



Academic Service Quality as the Leading Contributor to Student Satisfaction in Indonesian Islamic Universities

Oki Dermawan¹; Adri Efferi²; Saifuddin Saifuddin³; Jejen Musfah⁴;
Maftuhah Maftuhah⁵; Trisna Kusuma Yusuf⁶

^{1,6}Universitas Islam Negeri Raden Intan Lampung, Indonesia

²Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Kudus, Semarang, Indonesia

³Universitas Islam Negeri Siber Syekh Nurjati Cirebon, Indonesia

^{4,5}Universitas Islam Negeri Syarif Hidayatullah, Jakarta, Indonesia

¹Correspondence Email: okidermawan@radenintan.ac.id

Article Info

Received: February 17, 2026

Accepted: September 25, 2026

Published: September 30, 2026

Online First: September 29, 2026

Keywords

Student Satisfaction;
Academic Service Quality;
Administrative Management;
Academic Facilities;
Islamic Higher Education.

Abstract

Student satisfaction is a critical indicator of higher education quality, reflecting students' evaluations of academic experiences, institutional services, and learning environments. However, empirical evidence remains limited regarding the relative contributions of distinct institutional quality dimensions within Indonesian Islamic higher education. This study examines the relative predictive contribution of academic facilities quality, academic service quality, and administrative management effectiveness to student satisfaction across six Indonesian state Islamic universities. Employing a quantitative cross-sectional survey design with convenience sampling, data were collected via a structured online questionnaire administered to 699 undergraduate students and analyzed using multiple linear regression. The findings indicate that all three dimensions significantly contribute to student satisfaction, with academic service quality demonstrating the strongest relative effect, followed by administrative management effectiveness and academic facilities quality. These results suggest that student satisfaction is shaped by interconnected academic, administrative, and learning-environment experiences rather than an isolated institutional factor. Consequently, this study offers comparative empirical insights into institutional quality dynamics in Indonesian Islamic higher education and provides practical implications for designing integrated university quality enhancement strategies.

A. Introduction

Universities may possess extensive academic resources and sophisticated institutional systems yet still fail at the point where quality becomes most consequential: students' lived experience of the institution. Student satisfaction, therefore, cannot be reduced to a peripheral measure of educational consumption; it reflects how students judge whether universities successfully translate institutional resources, academic support, and service commitments into meaningful educational encounters. As students increasingly evaluate higher education through learning environments, academic support structures, and service delivery, satisfaction has become fundamentally tied to broader perceptions of institutional quality and performance (Al-Sheeb et al., 2018; Brown & Mazzarol, 2008; Fauzan et al., 2026; Manaf et al., 2026).

These evaluations are inherently multidimensional, encompassing academic support, institutional resources, and direct service experiences rather than academic achievement alone (Ali et al., 2016; Weerasinghe & Fernando, 2018; Fauzan et al., 2026). The critical empirical question is not simply whether institutional quality matters, but which dimensions exert the greatest influence when students evaluate their universities. Recent evidence from Indonesian Islamic educational contexts likewise characterizes satisfaction as an outcome driven by multiple institutional dimensions rather than a solitary determinant.

This inquiry is particularly consequential for Indonesian State Islamic Universities (*Universitas Islam Negeri* [UIN]), which operate within the national higher education system while upholding an explicit religious mission (Jami & Muharam, 2022; Misbach, 2018). Their institutional legitimacy hinges not only on religious and academic commitments but also on their capacity to provide credible educational services, functional administrative systems, and supportive learning environments (Ritonga & Yamin, 2021; Fitri, 2016; Yuliana et al., 2026; Lathifah et al., 2025). Students interact with these interconnected dimensions through classrooms, digital infrastructure, academic support, and administrative processes. Consequently, quality in Islamic higher education cannot be reduced to a single attribute; it emerges dynamically from diverse facets of service delivery and campus experience (Kodrat, 2020; Hadijaya et al., 2019; Pahrudin et al., 2026). Recent scholarship on quality assurance in Islamic education similarly underscores the interdependence among service quality, institutional performance, governance, and educational experience.

Within this multidimensional landscape, academic facilities constitute the most visible material expression of institutional capacity. Classrooms, libraries, laboratories,

information technology infrastructure, and learning spaces establish the physical conditions through which academic activities become possible (Weerasinghe & Fernando, 2018; Galabin, 2024; Fauzan et al., 2026). Yet material availability does not automatically translate into satisfactory educational experience. Students may have access to adequate infrastructure while still encountering poor communication, inaccessible academic support, or ineffective administrative processes. Academic service quality consequently occupies a distinct analytical position because it governs recurring student-institution interactions through advising, consultation, information exchange, responsiveness, reliability, assurance, and empathy (Ali et al., 2016; Annamdevula & Bellamkonda, 2016; Teeroovengadum et al., 2019; Manaf et al., 2026). Indonesian studies similarly associate academic and non-academic services with institutional quality and student satisfaction (Firdaus, 2019; Farihah et al., 2024; Syilfi & Obie, 2024; Fauzan et al., 2026).

Administrative management represents a less visible yet structurally consequential dimension of students' institutional experience. Registration, academic records, course scheduling, information access, and institutional communication determine whether students navigate university systems efficiently or encounter administrative bottlenecks (Indrawan & Refika, 2025; Efendi et al., 2021). Transparent and responsive administration strengthens perceptions of institutional reliability, whereas inefficient procedures degrade student experiences even when academic resources are abundant (Indrawan & Refika, 2025; Farooq et al., 2019; Lathifah et al., 2025). The widespread adoption of digital academic platforms has further amplified this concern, placing accessibility, data accuracy, and system usability at the core of administrative quality (Efendi et al., 2021; Wijaya et al., 2025; Agusnaya et al., 2024). Together, facilities, academic services, and administrative management function as distinct yet interconnected channels through which institutional quality is manifested to students, echoing digital learning research that underscores how support structures, user experience, and system quality jointly drive student engagement and evaluation.

Theoretical frameworks of higher education service quality reinforce this multidimensional perspective. Perceived service quality models treat satisfaction as an aggregate evaluation derived from through cumulative encounters with institutional performance rather than a discrete response to an isolated attribute (Hasan & Hosen, 2020; Farooq et al., 2019; Fauzan et al., 2026). SERVQUAL-informed frameworks likewise emphasize tangible assets, interpersonal encounters, administrative support, and learning

environments as complementary dimensions of educational service delivery (Hasan & Hosen, 2020; Farooq et al., 2019; Manaf et al., 2026). Research across broader higher education settings corroborates that students evaluate institutions through a synthesis of service dimensions rather than through any single determinant (Silva et al., 2017; Agusnaya et al., 2024; Wijaya et al., 2025). The critical research problem, therefore, is no longer whether these dimensions matter independently, but how their relative predictive power behaves when modeled simultaneously within a single empirical framework.

Existing research provides substantial evidence linking facilities, academic services, and administrative processes to student satisfaction, but these dimensions have often been examined in ways that leave their relative contributions unclear (Jami & Muharam, 2022; Misbach, 2018; Ritonga & Yamin, 2021; Fauzan et al., 2026; Yuliana et al., 2026). As a result, it remains difficult to determine whether particular dimensions retain their explanatory strength once other institutional quality factors are taken into account. This limitation becomes especially important in Indonesian Islamic higher education, where evidence across multiple institutional settings remains limited. What is therefore still insufficiently understood is the relative contribution of these major institutional quality dimensions when they are evaluated simultaneously within a broader multi-institutional context.

This study addresses that problem by positioning student satisfaction as the outcome of competing yet interconnected institutional experiences and examining academic facilities quality, academic service quality, and administrative management effectiveness within a single comparative predictive framework. Its contribution lies in shifting the analytical question from whether individual dimensions are associated with satisfaction to how strongly each contributes when the others are considered simultaneously. The novelty therefore resides not merely in studying six State Islamic Universities, but in integrating three institutionally distinct quality dimensions into a single model that reveals their relative predictive contributions across a multi-institutional Islamic higher education setting.

This study examines the relative predictive contribution of academic facilities quality, academic service quality, and administrative management effectiveness to student satisfaction across six Indonesian State Islamic Universities. In doing so, it seeks to provide a stronger empirical basis for understanding how institutional quality dimensions contribute differently to students' overall evaluations of their university experience.

B. Method

This study employed a quantitative cross-sectional survey design to examine the relative predictive contribution of academic facilities quality, academic service quality, and administrative management effectiveness to student satisfaction in Indonesian State Islamic Universities. The design was selected because the study focused on statistical associations among students' perceptions of institutional quality dimensions within a defined period rather than on establishing causal relationships. The study involved undergraduate students from six State Islamic Universities (*Universitas Islam Negeri*[UIN]) in Indonesia. Data were collected from September 30 to December 8, 2025, through a structured online questionnaire distributed via student communication networks. Participation was limited to active undergraduate students who completed the questionnaire required for statistical analysis, and convenience sampling was applied based on participant accessibility during the data collection process.

The analytical dataset was established when 699 completed responses had been obtained. During subsequent verification, additional responses were identified in the Google Form database because the questionnaire link remained accessible after the initial extraction. These later submissions increased the recorded number of responses to 738, but they were excluded because they were received after the original analytical dataset had been fixed. Accordingly, the final analysis was based on 699 valid responses from students across the six universities. The responses were treated as a pooled sample because the study was designed to estimate the relative predictive contribution of institutional quality dimensions rather than compare differences among individual universities.

The questionnaire was developed by adapting measurement indicators from previous studies on higher education service quality and student satisfaction (Ali et al., 2016; Annamdevula & Bellamkonda, 2016; Teeroovengadum et al., 2019). The initial instrument consisted of 86 items covering four constructs: academic facilities quality, administrative management effectiveness, academic service quality, and student satisfaction. Before the main survey, a preliminary validity and reliability assessment was conducted on April 11, 2025, with 35 undergraduate students from UIN Raden Intan Lampung. Based on this assessment, eight items were removed: F19 and F20, A18 and A19, P19 and P20, and K17 and K18. The final instrument therefore contained 78 retained items measured using a five-point Likert scale.

Statistical analysis was conducted using SPSS, beginning with descriptive statistics to summarize respondent characteristics and the distribution of the research variables. The measurement properties of the instrument were subsequently examined through reliability analysis and exploratory factor analysis (EFA), with Cronbach's alpha used to assess internal consistency and EFA employed to evaluate the underlying structure and adequacy of the retained measurement items (Afthanorhan et al., 2019; Silva et al., 2017). Multiple linear regression was then performed to estimate the relative predictive contribution of academic facilities quality, academic service quality, and administrative management effectiveness to student satisfaction. To assess the adequacy and stability of the regression model, diagnostic procedures included multicollinearity assessment and residual analysis.

Ethical considerations were integrated throughout the research process. Participation was voluntary, and respondents were informed about the purpose of the study, the confidentiality of their responses, and their voluntary participation before completing the questionnaire. The questionnaire did not collect personally identifiable information, and all responses were analyzed in aggregated form and used solely for academic research purposes.

C. Results and Discussion

This section presents the empirical findings and discusses their implications in relation to the study objectives and relevant literature. The results are first reported based on the analytical sequence applied in the study, including respondent characteristics, measurement assessment, descriptive statistics, and regression analysis. The discussion then interprets the findings by examining the relative contribution of academic facilities quality, academic service quality, and administrative management effectiveness to student satisfaction within the context of Indonesian State Islamic Universities.

1. Results

The results present the empirical evidence used to assess the relative predictive contribution of academic facilities quality, academic service quality, and administrative management effectiveness to student satisfaction. The analysis proceeds from the characteristics of the analytical sample to the assessment of measurement properties, descriptive patterns, and the regression model. Particular attention is given to the

relative magnitude of the three predictors and to diagnostic evidence relevant to the interpretation of the regression coefficients. All results reported in this section are based on the final analytical dataset of 699 undergraduate students from six Indonesian State Islamic Universities.

a. Respondent Characteristics

The final analytical sample consisted of 699 undergraduate students representing six Indonesian State Islamic Universities. The distribution was unequal across institutions, with UIN Raden Intan Lampung contributing the largest number of respondents ($n = 437$; 62.5%), followed by UIN Sumatera Utara ($n = 136$; 19.5%), UIN Sunan Kudus ($n = 62$; 8.9%), and UIN Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta ($n = 45$; 6.4%). Smaller proportions were recorded for UIN Alauddin Makassar ($n = 12$; 1.7%) and UIN Siber Syekh Nurjati Cirebon ($n = 7$; 1.0%). Thus, while the analytical dataset incorporated responses from six institutional settings, respondent representation varied substantially across participating universities.

Table 1. Distribution of Analytical Sample by University (N = 699)

University	n	%
UIN Raden Intan Lampung	437	62.5
UIN Sumatera Utara	136	19.5
UIN Sunan Kudus	62	8.9
UIN Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta	45	6.4
UIN Alauddin Makassar	12	1.7
UIN Siber Syekh Nurjati Cirebon	7	1.0
Total	699	100.0

Table 1 shows that the analytical sample was dominated by respondents from UIN Raden Intan Lampung, which accounted for almost two-thirds of all observations. The institutional distribution was reconstructed from questionnaire records corresponding to the dataset used in the statistical analysis. During verification, additional responses were found in the Google Form database because the questionnaire remained accessible after the original extraction. Those later responses were not incorporated into the analysis because they were submitted after the analytical dataset had been established. The reported institutional distribution therefore refers exclusively to the 699 cases included in the final statistical analysis.

b. Measurement Assessment

Before examining relationships among the research variables, the internal consistency of the four constructs was assessed using the 699-response analytical dataset. The retained instrument contained 78 items measuring academic facilities quality, administrative management effectiveness, academic service quality, and student satisfaction. Cronbach's alpha values were consistently high across the four constructs. Academic facilities quality produced an alpha coefficient of 0.966, administrative management effectiveness 0.976, academic service quality 0.979, and student satisfaction 0.978. The narrow range of coefficients, from 0.966 to 0.979, indicates consistently high internal consistency across the four measurement scales.

Table 2. Reliability Assessment of Research Constructs

Construct	Number of Items	Cronbach's Alpha
Academic Facilities Quality	27	0.966
Administrative Management Effectiveness	17	0.976
Academic Service Quality	18	0.979
Student Satisfaction	16	0.978

As summarized in Table 2, academic service quality recorded the highest Cronbach's alpha coefficient (0.979), closely followed by student satisfaction (0.978) and administrative management effectiveness (0.976). Academic facilities quality also demonstrated a high coefficient of 0.966. These results show that all four sets of retained indicators displayed strong internal consistency within the final analytical sample. The reliability results therefore supported the use of the corresponding composite measures in the subsequent descriptive and regression analyses.

The underlying structure of the 78 retained items was further examined using exploratory factor analysis (EFA). Principal axis factoring with Promax rotation produced a Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin value of 0.985. Bartlett's test of sphericity was statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 63,047.828$, $df = 3003$, $p < 0.001$), showing that the observed correlation matrix provided an adequate basis for factor extraction. The analysis extracted four factors with eigenvalues greater than one, and the resulting four-factor solution accounted for 66.137% of the total variance. The analysis applied a loading criterion of ≥ 0.40 .

Table 3. Summary of Exploratory Factor Analysis

Assessment	Result
Extraction Method	Principal Axis Factoring
Rotation Method	Promax Rotation
KMO Measure	0.985
Bartlett's Test	$\chi^2 = 63,047.828$; $df = 3003$; $p < 0.001$
Number of Extracted Factors	4
Total Variance Explained	66.137%
Loading Criterion	≥ 0.40

The extracted factor structure corresponded broadly to the four constructs specified in the study: academic facilities quality, administrative management effectiveness, academic service quality, and student satisfaction. Communality values showed that the retained indicators shared sufficient variance with the extracted factors. At the same time, several items belonging to academic service quality and administrative management effectiveness showed overlapping factor loadings. The results therefore supported the proposed four-dimensional structure while also indicating empirical proximity between these two service-related constructs. This overlap is subsequently taken into account when reporting the regression diagnostics and interpreting the relative coefficients.

c. Descriptive Statistics

Composite scores were calculated for each of the four research variables using the retained measurement items. Academic facilities quality recorded a mean score of 102.00 with a standard deviation of 19.36. Administrative management effectiveness had a mean of 62.66 (SD = 13.37), while academic service quality produced a mean of 67.29 (SD = 13.64). Student satisfaction recorded a mean score of 57.95 with a standard deviation of 12.36. These values demonstrate observable variation across respondents for each of the institutional quality dimensions and for the outcome variable.

Table 4. Descriptive Statistics

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation
Academic Facilities Quality	102.00	19.36
Administrative Management Effectiveness	62.66	13.37
Academic Service Quality	67.29	13.64
Student Satisfaction	57.95	12.36

The descriptive results should be read in relation to the different number of items comprising each construct. Academic facilities quality contained 27 items, administrative management effectiveness 17 items, academic service quality 18 items, and student satisfaction 16 items. Consequently, direct comparison of the accumulated mean scores would not provide an equivalent comparison of perceived levels across constructs. The descriptive statistics are therefore used primarily to characterize the distribution of each composite variable and to provide the empirical basis for the subsequent regression analysis rather than to establish a ranking among the four constructs.

d. Relative Predictive Contribution to Student Satisfaction

Multiple linear regression was used to estimate the relative predictive contribution of academic facilities quality, administrative management effectiveness, and academic service quality to student satisfaction. The overall regression model was statistically significant, $F = 565.539$, $p < 0.001$. The model produced an R value of 0.842 and an R^2 of 0.709, with an adjusted R^2 of 0.708. Thus, the three predictors considered jointly accounted for 70.9% of the observed variance in student satisfaction within the analytical sample.

Table 5. Multiple Linear Regression Results Predicting Student Satisfaction

Predictor	B	SE	β	t	p-value
Academic Facilities Quality	0.093	0.027	0.145	3.476	0.001
Administrative Management Effectiveness	0.174	0.049	0.189	3.592	<0.001
Academic Service Quality	0.488	0.045	0.539	10.739	<0.001

All three institutional quality dimensions contributed positively and significantly to the regression model. Academic facilities quality yielded an unstandardized coefficient of $B = 0.093$ ($SE = 0.027$), with a standardized coefficient of $\beta = 0.145$, $t = 3.476$, and $p = 0.001$. Administrative management effectiveness produced $B = 0.174$ ($SE = 0.049$), $\beta = 0.189$, $t = 3.592$, and $p < 0.001$. Academic service quality showed $B = 0.488$ ($SE = 0.045$), $\beta = 0.539$, $t = 10.739$, and $p < 0.001$. Accordingly, each predictor retained a statistically significant association with student satisfaction when the other two predictors were simultaneously included in the model.

Comparison of the standardized regression coefficients shows clear variation in the magnitude of the three predictive contributions. Academic service quality produced

the largest standardized coefficient ($\beta = 0.539$), followed by administrative management effectiveness ($\beta = 0.189$) and academic facilities quality ($\beta = 0.145$). Within the specified regression model, academic service quality therefore demonstrated the leading statistical predictive contribution to student satisfaction. This result refers specifically to the relative coefficients observed after the three predictors were entered simultaneously and should not be interpreted as evidence of causal effects or as a universal ordering of institutional quality dimensions.

e. Multicollinearity Diagnostics

Because the exploratory factor analysis indicated empirical proximity between some service-related dimensions, multicollinearity diagnostics were examined before interpreting the regression coefficients further. Tolerance values ranged from 0.152 to 0.240, while variance inflation factor (VIF) values ranged from 4.166 to 6.596. Academic facilities quality showed a tolerance value of 0.240 and a VIF of 4.166. Administrative management effectiveness recorded the lowest tolerance value (0.152) and the highest VIF (6.596), whereas academic service quality produced a tolerance value of 0.166 and a VIF of 6.022.

Table 6. Multicollinearity Diagnostics

Predictor	Tolerance	VIF
Academic Facilities Quality	0.240	4.166
Administrative Management Effectiveness	0.152	6.596
Academic Service Quality	0.166	6.022

The diagnostic results show greater statistical overlap between administrative management effectiveness and academic service quality than for academic facilities quality. Nevertheless, all three variables were retained in the regression model because they represented the distinct institutional quality dimensions specified in the research framework. The observed overlap is relevant to coefficient stability, and it therefore constrains how independently the standardized coefficients can be interpreted. Accordingly, the regression results are reported as relative predictive contributions within the specified model, rather than as evidence that the three predictors operate as completely independent determinants of student satisfaction. This qualification provides the empirical boundary for the subsequent discussion of the findings.

2. Discussion

The central significance of the findings lies in the varying relative contributions of institutional quality dimensions to student satisfaction. Although academic facilities, administrative management, and academic service quality were all significant, academic service quality demonstrated the strongest contribution within the examined model. This suggests that satisfaction is shaped not only by the resources universities possess, but also by how those resources and systems are experienced in everyday academic life. Higher education service quality has similarly been conceptualized as multidimensional rather than reducible to a single institutional attribute (Hasan & Hosen, 2020; Yusof et al., 2022). Teeroovengadum et al., (2019) further emphasize that students evaluate universities through interconnected service experiences, while recent evidence from Islamic educational settings points to the combined role of institutional support and service experience in shaping satisfaction (Fauzan et al., 2026; Manaf et al., 2026).

The stronger contribution of academic service quality may reflect the recurring character of student-institution interaction. Academic advising, consultation, information access, communication, responsiveness, reliability, assurance, and empathy make institutional support directly visible throughout students' academic experience. Ali et al., (2016) identify these service encounters as important components of students' evaluations of higher education, while Annamdevula and Bellamkonda (2016, 2016) demonstrate their relevance to satisfaction, motivation, and loyalty. Htang (2021) similarly highlights the importance of direct service experience. The present findings extend this literature by showing that academic service quality retains the strongest relative contribution even when facilities and administrative effectiveness are considered simultaneously. The issue is therefore not simply whether academic services matter, but how strongly they remain associated with satisfaction once other institutional dimensions are taken into account.

This distinction is particularly important within Indonesian Islamic higher education. Previous studies have documented associations between academic or non-academic services and student satisfaction in Islamic university contexts (Firdaus, 2019; Farihah et al., 2024), while Syilfi and Obie (2024) likewise demonstrate the salience of service quality in students' evaluations. The present study moves beyond evaluating these dimensions in isolation by estimating the relative contribution of academic services alongside administrative management and facilities across multiple institutions.

Evidence from Fauzan et al., (2026) and Manaf et al., (2026) also points to the multidimensional nature of institutional support. Within the present sample, academic service quality therefore appears particularly salient, but this pattern should remain context-specific rather than be interpreted as a universal hierarchy of university quality dimensions (Al-Sheeb et al., 2018; Brown & Mazzarol, 2008).

Administrative management adds a complementary dimension to student satisfaction because it shapes how students access and navigate university processes. Registration, academic records, scheduling, information systems, and institutional communication can either facilitate academic participation or create procedural barriers when they are poorly coordinated. In the present study, the significant contribution of administrative management indicates that students' evaluations of university quality are influenced not only by direct academic interaction but also by the reliability and accessibility of institutional procedures. This interpretation is supported by evidence linking academic administration with student satisfaction (Efendi et al., 2021; Farihah et al., 2024). Studies on higher education service management likewise show that the organization of institutional processes remains relevant to students' service evaluations (Farooq et al., 2019; Bawamenewi et al., 2022; Pratiwi et al., 2023). In Islamic higher education, this issue is also connected to broader concerns of educational management and institutional quality (Indrawan & Refika, 2025; Yuliana et al., 2026).

The empirical proximity between academic service quality and administrative management effectiveness suggests that students may experience these dimensions as interconnected parts of institutional support rather than as entirely separate functions. Academic guidance, information access, registration, scheduling, and communication often require movement across both academic and administrative processes, making continuity of service more salient than formal organizational boundaries. This interpretation is consistent with broader service-quality perspectives that emphasize students' cumulative institutional experiences (Hasan & Hosen, 2020; Htang, 2021). Evidence on academic administration also shows that administrative processes contribute directly to students' evaluations of institutional support (Farihah et al., 2024). Manaf et al. (2026) further reinforces the importance of integrated institutional support. The observed overlap should therefore be read as experiential interconnectedness rather than conceptual redundancy between the two constructs.

Academic facilities occupy a different position within the same institutional configuration. Classrooms, laboratories, libraries, internet infrastructure, and learning spaces create the material conditions required for academic participation (Weerasinghe & Fernando, 2018; Galabin, 2024). Their smaller relative coefficient does not imply that infrastructure is unimportant; rather, it indicates that facilities alone explain less variation in satisfaction once academic and administrative service experiences are considered simultaneously. Wati et al., (2024) similarly approach higher education quality through multiple service dimensions, while Clemons and Jance (2024) emphasize its broader multidimensional character. Digital learning studies also show that technological provision acquires value through the way students engage with and experience it (Agusnaya et al., 2024; Wijaya et al., 2025). Infrastructure is therefore better understood as an enabling condition whose educational value depends partly on the effectiveness of institutional support systems.

Taken together, these results suggest that institutional quality is experienced as a configuration rather than as a set of isolated attributes. Facilities enable academic participation, administrative systems organize access to institutional processes, and academic services translate institutional capacity into recurring student interactions. This interpretation extends multidimensional service-quality perspectives by differentiating the relative contribution of established dimensions within one empirical model rather than proposing an alternative theoretical framework (Hasan & Hosen, 2020; Farooq et al., 2019). Its contribution is therefore analytical: it identifies how theoretically distinguishable dimensions become interconnected in students' evaluations. This perspective is also relevant to quality-assurance debates in Islamic education, where institutional performance increasingly depends on the coordination of organizational processes, educational services, and resources (Yuliana et al., 2026; Lathifah et al., 2025).

The institutional context of UIN further clarifies the scope of this contribution. State Islamic Universities combine public higher education responsibilities with distinctive religious and institutional missions, but the present study did not measure Islamic identity or religious values as explanatory variables. The findings should therefore be interpreted in relation to institutional services and support rather than attributed directly to religious identity. Research on Islamic higher education indicates that institutional quality involves managerial, academic, organizational, and service

dimensions in addition to mission and identity (Jami & Muharam, 2022; Ritonga & Yamin, 2021). The present study adds to this discussion by showing how three concrete institutional dimensions are differentiated in students' evaluations, thereby retaining the distinctiveness of the UIN context without overstating the explanatory role of institutional identity.

The findings also carry practical implications for institutional improvement. Because academic service quality showed the strongest relative contribution, universities need sustained attention to academic communication, advising, information accessibility, and responsiveness. However, these improvements are unlikely to be effective if students continue to encounter administrative barriers or inadequate learning environments. Farihah et al., (2024) illustrate the relevance of academic administration to satisfaction, while Rahman et al., (2024) connect service quality and student satisfaction to broader institutional outcomes. Wati et al., (2024) likewise support a multidimensional approach to evaluating higher education services. In Islamic educational quality assurance, coordination between institutional processes, resources, and educational objectives is also increasingly emphasized (Yuliana et al., 2026; Lathifah et al., 2025). Quality improvement should therefore be organized around coherent student experiences rather than isolated organizational units.

The broader significance of these findings extends beyond Indonesian Islamic higher education. Across higher education systems, students encounter quality through varying combinations of academic interaction, administrative support, learning environments, material resources, and transformative experiences (Teeroovengadum et al., 2019; Oliso et al., 2023; Oliso et al., 2024). The importance assigned to these dimensions, however, is shaped by institutional structure, governance arrangements, cultural context, and student population (Mastoi et al., 2019; Surman & Tóth, 2019). The stronger contribution of academic service quality observed here should therefore not be universalized as a fixed international ordering. Instead, the finding demonstrates the value of examining institutional dimensions relationally and contextually. Evidence from digitally mediated education reinforces this argument by showing that technological availability alone does not ensure positive educational experience; usability, support, trust, and engagement also matter (Agusnaya et al., 2024; Wijaya et al., 2025).

This international perspective shifts attention from institutional possession to institutional translation. Universities may invest extensively in infrastructure, digital

platforms, and quality-assurance mechanisms, but those investments become meaningful to students only when they are converted into accessible and responsive educational experiences. Ali et al., (2016) demonstrate the central role of service encounters in higher education evaluations, while Htang (2021) emphasizes students' direct experience of university services. Rahman et al., (2024) further connect service quality with satisfaction and subsequent institutional outcomes. Research on institutional adaptability and integrated quality systems reinforces the need to understand quality as an experienced rather than merely provided condition (Lathifah et al., 2025; Yuliana et al., 2026). Wijaya et al., (2025) similarly show that digital educational experiences depend on how technological systems are perceived and used. The global contribution of this study therefore lies in foregrounding how institutional capacity is converted into coherent student experience.

The findings should nevertheless be interpreted within several methodological boundaries. Because the study used a cross-sectional design and self-reported measures, the observed relationships indicate predictive associations rather than causal effects. The pooled analysis across six State Islamic Universities also does not capture institution-level differences, while the unequal distribution of respondents limits the generalizability of the findings across universities. In addition, the empirical proximity between academic service quality and administrative management effectiveness may influence coefficient stability, and the use of a single questionnaire introduces the possibility of common-method bias. These considerations do not undermine the findings, but they define the scope within which the results should be understood and provide a clear basis for subsequent research.

D. Conclusion

This study shows that student satisfaction in Indonesian State Islamic Universities is shaped by the combined influence of academic facilities quality, administrative management effectiveness, and academic service quality, with varying relative contributions from each dimension. Academic service quality emerged as the strongest contributor, indicating that students' evaluations of institutional quality are closely connected to how academic support, communication, accessibility, and responsiveness are experienced in everyday university life. Administrative management structures access to institutional processes, while academic facilities provide the material conditions for academic participation. Overall, student satisfaction is best understood as the outcome of

interconnected institutional experiences rather than as a response to a single dimension of university quality.

The study contributes to higher education service-quality research by clarifying the relative role of established institutional dimensions within a multi-institutional Islamic higher education context. Rather than proposing a new theoretical model, it provides a more precise empirical understanding of how academic, administrative, and material dimensions operate together in shaping student evaluations. This contribution is particularly relevant to State Islamic Universities, where institutional quality depends on the coordination of services, organizational processes, and learning environments. The findings therefore support an approach to quality improvement centered on coherent student experiences rather than isolated institutional units.

For institutional leaders and quality-assurance practitioners, the findings imply that improvements in academic communication, advising, information accessibility, and responsiveness should be accompanied by reliable administrative systems and adequate learning infrastructure. More broadly, universities should assess quality not only by the resources they provide, but also by how effectively those resources are translated into accessible, coordinated, and meaningful student experiences.

Based on the limitations acknowledged in this study, future research should employ longitudinal or multi-wave designs, incorporate institution-level analysis, utilize more balanced sampling across universities, and apply more advanced measurement approaches to clarify the distinction between academic service quality and administrative management effectiveness. Multiple data sources would also help reduce potential common-method bias. Ultimately, institutional quality becomes meaningful when universities successfully convert their resources, systems, and services into coherent experiences that students perceive as supportive, accessible, and responsive.

Declaration of Competing Interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Declaration of Generative AI

During the preparation of this manuscript, the authors used Grammarly and QuillBot solely to improve grammar, clarity, readability, and linguistic consistency.

These tools were not used for conceptualization, data generation or analysis, interpretation of findings, or development of the study's arguments and conclusions. All AI-assisted suggestions were critically reviewed and revised by the authors, who retain full responsibility for the originality, integrity, accuracy, and academic content of the manuscript.

References

- Afthanorhan, A., Awang, Z., Rashid, N., Foziah, H., & Ghazali, P. L. (2019). Assessing the Effects of Service Quality on Customer Satisfaction. *Management Science Letters*, 9, 13–24. <https://doi.org/10.5267/j.msl.2018.11.004>
- Agusnaya, N., Wahid, A., Akbar, M., Hidayat M., W., Sanatang, S., Soeharto, S., & Lavicza, Z. (2024). Enhancing Digital Learning in Higher Education: The Mediating Role of Academic Self-Efficacy in Motivation and Engagement. *Online Learning in Educational Research*, 4(2), 167–183. <https://doi.org/10.58524/oler.v4i2.505>
- Ali, F., Zhou, Y., Hussain, K., Nair, P., & Ragavan, N. A. (2016). Does Higher Education Service Quality Effect Student Satisfaction, Image and Loyalty? *Quality Assurance in Education*, 24(1), 70–94. <https://doi.org/10.1108/qae-02-2014-0008>
- Al-Sheeb, B. A., Hamouda, A. M. S., & Abdella, G. M. (2018). Investigating Determinants of Student Satisfaction in the First Year of College in a Public University in the State of Qatar. *Education Research International*, 2018, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2018/7194106>
- Annamdevula, S., & Bellamkonda, R. S. (2016). Effect of Student Perceived Service Quality on Student Satisfaction, Loyalty and Motivation in Indian Universities. *Journal of Modelling in Management*, 11(2), 488–517. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jm2-01-2014-0010>
- Annamdevula, S., & Bellamkonda, R. S. (2016). The Effects of Service Quality on Student Loyalty: The Mediating Role of Student Satisfaction. *Journal of Modelling in Management*, 11(2), 446–462. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jm2-04-2014-0031>
- Bawamenewi, A., Sitanggang, N., & Nasrun, N. (2022). Higher Education Management in Academic Service to FKIP Student Satisfaction. *Indonesian Journal of Educational Research and Review*, 5(3), 624–630. <https://doi.org/10.23887/ijerr.v5i3.56102>
- Brown, R. M., & Mazzarol, T. (2008). The Importance of Institutional Image to Student Satisfaction and Loyalty within Higher Education. *Higher Education*, 58(1), 81–95. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-008-9183-8>
- Clemons, R., & Jance, M. (2024). Defining Quality in Higher Education and Identifying Opportunities for Improvement. *SAGE Open*, 14(3). <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440241271155>

- Efendi, M. A., Mahjudin, M., & Soelistya, D. (2021). The Importance of Measuring the Gap Level of Information System user Satisfaction in the World of Education in University: Electronic Service Quality Model. *Proceedings of the Universitas Muhammadiyah Gresik Engineering, Social Science and Health International Conference*, 1(2), 522. <https://doi.org/10.30587/umgeshic.v1i2.3422>
- Farihah, U., Arifin, S., Muhith, A., & Ghani, M. F. A. (2024). The Influence of Academic Administration Services with the RATER Approach on Student Satisfaction in Higher Education. *Al-Tanzim: Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan Islam*, 8(1), 174–191. <https://doi.org/10.33650/al-tanzim.v8i1.6105>
- Farooq, M., Khalil-Ur-Rehman, F., Abdurrahman, D. T., Younas, W., Sajjad, S., & Zreen, A. (2019). Service Quality Analysis of Private Universities Libraries in Malaysia in the Era of Transformative Marketing. *International Journal for Quality Research*, 13(2), 269–284. <https://doi.org/10.24874/ijqr13.02-02>
- Fauzan, A., Nasution, S. I., & Misdarwati. (2026). Determinants of Student Satisfaction in Higher Education: Evidence from Indonesian Islamic Universities. *Munaddhomah*, 7(2), 386–399. <https://doi.org/10.31538/munaddhomah.v7i2.2390>
- Firdaus, M. (2019). The Relationship between Quality of Service and Student Satisfaction within an Indonesian Islamic-Based University. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 10(2), 101–109. <https://doi.org/10.7176/jep/10-2-12>
- Fitri, A. Z. (2016). Quality Assurance System between the Islamic State University and the State University. *Jurnal Pendidikan Islam*, 2(2), 208–230. <https://doi.org/10.15575/jpi.v2i2.787>
- Galabin, N. D. (2024). Students' Satisfaction of Learning Space in St. Michael's College, Iligan City. *International Journal of Social Science and Human Research*, 7(2). <https://doi.org/10.47191/ijsshr/v7-i02-27>
- Hadijaya, Y., Nasution, I., & Suhairi, S. (2019). Implementation of the Balanced Score Card to Achieve Strategic Goals in the State Islamic Religious Colleges. *Jurnal Pendidikan Islam*, 7(2), 281–301. <https://doi.org/10.14421/jpi.2018.72.281-301>
- Hasan, M., & Hosen, M. Z. (2020). University Service Quality. *International Journal of Asian Education*, 1(3), 135–146. <https://doi.org/10.46966/ijae.v1i3.46>
- Htang, L. K. (2021). A Look at University Student Service Quality and Satisfaction. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 29(2/3), 101–115. <https://doi.org/10.1108/qae-09-2020-0108>
- Indrawan, I., & Refika, R. (2025). Dynamics of Islamic Education Management and its Impact on Academic Service Effectiveness in Islamic Higher Education. *Al-Tanzim: Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan Islam*, 9(3), 918–931. <https://doi.org/10.33650/al-tanzim.v9i3.11829>

- Jami, D. Z., & Muharam, A. (2022). Strategy for Improving the Quality of Islamic Religious Education Study Programs with Total Quality Management. *Nidhomul Haq: Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan Islam*, 7(2), 267–283. <https://doi.org/10.31538/ndh.v7i2.2096>
- Kodrat, D. (2020). Growth Mindset of Quality Management in an Islamic School. *Jurnal Kajian Peradaban Islam*, 3(1), 22–26. <https://doi.org/10.47076/jkpi.v3i1.37>
- Lathifah, Z. K., Fauziah, R. S. P., Rusli, R. K., Roestamy, M., Martin, A. Y., Indra, S., & Suherman, U. (2025). Quality Assurance in Pesantren: Modernization, Adaptability, and Integration into Indonesia's Education System. *Jurnal Pendidikan Islam*, 11(1), 101–114. <https://doi.org/10.15575/jpi.v11i1.43951>
- Mala, A., & Munirah. (2019). Organizational Culture and Quality of Services at IAIN Sultan Amai Gorontalo. *Al-Ulum*, 19(2), 345–366. <https://doi.org/10.30603/au.v19i2.928>
- Manaf, S., Mulazid, A. S., Arief, H., Darajat, M. H., Izfanna, D., Rahman Zh, M. H., & Musthofa, M. (2026). Examining the Effects of Kiai Leadership, Institutional Support, and Educational Technology on Student Satisfaction in Indonesian Pesantren. *Munaddhomah*, 7(2), 465–481. <https://doi.org/10.31538/munaddhomah.v7i2.2698>
- Mastoi, A. G., Lu, X., & Saengkrod, W. (2019). Higher Education Service Quality based on Students' Satisfaction in People's Republic of China. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 10(6), 109–121. <https://doi.org/10.7176/jep/10-6-15>
- Misbach, I. (2018). Services Quality of Islamic University. *MBR (Management and Business Review)*, 2(2), 71–84. <https://doi.org/10.21067/mbr.v2i2.3229>
- Oliso, Z. Z., Alemu, D. D., Jansen, J. D., & Hussein, J. O. (2023). Developing a Comprehensive Higher Education Service Quality Model in Ethiopian Context. *International Journal of Educational Management and Development Studies*, 4(4), 81–108. <https://doi.org/10.53378/353025>
- Oliso, Z. Z., Alemu, D. D., & Jansen, J. D. (2024). The Impact of Educational Service Quality on Student Academic Performance in Ethiopian Public Universities: A Mediating Role of Students' Satisfaction. *Journal of International Education in Business*, 17(2), 340–370. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jieb-07-2023-0042>
- Pahrudin, A., Sugiharta, I., & Arifin, Z. (2026). Predicting Students' Learning Perceptions through Deep Learning Pedagogy within a Transformative Curriculum: Evidence from Indonesian Islamic Higher Education. *Jurnal Pendidikan Agama Islam*, 23(1), 21–46. <https://doi.org/10.14421/v23i1.12441>
- Pratiwi, R., Amilia, W., & Luthfiani, L. (2023). Need Analysis for Designing Administrative Services Websites for Students. *Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan IPA*, 9, 267–273. <https://doi.org/10.29303/jppipa.v9iSpecialIssue.6242>
- Rahman, A. U., Manzoor, W., Yasmin, N., Yaqub, R. M. S., & Ali, M. S. (2024). From Service Quality to Brand Loyalty: The Mediating Effect of Student Satisfaction in

- Public Sector Universities. *Pakistan Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 12(2). <https://doi.org/10.52131/pjhss.2024.v12i2.2215>
- Ritonga, A. H., & Yamin, M. (2021). Integrated Quality Management of the State Islamic University of North Sumatra, Medan in the Development of Graduation Skills Based on Soft Skills. *International Journal of Progressive Sciences and Technologies*, 25(1), 389. <https://doi.org/10.52155/ijpsat.v25.1.2792>
- Silva, D. S., Moraes, G. H. S. M. de, Makiya, I. K., & César, F. I. G. (2017). Measurement of Perceived Service Quality in Higher Education Institutions. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 25(4), 415–439. <https://doi.org/10.1108/qae-10-2016-0058>
- Surman, V., & Tóth, Z. (2019). Developing a Service Quality Framework for a Special Type of Course. *Periodica Polytechnica Social and Management Sciences*, 27(1), 66–86. <https://doi.org/10.3311/ppso.12201>
- Syilfi, & Obie, M. (2024). Students' Satisfaction with Islamic Education Management Department Services at the State Islamic University of Sultan Amai Gorontalo, Indonesia. *Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies*, 50(6), 617–626. <https://doi.org/10.9734/ajess/2024/v50i61436>
- Teeroovengadum, V., Nunkoo, R., Grönroos, C., Kamalanabhan, T. J., & Seebaluck, A. K. (2019). Higher Education Service Quality, Student Satisfaction and Loyalty. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 27(4), 427–445. <https://doi.org/10.1108/qae-01-2019-0003>
- Wati, L., Dharma, S., Jadmiko, P., & Sugiarti, T. (2024). Measurement of Higher Education Service Quality using HEDPERF and HiEduQual Importance-Performance Analysis Methods. *Jurnal Apresiasi Ekonomi*, 12(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.31846/jae.v12i1.700>
- Weerasinghe, I. M. S., & Fernando, R. L. S. (2018). University Facilities and Student Satisfaction in Sri Lanka. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 32(5), 866–880. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijem-07-2017-0174>
- Wijaya, N. P. N. P., Gaffar, V., Widjajanta, B., Andriana, D., & Buana, D. M. A. (2025). Decoding e-Experience in Educational Technology: The Mediating Role of e-Trust and e-Satisfaction in Continuance Intention. *Online Learning in Educational Research*, 5(2), 245–258. <https://doi.org/10.58524/oler.v5i2.608>
- Yuliana, L., Hamdi, S., & Perdana, R. (2026). Quality Assurance in Islamic Higher Education: Global Trends, Challenges, and Future Directions. *Munaddhomah*, 7(1), 202–215. <https://doi.org/10.31538/munaddhomah.v7i1.2547>
- Yusof, N. M., Asimiran, S., & Kadir, S. A. (2022). Student Satisfaction of University Service Quality in Malaysia: A Review. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, 11(1), 677–688. <https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarped/v11-i1/10985>

