



INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES AND INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES

(Peer-reviewed, Refereed, Indexed & Open Access Journal)

DOI : 03.2021-11278686

ISSN : 2582-8568

IMPACT FACTOR : 6.865 (SJIF 2023)

Satisfaction of Students Perusing Hotel Management Programme in face-to-face mode in state of Uttarakhand, India

Mr. Vimal Kumar¹, Dr. Jatashankar R Tewari² & Prof. Shiv Mohan Verma³

¹Resarch Scholar, Swami Vivekanand Subharti University,
Meerut (Uttar Pradesh, India) E-mail: vimal1316@yahoo.com

²Associate Professor, Indra Gandhi Open University, New Delhi (India)
E-mail: tewari.js@gmail.com

³Professor, Swami Vivekanand Subharti University, Meerut (Uttar Pradesh, India)
E-mail: shivmverma@gmail.com

DOI No. **03.2021-11278686** DOI Link :: <https://doi-ds.org/doilink/12.2023-13575137/IRJHIS2312001>

Abstract:

The growing competition among higher education institution led them to understand the importance of student satisfaction. In addition, various studies have shown that student satisfaction has a positive impact on student motivation and student retention. The present study is undertaken to find the level of satisfaction among the students learning hotel management programme in state of Uttarakhand through face-to-face mode.

The primary objective of the research team was to find out the relationship between student satisfaction and the following variables of the face-to-face environment: Admission and registration procedure, course evaluation, programme delivery and Campus amenities. The sample consisted of 250 students perusing hotel management programme from various institutes affiliated to Board of Technical Education, Ramnagar; Kumaon University, Nainital and Uttarakhand Technical University, Dehradun. The analysis of data reveals that, 81.6% respondents score above mean and found to be satisfied in overall criterion which included Admission and registration procedure, course evaluation, programme delivery and Campus amenities in their institute of learning.

Keywords: student satisfaction, hotel management, student-instructor interaction, course evaluation, instructor performance, campus amenities etc.

Introduction:

According to Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary, 'satisfaction is the good feeling that you have when you have achieved something or when something that you wanted to happen does happen'. A student is the beginner in the field of the study which they are perusing. The satisfaction

among the student will be achieved when the programme of study, delivery methods and their achievement after the study of that programme enables them to make their dream come true. A satisfied person is the unpaid brand ambassador of the product/services provided by the service provider. Satisfied students are more motivated and committed to their classes and ultimately, are better learners than their unsatisfied counterparts (Biner, Dean & Mellinger, 1994). Now a day, there is growing competition among higher education providing institutions.

The present study was conducted in state of Uttarakhand. The study included the students from affiliating board/university permitting programme of hotel management in the state, includes board of Technical Education, Ramnagar; Uttarakhand Technical University, Dehradun; HNB Garhwal University, Srinagar; and Kumaon University, Nainital. The sample was drawn from all year of study including first year, second year, third/final year of learning. The sample was drawn from institution namely, Kukeraja Institute of Hotel Management, Dehradun; Institute of Hospitality and Management Studies, Kotdwar; and Amrapali Institute of Hotel Management, Haldwani. The objective of study was to assess the level of satisfaction of student perusing hotel management programme in Uttarakhand with respect to factors affecting their satisfaction. To attain the objectives of study following research questions were framed:

1. What is status of level of satisfaction among students perusing hotel management programme in Uttarakhand with respect to admission and registration procedure of their institution?
2. What is status of level of satisfaction among students perusing hotel management programme in Uttarakhand with respect curriculum of hotel management programme?
3. What is status of level of satisfaction among students perusing hotel management programme in Uttarakhand with respect to programme delivery in their institution?
4. What is status of level of satisfaction among students perusing hotel management programme in Uttarakhand with respect to campus amenities of their institution?
5. What is the status of satisfaction level of students perusing hotel management programme in Uttarakhand?

Review of Literature:

The dictionary meaning of word satisfaction is happy feeling when something is achieved or something happen which is intended to happen. Satisfaction is a pleasurable fulfilment which means that consumption of services was according to their needs and wants and thus fulfilment causes pleasure (Oliver, 1997). It may be consumer sense about the consumption of services according to customer parameters against pleasure versus displeasure (Oliver, 1999). According to Elliott and Shin (2002), student satisfaction is defined as; “the favourability of a student’s subjective evaluation of the various outcomes and experiences associated with education. The study suggests that professional comfortable environment; student assessment and learning experiences; classroom

environment; lecture and tutorial facilitating goods; textbooks and tuition fees; student support facilities; business procedures; relationship with the teaching staff; knowledgeable and responsive faculty; staff helpfulness; feedback; and class sizes were important factors that influences the students satisfaction(Yusoff M., Mcleay F. & Woodruffe-Burton H., 2015). Student satisfaction is the subjective perceptions, on students' part, of how well a learning environment supports academic success (Lo, 2010) Strong student satisfaction implies that appropriately challenging instructional methods are serving to trigger students' thinking and learning. Important elements in student satisfaction are likely to concern the role of the instructor and of the students; these elements may be central to student learning. The present study explored some of these elements, in an effort to begin identifying the ones most helpful for ensuring students' academic success (Winberg and Hedman, 2008). Satisfaction is a well researched topic in both academic and non-academic (workplace) settings. In academic settings, students' satisfaction data helps colleges and universities make their curriculum more responsive to the needs of a changing marketplace (Eyck, Tews & Ballester, 2009; Witowski, 2008). The effectiveness of a curriculum can be evaluated using direct performance measures (e.g., comprehensive exams, projects, and presentations) and by indirect performance measures (e.g., students' satisfaction with the curriculum) (Jamelske, 2009; Witowski, 2008). Numerous researchers have investigated issues related to students' satisfaction (e.g., 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 college. The measurement of learning satisfaction is important to higher education institutions, to help them to pinpoint their strengths and identify areas for improvement (Eom et al, 2006; Kember and Ginns, 2012; Marsh, 1982; Zerihun et al, 2012). The review of literature suggests that factors like admission procedure, curriculum, programme delivery and campus facilities plays a vital role in student satisfaction.

Research Methodology:

The study is empirical in nature; hence, survey method was employed to get in-depth understanding about the subject. The data was collected using a survey tool comprising of two sections. Section A, contains items related to demographic variables like age of respondents, sex of respondents, marital status, educational qualifications and occupation of respondents. Section B contains four sub-sections a, b, c, and d. Subsection a, contains nine items to assess respondents satisfaction related to admission and registration procedure; subsection b, contains five items to find students satisfaction related to curriculum of study; subsection c, contains fifty items to assess students satisfaction related to delivery of programme which includes domain knowledge and behavior of faculty with students, pedagogy, practical facilities, library, training and placement; and subsection d, contains thirty items to assess the students satisfaction related to campus amenities like

hostel, sports facilities, bank and ATM, miscellaneous shop etc. In order to determine the internal reliability of the questionnaire, a reliability analysis was performed with the use of Cronbach's alpha after the completion of the data collection phase. The alpha reliability coefficient of the satisfaction scale was 0.976, indicating that the instrument was highly reliable. The reliability statistics of each section and entire tool is summarised in table no. 1.

Table 01: Reliability Statistics for each section of research tool and for entire research tool

Section of Questionnaire	N of Items	Cronbach's Alpha
Admission and Registration	09	.838
Curriculum	05	.824
Programme Delivery	50	.963
Campus Facility	30	.969
For Entire tool	94	.976

Analysis and Results:

The data was collected, coded, tabulated and analyzed using SPSS version 21. The results obtained are discussed below.

Socio-Economic Characteristics of the Learners:

The data with respect to demographic profile of respondents is summarized in table no. 2.

Table 02: Demographic Profile of sample Respondents (N= 250)

Variables		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Age	Below 20 Years	91	36.4	36.4	36.4
	21-25 Years	152	60.8	60.8	97.2
	Above 25 Years	7	2.8	2.8	100.0
Sex	Male	234	93.6	93.6	93.6
	Female	16	6.4	6.4	100.0
Marital Status	Married	2	.8	.8	.8
	Unmarried	248	99.2	99.2	100.0
Educational Qualification	Intermediate/10+2	174	69.6	69.6	69.6
	Graduate	72	28.8	28.8	98.4
	Post Graduate	4	1.6	1.6	100.0
Occupation	Un-employed	233	93.2	93.2	93.2
	Employed	17	6.8	6.8	100.0

Programme of Study	Diploma in Hotel Management	60	24.0	24.0	24.0
	Bachelor of Hotel Management	160	64.0	64.0	88.0
	Master of Hotel Management	30	12.0	12.0	100.0
Year of Study	First Year	84	33.6	33.6	33.6
	Second Year	8	3.2	3.2	36.8
	Third Year	158	63.2	63.2	100.0
Affiliating Board/University	Board of Technical Education	60	24.0	24.0	24.0
	Uttarakhand Technical University	102	40.8	40.8	64.8
	H N B Garhwal University	4	1.6	1.6	66.4
	Kumaon University	84	33.6	33.6	100.0
Institution of Study	Kukeraja Institute of Hotel Management, Dehradun	104	41.6	41.6	41.6
	Institute of Hospitality and Management Studies, Kotdwar	88	35.2	35.2	76.8
	Amrapali Institute of Hotel Management, Haldwani	58	23.2	23.2	100.0

The data in table 2 reveals that, majority of the respondents were male(n=234, 93.9%) remaining 6.4% were female(n=16), according to age group majority of the respondents were in age

group of 21 years to 25 years(n=152, 60.8%), next were below 20 years of age(n=91, 36.4%) and only 2.8% respondents(n=7) were above 25 years of age. The distribution of respondents according to their marital status, majority of them were unmarried (n=248, 99.2%) remaining were married. The majority of the respondents according to their education level were intermediate (n=174, 69.6%), 28.8% graduate (n=72) and remaining 1.6% were post graduate (n=4). Majority of the students were un-employed (n=233, 93.2%) and remaining 6.8% were employed. According to programme of study majority of the learners were of Bachelor programme (n=160, 64%) in Hotel Management, next were studying diploma programme in Hotel Management (n=60, 24%) and remaining 12% were in master programme of Hotel Management. There were majority of learners from third/Final year of programme of study (n=158, 63.2%), followed by first year (n=84, 33.6%) and remaining 3.2% were of second year of programme of study. There were majority of students from Uttarakhand Technical university (n=102, 40.8%), followed by Kumaon University (n=84, 33.6%), then Board of Technical Education(n=60, 24%) and remaining were from HNB Garhwal University (n=4, 1.6%). According to their institution of study, the majority of students were from there were Kukeraja Institute of Hotel Management, Dehradun (n=104, 41.6%), followed by Institute of Hospitality and Management Studies, Kotdwar (n=88, 35.2%) and remaining were from Amrapali Institute of Hotel Management, Haldwani (n=58, 23.2%).

Student Satisfaction and Admission and Registration:

It was decided to compare the score of each individual respondent with mean score, and student would be supposed to be satisfied if their score exceeds mean score and dissatisfied if score found less than mean value. The respondents were asked to rate each items in Admission and registration procedure. Each student can obtain a minimum score nine and maximum score forty five and cumulative score for nine items for each respondent may range from 09 to 45. Thus, the mean value calculated for the score of entire admission and registration procedure for each individual respondent was found to be 27. It was decided that if the value of score of admission and registration procedure for an individual respondent were greater than 27 or equal to the mean value of score, the student would be treated as satisfied student and vice-versa. The score for admission and registration, curriculum, programme delivery and campus facilities are summarized in table 3. The data in table three reveals that, 82.8% students have scored greater than equal to mean score therefore, it may be concluded that majority students were satisfied with admission and registration procedures followed by their institute of study.

Table 3: Score of Students regarding factors of satisfaction(N=250)

Factors of Satisfaction	Min. Score	Max. Score	Mean Score	Number of Student whose score	Number of student whose score	% of student whose score is equal to or
-------------------------	------------	------------	------------	-------------------------------	-------------------------------	---

				is below Mean Score	is equal to or above Mean Score	above Mean Score
Admission and Registration	9	45	27	43	207	82.8
Curriculum	5	25	15	24	226	90.4
Programme Delivery	50	250	150	31	219	87.6
Campus Facilities	30	150	90	93	157	62.8
Overall Satisfaction	94	470	282	46	204	81.6

Student Satisfaction and curriculum:

It was decided to compare the score of each individual respondent with mean score, and student would be supposed to be satisfied if their score exceeds mean score and dissatisfied if score found less than mean value. The respondents were asked to rate each items related to curriculum. Each student can obtain a minimum score five and maximum score twenty five and cumulative score for five items for each respondent may range from 05 to 25. Thus, the mean value calculated for the score of entire admission and registration procedure for each individual respondent was found to be 15. It was decided that if the value of score of admission and registration procedure for an individual respondent were greater than 15 or equal to the mean value of score, the student would be treated as satisfied student and vice-versa. The score for curriculum is summarized in table 3. The data in table three reveals that, 90.4% students have scored greater than equal to mean score therefore, it may be concluded that majority students were satisfied with curriculum followed by their institute of study.

Student Satisfaction and Programme delivery:

It was decided to compare the score of each individual respondent with mean score, and student would be supposed to be satisfied if their score exceeds mean score and dissatisfied if score found less than mean value. The respondents were asked to rate each items in programme delivery procedure. Each student can obtain a minimum score 50 and maximum score 250 and cumulative score for nine items for each respondent may range from 50 to 250. Thus, the mean value calculated for the score of entire admission and registration procedure for each individual respondent was found to be 150. It was decided that if the value of score of admission and registration procedure for an individual respondent were greater than 150 or equal to the mean value of score, the student would be treated as satisfied student and vice-versa. The score for programme delivery is summarized in table 3. The data in table three reveals that, 87.6% students have scored greater than equal to mean score therefore, it may be concluded that majority students were satisfied with programme delivery procedure followed by their institute of study.

Student Satisfaction and Campus amenities:

It was decided to compare the score of each individual respondent with mean score, and student would be supposed to be satisfied if their score exceeds mean score and dissatisfied if score found less than mean value. The respondents were asked to rate each items in Admission and registration procedure. Each student can obtain a minimum score 30 and maximum score 150 and cumulative score for nine items for each respondent may range from 30 to 150. Thus, the mean value calculated for the score of entire admission and registration procedure for each individual respondent was found to be 90. It was decided that if the value of score of admission and registration procedure for an individual respondent were greater than 90 or equal to the mean value of score, the student would be treated as satisfied student and vice-versa. The score for programme delivery is summarized in table 3. The data in table three reveals that, 62.8% students have scored greater than equal to mean score therefore, it may be concluded that majority students were satisfied with campus facilities of their institute of study.

Overall Satisfaction of Student:

It was decided to compare the score of each individual respondent with mean score, and student would be supposed to be satisfied if their score exceeds mean score and dissatisfied if score found less than mean value. The respondents were asked to rate each items in Admission and registration procedure. Each student can obtain a minimum score 94 and maximum score 470 and cumulative score for nine items for each respondent may range from 94 to 45470. Thus, the mean value calculated for the score of entire admission and registration procedure for each individual respondent was found to be 282. It was decided that if the value of score of admission and registration procedure for an individual respondent were greater than 282 or equal to the mean value of score, the student would be treated as satisfied student and vice-versa. The score for overall satisfaction is summarized in table 3. The data in table three reveals that, 81.6% students have scored greater than equal to mean score therefore, it may be concluded that majority students were satisfied with their institute of study.

Conclusion and Implications:

The present study was conducted to gain insight about the satisfaction among the students studying Hotel Management programmes in state of Uttarakhand. Uttarakhand is a hill state. Tourists are visiting round the year in this state to enjoy snowfall in winter and get rid of heat waves in summer. The students perusing hotel management programmes in this state were found to be satisfied with their institution of study. It was observed that the maximum satisfaction was with curriculum and syllabus being 90.4% among the respondents. The curriculum and syllabus is mostly designed by the affiliating board of technical education or university, institutions have less access in formulating syllabus. This clearly indicates that Board of Technical Education and Affiliating

universities were excellent in framing curriculum and syllabus for said programme of study. The student satisfaction with programme delivery was found to be 87.6% among the respondents means institutions are performing well in delivering the education to students. The next factor related with satisfaction was admission and registration procedure where score was 82.2%, indicates that institutions are following good procedure for admitting students in said programmes of study in state of Uttarakhand. The campus facilities in institutions scored least, that is 62.8%, means institutions offering Hotel Management programmes of study needs to focus on maintaining and offering good campus facilities in order to satisfy their students. the overall satisfaction was found to be 81.6% among the respondents means in general students were satisfied with their institute of study.

References:

1. Astin, A. W. (1977). *Four critical years*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
2. Biner, P. M., Dean, R. S., and Mellinger, A. E. (1994). Factors underlying distance learner satisfaction with televised college-level courses. *The American Journal of Distance Education*, 8(1), 60-71.
3. Bryant, J. L. (2009). Linking Student Satisfaction and Retention. Retrieved on March 4, 2011 from <https://www.noellevitz.com/NR/rdonlyres/A22786EF-65FF-4053-A15ACBE145B0C708/0/LinkingStudentSatis0809.pdf>
4. 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.
5. Elliott, K.M. and Shin, D. (2002). Student satisfaction: an alternative approach to assessing this important concept, *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, Vol. 24, No. 2, pp. 197-209.
6. Eom, S B, Wen, H J and Ashill, N (2006) The Determinants of Students' Perceived Learning Outcomes and Satisfaction in University Online Education: An Empirical Investigation. *Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education*, 4(2), 215-235
7. Eyck, R., Tews, M., & Ballester, J. M. (2009). Improved Medical Student Satisfaction and Test Performance with a Simulation-Based Emergency Medicine Curriculum: A Randomized Controlled Trial. Paper presented at the ACEP 2008 *Research Forum*, October 2008, Chicago, IL.
8. <https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/satisfaction?q=Satisfaction>
9. Jamelske, xx (2009). Measuring the impact of a university first-year experience program on student GPA and retention. *Higher Education*, 57(3): 373-391.
10. Kember, D and Ginns, P (2012) *Evaluating teaching and learning*: Routledge.
11. Lo, C.C. (2010) How student satisfaction factors affect perceived learning. *Journal of the*

- Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, Vol. 10, No. 1, January 2010, pp. 47 – 54.
12. Marsh, H W (1982) SEEQ: A Reliable, Valid, and Useful Instrument for Collecting Students' Evaluations of University Teaching. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 52, 77-95
 13. Oliver, R.L. (1997). Satisfaction. A Behavioral Perspective on the Consumer, McGraw-Hill, New York, NY.
 14. Oliver, R.L. (1999). Whence consumer loyalty”, *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 63, pp. 33-44.
 15. Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2005). *How college affects students: A third decade of research*, Vol. 2. San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons.
 16. Winberg, T. M., and Hedman, L. (2008). Student attitudes toward learning, level of preknowledge and instruction type in a computer-simulation: effects on flow experiences and perceived learning outcomes. *Instructional Science*, 36(4), 269-287.
 17. Witowski, L. (2008). The relationship between instructional delivery methods and students learning preferences: What contributes to students' satisfaction in an online learning environment? Ph.D Dissertation. Retrieved on December 11, 2020 from <http://gradworks.umi.com/3310726.pdf>
 18. Yusoff, M., Mcleay, F. & Woodruffe-Burton, H. (2015). Dimensions driving business student satisfaction in higher education. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 23 (1), 86-104.
 19. Zerihun, Z, Beishuizen, J and Os, W (2012) Student learning experience as indicator of teaching quality. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 24(2), 99-111

