



# A Study Examining the Students Satisfaction in Higher Education: The Case of Bahauddin Zakariya University, Pakistan

Zaib-un-nisa<sup>1\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multan, Pakistan

<p><b>Abstract:</b> This study measures the level of student satisfaction with the current services offered by Pakistani universities. The exploration and comparison of possibilities differences in levels of satisfaction between genders and between various programs/disciplines formulate key objectives. A general survey guided by a questionnaire well-structured was administered via collusion sampling to a significant sample of 401 students. Bahauddin Zakariya University (BZU) was selected as a sample case and data were collected from eighteen different disciplines and/or programs. Ten main buildings, i.e. teaching, support administrative/management, transport, library, computer labs and general laboratories, accommodation, healthcare; Sports, prayer facilities/religious and classrooms. The average analysis reflects that students are dissatisfied with many important services and facilities such as teaching, administrative support, library, workshops, accommodation, healthcare and sports, while satisfaction was reported only in three areas such as transport, classrooms and places of prayer. It's interesting note that no significant differences in opinion were recorded between male and female respondents. Overall, the satisfaction level is alarmingly low and the findings indicate university students' dissatisfaction with educational services offered by Pakistani universities.</p> <p><b>Keywords:</b> Student Satisfaction, Higher Education, University Services.</p> <p><b>Copyright © 2024 The Author(s):</b> This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0) which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium for non-commercial use provided the original author and source are credited.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Research Paper</b></p>
	<p><b>*Corresponding Author:</b>  <i>Zaib-un-nisa</i>                      Bahauddin Zakariya University,                      Multan, Pakistan</p>
	<p><b>How to cite this paper:</b>                      Zaib-un-nisa (2024). A Study Examining the Students Satisfaction in Higher Education: The Case of Bahauddin Zakariya University, Pakistan. <i>Middle East Res J. Humanities Soc. Sci.</i> 4(3): 65-74.</p>
	<p><b>Article History:</b>                        Submit: 18.04.2024                          Accepted: 20.05.2024                          Published: 23.05.2024  </p>

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The objective of this article is to determine the level of satisfaction of students studying in Pakistani universities. In fact, the satisfaction of students has never been considered an important issue by education authorities not a matter of survival by educational institutions superior. This is evident from the fact that the impact of the educational services provided by a university on the level of satisfaction of its students has been in much of an area which remains unexplored. Higher education institutions especially universities, are like practice fields where students learn and acquire all the necessary skills and abilities that potential employers are looking for in the job market. For To ensure this happens, universities tend to bundle their offering which includes; I). Basic services, i.e. knowledge, skills intellectual skills, interpersonal skills and communication skills, ii). Actual services, i.e. university, graduate and post-graduate diplomas through regular teaching and research, and iii). Increased services including infrastructure i.e. construction, transport facilities transport/logistics, libraries, laboratories, computer labs, hostels/guesthouses, medical, sports and educational facilities, as well as administrative support.

It can be convincingly argued that student satisfaction with the tangible and intangible offerings of universities are vital to acquire the skills and capabilities that can meet the needs of those next in the chain, i.e. employers and society.

In Pakistan, higher education institutions are under immense pressure since the Higher Education Commission was established (HEC). The HEC began reforms in 2002 by providing universities with the necessary resources, such as unlimited access to digital libraries.

High-speed Internet and an incredible variety of local and international research grant programs. These reforms have changed the country's educational climate, while technology has helped improve the range of teaching and learning tools. On the one hand.

The Commission facilitates higher education institutions and on the other hand works to improve the quality of education in the country. This double-edged sword, that is, the expansion of higher education, and the high quality of higher education, have spurred a drive to

improve and enhance higher education quality standards. As a result, this has created a different and simulated “sphere of opportunity” between students, teachers and the market. The authors are of the opinion that this area of opportunity, if follows the principle of quality, will lead to an educational revolution in the country.

There are 124 universities in Pakistan of which 68 (55%) belong to the public sector, while 56 (45%) belong to the private sector. THE The total number of university students is 741,092 of which 637,037 (86%) in the public sector while 104,055 (14%) in the public sector private. The total enrollment of men in universities is 398,967 (54%), while the enrollment of women is 342,125 (46%). The total of teachers in universities is 46,893, of which 38,266 (82%) from the public sector and 8,627 (18%) from the private sector (Statistics, 2007-2008). If we look at the facts, during the academic year 2007-2008, a considerable number of students were enrolled, i.e. 741.092. The question underlying this study is whether Pakistani students are satisfied with their academic, administrative and logistics provided by the respective higher education institution. To measure college students' personal satisfaction, it was initiated this study to empirically measure the phenomenon taking Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multan (BZU) as a case.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

Kotler *et al.*, (2009, p.120) define satisfaction as “a person's feeling of pleasure that results from comparing performance (or results) perceived of a product with its expectations.” It means that if the performance corresponds to expectations, the customer will be satisfied. In the context of higher education, the issue of satisfaction concerns what students expect from their educational institution, in fact, everything that they it makes them fit to become productive and successful people in their practical life. Reid (2008) classified some basic characteristics that employers typically look for in a graduate. These include knowledge, intellectual abilities, ability to working in modern organizations, interpersonal skills and communication skills (Reid, 2008). Plus there are other features invisible that the market requires and which include: willingness to learn, participation and propensity for teamwork, ability to problem solving, analytical skills, leadership qualities, adaptability, flexibility, ability to summarize key issues and finally but not least, the ability to be a productive and loyal member of the team/organization. Achieving these skills and abilities is what that parents expect when they decide to send their children to higher studies at universities.

The question considered here is whether graduates are provided with the necessary facilities that make their experience favorable and positive the acquisition of the necessary skills and abilities is possible. This is critical not only to the success of the individual student, but also to their success for the success of the country's economy as a whole. In this

sense, Umbach and Porter (2002) argue that the impact institutional in student outcomes and, if anything is known, it is somewhat contradictory. Also, it is worth remembering that the different Academic disciplines vary in terms of application of practical problems, cognitive processes, time commitment of teachers, and so on academic production. Therefore, it is quite difficult to draw conclusions about the institutional impact on student outcomes. However, among the Previous researchers, Cameron and Ettington (1988) and Hartnett and Centra (1977), had measured the impact of departmental culture and climate on the environment student propensity and satisfaction.

Much of the current knowledge about student satisfaction can be gleaned from studies conducted over a period of unrest in the late 1960s and early 1970s (Betz *et al.*, 1970; Pervin, 1967). Curiously, the focus of these early studies was level of satisfaction with the cause of the satisfaction (see, for example, Bean and Bradley, 1986). In the literature, there is an interesting debate that suggests that student expectations are built before enrolling in a college or university, while satisfaction exists during their time in college or at university. For example, Palacio *et al.*, (2002) suggest that students' expectations typically increase even before entering university.

The image of an institution influences the mindset of students, which in turn influences their decision to enroll in that particular institution, which in turn time directly affects student satisfaction with the institution. However, Carey *et al.*, (2002) highlighted that satisfaction it is actually about issues of perception and experiences of students during their academic years. This was supported by Kara (2004), which has used empirical data and a conceptual model to demonstrate that students' college experience is positively related to their satisfaction and to intentions to stay in college or university. Previously, Keaveney and Clifford (1997) presented a satisfaction and loyalty model of the students. Under this model, professors, advising staff, and teaching facilities typically determine the hands-on college experience of students and are therefore considered key components of satisfaction and loyalty.

Researchers also measured student satisfaction in the context of many tangible and intangible items and features. For example, Feldman e Newcomb (1969) and Pascarella and Terenzini (1991) explored the relationship between students' learning experiences and their learning, development and satisfaction. Pike (1994) and Pace (1979) suggested alumni satisfaction as an excellent tool for evaluating the effects of the educational institution on the students. Based on the studies of Pascarella and Terenzini (1991) and Umbach and Porter (2002), it is stated that intellectual development and staff is among the key outcomes of educational institution satisfaction. Furthermore, they found that variables such as teachers' contact with students, emphasis on research

and the percentage of female students had a significant impact on student satisfaction. Ewell (1989) observed a negative correlation between institutional culture and its impact on student achievement.

There is a contradiction in the literature regarding the relationship between grades and student satisfaction. Authors such as Liu and Jung (1980) and Pike (1991) have observed a moderate relationship, whereas Bean and Bradley (1986) found no relationship. However, Centra and Rock (1983) and Lavin (1965) observed a significant relationship between grades and student satisfaction.

On the other hand, limited attempts have been made to measure the impact of gender, ethnicity, race, religion, and inter-educational migration on satisfaction of the students. However, existing evidence reports lower satisfaction among female students than among male students (e.g., Rienzi *et al.*, 1993).

Numerous studies have addressed the issue of service quality and student satisfaction. For example, Fitri *et al.*, (2008) observed that the dimensions of service quality, namely tangibility, responsiveness, reliability, safety and empathy, contribute positively to student satisfaction.

Some other authors such as Bigne *et al.*, (2003), Ham and Hayduk (2003) and Elliot and Shin (2002) reported a significant relationship between service quality, i.e. service reliability, responsiveness, empathy, safety, tangibility, etc., and satisfaction in higher education environments. Spreng and Mackoy (1996) have reported that perceived service quality is an antecedent of satisfaction.

Professors continue to have the most significant influence on student experience and satisfaction at universities. In this sense, universities have adopted the evaluation of students' teaching effectiveness to improve student satisfaction.

Evaluation of Student Teaching (SET) is one of the most widely used performance measurement tools in higher education institutions around the world (Pounder, 2007; Stratton, 1990). The Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) questionnaire is a monitoring tool used to measure the effectiveness of teaching reported by the students involved (Crumbley *et al.*, 2001). Historically, numerous studies have confirmed that evaluation of student teaching has provided reasonably valid multidimensional measures (Holtfreter, 1991; Marsh & Roche, 1997; McKeachie, 1987).

The main objective of the SET is to measure the teaching performance/effectiveness of a university's faculties. Furthermore, this technique is used in educational institutions to evaluate the abilities and skills of academic staff and, consequently, the evaluation score

shows on what basis students perceive their teachers in their minds, which affects your satisfaction directly.

In the context of Pakistan, most studies have focused on ways to improve the quality of higher education; Unfortunately, no significant studies have investigated the issue of student satisfaction. For example, Hanif *et al.*, (2008) examine the use of Balanced Scorecard for improving accountability and performance in higher education institutions and conclude that the long-term vision through evaluation.

Consistent performance is the key to improving performance in higher education institutions. Reid (2008), making a comparison between higher education in Scotland and Pakistan, highlighted industry as a source of evaluation parallel to the internal evaluation system. Furthermore, he suggested an increase in the number of professors with doctorates across the country. Owais and Akber (2008) discussed how to improve doctoral research and education in the country.

Aurangzeb (2008) presented a work-integrated learning model for students. The model suggests the role of three key players in education, namely students, higher education institutions and industry, in improving education and student satisfaction in the country. Hafeez and Fátima (2008) highlighted the importance of the strategic partnership between universities and industry.

They presented a conceptual model with the aim of transforming the type and level of collaboration between universities and industry.

Nasira *et al.*, (2008) presented an in-depth discussion on the importance of international ranking and its impact on students' mindset when choosing a college or university for higher education. They suggested that college or university ranking should not be the only criterion for selection any higher education institution, but students should gather other necessary information before making the final selection.

From the existing literature, the need to conduct systematic research to measure the important issue of student satisfaction in universities is evident Pakistani. From the literature, three different constructs, namely teaching, administration/management and support structures and augmented structures, were used as variables main to measure the student satisfaction in this study.

## 2. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

As stated earlier, this study aims to measure student satisfaction in Pakistani universities. Bahauddin Zakariya University (BZU) Multan was selected as a sample case because it is a public sector university and currently offers a wide range of study programs in various faculties at postgraduate and university. The university also has a significant population (students on

board) from neighboring countries. Six major colleges are playing a pioneering role in spreading education across the country and acting as catalysts for socio-economic development of the country. The faculties are: Faculty of Letters and Social Sciences, Faculty of Islamic Languages and Studies, Faculty of Commerce, Law and Business Administration, Faculty of Science and Agriculture, Faculty of Pharmacy and Faculty of Engineering. Therefore, the university was selected as a sample case and data was collected from current students enrolled in eighteen different disciplines and/or programs representing both undergraduate and graduate levels.

The first construct observed was “teaching”, which is considered a fundamental activity in higher education institutions. Nineteen different variables were used to measure student satisfaction with this construct. The variables under observation they were; teacher communication, teaching ability (qualitative subjects), teaching ability (quantitative subjects), research activities, nature of assignments and classwork, examination and evaluation (quantitative subjects), examination and evaluation (qualitative subjects), examination procedures, teachers' attitude towards the classroom, the teacher's respect for the class, additional consultations, additional reading material, feedback on homework, permanent senior teachers, permanent junior teachers, permanent teachers, permanent female teachers, visiting teachers, visiting teachers.

The second construct observed was “administrative support.” In addition to teaching, administrative activities are necessary to facilitate the development process of necessary skills and provide exposure to students based on market demand.

The administrative construct was operationalized through eight different variables which were; behavior of the department head and program coordinators, behavior of administrative staff, administrative support of department heads and program coordinators, administrative support of administrative staff, activities extracurricular facilities, banking services, campus dining facilities and prayer facilities.

The third construct observed was “increase in structures” and the variables used to measure it were; transport and logistics facilities, library, computer laboratories, general laboratories, student accommodation, medical facilities, sports facilities and classrooms. All these concepts were tested through different variables such as transportation and logistics, availability of buses, route times and behavior of drivers and conductors. Satisfaction with library facilities was measured through seven different variables, including availability of basic textbooks, availability of supporting books, availability of research journals, availability of newspapers and magazines, schedules of the library, the facilities of the central library and the behavior of library

staff. The computer labs in the following facilities were measured based to variables such as availability of a sufficient number of computers, availability and speed of the Internet, behavior of laboratory assistants, and computer laboratory hours and availability of electronic journals. Similarly, the availability of the necessary equipment, the behavior of laboratory assistants and laboratory schedules.

To measure students' satisfaction with the hostel and college, four different variables were used, which are; Availability and conditions of rooms, dining hall and canteen, behavior of hostel staff and general study environment.

Furthermore, medical facility was measured through several variables which are; availability of doctors, availability of medicines, availability of ambulances e availability of emergency personnel and medicines. The next concept sports facilities were measured through four different variables which are; availability of sports fields, training facilities, availability of sports equipment and sports development opportunities. The latest installation is increase.

The observation concerned classroom structures, which were measured through variables such as class size, lesson times, lessons, availability of multimedia content, air conditions, furniture and accessories.

All variables were measured on a Likert scale from 1 to 4 where: 1 = extremely satisfied; 2 = satisfied; 3 = dissatisfied and 4 = extremely dissatisfied.

A high Cronbach's Alpha value (0.92) reflects high reliability of the instrument. Table – 1 presents the response rate based on programmes/disciplines and gender.

Large variations in response were recorded between different faculties and different study programmes. A total of four hundred and eighteen (418) responses were collected, however, seventeen (i.e. 4.1%) were discarded because respondents did not mention gender or their study program, thus the sample size final is four hundred and one (401).

Out of four hundred and one, 191 (45.7%) of the respondents were men, while 210 were women, or 50.2%.

On the other hand, 218 (52.2%) respondents were pursuing undergraduate studies, while 183 (43.8%) were pursuing postgraduate studies.

Based on the literature synthesis, well-structured questionnaires have been formulated to know the level of satisfaction of students studying in different programs at different levels. The unit of analysis was



undergraduate and graduate students currently enrolled in any semester from forty different departments. For make it a systematic process, researchers attempted to manage an enrollment list (a sampling frame) across all study programs in all departments interested.

However, in some cases, administrative staff refused to provide the list of students due to confidentiality issues. As a result, questionnaires are completed using non-probability collusion sampling. The data was collected from the students enrolled in the autumn 2009 session.

Table 1. Department under observation – response rate categorized as per program/discipline & gender

	Faculty/Departments	RESPONDENTS		RESPONDENTS		GRADUATES		P.GRADUATES		Total
		Gradate	Post Graduate	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	
<b>A.</b>	<b>Faculty of Arts &amp; Social Sciences</b>									
1.	Department of Economics	15	12	16	11	08	07	08	04	27
2.	Department of Education	10	09	10	09	06	04	04	05	19
3.	Department of History & Geography	Nil	10	05	05	Nil	Nil	05	05	10
4.	Department of Pak Studies	Nil	11	06	05	Nil	Nil	06	05	11
5.	Department of Political Studies & International Relations	Nil	10	05	05	Nil	Nil	05	05	10
6.	Department of Mass Communication	15	12	14	13	07	08	07	05	27
7.	Department of Applied Psychology, Philosophy and Sociology	20	11	12	19	07	13	05	06	31
8.	Multan College of Arts	11	12	04	19	03	08	01	11	23
<b>B.</b>	<b>Faculty of Islamic Studies &amp; Languages</b>									
9.	Department of English, Urdu & Arabic	14	15	05	24	02	12	03	12	29
<b>C.</b>	<b>Faculty of Commerce, Law &amp; Business Administration</b>									
10.	Institute of Management Sciences.	15	16	17	14	10	05	07	09	31
11.	Department of Commerce	07	05	06	06	03	04	03	02	12
12.	University Law College	08	03	08	03	06	02	02	01	11
<b>D.</b>	<b>Faculty of Science &amp; Agriculture</b>									
13.	Department of Physics.	Nil	12	08	04	Nil	Nil	08	04	12
14.	Institute of Computing	25	11	16	20	10	15	06	05	36
15.	Department of Statistics	07	04	04	07	03	04	01	03	11
16.	University College of Agriculture & Agri-engineering.	18	18	21	15	10	08	11	07	36
<b>E.</b>	<b>Faculty of Pharmacy</b>									
17.	Department of Pharmacy	08	12	09	11	02	06	07	05	20
<b>F.</b>	<b>Faculty of Engineering</b>									
18.	University College of Engineering & Technology & Institute of Advance Material Sciences	45	Nil	25	20	25	20	Nil	Nil	45
<b>Total</b>	<b>19 Departments</b>	<b>218</b>	<b>183</b>	<b>191</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>401</b>

Table 2. Program & gender wise mean comparison across different constructs/concepts/variables

Constructs/Concepts/Variables	Mean G PG		Mean M F		Total	Mean G PG		Mean M F		Total
	G	PG	M	F		G	PG	M	F	
<b>1. Transportation/Logistics Facilities</b>										
Transportation (Bus) availability	2.52	2.48	2.43	2.56	2.50	2.23	2.19	2.10	2.31	2.21
Routes Timings	2.19	2.32	2.22	2.28	2.25	2.37	2.41	2.34	2.44	2.39
Drivers/Conductors Behavior	2.91	2.84	2.97	2.79	2.88	3.74	3.93	3.80	3.86	3.83
<b>2. Library</b>										
Availability of Text Books	2.76	2.58	2.62	2.73	2.68	3.23	3.32	3.32	3.22	3.27
Availability of Supporting Books	2.75	2.64	2.68	2.72	2.70	2.45	2.37	2.36	2.46	2.41
Availability of Research Journals	3.11	3.01	3.02	3.10	3.06					
Availability of Newspapers/Magazines	2.44	2.39	2.36	2.47	2.42	2.75	2.92	2.88	2.78	2.83
Library Timings	2.68	2.70	2.71	2.67	2.69	2.69	2.70	2.66	2.73	2.69
Facilities at Central Library	2.78	2.83	2.78	2.83	2.80	2.91	3.11	3.01	3.00	3.00
Behavior of Library Staff	2.74	2.59	2.62	2.72	2.67	3.14	3.43	3.19	3.34	3.27
<b>3. Computer Labs</b>										
Availability of Computers	3.32	3.30	3.42	3.21	3.31	2.58	2.47	2.50	2.56	2.53
Internet Speed	3.88	3.92	3.88	3.92	3.90	3.11	3.47	3.23	3.32	3.27
Behavior of Lab Attendants	2.89	2.95	2.87	2.95	2.91	2.76	2.75	2.63	2.87	2.76
Computer Lab Timings	3.19	3.24	3.25	3.18	3.21	2.17	2.20	2.13	2.24	2.18
Availability of e-Journals	3.43	3.32	3.47	3.30	3.38					
<b>1. Labs</b>										
Availability of Equipments	3.12	3.37	3.21	3.23	3.22	2.36	2.31	2.25	2.42	2.34
Behavior of Lab Attendants	2.57	3.00	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.50	2.45	2.42	2.53	2.48
Lab Timings	2.56	2.91	2.69	2.71	2.70	3.12	3.28	3.18	3.21	3.20
<b>2. Hostel/Boarding</b>										
Availability & Conditions of Rooms	3.53	3.24	3.30	3.47	3.39	3.04	2.86	2.92	2.99	2.96
Mess/Dinning	3.59	3.68	3.58	3.67	3.63	2.98	3.13	3.22	2.89	3.05
Behavior of Hostel Staff	3.32	3.19	3.14	3.37	3.26	2.88	2.93	2.93	2.89	2.90
Overall Study Environment	3.42	3.40	3.56	3.27	3.41	2.80	2.75	2.67	2.87	2.77
<b>3. Medical Facilities</b>										
Availability of Doctors	3.13	3.17	3.18	3.11	3.15	2.53	2.46	2.43	2.57	2.50
Availability of Medicines	3.24	3.18	3.18	3.24	3.21	2.48	2.50	2.41	2.56	2.49
Availability of Ambulance	2.93	2.77	2.82	2.89	2.86	2.31	2.29	2.29	2.31	2.30
Availability of Emergency Staff/Medicine	3.23	3.39	3.32	3.28	3.30	2.73	2.74	2.64	2.82	2.74
<b>4. Sports Facilities</b>										
Availability of Sports Ground/Place	2.68	2.67	2.60	2.75	2.68	3.00	3.08	2.86	3.19	3.04
Coaching Facilities	3.30	3.51	3.44	3.36	3.40	2.63	2.54	2.57	2.61	2.59
Availability of Sports Items/Equipments	3.53	3.72	3.64	3.59	3.62	2.65	2.52	2.51	2.66	2.59
Sports Opportunities	3.34	3.32	3.29	3.36	3.33	2.53	2.62	2.54	2.60	2.57
						2.86	2.87	2.99	2.75	2.87
						2.94	2.95	2.98	2.91	2.95
						2.93	2.99	3.00	2.92	2.96
						3.05	3.02	3.01	3.07	3.04

### 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The main objective of this study was to measure student satisfaction in Pakistani universities. The three elements used to achieve this goal were teaching, administrative support and increased facilities. The first construct applied was that of "teaching", which is obviously a central activity in any educational institution. Nineteen different variables were used to measure student satisfaction with teaching and related activities (see section 3 of Table 2 for more details).

With the exception of some variables, the overall mean values of the variables relating to this construct reflect students' dissatisfaction with the methods and techniques of existing teaching. The average values of the different variables that improve the satisfaction of university students are; teacher communication (average value of 2.34), skills in teaching qualitative subjects (average value of 2.48), examination procedures (average value of 2.50), teachers' attitude towards the class (average value of 2.49), respect for teachers for the class (average value 2.30).

It is observed that several key areas require close attention from teachers, department heads, deans and vice-chancellors.

The areas are; teaching ability in quantitative subjects (average value of 3.20), feedback on assigned assignments (average value of 2.59), number of senior teachers full-time (average value of 2.59), number of full-time junior teachers (average value of 2.57), research activities (average value of 2.96), nature of assignments and homework in class (average value 3.05), examination and evaluation of qualitative subjects (average value 2.90), additional reading material (average value 2.90) 3.04, examination and evaluation of quantitative subjects (average value 2.77), extra consultation time by teachers (average value 2.74), permanent professors (full time) (average value 2.87), permanent professors (part-time) (average value 2.95), visiting professor (part-time) (average value 2.96), visiting professor (part-time) (average value 3.04).

The results of the average analysis clearly reflect that students are largely dissatisfied with communication skills. By their teachers (language used in the lesson). Furthermore, to investigate the level of satisfaction of university students with the ability to give lessons by their teachers, the questions were included based on the classification of the curriculum, i.e. the courses quantitative and qualitative. Students unanimously stated that they were dissatisfied with the delivery capabilities of the course teachers of quantitative versus qualitative courses. Perhaps this reflects a positive attitude of Pakistani students towards qualitative rather than quantitative themes; However, there is a need to improve the delivery capabilities of the teachers of quantitative courses. Furthermore, since there

is no visible difference in opinion between male and female students who study at the undergraduate or graduate level, the findings reinforce the previous discussion.

Furthermore, undergraduate students reported lower satisfaction with research activities than graduate students, confirming the fact that in universities.

Higher level research activities are generally required and carried out in Pakistan. However, the means analysis shows that students are dissatisfied with the nature of research carried out in different disciplines. This situation is quite alarming for higher education authorities, especially the Higher Education Commission (HEC), which is committed to quality research in Pakistani universities.

Interestingly, male respondents reported high dissatisfaction with the nature of classroom tasks, supporting the idea that faculty (in universities (Pakistani) generally assign easier homework and assignments to female students, which constitutes gender discrimination on the part of teachers. Likewise, the postgraduate Students are more dissatisfied with the nature of homework than university students. Perhaps this dissatisfaction is due to the fact that students have failed to recognize the visible differences in terms of the nature and quality of the tasks performed during university studies compared to those carried out during university studies. THE overall results related to research activities attract the attention of Higher Education Commission of Pakistan in general and management of BZU University in particular.

Less dissatisfaction with quantitative versus qualitative course evaluation supports a natural response and perhaps attitude mature on the part of the students. However, widespread dissatisfaction with grades and assessments reflects distrust in the assessment style of university teachers.

On the other hand, a satisfactory average score in the examination procedure reflects valuable confidence in the new measures taken by universities to improve exam standards. In these variables, no visible differences in opinion between male and female students were reported. Trust in the procedure exam and no confidence in assessment reflects the university's commitment to improving educational standards and at the same time provokes serious reflection on the style of evaluating homework and the work of professors. Subsequently, the average scores reflect teachers' positive attitudes towards their classes.

However, provision of adequate time for consultation was reported to be an unsatisfactory variable. In reality, the results are plausible, because The large student population of Pakistani universities makes it difficult for academic staff to allocate equal additional



support to all students, leading to dissatisfaction at the individual level.

Finally, from the results it can be observed that, in general, students are dissatisfied with academic teachers, regardless of whether they are senior or junior, male or female, permanent or visiting. Likewise, dissatisfaction is quite high with visiting professors, indicating distrust in the university's pathetic recruitment policy.

It is recommended that authorities hire high-level permanent teachers with excellent academic skills rather than relying on teaching staff a contract or visiting. In this regard, the Higher Education Commission's (HEC) new recruitment policy can bring positive changes to provided that it is implemented in the right spirit and monitored consistently.

Furthermore, if strictly necessary, the respective deans and heads of departments should ensure the hiring of highly qualified and experienced visiting professors. A clear policy in this regard needs to be developed and implemented.

Here it is worth mentioning that the sample case i.e. Bahauddin Zakariya University is located in South Punjab. In this part of the country, hiring high caliber, motivated and highly qualified people has always been a challenging task for university management. This region is largely remote and more qualified people prefer to live and work in metropolitan cities of Pakistan such as Islamabad, Lahore and Karachi.

Secondly, BZU is a public sector university and cannot offer competitive salaries or financial incentives. Furthermore, the lack of motivation to work at a university, the distorted behavior of the university management, the additional unpaid workload and Limited opportunities for training and personal development are among the main reasons that limit the entry of competent people into the education sector. Beyond this, the university is located far from the city center, which makes it difficult for visiting professors to go there to work for a few hours, and therefore the level of interest is Bass. Furthermore, the university does not have an incentive plan to attract high-quality professionals University.

The second construct observed was "administrative support." From the analysis of the individual average it emerges that there are some fundamental structures that currently are responsible for overall student satisfaction. These are; prayer facilities available on campus (mean value 2.18) and facilitation from part of the university management for extracurricular activities (average value 2.41). For these variables there are no significant differences in opinion between students and students, nor at study level, i.e. university or graduate. Interestingly, branches of two

highly reputed national banks are operational on the campus, which is surprising; Students reported dissatisfaction with the current banking structures.

On the other hand, the behavior of the department chair and program coordinators (mean value of 2.83), the administrative support of the chair and coordinators (average value of 3.00), administrative support of administrative staff (average value of 3.27), general disorder and room catering.

The facilities available on campus emerge as critical factors (average value equal to 2.76). In this regard, it is above all female students who report a level highest level of dissatisfaction with the behavior and treatment of administrative staff, which is surprising and rather alarming. The results require immediate attention from university authorities and concrete measures must be taken to improve staff behavior administrative. It is also recommended that the competent authorities take appropriate measures to improve the overall level of administrative support.

The third construct observed was "increase in facilities", measured using the following variables; transport and logistics facilities, library, computer laboratories, laboratories, hostels/colleges, medical facilities, sports facilities and classrooms. Transportation and logistics facilities were measured through factors such as the availability of buses (average value of 2.50), route times (average value of 2.25) and the behavior of drivers and bus drivers (average value 2.88). The overall average values with respect to transport facilities reflect the student satisfaction with the available transportation services offered by the university. It is important to note that the behavior of bus drivers and conductors is problematic for student satisfaction. In this sense, Male students appear to be more dissatisfied with the behavior of bus staff than females students. The second increasing facility under observation was the library and student satisfaction with the facilities.

The library equipment was measured through seven different variables, namely the availability of basic textbooks (average value of 2.68), availability of support books (average value 2.70), availability of research journals (average value 2.70). Value of 3.06), availability of relevant newspapers and magazines (average value 2.42), library opening hours (average value 2.69), services in the central library (average value 2.80), behavior of library staff (average value 2.67). The results show clearly that students are not satisfied with the current library facilities; Moreover, they showed a remarkable dissatisfaction with the availability of research journals. Once again there was no difference of opinion significant difference between male and female students, both at undergraduate and graduate level.

Subsequently, the availability of computers (average value of 3.31), the availability and speed of the



Internet (average value of 3.96), the behavior of assistants laboratory (average value of 2.91), the laboratories (average value of 3.21) and the availability of e-diaries (average value of 3.38) were used to survey the satisfaction of the students regarding the IT facilities available in various colleges. All related variables reflect visible student dissatisfaction; therefore, this situation invites unconditional inertia of the Higher Education Commission (HEC) and enthusiastic attention of the higher authorities of the university. It was not no significant difference in opinion was observed between male and female students studying at undergraduate or graduate level.

Some disciplines such as natural sciences, agriculture and engineering require laboratories equipped with the most modern equipment practical demonstrations and advanced research. Hence, the laboratories were taken as the central facility to observe the student satisfaction and the construct were tested through variables such as; availability of the necessary equipment (average value of 3.22), behavior of laboratory managers (average value 2.74) and laboratory hours (average value 2.70).

Again the results reveal that students are dissatisfied with the available equipment, even if the equipment is not sufficient or obsolete. Graduate students showed greater dissatisfaction with equipment availability compared to university students. Therefore, it can be suggested that better results can be expected from the search if the Graduate students are provided with the most modern laboratory and research equipment.

To measure students' satisfaction with the hostel and college, four different variables were used, which are; availability and room conditions (average value of 3.39), catering/refreshment facilities within hostels (average value of 3.63), hostel staff behavior (mean value of 3.26) and general study environment (mean value of 3.41). The general results indicate the highest level of dissatisfaction with the hostel and boarding offered by the university. Despite the dissatisfaction Overall it is very high, the results reflect that female students are relatively more dissatisfied with availability of the rooms, canteens and behavior of the hostel staff towards male students. In the same building (hostel/college), university students express a higher level of dissatisfaction than their peers of postgraduate.

Subsequently, the medical facility was measured through four different variables which are; availability of doctors (average value 3.15), availability of medicines (average value 3.21), availability of ambulances (average value 2.86) and availability of emergency personnel and medicines (average value 3.30). Once again, results indicate student dissatisfaction.

Here it is important to note that the university has separate medical centers for male and female students. In addition to this.

The university has appointed two male doctors and one full-time female doctor to ensure an adequate level of facilities doctor 24 hours a day. However, dissatisfaction indicates a lack of awareness of this among students or poor provision of structures in reality.

Sports plays an important role in promoting a healthy mind. As previously mentioned, sports facilities are, they measured through four different variables which are; availability of sports fields (average value 2.68), sports facilities training (average value 3.40), availability of sports items and equipment (average value 3.62) and development opportunities sports (average value equal to 3.33). The results indicate that the university lacks sporting opportunities, however this is the case build a new sports complex that can change the experience of future university students.

Here it is important to note that no significant difference in opinion was observed between male and female students, at both undergraduate and graduate level.

The last augmented structure under observation were classroom structures, measured through variables such as class size (average value of 2.23), lesson times (average value of 2.34), availability of multimedia content (average value of 3.82), air conditioning (average value 3.17) and furniture and furnishings (average value 2.44). Except for two key installations which are multimedia and air conditioning, students are satisfied with the size of the room, the class.

Hours, furniture and accessories. Also in this case there are no significant differences in opinion between male and female students, either at level undergraduate and postgraduate.

#### 4. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The overall results reveal that university students are satisfied with the available means of transportation, facilities in school classrooms, in religious structures (places of prayer) and in the facilitation of extra-circular activities. On the other hand, students express your dissatisfaction with teaching techniques and methods, the behavior of administration and staff, and facilities IT, library and related facilities, general workshops, hostel/guest house facilities and opportunities sports and the cafeteria/dining room available on campus.

Based on the above mentioned facts it can be concluded that most of the students studying in Pakistani universities are not satisfied of the current offer. On the one hand, the "educational" structures, including teaching methods and techniques, are obsolete and, on

the other, the lack of administrative support increases student dissatisfaction.

It is worth mentioning that although the Higher Education Commission (HEC) is constantly introducing reforms in higher education, unfortunately these reforms cannot generate satisfaction among graduates. The results also highlight management weaknesses/administrative and the same is evident from the fact that universities have considerable resources (in terms of infrastructure) such as access unlimited digital libraries, high-speed Internet, and an incredible variety of educational programs. local and international scholarships. However, lack of administrative interest and poor management have created student discontent. Likewise, also the lack of students' awareness and dissatisfaction with available resources such as the Internet, laboratories, libraries, medical facilities, banks and other structures evidence poor management.

The current situation attracts the attention of all education authorities namely the Ministry of Education, Government of Pakistan, Commission for Higher Education of Pakistan, Vice Chancellors of Public and Private Universities, Vice Chancellors and Principals, concerned Principals and all responsible improving the quality and standards of higher education. Education in the country. This research should be considered as a first step to know the satisfaction level of university students in Pakistan.

The findings of this study can be generalized if the scope of the research is extended to more universities and disciplines. Likewise, more systematic sampling could also contribute to the validity of the results.

Furthermore, the impact of satisfaction on students' personality, market performance and results, intellectual abilities, the necessary capabilities, etc., are among the key areas for future research.

## REFERENCES

- Aurangzeb, C. R. (2008). *Quality assurance model for the evaluation of work-integrated learning in an educational institution superior of Pakistan*. Work presented at the 2nd International Conference on Quality Assessment in Higher Education.
- Bean, J. P., & Bradley, R. K. (1986). Disentangling the satisfaction-performance relationship of college students. *Journal of Higher Education*, 57(04), 393-412.
- Betz, B. L., Klingensmith, J. B., & Menne, J. W. (1970). The measurement and analysis of university student satisfaction. *Measurement e Evaluation in the Guide*, 03, 110-118.
- Bigne, E., Moliner, M. A., & Sánchez, J. (2003). Perceived quality and satisfaction in multiservice organizations: the case of public services Spaniards. *The Journal of Services Marketing*, 17(04), 420-442.
- Cameron, K., & Ettington, D. (1988). The conceptual foundations of organizational culture (Smart, J. ed. Vol. 04). *Handbook of theory and research in higher education*.
- Carey, K., Cambiano, R. L., & De Vore, J. B. (2002). *Student and faculty satisfaction at a Midwestern university in the United States*.
- Centra, J. A., & Rock, D. (1983). University environments and student achievement. *American Journal of Educational Research*, 08, 623-634.
- Crumbley, L., Henry, B. K., & Kratchman, S. H. (2001). Students' perceptions of the evaluation of university teaching. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 9(4), 197-207.
- Elliot, K. M., & Shin, D. (2002). Student satisfaction: An alternative approach to evaluating this important concept. *Journal of politics and higher education management*, 24(02), 197-209.
- Ewell, P. T. (1989). Institutional characteristics and teachers' and administrators' perceptions of achievement: An exploratory analysis. *Research in Higher Education*, 30(02), 113-136.
- Feldman, K. A., & Newcomb, T. M. (1969). *The impact of university on students*. Jossey Bass.
- HERDSA, [online] State. 93-97. Available: [www.ecu.edu.au/conferences/herdsa/main/papers/ef/pdf/Carey.pdf](http://www.ecu.edu.au/conferences/herdsa/main/papers/ef/pdf/Carey.pdf).