Factors Affecting to Students Satisfaction of State Universities - With Special Reference to Regional State Universities in Sri Lanka

W.M.R.B. Weerasooriya and U.W.M.R.S. Kappagoda

Faculty of Management Studies, Rajarata University of Sri Lanka, Mihintale, Sri Lanka

Abstract: Students' satisfaction can be defined as a short-term attitude resulting from an evaluation of students' educational experiences, services and facilities. Students' satisfaction in higher education is a multidimensional process which is influenced by different factors. Hence, the study focused to investigate the factors affecting to students' satisfaction in state universities in Sri Lanka. Study empirically investigates the previous research papers and other secondary sources. Study samples comprises of the 650 respondents from the various state universities in Sri Lanka and data gathered through the standard questionnaire. It's consisting of section A (demographic factors) and section B (included student arrangement, studying, student assessment, premises, cleaning and sanitary facilities, canteen services, library, practical training and research work). The data was analyzed using SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Science) and mean score and standard deviation were used as a descriptive analysis and correlation coefficient was used as a bivariate analysis. The hypotheses were tested using the Pearson correlation coefficient and multiple regression analysis. According to the results review that the studying, cleaning and sanitary facilities and practical training have strong positive relationship between the students satisfaction while lowest relationship shows the studying arrangement. Study recommended to more attention about the studying arrangements (adequacy of the supportive equipment's), student assessments, premises (comfortability), canteen services and research works.

Key Words: Student's Satisfaction, student arrangement, studying, student assessment, premises, cleaning and sanitary facilities, canteen services, library, practical training and research work.

I. Background of the study

With the increasing importance, higher education is seen as a major asset for socio- economic and technological development in any country. The quality of education provided by higher education institutions has a direct impact on the performance of any country. In the higher education system, students are considered the university's major stakeholder group and university students' satisfaction has individual, institutional and social implications. Satisfied students continue their studies with high academic performance. This increase the reputation of the university and finally performance of the country. By considering the importance of students' satisfaction, numerous researchers have investigated issues related to students' satisfaction (Astin, 1977; Bryant, 2009; DeShields, Kara, & Kaynak, 2005; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005), and most of them agree that highly satisfied students are more likely to remain in, and ultimately, successfully graduate from universities. Some research also reveals that student satisfaction is inversely related to student complaints regarding advising, career preparation, and the need for new courses or effectiveness of current courses (e.g., Korn, Sweetman, & Nodine, 1996). In academic settings, students' satisfaction data helps universities make their curriculum more responsive to the needs of a changing marketplace (Elliott, K. M. & Shin, D. 2002).

History of the Sri Lankan Higher Education system

Higher education in Sri Lanka has been based on the several prominent Parvenus (Ancient Buddhist Monks Training Centers) during the local Kingdoms. The origins of the modern university system in Sri Lanka dates back to 1921 when a University College. The Ceylon University College was established at the former premises of Royal College Colombo affiliated to the University of London. However, the begin of modern higher education in Ceylon was in 1870 when the Ceylon Medical School was established followed by Colombo Law College (1875), School of Agriculture (1884) and the Government Technical College (1893).

The University of Ceylon was established on 1 July 1942 by the Ceylon University Ordinance No.20 of 1942 which was to be unitary, residential and autonomous. The University was located in Colombo and several years later a second campus was built in Peradeniya. University of Ceylon became the University of Sri Lanka follow in the University of Ceylon Act No. 1 of 1972 resulting in a more centralized administration and more direct government control, this gave way for creation of separate universities after the Universities Act No. 16 of 1978. Until amendments to the University Act were made in 1999 only state universities were allowed to grant undergraduate degrees, however this has since changed.

There are currently only 17 state universities in Sri Lanka. The prominent ones are University of Colombo, University of Peradeniya,

University of Ruhuna, University of Kelaniya, University of SriJayawardhenapura and University of Moratuwa. In recent years with changes to the University Act afew institutes have been given permission to grant their own degrees, the most prominent is the government owned Sri Lanka Institute of Information Technology.

It is to regularize, expand and develop the institutions under the Higher Education System; the government established the Ministry of Higher Education. As such this Ministry has a great responsibility in social and economic development. It has a huge impact towards the Development ofHuman Resource demanded by the key sectors as well. The present situation created a favorable atmosphere for education sector while freeing the government to finally focus on education andother economic and social development activities. As a result the Ministry of Higher Education and Education has already formulated policies and strategies and implementing the same to bring the education system of the country equivalent to the standards of the rest of the world.

Ministry of Higher Education (MOHE) with the University Grants Commission (UGC) having continuous dialog with academia, trade unions and other key stakeholders to uplift higher education system to the desired level. Ministry of Higher Education is taking measures to strength its institutional framework and established Quality Assurance and Accreditation Council (QAAC) under the UGC. The QAAC is key objective is ensure excellence in higher education through qualityassurance.

Action have been taken to enhance the demand in the job market value for local graduates by shifting them towards job oriented education system and also providing them with effective communication skills and literacy in Information Technology. This strategy will ultimately improve the net value of the Human Capital in Sri Lanka.

The MOHE develops partnerships with international universities for two way exchange resource andto increase opportunities for scholarships for overseas study for Sri Lankans. Other areas that the MOHE is responsible for, involved acquiring relevant skilled consultant teams for faculties such as Engineering, Medicine, Law and Arts in response to requests. It provides expertise and opportunitiesfor dissemination of information, sharing of ideas and upgrading skills.

The successful transition to a knowledge economy depends on the key contribution from universitieswhere a knowledge-based, skilled workforce is produced. Thus, universities as centers of knowledgecreation and dissemination are pivotal in guiding the country towards a knowledge economy (Commission, 2015). In this journey, Sri Lankan university system plays a decisive role in creating intellectuals for the nation. At present, there are 17 state universities, two (02) campuses, twenty (20)institutes, and five (05) other government universities are functioning in Sri Lankan higher education industry which produces around 27,000 graduates annually (National Education Commission, 2020). The universities offer diversified degree programs at both undergraduates and postgraduates levels under five major disciplines such as Mathematics, Science, Management & Commerce, Art and Technology (Commission, 2015). Management is one of past moving the field in the global education setting and no exception for Sri Lanka. All Sri Lankan state universities are functioning under preview of UGC aligning to Sri Lankan Qualification Framework and the academic programs are reviewed to maintain the consistency of university system. UGC selects students for state universities on the basis of student's performance and their preferences. The University Grants Commission has set a target to increase the Gross Enrolment Ratio (GER) in higher education to 30 per cent by 2020 from the present 25.4 per cent, The number of students enrolled in higher education system has gone up to about 3.66 crore in 2017-18. The GER rose to 25.4 per cent in 2017-18, while the aim is to increase it to 30 per cent by 2020.

Problem Statement

According to the pilot study conducted by the researchers, found that even though the students need to maintain regular attendance per each semester, the majority of the students do not maintain the standard attendance up to the expected level and also, around 3 % of undergraduates don't complete their degree within the academic periods. Some students give up the degree and leave universities. Furthermore, the researchers discussed with selected students of a few Sri Lankan state universities, found majority of students are not satisfied with their university life. The direct and noticeable actions and protests organized by the university students give the more evidences for their dissatisfaction.

These evidences indicate the problem of students' satisfaction in state universities. To address this problem first authorities need to identify the factors affecting students' satisfaction. However in Sri Lankan context, the problem has been received less attention from the researchers and problem is still remaining at large in regional state universities. This is the first study which investigates the direct and indirect impact on students' satisfaction in state universities in Sri Lanka. More ever, study findings help policy makers to develop suitable policy packages for universities to enhance thelevel of their students' satisfaction by increasing university image and quality of university staffs. Further, the study help university academic and non-academic staffs to identify the impact of their behavior, activities and contribution in enhancing university image and students' satisfaction in state universities. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to find the factors affecting students' satisfactionof state universities in Sri Lanka.

Objectives of the Study

Study comprises the following objectives and those were achieved at the end of the study.

1. To find out factors affecting to the students satisfaction of the state universities in Sri Lanka
2. To examine most important factor/s affecting to the overall satisfaction of the state universities inSri Lanka
3. To examine the demographic factors, specially year of study and study program are associationwith student satisfaction of the state universities in Sri Lanka

II. Literature Review

Student Satisfaction and antecedents of student satisfaction

Student satisfaction definitions have varied widely depending on the research approach and focus (Hanssen, T.-E. S. & Solvoll, G., 2015). In this study, student satisfaction was examined from an educational perspective. Student satisfaction was a major performance indicator for higher educationinstitutions (Bryant.J, 2009). Student satisfaction is a short-term feeling resulting from an evaluation of educational experiences, services and facilities encountered by a student during the learning process (Elliot & Shin, 2002, Sojkin, B., Bartkowiak, P. & Skuza, A., 2012). It is a function of the relative level of experiences and perceived performance about educational service which is provided by higher educational institutes (Mukhtar, et al., 2015).

Previous studies have identified that different factors influencing student satisfaction. Marzo- Navarro et al. (2005) identified demographic characteristics of age, gender, ethnic origin and level ofeducation as the factors that influence on the level of satisfaction in the higher education institutions.Bosch et al. (2008) found the same results and in addition to that disciplinary background, religion and learning style are the factors influencing students' satisfaction. According to Appleton-Knapp and Krentler (2006) personal factors and institutional factors are influencing factors on student satisfaction. The personal factors cover gender, employment, preferred learning style and grade pointaverage (GPA). Institutional factors that include the quality of instructions, the promptness of the instructor's feedback, the clarity of expectation and the teaching style.

Tandilashvili (2019), Song, Y. (2022), und the satisfier factors on students' satisfaction in Georgian Higher Education Institutions. According to him, the satisfier factors can be categorized within purely academic elements and elements that are linked with other services provided by higher education institutions. However, these two sets of satisfier factors are linked and should be studied together to expect higher satisfaction level.

According to Palacio, A., Meneses, G. & Perez, P., (2002) university staff, university image is two main factors that influence on students' satisfaction. University image is influenced by multiple constitutes such as infrastructures, academic programs, academic staff, administrative procedure, university location and even university surrounding (Andrea, I. & Benjamin, S., 2013). In the context of higher education, university image work as one of key determinant of student's satisfaction (Alvis & Rapaso, 2006), Petruzellis, L. (2016), Raposo, M. (2018), Sohrabifard, N. (2015), Sultan, P. (2017), ToyinSawyerr, P. (2018), Umbach, P.D. (2016), Jayasinghe P.M.R.H, Prasad P.V.C, Premarathna K.H.H.K, Madhumali M.V.B (2023), Yao, H. (2023). The university staff is grouped into two separate parties as academics and non-academics on the basis of activities they engage. The academic staff of the universities can be defined as professional and administrativepersonnel with duties and types of appointments that are primarily associated with higher education institutions. Non-academic staffs can be defined as persons who are engaging in general administrative activities of education institute such as student registration, exams, student services (Alves, H. & Raposo, M., 2010). University administrators and their services are critical to university for smooth functioning (Alves, H. & Raposo, M., 2010). According to the Malik, et al (2010) the cooperation, kindness, responsiveness of non-academic staff play a vital role in determining students' satisfaction. The quality of teaching and learning are paramount important for academics and it determines overall quality and image of institute in long run (Douglas, 2006). Lecturer's performance and outside classes is significant for students' loyalty, motivation and satisfaction (Abdullah, 2006).

Garcl a-Aracil (2009) found that course content, teaching quality and teaching/learning materials, learning equipment and library facilities have high impact on student satisfaction. Similarly, Wilkins Balakrishnan (2013), Prifti, R. (2022) and Qiongying Gu and Guodong Lu (2023) found a significant relationship between quality of lecturers, resource availability, and effective use of technology and student satisfaction. According to Karna and Julin (2015), Butt S, Mahmood A, Saleem S (2022), research and teaching facilities and core university activities are highly influencingfactors on student satisfaction. Teaching staff, teaching methods and course administration arehighly correlated with student satisfaction (Navarro et al., 2005). Douglas et al., (2006), Aldhahi,M. I., Alqahtani, A.S., Baattaiah,B.A., & Al-Mohammed, H.I. (2022) identified teaching and learning asa significant determinant of student satisfaction. According to Martirosyan (2015) curricular and faculty services are key antecedents of student satisfaction. A recent study by Nino Tandilashvili, (2019), Aggarwal A, Chand PA, Jhamb D, Mittal (2020), Adeshola, I., & Agoyi, M. (2022) showed that students who are more involved in extra curriculum activities, such as sport event,7

organizational activities, social gathering, etc. are more satisfied compared to those who do not participate in any extra curriculum activities.

Shago (2005) conducted a study in Thailand with the intention of taking student satisfaction survey selecting seven independent variables (learning outcomes, programme-related issues, academic administration, general student services, access to student services and study assistance, general student's facilities, student representative council). He found that Academic Administration, Access to student services and Access to general Student Facilities" as important factors for Students' Satisfaction. Based on the discussed evidences and first objective of the study, the researchers identified Studying Arrangements, Studying, Students Assessments, Premises, Cleaning and Sanitary Facilities, Canteen Service, Library, Practical Training, and Research Works as the factors affecting student satisfaction in state universities in Sri Lanka.

III. Methodology of the Research

The lack of well-grounded evidences on the underline phenomena leads this study to more rely on aninductive approach and quantitative data in phase of the study. Further data gathered from the non- contrive setting and focusing the study to all state universities which engage in a range of activities would create the study more complex and blurred. A multistage sampling was employed in selecting the samples to ensure the representation of all the state universities of the country. The results this exercise were utilized for constructing questionnaires that are planned to use in data collection. Six different degree program students were selected for samples by constituting of 650 undergraduates from the selected states universities. Quantitative data analysis techniques were utilized in the data analysis. To ensure the accuracy of the information of the findings the researcher tends to use a facilitator to data analyzing process. The frequently using software, Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) ver. 21.0 is used by the researcher to investigate the data 650 collected from structured questionnaires. In analysis and evaluation tests it consider on Data screening Univariate, Bivariate and Multivariate analysis functions.

IV. Data Analysis and Discussion

Table 01 depicts the sample profile reflects along with respondents profile under different demographical variables. It shows that the most of the respondents are females including 347 at the percentage of 53.4 and the T Test values shows the 0.313 which mean there is no significant affects to students satisfaction from the gender. When considering the age categories, majority of the respondents shows the 20-21 age group and its recorded 261 out of 650. The lowest age category is 18-19 group and it is recorded 147 respondents. The age group 20-21 and 22-23 comprises 77.4 percent of the cumulative values. According to the one way ANOVA test the significant values shows the 0.270 which mean no significant impact to the student satisfaction. The majority of the student's represented the second and final year students in the university system.

Table 01- Sample Profile

Demographic Factors		Frequency	Percentage	Sig.
Gender	Male	303	46.6	0.313
	Female	347	53.4	
Age	18-19	147	22.6	0.270
	20-21	261	40.2	
	22-23	242	37.2	
Year	1st year	127	19.5	0.873
	2nd year	186	28.6	
	3rd Year	165	25.4	
	4th Year	172	26.5	
Degree	MGT	95	14.6	0.363
	SSH	86	13.2	
	MED	90	13.8	
	ENGI	125	19.2	
	TECH	140	21.5	
	APP	114	17.5	

According to the third objective, the frequency vales for both group recorded 358 (55.1%) out of 650and significant vales (ANOVA test) shows the 0.873, which mean no significant impact on students satisfaction throughout the year wise students categories. The degree wise analysis, majority of the students shows the technology students and lowest recorded the Social Sciences students, the frequency shows the 140 and 86 respectively. The significance values is 0.363 and no significance impact for student's satisfaction

from the degree wise analysis.

V. Data Screening of Study

The results of evaluating the normality, linearity, multicollinearity, validity of the construct and reliability of analysis were discussed in this section. A normally distributed data set has a bell- shaped density curve designated by its mean and standard deviation in statistics. The density curve issymmetrical, centered near to its mean, with its range determined by its standard deviation.

Table 2 - Test of Normality

Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test	
Variable	**Sig.**
Studying Arrangements, (SA)	0.151
Studying (STU)	0.128
Students Assessments (SAS)	0.128
Premises (PR)	0.162
Cleaning and Sanitary Facilities (CS)	0.172
Canteen Service (CAS)	0.143
Library (LIB)	0.152
Practical Training (PT)	0.112
Research Works (RW)	0.142
Students Satisfaction (ST)	0.152

Source: Survey Data (2023)

In this study, sample size was greater than 50 (650) and normality was evaluated using Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test. If the significant value of K-S test is greater than 0.05 (K-S Value >0.05), the sample can be assumed as normally distributed. According to table 2, All the significant values of dependentvariables and independent variable were greater than 0.05. Hence the selected sample data set is normally distributed.

Multicollinearity of Study

To observe the probable multi-collinearity, Table 3 depicts the correlations among independent variables. Multicollinearity can lead to skewed or misleading results. In general, multicollinearitycan lead to wider confidence intervals and less reliable probability values for the independent variables. When high multicollinearity is present, confidence intervals for coefficients tend to bevery wide and t statistics tend to be very small.

Table 3 - Test of Multicollinearity

Variables	Collinearity Statistics	
	Tolerance	**VIF**
Studying Arrangements (SA)	0.745	1.885
Studying (STU)	0.832	2.645
Students Assessments (SAS)	0.675	2.556
Premises (PR)	0.558	2.752
Cleaning and Sanitary Facilities (CS)	0.752	2.654
Canteen Service (CAS)	0.783	2.753
Library (LIB)	0.854	3.214
Practical Training (PT)	0.455	2.112
Research Works (RW)	0.887	1.727
Dependent Variable: Students Satisfaction (ST)		

Source: Survey Data (2023)

The common cutoff value is a tolerance value of 0.10, which corresponds to VIF of 10. The VIF value which exceeds 10 and tolerance value lower than 0.10 consider as values indicates potential problem of multicollinearity. As per the table 3, all tolerance values of independent variable are greater than 0.10 and all VIF values are lower than 10. Hence, the results conclude that, there are no multicollinearity issues within the independent variables.

Validity of the Study

The factor analysis is mostly used to assess the validity of the construct of collected data. Factor analysis is a statistical method to test the validity which is used to reduce a large number of variablesinto small numbers of factors and verifying their validity. Following tables explain the inter item correlation within the each indicators and few variables are explained with KMO values, it implies that sampling is adequate for measure Students Satisfaction.

Table 4 - Correlation matrix of Studying Arrangements

	SA 1	SA 2	SA 3	SA 4	SA 5	SA 6	SA 7	SA 8
SA 1	1.000							
SA 2	.294	1.000						
SA 3	.356	.411	1.000					
SA 4	.257	.420	.041	1.000				
SA 5	.189	.358	-.197	.138	1.000			
SA 6	.067	.499	.285	.474	.245	1.000		
SA 7	.136	-.022	.401	.096	-.320	-.067	1.000	
SA 8	.257	.606	.381	.236	.327	.339	.016	1.000
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy = 0.510								

Source: Survey Data (2023)

According to table 4 correlation values lay between 0.3 and 0.9. It indicates that there are no discriminate and convergent validity issues in data set. The KMO value is greater than 0.5(0.510) and it implies that sampling is adequate for measure Students Satisfaction. When considering the other variables including dependent variable, those imply that no discriminate or convergent validity issues in data set. The calculated KMO values for each variable presented the table 5.

Table 05 – KMO Values

Variable	Items	KMO
Studying Arrangements, (SA)	08	0.510
Studying (STU)	06	0.645
Students Assessments (SAS)	05	0.543
Premises (PR)	07	0.566
Cleaning and Sanitary Facilities (CS)	02	0.633
Canteen Service (CAS)	06	0.642
Library (LIB)	05	0.598
Practical Training (PT)	08	0.611
Research Works (RW)	04	0.596
Students Satisfaction (ST)	19	0.645

Source: Survey Data (2023)

Reliability of Study

The psychometric properties of the variable were evaluated in terms of reliability, Crochbach Alpha.The Crochbach's values for the dependent and independent variables were as follows in table 06.

Table 06 - Reliability Analysis

Variable	Items	Cronbach's Alpha
Studying Arrangements, (SA)	08	0.796
Studying (STU)	06	0.719
Students Assessments (SAS)	05	0.735
Premises (PR)	07	0.700
Cleaning and Sanitary Facilities (CS)	02	0.754
Canteen Service (CAS)	06	0.707
Library (LIB)	05	0.770
Practical Training (PT)	08	0.738
Research Works (RW)	04	0.742
Students Satisfaction (ST)	19	0.722

Source: Survey Data (2023)

Cronbach's alpha is computed in terms of the average inter correlations among the items measuring the concept (Sekaran & Bougie, 2013). Cronbach's alpha should be greater than its' minimum value of 0.700 (Table 06) and considered questions in the questionnaire can be accepted.

Table 07 - Variables and Indicators wise Descriptive Statistics

Variable	Mean	Std. Deviation
Student Satisfaction (ST)	**3.3975**	**.3999**
Studying Arrangement (SA)	**3.3677**	**.5135**
Enough tools and equipment	3.1425	.7568
Tools and equipment work properly	3.2453	.6542
Teaching aids are available as planned	3.3675	.5456
Use of equipment when I need	3.4325	.6457
Satisfied with my opportunities to use IT facilities	3.1425	.5457
Computer and network function well	3.0624	.6547
I receive help in problems related to the information systems	3.2754	.7545
Classroom well arrange	3.4256	.5798
Studying (STU)	**3.4851**	**.4495**
Achieved objectives that I sat my learning	3.5458	.5498
Teaching groups enough for my learning	3.6574	.5469
Various teaching methods used	3.7562	.3265
Sufficient feedback on my studies	3.1254	.5469
Opportunity to give teachers feedback on courses that followed	3.2564	.6578
Provide opportunity to participate international activities	3.1258	.7568
Student Assessment (SAS)	**3.3022**	**.5761**
Assessment criteria explained beginning of the Course	3.7589	.5762
Aware about how to proceed if I cannot completes course	3.6597	.5578
Assessment results obtained reasonable time	3.1259	.7589
Own assessment match with achievements	3.4569	.6548
Assess own learning achievement	3.4569	.6578

Premises (PR)	**3.4037**	**.4871**
Safe and secure at the university	3.5489	.4489
Temperature is appropriate at the study premise	3.5648	.5489
Lighting is appropriate at the study premise	3.5975	.4587
Classroom comfortable	3.1258	.4589
University public area are comfortable	3.1245	.7858
Easy for Physically disabled people to enter area of buildings	3.4028	.4589
Aware of parking arrangement	3.2549	.6548
Cleaning and Sanitary Facilities (CS)	**3.4031**	**.7152**
University premises are clean	3.1257	.7525
University external environment are clean	3.2571	.6457
Canteen Service (CAS)	**3.3041**	**.6269**
Canteen premise are tidy	3.1257	.5429
Canteen service function well	3.2567	.4259
Menu in the canteen is suitable	3.1225	.5859
Food is good	3.2257	.6524
Opening hours are suit	3.4589	.5648
There is enough food	3.1257	.7259
Library (LIB)	**3.2954**	**.5973**
Supply of books is sufficient	3.4569	.6578
Professional journals is sufficient	3.4037	.4871
Library opening hours are suit	3.5489	.4489
I know how to use the library	3.4569	.6578
Can get help in using the library service when I need it	3.3041	.6269
Particle Training (PT)	**3.4125**	**.4163**
I know what I was supposed to learn during the particle training	3.2571	.6457
Received sufficient guidance at the workplace	3.3041	.6269
Achieved objectives set for my training period	3.1257	.5429
Satisfied with particle training period	3.2567	.4259
Particle training will promote my further employment opportunities	3.1225	.5859
Particle training period helped me to improve my learning achievement	3.2453	.6542
I explained necessary safety and security issues at workplace	3.3675	.5456
People at the workplace treated me appropriately	3.4325	.6457
Research Work (RW)	**3.2088**	**.5408**
University encourage research works	3.2125	.5548
I have opportunity to participate international conferences	3.1227	.6458
I have opportunity to participate join research works	3.1248	.5233
University provide sufficient time for research works	3.4587	.5254

Source: Survey Data (2023)

Table 07 describes descriptive statistics of responses of respondents related with independent and dependent variables of the study and broadly discussed the each indicates reflection. According to the above table, mean value for students satisfaction is in moderate level (M=3.975, SD=0.40).Mean value of studying arrangement, studying, students assessment, premises, cleaning and

sanitary facilities, canteen services, library, practical training and research work are in moderate level. This explains the students are moderately satisfied with the identified factors. Considering the SA, availability of tools and equipment's and satisfaction about the facilities are lower mean values and represented high SD, these factors more concern by the decision makers. Majority of the students not satisfied with the feedback given by the teachers not in a write time. Also university offered lack of the opportunities to the students for participate an international events. Assessments result have not process properly and students cannot obtained result in a timely manner. Students not satisfied with both classroom and the public areas are comfortable. These are the key and major area of the study centers and should consider with given higher priority to upkeep properly. Another important supportive function in each university is the canteen service and given top priority to clean, maintained quality of the food, availability of the options are the important from the view of the student's perspective. University and the faculty should provide different training opportunities and research opportunities for participating international conferences.

Table 08 - Correlations Analysis

Dependent Variable	Independents Variables	R	Sig
Students Satisfaction	Studying Arrangements	0.370	0.000
	Studying	0.773	0.000
	Students Assessments	0.445	0.000
	Premises	0.457	0.000
	Cleaning and Sanitary Facilities	0.769	0.000
	Canteen Service	0.448	0.000
	Library	0.596	0.000
	Practical Training	0.748	0.000
	Research Works	0.419	0.000

Source: Survey Data (2023)

When considering the second objective of the study and according to the correlation analysis, there is a positive weak correlation between studying arrangements and student satisfaction ($r = 0.37$, $p < 0.01$). Studying ($r = 0.773$, $p < 0.01$), cleaning and sanitary facilities ($r = 0.769$, $p < 0.01$) and practical training is correlated with student satisfaction. Library facility is also positively correlated($r = 0.569$, $p < 0.01$ with student satisfaction. Student assessment, premises, canteen services and research works are moderately correlated with student satisfaction. Those were recorded the lowest r values when compared to others. Results taken (table 08) as whole the r values are positively correlated and the relationship are significant under the rule of 0.05 levels.

Table 09 – Multiple Regression Analysis

Coefficients							
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	.541	.060		8.991	.000	.423	.659
	SA	.7793	.060	.416	4.283	.000	.757	.430
	STU	.993	.070	1.116	14.283	.000	.857	1.130
	SAS	.267	.054	.385	4.928	.000	.161	.373
	PR	-1.119	.059	-1.363	-18.852	.000	-1.236	-1.002
	CS	-.020	.025	-.036	-.808	.419	-.068	.028
	CAS	-.012	.045	-.013	-.277	.782	-.100	.075
	LIB	.020	.020	.030	1.010	.313	-.019	.059
	PT	.202	.045	.210	4.472	.000	.113	.291
	RW	.507	.059	.686	8.553	.000	.391	.624
a. Dependent Variable: ST.SAT								

Source: Survey Data (2023)

According to the table 09 shows that the overall impact of the independent variables in to the dependent variable relationship

(Student satisfaction). Further it shows that the Cleaning and Sanitary Facilities (CS), Canteen Service (CAS) and Library (LIB) were record the more than of the 0.05 level of the significances. Which mean those were not significantly impact to the student's satisfaction and others variables are most important when deciding on the student's satisfaction.

VI. Conclusion and Recommendations

This paper focused on studying the factors that affecting to the students satisfaction about the state universities in Sri Lanka. Study focused on the students in the different degree program whofollowed and their levels of the satisfaction. This was measured through varies services offered by each universities for smoothly functioning of their level of education. The student satisfaction is evaluated from the view of the student's part from the facilities and services rendered by the state universities and satisfaction about the teaching, learning and assessment process.

The study showed that higher education service quality is a combination of different elements out of which the quality of nonacademic and administrative staff are the most important, followed closely by the quality of academic staff. The reputation of study programs and available spaces for students' life are other essential elements. From university point of view there are obvious areas of interest where deploying resources and efforts should be targeted. Evaluating service quality levels (See the table 02- study using nine components) and understanding how various dimensions impact overall service quality enable higher educational institutes to efficiently design the service delivery process. In addition, knowing the strengths and weaknesses of the dimensions which influence the satisfaction level of students can result in better allocation of resources so as to provide a better service to students.

Students are more concern on the studying arrangement and facilities, including computers, networking facilities and classroom arrangements. According to the results they were not in the position to satisfy in overall process and this should more concern by the administrators deeply in this system. The objectives of the students and proper feedback are most important dimensions of the succession of the teaching, learning and assessment process. This is the most important part of the study and each superior should process their level of feedback with constructive comments as well.

Cleaning and sanitary, canteen service and library are the most important supportive functions in the student satisfaction. The quality of the meals, environment cleaning and overall satisfaction about library is important in this regard. Well develop research culture also important and student should have a possibility to encouraging research works, participating to the research conferences, encouraging join research are most important to up lip their knowledge, skill and research attitudes. Further university should provide in plant training opportunities with reputed organizations is important to develop students' knowledge, skills, attitudes and mindset.

VII. Limitation and Further Research Idea

There are a number of limitations can be encounter in this study. First, as the study population was selected randomly (650) in order to complete an objective and variables selection also depend on the previous empirical evidences. An absolute majority of respondents are female (53.4%). However taking into account the national culture, university setting, geographic factors, and nature of the degree program also the little differences observed in literature in this regard. Future steps of this research can be undertaken in order to compare the results of this study to an international counter party. It will be interesting to observe similar trends over cultural and socio-demographic varieties. Also need to consider all universities when taking representative sample is much important when conducting this kind of the research.

References

1. Abdullah, F., (2006). Measuring service quality in higher education: HEdPER versusSERVPERF. Marketing Intelligence and Planning, 31-47.
2. Adeshola, I., & Agoyi, M. (2022). examining factors influencing e-learning engagement among university students during covid-19 pandemic: a mediating role of "learning persistence". InteractiveLearning Environments, 1-28
3. Aggarwal A, Chand PA, Jhamb D, Mittal (2020) A. Leader-member exchange, work engagementand psychological withdrawal behaviour: The mediating role of psychological empowerment. Frontiers in Psychology. 2020;11:1–17
4. Aigbavboa, C. & Thwala, W., (2013). A Theoretical Framework of Users' Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction Theories and Models. Pattaya, 2nd International Conference on Arts, Behavioral Sciences and Economics Issues.
5. Aldhahi, M. I., Alqahtani, A. S., Baattaiah, B. A., & Al-Mohammed, H. I. (2022). Exploring the relationship between students' learning satisfaction and self-efficacy during the emergency transitionto remote learning amid the coronavirus pandemic: A cross-sectional study. Education and Information Technologies, 27(1), 1323-1340.
6. Alves, H. & Raposo, M., (2010). The influence of university image on student behaviour. International journal of Educational Management, 73-85.

7. Andrea, I. & Benjamin, S., (2013). University students' needs and satisfaction with their host city. Journal of Place Management and Development, 6(3), 178-191.

8. Appleton-Knapp, S. & Krentler, K., (2006). Measuring student expectations and their effects on satisfaction: the importance of managing student expectations. Journal of Marketing Education, 254-264.

9. Astin, A. W. (1977). Four critical years. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

10. Bosch, W. C., Hester, J. L., MacEntee, V. M., MacKenzie, J. A., Morey, T. M., Nichols, J. T. (2008). Beyond lip service: An operational definition of "learning-centered college." Innovative Higher Education, 33(2), 83-98.

11. Bryant, J. L. (2009). Linking Student Satisfaction and Retention. https://www.noellevitz.com/NR/rdonlyres/A22786EF-65FF-4053-A15A CBE145B0C708/0/LinkingStudentSatis0809.pdf

12. Butt S, Mahmood A, Saleem S (2022), The role of institutional factors and cognitive absorption on students' satisfaction and performance in online learning during COVID 19. .PLoS One. 2022 Jun 22;17(6):e0269609. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0269609

13. DeShields, O. W., Kara, A., & Kaynak, E. (2005). Determinants of business student satisfaction and retention in higher education: Applying Herzberg's two-factor theory. International Journal of Educational Management, 19(2), 128-139.

14. Douglas, J., Douglas, A. & Barnes, B., (2006). Measuring student satisfaction at a UKuniversity. Quality Assurance in Education, 251-267.

15. Elliott, K. M. & Shin, D. (2002). Student Satisfaction: An alternative approach to assessing thisimportant concept, Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 24: 2, 197 - 209.

16. Garcl a-Aracil, A., (2009). European graduates' level of satisfaction with higher education. Journalof Higher Education, 57(1), 1-21.

17. Gu Q and Lu G (2023) Factors influencing the satisfaction level of college students in China:Literature analysis based on grounded theory. *Front. Psychol.* 13:1023420. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1023420

18. Hanssen, T.-E. S. & Solvoll, G., (2015). The importance of university facilities for student satisfaction at a Norwegian University. Facilities, 744-759.

19. Jayasinghe P.M.R.H, Prasad P.V.C, Premarathna K.H.H.K, Madhumali M.V.B (2023) A study on Student satisfaction in Private Universities in Sri Lanka, This is a preprint; it has not been peer reviewed by a journal.https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-2918094/v1

20. Karna, S. & Julin, P., (2015). A framework for measuring student and staff satisfaction withuniversity campus facilities. Quality Assurance in Education, 47-61.

21. Korn, J. H., Sweetman, M. B., Nodine, B. F. (1996). An analysis of and commentary on consultants' reports on undergraduate psychology programs. Teaching of Psychology. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15328023top2301_2

22. Malik, M. E., Danish, R. Q. & Usman, A., (2010). The Impact of Service Quality on Students'Satisfaction in Higher Education Institutes of Punjab. Journal of Management Research, 1-11.

23. Mukhtar, U., Anwar, S., Ahmed, U. & Baloch, M. A., (2015). Factors effecting the service quality ofpublic and private sector universities comparatively: an empirical investigation. Arts, Science & Commerce, 132-142.

24. Navarro, M. M., Iglesias, M. P. & Torres, P. R., (2005). A new management element for universities: satisfaction with the offered courses. International Journal of Educational Management, 19(6), 505-526.

25. Nino Tandilashvili, (2019). "Factors Influencing Student Satisfaction in Higher Education. The Caseof a Georgian State University," Proceedings of the 13th International RAIS Conference, June 10- 11, 2019 05NT, Research Association for Interdisciplinary Studies.

26. Palacio, A., Meneses, G. & Perez, P., (2002). The configuration of the university image and its relationship with the satisfaction of students. Journal of Educational Administration, 40(5), 486-505.

27. Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2005). How college affects students: A third decade of research, Vol. 2. San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons.

28. Prifti, R. (2022). Self–efficacy and student satisfaction in the context of blended learning courses. Open Learning: The Journal of Open, Distance and e-Learning, 37(2), 111- 125.

29. Sekaran, U. and Bougie, R. (2013) Research Methods for Business: A Skill-Building Approach. 6th Edition, Wiley, New York.

30. Shago, N.E. (2005). "Student satisfaction survey as a quality improvement tool at Tshwane University of Technology", submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degreeMagister technologies, Department of Post-Graduate Studies in Education. Faculty of Education, Tshwane University of Technology.

31. Sojkin, B., Bartkowiak, P. & Skuza, A., (2012). Determinants of higher education choices and student satisfaction: the case of Poland. Higher Education, 63 (5), 565-81.

32. Song, Y. (2022). Factors Affecting Student Satisfaction and Loyalty: A Case Study of XihuaUniversity. AU-GSB

E-JOURNAL, 15(1), 174-184.https://doi.org/10.14456/augsbejr.2022.51

33. Wilkins, S. & Balakrishnan, M. S., (2013). Assessing student satisfaction in transnational higher education. International Journal of Educational Management, 146-153.

34. Yao, H. (2023). Factors Impacting Satisfaction and Loyalty of Students: A Case Study of a Public University in Shanxi, China. AU-GSB. E-JOURNAL, 16(1), 90-99. https://doi.org/10.14456/augsbejr.2023.10