Analysis of Student Satisfaction with School Administration Services

Achadi Budi Santosa

Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Yogyakarta, Indonesia; budi.santosa@mp.uad.ac.id

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT
	This study investigated students' satisfaction with administrative services at the Senior High School level in the Yogyakarta area. Using a quantitative descriptive approach, data were collected through a Likert-scale questionnaire distributed to 104 students and analyzed using descriptive statistics. The findings of the study indicated that the overall level of student satisfaction was categorized as "good," with a mean score of 3.4 and a dominant median value of 4 across 12 service indicators. Key service aspects, such as comfort of service space, adequacy of facilities, responsiveness, clarity of communication, empathy, and non-discrimination, received good ratings, although some indicators, particularly those related to complaint handling and physical comfort, needed improvement. This study highlights the importance of continuous improvement in service quality to meet students' expectations and strengthen the reputation of the institution. Future research is encouraged to adopt a longitudinal design to assess the sustainability of service improvements and explore the determinants of satisfaction in varying educational contexts. *This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-SA license.*

Corresponding Author:
Achadi Budi Santosa
Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Yogyakarta, Indonesia; budi.santosa@mp.uad.ac.id

1. INTRODUCTION

Education is a mandatory right of citizens as regulated in the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia.. Education is not only in formal schools, but also non-formal. Such as life skills education, early childhood education, youth education, women's empowerment education, literacy education, skills education, job training, equivalency education, etc.(Johnson & Majewska, 2022; Kicherova & Trifonova, 2023). Non-formal education aims to develop students' abilities outside of formal education. In addition to education that is mandatory for the community, services in educational institutions are no less important. Currently, many schools only prioritize accepting new students (PPDB) without thinking about services for school residents. The fulfillment of the rights of others in the form of services must also be a concern and needs to be improved both in terms of quality and quantity(Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2021; Nwankpa, Agabi, & Osaat, 2023).

Efforts to improve the quality and quantity of services are certainly related to the human resources owned by the service unit. Service quality is always associated with satisfaction, which creates

satisfaction value for customers(Afthanorhan, Awang, Rashid, Foziah, & Ghazali, 2019; Dam & Dam, 2021). The dimensions that are the focus of service quality include 1) reliability, 2) responsiveness, 3) assurance, 4) empathy, and 5) physical evidence (Poniman & Kusmardi, 2010). Quality is one of the important issues that need serious attention in running an organization or institution (Udiutomo, 2011). In any institution, the quality of service must be prioritized. "…*Customer satisfaction incentive schemes are increasingly common in a variety of industries. We offer explanations as to how and when incenting employees on customer satisfaction is profitable and offer several recommendations for improving upon current practice*" (Hauser et al., 2007).

According to research conducted by Khusaeni (2016), the higher the quality of service, the higher the student satisfaction. High service, facilities, and performance can provide a sense of satisfaction to students. Satisfaction can also be said as an alternative chosen to advance or evaluate an institution. On the other hand, Nyoman & Puspaningsih (2007) stated that the level of satisfaction can be influenced by four aspects, namely: 1) empathy towards customers, 2) speed in handling complaints, 3) fairness or justice in solving problems or complaints, and 4) ease for consumers to contact the institution. Meanwhile, according to Irawan & Japarianto (2013) satisfaction has a meaning that comes from the Latin words "satin" (good enough satisfied) and "facio" (to do or make). In simple terms, it can be interpreted as an effort to fulfill something. According to him, satisfaction is a level of feeling after comparing perceived performance with expectations.

"….Customer satisfaction is becoming an increasingly salient topic in many firms and in academic research. One main rationale behind this interest is that customer satisfaction is believed to be associated with fruitful customer behavior from the firm's point of view"(Chi & Gursoy, 2009).

In the world of education, service quality is also prioritized because, currently, educational institutions are also promising businesses. Not only in the form of schools, in the world of education, there are also tutoring institutions that promise quality of service to customers. Educational institutions currently provide hope to consumers in terms of hobbies owned by prospective consumers (prospective students). Therefore, the school's superior programs to attract the power and interest of consumers (students). Educational institutions must be able to provide and organize the best service to their customers (students) so that they can improve the quality of life through the education provided. According to Rahmawati (2013), service is a factor that influences customer satisfaction, which includes three things: punctuality of promise (commitment), closeness to customers, and ability to help customers. Students are the main customers in educational institutions, both elementary and secondary. Students can be said to be customers with a level of service satisfaction before entering and after becoming output so that the satisfaction of the service can be dedicated and promoted to the closest residents of the daily environment about the best service at the school. The main priority for assessing an institution is in service so that customers can experience after becoming an output or after school, so that maximum satisfaction value is created. Satisfaction can be said to be the level of emotional satisfaction of the self given by an institution. According to Kotler et al.(1999; 2001), stated that satisfaction is a feeling of pleasure or disappointment that arises after comparing the perception/impression of the performance (result) of an expectation.

Previous research generally discusses the satisfaction of school administration services to the community(Suarga, 2017; Zakhiroh, 2017), efforts to achieve satisfaction with school administration services (Rinaldi, 2012; Silvia, 2018), and factors inhibiting satisfaction with administrative services (Along, 2020; Bahari, 2020). Research on satisfaction with school administrative services is important to measure the level of satisfaction with services, such as facilities, satisfaction with teaching staff, and administration at the school.

2. METHODS

This type of research uses quantitative description. Quantitative descriptive measures between two or more variables that describe the nature or characteristics of the research object through data collection and data analysis(Duncan, 1992). The instrument used is a questionnaire with a Likert scale

of 1 to 5 (from very bad to very good). The population used was students of SMAN 2 Ngaglik, Sleman, Yogyakarta. The sample used was a class of class XI students consisting of 5 classes, using random sampling in distributing the questionnaire. As stated by Dubey & Kothari (2022) the most practical way of sampling is to select each item on the list. This type of sampling is known as systematic sampling. The element of randomness is introduced into this type of sampling by using random numbers to select the unit to be used as a starting point. This study uses simple random sampling because sampling can be estimated. Because we can determine the number of respondents randomly without having to be bound by the instrument. If the distribution of instruments to respondents cannot be forced, then it is better to use random sampling(Lavrakas et al., 2019; Raifman, DeVost, Digitale, Chen, & Morris, 2022). In distributing the questionnaire using google form to make it easy to distribute and obtain the latest data. The data analysis technique in this study uses descriptive statistics (frequency, mean, and standard deviation).

According to Denis, (2021) descriptive statistics describe data that is numerical in nature. We can categorize it based on the number of variables involved: univariate, bivariate, or multivariate (for one, two, and three or more variables. Data Analysis with Frequency Distribution according to Syamsuar (2017) is data whose presentation form can provide useful information. In its implementation, there are three main stages of activity in frequency distribution: 1) Data sorting (Sorting): sorting raw data from lowest to highest value. 2) Determining data class (Grouping): creating a class where raw data will be grouped based on its class. 3) Data calculation (Counting): calculating the number of observations or the amount of raw data that will be entered into each Class to be determined. They found the results of the frequency distribution using the SPSS program. All questionnaire data were entered into the SPSS program. Further analysis identified questions and analyzed the Frequency Distribution.

3. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Of the total 105 respondents involved in this study, 50 people or 47.6% were male, while the other 54 people, or 51.4% were female. This division aims to provide a clearer picture of the demographic characteristics of the respondents so that data analysis can be carried out in more depth by considering the differences between the groups. This frequency distribution is also an initial step in understanding the response patterns of each group.

Table 1. Frequency Distribution

Gender	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid				
Man	50	47.6	47.6	48.6
Woman	54	51.4	51.4	100.0
Total	105	100.0	100.0	

Based on the results of the analysis, an average value (mean) of 3.4 was obtained. This value shows that, in general, students are quite in agreement with various aspects of the services provided by the school. The aspects assessed include administrative services, satisfaction in the learning process, available classroom facilities, and the performance of educators. These results provide an overview that SMAN 2 Ngaglik, Sleman, has been able to meet student expectations in providing educational services, although there is still room for further improvement in several aspects.

Table 2. Descriptive Analysis Table of Student Satisfaction Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Q1	104	1.00	5.00	3.0192	1.17400
Q2	104	1.00	5.00	3.4327	1.26002
Q3	104	1.00	5.00	3.4038	.87599
Q4	104	1.00	5.00	3.8077	.96619
Q5	104	1.00	5.00	3.7019	.97423
Q6	104	1.00	5.00	3.4904	1.14056
Q7	104	1.00	5.00	3.0288	1.07448
Q8	104	1.00	5.00	3.6635	1.00107
Q9	104	1.00	5.00	3.3942	.86370
Q10	104	1.00	5.00	3.7885	1.12062
Q11	104	1.00	5.00	3.8077	.96619
Q12	104	2.00	5.00	3.7500	.79745
Valid N (listwise)	104				

From the data above, the N value or sample of 104 respondents was obtained. The average mean value was 3.4, which indicated a fairly agreeable attitude towards the satisfaction of services provided at the school. Especially administrative services, satisfaction during learning, satisfaction with classroom facilities, and satisfaction with educators.

Table 3. Median Results of Respondents' Answers.

Nomor	Median	Responden	Presentase	Rata-rata
Q1	Point 4	35	33,3%	Baik
Q2	Point 3	29	27,8%	Cukup Baik
Q3	Point 4	45	42,9%	Baik
Q4	Point 4	42	40%	Baik
Q5	Point 4	48	45,7%	Baik
Q6	Point 3	35	33.3%	Cukup Baik
Q7	Point 3	33	29,5%	Cukup Baik
Q8	Point 4	46	43,8%	Baik
Q9	Point 4	44	41,9%	Baik
Q10	Point 4	46	43,8%	Baik
Q11	Point 4	42	40%	Baik
Q12	Point 4	53	50,5%	Baik

The table above shows that the indicators of administrative services in schools are in the good category, as indicated by the average median value for items Q1 to Q12 of 4. This condition shows that most respondents gave a positive assessment of the quality of administrative services provided by the school. However, the good quality of service needs to be maintained and improved continuously. Efforts to improve services are a must, especially to support the progress of the school and provide a positive impression to prospective new students who will continue their education from junior high school to high school. The data in the table also shows that most respondents tend to choose the number 4 on the assessment scale, which further confirms that the quality of administrative services in this school is at a satisfactory level. The results of the analysis of the frequency distribution tables are explained in the following tables:

1) Comfort of the Administrative Service Room

Table 4. Frequency Distribution Results of Q1

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	13	12.5	12.5	12.5
	2	23	22.1	22.1	34.6
	3	25	24.0	24.0	58.7
	4	35	33.7	33.7	92.3
	5	8	7.7	7.7	100.0
	Total	104	100.0	100.0	

This shows that school comfort as many as 13 respondents chose very bad reaching 12.5%, choosing bad as many as 23 respondents as many as 22.1%, choosing quite good as many as 25 respondents as many as 24%, choosing good as many as 35 respondents as many as 33.7%, and choosing very good as many as 8 respondents as many as 7.7%. This means that the comfort of the administrative service room in the school is quite good.

2) Feeling the Comfort of the School Facilities

Table 5. Frequency Distribution Results of Q2

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	10	9.6	9.6	9.6
	2	13	12.5	12.5	22.1
	3	29	27.9	27.9	50.0
	4	26	25.0	25.0	75.0
	5	26	25.0	25.0	100.0
	Total	104	100.0	100.0	

The following data shows that the level of comfort of school facilities varies among respondents. As many as 10 respondents (9.6%) rated the comfort of the facilities as very poor, 13 respondents (12%) rated it poor, 29 respondents (27.9%) rated it quite good, 26 respondents (25%) rated it good, and 26 respondents (25%) rated it very good. These results indicate that the majority of assessments are in the fairly good category, which shows that although school facilities have met the comfort standards for most respondents, further improvements are still needed to achieve a more optimal level of comfort.

3) Principal Service

Table 6. Frequency Distribution Results of Q3

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	3	2.9	2.9	2.9
	2	11	10.6	10.6	13.5
	3	38	36.5	36.5	50.0
	4	45	43.3	43.3	93.3
	5	7	6.7	6.7	100.0
	Total	104	100.0	100.0	

The table above shows that related to the level of principal service, there are 3 respondents who consider it very bad, reaching 2.9%, 11 respondents feel bad, reaching 10.6%, 38 respondents feel quite good, reaching 36.5%, 45 respondents feel good, reaching 43.3%, and 7 respondents feel very good, reaching 6.7%. So the highest value, namely 43.3%, feels that the principal's service is good.

4) School Responsiveness.

Table 7. Frequency Distribution Results of Q4

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	1	1.0	1.0	1.0
	2	10	9.6	9.6	10.6
	3	24	23.1	23.1	33.7
	4	42	40.4	40.4	74.0
	5	27	26.0	26.0	100.0
	Total	104	100.0	100.0	

At this point shows that the school's responsive attitude 1 respondent felt very bad, reaching 1%, 10 respondents felt bad, reaching 9.6%, 24 respondents felt quite good, reaching 23.1%, 42 respondents felt good, reaching 40.4%, and 27 respondents felt very good, reaching 26%. The highest value, namely 43.3%, felt the principal's service was good.

5) School Officers/staff are Polite when serving.

Table 8. Frequency Distribution Results of Q5

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	3	2.9	2.9	2.9
	2	9	8.7	8.7	11.5
	3	24	23.1	23.1	34.6
	4	48	46.2	46.2	80.8
	5	20	19.2	19.2	100.0
	Total	104	100.0	100.0	

The table shows that the attitude of the school officers/staff is polite when serving students, 3 responses feel very bad reaching 2.9%, 9 respondents feel bad reaching 8.7%, 24 respondents feel quite good reaching 23.1%, 48 respondents feel good reaching 46.2% and 20 respondents feel very good reaching 19.2%. It can be concluded that the school officers/staff are polite to students.

6)   Staff and School Committee communicate in easy-to-understand language.

Table 9. Frequency Distribution Results of Q6

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	5	4.8	4.8	4.8
	2	14	13.5	13.5	18.3
	3	35	33.7	33.7	51.9
	4	25	24.0	24.0	76.0
	5	25	24.0	24.0	100.0
	Total	104	100.0	100.0	

The data above shows that 5 respondents felt that it was very bad, reaching 4.8%, 14 respondents felt that it was not good, reaching 13.5%, 35 respondents felt quite good, 25 respondents felt good, reaching 24%, and 25 respondents felt very good, reaching 24%. So it can be concluded that the staff and school committee communicate in a language that is easy to understand.

7)   The School Can Follow Up On Student Complaints.

Table 10.   Frequency Distribution Results of Q7

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	9	8.7	8.7	8.7
	2	24	23.1	23.1	31.7
	3	33	31.7	31.7	63.5
	4	31	29.8	29.8	93.3
	5	7	6.7	6.7	100.0
	Total	104	100.0	100.0	

At this point, it shows that 9 respondents feel very bad, reaching 8.7%, 24 respondents feel bad, reaching 23.1%, 33 respondents feel quite good, reaching 31.7%, 31 respondents feel good, reaching 29.8%, and 7 respondents feel very good, reaching 6.7%. This situation shows that schools still need to improve their efforts in understanding and following up on student complaints.

8)   Consistent in Service

Table 11.   Frequency Distribution Results of Q8

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	3	2.9	2.9	2.9
	2	11	10.6	10.6	13.5
	3	24	23.1	23.1	36.5
	4	46	44.2	44.2	80.8
	5	20	19.2	19.2	100.0
	Total	104	100.0	100.0	

The table above shows data that 3 respondents felt very bad, reaching 1.9%, 11 respondents felt bad, reaching 10.6%, 24 respondents felt quite good, reaching 23.1%, 46 respondents felt good, reaching 44.2%, and 20 respondents felt very good, reaching 19.2%. It can be concluded that consistency in service has a good value.

9)   The School is Very Friendly and Caring

Table 12.   Frequency Distribution Results of Q9

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	2	1.9	1.9	1.9
	2	13	12.5	12.5	14.4
	3	38	36.5	36.5	51.0
	4	44	42.3	42.3	93.3
	5	7	6.7	6.7	100.0
	Total	104	100.0	100.0	

The table shows that the data of 2 respondents felt very bad, reaching 1.9%, 13 respondents felt bad, reaching 12.5%, 38 respondents felt quite good, reaching 36.5%, 44 respondents felt good, reaching 42.3%, and 7 respondents felt very good, reaching 6.7%. The school is very friendly and caring the results of the majority of respondents are good.

10) Fast and Responsive

Table 13.   Frequency Distribution Results of Q10

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	5	4.8	4.8	4.8
	2	12	11.5	11.5	16.3
	3	12	11.5	11.5	27.9
	4	46	44.2	44.2	72.1
	5	29	27.9	27.9	100.0
	Total	104	100.0	100.0	

At this point, it shows that the data of 5 respondents felt very bad, reaching 4.8%, 12 respondents felt bad, reaching 11.5%, 12 respondents felt quite good, reaching 11.5%, 46 respondents felt good, reaching 44.2%, and 29 respondents felt very good, reaching 27.9%. Shows that the fast and responsive response is good.

11)   Patient in Serving Students

Table 14.   Frequency Distribution Results of Q11

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	1	1.0	1.0	1.0
	2	10	9.6	9.6	10.6
	3	24	23.1	23.1	33.7
	4	42	40.4	40.4	74.0
	5	27	26.0	26.0	100.0
	Total	104	100.0	100.0	

The table above shows that 1 respondent felt very bad, reaching 1%, 10 respondents felt bad, reaching 9.6%, 24 respondents felt quite good, reaching 23.1%, 42 respondents felt good, reaching 40.4%, and 27 respondents felt very good, reaching 26%. This means that being patient in serving students is good.

12)   Not Discriminating in Serving

Table 15. Frequency Distribution Results of Q12

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2	7	6.7	6.7	6.7
	3	28	26.9	26.9	33.7
	4	53	51.0	51.0	84.6
	5	16	15.4	15.4	100.0
	Total	104	100.0	100.0	

The data in the table shows that 7 respondents who felt bad reached 6.7%, 28 respondents who felt quite good reached 26.9%, 53 respondents who felt good reached 51%, and 16 respondents felt very good reached 15.4%. It can be concluded that the service does not differentiate between good and bad.

Overview of Student Satisfaction

The results of this study indicate that student satisfaction with administrative services at school is in the good category, as indicated by the average median value of items Q1 to Q12 of 4. This condition indicates that most respondents gave a positive assessment of the quality of administrative services provided by the school. However, the quality of service that is already good needs to be maintained and improved continuously. Efforts to improve services are a must, especially to support the progress of the school and provide a positive impression to prospective new students who will continue their education at this school. The data in the table also shows that most respondents tend to choose the number 4 on the assessment scale, which further confirms that the quality of administrative services at this school is at a satisfactory level. Ngaglik Sleman is generally classified as good, evidenced by an

average mean score of 3.4 and a dominant median score of 4 across most service dimensions. These results corroborate prior studies emphasizing the significant role administrative services play in shaping students' perceptions of institutional quality (Sohail & Hasan, 2021). Furthermore, the balanced gender composition among respondents—47.6% male and 51.4% female—strengthens the reliability and generalizability of the findings, consistent with assertions made by Papadopoulou et al.(2019), regarding the importance of demographic balance in satisfaction research.

Administrative Service Quality

Regarding administrative service quality, aspects such as service room comfort (Q1) and facility adequacy (Q2) revealed moderate to good levels of student satisfaction. This observation aligns with the SERVQUAL framework, which posits that tangible elements—such as physical facilities, equipment, and the appearance of personnel—are critical determinants of customer satisfaction in service-oriented organizations, including educational institutions (Aboubakr & Bayoumy, 2022); Twum & Peprah, 2020). Although 33.7% of respondents rated service room comfort as "good" and 7.7% as "very good," a significant proportion (34.6%) rated it "poor" to "very poor," signaling an urgent need for facility improvements. Similarly, while 50% rated overall school facilities positively, approximately 22% expressed dissatisfaction, emphasizing the necessity for infrastructural enhancements to foster student engagement (Sökmen, 2021).

Principal and Staff Services

The evaluation of principal (Q3) and school staff (Q5) services yielded favorable outcomes, with over 40% of students rating these services as "good" or better. This supports previous findings suggesting a strong correlation between leadership responsiveness and institutional satisfaction(Nazareno, n.d.2024) Specifically, 43.3% of students rated the principal's service as "good," although 13.5% rated it "poor" or "very poor," indicating a degree of inconsistency in leadership practices. Concerning staff politeness, 46.2% of students evaluated it as "good" and 19.2% as "very good." These results are consistent with the research of Goss (2023), who emphasized that school culture is predominantly shaped by the behaviors and attitudes of staff toward students.

Communication and Responsiveness

In the dimensions related to communication clarity and responsiveness (Q6–Q8), the majority of median scores ranged between 3 ("fairly good") and 4 ("good"), indicating moderate performance. Alshurideh et al.(2022); Musa & Yunus, n.d.(2023) assert that transparent and consistent communication practices are essential for achieving high levels of service satisfaction. Nevertheless, only 24% of students rated communication clarity (Q6) as "very good," and approximately 32% assessed complaint handling (Q7) as merely "fairly good." These findings suggest that improvements in complaint management are imperative, aligning with service recovery standards proposed by Bureau (2018); and Msosa (2022).

Emotional Aspects and Recommendations for Improvement

The emotional dimensions of service, including friendliness (Q9), patience (Q11), and non-discrimination (Q12), received highly favorable assessments. Approximately 42.3% of students rated friendliness as "good," 40.4% rated patience similarly, and 51% perceived services as non-discriminatory, thereby aligning with UNESCO's standards on inclusive education practices (Kenny, McCoy, & O'Higgins Norman, 2023). Despite the overall positive evaluations, several key areas warrant attention: the enhancement of physical facilities to address divergent perceptions of comfort (Yong Jang

& Yeol Baek, 2024). The establishment of more effective complaint-handling mechanisms(Alex, 2023), and the implementation of standardized communication protocols to ensure consistency and clarity (Pingulkar et al., 2021).

4. CONCLUSION

This study affirms that administrative services at Ngaglik Senior High School, Sleman, are generally perceived positively by students, particularly in dimensions related to service quality, leadership responsiveness, communication clarity, and emotional engagement. Nevertheless, the findings also highlight critical areas requiring immediate attention, including the upgrading of physical facilities, the improvement of complaint handling mechanisms, and the enhancement of communication consistency. Addressing these areas will not only strengthen overall student satisfaction but also contribute significantly to the school's institutional reputation and educational quality. Future research may benefit from a longitudinal approach to assess the long-term impact of service improvements and to explore additional factors influencing student satisfaction across diverse educational contexts.

REFERENCES

Aboubakr, R. M., & Bayoumy, H. M. M. (2022). Evaluating educational service quality among dentistry and nursing students with the SERVQUAL model: A cross-sectional study. *Journal of Taibah University Medical Sciences*, *17*(4), 648–657.

Afthanorhan, A., Awang, Z., Rashid, N., Foziah, H., & Ghazali, P. (2019). Assessing the effects of service quality on customer satisfaction. *Management Science Letters*, *9*(1), 13–24.

Alex, A. O. I. (2023). An Automated and Robust Tertiary Institution Web-Based Student Complaint Management System. *International Research Journal of Innovations in Engineering and Technology (IRJIET)*, *7*(12), 110–124.

Along, A. (2020). Kualitas layanan administrasi akademik di Politeknik Negeri Pontianak. *Jurnal Ilmiah Administrasi Publik*, *6*(1), 94–99.

Alshurideh, M., Alrawabdeh, W., Al Kurdi, B., & Alzoubi, A. (2022). The impact of service quality and service transparency on customer satisfaction. *International Journal of Theory of Organization and Practice (IJTOP)*, *1*(1), 137–154.

Bahari, A. F. (2020). Analisis kualitas layanan dalam upaya meningkatkan kepuasan narapidana di Lapas Narkotika Kelas II A Pamekasan. *Jurnal Ilmu Hukum Dan Humaniora*, *7*(1), 84–102.

Bureau, E. (2018). *Guidelines for handling school complaints*.

Chi, C. G., & Gursoy, D. (2009). *International Journal of Hospitality Management Employee satisfaction , customer satisfaction , and financial performance : An empirical examination*. *28*, 245–253. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2008.08.003

Dam, S. M., & Dam, T. C. (2021). Relationships between service quality, brand image, customer satisfaction, and customer loyalty. *The Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business*, *8*(3), 585–593.

Denis, D. J. (2021). *Applied univariate, bivariate, and multivariate statistics: Understanding statistics for social and natural scientists, with applications in SPSS and R*. John Wiley & Sons.

Dubey, U. K. B., & Kothari, D. P. (2022). *Research methodology: Techniques and trends*. Chapman and Hall/CRC.

Duncan. (1992). Research Methodology. *Japanese Society of Biofeedback Research*, *19*, 463–466. https://doi.org/10.20595/jjbf.19.0_3

Goss, A. C. (2023). Culture shifts: The influence of organizational changes on staff culture & students' school experiences. *Thresholds in Education*, *46*(3), 515–533.

Hauser, J. R., Simester, D. I., Wernerfelt, B., Science, M., Autumn, N., Hauser, J. R., … Wernerfelt, A. N.

D. B. (2007). *Customer Satisfaction Incentives*. 13(4), 327–350.

Irawan, D., & Japarianto, E. (2013). Analisa Pengaruh Kualitas Produk Terhadap Loyalitas Melalui Kepuasan Sebagai Variabel Intervening Pada Pelanggan Restoran Por Kee Surabaya. *Jurnal Manajemen Pemasaran*, 1(2), 1–8.

Johnson, M., & Majewska, D. (2022). Formal, Non-Formal, and Informal Learning: What Are They, and How Can We Research Them? Research Report. *Cambridge University Press & Assessment*.

Kenny, N., McCoy, S., & O'Higgins Norman, J. (2023). A whole education approach to inclusive education: An integrated model to guide planning, policy, and provision. *Education Sciences*, 13(9), 959.

Khusaeni, A. (2016). Kepuasan Siswa dan Loyalitas Siswa (Studi Empirik di SMK Negeri Rembang , Pasuruan , Jawa Timur). *Jurnal Aplikasi Manajemen*, 14(36), 657–666.

Kicherova, M. N., & Trifonova, I. S. (2023). Non-formal education: The review of current studies. *Образование и Наука*, 25(2), 46–67.

Kotler, P. (1999). *Kotler on marketing: How to create, win, and dominate markets*. Simon and Schuster.

Kotler, P., Armstrong, G., Saunders, J., & Wong, V. (2001). Marketing in a changing world. *Underst. Bus.: Process*, 6, 69–90.

Lavrakas, P. J., Traugott, M. W., Kennedy, C., Holbrook, A. L., de Leeuw, E. D., & West, B. T. (2019). *Experimental methods in survey research: Techniques that combine random sampling with random assignment*. John Wiley & Sons.

Lunenburg, F. C., & Ornstein, A. (2021). *Educational administration: Concepts and practices*. Sage Publications.

Msosa, S. K. (2022). *Service failure and complaints management in higher education institutions.*

Musa, M., & Yunus, S. (n.d.). *The Effect of Ease of Access to Services and Transparency of Information on Population Service Satisfaction.*

Nazareno, A. T. (n.d.). *Leadership and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors in Public Schools*.

Nwankpa, L. E., Agabi, O. G., & Osaat, D. S. (2023). APPLICATION OF CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS ON STUDENT RIGHTS AND ENFORCEMENT IN SECONDARY SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION IN RIVERS STATE. *Human Rights*, 1(1).

Nyoman, N., & Puspaningsih, T. (2007). Analisis Faktor-Faktor Yang Mempengaruhi Kepuasan Pelanggan. *Buletin Studi Ekonomi*, 12(1), 9–28.

Papadopoulou, P., Hulthén, E., Bingerud, M., & Enelund, M. (2019). Gender differences in student satisfaction surveys. *The 15th International CDIO Conference*.

Pingulkar, C., Tirupati, K. K., Ganipaneni, S., Shrivastav, A., Vashishtha, S., & Jain, S. (2021). Developing Effective Communication Strategies for Multi-Team Solar Project Management. *International Journal of General Engineering and Technology (IJGET)*, 10(1), 307–326.

Poniman, B., & Kusmardi. (2010). *Terhadap Kepuasan Siswa Pada Sekolah Menengah Kejuruan Negeri 4 Klaten.*

Rahmawati, D. (2013). Analisis Faktor-Faktor Yang Mempengaruhi Kepuasan Mahasiswa. *Jurnal Economia*, 9(1), 52–65. https://doi.org/10.21831/economia.v9i1.1376

Raifman, S., DeVost, M. A., Digitale, J. C., Chen, Y.-H., & Morris, M. D. (2022). Respondent-driven sampling: a sampling method for hard-to-reach populations and beyond. *Current Epidemiology Reports*, 9(1), 38–47.

Rinaldi, R. (2012). Analisis kualitas pelayanan publik. *Jurnal Administrasi Publik (Public Administration Journal)*, 2(1), 22–34.

Silvia, F. (2018). *Pelayanan prima dan kepuasan pelanggan di kantor pelayanan perbendaharaan negara (KPPN) Makassar II*. FIS.

Sohail, M. S., & Hasan, M. (2021). Students' perceptions of service quality in Saudi universities: the SERVPERF model. *Learning and Teaching in Higher Education: Gulf Perspectives*, 17(1), 54–66.

Sökmen, Y. (2021). The role of self-efficacy in the relationship between the learning environment and student engagement. *Educational Studies*, 47(1), 19–37.

Suarga, S. (2017). Efektivitas Penerapan Prinsip-Prinsip Kepemimpinan Kepala Sekolah Terhadap Peningkatan Mutu Layanan Administrasi Pendidikan. *Idaarah: Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan*, *1*(1).

Syamsuar; Ginanjar. (2017). *Statistika Deskriptif*.

Twum, F. O., & Peprah, W. K. (2020). The impact of service quality on students' satisfaction. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, *10*.

Udiutomo, P. (2011). Analisa Tingkat Kepuasan Siswa Terhadap Layanan Program Smart Ekselensia Indonesia Tahun 2011. *Jurnal Pendidikan*, *1*(1), 1–19.

yong Jang, W., & yeol Baek, S. (2024). The relative importance of servicescape in fitness center for facility improvement. *Heliyon*, *10*(9).

Zakhiroh, R. (2017). Pengaruh kinerja tenaga administrasi sekolah terhadap kualitas layanan administrasi non akademik. *Didaktika: Jurnal Pemikiran Pendidikan*, *19*(2), 59–70.