

## **The Effect of Lecturers Teaching Performance on Students Satisfaction in a University**

**Fajriani Azis, Muhammad Azis, M. Yusuf A. Ngampo, Abd Rijal**

Department of Accounting Education, Faculty of Economics, Makassar State University

Email : [fajrianiazis@unm.ac.id](mailto:fajrianiazis@unm.ac.id)

### **ABSTRACT**

Student learning satisfaction is one of the indicators of teachers or lecturers success in teaching performance. It is assumed that the greater student satisfaction with a lecturer's teaching style equates to better teaching performance by the lecturer. Current research has established that students satisfaction level within a university learning environment correlates with the lecturers teaching performance. The present study took place within a university examining students and lecturers in the Faculty of Economics at Makassar State University in Indonesia. The sample comprised 81 individuals who were investigated using a correlational descriptive study model. Data were gathered through questionnaires and the study of documents and then further analysed using a regression model that consisted of  $R^2$ , F, t, and determination tests. Findings were that a lecturer's performance, which involves preparation, opening, core, and closing activities in a lesson, positively and significantly correlated with student satisfaction levels.

**Keywords:** teaching performance; student satisfaction; tertiary education

### **INTRODUCTION**

In 2016 people in ASEAN countries entered a new age of free trading, joining other countries in the world. This new age brings about a reduction in cross-country trading limitations and boundaries. The competition in all areas, such as products, service, and labour markets call for better and appropriate measures (Chowdhury et al., 2022; Dai et al., 2020; Danzer & Grundke, 2020; Duch-Brown et al., 2022; Pawlowski et al., 2021; Zens et al., 2020).

In addition to developments in the AEC (ASEAN Economic Community), the issues of globalization and free trade have also become important topics because they require a better quality of a nation's human resources (Boldrin & Levine, 2008; Varman & Costa, 2009). The demand of competition calls for everyone to improve their competitive advantages in every field of work. In this age, only those with competitive advantages will survive the market (Farrell & Klemperer, 2007; Jullien et al., 2021).

The high level of competition, which requires high quality human resources, places particular demands on education institutions to produce graduates ready to enter the fierce

competition in the market. It calls for various endeavours' and development strategies based on quality improvement and skill mastery for the education institution to implement continuous transformation.

The demand for education in today's age of globalization is in line with the requirement of Indonesia's Law No 20/2003 article 35, which states that the National Standard of Education consists of standards of content, process, graduates' competences, educational staff, facilities, management, funding, and education evaluation, all of which need to be continuously improved. Considering this legal requirement, educators' (lecturers) performance in producing high quality human resources is an important factor. Government Regulation No 19/2005 in the National Standard of Education implies that lecturers, as agents of learning, should possess pedagogic, personal, professional, and social competence.

In higher education, lecturers are crucial agents that drive the education process. Their competences need to be more comprehensive than those possessed by educators (teachers) in primary and secondary schools. Lecturers produce human resources who will be directly involved in various key roles and aspects of life, including the economy, politics, and social environments.

In line with this, Rosyada (2004) argues that lecturers in general have to satisfy two requirements: possessing capability and loyalty. They must have a high level of competencies and skills in the subjects they teach, as well as theoretical comprehension of 'good' teaching, which includes planning, implementation, and evaluation of education and teaching loyalty. Furthermore, it is stated that good lecturers have to satisfy seven criteria: attitude, knowledge of the subject, teaching method, expectation, reaction towards students, and management.

The teaching and learning process is the core of the formal education process in universities. In the process, various components interact. The primary components of the higher education process are (1) lecturers, (2) learning materials, and (3) students. Interaction between these three components involves the use of learning facilities, methodology, media, and environment to create a learning atmosphere that facilitates the achievement of learning objectives. In the learning process, lecturers not only transfer their knowledge to the students but also pay attention to student contentment/satisfaction levels to achieve the learning objectives of each subject.

To produce quality education that will satisfy students, a high quality learning process is needed. The quality of the instruction (teaching-learning) process depends closely on lecturers competence and commitment to the learning process, reflected in teaching performance.

In general, the instruction process consists of several activities: preparation, an opening activity, a core activity, and a closing activity. These activities call for a lecturer's skilled performance in delivering the materials. Student ability to absorb and comprehend the material also depends on lecturers performance during the teaching process. Lecturers

teaching performance should produce student satisfaction, which in turn will generate high quality graduates ready to compete in the real world.

In the teaching-learning process, students show various levels of satisfaction: Some are very satisfied, while others are merely satisfied, barely satisfied, or not satisfied at all. There are many factors that influence students' satisfaction in learning. One of these is the teaching performance of lecturers.

Based on this phenomenon, the researchers aimed to study students' levels of satisfaction with their lecturers teaching performance. This topic was formulated into a specific research question: What are student levels of satisfaction with their lecturers teaching performance? The study was undertaken with students in the Faculty of Economics at Makassar State University in Indonesia. The aim of the study was to analyse and describe students' levels of satisfaction with lecturers teaching performance.

## **METHOD**

The present study was a correlational descriptive study, aiming to provide a clear overview of the effect of lecturers teaching performance on students' satisfaction in the Faculty of Economics at Makassar State University. The object of the study was students in the Faculty of Economics at this university. The population consisted of 1896 students from which the sample was selected through a simple random sampling technique. In line with (Creswell, 1999, 2010; Creswell & Clark, 2017; Feters et al., 2013), the simple random sampling resulted in a sample of 81 students. The research instrument was designed to measure student satisfaction levels regarding lecturers performance. The data collection instrument used in the present study was a questionnaire with a Likert scale. Data were gathered through questionnaires and document study, and analysed using the inferential statistics technique. This technique was implemented to measure the relationship and effect of independent variables on dependent variables. The statistical tool employed in this study is the multiple regression analysis approach, with the formula of:  $Y = a + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + b_3X_3 + b_4X_4 + e$ .

## **RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

### **Results of regression analysis**

Multiple regression analysis was applied to describe the effects of the independent variables on the dependent variables. Important parts of regression analysis are: regression equation, correlated coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ -adj), F-test and t-test. Based on the regression equation, it was found that the dependent variable of student satisfaction (Y) can be predicted from the independent variables of learning preparation (X1), a lesson's preliminary learning activities (X2), core learning activities (X3), and final learning activities (X4). Regression coefficients for the four variables were

positive, indicating that the improvement in learning preparation, preliminary, core, and final learning activities had a positive effect on student satisfaction. Based on the calculation of regression analysis, a regression equation with standardized coefficient (beta) was found as follows:

$$Y = 0.457X_1 + 0.323X_2 + 0.369X_3 + 0.216X_4$$

### Results of F-test

It was found that  $F_{\text{calc}}$  is 23.107 (higher than  $F_{\text{table}}$ ) and the coefficient of determination was 60.7%. This result indicates that, simultaneously, there are significant effects of the four independent variables on student satisfaction, with a contribution level of 60.7%, while the other 39.3% is explained by other variables outside the scope of this study.

### Results of t-test

The effect of the learning preparation variable on student satisfaction was individually measured by t-tests. The t-test result for this regression coefficient was significant ( $p \text{ value} > 0.05$ ). The variable of learning preparation with regression coefficient of 0.475 has a significant influence on students' satisfaction. This is proven by the value of  $t_{\text{calc}}$  (3.3843), which is higher than the value of  $t_{\text{table}}$  (2.028); or the  $p \text{ value}$  (0.001), which is higher than  $\alpha$  (0.05). Statistically, the coefficient of regression indicates that the effect of the learning preparation variable on student satisfaction is significant. The beta coefficient of 0.310 shows that with appropriate preparation of the lecturers, the lesson materials, content, methodology, and implementation will be facilitating factors for student satisfaction improvement. The partial correlation coefficient of 0.403 is the degree of correlation between learning preparation and student satisfaction, corrected with the correlation to opening and core activities of learning. This indicates that the variety in student satisfaction can be explained directly by the variable of learning preparation.

The effect of the preliminary learning activities variable on student satisfaction was individually measured by t-test. The t-test result for this regression coefficient is significant ( $p \text{ value} > 0.05$ ). The variable of preliminary learning activities, with a regression coefficient of 0.323, has significant influence on student satisfaction. This is shown by the value of  $t_{\text{calc}}$  (2.848), which is higher than the value of  $t_{\text{table}}$  (2.028); or the  $p \text{ value}$  (0.006), which is higher than  $\alpha$  (0.05). Therefore, statistically, the coefficient of regression indicates that the effect of the preliminary learning activities variable on student satisfaction is significant. The beta coefficient of 0.244 shows that the preliminary learning activities consisting of checking attendance and student readiness, stating the objectives of the lesson, and a perception activity, facilitate the improvement of student satisfaction. The partial correlation coefficient of 0.311 is the degree of

correlation between preliminary learning activities and student satisfaction, corrected with the correlation to learning preparation and core learning activities. This indicates that the variety in student satisfaction can be explained directly by the variable of preliminary learning activities.

Individually, the effect of the core learning activities variable on student satisfaction was measured by t-test. The t-test result for this regression coefficient is significant ( $p$  value  $> 0.05$ ). The variable of core learning activities, with a regression coefficient of 0.369, has significant influence on student satisfaction. This was proven by the value of  $t_{\text{calc}}$  (3.233), higher than the value of  $t_{\text{table}}$  (2.028); or the  $p$  value (0.006) higher than  $\alpha$  (0.05). Thus, statistically, the coefficient of regression indicates that the effect of the core learning activities variable on student satisfaction is significant. The beta coefficient of 0.303 indicates that the core learning activities, including the mastery level of materials, the use of appropriate method, suitable teaching-learning strategy, the use of learning media, techniques of asking questions, and reinforcement, will facilitate the improvement of student satisfaction. The partial correlation coefficient of 0.348 is the degree of correlation between core learning activities and student satisfaction, corrected with the correlation to learning preparation and preliminary learning activities. The variety of student satisfaction can be explained directly by the variable of core learning activities.

The effect of the final learning activities variable on student satisfaction was individually measured by t-test. The t-test result for this regression coefficient is significant ( $p$  value  $> 0.05$ ). The variable of final learning activities, with regression coefficient of 0.216, has significant influence on student satisfaction. This is proven by the value of  $t_{\text{calc}}$  (2.321), which is higher than the value of  $t_{\text{table}}$  (2.028); or the  $p$  value (0.006), higher than  $\alpha$  (0.05). Therefore, statistically, the coefficient of regression indicates that the effect of the final learning activities variable on student satisfaction is significant. The beta coefficient of 0.211 shows that the final learning activities, consisting of evaluation techniques, the strictness level of scoring, how soon scores are published, and follow-up activities in the form of homework or tasks, will facilitate an increase in student satisfaction. The partial correlation coefficient of 0.257 is the degree of correlation between final learning activities and student satisfaction, after being corrected with the correlation to learning preparation, preliminary learning activities, and core learning activities. This indicates that the range of student satisfaction can be explained directly by the variable of final learning activities.

### **Coefficient of determination**

Based on statistical calculations, it was found that the coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ) is 0.634; indicating that the ability of the regression equation to predict the value of the dependent variable is 63.4%. Furthermore, the value of 63.4% shows that the variables of learning preparation, preliminary learning activities, core learning activities, and final learning activities, are able to explain 63.4% of the changes in the

student satisfaction variable (Y); the other 36.6% is explained by other variables beyond the scope of this study.

## Discussion

The present study was based on two hypotheses. The first (H1) assumed that the variables of learning preparation, preliminary learning activities, core learning activities, and final learning activities, simultaneously have significant influence on student satisfaction in the Faculty of Economics at Makassar State University in Indonesia. The result of the F-test on the simultaneous contribution of the four independent variables to student satisfaction (23.107) was significant ( $p\text{-value} = 0.000$ ). It can be concluded that the findings **confirm** H1. In other words, the variables of learning preparation, preliminary, core, and final learning activities, significantly affect student satisfaction at the same time.

Student satisfaction with lecturers teaching performance is a crucial factor in the success of education. Satisfaction in learning is one of the indicators of lecturers success when performing their duties. Ensuring that students are satisfied with lecturers teaching performance is an important step for students to succeed in their studies. In other words, student satisfaction reflects that the learning process has been conducted as intended.

Another benefit of student satisfaction with lecturers teaching performance is that satisfied students are more likely to master the materials being delivered. The success of lecturers in delivering materials to students will gradually improve students competence. This is useful for the students to prepare them for entering employment in this age of free competition.

Learning preparation is the first step that determines the success of the learning process. Preparing a good lesson plan is necessary to develop a direction for the learning activities to achieve the intended learning objectives. With thorough preparation, the final result achieved will be optimal and accurate. Preparation also allows for a prediction of how much success can be achieved.

Preliminary learning activities may consist of an observation of students previous knowledge or a short discussion to prepare students' minds before focusing on core learning activities. Just like with sport, a warm-up is needed before the actual core learning activities are performed, to reduce the risk of injury. In learning activities, it is also important to 'warm up' students so that they are ready for the lesson materials to be delivered. Students readiness to receive lesson materials is one of the factors that determine the success of the learning process.

Core learning activities are primary activities in the teaching-learning process. Student satisfaction is generally formed in this stage. Davis et al. (1996) considers ability and motivation as the two factors that affect performance. Ability consists of potential ability (IQ) and real ability (knowledge + skill). During core learning activities,

lecturers teaching performance receives full attention from the students, ultimately determining whether students are satisfied with a lecturer's performance.

Final learning activities comprise the last stage of learning in which the students are evaluated. A positive or negative impression of a lecturer's performance is finalized in this stage. Lecturers teaching performance may leave a deep impression on the students, or may leave none at all. Students evaluate lecturers teaching performance during the final learning activities.

The second hypothesis (H2) assumed that the variables of learning preparation, preliminary learning activities, core learning activities, and final learning activities have a significant effect, partially (individually), on student satisfaction in the Faculty of Economics at Makassar State University. This hypothesis relates to the results of the four regression coefficient tests. The result of t-tests on the regression coefficient of the learning preparation variable's effect on student satisfaction is 0.457, which is significant ( $p\text{-value} = 0.001$ ). Similarly, the result of the regression coefficient of the preliminary learning activities' effect on student satisfaction (0.323) is significant ( $p\text{-value} = 0.006$ ), as are the regression coefficients of core learning activities' (0.369,  $p\text{-value} = 0.006$ ) and final learning activities' (0.216,  $p\text{-value} = 0.006$ ) effects on student satisfaction. These results are significant, which means that the findings **confirm** H2.

Individually, the variables of learning preparation, preliminary, core, and final learning activities are important factors that affect student satisfaction with lecturers teaching performance. In other words, anything lecturers do, from preliminary to final student learning activities, will be a source of satisfaction. This is in line with (Ahmad et al., 2018; Shaari et al., 2014), who argues that lecturers performance involves various skills/behaviors including teaching, evaluating and mentoring.

Communication with students, particularly in improving their learning motivation, is one of the most important skills that determine lecturers performance. (Niswaty et al., 2017; Saggaf et al., 2017) views performance as a result of multiplying ability and motivation. Thus, optimal performance is measured not only from the aspect of capability, but also in terms of motivating skills, i.e. the ability to motivate students to study.

The analysis shows that both individually and together, lecturers performance that consists of learning preparation, preliminary learning activities, core learning activities, and final learning activities, has a significant effect on student satisfaction in the Faculty of Economics at Makassar State University. Lecturers performance is an important factor in developing students' cognitive, affective, and psychomotor skills. With good performance on the part of the lecturers, students will be able to improve their skills and confidence to face the challenges of globalization and free market in the real world.

## CONCLUSION

The present study aimed to analyse the effect of lecturers' performance on student satisfaction in the Faculty of Economics at Makassar State University in Indonesia. The variables employed to measure lecturers' performance included learning preparation, preliminary, core and final learning activities. Student satisfaction was the independent variable in this study.

Based on the results of regression analysis, it is concluded that lecturers performance, both considered individually and as a whole, has a significant influence on student satisfaction. The result of F-test on the combined contribution of the four independent variables on student satisfaction (23.107) is significant ( $p\text{-value} = 0.000$ ). The findings **confirm** our H1 hypothesis: the variables of learning preparation, preliminary, core and final learning activities, together significantly affect student satisfaction.

The results of t-tests on the regression coefficient of the effect of learning preparation, preliminary, core and final learning activities on student satisfaction were significant. These results **confirm** the H2 hypothesis.

The results of F-test and t-test indicate that with thorough learning preparation and effective learning activities at each stage, student satisfaction can be improved. The effect of each variable on student satisfaction varies.

## REFERENCES

- Ahmad, S. Z., Abu Bakar, A. R., & Ahmad, N. (2018). An evaluation of teaching methods of entrepreneurship in hospitality and tourism programs. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 16(1), 14–25. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2017.11.002>
- Boldrin, M., & Levine, D. K. (2008). Perfectly competitive innovation. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 55(3), 435–453. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmoneco.2008.01.008>
- Chowdhury, H., Hodgson, A., & Hasan, M. M. (2022). Does a competitive external labour market affect corporate social responsibility? Evidence from industry tournament incentives. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Finance*, 33, 100617. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbef.2021.100617>
- Creswell, J. W. (1999). Mixed-method research: Introduction and application. In *Handbook of educational policy* (pp. 455–472). Elsevier.
- Creswell, J. W. (2010). Mapping the developing landscape of mixed methods research. *SAGE Handbook of Mixed Methods in Social & Behavioral Research*, 2, 45–68.
- Creswell, J. W., & Clark, V. L. P. (2017). *Designing and conducting mixed methods*



research. Sage publications.

- Dai, M., Huang, W., & Zhang, Y. (2020). Persistent effects of initial labor market conditions: The case of China's tariff liberalization after WTO accession. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 178, 566–581. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2020.07.036>
- Danzer, A. M., & Grundke, R. (2020). Export price shocks and rural labor markets: The role of labor market distortions. *Journal of Development Economics*, 145, 102464. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdeveco.2020.102464>
- Davis, K., Newstrom, J. W., & DHARMA, A. (1996). *Perilaku dalam Organisasi*, jilid 1.
- Duch-Brown, N., Gomez-Herrera, E., Mueller-Langer, F., & Tolan, S. (2022). Market power and artificial intelligence work on online labour markets. *Research Policy*, 51(3), 104446. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2021.104446>
- Farrell, J., & Klemperer, P. (2007). *Chapter 31 Coordination and Lock-In: Competition with Switching Costs and Network Effects* (M. Armstrong & R. B. T.-H. of I. O. Porter (eds.); Vol. 3, pp. 1967–2072). Elsevier. [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S1573-448X\(06\)03031-7](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S1573-448X(06)03031-7)
- Fetters, M. D., Curry, L. A., & Creswell, J. W. (2013). Achieving integration in mixed methods designs—principles and practices. *Health Services Research*, 48(6pt2), 2134–2156.
- Jullien, B., Pavan, A., & Rysman, M. (2021). Chapter 7 - Two-sided markets, pricing, and network effects☆☆For comments and suggestions, we thank the editors, anonymous referees, as well as Mark Armstrong, Jay-Pil Choi, Avi Goldfarb, Hanna Halaburda, Igal Hendel, Chuqing Jin, Marshall Van Alstyne, Shuang Wang, Stefan Weiergraeber, Julian Wright, and Junjie Zhou. Special thanks to Martin Peitz for very detailed comments. Jishan Du, Tyler Haas, and Shuang Wang provided excellent research assistance. Bruno Jullien acknowledges funding from ANR under grant ANR-17-EURE-0010 (Investissements d'Avenir program) and ANITI (ANR grant 3IA), and from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No 670494). In K. Ho, A. Hortaçsu, & A. B. T.-H. of I. O. Lizzeri (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial Organization, Volume 4* (Vol. 4, Issue 1, pp. 485–592). Elsevier. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.hesind.2021.11.007>
- Niswaty, R., Rusbiati, S., Jamaluddin, J., & Salam, R. (2017). The Influence of Teacher's Reinforcement for Students Motivation. *International Conference on Education, Science, Art and Technology*, 148–152.
- Pawlowski, T., Steckenleiter, C., Wallrafen, T., & Lechner, M. (2021). Individual labor market effects of local public expenditures on sports. *Labour Economics*, 70,

101996. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.labeco.2021.101996>
- Rosyada, D. (2004). *Paradigma pendidikan demokratis: sebuah model pelibatan masyarakat dalam penyelenggaraan pendidikan*.
- Saggaf, M. S., Salam, R., & Wirawan, H. (2017). The Influence of Teacher's Pedagogic Competence on Learning Motivation of Student of Office Administration Expertise Package. *8th International Conference of Asian Association of Indigenous and Cultural Psychology (ICAAIP 2017)*.
- Shaari, A. S., Yusoff, N. M., Ghazali, I. M., Osman, R. H., & Dzahir, N. F. M. (2014). The Relationship between Lecturers' Teaching Style and Students' Academic Engagement. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 118, 10–20. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.02.002>
- Varman, R., & Costa, J. A. (2009). Competitive and Cooperative Behavior in Embedded Markets: Developing an Institutional Perspective on Bazaars. *Journal of Retailing*, 85(4), 453–467. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretai.2009.04.006>
- Zens, G., Böck, M., & Zörner, T. O. (2020). The heterogeneous impact of monetary policy on the US labor market. *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*, 119, 103989. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jedc.2020.103989>