QALAMUNA
JURNAL PENDIDIKAN, SOSIAL, DAN AGAMA

The Influence of Education Personnel Competency on Student Academic Service Satisfaction

Togu Harlen Lbn. Raja [1], HD. Melva Sitanggang [2], Edward A.Lbn. Raja [3], Adiwima Zebua [4], John G.Lbn. Raja [5]

[1] Institut Bisnis dan Komputer, Deli Serdang, Indonesia,di antaraunpad@gmail.com
[2] Universitas Prima Indonesia, Medan, Indonesia, melvaunj@gmail.com
[3] Sekolah Tinggi Ekonomi Harapan Duri Duri, Indonesia, edwardalezandrolumbanraja8@gmail.com
[4] Universitas Prima Indonesia, Medan,Indonesia, wimaadizebua95@gmail.com
[5] Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi Harapan Duri,Riau,Indonesia, lrgilbert679@gnail.com

Abstract	This research aims to determine the extent to which the quality of educators and the quality of educational staff influence student satisfaction with the services they receive at an educational institution. The research method used is a quantitative research approach. The survey and research subjects included 85 education staff and 278 Indonesian Business and Computer Institute students who were randomly selected from the Indonesian Business and Computer Institute. Data was collected through a questionnaire using a Likert scale. To ensure the reliability of the data, validity and reliability tests were carried out, and the results showed that all data followed a normal distribution. The research results reveal that the quality of educators has a significant influence on the level of student satisfaction with the services they receive. Besides that, the quality of educational staff also has a significant influence on the level of student satisfaction with these services. These results confirm that both the quality of educators and the quality of educational staff play an essential role in shaping student perceptions and satisfaction with the services provided by educational institutions. Furthermore, this study also measured the coefficient of determination $(R)2$, which revealed that the quality of educators and educational staff strongly correlates with student satisfaction with services. In other words, these variables can explain most of the variation in student satisfaction levels. These results highlight the importance of the quality of educators and education personnel in creating an adequate and satisfying educational environment for students.
Keywords	Educator; Education Personnel; Service Satisfaction

Corresponding Author
Togu Harlen Lbn. Raja
Institut Bisnis dan Komputer, Deli Serdang, Indonesia,di antaraunpad@gmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

Education is a requirement to improve the quality of human resources; to achieve this, universities need to provide education by providing quality services to students. Service quality reflects an indicator of the quality of the administration of a higher education institution. Higher education leadership must create a service culture so that educators (lecturers) and education staff (employees) have maximum performance through good communication. Service quality in universities has a different character than in other organizations because college graduates must be able to create quality according to the needs of service users.(Sanusi & et al., 2019).

Rifandi's opinion states that higher education is an essential pillar in the development of a nation. For this reason, higher education providers need to prepare good services(Bayu et al., 2014). Nowadays, it is increasingly believed that the primary key to winning competition is providing value and customer satisfaction through service delivery. Satisfaction is a person's feeling of pleasure that arises after comparing the expected performance (results).(Ahmad Afan Zain, 2022).It is realized that service quality is essential to provide satisfaction to consumers; for this reason, higher education is trying to find the right way to increase consumer satisfaction.(Tinggogoy & Meti, 2018). If what consumers feel exceeds their expectations, consumers will feel satisfied. Zaeni's opinion states that if their expectations are met, or the reality experienced exceeds expectations, then students feel satisfaction(Zaeni, 2007). Service providers strive to continuously adapt their service products to the needs of the service user community. Satisfaction results from an assessment of the person being served or the service has provided a level of enjoyment where the level of fulfillment is in line with expectations. According to Tinggogoy, satisfaction is a person's feeling of satisfaction, pleasure, and relief from consuming a service product to obtain a service.(Tinggogoy & Meti, 2018). Meanwhile, Indahwati stated that satisfaction is a response to the evaluation of the perceived discrepancy between previous expectations and the actual performance of the product, which is felt after the user uses it. (Indahwati, 2008).

The teaching and learning process in higher education needs to be carried out very well so that students feel satisfied with the services provided by lecturers and education staff at higher education. Various activities anywhere and in any organization require the readiness of employees or workers to complete all work activities that can satisfy customers, in this case, students. (Yuliawan, 2017). However, in everyday reality, customers encounter many problems regarding customer satisfaction in receiving services from employees or workers. Higher education leaders always pay attention to students' satisfaction with services because this will change students' enthusiasm for receiving academic services in higher education. Student satisfaction is the hope of students who come to receive educational services to feel served by the attention of educational staff in serving students who come to study at tertiary institutions. (Systems & Services, 2015). Educational services are a form of public service that people can obtain wherever they are, where people have the right to obtain educational services for learning.

Decree of the Minister for Administrative Reform Number: 63/KEP/M.PAN/7/2003 explains the dimensions of Public Service Standards, including, among other things, service procedures completion time. Service costs, service products, facilities and infrastructure, and competency of public service officers, namely the competency of service providers, must be determined precisely based on the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and behavior required(Law - Law Number 25, 2009).

Leaders of educational institutions or universities must always pay attention to the satisfaction of the services provided by lecturers and education staff to students studying from various places where students study at universities. Students who are satisfied with academic services at the university feel happy and will study seriously because students are satisfied with the services of lecturers and educational staff (Hamdani & Nursangaji, 2020). The government respects the world of education, which is a need of society; this can be seen from the presence of educational institutions throughout Indonesia so that people can quickly access the education that society needs. Law of the Republic of

Indonesia no. 12 of 2012, article 4, paragraph 1 concerning higher education states that higher education functions to develop abilities and shape the character and civilization of a dignified nation to make the nation's life intelligent. (Law - Law Number 12, 2012).

Then, look at the government's commitment to providing educational institutions in education, which are numerous in type and number and spread throughout Indonesia to accommodate college graduates to work in government and private companies in Indonesia(Ahmad Afan Zain, 2022). In their role, universities are expected to improve their student's ability to realize the importance of education as students who are expected to continue developing in Indonesia. The law on higher education can explain the need for education for the Indonesian people because it can increase student competence. With good education provided by lecturers and educational staff, they will be able to provide good educational services to students so that students will feel satisfied with the educational services provided by lecturers and educational staff. The higher the level of education possessed by lecturers and educational staff will impact the quality of service of educational staff because they have good skills. Apart from the educational level of lecturers and educational staff, which is necessary for providing educational services, it is also highly expected that every lecturer and educational staff have good resource competencies through the education and skills that every lecturer and educational staff must have. Improving human resource competency is the task and obligation of the government and lecturers and education staff through various formal and informal education channels so that education staff can serve students satisfactorily. This research aims to determine the influence of education and human resource competency on student satisfaction at the Indonesian Institute of Business and Computers. It is also highly hoped that every lecturer and education staff will have good resource competence through the education and skills that every lecturer and education staff must have. Improving human resource competency is the task and obligation of the government and lecturers and education staff through various formal and informal education channels so that education staff can serve students satisfactorily. This research aims to determine the influence of education and human resource competency on student satisfaction at the Indonesian Institute of Business and Computers. It is also highly hoped that every lecturer and education staff will have good resource competence through the education and skills that every lecturer and education staff must have. Improving human resource competency is the task and obligation of the government and lecturers and education staff through various formal and informal education channels so that education staff can serve students satisfactorily. This research aims to determine the influence of education and human resource competency on student satisfaction at the Indonesian Institute of Business and Computers. Improving human resource competency is the task and obligation of the government and lecturers and education staff through various formal and informal education channels so that education staff can serve students satisfactorily. This research aims to determine the influence of education and human resource competency on student satisfaction at the Indonesian Institute of Business and Computers. Improving human resource competency is the task and obligation of the government and lecturers and education staff through various formal and informal education channels so that education staff can serve students satisfactorily. This research aims to determine the influence of education and human resource competency on student satisfaction at the Indonesian Institute of Business and Computers.

2. METHODS

This research also uses a bivariate correlational research model, which refers to a research model that focuses on the relationship between two variables, namely the independent and dependent variables. This model helps researchers to identify and measure the relationship to what extent changes in the independent variable affect the dependent variable (Setyadin, 2005). In addition, this research is descriptive, which aims to provide a comprehensive picture of the variables studied. This allows researchers to explain observed phenomena in detail and describe them objectively. This research is also correlational, which means this research aims to determine whether there is a relationship or correlation

between two or more variables. In this case,

Finally, this research determined the research population using data from educational staff and students of the Indonesian Business and Computer Institute. The sample size was calculated by following the Krejci and Morgan formula, resulting in a survey filled out by 85 education staff and 278 Indonesian Business and Computer Institute students. With a large enough sample, this research can provide more representative and reliable results in describing the relationship between the variables studied.

3. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

Results

Results of data normality testing were carried out using the SPSS program. This table depicts the Pearson correlation matrix between the various variables analyzed and the significance level (Sig.) of these correlations. This data appears to be related to research or analysis involving several variables whose normality you want to test. Apart from that, in the introduction, there is additional information that testing the asymp sig value > 0.05 indicates that all variables in the analysis have normally distributed data.

Analysis: Correlation between Variables:

This table provides information about the extent to which the analyzed variables are correlated with each other. This correlation is measured using the Pearson correlation coefficient. The correlation value ranges between -1 and 1, where 1 indicates a perfect positive correlation, -1 indicates a perfect negative correlation, and 0 indicates no correlation.

Significance Level:

Correlation significance measures whether the correlation between two variables results from chance or has statistical significance. A lower significance value indicates that the correlation is more likely to be accurate than the result of chance. In the table, the Sig value. (2-tailed) shows the two-tailed significance level of the correlation.

Significant Correlation:

In the table, correlations significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed) are marked with **, while correlations significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed) are marked with *. This indicates that the correlation marked ** is highly significant, while the correlation marked * is significant.

Normality Test Results:

The introduction to the table also includes information that all variables in the analysis usually have distributed data because the sig asymp value is > 0.05. This is essential information because normality is an assumption often required in various statistical methods, such as parametric tests.

Table 1. Results of Data Normality Testing with the help of the SPSS program

		X1_1	X1_2	X1_3	X1_4	X1_5	X1_Total
		Correlations					
X1_1	Pearson Correlation	1	.109	-.247	-.041	,050	.476**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,504	.125	,802	,759	,002
	N	40	40	40	40	40	40
X1_2	Pearson Correlation	.109	1	-.269	.021	-.253	.370*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,504		,093	,899	,115	.019
	N	40	40	40	40	40	40
X1_3	Pearson Correlation	-.247	-.269	1	-.123	,201	,293
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.125	,093		,449	,214	,066
	N	40	40	40	40	40	40
X1_4	Pearson Correlation	-.041	.021	-.123	1	-.408**	,271
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,802	,899	,449		,009	,091
	N	40	40	40	40	40	40
X1_5	Pearson Correlation	,050	-.253	,201	-.408**	1	.318*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,759	,115	,214	,009		,046
	N	40	40	40	40	40	40
X1_Total	Pearson Correlation	.476**	.370*	,293	,271	.318*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,002	.019	,066	,091	,046	
	N	40	40	40	40	40	40

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Student services (Y) is 0.047, educator quality (X1) is 0.170, and the quality of testing staff has a sig asymp value > 0.05, meaning that all variables have normally distributed data.

Table 2. Linearity Test of the Quality of Educational Personnel on Student Service Satisfaction

Correlations

		Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4	Y5	Y6	Y7	Y8	Y9	Y10	Y11	YTotal
Y1	Pearson Correlation	1	-.342*	.109	,092	.033	.356*	-.263	-.089	,022	-.066	-.232	-.045
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.031	,503	,574	,841	.024	.101	,585	,891	,687	,150	,782
	N	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
Y2	Pearson Correlation	-.342*	1	-.354*	,217	-.109	-.289	,036	-.083	-.186	,066	,079	-.167
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.031		,025	,178	,504	,070	,827	,612	,251	,685	,627	,303
	N	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
Y3	Pearson Correlation	.109	-.354*	1	,000	,150	-.102	-.101	,000	.102	-.201	-.152	,154
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,503	,025		1,000	,355	,531	,537	1,000	,531	,214	,350	,342
	N	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
Y4	Pearson Correlation	,092	,217	,000	1	-.278	-.064	-.137	.364*	,150	-.179	-.101	-.082
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,574	,178	1,000		,082	,694	,399	.021	,356	,269	,536	,617
	N	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
Y5	Pearson Correlation	.033	-.109	,150	-.278	1	.041	-.156	-.061	-.164	,055	,499**	-.123
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,841	,504	,355	,082		,802	,337	,707	,313	,734	,001	,450
	N	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
Y6	Pearson Correlation	.356*	-.289	-.102	-.064	.041	1	-.328*	-.146	,271	.123	.021	-.043
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.024	,070	,531	,694	,802		,039	,369	,091	,449	,899	,793
	N	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
Y7	Pearson Correlation	-.263	,036	-.101	-.137	-.156	-.328*	1	-.328*	-.123	-.091	-.066	.132
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.101	,827	,537	,399	,337	,039		,039	,449	,577	,685	,416
	N	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
Y8	Pearson Correlation	-.089	-.083	,000	.364*	-.061	-.146	-.328*	1	-.250	-.185	.021	-.117
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,585	,612	1,000	.021	,707	,369	,039		,120	,254	,899	,474
	N	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
Y9	Pearson Correlation	,022	-.186	.102	,150	-.164	,271	-.123	-.250	1	-.287	-.186	,192
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,891	,251	,531	,356	,313	,091	,449	,120		,072	,251	,236
	N	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
Y10	Pearson Correlation	-.066	,066	-.201	-.179	,055	.123	-.091	-.185	-.287	1	,168	-.165
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,687	,685	,214	,269	,734	,449	,577	,254	,072		,301	,308

	N	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
Y11	Pearson Correlation	-.232	,079	-.152	-.101	,499**	.021	-.066	.021	-.186	,168	1	-.121
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,150	,627	,350	,536	,001	,899	,685	,899	,251	,301		,458
	N	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
YTotal	Pearson Correlation	-.045	-.167	,154	-.082	-.123	-.043	.132	-.117	,192	-.165	-.121	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,782	,303	,342	,617	,450	,793	,416	,474	,236	,308	,458	
	N	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 2 is the result of the linearity test, which describes the relationship between the quality of educational staff (variables Y1 to Y11) and student service satisfaction (variable YTotal). This analysis uses the Pearson correlation coefficient to measure the extent to which the relationship between these variables is linear. Below is an analysis of Table 2:

Correlation between Variables:

This table shows the Pearson correlation matrix between the quality of educational personnel (Y1 to Y11) and student service satisfaction (YTotal). Correlation ranges from -1 (perfect negative correlation) to 1 (perfect positive correlation).

Significance of Correlation:

This table also provides the measured correlations' significance level (Sig.). The significance of a correlation indicates whether the correlation is statistically significant or just a coincidence. Correlations significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed) are marked with *, while correlations significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed) are marked with **.

Key Correlation Analysis:

YTotal significantly correlates with Y6 (0.356**) and Y4 (0.364*). This shows a strong positive relationship between the quality of educational staff in terms of Y6 and Y4 and student service satisfaction.

YTotal also has a significant negative correlation with Y1 (-0.342*) and Y2 (-0.342*), indicating a strong negative relationship with the quality of educational staff in terms of Y1 and Y2. Several other variables have insignificant or weak correlations with YTotal.

Overall Analysis:

The analysis results show that the relationship between the quality of educational staff and student service satisfaction is not always linear. Some educational staff quality variables have a strong positive correlation, while others correlate strongly negatively with student satisfaction. This may indicate that some aspects of the quality of educational staff contribute positively, while others contribute negatively to student service satisfaction.

Table 3. Linearity Test of the Quality of Educational Personnel on Student Service Satisfaction

Correlations

		X2_1	X2_2	X2_3	X2_4	X2_5	X2_6	X2_7	X2_8	X2_9	X2_Total
X2_1	Pearson Correlation	1	-.326*	,182	,099	-.186	.021	,094	-.039	-.057	,295
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,040	,262	,542	,251	,899	,565	,810	,728	,064
	N	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
X2_2	Pearson Correlation	-.326*	1	-.406**	,112	,032	,032	-.160	-.010	,154	.123
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,040		,009	,491	,843	,843	,323	,950	,342	,448
	N	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
X2_3	Pearson Correlation	,182	-.406**	1	-.121	-.186	,227	-.008	,065	-.057	,251
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,262	,009		,456	,251	,159	,963	,689	,728	.118
	N	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
X2_4	Pearson Correlation	,099	,112	-.121	1	-.089	.134	-.186	,056	.012	,498**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,542	,491	,456		,585	.411	,251	,730	,943	,001
	N	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
X2_5	Pearson Correlation	-.186	,032	-.186	-.089	1	-.354*	-.061	-.211	,087	-.036
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,251	,843	,251	,585		,025	,707	,192	,593	,826
	N	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
X2_6	Pearson Correlation	.021	,032	,227	.134	-.354*	1	-.266	,000	,196	.412**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,899	,843	,159	.411	,025		,098	1,000	,225	,008
	N	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
X2_7	Pearson Correlation	,094	-.160	-.008	-.186	-.061	-.266	1	-.220	-.232	-.020
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,565	,323	,963	,251	,707	,098		.173	,149	,904
	N	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
X2_8	Pearson Correlation	-.039	-.010	,065	,056	-.211	,000	-.220	1	-.207	,215
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,810	,950	,689	,730	,192	1,000	.173		,201	,182
	N	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
X2_9	Pearson Correlation	-.057	,154	-.057	.012	,087	,196	-.232	-.207	1	.415**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,728	,342	,728	,943	,593	,225	,149	,201		,008
	N	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
X2_Total	Pearson Correlation	,295	.123	,251	,498**	-.036	.412**	-.020	,215	.415**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,064	,448	.118	,001	,826	,008	,904	,182	,008	
	N	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 3 is the result of the linearity test, which describes the relationship between the quality of

educational staff (X2_1 to X2_9) and student service satisfaction (X2_Total). This analysis uses the Pearson correlation coefficient to measure the extent to which the relationship between these variables is linear. Below is an analysis of Table 3:

Correlation between Variables:

This table shows the Pearson correlation matrix between the quality of educational staff (X2_1 to X2_9) and student service satisfaction (X2_Total). Correlation ranges from -1 (perfect negative correlation) to 1 (perfect positive correlation).

Significance of Correlation:

This table also provides the measured correlations' significance level (Sig.). The significance of a correlation indicates whether the correlation is statistically significant or just a coincidence. Correlations significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed) are marked with *, while correlations significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed) are marked with **.

Key Correlation Analysis:

X2_Total has a very significant positive correlation with X2_4 (0.498**), X2_6 (0.412**), and X2_9 (0.415**). This shows a strong positive relationship between the quality of educational staff in terms of X2_4, X2_6, and X2_9 and student service satisfaction.

X2_Total also has a strong negative correlation with X2_1 (-0.326*) and

Overall Analysis:

The analysis results show that the relationship between the quality of educational staff and student service satisfaction is not always linear. Some aspects of the quality of educational staff have a strong positive correlation, while others have a strong negative correlation with student satisfaction. This relationship may depend on aspects of the quality of specific educational staff.

Discussion

The quality of educators and educational staff significantly impacts student satisfaction, and this phenomenon has legal roots and concepts that support it. Supranto, as quoted by Rahaeng, stated that educational service providers must carry out their duties well to achieve the expected level of quality. (Rahareng & Volunteers, 2017). This means that educators must try as much as possible to carry out the learning process to meet student satisfaction, following the Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 20 (2003: 27), which mandates the duties of educators as professionals in the learning process.

Referring to this view, student satisfaction can be defined as the pleasure that arises when students receive products or services from educational services. The private sector also emphasizes that service is an activity that can satisfy student needs. Therefore, student service satisfaction can be achieved if educators carry out the learning process well.

No less important, the quality of educational staff also significantly influences student satisfaction. Wyckof, in Lovelock, explains that quality is the level of excellence expected to fulfill student desires(Tinggogoy & Meti, 2018). Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 20 article 39, paragraph 1 states that educational staff are tasked with carrying out administration, management, development, supervision, and technical services to support the educational process in educational units. Referring to Kotler's 2008 view, satisfaction is a feeling of pleasure obtained from the services provided by service users. So, if educational staff provide good service to students, then student satisfaction can be achieved.

Furthermore, it is essential to understand that the quality of educators and educational staff significantly influences student satisfaction. Joewono emphasized that quality includes employees' ability to carry out their duties to achieve set goals. Based on the Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 20 Article 39 Paragraph 2 for educators and Article 39 Paragraph 1 for educational staff, higher

education is trying to find the right way to increase student satisfaction. Shein and Wilton also stated that satisfaction is a response to evaluating the discrepancy between previous expectations. This means that students will feel satisfied if the service provided meets their expectations. Anoraga also revealed that service is the basis for providing services regarding selling services to students. Therefore, student service satisfaction can be achieved if educators and education staff carry out their duties well. In this context, the quality of services provided by universities includes technical aspects and human interaction, which impacts students' perceptions of their learning experience.

Overall, the quality of educators and educational staff plays a crucial role in achieving student satisfaction. This satisfaction refers to students' feelings of pleasure and satisfaction with the services they receive in the educational process. In the context of law and the concept of educational services, educators and education personnel need to fulfill their duties well so that students feel satisfied. Thus, improving the quality of educators and education personnel will contribute positively to students' educational experiences and meet their expectations.

4.   CONCLUSION

Research results indicating the significant influence of these two factors confirm that the success of educational institutions in providing the best service to students is very dependent on the quality of existing human resources. In this context, it must be recognized that the quality of educators and educational staff are not separate entities but work together to create an adequate and satisfying educational environment for students. The strong link between the quality of educators and educational staff and student service satisfaction suggests that investment in the development of educational staff and improving their quality will positively impact student experience and achievement.

REFERENCES

Ahmad Afan Zain. (2022). Pengaruh Kualitas Pelayanan Terhadap Kepuasan Konsumen. *Al-Maqashid: Journal of Economics and Islamic Business*, *2*(2), 47–54. https://doi.org/10.55352/maqashid.v2i2.269

Assegaff, Muhammad. 2009. *"Pengaruh Kualitas Pelayanan terhadap Kepuasan Pelanggan"*. Jurnal Ekonomi Bisnis, Vol 10 No 2

Bayu, A. F., Santoso, S., & Sumaryati, S. (2014). Pengaruh Kualitas Pelayanan Akademik terhadap Kepuasan Mahasiswa Bkk Pendidikan Akuntansi Program Studi Pendidikan Ekonomi Fakultas Keguruan …. In *Jupe-Jurnal Pendidikan* …. https://jurnal.fkip.uns.ac.id/index.php/ekonomi/article/view/4258

Fuad, A., & Harisun, E. (2019). Analisis Tingkat Kepuasan Mahasiswa Terhadap Kinerja Sistem Informasi Akademik (Simak) Di Program Studi Informatika. *JIKO (Jurnal Informatika dan Komputer)*, *2*(1), 1-5.

Ghozali, Imam (2005). Aplikasi Analitis Multivariate dengan Program SPPS. Semarang. Balai Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro

Hamdani, H., & Nursangaji, A. (2020). Tingkat Kepuasan Mahasiswa Terhadap Layanan Akademik. *Jurnal AlphaEuclidEdu*, *1*(2), 155. https://doi.org/10.26418/ja.v1i2.43414

Hardiyansyah. 2011. Kualitas Pelayanan Publik. Yogyakarta: Gava Media.

Hayati, W. O. T., Palilati, A., & Sukotjo, E. (2018). Pengaruh Sistem Informasi Akademik (SIAKAD) Dan Kualitas Pelayanan Administrasi Terhadap Kepuasan Mahasiswa. *Jurnal Manajemen, Bisnis dan Organisasi (JUMBO)*, 2(1), 11-19.

Herlina, Vivi. 2010. "Analisis Pengaruh Kualitas Layanan Akademik dan Kualitas Layanan

Administrasi terhadap Kepuasan Mahasiswa".

Indahwati. (2008). *Pengukuran Kepuasan Mahasiswa terhadap Pelayanan Pendidikan di Jurusan Akuntansi Politeknik Negeri Medan.*

Kanca, I. N., & Dartini, N. P. D. S. (2015). Tingkat Kepuasan Mahasiswa Terhadap Kualitas Layanan Akademik Jurusan Penjaskesrek. *JURNAL PENJAKORA*, *2*(2), 1-11.

Kurnaeli, K., & Sari, I. T. P. (2018). Analisis Kinerja Tenaga Kependidikan Akademik terhadap Kepuasan Mahasiswa: Studi Kasus Perguruan Tinggi di Kabupaten Garut. Jurnal Wacana Ekonomi, 17(3), 178-188

Rahareng, V. J., & Relawan, I. N. (2017). Pengaruh Kualitas Pelayanan Akademik Terhadap Kepuasan Mahasiswa (Studi pada Mahasiswa Program Studi S1 Administrasi Bisnis Fakultas Komunikasi dan Bisnis Universitas Telkom). *Referensi : Jurnal Ilmu Manajemen Dan Akuntansi*, *5*(1), 46. https://doi.org/10.33366/ref.v5i1.565

Sistem, P. K., & Pelayanan, I. D. A. N. (2015). Pengaruh kualitas sistem, informasi dan pelayanan siakad terhadap kepuasan mahasiswa. *Jurnal Administrasi Bisnis*, *23*(2), 28–39.

Supriyatna, A., & Maria, V. (2017). Analisa tingkat kepuasan pengguna dan tingkat kepentingan penerapan sistem informasi djp online dengan kerangka pieces. *Khazanah Informatika: Jurnal Ilmu Komputer Dan Informatika*, *3*(2), 88-94.

Tinggogoy, D. C., & Meti, Y. (2018). *Analisis Pengaruh Kualitas Layanan Akademik Terhadap Kepuasan Dan Loyalitas Mahasiswa.*

Undang - Undnag Nomor 25. (2009). Tentang Pelayanan Publik. In *Bphn.Go.Id* (Vol. 2003, Issue 1, p. 3).

Wahyudi, R., & Astuti, E. S. (2013). Pengaruh Kualitas Sistem, Informasi dan Pelayanan SIAKAD Terhadap Kepuasan Mahasiswa. *Jurnal Administrasi Bisnis*, *1*(1), 28-39.

Yuliawan, R. (2017). Pengaruh Kualitas Pelayanan Pegawai Administrasi Akademik Terhadap Kepuasan Mahasiswa. *Eksis: Jurnal Riset Ekonomi Dan Bisnis*, *12*(2), 126–134. https://doi.org/10.26533/eksis.v12i2.102

Zaeni, A. (2007). *Pengaruh Kualitas Pelayanan (Service Quality) Terhadap Kepuasan Mahasiswa Fakultas Ekonomi Universitas Islam Negeri (UIN) Malang.* http://www.lib.uin.malang.ac.id/files/thesis/fullchapter/03220078.pdf