



Capturing Stakeholder Needs: A Case Study About Satisfaction Survey Follow-Up in the University

Dwi Narullia¹, Dhika Maha Putri¹(✉), Fitri Purnamasari¹, and Mohd. Rizal Palil²

¹ Faculty of Economic, Universitas Negeri Malang, Malang, Indonesia
dhika.maha.fe@um.ac.id

² Faculty of Economics and Management, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Selangor, Malaysia

Abstract. This study aims to narrate stakeholder perceptions of the follow-up to university satisfaction survey results. Informants in this study are stakeholders at universities in Indonesia who have good ratings in public services, especially in terms of information disclosure. The research uses a qualitative method with a case study approach that utilizes primary data in interviews. Based on the study results, it can be seen that stakeholders have a positive perception of the satisfaction survey conducted by universities. The survey is considered sufficient to accommodate inputs and suggestions given by stakeholders. However, only a small percentage of stakeholders felt adequate follow-up or feedback on the satisfaction survey results. This is because stakeholders feel that there has been no significant change in management even though they have been given input through a satisfaction survey.

Keywords: University · Stakeholder · Satisfaction survey · Follow-up

1 Introduction

A company strives to provide the best service for its customers to establish closer relationships. Kotler et al. [1] describe several steps to find prospective customers, starting from looking for qualifications, approaches, presentations, and demonstrations, handling objections, closing, and follow-up. A study conducted by Hendriyani et al. [2] stated that entities that need customers must use a positive approach, look for hidden complaints from customers, ask customers to clarify complaints, consider complaints as opportunities to provide further information and turn complaints into reasons for further purchases. Furthermore, according to Kotler & Armstrong, the follow-up step is essential if the entity wants customers to feel satisfied and come back.

The concept of customer engagement also needs to be considered in retaining customers. Customer engagement is a marketing concept that increases customer value to produce more profitable relationships [3]. Customers who already have customer engagement will automatically perform marketing functions, such as communicating

their experiences to other customers [2]. Thus, if the customer experiences the impression of being satisfied with the entity's services, he may spread that impression to other potential customers.

The quality of this service is continuously improved to maintain or even increase customer satisfaction. The increased customer and stakeholders' satisfaction will improve the company's performance. Agencies from any sector will focus on retaining old customers and attracting new customers [4].

The education sector also needs to prioritize customer satisfaction in which the customers are the users of educational services [5]. Just as business institutions have consumers and investors as the main stakeholders, higher education institutions have students, lecturers, and education staff as the primary stakeholders [6, 7]. Educational institutions, such as universities, are non-profit service institutions that prioritize excellent service as their primary goal. In university, the main stakeholders are the academic community, including students, lecturers, and education staff. As with business in general, the relationship between universities and stakeholders must be maintained [8]. Several ways can be taken to determine the degree of satisfaction of service users at higher education institutions, including by distributing questionnaires/surveys electronically.

Stakeholder satisfaction surveys in higher education are the main agenda that must be carried out as a series of activities to improve higher education performance. It will describe the success of an institution in providing services to its stakeholders [9]. Many studies related to stakeholder satisfaction have been carried out, both on internal and external stakeholders of an educational institution [6, 9–24].

The survey alone cannot meet stakeholder needs if universities stop collecting it. The satisfaction survey must be followed up to meet the needs of stakeholders. The follow-up results of this satisfaction survey are an effort made by universities to improve the quality of services provided to their stakeholders that will affect university performance. The inputs and suggestions obtained from the survey results should be followed up by improving the management of higher education institutions. This study aims to narrate stakeholder perceptions of the follow-up results of the satisfaction survey conducted by universities.

2 Methods

This research uses a qualitative method with a case study approach that utilizes primary data in interviews. Informants in this study are stakeholders at universities in Indonesia who have good ratings in public services, especially in terms of information disclosure. The data were analyzed using several steps adapted to the theory of Miles & Huberman [25], data condensation, data display, and verification [25]. This model is expected to guide the delivery of research results related to stakeholder satisfaction. After the data has been collected, the research team selects, sorts, narrows, simplifies, summarizes, and transforms the data, referred to as the data condensation stage [26]. After that, the data will be used as narrative mapping material presented in the research results and discussion.

This study uses primary data by conducting in-depth interviews. Data collection methods require significant adjustments due to the Covid-19 pandemic. Research

resource persons consist of various elements representing the stakeholders of higher education institutions who are the object of research, namely (1) S (lecturer); (2) RC (student); (3) N (education staff); and (4) F (alumni). In addition to primary data, there are secondary data in studies related to stakeholder satisfaction, especially in higher education institutions. Combining primary and secondary data will produce a comprehensive picture of higher education's satisfaction.

The final step is to verify the study results using triangulation techniques. Triangulation is one of the techniques that researchers can apply to maximize the processing of qualitative data. The triangulation technique can be said as a technique of checking data reliability, and source triangulation is used in this study. The researcher compares the answers of an informant with other informants regarding the same question. Based on the triangulation results, the researchers reviewed the research data that had been collected and then turned it into one of the considerations in presenting the data.

3 Results

As a form of data mining, researchers conducted interviews with three main stakeholders from universities, namely students, lecturers, and education staff. Stakeholders are individuals and groups who can influence and be affected by the obtained strategic results that have enforceable claims on a firm's performance [27]. In the continuity of education in higher education, the existence of the main stakeholders is needed. Sustainability and success in an organization are very dependent on the stakeholder involved. When a crisis strikes the company organization, managing relationships with the stakeholders plays an important role. Error in managing relationships with stakeholders will negatively impact an organization/institution.

Unlike previous studies that have focused more on stakeholder satisfaction, we focus on the importance of satisfaction surveys and how these surveys are followed up. The writer divides the discussion section into two parts based on the research results.

3.1 Stakeholder Satisfaction Survey

Stakeholder satisfaction in an institution is highly dependent on how service quality meets or even exceeds stakeholder expectations. Therefore, how institutions provide services and how satisfaction surveys are conducted will largely determine their improvement in the future. One of the universities' efforts to remain competitive is consistently providing higher quality services than other universities. Service quality is an effort to fulfill needs coupled with the wishes of stakeholders and the accuracy of delivery methods to meet customer expectations and satisfaction [28]. Generally, service quality is known by comparing stakeholder expectations for the ideal service with the service they receive. If the service received or perceived is as expected, then the perceived service quality is excellent and satisfying. If the service received exceeds customer expectations, the service quality is perceived as ideal. Conversely, if the service received is lower than expected, the service quality is perceived as bad. Thus, whether or not the quality of service is good depends on the ability of the service provider to meet the expectations/interests of its customers.

On the other hand, the implementation of the satisfaction survey is in line with the Regulation of the Minister for Administrative Reform and Bureaucratic Reform (Permen PAN-RB) Number 14 of 2017 concerning Guidelines for Compiling a Community Satisfaction Survey for Public Service Providers. The regulation explains that public service providers are required to conduct a Community Satisfaction Survey periodically at least once a year [29]. A good satisfaction survey is a survey that can accommodate the aspirations of all stakeholders in an institution. For stakeholders, surveys are a means to convey criticism and suggestions for the institution's progress in the future.

“I think the current survey is very important for universities. Similar to business entities, universities must understand the needs of stakeholders. One of the survey functions is here” (Informant V).

“Through surveys, universities can find out the advantages and disadvantages of the services that have been provided. Thus the survey can encourage continuous improvement of the university itself” (Informant A).

Based on collecting data on several stakeholders, several types of surveys are most widely circulated and filled out. They tend to attract attention from university service providers and the stakeholders themselves. The surveys include a survey on the implementation of teaching and learning activities as well as a survey on the use of learning facilities, especially e-learning facilities.

“For satisfaction surveys, in general, we fill in 3 times a year. The survey is related to the teaching and learning process, services and infrastructure” (Informant Z).

Based on the interviews we have conducted, the average informant said that he was pretty satisfied with the question items in the satisfaction survey. The informants said that the satisfaction survey conducted by the university was sufficient to accommodate the aspirations and suggestions of the stakeholders.

“Basically, my aspirations have been sufficiently conveyed through the question items in the satisfaction survey. I think the survey is quite good” (Informant O).

3.2 Capturing Stakeholder Needs: Satisfaction Survey Follow-Up

From various opinions of research informants, the majority have stated that surveys conducted by universities have succeeded in accommodating their impressions and suggestions. However, the majority of the informants said there had been no adequate follow-up on the suggestions *given in the satisfaction survey* [30].

This condition is undoubtedly contrary to the theory of customer satisfaction, which states that “The customer can feel customer satisfaction after the customer uses the services or products offered by the company” [31]. After using it, the customer will be able to provide feedback about the product or service that is following the wishes or expectations of the customer. Satisfaction is a customer's short-term emotional reaction to the performance of certain services [32]. Customer satisfaction is a person's feelings of pleasure or disappointment that arise after comparing expectations with the reality

obtained. High satisfaction or pleasure creates an emotional bond with the brand or company in question.

Higher education stakeholders, in this case, were only asked to fill out a satisfaction survey but did not find the meaning of satisfaction itself because there was no real action from the input they had given.

“Survey is important, but the follow-up is more important” (Informant D).

“The survey will only become garbage in and garbage out if there is no real follow-up from the survey itself;” (Informant Y).

“Often, we find it useless to fill out surveys. It is useless to fill in if there is no real follow-up” (Informant C).

“It’s as if our suggestions and criticisms are just paper decorations if there is no adequate follow-up” (Informant W).

Certain survey results, such as the survey on lecturers teaching method, do not necessarily change the way the lecturers teach, even though there have been many criticisms. Criticisms and suggestions related to facilities and infrastructure are often not followed up if they are not conveyed directly and verbally. On the other hand, the absence of adequate publications related to the satisfaction survey results has resulted in a lack of follow-up results of the satisfaction survey that has been carried out.

4 Conclusion

To maintain the stability of stakeholder trust, universities, as one of the entities engaged in the service sector, must provide the best public services. Improving the quality of public services is important for institutions to gain better control over themselves. In addition, a service product must also pay attention to the quality it has, whether it is in accordance with the expectations and desires of the stakeholders. A satisfaction survey is one of the efforts to maintain and improve public services. The inputs and suggestions obtained from the survey results should be followed up by improving the management of higher education institutions.

The study results conclude that stakeholders positively perceive the satisfaction survey that higher education institutions have carried out. The survey is considered capable of being a place to accommodate input and suggestions from stakeholders. However, stakeholders expressed disappointment regarding the follow-up or feedback on the satisfaction survey results. This makes the stakeholders do not feel real satisfaction due to the lack of significant changes to the inputs that have been given.

References

1. Kotler, P., Armstrong, G., & Opresnik, M. (2018). *Principle of Marketing*. Pearson Education Limited.
2. Hendriyani, C., et al. (2020). Analysis of Whatsapp Business Usage in Encouraging Sales and. *J. Pemikir. dan Penelit. Adm. Bisnis dan Kewirausahaan*, 5(2), 193–200. <https://doi.org/10.24198/adbispeneur.v5i2.29171>

3. Chaffey, D., & Ellis-Chadwick, F. (2019). *Digital Marketing*. Pearson Education Limited.
4. Ugboma, C., Ogwude, I. C., Ugboma, O., & Nnadi, K. (2007). Service quality and satisfaction measurements in Nigerian ports: An exploration. *Maritime Policy & Management*, 34(4), 331–346. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03088830701539073>
5. Butt, B. Z., & Rehman, K. U. (2010). A study examining the students satisfaction in higher education. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2(2), 5446–5450. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.03.888>
6. Shi, W., Drzymalski, J., & Guo, J. (2014). Measuring college student satisfaction: Analyzing interactions among student attributes. In: *Proceedings of the Conference on Ind. Systems Engineering Research*.
7. Narullia, D., Putri, S. F., & Astuti, Y. W. (2019). Students' perceptions about satisfaction disclosure in higher education institution. *South East Asian Journal of Contemporary Business, Economics and Law*, 19 (5), 224–229.
8. Danjuma, I., & Rasli, A. (2012). Imperatives of service innovation and service quality for customer satisfaction: Perspective on higher education. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 40, 347–352. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.03.198>
9. Azoury, N., Daou, L., & EL Khoury, C. (2014). University image and its relationship to student satisfaction- case of the Middle Eastern private business schools. *International Strategic Management Review*, 2(1), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ism.2014.07.001>
10. Sukirman. (2009). Persepsi stakeholder sekolah terhadap tingkat kepentingan penyajian laporan keuangan. *Jurnal Din Akunt*, 1(2), 86–98. <https://doi.org/10.15294/jda.v1i2.1915>
11. Sembiring, M. G. (2015). Student satisfaction and persistence: Imperative features for retention in open and distance learning. *Asian Association of Open Universities Journal*, 10(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1108/aaouj-10-01-2015-b002>
12. Suprihatin, T. (2016). Kepuasan mahasiswa terhadap pembimbing akademik. *Proyeksi*, 11(1), 36–45. <https://doi.org/10.30659/jp.11.1.36-45>
13. Ariati, J. (2010). Subjective Well-being dan Kepuasan Kerja pada Staf Pengajar (Dosen) di Lingkungan Fakultas Psikologi Universitas Diponegoro. *Jurnal Psikologi Undip*, 8(2), 117–123. <https://doi.org/10.14710/jpu.8.2.117-123>
14. Awaluddin, M. (2016). Pengaruh Budaya Organisasi, Kepuasan dan Lingkungan Kerja terhadap Kinerja Dosen UIN Alauddin Makasar. *Assets*, 6(1), 116–125.
15. Hersusdadikawati, E. (2005). Pengaruh Kepuasan atas Gaji Terhadap Keinginan Untuk Berpindah Kerja, Dengan Komitmen Organisasional Sebagai Variabel Intervening (Studi empiris pada Dosen Akuntansi Perguruan Tinggi Swasta Jawa Tengah). *Journal of Study Management and Organisation*, 2(1), 85–110.
16. Sudiro, A. (2008). Pengaruh Komitmen Keorganisasian dan Kepuasan Kerja terhadap Kinerja Tenaga Edukatif/Dosen (Studi di Universitas Brawijaya Malang). *J Apl Manaj*, 7(1).
17. Sudiro, A. (2008). Pengaruh Timbal-Balik Antara Kepuasan Kerja Dengan Kepuasan Keluarga Dan Komitmen Kerja Serta Dampaknya Terhadap Prestasi Kerja Dan Karier Dosen. *Jurnal Manaj dan Kewirausahaan*, 10, 38–49. <https://doi.org/10.9744/jmk.10.1.pp.%2038-49>
18. Farida, S. I., Iqbal, M., & Kurniasih, A. (2016). Pengaruh Kepercayaan dan Komitmen Organisasi terhadap Motivasi dan Kepuasan Kerja. *Jurnal Kependidikan*, 46(1), 121–134. <https://doi.org/10.21831/jk.v46i1.9576>
19. Juliani, R. D., & Fatmasari, D. (2017). Kepuasan Dosen dan Tenaga Kependidikan terhadap Sistem dan Praktek Pengelolaan SDM. *Maj Ilm Inspiratif*, 2(4).
20. Motefakker, N. (2016). The study of the level of satisfaction of the students of the faculty of social sciences with Welfare Services of Imam Khomeini International University of Qazvin. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 36(16), 399–407. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s2212-5671\(16\)30052-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/s2212-5671(16)30052-1)

21. Alemu, A. M., & Cordier, J. (2017). Factors influencing international student satisfaction in Korean universities. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 57, 54–64. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2017.08.006>
22. El-Said, O. A., & Fathy, E. A. (2015). Assessing university students' satisfaction with on-campus cafeteria services. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 16, 318–324. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2015.09.006>
23. de Jager, J., & Gbadamosi, G. (2013). Predicting students' satisfaction through service quality in higher education. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 11(3), 107–118. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2013.09.001>
24. Punyanunt-Carter, N. M., De La Cruz, J. J., & Wrench, J. S. (2017). Investigating the relationships among college students' satisfaction, addiction, needs, communication apprehension, motives, and uses & gratifications with Snapchat. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 75, 870–875. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2017.06.034>
25. Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., Rohidi, T. R., & Mulyarto. (1992). *Analisis data kualitatif: buku sumber tentang metode baru*. UI-Press.
26. Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Method Sourcebook*. SAGE Publications Inc.
27. Hitt, M. A., Ireland, R. D., & Hoskisson, R. E. (2001). *Manajemen Strategis Daya Saing dan Globalisasi*. Salemba Empat.
28. Mustaffa, W. S. W., @ Hamid, M. H. A., Bing, K. W., & Rahman, R. A. (2016). Investigating the relationship among service quality, emotional satisfaction and favorable behavioral intentions in higher education service experience. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 224, 499–507. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.05.426>
29. Indonesia. (2017). Peraturan Menteri Pendayagunaan Aparatur Negara dan Reformasi Birokrasi tentang Pedoman Penyusunan Survei Kepuasan Masyarakat Unit Penyelenggara Pelayanan Publik.
30. Kotler, P., Maulana, A., Sabran, B., & Keller, K. L. (2009). *Manajemen Pemasaran* (13th edn). Erlangga.
31. Putri, K. I. N. S., & Nurcaya, I. N. (2011). *Pengaruh Dimensi Kualitas Pelayanan Jasa Terhadap Kepuasan Pelanggan Skin Centre Denpasar* (pp. 918–937).
32. Lovelock, C. H., Widyantoro, A., Samosir, M., & Wright, L. K. (2007). *Manajemen Pemasaran Jasa*. INDEKS.

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

