagues are very friendly.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
7.	I feel restless.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
8.	I am given the chance to do work that really interests me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
9.	I feel important.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
10	I learn to get along with other people.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	I feel proud to be a student.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
12	People look up to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
13	Lecturers give me the marks I deserve.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
14	I am treated with respect.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
15	People think a lot of me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
16	I get upset.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
17	I feel proud of myself.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
18	Lecturers listen to what I say.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
19	The things I learn are important to me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
20	Mixing with other people helps me to understand myself.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
21	I am a success as a student.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
22	I feel worried.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
23	Other students accept me as I am.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
24	I have learned to work hard.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
25	Lecturers treat me fairly.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
26	People care about what I think.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
27	The things I am taught are worthwhile learning.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
28	Lecturers help me do my best.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
29	I know how to cope with work.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
30	I get on well with other students in my class.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
31	I really get involved in my work.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
32	Lecturers take a personal interest in helping me with my work.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
33	I have acquired skills that will be useful to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
34	I achieve a satisfactory standard in my work.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
35	The things I learn will help me in my life.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
36	Lecturers are fair and just.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
37	I feel lonely.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
38	I know I can do well enough to be successful.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
39	I like studying here.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
40	The work I do is good preparation for my future.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

<b>PART III</b>											
<b>Instruction:</b> Please circle at the appropriate response on the given scale regarding your level of satisfaction <b>1 = Very Dissatisfied</b> <b>10 = Very Satisfied</b>											
<b>A. SATISFACTION WITH EDUCATION SERVICES AT YOUR UNIVERSITY</b>											
<i>A-1: Academician</i>											
1)	Quality of teaching	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
2)	Accessibility of lecturers	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
3)	Lecturers knowledge of subject matter	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
4)	Interaction in the classroom	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
5)	Lecturers use of technology	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
6)	Lecturers communication skills	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
<i>A-2: Coursework</i>											
1)	Overall workload (lectures, tutorial, lab, assignment)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
2)	Level of difficulty	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
3)	Course content/ syllabus	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
<b>B. SATISFACTION WITH ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES AT YOUR UNIVERSITY</b>											
<i>B-1: Administrative Office</i>											
1)	Office overall	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
2)	Office staffs - faculty	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
3)	Office staffs - other places at your university	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
4)	Counter service - faculty	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
5)	Counter service - other places at your university	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
<i>B-2: Academic Office</i>											
1)	Office overall	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
2)	Office staffs - faculty	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
3)	Office staffs - other places at your university	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
4)	Counter service - faculty	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
5)	Counter service - other places at your university	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
<i>B-3: Library</i>											
1)	Library overall	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
2)	Library staff	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
3)	How the library is organized	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
4)	Library reference section	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
5)	Reserve desk	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
6)	Availability of materials	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

<i>B-4: Healthcare</i>											
1)	Overall healthcare services offered at your university	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
2)	The university medical centre atmosphere	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
<i>B-5: Food</i>											
1)	Food service - faculty	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
2)	Food service - other places at your university	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
3)	Quality of food - faculty	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
4)	Quality of food - other places at Your university	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
5)	Variety of food - faculty	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
6)	Variety of food - other places at your university	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
7)	On-campus eating facilities	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
8)	Convenience of on-campus fast food (i.e. grab and go)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
<i>B-6: Security, Parking and Transport</i>											
1)	Campus security overall	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
2)	The parking situation - faculty	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
3)	The parking situation - other places at your university	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
4)	The transportation service in/out campus	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
5)	The transportation service within campus	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
6)	Feeling safe walking around campus	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
<b>B-7: Other Services/ On Campus Activities</b>											
1)	Overall academic/social activities	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
2)	Activities organised by HEP	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
3)	Speaker series	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
4)	Sporting events	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
5)	Hostel organized activities	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
6)	University support of spiritual life (i.e. motivational talk)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
7)	On campus counselling services	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
8)	Theatre/Arts events	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
<b>C. SATISFACTION WITH FACILITIES AT Your university</b>											
<b>C-1: Classroom Environment</b>											
1)	Location	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
2)	Seating	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
3)	Proper lighting/acoustics	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
4)	Class size (number of students)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
5)	Classroom technology	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
6)	Classroom atmosphere	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

<b>C-2: Telecommunications and Technology</b>											
1)	Availability of the computer labs	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
2)	The quality of the computer systems/ labs	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
3)	Availability of printers	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
4)	The quality of the printers	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
5)	Availability of LCDs	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
6)	The quality of the LCDs	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
7)	Availability of wireless network	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
8)	Availability of Internet Café	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
9)	Availability of public telephone	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
10)	The quality of the public telephone	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
<b>C-3: Social Activity Facilities</b>											
1)	Sports Centre overall	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
2)	Student's Lounge overall (i.e. foyer)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
<b>C-4: Convenient Facilities</b>											
1)	Campus bookstore overall	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
2)	Campus bookstore hours of operation	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
3)	Stocking of books in store	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
4)	Availability of Prayer's room	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
5)	Water cooler outlets	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
6)	Auto teller machines (ATM)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
<b>C-5: Campus Environment</b>											
1)	The way the campus looks overall	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
2)	Location (geographic)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
3)	Distance from your family's home	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
4)	Population density	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
<b>C-6: Housing</b>											
1)	The quality of housing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
2)	Maintenance of housing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
3)	Security of housing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
4)	Location and convenience of housing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
5)	Housing availability	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

