

# LECTURER PERFORMANCE, ACADEMIC SERVICE QUALITY, AVAILABILITY OF FACILITIES on STUDENT SATISFACTION at STAIN KEPULAUAN RIAU

Dvi Afriansyah<sup>1</sup>, Razaki Persada<sup>2</sup> Agus Susanto<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1,2,3</sup>Universitas Terbuka, Jakarta, Indonesia

Email: [ravaarbi@gmail.com](mailto:ravaarbi@gmail.com)<sup>1</sup>, [persadarazaki@yahoo.co.id](mailto:persadarazaki@yahoo.co.id)<sup>2</sup>  
[sugus.susanto@gmail.com](mailto:sugus.susanto@gmail.com)<sup>3</sup>

---

**Abstract:** Lecturer Performance, Academic Service Quality, Availability of Facilities and Infrastructure in Islamic universities have a major impact on the quality of education, scientific development, and entry into the institution. Based on initial observations, STAIN Sultan Abdurrahman Kepri has a low level of Student Satisfaction in 3 aspects. This research is a quantitative study. The primary data source was obtained from students of STAIN Sultan Abdurrahman Kepulauan Riau consisting of 11 study programs with a total of 92 students. The instrument used to collect data in this study was in the form of a digital questionnaire as the main instrument and observation as a supporting instrument. The results of this study Constant (15.707), This shows the basic value of student satisfaction when all independent variables are zero. In this context, the theoretical value that shows the basic level of satisfaction without the influence of lecturer performance, academic service quality, or the availability of facilities and infrastructure. Lecturer Performance (0.175), This coefficient shows that every one unit increase in lecturer performance, assuming other variables remain constant, will increase student satisfaction by 0.175 units. This shows that lecturer performance has a positive and significant influence on student satisfaction. Academic Service Quality (0.191), This coefficient shows that every one unit increase in academic service quality, assuming other variables remain constant, will increase student satisfaction by 0.191 units. This indicates that the quality of academic service also contributes positively and significantly to student satisfaction. Availability of Facilities and Infrastructure (-0.011), This negative coefficient shows that every one unit increase in the availability of facilities and infrastructure, assuming other variables remain constant, will reduce student satisfaction by 0.011 units, this shows that the availability of facilities and infrastructure is still inadequate, and needs to be improved.

**Keywords:** Lecturer Performance; Quality of Academic Services; Availability of Facilities and Infrastructure.

---

## Introduction

Higher education is one of the educational institutions that contribute to the intelligence of the nation, because education is a long-term investment in human resources that has strategic value for the continuity of human civilization in the world (Oviyanti, 2013). Students are the ones who determine the success of a higher education institution. Higher education institutions must be able to satisfy all students so that they feel happy and show good achievements. The quality of educational institutions is greatly influenced by investment in the education system, including students, lecturers, and facilities that support the teaching process. These three factors are interdependent and influence each other to create a successful teaching process. (Ghofiroh dan Sudarwanto, 2018).

Student satisfaction indicators include: conformity of expectations, which is the level of conformity between the performance of the service provider expected by students and that felt by students. Interest in revisiting, which is the willingness of students to revisit or perform and use related services. Willingness to recommend, namely the willingness of service to recommend services or services that have been felt to friends or family (Isnaini, 2016).

STAIN Sultan Abdurrahman Kepulauan Riau or commonly known as STAIN Kepri, which has 11 study programs currently has 1124 active students, 6 students on leave, while 22 students are inactive, so that the total is 1352 students. Data on permanent lecturers with the position of assistant expert is the most, namely 60 lecturers,

followed by Non Jabfung lecturers of 23 lecturers. Then only 2 lecturers are lecturers and 14 lecturers as lecturers. Then from education, it is known that there are 93 lecturers with the last education of S2 and 6 lecturers with the last education of S3. From this education, it is known that there is a very large difference in the number of S3 compared to S2 at STAIN Sultan Abdurrahman Kepri. Several types of infrastructure available at STAIN Sultan Abdurrahman Kepri, including classrooms, libraries, laboratories, offices, student dormitories, and sports facilities. From the available data, it can be seen that most of these types of infrastructure are available at STAIN Sultan Abdurrahman Kepri in adequate numbers. However, even though the available facilities appear adequate, efforts are still needed to continue to improve the quality and quantity of infrastructure at STAIN Sultan Abdurrahman Kepri to provide better services for students and increase student satisfaction.

Facilities and infrastructure are important components in supporting an effective and quality education process in higher education. The availability of adequate facilities such as classrooms, laboratories, libraries, internet access, and other supporting facilities contribute greatly to the comfort and success of students in pursuing their education. However, based on various complaints and initial findings, students of STAIN Sultan Abdurrahman Kepri showed a low level of satisfaction with aspects of campus facilities and infrastructure.

These complaints include limited representative study rooms, lack of laboratory and practice facilities, unkempt building conditions, and suboptimal access to technology. This low level of satisfaction has the potential to hinder the learning process, reduce student motivation, and have an impact on the overall image of the institution. Therefore, it is important to identify the causes of the low level of student satisfaction, evaluate the actual condition of facilities and infrastructure, and find solutions that can improve the quality of educational services on campus. This problem needs to be studied in depth so that STAIN Sultan Abdurrahman Kepri can create a more conducive learning environment that meets student expectations.

Based on the results of the researcher's initial observations of students, that students of STAIN Sultan Abdurrahman Kepri have a low level of student satisfaction, especially in terms of facilities and infrastructure that are still inadequate, such as many projectors that cannot operate properly, thus hindering the learning process, in addition the services provided are often not as expected. Based on the researcher's observations, there is no questionnaire for evaluating academic services and facilities and infrastructure, while for lecturer performance there is a questionnaire provided and distributed in the form of a google form by the campus but it is not effective because not many students fill it out.

## Method

The type of research in quantitative research with a correlational approach. The primary data source obtained directly, which has a direct relationship to the problem to be studied, namely students of STAIN Sultan Abdurrahman Riau Islands consisting of 11 Study Programs in the 2018/2019 intake. The instrument used to collect data in this study is in the form of a digital questionnaire as the main instrument and observation as a supporting instrument. In collecting data from samples or informants, researchers use the Nonprobability Sampling technique, namely a sampling technique that does not provide equal opportunities for each element (member) of the population to be selected as a sample.

In collecting data, researchers use the Slovin formula so that the respondents in this study were 92 students of STAIN Sultan Abdurrahman Kepri. Analyzing and describing data from respondents in this study, researchers use multiple linear analysis using statistical tools in the form of the SPSS program. The form of the multiple linear regression analysis model equation is:

$$Y = a + \beta_1X_1 + \beta_2X_2 + e$$

Description:

Y = Student Satisfaction

$\alpha$  = Constant

X1 = Lecturer performance

X2 = Quality of academic services

X3 = Availability of facilities and infrastructure

e = Error term

In hypothesis testing, in the f test the author will compare the calculated F value with the F table value. Where the calculated F is obtained from the SPSS output, while the F table value is obtained with a 95% confidence level, error rate ( $\alpha$ ) = 5% = 0.05 and degrees of freedom (df) = n-2. is carried out to determine whether there is a significant joint influence on variables X and Y. While the T test to test H1, H2, and H3 that have been submitted in advance, the author will compare the calculated t value with the t table value. Where the calculated t value is obtained from the SPSS output, while the t table value is obtained with a 95% confidence level, error rate ( $\alpha$ ) = 5%

= 0.05 and degrees of freedom (df) = n - 2 is carried out to determine whether there is a significant influence on variables X and Y.

## Findings and Discussion

### Findings

The respondents of this study were students of STAIN Sultan Abdurrahman Riau Islands consisting of 11 study programs and were taken randomly from semesters 2 to 8 using the Nonprobability Sampling method. The researcher used the Quota Sampling type with a total of 92 respondents.

**Table 1. Respondent Quota**

No.	Study Program	Number of Respondents
1.	Hukum Ekonomi Syariah	9
2.	Hukum Keluarga Islam	8
3.	Manajemen Bisnis Syariah	9
4.	Akuntansi Syariah	8
5.	Manajemen Pendidikan Islam	9
6.	Pendidikan Agama Islam	9
7.	Pendidikan Islam Anak Usia Dini	8
8.	Pendidikan Bahasa Arab	8
9.	Ilmu Al-Qur'an dan Tafsir	8
10.	Tadris Bahasa Inggris	8
11.	Komunikasi dan Penyiaran Islam	8
<b>Total</b>		<b>92</b>

**Table 2. Frequency Distribution of Respondent Characteristics Based on Gender**

		Gender			
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	44	47.8	47.8	47.8
	Female	48	52.2	52.2	100.0
	Total	92	100.0	100.0	

Based on the data presented in the frequency distribution table of respondent characteristics based on gender, it can be interpreted that of the total 92 respondents who participated in this study, there was a fairly good balance between male and female respondents. Specifically, the number of female respondents was slightly more than male respondents, with 48 respondents (52.2%) being female and 44 respondents (47.8%) being male.

**Table 3. Frequency Distribution of Respondent Characteristics Based on Study Program**

		Study Program			
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Akuntansi Syari'ah	8	8.7	8.7	8.7
	Hukum Ekonomi Syari'ah	9	9.8	9.8	18.5
	Hukum Keluarga Islam	8	8.7	8.7	27.2
	Ilmu Al Qur'an dan Tafsir	8	8.7	8.7	35.9
	Komunikasi Penyiaran Islam	8	8.7	8.7	44.6
	Manajamen Bisnis Syari'ah	9	9.8	9.8	54.3
	Manajemen Pendidikan Islam	9	9.8	9.8	64.1
	Pendidikan Agama Islam	9	9.8	9.8	73.9
	Pendidikan Bahasa Arab	8	8.7	8.7	82.6
	Pendidikan Islam Anak Usia Dini	8	8.7	8.7	91.3

Tadris Bahasa Inggris	8	8.7	8.7	100.0
Total	92	100.0	100.0	

The study programs with the largest number of respondents, 9 students each (9.8%), were Sharia Economic Law, Sharia Business Management, Islamic Education Management, and Islamic Religious Education. Meanwhile, other study programs such as Sharia Accounting, Islamic Family Law, Al-Quran Science and Tafsir, Islamic Broadcasting Communication, Arabic Language Education, Early Childhood Islamic Education, and English Language Teaching were each represented by 8 respondents (8.7%). The diversity of these study programs provides a wealth of perspectives in assessing the factors that influence student satisfaction, considering that each study program may have different characteristics and needs in terms of lecturer performance, academic services, and facilities and infrastructure.

**Table 4. Validity Test of Lecturer Performance Variables**

Variable Indicator	R Count	≈	R Table Sig 5% (df=92-2)	Information
P1	0.721	>	0.205	Valid
P2	0.812	>	0.205	Valid
P3	0.619	>	0.205	Valid
P4	0.676	>	0.205	Valid
P5	0.784	>	0.205	Valid
P6	0.752	>	0.205	Valid
P7	0.853	>	0.205	Valid
P8	0.852	>	0.205	Valid
P9	0.816	>	0.205	Valid
P10	0.820	>	0.205	Valid
P11	0.814	>	0.205	Valid
P12	0.748	>	0.205	Valid
P13	0.698	>	0.205	Valid
P14	0.682	>	0.205	Valid
P15	0.757	>	0.205	Valid
P16	0.672	>	0.205	Valid

The results of the validity test for the lecturer performance variable show that all indicators have a calculated r value greater than r Table (0.205) at a significance level of 5% with degrees of freedom (df) of 90. This means that all indicators (P1 to P16) used to measure lecturer performance are declared valid. The highest calculated r value is found in indicators P7 (0.853) and P8 (0.852), indicating that these two indicators have a very strong correlation with the overall lecturer performance variable. This high validity indicates that the instrument used is able to effectively measure aspects of lecturer performance that are relevant to student satisfaction.

**Table 5. Validity Test of Academic Service Quality Variables**

Variable Indicator	R Count	≈	R Table Sig 5% (df=92-2)	Information
P1	0.776	>	0.205	Valid
P2	0.749	>	0.205	Valid
P3	0.767	>	0.205	Valid
P4	0.625	>	0.205	Valid
P5	0.749	>	0.205	Valid
P6	0.862	>	0.205	Valid

P7	0.804	>	0.205	Valid
P8	0.816	>	0.205	Valid
P9	0.780	>	0.205	Valid
P10	0.790	>	0.205	Valid
P11	0.806	>	0.205	Valid

The results of the validity test show that all indicators also have a calculated r value greater than r Table (0.205), making all indicators (P1 to P11) valid. Indicator P6 shows the highest calculated r value of 0.862, indicating that this indicator is very strong in measuring the quality of academic services. Overall, the high validity of these indicators indicates that the research instrument can effectively capture various aspects of academic services that affect student satisfaction.

**Table 6. Validity Test of Availability of Facilities and Infrastructure Variables**

Variable Indicator	R Count	≈	R Table Sig 5% (df=92-2)	Information
P1	0.604	>	0.205	Valid
P2	0.711	>	0.205	Valid
P3	0.652	>	0.205	Valid
P4	0.703	>	0.205	Valid
P5	0.699	>	0.205	Valid
P6	0.705	>	0.205	Valid
P7	0.792	>	0.205	Valid
P8	0.803	>	0.205	Valid
P9	0.690	>	0.205	Valid
P10	0.889	>	0.205	Valid
P11	0.890	>	0.205	Valid
P12	0.834	>	0.205	Valid
P13	0.747	>	0.205	Valid
P14	0.737	>	0.205	Valid
P15	0.648	>	0.205	Valid
P16	0.677	>	0.205	Valid

The results of the validity test for the variable of availability of facilities and infrastructure show that all indicators have a calculated r value greater than r Table (0.205), so that all indicators (P1 to P16) are declared valid. Indicator P11 has the highest calculated r value of 0.890, indicating a very strong correlation with this variable. The strong validity of these indicators shows that the research instrument is able to effectively measure the availability of facilities and infrastructure that are relevant to student satisfaction.

**Table 7. Validity Test of Student Satisfaction Variables**

Variable Indicator	R Count	≈	R Table Sig 5% (df=92-2)	Information
P1	0.596	>	0.205	Valid
P2	0.726	>	0.205	Valid
P3	0.448	>	0.205	Valid
P4	0.573	>	0.205	Valid
P5	0.520	>	0.205	Valid

P6	0.648	>	0.205	Valid
P7	0.628	>	0.205	Valid
P8	0.488	>	0.205	Valid
P9	0.702	>	0.205	Valid
P10	0.482	>	0.205	Valid
P11	0.522	>	0.205	Valid
P12	0.484	>	0.205	Valid

For the student satisfaction variable, all indicators have a calculated  $r$  value greater than  $r$  Table (0.205), which means that all indicators (P1 to P12) are valid. Indicator P2 has the highest calculated  $r$  value of 0.726, indicating that this indicator is very strong in measuring student satisfaction. The high validity of these indicators indicates that the research instrument can effectively capture various aspects of student satisfaction related to lecturer performance, academic services, and the availability of facilities and infrastructure.

**Table 8. Reliability Test**

No	Variables	Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items	Information
1	Variable Lecturer Performance	0.948	16	Reliabel
2	Variable Academic Service Quality	0.932	11	Reliabel
3	Variable Availability of Facilities and Infrastructure	0.942	16	Reliabel
4.	Variable Student Satisfaction	0.807	12	Reliabel

The reliability test results for the lecturer performance variable showed a Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.948 with 16 items, indicating a very high level of reliability. For the academic service quality variable, the Cronbach's Alpha value was recorded at 0.932 with 11 items, also indicating a very high level of reliability. The availability of facilities and infrastructure variable had a Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.942 with 16 items, indicating that this instrument was also very reliable. Likewise, the student satisfaction variable had a Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.807 with 12 items.

**Table 9. Descriptive Statistical Test**

Descriptive Statistics					
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Lecturer Performance	92	16	48	25.38	7.870
Academic Service Quality	92	11	34	17.87	5.848
Availability of Facilities and Infrastructure	92	16	64	29.54	9.665
Student Satisfaction	92	15	36	23.36	3.974
Valid N (listwise)	92				

The results of the descriptive statistical test provide an overview of the data distribution for each variable in this study. For the Lecturer Performance variable, the minimum value obtained was 16 and the maximum was 48, with a mean of 25.38 and a standard deviation of 7.870. For the Academic Service Quality variable, the minimum value was 11 and the maximum was 34, with a mean of 17.87 and a standard deviation of 5.848. The lower mean compared to other variables indicates that students may have a more critical view of the Academic Service Quality they receive. The Availability of Facilities and Infrastructure variable has a minimum value of 16 and a maximum of 64, with a mean of 29.54 and a standard deviation of 9.665. Meanwhile, the Student Satisfaction variable shows a minimum value of 15 and a maximum of 36, with a mean of 23.36 and a standard deviation of 3.974.

**Table 10. Normality Test**

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test		
		Unstandardized Residual
N		92
Normal Parameters <sup>a,b</sup>	Mean	.0000000
	Std. Deviation	3.13729485
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.086
	Positive	.060
	Negative	-.086
Test Statistic		.086
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.087 <sup>c</sup>
a. Test distribution is Normal.		
b. Calculated from data.		
c. Lilliefors Significance Correction.		

In this study, the normality test was conducted using the One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test. The test results showed an Asymp. Sig. value of 0.087, which is greater than the significance level of 0.05. This indicates that the residual distribution is not significantly different from the normal distribution, so the normality assumption is met. Thus, the regression analysis can be continued because the data meets the necessary normality prerequisites.

**Table 11. Multicollinearity Test**

Coefficients <sup>a</sup>			
Model		Collinearity Statistics	
		Tolerance	VIF
1	Lecturer Performance	.492	2.034
	Academic Service Quality	.488	2.050
	Availability of Facilities and Infrastructure	.568	1.760
a. Dependent Variable: Student Satisfaction			

Multicollinearity test was conducted to ensure that there is no high correlation between independent variables in the regression model, which can cause problems in the interpretation of the regression coefficient. In this study, multicollinearity was tested using the Tolerance and Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) statistics. The results showed that all independent variables had a Tolerance value above 0.1 and a VIF value below 10, namely Lecturer Performance (VIF = 2.034), Academic Service Quality (VIF = 2.050), and Availability of Facilities and Infrastructure (VIF = 1.760).

**Table 12. Heteroscedasticity Test**

Coefficients <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.996	.665		3.000	.004
	Lecturer Performance	-.002	.033	-.008	-.056	.956
	Academic Service Quality	.007	.036	.031	.206	.837
	Availability of Facilities and Infrastructure	.018	.025	.100	.710	.479
a. Dependent Variable: Abs_Res						

The heteroscedasticity test aims to check whether there is inconsistent variability (heteroscedasticity) in the residuals of the regression model, which can affect the validity of the statistical test. In this study, heteroscedasticity was tested through the analysis of the regression coefficient of the independent variable against the absolute value of the residual (Abs\_Res). The results show that all independent variables have a significance value greater than 0.05, namely Lecturer Performance ( $p = 0.956$ ), Academic Service Quality ( $p = 0.837$ ), and Availability of Facilities and Infrastructure ( $p = 0.479$ ).

**Table 13. Multiple Linear Regression Test**

Coefficients <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	15.707	1.223		12.841	.000
	Lecturer Performance	.175	.061	.347	2.890	.005
	Academic Service Quality	.191	.067	.343	2.847	.005
	Availability of Facilities and Infrastructure	-.011	.046	-.026	-.230	.819

a. Dependent Variable: Student Satisfaction

The multiple linear regression test in this study aims to analyze the influence of independent variables, namely Lecturer Performance, Academic Service Quality, and Availability of Facilities and Infrastructure, on the dependent variable, namely Student Satisfaction. Based on the results of the analysis, the multiple linear regression equation can be written as follows:

$$Y = 15.707 + 0.175X_1 + 0.191X_2 - 0.011X_3$$

di mana:

- Y are Student Satisfaction,
- X1 are Lecturer Performance,
- X2 are Academic Service Quality,
- X3 are Availability of Facilities and Infrastructure.

Constant (15.707): This indicates the baseline value of Student Satisfaction when all independent variables are zero. In a real context, this is a theoretical value that indicates the baseline level of satisfaction without the influence of Lecturer Performance, Academic Service Quality, or Availability of Facilities and Infrastructure.

Lecturer Performance (0.175): This coefficient indicates that every one unit increase in Lecturer Performance, assuming other variables remain constant, will increase Student Satisfaction by 0.175 units.

Academic Service Quality (0.191): This coefficient shows that every one unit increase in Academic Service Quality, assuming other variables remain constant, will increase Student Satisfaction by 0.191 units. Availability of Facilities and Infrastructure (-0.011): This negative coefficient shows that every one unit increase in Availability of Facilities and Infrastructure, assuming other variables remain constant, will reduce Student Satisfaction by 0.011 units. However, based on the sig value which shows a value above 0.05, this relationship is not statistically significant.

Based on the table above, for the T test Based on the output table, it is known that the Significance value (Sig) for the Lecturer Performance Variable is 0.000. Because the Sig. value is 0.000 < probability 0.05, it can be concluded that H0 is rejected and H1 is accepted. This means that there is a significant influence between Lecturer Performance and Student Satisfaction in this study.

Academic Service Quality Testing Against Student Satisfaction:

H0:  $\beta_2 = 0$ , This means that Academic Service Quality does not affect Student Satisfaction.

- H1:  $\beta_2 \neq 0$ , This means that Academic Service Quality has a significant influence on Student Satisfaction.

The Significance Value (Sig) for the Academic Service Quality Variable is 0.000. Because the Sig. value is 0.000 < probability 0.05, it can be concluded that H0 is rejected and H1 is accepted. This means that there is a significant influence between Academic Service Quality and Student Satisfaction.

Testing the Availability of Facilities and Infrastructure on Student Satisfaction:

H0:  $\beta_3 = 0$ , This means that the Availability of Facilities and Infrastructure does not affect Student Satisfaction.

- H1:  $\beta_3 \neq 0$ , This means that the Availability of Facilities and Infrastructure has a significant effect on Student Satisfaction.

The Significance Value (Sig) for the Availability of Facilities and Infrastructure Variable is 0.819. Because the Sig. value is 0.819 > probability 0.05, it can be concluded that H0 is accepted and H1 is rejected. So it can be interpreted as Availability of Facilities and Infrastructure does not have a direct effect on Student Satisfaction.

**Table 14. Simultaneous Effect F Test**

ANOVA <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	541.485	3	180.495	17.734	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	895.678	88	10.178		
	Total	1437.163	91			
a. Dependent Variable: Student Satisfaction						
b. Predictors: (Constant), Availability of Facilities and Infrastructure, Lecturer Performance, Academic Service Quality						

Based on the ANOVA Table of the F test results in this study, the simultaneous influence of the independent variables (Lecturer Performance, Academic Service Quality, and Availability of Facilities and Infrastructure) on the dependent variable (Student Satisfaction) is as follows:

- H0: All regression coefficients of the independent variables are zero, meaning that there is no significant simultaneous influence of Lecturer Performance, Academic Service Quality, and Availability of Facilities and Infrastructure on Student Satisfaction.
- H1: There is at least one regression coefficient from the independent variable that is not zero, meaning that there is a significant simultaneous influence of Lecturer Performance, Academic Service Quality, and Availability of Facilities and Infrastructure on Student Satisfaction.

## Discussion

Lecturer Performance has a positive and significant effect on Student Satisfaction. This positive coefficient indicates that lecturer performance has a positive and significant influence on student satisfaction. This is in line with the servqual theory by Parasuraman et al. (1985), which states that reliability and assurance – which in the context of education are reflected in the ability, knowledge, and professionalism of lecturers – are the main determinants in forming perceptions of quality service. Lecturers who are able to deliver material well, provide feedback, and guide students effectively will improve students' learning experience, which ultimately increases their level of satisfaction.

Academic Service Quality also contributes positively and significantly to Student Satisfaction. This strengthens the view of Tjiptono (2014) who stated that the quality of service, including the speed of administrative services, clarity of academic procedures, and availability of academic information, plays an important role in shaping customer (student) satisfaction. The better the academic services received by students, the higher the level of satisfaction they feel.

Conversely, the availability of facilities and infrastructure did not show a significant effect on student satisfaction and, in fact, had a negative coefficient. Although counterintuitive, this result can be explained using the Expectation-Disconfirmation Theory by Oliver (1980), which posits that satisfaction depends on the gap between expectations and perceived performance.

Overall, these results indicate that Lecturer Performance and Academic Service Quality have a positive influence on Student Satisfaction, while Availability of Facilities and Infrastructure shows a negative influence in this model. These results can provide guidance for institutions to improve Lecturer Performance and Academic Service Quality, as well as further evaluate aspects of facilities and infrastructure that may need improvement or adjustment. The results showing negative and statistically insignificant coefficients are quite interesting, because theoretically the availability of facilities and infrastructure should have a positive contribution to satisfaction. However, this result can be explained through Oliver's (1980) disconfirmation theory, which states that satisfaction occurs if actual performance meets or exceeds expectations. In this context, even though facilities and infrastructure are available, if their condition does not match students' expectations – either in terms of quality, completeness, or accessibility – then their contribution to satisfaction becomes statistically insignificant. Another factor that may explain this finding is "inertial satisfaction" or satisfaction that is not responsive to certain changes because students are used to it or do not have high expectations of campus facilities. This means that even though there are changes in the provision of facilities and infrastructure, this is not enough to significantly shift their level of satisfaction.

Theoretically, this finding supports the customer satisfaction theory model developed by Oliver (1980), which states that satisfaction is the result of evaluating experiences against expectations. In the context of higher education, students as "customers" will feel satisfied if the services received, both in terms of lecturers, academic services, and campus facilities, meet or exceed their expectations.

## Conclusion

This study aims to analyze the influence of Lecturer Performance, Academic Service Quality, and Availability of Facilities and Infrastructure on Student Satisfaction at STAIN Sultan Abdurrahman Kepulauan Riau. Based on data analysis conducted on 92 students from various study programs, several important findings were obtained. Overall, the research instruments used were proven to be valid and reliable, so that the measurement results can be trusted. Linear regression analysis shows that Lecturer Performance and Academic Service Quality have a positive and significant influence on Student Satisfaction. This means that the better the performance of the lecturer and the academic services provided, the level of student satisfaction tends to increase.

However, the results that are quite interesting and need attention are that the Availability of Facilities and Infrastructure shows an insignificant negative influence on student satisfaction. This means that even though the facilities are available, their existence has not had enough impact in increasing student satisfaction. This can be interpreted that the existence of facilities has not met student expectations, both in terms of quality, accessibility, and direct usefulness. Therefore it is necessary to improve the quality of lecturer-student interaction. Considering that Lecturer Performance has a major influence on satisfaction, institutions are advised to conduct pedagogical training, routine evaluation of lecturers, and build a participatory feedback system. Strengthening the academic service system needs to be improved in terms of speed, clarity of procedures, and openness of information. Students greatly appreciate fast and transparent service. Evaluation of the quality and effectiveness of campus facilities that need to be evaluated not only from their availability, but from the perspective of student needs that are required from the perspective of their use by students. therefore STAIN Kepri needs to involve students in the facility development planning process.

## References

- Abdullatif, R. (2023). Pengaruh sarana prasarana akademik, kualitas mengajar dosen dan kualitas layanan administrasi terhadap loyalitas mahasiswa dengan kepuasan mahasiswa sebagai variabel intervening pada Universitas Nuku. *Akrab Juara: Jurnal Ilmu-ilmu Sosial*, 8(1), 1-10.
- Anandikha, A. V., Chairunissa, M., & Indriyani, D. (2024). Pengaruh kualitas layanan administrasi dan fasilitas perguruan tinggi terhadap kepuasan mahasiswa Politeknik STIA LAN Jakarta. *Jurnal Pendidikan Non Formal*, 1(4), 11.
- Arista, Fitri Jayanti & Nanda Tika. (2018). Persepsi Mahasiswa Terhadap Pelayanan Perpustakaan Universitas Trunojoyo Madura. *Kompetensi*, 12(2), 205-223.
- Asmoro, Mashur Hasan Bisri & Bramantyo Tri. (2019). Etika Pelayanan Publik di Indonesia. *Journal of Governance Innovation*, 1(1), 59-76.
- Basuki, Johannes. (2021). Tantangan Ilmu Administrasi Publik: Paradigma Baru Kepemimpinan Aparatur Negara. *Public Inspiration: Jurnal Administrasi Publik*, 6(2), 160-181.
- Bhakti, Y. B., & Rahmawati, E. Y. (2018). Indeks Kepuasan Mahasiswa terhadap Pelayanan Program Studi Pendidikan Matematika. *Formatif: Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan MIPA*, 7(3).
- Cahyani, G. H. N., & Trihantoyo, S. (2020). Pengaruh Kinerja Dosen Dan Layanan Administrasi Akademik Tenaga Kependidikan Terhadap Kepuasan Mahasiswa Di Jurusan Manajemen Pendidikan Fakultas Ilmu Pendidikan Universitas Negeri Surabaya. *Jurnal Inspirasi Manajemen Pendidikan*, 8(2), 50-60.
- Chairat, A. S. N., & Wahyuningsih, U. (2018). Pengaruh Kinerja Dosen terhadap Kepuasan Mahasiswa. *Jurnal PowerPlant*, 6(2), 109-116.
- Chandra, T., Hafni, L., Chandra, S., Purwati, A. A., & Chandra, J. (2019). The influence of service quality, university image on student satisfaction and student loyalty. *Benchmarking*, 26(5), 1533-1549.
- Fikri, Miftahul. (2020). Konsep Dasar Manajemen pendidikan & Peran Standar Operasional Prosedur (SOP). Cimahi: Najmu Books Publishing.
- Ghofiroh, N. (2016). Pengaruh Kualitas Layanan Terhadap Kepuasan Mahasiswa (Studi Pada SMM ISO 9001: 2008 Kemahasiswaan Fakultas Ekonomi Universitas Negeri Surabaya). *Jurnal Pendidikan Tata Niaga (JPTN)*, 4(3).
- Gultom, D. K., Arif, M., & Fahmi, M. (2020). Determinasi kepuasan pelanggan terhadap loyalitas pelanggan melalui kepercayaan. *Maneggio: Jurnal Ilmiah Magister Manajemen*, 3(2), 171-180.
- Harahap, Y., Makhdalena, M., & Zulkarnain, Z. (2019). Pengaruh kualitas pelayanan akademik dan sarana prasarana pendidikan terhadap kepuasan mahasiswa fakultas keguruan dan ilmu pendidikan (fkip) universitas riau. *Jurnal JUMPED (Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan)*, 7(1), 116-128.
- Isnaini, M., Wardani, D. K., & Noviani, L. (2016). Pengaruh kompetensi dosen dan fasilitas belajar terhadap kepuasan mahasiswa pendidikan ekonomi fkip uns. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bisnis Dan Ekonomi*, 1(2).

- Kisworo, B., Utsman, U., Ilyas, I., & Siswanto, Y. (2018). Kepuasan Mahasiswa dan Pengguna Lulusan Program Studi Pendidikan Luar Sekolah Universitas Negeri Semarang. *Journal of Nonformal Education and Community Empowerment*.
- Kotler, P., & Keller, K. L. (2012). *Marketing Management* (14th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Kurbani, A. (2017). Pengaruh Kualitas Pelayanan Akademik dan Fasilitas Pendidikan terhadap Kepuasan Mahasiswa Kuliah pada Universitas PGRI Palembang. *Jurnal Media Wahana Ekonomika*, 13(4), 22–35.
- Mahidin. (2017). Kajian Administrasi Pendidikan di Dunia Pendidikan. *Al-Irsyad: Jurnal Pendidikan dan Konseling*, 7(1), 131–138.
- Mariska, L., & Hati, S. W. (2015). Pengaruh Kualitas Pelayanan Akademik Terhadap kepuasan Mahasiswa Di Politeknik Negeri Batam. *Jurnal Akuntansi, Ekonomi dan Manajemen Bisnis*, 3(1), 1–9.
- Marthalina. (2018). Analisis Kualitas Pelayanan Akademik Dan Kepuasan Mahasiswa Di Ipdn Kampus Jakarta. *Jurnal Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*, 5(1), 1–18.
- Matin dan Nurhattati Fuad. (2016). *Manajemen Sarana Prasarana Pendidikan*. Jakarta: PT RajaGrafindo Persada.
- Muin, Rahmawati. Analisis Tingkat Kepuasan Mahasiswa Terhadap Pelayanan Kampus. *Jurnal ASSETS*, 4 (1).
- Nafidzatul Ghofiroh dan Tri Sudarwanto. (2008). Pengaruh Kualitas Layanan Terhadap Kepuasan Mahasiswa (Studi Pada SMM ISO 9001:2008 Kemahasiswaan Fakultas Ekonomi Universitas Negeri Surabaya). *Jurnal Pendidikan Tata Niaga*, 3(3), 1–10.
- Nasution, L. E. (2025). Pengaruh kompetensi dosen, kualitas pelayanan tendik dan sarana prasarana belajar terhadap prestasi akademik melalui kepuasan mahasiswa STIE Eka Prasetya. *Jurnal PenKoMi: Kajian Pendidikan dan Ekonomi*, 8(1), 53–62.
- Nurlaela, & Sugiyanto. (2019). Pengaruh Kinerja Dosen dan Kualitas Layanan Administrasi Akademik terhadap Kepuasan Mahasiswa Dampaknya terhadap Prestasi Belajar di Universitas Pamulang Tangerang Selatan. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Humanis 2019*, 577– 589.
- Persada, R. Kualitas Pelayanan Pemungutan Pajak Kendaraan Bermotor Pada Kantor Bersama Samsat Kota Batam.
- Puang, D., Syarifuddin, & Nurdin. (2023). Pengaruh kualitas pelayanan, budaya akademik, dan kinerja dosen terhadap kepuasan mahasiswa pendidikan ekonomi Universitas Patompo Makassar. *Jurnal Ilmiah Pena*, 15(2), 9–12.
- Rahmawati, D. (2013). Analisis Faktor-faktor yang Mempengaruhi Kepuasan Mahasiswa. *Jurnal Economia*, 9(1), 52–65.
- Sadewa, P., & Damayanti, R. (2024). Pengaruh kompetensi dosen dan lingkungan kampus terhadap kepuasan mahasiswa S1 Akuntansi Universitas Pamulang. *Scientific Journal of Reflection: Economic, Accounting, Management and Business*, 6(1), 1–10.
- Sagala, Syaiful. (2009). *Kemampuan Profesional Tenaga pendidik dan Tenaga Kependidikan*, Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Saputri, N., Nadiya, & Amelia. (2023). Pengaruh kinerja dosen, kualitas pelayanan akademik, dan fasilitas belajar terhadap kepuasan mahasiswa Fakultas Ekonomi Universitas Muhammadiyah Aceh. *JEMSI (Jurnal Ekonomi, Manajemen, dan Akuntansi)*, 9(5), 2268–2277.
- Shahbana, E. B., Timan, A., & Sultoni. (2023). Pengaruh mutu layanan akademik, sarana dan prasarana terhadap kepuasan mahasiswa pascasarjana terintegrasi di Fakultas Program Magister Universitas Negeri Malang. *Jurnal Pendidikan: Teori, Penelitian, dan Pengembangan*, 8(1), 1–10.
- Soro, S. H., Budiman, K., Supriyadi, D., & Ainiyah, N. (2023). Implementasi Pengelolaan Sarana Prasarana Dalam Pemenuhan Standar Mutu Pendidikan Di Institut Lembaga pendidikan Tinggi (IPI) Garut. *al-Afkar, Journal for Islamic Studies*, 6(2), 291–303.
- Sufiyah, A. (2011). Pengaruh Kulaitas Layanan Akademik dan Birokrasi terhadap Kepuasan Mahasiswa. *Jurnal Ilmiah Aset*, 13(2), 85–93.
- Sugiyono. (2015). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Syefudin. (2019). *Pengaruh Kualitas Pelayanan Akademik Dan Kinerja Dosen Terhadap Kepuasan Mahasiswa Pascasarjana Institut Lembaga pendidikan Tinggi Ilmu Al-Quran (PTIQ) Jakarta* [published Thesis]. Institut PTIQ Jakarta.
- Tjiptono, Fandy. (2014). *Strategi Pemasaran*. Yogyakarta: Andi.
- Triyono, A. (2018). Lembaga pendidikan Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi Indragiri (STIE-I) Rengat 46. *Jurnal Manajemen Dan Bisnis*, VII (04), 46–56.
- Unnisa, H., & Sukwatus, I. (2021). Pengaruh Kualitas Layanan dan Sarana Prasarana L aboratorium Komputer Terhadap Kepuasan Mahasiswa (Studi Pada Mata Kuliah Aplikasi Komputer Mahasiswa Program Studi Pendidikan Ekonomi Universitas Bhinneka PGRI).

- Warnadi, W. (2019). Pengaruh Kualitas Pelayanan Akademik Dan Fasilitas Terhadap Kepuasan Mahasiswa Lembaga pendidikan Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi Indragiri (Stie-1) Rengat. *Jurnal Manajemen Dan Bisnis*, 8(1), 10-20.
- Wina Sanjaya, 2008. *Kurikulum dan Pembelajaran*, Jakarta: Kencana, 2013. *Penelitian Pendidikan*, Jakarta: Kencana
- Zulkarnain, dkk. (2019). The Influence of The Quality Academic Services and Educational Infrastructure Facilities To The Satisfaction To The Students Faculty Of Teacher And Education Science (FKIP) Of Riau University. *Jurnal JUMPED (Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan)*, 7(1), 116-182.