



Compensation Of Educational Personnel Moderates The Influence Of Academic Information System Service Quality On Student Satisfaction

Ari Usman Efendi¹, Deviyantoro²

¹ Student Master of Management Study Program Faculty of Economics and Business, Serang Raya University, Banten, Indonesia,

² Faculty of Economics and Business, Serang Raya University, Banten, Indonesia
email: ariusmanefendi646@gmail.com¹, deviyantoro@yahoo.com.id²

Abstract . This study aims to determine compensation moderating the influence of service quality of educational staff on student satisfaction at Serang Raya University. The form of research used is descriptive and quantitative research. Descriptive research is a form of research that aims to describe existing phenomena, both natural phenomena and man-made phenomena. The population in this study were 100 educational staff respondents and 100 student respondents at Serang Raya University. Then, data processing used the SmartPLS 4.0 application. The results showed that the interaction of compensation variables had a positive but insignificant effect on service quality of 0.184 with a p-value of 0.063 (> 0.05). The interaction of service quality variables had a significant positive effect on student satisfaction of 0.915 with a p-value of 0.000 (< 0.05) and the interaction of compensation variables in moderating service quality on student satisfaction had a positive but insignificant effect of 0.048 with a p-value of 0.373 (> 0.05). The study was conducted at only one institution (University of Serang Raya), so the findings may not be generalizable to other organizations. The findings of this study have the potential to lead to the development of a new theoretical framework that incorporates the moderating effect of compensation on the relationship between service quality and student satisfaction. This framework can provide a more comprehensive understanding of how compensation affects student satisfaction in educational settings.

Keywords: Compensation, Service Quality, Satisfaction.

1. INTRODUCTION

Improving the quality of higher education through strategies oriented towards student satisfaction aims to provide optimal contributions to education. The impact is increased student satisfaction, which is an indicator of the success of higher education. Quality academic services in all aspects, including curriculum, guidance, lecture process, and supporting facilities, can produce students who are ready to compete globally (Mujahid, 2019). Service quality is important for higher education because it has an impact on the reputation of the institution. Student satisfaction is crucial to the success of a university. Good HR management supports productivity and service quality (Akbar et al., 2022). It is important to improve the quality of higher education services by focusing on student satisfaction. Customer satisfaction-oriented strategies help improve higher education services and contributions to education. A reliable academic information system is also important to improve service quality.

Astuti and Lutfi (2019) concluded that customer satisfaction and service quality have a significant and positive effect on customer loyalty. Ibrahim & Thawil (2019) have results showing that product quality and service quality have a significant and positive effect on

customer satisfaction, with product quality having the most significant effect. Another study conducted by Juni in (Sarbina et al., 2021) found that the dimensions of tangibles, assurance, reliability, empathy and responsiveness significantly influence student satisfaction, with the tangible dimension having a very large impact. However, the results of a study by Vinny et al., (2017) showed that the dimensions of responsiveness and tangibles have a real effect on student satisfaction, while the dimensions of assurance, empathy and reliability do not have a significant effect on student satisfaction. (Rahareng & Relawan (2017).

Susetyo et al (2022) showed that the quality of academic services has a positive effect on student satisfaction. The results of Nuraini's (2022) study indicate that student satisfaction with student affairs services is categorized as high. Saepuloh et al.'s (2020) study found that service quality has a significant and positive effect on customer satisfaction, with a focus on appearance, empathy, responsiveness in service, and consistency in providing services that can build customer trust.

Nugraha & Surjani (2018), Kadarisman (2019), Hartono et al. (2021), and Zayed et al. (2022), concluded that there is a positive influence between compensation and employee service quality. However, other studies by Katidjan et al. (2017), Rinny et al. (2020), and Afrianti & Mandaria (2021), show that although employee compensation has a positive but not significant effect on employee service quality.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Compensation

Milkovich & Newman in (Mardikaningsih & Darmawan, 2022): Compensation is a form of appreciation given as a reward for services, hard work, skills and sacrifices that have been given to the organization, both in financial and non-financial forms. Nurmalasari (2021): Any form of reward given by a company, institution, or superior to employees, staff, or subordinates as recognition of services or performance that has been done, is compensation. Geralyn in (Mardikaningsih & Darmawan, 2022): a reward given to someone who has completed the work ordered to him. Chepchumba and Kimutai in (Kuswahyudi et al., 2022): 4 (four) indicators used in measuring compensation, including: 1) salary, 2) facilities, 3) incentives, 4) pension programs, and 5) allowances. Karomah (2019): Compensation is categorized into two large groups: 1) Direct compensation, namely compensation given by the company to employees as an appreciation for their achievements that contribute to the interests of the company. Direct compensation can be in the form of salary or wages, position allowances, and bonuses or incentives. 2) Indirect compensation is a

form of compensation given to employees as an addition in accordance with the policies taken by the leadership in an effort to improve welfare. Indirect compensation is compensation that is not directly related to the work done by employees, such as pension benefits, holiday allowances, and health.

Quality Of Service

Akbar and Parves in (Handayani & Pandanwangi, 2021): service quality is the result of a comparison between customer expectations of the service that should be received and opinions after experiencing the service. Ratnaningrum (2023): Service quality is defined as the extent of the difference between customer expectations and the reality of the service received. Berry, Zeithaml, and Parasuraman quoted by Tjiptono and Gregorius in (Handayani & Pandanwangi, 2021): 5 (five) dimensions of service quality to customers, namely *tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, empathy*. Prakoso et al. (2019): Service quality includes a number of characteristics that allow a product or service to meet the needs and expectations set. Firdaus et al. (2021): Service quality has a significant impact on an educational institution. If the service at the institution is inadequate or poor, students tend to look for other universities and share this information with people around them, such as friends, relatives, and neighbors. This can lead to a decrease in the number of students who register and students feel dissatisfied with the services of educational staff. Widawati & Siswohadi (2020): the quality of good academic services depends on the performance of various parties, including lecturers, administrative staff, and cleaning staff. Administrative staff must provide optimal support and services in terms of administration to students, so that students can carry out their academic activities smoothly.

Student Satisfaction

Referring to Kotler & Ketler's research in (Jasmara & Wati, 2021): satisfaction can be defined as a feeling of satisfaction or dissatisfaction that arises when comparing product performance with customer expectations. Sopiatin (2020): student satisfaction is a positive attitude towards higher education services due to the conformity between expectations and the reality received. Pramadista, (2019); (Wulandari, 2019): student satisfaction is a feeling of pleasure felt after comparing price, service performance, and location with expectations. Handayani & Pandanwangi (2021): Driving factors such as the quality of academic services and interpersonal communication affect student satisfaction. Interpersonal communication

involves openness, support, positive attitudes, empathy, and similarity, which create mutual understanding and appreciation.

3. RESEARCH METHODS

The form of research used in this study is quantitative research with a case study approach through quantitative data collection of questionnaires given to 100 educational staff respondents and 100 student respondents at Serang Raya University. The survey includes questions related to the quality of information system services, student satisfaction, and compensation. The collected data will be analyzed and processed using statistical methods such as regression analysis and moderation analysis to test the relationship between the variables studied and see the effect of compensation as a moderating variable.

4. RESULTS

Research Respondent Data

Table 1.

Description of Student Subjects Based on Gender and Study Program

Respondent Identity Variable	Category	Amount	Percentage (%)
Gender	Man	65	65%
	Woman	35	35%
Study program	Faculty of Economics and Business	36	36%
	Faculty of Social and Political Sciences	19	19%
	Faculty of Information Technology	24	24%
	Faculty of Engineering	15	15%
	Vocational Education Program	5	5%
	FSIP	1	1%

Source: *Processed from questionnaire data (2024)*

Table 4.1. shows that the respondents of male students are 65 respondents or 65%, while female respondents are 35 respondents or 35%. The student respondents consist of the Faculty of Economics and Business as many as 36 respondents (36%), the Faculty of Social Sciences, Political Sciences and Law as many as 19 respondents (19%), the Faculty of Information Technology as many as 24 respondents (24%), the Faculty of Engineering as many as 15 respondents (15%), the Vocational Education Program as many as 5 respondents (5%), and the Faculty of Islamic Studies and Education as many as 1 respondent (1%).

Semester and Year of Entry are excluded from the table, because the questionnaire was distributed to all active students of Serang Raya University.

Table 2.

Description of Educational Personnel Subjects Based on Gender, Age,
Length of Service and Last Education

Respondent Identity Variable	Category	Amount	Percentage (%)
Gender	Man	32	32%
	Woman	68	68%
Age	19-25 Years	31	31%
	26-39 Years	63	63%
	>40 Years	6	6%
Length of work	< 1 Year	4	4%
	1-5 Years	52	52%
	6-10 Years	35	35%
	>10 Years	9	9%
Last education	High School/Vocational School/Equivalent/D3	21	21%
	S1	76	76%
	S2	3	3%

Source: Processed from questionnaire data (2024)

Based on the table above, it is known that the respondents of education personnel with male gender are 32 respondents (32%), while female respondents are 68 respondents (68%). Age 19-25 years old are 31 respondents (31%), 26-39 years old are 63 respondents (63%), and age over 40 years are 6 people (6%). Length of work less than 1 year are 4 respondents (4%), 1-5 years are 52 respondents (52%), 6-10 years are 35 respondents (35%), more than 10 years are 9 people (9%). On average, 76 respondents (76%) are undergraduate education, 21 respondents (21%) are high school/vocational high school/equivalent/D3 graduates, and 3 respondents are postgraduate graduates (3%).

Model 1 Measurement Model (Outer Model)

Convergent Validity

Convergent validity of the measurement model can be from the correlation between the item/instrument score and its construct score (*loading factor*) with the criteria of *the loading factor value* of each instrument (>0.7). In order to meet the required *convergent validity*, which is higher than 0.7, instruments with values below 0.7 must be eliminated or removed from the model, then the second data processing is carried out. The following is Figure 4.5. the results of stage 2 data processing.

Table 3 Loading factor

Variables	Indicator	Loading Factor	Rule of Thumb	Conclusion	
Quality of Service	PF2	0.890	0.700	Valid	
	PF3	0.854	0.700	Valid	
	K1	0.830	0.700	Valid	
	K2	0.858	0.700	Valid	
	K3	0.865	0.700	Valid	
	DT1	0.829	0.700	Valid	
	DT2	0.875	0.700	Valid	
	DT3	0.870	0.700	Valid	
	J1	0.858	0.700	Valid	
	J2	0.792	0.700	Valid	
	J3	0.853	0.700	Valid	
	E1	0.773	0.700	Valid	
	E2	0.863	0.700	Valid	
	E3	0.842	0.700	Valid	
	Student Satisfaction	TK1	0.852	0.700	Valid
		TK2	0.824	0.700	Valid
TK3		0.849	0.700	Valid	
TK4		0.848	0.700	Valid	
AR1		0.844	0.700	Valid	
AR2		0.829	0.700	Valid	
AR3		0.842	0.700	Valid	
AR4		0.855	0.700	Valid	
AR5		0.861	0.700	Valid	
AR6		0.832	0.700	Valid	
LP1		0.783	0.700	Valid	
LP2		0.834	0.700	Valid	
LP3		0.901	0.700	Valid	
LP4		0.925	0.700	Valid	
LP5		0.861	0.700	Valid	
Compensation		LP6	0.835	0.700	Valid
	LP7	0.909	0.700	Valid	
	LP8	0.877	0.700	Valid	
	F1	0.741	0.700	Valid	
	F2	0.808	0.700	Valid	
	F3	0.811	0.700	Valid	
	G1	0.867	0.700	Valid	
Compensation	T1	0.805	0.700	Valid	
	FS1	0.849	0.700	Valid	

Source: Data processed with SmartPLS 4.0 (2024)

Based on the second stage of data processing, all variables consisting of Service Quality, Student Satisfaction and Compensation have met the criteria, namely more than 0.7 and are declared valid. Based on table 4.5. in the Service Quality variable, the highest loading factor value is in statement PF2 of 0.890 which contains the statement "Education Personnel communicate clearly and friendly". In the Student Satisfaction variable, the largest loading

factor value is in statement LP7 of 0.909 which contains the statement "Education Personnel have good abilities in serving student administration". In the Compensation variable, the highest loading factor value is in statement G1 of 0.867 which contains the statement "The salary I currently receive from the institution is in accordance with my performance" .

Model 2 Reliability Test and AVE Test

Reliability Test

Table 4 Reliability Test Results

Variables	Cronbach's Alpha	Composite Reliability	Limits of Reliability	Conclusion
Quality of Service	0.970	0.970	0.700	Reliable
Student Satisfaction	0.980	0.981	0.700	Reliable
Compensation	0.798	0.837	0.700	Reliable

Source: Data processed with SmartPLS 4.0 (2024)

The conclusion of data processing shows satisfactory figures, all variables are above the threshold of 0.70, indicating high consistency and stability of the instruments used. It is concluded that all constructs of this study have become a fit measuring instrument, and have good reliability.

Average Variance Extracted (AVE) Test

Table 5 Results of the Average Variance Extracted (AVE) Value Test

Variables	AVE	AVE Value Limit	Conclusion
Quality of Service	0.717	0.500	Fulfilled
Student Satisfaction	0.714	0.500	Fulfilled
Compensation	0.707	0.500	Fulfilled

Source: Data processed with SmartPLS 4.0 (2024)

AVE Test Shows how much variance of the diversity of manifest variables owned by the latent construct, a standard number of 0.5 means good convergent validity can also be interpreted as an average above the indicator variant. The number 0.50 or above is the standard value of the variable AVE (Haryono, 2017). The results of the research data processing show that all variables have good construct validity.

Discriminant Validity Test

Cross Loading

Table 6 Cross Loading Value Results

	Compensation	Student Satisfaction	Quality of Service	Compensation X Quality of Service
G1	0.867	0.145	0.171	0.267
T1	0.805	0.022	0.145	0.152
FS1	0.849	0.101	0.143	0.087
TK1	0.101	0.852	0.744	0.054
TK2	-0.030	0.824	0.722	-0.038
TK3	0.030	0.849	0.698	-0.031
TK4	0.104	0.848	0.741	0.009
AR1	0.089	0.844	0.766	0.175
AR2	0.086	0.829	0.718	0.084
AR3	0.100	0.842	0.705	0.185
AR4	0.076	0.855	0.782	0.082
AR5	0.118	0.861	0.790	0.084
AR6	0.157	0.832	0.776	-0.003
LP1	0.163	0.783	0.711	0.144
LP2	0.050	0.834	0.738	0.032
LP3	0.078	0.901	0.781	0.069
LP4	0.204	0.925	0.893	0.009
LP5	0.010	0.861	0.762	0,000
LP6	0.070	0.835	0.734	0.032
LP7	0.106	0.909	0.852	0.021
LP8	0.177	0.877	0.890	-0.028
F1	0.104	0.741	0.684	0.061
F2	0.149	0.808	0.790	0.033
F3	0.111	0.811	0.731	0.105
PF2	0.178	0.839	0.890	0.080
PF3	0.056	0.802	0.854	0.091
K1	0.195	0.699	0.830	0.068
K2	0.201	0.752	0.858	0.099
K3	0.252	0.789	0.865	-0.012
DT1	0.153	0.714	0.829	0.025
DT2	0.143	0.787	0.875	-0.010
DT3	0.060	0.793	0.870	-0.111
J1	0.154	0.748	0.858	0.058
J2	0.182	0.792	0.792	0.036
J3	0.105	0.818	0.853	0.074
E1	0.218	0.663	0.773	-0.027
E2	0.144	0.764	0.860	0.001
E3	0.143	0.752	0.842	-0.023
Compensation x Quality of Service	0.212	0.059	0.030	1,000

Source: Data processed with SmartPLS 4.0 (2024)

From the results of the data processing above, it is obtained that all indicators have a higher correlation coefficient number for each of their own variables compared to the correlation coefficient number of the indicator with other variables, so that in the end it is summarized that each indicator in the block is a variable or construct former in the column.

AVE Root Value and Correlation Between Constructs

Table 7. Results of AVE Root Values and Correlations Between Constructs

	Student Satisfaction	Compensation	Quality of Service
Student Satisfaction	0.845		
Compensation	0.118	0.841	
Quality of Service	0.906	0.184	0.847

Source: Data processed with SmartPLS 4.0 (2024)

Table 4.8. shows if the AVE root value and correlation of constructs with other constructs, Compensation: The AVE root value is 0.841, the correlation value of Compensation with other variables: 0.118; and 0.184. Service Quality: The AVE root value is 0.847, the correlation value of Service Quality with other variables: 0.906; and 0.184. Student Satisfaction: The AVE root value is 0.845, the correlation value of Student Satisfaction with other variables: 0.118; and 0.906.

Model 3 Inner Model Test

R Square Analysis

Table 8. R Square Value Results

	R Square	R Square Adjusted
Student Satisfaction	0.825	0.819
Quality of Service	0.034	0.024

Source: Data processed with SmartPLS 4.0 (2024)

Based on the table above, it is known that:

- The R-Square value of the Student Satisfaction variable is 0.825, which means that the Student Satisfaction construct variable can be explained by the Service Quality and Compensation variables by 82.5%, while the remaining 17.5% is explained by other variables outside those studied.

Chin (1998) in Gozali and (Latan, 2015), the R-Square model value is 0.67 (strong); 0.33 (moderate); and 0.19 (weak) so it can be concluded that it has a high influence.

- The R-Square value of the Service Quality variable is 0.034. This R-Square value means that the Service Quality construct variable that can be explained by the Student

Satisfaction and Compensation variables is only 3.4 % while the rest is explained by other variables outside those that have been studied.

Chin (1998) in Gozali and (Latan, 2015), the R-Square model value is 0.67 (strong); 0.33 (moderate); and 0.19 (weak) so it can be concluded that it has a low influence.

Effect Size (f^2)

Table 9. Results of f Square Values

	Student Satisfaction	Quality of Service	Compensation	Compensation X Quality of Service
Student Satisfaction				
Compensation	0.019	0.035		
Quality of Service	4,617			
Compensation X Quality of Service	0.010			

Source: Data processed with SmartPLS 4.0 (2024)

From table 4.9. it can be seen:

- Compensation variable on student satisfaction, the f square value of 0.019 has an influence but is not significant.
- Compensation variable on service quality, the f square value of 0.035 has an influence but is not significant.
- The variable of service quality on student satisfaction, the f square value is 4.617 which means it is very influential and significant.
- The Compensation variable moderates Service Quality on Student Satisfaction, the f square value of 0.010 means it has an influence but is small or not significant.

Q -square analysis (Q^2) and Q^2 Effect Size

Table 10. Q -square Test Results

	SSO	SSE	Q^2 (=1-SSE/SSO)
Compensation	300,000	300,000	
Student Satisfaction	2100,000	892,727	0.575
Quality of Service	1400,000	1368,123	0.023

Source: Data processed with SmartPLS 4.0 (2024)

Based on table 4.10. it is known that the sum of the Q -Square values on the two endogenous variables is 0.598. This result means that the magnitude of data diversity explained by this research model is 59.8 %. While the remaining percentage of 40.2 % is explained by other

factors outside this research model. Thus, this research model is declared to meet the requirements of goodness (*model fit*).

Goodness of Fit (GoF) Test

Table 11. Average *R-square* and *Communalities*

	<i>Communalities</i>	<i>R-square</i>
Compensation	0.717	
Student Satisfaction	0.714	0.825
Quality of Service	0.707	0.034
Average	0.713	0.430

Source: Data processed with excel (2024)

Formula for calculating GoF value:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{GoF} &= \sqrt{\text{Com} \times \overline{R^2}} \\ &= \sqrt{0,713 \times 0,430} \\ &= 0.554 \end{aligned}$$

From the results of the GoF calculation above, a value of 0.554 was obtained, so it can be concluded that the model has a large GoF. The greater the GoF value, the more appropriate it is in describing the research sample.

Hypothesis Testing

Table 12.

Value of Relationship Between Variables (*direct and indirect effects*)

Variable Relationship	O	T	P	Information
K → KP	0.184	1,862	0.063	Positive Not Significant
KP → KM	0.915	30,239	0,000	Significant Positive
K x P → KM	0.048	0.892	0.373	Positive Not Significant

K (Compensation); KM (Student Satisfaction); KP (Service Quality)

Source: Data processed with SmartPLS 4.0 (2024)

Based on the table above, the relationship between variables can be explained as follows:

- The value of the influence of the variable K on KP is 0.184 with a p-value of 0.063 (>0.05). This means that the interaction of the Compensation variable has a positive but not significant effect on Service Quality. Thus H1 is accepted.
- The value of the influence of the KP variable on KM is 0.915 with a p-value of 0.000 (<0.05). This means that the interaction of the Service Quality variable has a positive and significant effect on Student Satisfaction. Thus H2 is accepted.

- The value of the influence of the K x KP variable on KM is 0.048 with a p-value of 0.373 (>0.05). This means that the interaction of the Compensation variable in moderating Service Quality has a positive but insignificant effect on Student Satisfaction. Thus H3 is accepted.

5. DISCUSSION

The Influence of Compensation on Service Quality

Compensation attributes have a positive but insignificant effect on the quality of education personnel services (H1). The assessment of credibility is obtained from respondents' perceptions of indicators such as salary (G1), allowances (T1) and facilities (FS1), where research respondents agree that when the salary and allowances given are in accordance with the workload and position they hold, and the availability of facilities such as health insurance for all education personnel, the quality of service will increase. The findings of this study are in line with research conducted by Katidjan et al (2017), Rinny et al (2020), and Arifin & Mandaria (2021) which show that although the compensation given to education personnel has a positive but insignificant effect on the quality of education personnel services. However, several studies, including those conducted by Nugraha & Surjani (2018), Kadarisman (2019), Hartono et al (2021), and Zayed et al (2022), concluded that there is a positive and significant effect between compensation and service quality.

The Influence of Service Quality on Student Satisfaction

Service Quality Attributes have a positive and significant effect on Student Satisfaction (H2). Assessment of service quality is obtained from respondents' perceptions of physical appearance indicators (PF2, PF3), reliability (K1, K2, K3), responsiveness (DT1, DT2, DT3), assurance (J1, J2, J3) and empathy (E1, E2, E3). When educational personnel have these elements, students' attitudes towards educational personnel will be more positive. This is not in line with research conducted by Vinny et al., (2017) which shows that the responsiveness dimension and tangible dimension have a real influence on student satisfaction, while Rahareng & Relawan (2017) stated that the assurance, empathy and reliability dimensions do not have a significant influence on student satisfaction. However, this finding is in line with the research results by Astuti and Lutfi (2019), Ibrahim & Thawil (2019), Saepuloh et al. (2020), Sarbina et al. (2021), Susetyo et al. (2022), Nuraini (2022) showing that service quality has a positive and significant effect on customer satisfaction, in this case student satisfaction.

The Moderating Role of Compensation in the Relationship between Service Quality and Student Satisfaction

The results of the hypothesis test show that the moderating effect of the Compensation variable on Service Quality towards Student Satisfaction is positive but not significant (H3). This means that compensation factors such as salary (G1), allowances (T1) and facilities (FS1) indirectly moderate the effect of service quality of educational staff on student satisfaction although not significant. So far there has been no research on compensation moderating service quality.

Some researchers focus more on the influence of compensation on service quality, such as research conducted by Nugraha & Surjani (2018), Kadarisman (2019), Hartono et al (2021), and Zayed et al (2022) which showed positive results between compensation on service quality, while research by Katidjan et al (2017), Rinny et al (2020), and Afrianti & Mandaria (2021) showed that although compensation had a positive effect, it was not significant on service quality.

6. CONCLUSION

Based on the results of data analysis and discussion that have been described and processed using SmartPLS 4.0 regarding compensation moderating the quality of educational staff service on student satisfaction, it can be concluded that compensation has a positive but insignificant effect on service quality, service quality has a positive and significant effect on student satisfaction, compensation moderates the effect of service quality on student satisfaction with positive but insignificant results.

7. IMPLICATIONS

Extending the service quality model by adding compensation as a moderating variable, which shows that it can significantly affect perceived service quality and ultimately impact student satisfaction. The findings of this study have the potential to lead to the development of a new theoretical framework that incorporates the moderating effect of compensation on the relationship between service quality and student satisfaction. This framework can provide a more comprehensive understanding of how compensation affects student satisfaction in educational settings.

This study highlights the importance of implementing fair and appropriate compensation strategies for educational staff, which may involve evaluating existing payroll systems, benefits and facilities. Understanding the role of compensation in moderating

service quality can inform the development of more effective interventions such as ongoing training and development of educational staff, improving infrastructure and optimizing administrative processes.

High student satisfaction can increase retention rates and attract new students through effective compensation strategies and service quality, institutions can build a strong reputation and attract potential students. This study emphasizes the need for institutions to involve students and education staff. This can be done through surveys, focus groups, and other forms of feedback mechanisms.

REFERENCE

- Adityas, D., & Irhamah. (2019). Evaluation of student satisfaction towards the service performance of the Sepuluh Nopember Institute of Technology (ITS). *ITS Journal of Science and Arts*, 8(2), 277–283.
- Ali, S., Shariff, N., Said, N., & Mat, K. (2020). The effects of service quality dimensions on students' satisfaction: Hedge model adoption. *Journal of Intellect*, 15(1), 69–76.
- Astuti, D. S., & Lutfi, M. (2019). Analysis of the influence of service quality and customer satisfaction on customer loyalty. *Journal of Ekobis Economics Business & Management*, 9(2), 132–144.
- Aziz, M. Z., Gani, A., & Mas'ud, M. (2023). The influence of competence, motivation, and compensation on employee performance at Klabers Studio Makassar Company. *Journal on Education*, 5(3), 9741–9755.
- Bhakti, Y. B., & Rahmawati, E. Y. (2017). Student satisfaction index towards the services of the Mathematics Education Study Program. *Formative Journal*, 7(3), 272–285.
- Cahyoadi, B., & Loisa, G. (2019). The effect of academic information system (siakad) performance on student satisfaction to increase loyalty with image as an intervening variable (study on STKIP PGRI Tulungagung students). *Indonesian Journal of Strategic Management*, 2(2).
- Firdaus, S., Suwiryo, D. H., & Sukmawaty, F. (2021). The influence of academic service quality and lecturer competence on student satisfaction. *Muqoddimah Journal: Journal of Social, Political and Humanities Sciences*, 5(2), 320–328.
- Garaika. (2020). The influence of compensation, work motivation, and job satisfaction as intervening variables on performance. *Scientific Journal of Management and Business*, 21(1), 28–34.
- Ginanjar, N. S., Resmanasari, D., & Mulyani, R. (2020). Quality of service and facilities on student satisfaction of STIE PGRI Sukabumi. *Jurnal Ekonomak*, 6(3), 71–80.

- Hami, A., & Anggraini, D. (2022). Quality of academic information system (siakad) services on student satisfaction as users. *Journal of Information and Computers*, 10(1), 121–129.
- Handayani, M., & Pandanwangi, E. (2021). The influence of interpersonal communication and academic service quality on student satisfaction. *Journal of Communication Science Dynamics*, 1(1), 9–15.
- Hapsara, O., Gupron, Y., & Yandi, A. (2020). Analysis of student satisfaction in using the integrated academic information system (SITA) of Batanghari University, Jambi. *Journal of Management and Science*, 5(2), 327–334.
- Ibrahim, M., & Thawil, S. M. (2019). The influence of product quality and service quality on consumer satisfaction. *Journal of Management and Business Research (JRMB) Faculty of Economics UNIAT*, 4(1), 175–182.
- Jasmara, T., & Wati, L. (2021). The influence of academic information system quality and service quality on student satisfaction in online learning at Bung Hatta University. *Abstract of Undergraduate Research*. Retrieved from ejurnal.bunghatta.ac.id
- Kamal, F., Winarso, W., & Mardiani, L. (2020). Increasing student satisfaction through academic service quality (Case study at the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, As-Syafi'iyah Islamic University, Jakarta). *Journal of Accounting and Management (JIAM)*, 16(1), 33–45.
- Karomah, N. G. (2019). Compensation for employee performance at PT. Tri Dharma Pusaka South Jakarta. *Lentera Bisnis Journal*, 8(1), 30–49.
- Kusyana, D. N. B., Purwaningrat, P. A., & Sunny, M. P. (2020). The role of service quality in creating student loyalty. *Journal of Widya Management*, 2(1), 10–27.
- Muhtadin, I., & Purwanto, E. (2023). The effect of compensation and work motivation on the performance of employees at the Cinere Dispenda Service Branch. *Journal of Applied Business and Economic (JABE)*, 9(3), 306–321.
- Mujahid, A. M. (2019). Student satisfaction in academic services at Kunia Jaya Persada Palopo Health Sciences College. Thesis.
- Ndruru, E. K., & Sibuea, A. (2020). The influence of academic services on student satisfaction levels at Stmikitmi Medan. *Global Management Journal - S1 Management Study Program, FE UDA*, 9(2), 86–94.
- Ningsih, N. L. A. P., Widari, D. A. P. N., & Artawan, I. M. (2020). Analysis of student satisfaction with the quality of educational services. *Economic Discourse (Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting)*, 19(1), 24–29.
- Nurmalasari. (2021). The influence of compensation and work ethic on the quality of academic services of the Darul Masholeh Islamic Education Foundation, Cirebon City. *Repository of the Bunga Bangsa Islamic Institute, Cirebon*, 1–127.
- Pawening, R. (2021). The k-means algorithm for measuring student satisfaction using e-learning. *Joti*, 3(1), 27–33.

- Prakoso, S., Sari, D. R., & Lisnawati, E. (2019). Service quality and customer satisfaction in increasing customer loyalty of services at sub agent PT. JNE Pangleseran Branch. *Jurnal Ekonomak*, 5(1), 113–120.
- Pramadista, A. (2019). The influence of service quality on student satisfaction at Poltekkes Yapkesbi Sukabumi. *Jurnal Ekonomak*, 5(3), 21–30.
- Pratiwi. (2020). The influence of service quality on loyalty at Ratu Hotel (Ex. Queen Hotel) Denpasar with customer satisfaction as an intervening variable. *Bisma Journal of Management*, 6(1), 17.
- Purnomo, M. W. (2022). The influence of performance management and compensation on the quality of health services at the Adventist Hospital in Bandar Lampung. *Jurnal Mitra Manajemen (JMM Online)*, 6(6), 318–332.
- Rahareng, V. J., & Relawan, I. N. (2017). The influence of academic service quality on student satisfaction. *REFERENCES: Journal of Management and Accounting Sciences*, 5(1), 46–54.
- Rahayu, A. P., Santoso, H. B., & Rahayuningsih, S. (2019). Analysis of student academic information system satisfaction using E-SERVQUAL. *JATI UNIK*, 2(1), 55–63.
- Rahmadiani. (2020). Analysis of service quality factors on inpatient satisfaction at Al-Islam Hospital, Bandung. *JSMA (Journal of Management Science and Accounting)*, 12(2), 77–85.
- Ratnaningrum, L. P. R. A. (2023). Analysis of student satisfaction towards the quality of academic services at the Indonesian College of Informatics & Computer Management. *Bussman Journal: Indonesian Journal of Business and Management*, 3(1), 279–299.
- Ratnasari, D. Y., Susilaningsih, N., & Heryanto, B. (2023). Analysis of the influence of financial and non-financial compensation on employee performance (On employees of PT Astra International, Tbk - Daihatsu Kediri). *Risk: Journal of Business and Economic Research*, 4(1), 75–83.
- Rokhani, S., & Marlianingrum, P. R. (2021). The influence of service quality and online learning quality on student satisfaction during the Covid-19 pandemic. *Journal of Management (SME's)*, 14(3), 291–310.
- Ruswandi, W., Mulyani, R., & Riswandi, R. (2019). Brand image, product quality, and service quality in increasing consumer satisfaction of motorcycle workshops in Sukabumi. *Jurnal Ekonomak*, 5(3), 108–118.
- Saputri, N. (2023). The influence of lecturer performance, academic service quality, and learning facilities on student satisfaction at the Faculty of Economics, Muhammadiyah University of Aceh. *Jemsi (Journal of Economics, Management and Accounting)*, 9(5), 2268–2277.
- Sarbina, D. A. B., Prapti, R. L., & Triyani, D. (2021). Analysis of the influence of academic sub-division service quality on student satisfaction at the Faculty of Medicine, Diponegoro University, Semarang. *SOLUTION: Scientific Journal of Economics*, 19(3), 92–101.

- Sipahutar, D. M. (2022). Analysis of student satisfaction levels towards academic services at Stikes Senior Medan. *MES: Journal of Mathematics Education and Science*, 7(2), 89–96.
- Sitepu, C. M., Lengkong, F. D., J., & Londa, V. Y. (2018). The effect of compensation on the quality of public services of the Manado City Health Service.
- Widawati, E., & Siswohadi. (2020). Analysis of student satisfaction with academic services and administrative services. *Jurnal Mitra Manajemen (JMM Online)*, 4(10), 1500–1513.
- Wulandari, R. (2019). The influence of product quality and service quality on consumer satisfaction at PT Smartfren Telecom Tbk Sukabumi Branch. *Jurnal Ekonomak*, 5(3), 75–91.
- Yuniarti, Y. (2014). The influence of service quality on student satisfaction: Extension Program, Faculty of Economics, University of Jambi. *Journal of Economics: Trikonomika*, 13(1), 49–61.