

**DETERMINANTS OF INTERNATIONAL STUDENT'S
SATISFACTION IN UUM 2014**

ONG CHEE HUI

MASTER OF SCIENCE (MANAGEMENT)

UNIVERSITI UTARA MALAYSIA

JUNE 2014

PERMISSION TO USE

In presenting this dissertation/project paper in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a Post Graduate degree from the University Utara Malaysia (UUM), I agree that the Library of this university may make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for copying this dissertation/project paper in any manner, in whole or in part, for scholarly purposes may be granted by my supervisor(s) or in their absence, by the Dean of Othman Yeop Abdullah Graduate School of Business where I did my dissertation/project paper. It is understood that any copying or publication or use of this dissertation/project paper parts of it for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission. It is also understood that due recognition shall be given to me and to the UUM in any scholarly use which may be made of any material in my dissertation/project paper.

Request for permission to copy or to make other use of materials in this dissertation/project paper in whole or in part should be addressed to:

Dean of Othman Yeop Abdullah Graduate School of Business

Universiti Utara Malaysia

06010 UUM Sintok

Kedah DarulAman

Abstract

Nowadays, higher education is becoming increasingly globalized and internationalized. The number of international students studying in Malaysian institution of higher education is continuously growing. International students contribute their own success, campus diversity, campus internationalization and also economic of Malaysia. However, decreasing number of international students in UUM show a declining trends compare with the increasing number of international students in Malaysia. So, the purpose of the study is to examine the determinants of international student's satisfaction. There is a large body of research on student satisfaction and factors leading to student satisfaction. However, this study will focus only on all the international students in UUM, total 2053 international students in different education level and from different countries. This study is a quantitative research, a questionnaire has been developed and an online survey was used. A total of 178 usable responses were received and regression analysis is using to analyze the data. This study develops and tests a model of international student satisfaction. The findings indicate the importance of service quality related to both educational and non-educational services varies among nationality groups, therefore has a differential impact on student satisfaction. Eight factors that have been investigated in the study is accommodation, economic consideration, safety, education, technology, social, image and prestige and culture integrated. The eight factors were adopted from previous research by Arambewela & Hall (2009) and Akiko (2008).

Keyword: Higher Education, Internationalization, International Student, Student's Satisfaction, UUM Malaysia

Abstrak

Kini, sector pendidikan tinggi telah menjadi semakin globalisasi dan internationalize. Bilangan pelajar antarabangsa yang belajar di institusi pengajian tinggi Malaysia juga semakin berkembang dan mereka bukan sahaja menyumbangkan kerjayaan mereka sendiri, kepelbagaian kampus antarabangsa dan juga ekonomi Malaysia. Sebaliknya, UUM pula menunjukkan bilangan pelajar antarabangsa di UUM semakin menurun. Keadaan yang bertentangan dengan bilangan pelajar antarabangsa yang semakin bertambah di Malaysia perlu diperhatikan. Oleh itu, kajian ini adalah untuk mengenalpastikan factor-faktor yang akan menjejaskan kepuasan pelajar antarabangsa di UUM. Walaupun terdapat banyak penyelidikan yang telah menjalankan kajian mengenai kepuasan pelajar dan factor-faktor yang menjejaskan kepuasan pelajar, tetapi kajian ini hanya member tumpuan kepada semua pelajar antarabangsa di UUM sahaja. Sejumlah 2053 pelajar antarabangsa di UUM yang berbeza peringkat pendidikan dan pelbagai Negara termasuk dalam kajian ini. Kajian ini adalah kajian kuantitatif. Borang soal selidik yang disediakan akan dihantar kepada responden melalui email. Sebanyak 178 balasan jawapan soal selidik yang boleh digunakan telah diterima. Teknik Regression dalam SPSS telah digunakan untuk menganalisis data yang diterima. Kajian ini dapat membina dan menguji model kepuasan pelajar antarabangsa. Kajian ini menunjukkan kepentingan kualiti perkhidmatan kepada aspek kepuasan pelajar baik dari segi pendidikan ataupun bukan pendidikan di kalangan kumpulan pelajar antarabangsa. Lapan factor yang dikaji dalam kajian ini adalah penginapan, pertimbangan ekonomi, keselamatan, pendidikan, teknologi, social, imej dan prestij dan budaya. Lapan factor ini adalah diambil dari kajian-kajian lepas yang dikaji oleh Arambewela (2009) dan Akiko (2008).

Katakunci: Pendidikan Tinggi, Internationalize, Pelajar Antarabangsa, Kepuasan Pelajar, UUM Malaysia

Acknowledgement

As John Donne wrote “No man is an island”, everyone needs to co-operate with others to complete certain task. This does not only refer to ask for help but also include the counterpart that provide us the information and guide us on our task. Similarly this is the first time for me to be involved in writing a proper research proposal. I’m starting with unclear path but with the guidance of my dissertation supervisor, Dr Ahmed Rageh Ismail, slowly I found out my way to go on with my research proposal. Dr Ahmed has inspired me a lot on the survey model, survey questionnaire, research method and also some of the overview of the viva section. So, the first person I would like to thank is my supervisor, Dr Ahmed Rageh for putting so much effort to guide me on my research.

The second person that I really appreciate is UUM HEA group, as they have lend me a hand and giving me the information of international student in UUM. They have tried their best to give me the complete data that I needed in my survey. Of course, I would like to say thanks you to the international students in UUM that participated in the survey and answered all the questionnaire that I send to them. Your response really helped me a lots in my research. Again, thanks to those who willing to take some of their precious time answer and respond to my questionnaire.

Besides that, I would like to thank my family for keep on supporting me to my study and career. Their support made feel relieve, so that I can keep on work on my research proposal. Finally, I would like to thank for my classmates that willing to share the knowledge and skills on doing research proposal with me and giving me some opinion at the moment I needed it.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE PAGE	i
PERMISSION TO USE.....	ii
ABSTRACT.....	iii
ABSTRAK	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.....	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vi
LIST OF TABLES	ix
LIST OF FIGURES	x
CHAPTER ONE INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Problem Statement	5
1.3 Research Questions	6
1.4 Research Objectives	7
1.5 Scope of Study	8
1.6 Significance of Study	8
1.6.1 Significance to Academic	8
1.6.2 Significance to Practitioner	10
1.7 Definition of Key Terms	11
1.7.1 International Student	11
1.7.2 Student's Satisfaction.....	11
1.7.3 Accommodation	11
1.7.4 Economic Consideration	11
1.7.5 Education	11
1.7.6 Technology	12
1.7.7 Social.....	12
1.7.8 Image and prestige	12
1.7.9 Safety	12
1.7.10 Culture Integrated	13

1.8 Organization of the Study	13
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW	14
2.1 Introduction.....	14
2.2 Internationalization of Higher education	14
2.3 Students Mobility.....	16
2.4 Theories and Models Associated with Dependent Variable	19
2.4.1 Overview of Dependent Variable	21
2.5 Discussion on Independent Variables	26
2.5.1 Accommodation.....	26
2.5.2 Economic Consideration.....	27
2.5.3 Education	29
2.5.4 Technology	31
2.5.5 Social.....	33
2.5.6 Image and Prestige.....	36
2.5.7 Safety	37
2.5.8 Culture Integrated	38
2.6 Overview on Variable	41
2.7 Research Framework	42
2.8 Hypothesis Development.....	43
2.9 Chapter Summary	44
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	45
3.1 Introduction.....	45
3.2 Research Design.....	45
3.3 Population and Sample	46
3.4 Sampling Method.....	48
3.5 Data Collection Techniques	49
3.6 Data Analysis Techniques.....	49
3.7 Chapter Summary	50

CHAPTER FOUR: RESULT AND DICUSSION	51
4.1 Introduction.....	51
4.2 Reliability.....	52
4.3 Regression.....	53
4.4 Chapter Summary	58
CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION.....	59
5.1 Introduction.....	59
5.2 Discussion and Conclusion	59
5.3 Limitation.....	62
5.4 Recommendation	63
5.4.1 Recommendation for Practitioner	63
5.4.2 Recommendation for Future Research.....	64
REFERENCES.....	66
APPENDIX.....	81

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.0: Table of Variables and Measurement	45
Table 3.1: Population of International Students in UUM	47
Table 3.2: Total of Undergraduate and Postgraduate International Student.....	48
Table 4.0: Total Respondent by Gender	51
Table 4.1: Total Respondent by Countries	51
Table 4.2: Cronbach's Alpha	52
Table 4.3: ANOVA result for regression Analysis	54
Table 4.4: Regression Model Summary.....	54
Table 4.5: Coefficients.....	55
Table 4.6: Hypothesis Test Result	57

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.0: Structural Model of Student's Satisfaction	41
Figure 2.1: Variables Diagram.....	42

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This chapter introduces outline of the study. The chapter will begin with problem statement, which will describe the concerning issues of study. The next step will touch on research objective and this objective is to determine what the researcher want to achieve in the study. After the objective, research questions will be demonstrated. Next, significant of study and definition of key terms will be highlighted. On the final stage of the chapter will state out the organization of chapter for the study.

1.1 Background

Service is any activities that does not directly produce the physical product but create value for customer through some activities and it involves transaction between buyer and seller with non-good activities, it is refer to intangible and it cannot be stored, repair or moved but can be felt, enjoyed and get benefit from it (Evan & Collier, 2007, P11). As mention by Falindah et al (2013), higher education also referred as services industries because the knowledge provided by higher education with using their feeling, their communication with lecturer but they can't actually touch and take the knowledge directly and keep inside their bag or brains.

In the last century before, higher education industry is taking more conservative approach on marketing sector as they did not put so much effort on doing promotion attracting consumer attention (Naude & Ivy, 1999) However in the recent years, changes in policy, governance, structure and status of higher education have been taken place all over the world (Nicolescu, 2009). Environmental changes such as privatization, diversification, decentralization, internationalization and

The contents of
the thesis is for
internal user
only

REFERENCES

- Adelegan, F., & Parks, D. (1985). Problems of transition for African students in an American university. *Journal Of College Student Personnel*, 26 (6) 504-508
- Akiko, O. (2008). *INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS' SATISFACTION ON CAMPUS*. Doctor of Philosophy. Claremont Graduate University.
- Aliaga, M., & Gunderson, B. (2002). *Interactive Statistics* (2nd ed.). Prentice.
- Altbach, P., & Peterson, P. (2007). *Higher education in the new century: Global challenges and innovative ideas*. Chestnut Hill, MA: Centre for higher Education, Boston College (1st ed.). Sense Publishers.
- Altbach, P. (2008). The complex roles of universities in the period of globalization. *Palgrave Macmillan*.
- Altbach, P., Reisberg, L. and Rumbley, L. (2009). *Trends in Global Higher Education: Tracking an Academic Revolution, a report prepared for the UNESCO 2009 World Conference on Higher Education*. [online] Unesdoc.unesco.org. Available at: <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0018/001831/183168e.pdf>. [Accessed 7 Dec. 2013].
- Anderson, E., & Sullivan, M. (1993). The antecedents and consequences of customer satisfaction for firms. *Marketing Science*, 12(2), 125--143.
- Anderson, E., Fornell, C., & Lehmann, D. (1994). Customer satisfaction, market share, and profitability: findings from Sweden. *The Journal Of Marketing*, 53--66.
- Arambewela, R., & Hall, J. (2009). An empirical model of international student satisfaction. *Asia Pacific Journal Of Marketing And Logistics*, 21(4), 555--569.
- Arambewela, R., Hall, J. and Zuhair, S. (2006). Postgraduate international students from Asia: Factors influencing satisfaction. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, 15(2), pp.105--127.
- Ayoubi, R. and Al-Habaibeh, A. (2006). An investigation into international business collaboration in higher education organisations: A case study of international partnerships in four UK leading universities. *International Journal of*

Educational Management, 20(5), pp.380--396.

- Ayoubi, R.M. and H.K. Massoud, 2007. The strategy of internationalisation in universities. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 21(4).
- Banwet, D., & Datta, B. (2003). A study of the effect of perceived lecture quality on post-lecture intentions. *Work Study*, 52(5), 234--243.
- Barnett, G., & Wu, R. (1995). The international student exchange network: 1970 & 1989. *Higher Education*, 30(4), 353--368.
- BEERKENS, E. (2007). Global Opportunities and Institutional Embeddedness: Cooperation in Higher Education Consortia. *Public-Private Dynamics In Higher Education: Expectations, Developments And Outcomes. Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag*, 247--270.
- Beltyukova, S., & Fox, C. (2002). Journal of College Student Development. *Student Satisfaction As A Measure Of Student Development: Towards A Universal Metric*, 43(2), 161-172.
- Bond, S., & Bowry, C. (2002). *Connections & complexities* (1st ed.). Winnipeg: Centre for Higher Education Research and Development, University of Manitoba.
- Braxton, J. M. (2003). *Student success*. In Komives, S. R., Woodard, Jr. D. B. & Associates Eds.), *Student services*. (4th ed., pp. 317-335). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- Burke, B. (1986). *Experiences of overseas undergraduate students*, *Bullentin No, 18* (1st ed.). Kensington, N.S.W.: Student Counselling and Research Unit, University of New South Wales.
- Chen, L. (2008). Internationalization or international marketing? Two frameworks for understanding international students' choice of Canadian universities. *Journal Of Marketing For Higher Education*, 18(1), 1--33.
- Clemes, M., Gan, C., Kao, T., & Choong, M. (2008). An empirical analysis of customer satisfaction in international air travel. *Innovative Marketing*, 4(2), 50--62.
- Conant, J., Brown, J., & Mokwa, M. (1985). Students are important consumers:

- Assessing satisfaction in a higher education context. *Journal Of Marketing Education*, 7(2), 13--20.
- Creswell, J. (2003). *Research design* (1st ed., p. 4). Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.
- Das, A., Chow, S. and Rutherford, B. (1986). The counseling needs of foreign students. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling*, 9(2), pp.167--174.
- Davies, R. (2007), “Traditional education not that bad”, The Jakarta Post, 14 April
- De Mooij, M. and Hofstede, G. (2002). Convergence and divergence in consumer behavior: implications for international retailing. *Journal of retailing*, 78(1), pp.61--69.
- Denver, CO, (1997). “*The student satisfaction and retention model(SSRM)*,”. Working Paper. University of Colorado.
- DeShields Jr, O., Kara, A. and 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), pp.128--139.
- Douglas, J., Douglas, A. and Barnes, B. (2006). Measuring student satisfaction at a UK university. *Quality assurance in education*, 14(3), pp.251--267.
- Elliott, K. and Shin, D. (2002). Student satisfaction: An alternative approach to assessing this important concept. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 24(2), pp.197--209.
- Evans, J. and Collier, D. (2007). *Operation Management*. 1st ed. Canada: SOUTH-WESTERN CENGAGE LEARNING, p.11.
- Fedorikhin, A. and Cole, C. (2004). Mood effects on attitudes, perceived risk and choice: Moderators and mediators. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 14(1), pp.2--12.
- Ford, J., Joseph, M. and Joseph, B. (1999). Importance-performance analysis as a strategic tool for service marketers: the case of service quality perceptions of

- business students in New Zealand and the USA. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 13(2), pp.171--186.
- Friesen, R. (2011). *Canadian university internationalization*. 1st ed. pp.1-25.
- Gabel, D. (1994). *Handbook of research on science teaching and learning*. 1st ed. New York: Macmillan.
- Gamage, D., Suwanabroma, J., Ueyama, T., Hada, S. and Sekikawa, E. (2008). The impact of quality assurance measures on student services at the Japanese and Thai private universities. *Quality assurance in Education*, 16(2), pp.181--198.
- Garland, P. and Grace, T. (1994). New Perspectives for Student Affairs Professionals: Evolving Realities, Responsibilities and Roles. ERIC Digest. *ERIC*.
- Geall, V. (2000). The expectations and experience of first-year students at City University of Hong Kong. *Quality in Higher Education*, 6(1), pp.77--89.
- Gornitzka, A. and Langfeldt, L. (2008). *Borderless knowledge Understanding the "New" Internationalisation of Research and higher education in Norway*. 1st ed. Springer, pp.171-184.
- Gruber, T., Fuss, S., Voss, R. and Gl"aser-Zikuda, M. (2010). Examining student satisfaction with higher education services: Using a new measurement tool. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 23(2), pp.105--123.
- Hammons, L., Lee, Y., Akins, R., Somasundaram, U. and Egan, T. (2004). An Evaluation Case Study of an International Student Services Office: Assessing Satisfaction and Productivity. *Online Submission*.
- Hanaysha, J., Abdullah, H. and Warokka, A. (2011). Service Quality and Students' Satisfaction at Higher Learning Institutions: The Competing Dimensions of Malaysian Universities' Competitiveness. *Journal of Southeast Asian Research*, 1.
- Harrison, E. (2009). What constitutes good academic advising? Nursing students' perceptions of academic advising. *The Journal of nursing education*, 48(7),

pp.361--366.

Hartman, D. and Schmidt, S. (1995). Understanding student/alumni satisfaction from a consumer's perspective: the effects of institutional performance and program outcomes. *Research in Higher Education*, 36(2), pp.197--217.

Hearn, J. (1985). Determinants of college students' overall evaluations of their academic programs. *Research in Higher Education*, 23(4), pp.413--437.

Hill, F. (1995). Managing service quality in higher education: the role of the student as primary consumer. *Quality assurance in education*, 3(3), pp.10--21.

Ilias, A., Hasan, H. and Rahman, R. (2009). Student Satisfaction and Service Quality: Any Differences in Demographic Factors?. *International Business Research*, 1(4), p.131.

Ismail, A., Abdullah, M. and Francis, S. (2009). Exploring the relationships among service quality features, perceived value and customer satisfaction. *Journal of Industrial Engineering and Management*, 2(1), pp.230--250.

James, R., Baldwin, G., McInnis, C. and others, (1999). Which University?: The factors influencing the choices of prospective undergraduates. *Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs*.

Jean, P. (2014). *Student Satisfaction with International Student Support Services at a Mid-Atlantic University*. Doctor of Business Administration. Wilmington University.

Jeng, L. (2005). *University and Student Services: Satisfaction and Importance From the Perspective of Students and Faculty at The University of Idaho*. Degree of Doctor of Philosophy. University of Idaho.

Padlee, S. and Yaakop, A. (n.d.). SERVICE QUALITY OF MALAYSIAN HIGHER EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS: A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK.

Sim, H. and Idrus, R. (2003). Student Satisfaction in Malaysia: customer-focused learner support. *Asian Journal of Distance Education*, 1(1), pp.69--77.

Hemsley-Brown, J., & Oplatka, I. (2006). Universities in a competitive global

- marketplace: A systematic review of the literature on higher education marketing. *International Journal Of Public Sector Management*, 19(4), 316--338.
- Niehoff, A. (1971). Culture Shock: A Reader in Modern Cultural Anthropology. PHILIP K. BOCK. *American Anthropologist*, 73(6), 1297--1298.
- Jones, T., Sasser, W. and others, (1995). Why satisfied customers defect. *Harvard business review*, 73(6), p.88.
- Kara, A. and DeShields, O. (2004). Business student satisfaction, intentions and retention in higher education: An empirical investigation. *Marketing Education Quarterly*, 3(1), pp.1--25.
- Kim, J. and Feldman, L. (2011). Marketing Management Journal. *Managing academic advising services quality: Understanding and meeting needs and expectations of different student segments*, 21(1), pp.202-238.
- Kless, S. (2004). We threaten national security by discouraging the best and brightest students from abroad. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 51(7), pp.9--11.
- KnIGHT, J. (2008). Higher education in turmoil. *The Changing World of Internationalisation*. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Kondakci, Y. (2011). Student mobility reviewed: attraction and satisfaction of international students in Turkey. *Higher Education*, 62(5), pp.573--592.
- Kotler, P. and Clarke, R. (1986). *Marketing for health care organizations*. 1st ed. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Kotler, P. and Fox, K. (1995). *Strategic marketing for educational institutions*. 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Kotler, P. and Fox, K. (2002). *Strategic marketing for educational institutions*. 2nd ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Kwek, and Choon Ling, (2010). Management Science and Engineering. *The 'Inside-out' and 'Outside-in' Approaches on Students' Perceived Service Quality: An Empirical Evaluation*, 4(2), pp.01-26.
- Lee, J. and Rice, C. (2007). Welcome to America? International student perceptions

- of discrimination. *Higher Education*, 53(3), pp.381--409.
- Lee, J. (2007). *Beyond U.S. borders: Combating neo-racism toward international students. About Campus*, 11(6).
- Lee, M. and Hwan, I. (2005). *International Journal of Management. Relationships among Service Quality, Customer Satisfaction and Profitability in the Taiwanese Banking Industry*, 22(4), pp.635-648.
- Letcher, D. and Neves, J. (2010). *Research in Higher Education Journal. Determinant of undergraduate business student satisfaction*, pp.1-26.
- Marginson, S. (2004). Competition and markets in higher education: a 'glonacal' analysis. *Policy futures in Education*, 2(2), pp.175--244.
- Maringe, F. (2006). University and course choice: Implications for positioning, recruitment and marketing. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 20(6), pp.466--479.
- Mavondo, F., Tsarenko, Y. and Gabbott, M. (2004). International and local student satisfaction: resources and capabilities perspective. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, 14(1), pp.41--60.
- Mavondo, F., Zaman, M. and Abubakar, B. (2000). Student satisfaction with tertiary institution and recommending it to prospective students.
- Mazzarol, T., Soutar, G. and Thein, V. (2001). Critical success factors in the marketing of an educational institution: a comparison of institutional and student perspectives. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, 10(2), pp.39--57.
- Mazzarol, T. (1998). *International Journal of Education Management. Critical success factor for international education marketing*, 12(4), pp.163-175.
- Noel-Levitz, (2005). *A brief description of the student satisfaction inventory*. [online] World Wide Web. Available at:
<http://www.noellevitz.com/nlcom/our+services/retention/tools/student+satisfaction+inventory/> [Accessed 20 Apr. 2014].
- Noel-Levitz, (2008). *2008 e-recruiting practices report*. [online] World Wide Web.

Available at: <https://www.noellevitz.com/NR/rdonlyres/18C8BFE1-2E8A-4C4A-AB5A-41BDF0B348EC/0/ERecruitingReport2008.pdf> [Accessed 20 Apr. 2014].

StudyPortals, (2011). *Key influencers of international student satisfaction in Europe*. Education and Culture DG.

Sumaedi, S., Bakti, I. and Metasari, N. (2011). The effect of students' perceived service quality and perceived price on student satisfaction. *Management Science and Engineering*, 5(1), pp.88--97.

The University of Central England, (2001). *Student Feedback: A Report to the Higher Education Funding Council for England*. Centre for Research and Quality. Birmingham.

Usman, A. (2010). The impact of service quality on students' satisfaction in higher education Institutes of Punjab. *Journal of Management Research*, 2(2).

Wiers-Jenssen, J., Stensaker, B. and Gr?gaard, J. (2002). Student satisfaction: towards an empirical deconstruction of the concept. *Quality in higher education*, 8(2), pp.183--195.

Gwendolyn, D. (2006). *Before and After the Attack: An Empirical Study and Comparison of International Student Satisfaction Before and After the 9/11/01 Terrorists' Attack*. DOCTOR OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION. Nova Southeastern University.

Jones, T., Sasser, W. and others, (1995). Why satisfied customers defect. *Harvard business review*, 73(6), p.88.

Kara, A. and DeShields, O. (2004). Business student satisfaction, intentions and retention in higher education: An empirical investigation. *Marketing Education Quarterly*, 3(1), pp.1--25.

Kim, J. and Feldman, L. (2011). *Marketing Management Journal. Managing academic advising services quality: Understanding and meeting needs and expectations of different student segments*, 21(1), pp.202-238.

Kless, S. (2004). We threaten national security by discouraging the best and brightest

- students from abroad. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 51(7), pp.9--11.
- KnIGHT, J. (2008). Higher education in turmoil. *The Changing World of Internationalisation*. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Kondakci, Y. (2011). Student mobility reviewed: attraction and satisfaction of international students in Turkey. *Higher Education*, 62(5), pp.573--592.
- Kotler, P. and Clarke, R. (1986). *Marketing for health care organizations*. 1st ed. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Kotler, P. and Fox, K. (1995). *Strategic marketing for educational institutions*. 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Kotler, P. and Fox, K. (2002). *Strategic marketing for educational institutions*. 2nd ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Kwek, and Choon Ling, (2010). Management Science and Engineering. *The 'Inside-out' and 'Outside-in' Approaches on Students' Perceived Service Quality: An Empirical Evaluation*, 4(2), pp.01-26.
- Lasanowski, V. and Verbik, L. (2007). International student mobility: Patterns and trends. *Report, The Observatory on Borderless Higher Education, London*.
- Lee, J. and Rice, C. (2007). Welcome to America? International student perceptions of discrimination. *Higher Education*, 53(3), pp.381--409.
- Lee, J. (2007). *Beyond U.S. borders: Combating neo-racism toward international students*. *About Campus*, 11(6).
- Lee, M. and Hwan, I. (2005). International Journal of Management. *Relationships among Service Quality, Customer Satisfaction and Profitability in the Taiwanese Banking Industry*, 22(4), pp.635-648.
- Letcher, D. and Neves, J. (2010). Research in Higher Education Journal. *Determinant of undergraduate business student satisfaction*, pp.1-26.
- Marginson, S. (2004). Competition and markets in higher education: a 'glonacal' analysis. *Policy futures in Education*, 2(2), pp.175--244.

- Maringe, F. (2006). University and course choice: Implications for positioning, recruitment and marketing. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 20(6), pp.466--479.
- Mavondo, F., Tsarenko, Y. and Gabbott, M. (2004). International and local student satisfaction: resources and capabilities perspective. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, 14(1), pp.41--60.
- Mavondo, F., Zaman, M. and Abubakar, B. (2000). Student satisfaction with tertiary institution and recommending it to prospective students.
- Mazzarol, T. and Soutar, G. (2008). *The global market for higher education: Sustainable competitive strategies for the new millennium*. 1st ed. Cheltenham, UK: E. Elgar.
- Mazzarol, T., Soutar, G. and Thein, V. (2001). Critical success factors in the marketing of an educational institution: a comparison of institutional and student perspectives. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, 10(2), pp.39--57.
- Mazzarol, T. (1998). *International Journal of Education Management. Critical success factor for international education marketing*, 12(4), pp.163-175.
- McClam, T. and Woodside, M. (2005). International Education. *Using case studies: An international approach*, 34(2), pp.36-45.
- McKinlay, N., Pattison, H. and Gross, H. (1996). An explanatory investigation of the effects of a cultural orientation programme on the psychological well-being of international university students. *Higher Education*, 31, pp.379-395.
- McManus, D. (2006). “Getting to know your students: three challenges”. *The Teaching Professor*, 20(4), pp.57-71.
- Mitra, S. (2009). Student support services in open schooling: a case study of students' needs and satisfaction in India. *Open Learning*, 24(3), pp.255--265.
- Mooi, E. and Sarstedt, M. (2011). *A concise guide to market research*. 1st ed. Berlin: Springer.
- Mori, S. (2000). Addressing the mental health concerns of international students.

- Journal of Counseling & Development*, 78(2), pp.137--144.
- Morshidi, s. (2008). The impact of september 11 on international student flow into malaysia: Lesson learned. *The International Journal of Asia Pacific studies*, 4(1), pp.79-95.
- Naceur, J. (2009). Economic and cultural factors affecting university excellence quality. *Assurance in Education*, 17(4), pp.416-429.
- Nadiri, H. (2007). Strategic Issue in Higher Education Marketing: How University Students' Perceive Higher Education Services. *Asian Journal on Quality*, 7(2), pp.125--140.
- Naidoo, V. (2006). International education A tertiary-level industry update. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 5(3), pp.323--345.
- Naude, P. and Ivy, J. (1999). The marketing strategies of universities in the United Kingdom. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 13(3), pp.126--136.
- Nicolescu, L. (2009). Management & Marketing. *APPLYING MARKETING TO HIGHER EDUCATION: SCOPE AND LIMITS*, 4(2), pp.35-44.
- Noel-Levitz, (2005). *A brief description of the student satisfaction inventory*. [online] World Wide Web. Available at:
<http://www.noellevitz.com/nlcom/our+services/retention/tools/student+satisfaction+inventory/> [Accessed 20 Apr. 2014].
- Noel-Levitz, (2008). *2008 e-recruiting practices report*. [online] World Wide Web. Available at: <https://www.noellevitz.com/NR/rdonlyres/18C8BFE1-2E8A-4C4A-AB5A-41BDF0B348EC/0/ERecruitingReport2008.pdf> [Accessed 20 Apr. 2014].
- Oberg, K. (2006). Cultural Shock: Adjustment to New Cultural Environments1. *curare*, 29(2), p.3.
- OECD Publishing, (2011). *Education at a Glance 2011: OECD Indicators*. [online] Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/eag-2011-en> [Accessed 12 Feb. 2014].

- Omar, N., Nazri, M., Abu, N. and Omar, Z. (2009). Parents' perceived service quality, satisfaction and trust of a childcare centre: implication on loyalty. *International Review of Business Research Papers*, 5(5), pp.299--314.
- Paweena, S., Chenin, C. and Athapol, R. (2014). A Study of Factors Influencing Chinese Students' Satisfaction toward Thai Universities. *Journal of Economics, Business and Management*, 2(2), pp.105-111.
- Prem, R. and Massimiliano, T. (2009). The impact of culture on learning: Exploring student perceptions. *Multicultural Education & Technology Journal*, 3(3), pp.182--195.
- Price, I., Matzdorf, F., Smith, L. and Agahi, H. (2003). The impact of facilities on student choice of university. *Facilities*, 21(10), pp.212--222.
- Rice, K., Choi, C., Zhang, Y., Villegas, J., Ye, H., Anderson, D., Nesic, A. and Bigler, M. (2009). International student perspectives on graduate advising relationships. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 56(3), pp.376-391.
- Roberts, J. (2009). *Student satisfaction and persistence: Factors vital to student retention*. 1st ed. pp.1-18.
- Russell, J., Rosenthal, D. and Thomson, G. (2010). The international student experience: three styles of adaptation. *High Educ*, [online] 60(2), pp.235-249. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10734-009-9297-7> [Accessed 9 Mar. 2014].
- Scott, N. A. (1997). *Student success: Serving international students in an age of technology*. Paper presented at the Caring in an Age of Technology, proceedings of the International Conference on Counseling in the 21st Century, Beijing, China.
- Sami, M. (1986). A model for orientation program of adjustment of foreign students in American colleges and universities. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 47(6A), pp.2050-2051.
- Santos, J. (1999). Cronbach's alpha: A tool for assessing the reliability of scales. *Journal of extension*, 37(2), pp.1--5.

- Sapri, M., Kaka, A. and Finch, E. (2009). Factors that Influence Student's Level of Satisfaction with Regards to Higher Educational Facilities Services. *Malaysian Journal of Real Estate*, 4(1), pp.34-51.
- Sekaran, U. and Bougie, R. (2013). *Research methods for business*. 6th ed. New York: Wiley.
- Selvadurai, R. (1992). Problems faced by international students in American colleges and universities. *Community Review*, 12(1-2), pp.27-32.
- Selvadurai, R. (1998). Problems faced by international students in American colleges and universities. *Community Review*, 16, pp.153-158.
- Sirat, M. (2008). The Impact of September 11 on International Student Flow into Malaysia: Lessons Learned. *International Journal of Asia Pacific Studies*, 4.
- Stoltenberg, G. (2011). Investigating the Concept of Student's Satisfaction.: The Case of International Students at the UiO.
- StudyPortals, (2011). *Key influencers of international student satisfaction in Europe*. Education and Culture DG.
- Sumaedi, S., Bakti, I. and Metasari, N. (2011). The effect of students' perceived service quality and perceived price on student satisfaction. *Management Science and Engineering*, 5(1), pp.88--97.
- THIURI, P. (2011). *INTERNATIONAL STUDENT SATISFACTION WITH STUDENT SERVICES AT THE ROCHESTER INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY*. Doctor of Philosophy. BOSTON COLLEGE Lynch School of Education.
- Thomas, E. and Galambos, N. (2004). What satisfies students? Mining student-opinion data with regression and decision tree analysis. *Research in Higher Education*, 45(3), pp.251--269.
- The Malaysian Insider, (2014). government aims to attract 200000 international students by 2020. [online] Available at: <http://www.themalaysianinsider.com/malaysia/article/government-aims-to-attract-200000-international-students-by-2020> [Accessed 5 May. 2013].

- Tian, R. and Wang, C. (2010). "Cross- Cultural Customer Satisfaction at a Chinese Restaurant: The Implications to China Foodservice Marketing. *International Journal of China Marketing*, 1(1), pp.62-72.
- Tim, M. and Geoffrey, N. (2002). Push and pull factors influencing international student destination choice. *The International Journal of Educational Management*, 16(2), pp.82-92.
- Trice, A. (2001). Faculty perceptions of graduate international students: The benefits and challenges. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 7(4), pp.379--403.
- Trudeau, C. (1999). *A study of overall student satisfaction and the factors influencing satisfaction at a Midwestern church-related college*. Doctoral dissertation. Indiana University.
- Upcraft, M. and Schuh, J. (1996). *Assessment in student affairs: A guide for practitioners*. 1st ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Usman, A. (2010). The impact of service quality on students' satisfaction in higher education Institutes of Punjab. *Journal of Management Research*, 2(2).
- Van Damme, D. (2001). Quality issues in the internationalisation of higher education. *Higher Education*, 41(4), pp.415--441.
- Van Der Wende, M. (1999). An innovation perspective on internationalization of higher education institutionalisation: The critical phase. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 3(1), pp.3-14.
- Vavra, G. T. (1997). *Improving your measurement of customer satisfaction*. Milwaukee: Quality press
- World Bank, (2002). *Constructing Knowledge Societies: New Challenges for Tertiary Education..* [online] Available at: <http://www.worldbank.org/education/tertiary>. [Accessed 28 Dec. 2013].
- Yeh, C. and Inose, M. (2003). International students' reported English fluency, social support satisfaction, and social connectedness as predictors of acculturative stress. *Counselling Psychology Quarterly*, 16(1), pp.15--28.

Zeithaml, V., Berry, L. and Parasuraman, A. (1993). The nature and determinants of customer expectations of service. *Journal of the academy of Marketing Science*, 21(1), pp.1--12.

APPENDIX A

Page 1

This is a questionnaire use for Ong Chee Hui- Student of MSC dissertation survey
INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS SATISFACTION IN UUM
Please write your answer in English only.

1) Gender

2) Age

3) What is your course of study?

4) How you know about UUM?

5) What is your nationality?

6) Accomodation provided by UUM is convenient
This is the first answer choice

7) The standard of accomodation provided by UUM is better than
This is the first answer choice

8) The cost of accomodation in UUM is to be worth.
This is the first answer choice

9) My belongings are safe and secure at UUM
This is the first answer choice

10) UUM classroom are comfortable
This is the first answer choice

11) UUM public areas are secure
This is the first answer choice

12) UUM public areas are comfortable
This is the first answer choice

13) There are enough signs at UUM for locating different sites
This is the first answer choice

14) UUM premises are tidy
This is the first answer choice

15) The canteen premises are tidy
This is the first answer choice

16) Malaysia's people are friendly
This is the first answer choice

17) Malaysia's people are passion
This is the first answer choice

18) The food in Malaysia are delicious
This is the first answer choice

19) Malaysia's food are similar with my own country's taste
This is the first answer choice

20) The weather in Malaysia is fine
This is the first answer choice

21) I love the culture in Malaysia
This is the first answer choice

22) UUM has a good reputation
This is the first answer choice

23) I have enough information about the studies from this institution
This is the first answer choice

24) Study in UUM had improve my working capability to work in
This is the first answer choice

25) UUM provides opportunities to participate in international activities
This is the first answer choice

26) I can communicate well with the administrator in UUM
This is the first answer choice

27) The information system for international student in UUM is
This is the first answer choice

28) Orientation program provide for new international student is useful							
This is the first answer choice							

29) The teaching staff in UUM are welcoming							
This is the first answer choice							

30) The counseling service for international student in UUM is							
This is the first answer choice							

31) UUM staff are helpful							
This is the first answer choice							

32) There are enough necessary tools and equipment for studies in							
This is the first answer choice							

33) UUM tools and equipment work properly							
This is the first answer choice							

34) UUM teaching aids are available as planned							
This is the first answer choice							

35) I can get help in the use of equipment when i need it							
This is the first answer choice							

36) I am satisfied with my opportunities to use IT (email and software)							
This is the first answer choice							

37) UUM's computers and network function well							
This is the first answer choice							

38) I receive help in problem related to the information systems							
This is the first answer choice							

39) Classroom arrangement are well organized							
This is the first answer choice							

40) The system and machine in library is easy to access							
This is the first answer choice							

41) I can get help in using the library service when i need it							
This is the first answer choice							

42) I have opportunity to get guidance for my learning difficulties							
This is the first answer choice							

43) I get sufficient information about matter related to my studies							
This is the first answer choice							

44) I have achieved the objectives that i set for my learning							
This is the first answer choice							

45) Teaching groups sizes are enough for my learning							
This is the first answer choice							

46) Various teaching method have been used (pairwork,groupwork)							
This is the first answer choice							

47) I have received sufficient feedback on my studies							
This is the first answer choice							

48) I have the opportunity to give lecturer feedback on courses							
This is the first answer choice							

49) My interest in study foreign languages and cultures has grown							
This is the first answer choice							

50) The assessment criteria of courses have been explained to me at							
This is the first answer choice							

51) The supply of book in library is sufficient							
This is the first answer choice							

52) The range of professional journal is sufficient							
This is the first answer choice							

53) The library open hour suits me							
This is the first answer choice							

54) Lecturer professional skills were up to date							
This is the first answer choice							

55) Work during the lesson and in workshop was efficient							
This is the first answer choice							

56) I got enough supportive feedback from the teacher							
This is the first answer choice							

57) Group work session help my learning							
This is the first answer choice							

58) Lecturer assessed students equally							
This is the first answer choice							

59) Lecturer were competent on the topic							
This is the first answer choice							

60) What is your main source of income?(scholarship from own country, support from family, part time job, saving, other)

61) About how much your monthly living cost? (Except tuition fee)

62) Did part time job important for you in UUM to solve your financial problem?

63) Do you currently work in campus as teaching assistant or research assistant?

64) What is the main reason for you to come abroad UUM continue your study?

65) What is your overall satisfaction on uum?							
This is the first answer choice							

APPENDIX B

Reliability

Scale: ALL VARIABLES

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	166	92.7
	Excluded ^a	13	7.3
	Total	179	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.845	3

Item Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Accomodation is convenient	3.4940	1.69043	166
Better than expectation	3.0843	1.60079	166
Accomodation cost is worth	3.9639	1.66567	166

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Accomodation is convenient	7.0482	8.470	.756	.740
Better than expectation	7.4578	8.832	.775	.725
Accomodation cost is worth	6.5783	9.664	.612	.878

Scale Statistics

Mean	Variance	Std. Deviation	N of Items
10.5422	18.771	4.33254	3

Reliability

Scale: ALL VARIABLES

Case Processing Summary

	N	%
Valid	166	92.7
Cases Excluded ^a	13	7.3
Total	179	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.374	7

Item Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Belongings are secure at UUM	4.4217	1.62272	166
Classroom are comfortable	4.6084	1.46794	166
Public area are secure	4.6325	1.39823	166
Public area are comfortable	4.4819	1.53632	166
Sign locating are enough in UUM	3.8554	1.57351	166
Premises are tidy	4.5904	5.01522	166
Canteen premises are tidy	3.7831	1.41463	166

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Belongings are secure at UUM	25.9518	51.149	.139	.353
Classroom are comfortable	25.7651	53.260	.074	.376
Public area are secure	25.7410	51.042	.200	.335
Public area are comfortable	25.8916	47.176	.354	.275
Sign locating are enough in UUM	26.5181	48.530	.273	.303
Premises are tidy	25.7831	24.231	.154	.527
Canteen premises are tidy	26.5904	48.340	.338	.288

Scale Statistics

Mean	Variance	Std. Deviation	N of Items
30.3735	56.999	7.54977	7

Reliability

Scale: ALL VARIABLES

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	166	92.7
	Excluded ^a	13	7.3
	Total	179	100.0

a. List wise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.527	6

Item Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Belongings are secure at UUM	4.4217	1.62272	166
Classroom are comfortable	4.6084	1.46794	166
Public area are secure	4.6325	1.39823	166
Public area are comfortable	4.4819	1.53632	166
Sign locating are enough in UUM	3.8554	1.57351	166
Canteen premises are tidy	3.7831	1.41463	166

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Belongings are secure at UUM	21.3614	17.990	.262	.489
Classroom are comfortable	21.1747	18.666	.269	.485
Public area are secure	21.1506	17.789	.380	.433
Public area are comfortable	21.3012	18.078	.290	.474
Sign locating are enough in UUM	21.9277	19.619	.153	.542
Canteen premises are tidy	22.0000	18.364	.319	.462

Scale Statistics

Mean	Variance	Std. Deviation	N of Items
25.7831	24.231	4.92255	6

Reliability

Scale: ALL VARIABLES

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	166	92.7
	Excluded ^a	13	7.3
	Total	179	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.542	5

Item Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Belongings are secure at UUM	4.4217	1.62272	166
Classroom are comfortable	4.6084	1.46794	166
Public area are secure	4.6325	1.39823	166
Public area are comfortable	4.4819	1.53632	166
Canteen premises are tidy	3.7831	1.41463	166

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Belongings are secure at UUM	17.5060	13.100	.331	.471
Classroom are comfortable	17.3193	13.443	.374	.446
Public area are secure	17.2952	12.634	.506	.368
Public area are comfortable	17.4458	15.400	.154	.576
Canteen premises are tidy	18.1446	15.385	.201	.544

Scale Statistics

Mean	Variance	Std. Deviation	N of Items
21.9277	19.619	4.42933	5

Reliability

Scale: ALL VARIABLES

Case Processing Summary

	N	%
Valid	166	92.7
Cases Excluded ^a	13	7.3
Total	179	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.576	4

Item Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Belongings are secure at UUM	4.4217	1.62272	166
Classroom are comfortable	4.6084	1.46794	166
Public area are secure	4.6325	1.39823	166
Canteen premises are tidy	3.7831	1.41463	166

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Belongings are secure at UUM	13.0241	8.424	.461	.412
Classroom are comfortable	12.8373	9.276	.444	.434
Public area are secure	12.8133	8.298	.639	.273
Canteen premises are tidy	13.6627	13.546	-.014	.753

Scale Statistics

Mean	Variance	Std. Deviation	N of Items
17.4458	15.400	3.92429	4

Reliability

Scale: ALL VARIABLES

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	166	92.7
	Excluded ^a	13	7.3
	Total	179	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.753	3

Item Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Belongings are secure at UUM	4.4217	1.62272	166
Classroom are comfortable	4.6084	1.46794	166
Public area are secure	4.6325	1.39823	166

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Belongings are secure at UUM	9.2410	6.293	.567	.694
Classroom are comfortable	9.0542	7.276	.520	.739
Public area are secure	9.0301	6.720	.672	.575

Scale Statistics

Mean	Variance	Std. Deviation	N of Items
13.6627	13.546	3.68050	3

Reliability

Scale: ALL VARIABLES

Case Processing Summary

	N	%
Valid	166	92.7
Cases Excluded ^a	13	7.3
Total	179	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.753	6

Item Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Malaysia's people are friendly	4.0361	1.72641	166
Malaysia's people are passion	3.7771	1.60067	166
Malaysia's food are delicious	3.0843	1.53113	166
Malaysia's food similar own country's taste	2.3193	1.50570	166
Weather is Fine in Malaysia	3.9036	1.62268	166
love Malaysia culture	4.2711	1.56631	166

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Malaysia's people are friendly	17.3554	27.467	.576	.692
Malaysia's people are passion	17.6145	28.857	.550	.701
Malaysia's food are delicious	18.3072	28.299	.628	.680
Malaysia's food similar own country's taste	19.0723	32.916	.329	.757
Weather is Fine in Malaysia	17.4880	31.500	.370	.750
love Malaysia culture	17.1205	29.682	.512	.711

Scale Statistics

Mean	Variance	Std. Deviation	N of Items
21.3916	40.870	6.39296	6

Reliability

Scale: ALL VARIABLES

Case Processing Summary

	N	%
Valid	166	92.7
Cases Excluded ^a	13	7.3
Total	179	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.841	3

Item Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
UUM has good reputation	4.4880	1.45951	166
Have enough information for UUM	4.0422	1.47444	166
Improve working capability in international working environment	4.2651	1.51825	166

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
UUM has good reputation	8.3072	7.305	.710	.774
Have enough information for UUM	8.7530	7.460	.671	.811
Improve working capability in international working environment	8.5301	6.881	.735	.749

Scale Statistics

Mean	Variance	Std. Deviation	N of Items
12.7952	15.037	3.87770	3

Reliability

Scale: ALL VARIABLES

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	166	92.7
	Excluded ^a	13	7.3
	Total	179	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.893	7

Item Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Opportunities participate in international activities	3.6807	1.62570	166
Well communicate with UUM admin	3.6627	1.53960	166
Complete information system in UUM	3.4880	1.46779	166
Orientation program is useful	3.9398	1.57133	166
Teaching staff are welcoming	4.4096	1.46089	166
Satisfied counseling service	3.5843	1.46953	166
Staff are helpful	4.0181	1.58964	166

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Opportunities participate in international activities	23.1024	51.717	.672	.879
Well communicate with UUM admin	23.1205	53.125	.650	.882
Complete information system in UUM	23.2952	51.991	.753	.870
Orientation program is useful	22.8434	53.309	.623	.885
Teaching staff are welcoming	22.3735	51.835	.766	.868
Satisfied counseling service	23.1988	52.184	.741	.871
Staff are helpful	22.7651	52.666	.645	.883

Scale Statistics

Mean	Variance	Std. Deviation	N of Items
26.7831	70.074	8.37102	7

Reliability

Scale: ALL VARIABLES

Case Processing Summary

	N	%
Valid	166	92.7
Cases Excluded ^a	13	7.3
Total	179	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.924	10

Item Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Necessary Equipment for studies is enough	4.3855	1.47571	166
Tool and Equipment work properly	4.3072	1.45505	166
Teaching Aids are available as planned	4.1988	1.42370	166
Can get help in the use of equipment	3.9036	1.48622	166
Opportunities to use IT at UUM is satisfied	4.0843	1.58558	166
Computer and network function well	3.4940	1.54428	166
Receive help in problem related to information system	3.6928	1.46749	166
Well classroom arrangement	4.3193	1.38406	166
Easy access to system and machine in library	4.7892	1.29713	166
can get help when using the library service	4.7711	1.34232	166

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Necessary Equipment for studies is enough	37.5602	99.812	.763	.913
Tool and Equipment work properly	37.6386	100.075	.766	.913
Teaching Aids are available as planned	37.7470	101.802	.719	.916
Can get help in the use of equipment	38.0422	98.816	.794	.911
Opportunities to use IT at UUM is satisfied	37.8614	98.993	.728	.915
Computer and network function well	38.4518	104.686	.551	.925
Receive help in problem related to information system	38.2530	101.584	.701	.916
Well classroom arrangement	37.6265	100.696	.788	.912
Easy access to system and machine in library	37.1566	105.381	.654	.919
can get help when using the library service	37.1747	105.042	.641	.920

Scale Statistics

Mean	Variance	Std. Deviation	N of Items
41.9458	124.488	11.15742	10

Reliability

Scale: ALL VARIABLES

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	166	92.7
	Excluded ^a	13	7.3
	Total	179	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.782	18

Item Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Have Opportunity to get guidance for my learning difficulties	4.2048	3.41391	166
Get sufficient information related to studies	3.9759	1.31634	166
Achieve the objective i set for my learning	3.8735	1.41495	166
Teaching group sizes are enough for learning.	4.1687	1.39540	166
Various teaching method have been used	4.0301	1.47884	166
receive sufficient feedback on my studies	3.9096	1.34760	166
have opportunity to give lecture feedback on courses	3.9880	1.47705	166
Interest in study foreign language and cultures has grown	4.0422	1.49079	166

Assessment criteria of courses have explain at the begining of course	4.2470	1.45825	166
Book suply in library is sufficient	4.5241	1.33349	166
Range of professional jpurnal is sufficient	4.2771	1.42543	166
Library open hour suits me	4.6928	1.34239	166
Lecturer professional skills were up to date	4.2169	1.49381	166
Work during lesson and workshop was efficient	4.0542	1.35403	166
Enough supportive feedback from the lecturer	4.1506	1.40828	166
Group work session help my learning	4.0241	1.52535	166
Lecturer accessed students equally	4.0542	1.57348	166
Lecturer were competent on the topic	4.5301	1.95301	166

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Have Opportunity to get guidance for my learning difficulties	70.7590	156.790	.183	.815
Get sufficient information related to studies	70.9880	162.897	.580	.760
Achieve the objective i set for my learning	71.0904	161.283	.580	.759
Teaching group sizes are enough for learning.	70.7952	166.515	.435	.768
Various teaching method have been used	70.9337	165.577	.430	.768
receive sufficient feedback on my studies	71.0542	165.203	.494	.765
have opportunity to give lecture feedback on courses	70.9759	165.066	.445	.767

Interest in study foreign language and cultures has grown	70.9217	166.242	.407	.769
Assessment criteria of courses have explain at the beginning of course	70.7169	164.774	.460	.766
Book suply in library is sufficient	70.4398	170.793	.331	.774
Range of professional jpurnal is sufficient	70.6867	169.659	.335	.774
Library open hour suits me	70.2711	174.126	.231	.780
Lecturer professional skills were up to date	70.7470	169.148	.328	.774
Work during lesson and workshop was efficient	70.9096	167.161	.432	.768
Enough supportive feedback from the lecturer	70.8133	167.135	.412	.769
Group work session help my learning	70.9398	170.093	.294	.776
Lecturer accessed students equally	70.9096	163.610	.448	.766
Lecturer were competent on the topic	70.4337	167.993	.243	.782

Scale Statistics

Mean	Variance	Std. Deviation	N of Items
74.9639	184.120	13.56908	18

Reliability

Scale: ALL VARIABLES

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	166	92.7
	Excluded ^a	13	7.3
	Total	179	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.172	4

Item Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
The main source of income	1.8494	.98237	166
Monthly living cost (Except tuition fee)	3.2711	1.04098	166
Did part time job important to solve financial problem	1.3554	.48009	166
Do you work in campus as teaching assistant or research assistant	1.9518	.21482	166

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
The main source of income	6.5783	1.385	.139	.026

Monthly living cost (Except tuition fee)	5.1566	1.236	.152	-.007 ^a
Did part time job important to solve financial problem	7.0723	2.431	.006	.207
Do you work in campus as teaching assistant or research assistant	6.4759	2.615	.014	.192

a. The value is negative due to a negative average covariance among items. This violates reliability model assumptions. You may want to check item codings.

Scale Statistics

Mean	Variance	Std. Deviation	N of Items
8.4277	2.671	1.63417	4

Reliability

Scale: ALL VARIABLES

Case Processing Summary

	N	%
Valid	166	92.7
Cases Excluded ^a	13	7.3
Total	179	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.192	3

Item Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
The main source of income	1.8494	.98237	166
Monthly living cost (Except tuition fee)	3.2711	1.04098	166
Did part time job important to solve financial problem	1.3554	.48009	166

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
The main source of income	4.6265	1.314	.149	.000
Monthly living cost (Except tuition fee)	3.2048	1.182	.154	-.023 ^a
Did part time job important to solve financial problem	5.1205	2.398	-.009	.291

a. The value is negative due to a negative average covariance among items. This violates reliability model assumptions. You may want to check item codings.

Scale Statistics

Mean	Variance	Std. Deviation	N of Items
6.4759	2.615	1.61696	3

Reliability

Scale: ALL VARIABLES

Case Processing Summary

	N	%
Valid	166	92.7
Cases Excluded ^a	13	7.3
Total	179	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.291	2

Item Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
The main source of income	1.8494	.98237	166
Monthly living cost (Except tuition fee)	3.2711	1.04098	166

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
The main source of income	3.2711	1.084	.171	.
Monthly living cost (Except tuition fee)	1.8494	.965	.171	.

Scale Statistics

Mean	Variance	Std. Deviation	N of Items
5.1205	2.398	1.54839	2

```
COMPUTE SAFETY=(Safety_1 + Safety_2 + Safety_3) / 3.
EXECUTE.
```

```
REGRESSION
  /DESCRIPTIVES MEAN STDDEV CORR SIG N
  /MISSING LISTWISE
  /STATISTICS COEFF OUTS R ANOVA
  /CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10)
  /NOORIGIN
  /DEPENDENT Satisfaction
  /METHOD=ENTER ACCOMMODATION
  /METHOD=ENTER CULTURE
  /METHOD=ENTER IMAGE
  /METHOD=ENTER SOCIAL
```



```

/METHOD=ENTER TECHNOLOGY
/METHOD=ENTER EDUCATION
/METHOD=ENTER SAFETY.

```

[DataSet1] C:\Users\SONY\Desktop\spss 1.sav

- a. Dependent Variable: Overall satisfaction
- b. All requested variables entered.

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.033 ^a	.001	-.005	1.25973
2	.121 ^b	.015	.003	1.25492
3	.237 ^c	.056	.038	1.23217
4	.238 ^d	.057	.033	1.23554
5	.280 ^e	.079	.050	1.22489
6	.281 ^f	.079	.044	1.22863
7	.304 ^g	.093	.052	1.22325

- a. Predictors: (Constant), ACCOMMODATION
- b. Predictors: (Constant), ACCOMMODATION, CULTURE
- c. Predictors: (Constant), ACCOMMODATION, CULTURE, IMAGE
- d. Predictors: (Constant), ACCOMMODATION, CULTURE, IMAGE, SOCIAL
- e. Predictors: (Constant), ACCOMMODATION, CULTURE, IMAGE, SOCIAL, TECHNOLOGY

f. Predictors: (Constant), ACCOMMODATION, CULTURE, IMAGE, SOCIAL, TECHNOLOGY, EDUCATION

g. Predictors: (Constant), ACCOMMODATION, CULTURE, IMAGE, SOCIAL, TECHNOLOGY, EDUCATION, SAFETY

ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	.282	1	.282	.178	.674 ^b
	Residual	260.254	164	1.587		
	Total	260.536	165			
2	Regression	3.838	2	1.919	1.219	.298 ^c
	Residual	256.698	163	1.575		
	Total	260.536	165			
3	Regression	14.579	3	4.860	3.201	.025 ^d
	Residual	245.957	162	1.518		
	Total	260.536	165			
4	Regression	14.760	4	3.690	2.417	.051 ^e
	Residual	245.777	161	1.527		
	Total	260.536	165			
5	Regression	20.480	5	4.096	2.730	.021 ^f
	Residual	240.056	160	1.500		
	Total	260.536	165			
6	Regression	20.521	6	3.420	2.266	.040 ^g
	Residual	240.015	159	1.510		
	Total	260.536	165			
7	Regression	24.113	7	3.445	2.302	.029 ^h
	Residual	236.423	158	1.496		
	Total	260.536	165			

a. Dependent Variable: Overall satisfaction

b. Predictors: (Constant), ACCOMMODATION

c. Predictors: (Constant), ACCOMMODATION, CULTURE

d. Predictors: (Constant), ACCOMMODATION, CULTURE, IMAGE

e. Predictors: (Constant), ACCOMMODATION, CULTURE, IMAGE, SOCIAL

f. Predictors: (Constant), ACCOMMODATION, CULTURE, IMAGE, SOCIAL, TECHNOLOGY

g. Predictors: (Constant), ACCOMMODATION, CULTURE, IMAGE, SOCIAL, TECHNOLOGY, EDUCATION

h. Predictors: (Constant), ACCOMMODATION, CULTURE, IMAGE, SOCIAL, TECHNOLOGY, EDUCATION, SAFETY

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	4.604	.258		17.854	.000
	ACCOMMODATION	.029	.068	.033	.422	.674
2	(Constant)	4.116	.414		9.934	.000
	ACCOMMODATION	.028	.068	.032	.412	.681
	CULTURE	.138	.092	.117	1.503	.135
3	(Constant)	3.649	.443		8.235	.000
	ACCOMMODATION	.039	.067	.045	.590	.556
	CULTURE	-.033	.111	-.028	-.296	.767
	IMAGE	.243	.091	.250	2.660	.009
4	(Constant)	3.619	.452		7.999	.000
	ACCOMMODATION	.042	.067	.049	.631	.529
	CULTURE	-.045	.117	-.038	-.389	.698
	IMAGE	.216	.119	.223	1.821	.070
	SOCIAL	.046	.133	.043	.344	.731
5	(Constant)	3.286	.480		6.845	.000
	ACCOMMODATION	.039	.067	.045	.586	.559
	CULTURE	-.060	.116	-.051	-.516	.607
	IMAGE	.165	.121	.169	1.364	.174
	SOCIAL	-.041	.139	-.039	-.295	.768
	TECHNOLOGY	.226	.116	.201	1.953	.053
6	(Constant)	3.233	.577		5.600	.000
	ACCOMMODATION	.035	.072	.040	.490	.625
	CULTURE	-.061	.116	-.051	-.521	.603
	IMAGE	.164	.121	.169	1.354	.178
	SOCIAL	-.043	.140	-.041	-.310	.757
	TECHNOLOGY	.220	.122	.195	1.805	.073
	EDUCATION	.026	.156	.016	.165	.869
7	(Constant)	2.923	.609		4.802	.000
	ACCOMMODATION	-.018	.079	-.021	-.229	.819
	CULTURE	-.080	.117	-.068	-.685	.494
	IMAGE	.193	.122	.198	1.578	.117
	SOCIAL	-.034	.139	-.032	-.244	.808
	TECHNOLOGY	.230	.122	.204	1.894	.060
	EDUCATION	-.051	.163	-.030	-.311	.756

Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
7 SAFETY	.150	.097	.147	1.549	.123

a. Dependent Variable: Overall satisfaction

Excluded Variables ^a						
Model	Beta In	t	Sig.	Partial Correlation	Collinearity Statistics	
					Tolerance	
1	CULTURE	.117 ^b	1.503	.135	.117	1.000
	IMAGE	.233 ^b	3.063	.003	.233	.998
	SOCIAL	.191 ^b	2.473	.014	.190	.987
	TECHNOLOGY	.256 ^b	3.381	.001	.256	.998
	EDUCATION	.154 ^b	1.914	.057	.148	.925
2	SAFETY	.107 ^b	1.170	.244	.091	.728
	IMAGE	.250 ^c	2.660	.009	.205	.662
	SOCIAL	.190 ^c	1.945	.053	.151	.621
	TECHNOLOGY	.257 ^c	2.998	.003	.229	.784
	EDUCATION	.128 ^c	1.496	.137	.117	.823
3	SAFETY	.102 ^c	1.122	.264	.088	.727
	SOCIAL	.043 ^d	.344	.731	.027	.368
	TECHNOLOGY	.191 ^d	1.967	.051	.153	.606
	EDUCATION	.070 ^d	.800	.425	.063	.757
	SAFETY	.145 ^d	1.606	.110	.126	.707
4	TECHNOLOGY	.201 ^e	1.953	.053	.153	.544
	EDUCATION	.067 ^e	.743	.459	.059	.726
	SAFETY	.145 ^e	1.600	.112	.125	.707
5	EDUCATION	.016 ^f	.165	.869	.013	.659
	SAFETY	.138 ^f	1.531	.128	.121	.706
6	SAFETY	.147 ^g	1.549	.123	.122	.641

a. Dependent Variable: Overall satisfaction

b. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), ACCOMMODATION

c. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), ACCOMMODATION, CULTURE

d. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), ACCOMMODATION, CULTURE, IMAGE

e. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), ACCOMMODATION, CULTURE, IMAGE, SOCIAL

f. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), ACCOMMODATION, CULTURE, IMAGE, SOCIAL, TECHNOLOGY

g. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), ACCOMMODATION, CULTURE, IMAGE, SOCIAL, TECHNOLOGY, EDUCATION

```
REGRESSION
  /DESCRIPTIVES MEAN STDDEV CORR SIG N
  /MISSING LISTWISE
  /STATISTICS COEFF OUTS R ANOVA
  /CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10)
  /NOORIGIN
  /DEPENDENT Satisfaction
  /METHOD=ENTER ACCOMMODATION CULTURE IMAGE SOCIAL TECHNOLOGY EDUCATION
SAFETY.
```

Regression

Notes		
Output Created		09-JUN-2014 14:51:06
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Users\SONY\Desktop\sps s 1.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data	179
	File	
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
		Statistics are based on
	Cases Used	cases with no missing values for any variable used.

Syntax	REGRESSION /DESCRIPTIVES MEAN STDDEV CORR SIG N /MISSING LISTWISE /STATISTICS COEFF OUTS R ANOVA /CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10) /NOORIGIN /DEPENDENT Satisfaction /METHOD=ENTER ACCOMMODATION CULTURE IMAGE SOCIAL TECHNOLOGY EDUCATION SAFETY.	
	Processor Time	00:00:00.05
Resources	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.06
	Memory Required	4740 bytes
	Additional Memory Required	0 bytes
	for Residual Plots	

[DataSet1] C:\Users\SONY\Desktop\spss 1.sav

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Overall satisfaction	4.7048	1.25659	166
ACCOMMODATION	3.5141	1.44418	166
CULTURE	3.5653	1.06549	166
IMAGE	4.2651	1.29257	166
SOCIAL	3.8262	1.19586	166
TECHNOLOGY	4.1946	1.11574	166
EDUCATION	4.1647	.75384	166
SAFETY	4.5542	1.22683	166

Correlations

		Overall satisfaction	ACCOMMODAT ION	CULTURE	IMAGE
Pearson Correlation	Overall satisfaction	1.000	.033	.117	.231

Sig. (1-tailed)	ACCOMMODATION	.033	1.000	.008	-.048
	CULTURE	.117	.008	1.000	.579
	IMAGE	.231	-.048	.579	1.000
	SOCIAL	.185	-.113	.604	.766
	TECHNOLOGY	.254	-.040	.462	.613
	EDUCATION	.152	.273	.322	.380
	SAFETY	.095	.522	.034	-.121
	Overall satisfaction	.	.337	.067	.001
	ACCOMMODATION	.337	.	.460	.269
	CULTURE	.067	.460	.	.000
	IMAGE	.001	.269	.000	.
	SOCIAL	.008	.074	.000	.000
	TECHNOLOGY	.000	.307	.000	.000
	EDUCATION	.026	.000	.000	.000
	SAFETY	.112	.000	.332	.060
	Overall satisfaction	166	166	166	166
	ACCOMMODATION	166	166	166	166
N	CULTURE	166	166	166	166
	IMAGE	166	166	166	166
	SOCIAL	166	166	166	166
	TECHNOLOGY	166	166	166	166
	EDUCATION	166	166	166	166
	SAFETY	166	166	166	166

Correlations

		SOCIAL	TECHNOLOGY	EDUCATION	SAFETY
Pearson Correlation	Overall satisfaction	.185	.254	.152	.095
	ACCOMMODATION	-.113	-.040	.273	.522
	CULTURE	.604	.462	.322	.034
	IMAGE	.766	.613	.380	-.121
	SOCIAL	1.000	.648	.399	-.109
	TECHNOLOGY	.648	1.000	.480	-.039
	EDUCATION	.399	.480	1.000	.333
	SAFETY	-.109	-.039	.333	1.000
Sig. (1-tailed)	Overall satisfaction	.008	.000	.026	.112
	ACCOMMODATION	.074	.307	.000	.000
	CULTURE	.000	.000	.000	.332
	IMAGE	.000	.000	.000	.060
	SOCIAL	.	.000	.000	.081
	TECHNOLOGY	.000	.	.000	.311

N	EDUCATION	.000	.000	.	.000
	SAFETY	.081	.311	.000	.
	Overall satisfaction	166	166	166	166
	ACCOMMODATION	166	166	166	166
	CULTURE	166	166	166	166
	IMAGE	166	166	166	166
	SOCIAL	166	166	166	166
	TECHNOLOGY	166	166	166	166
	EDUCATION	166	166	166	166
	SAFETY	166	166	166	166

Variables Entered/Removed^a

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	SAFETY, CULTURE, EDUCATION, ACCOMMODATION, TECHNOLOGY, IMAGE, SOCIAL ^b	.	Enter

a. Dependent Variable: Overall satisfaction

b. All requested variables entered.

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.304 ^a	.093	.052	1.22325

a. Predictors: (Constant), SAFETY, CULTURE, EDUCATION, ACCOMMODATION, TECHNOLOGY, IMAGE, SOCIAL

ANOVA^a

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	24.113	7	3.445	2.302	.029 ^b

Residual	236.423	158	1.496		
Total	260.536	165			

a. Dependent Variable: Overall satisfaction

b. Predictors: (Constant), SAFETY, CULTURE, EDUCATION, ACCOMMODATION, TECHNOLOGY, IMAGE, SOCIAL

Coefficients ^a					
Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	2.923	.609		4.802	.000
ACCOMMODATION	-.018	.079	-.021	-.229	.819
CULTURE	-.080	.117	-.068	-.685	.494
IMAGE	.193	.122	.198	1.578	.117
SOCIAL	-.034	.139	-.032	-.244	.808
TECHNOLOGY	.230	.122	.204	1.894	.060
EDUCATION	-.051	.163	-.030	-.311	.756
SAFETY	.150	.097	.147	1.549	.123

a. Dependent Variable: Overall satisfaction

```

GET
  FILE='C:\Users\SONY\Desktop\spss 1.sav'.
DATASET NAME DataSet1 WINDOW=FRONT.
COMPUTE SAFETY=(Safety_1 + Safety_2 + Safety_3 + Safety_4 + Safety_5 + Safety_6
+ Safety_7)/7.
EXECUTE.
COMPUTE CULTURE=(Culture_1 + Culture_2 + Culture_3 + Culture_4 + Culture_5 +
Culture_6) / 6.
EXECUTE.
COMPUTE IMAGE=(Image_1 + Image_2 + Image_3)/3.
EXECUTE.
COMPUTE SOCIAL=(Social_1 + Social_2 + Social_3 + Social_4 + Social_5 + Social_6
+ Social_7)/7.
EXECUTE.
COMPUTE TECHNOLOGY=(Tech_1 + Tech_2 + Tech_3 + Tech_4 + Tech_5 + Tech_6 + Tech_7
+ Tech_8 + Tech_9 + Tech_10)/10.
EXECUTE.
COMPUTE EDUCATION=(Edu_1 + Edu_2 + Edu_3 + Edu_4 + Edu_5 + Edu_6 + Edu_7 + Edu_8
+ Edu_9 + Edu_10 + Edu_11 + Edu_12 + Edu_13 + Edu_14 + Edu_15 + Edu_16 + Edu_17
+ Edu_18)/18.
EXECUTE.
REGRESSION
  /DESCRIPTIVES MEAN STDDEV CORR SIG N
  /MISSING LISTWISE
  /STATISTICS COEFF OUTS R ANOVA
  /CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10)
  /NOORIGIN
  /DEPENDENT Satisfaction
  /METHOD=ENTER ACCOMMODATION
  /METHOD=ENTER SAFETY
  /METHOD=ENTER CULTURE
  /METHOD=ENTER IMAGE
  /METHOD=ENTER SOCIAL
  /METHOD=ENTER TECHNOLOGY
  /METHOD=ENTER EDUCATION.

```

Regression

Notes

Output Created		09-JUN-2014 14:20:32
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Users\SONY\Desktop\spss 1.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>

Missing Value Handling	N of Rows in Working Data File	179
	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics are based on cases with no missing values for any variable used.
		REGRESSION /DESCRIPTIVES MEAN STDDEV CORR SIG N /MISSING LISTWISE /STATISTICS COEFF OUTS R ANOVA /CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10) /NOORIGIN /DEPENDENT Satisfaction /METHOD=ENTER ACCOMMODATION /METHOD=ENTER SAFETY /METHOD=ENTER CULTURE /METHOD=ENTER IMAGE /METHOD=ENTER SOCIAL /METHOD=ENTER TECHNOLOGY /METHOD=ENTER EDUCATION.
Syntax		
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.05
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.09

Notes

Resources	Memory Required	5100 bytes
	Additional Memory Required for Residual Plots	0 bytes

[DataSet1] C:\Users\SONY\Desktop\spss 1.sav

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Overall satisfaction	4.7048	1.25659	166
ACCOMMODATION	3.5141	1.44418	166
SAFETY	4.3391	1.07854	166
CULTURE	3.5653	1.06549	166
IMAGE	4.2651	1.29257	166
SOCIAL	3.8262	1.19586	166
TECHNOLOGY	4.1946	1.11574	166
EDUCATION	4.1647	.75384	166

Correlations

		Overall satisfaction	ACCOMMODATION	SAFETY	CULTURE
Pearson Correlation	Overall satisfaction	1.000	.033	.211	.117
	ACCOMMODATION	.033	1.000	.181	.008
	SAFETY	.211	.181	1.000	.319
	CULTURE	.117	.008	.319	1.000
	IMAGE	.231	-.048	.377	.579
	SOCIAL	.185	-.113	.407	.604
	TECHNOLOGY	.254	-.040	.408	.462
	EDUCATION	.152	.273	.398	.322
Sig. (1-tailed)	Overall satisfaction	.	.337	.003	.067
	ACCOMMODATION	.337	.	.010	.460
	SAFETY	.003	.010	.	.000
	CULTURE	.067	.460	.000	.
	IMAGE	.001	.269	.000	.000
	SOCIAL	.008	.074	.000	.000
	TECHNOLOGY	.000	.307	.000	.000
	EDUCATION	.026	.000	.000	.000
N	Overall satisfaction	166	166	166	166
	ACCOMMODATION	166	166	166	166
	SAFETY	166	166	166	166
	CULTURE	166	166	166	166
	IMAGE	166	166	166	166
	SOCIAL	166	166	166	166
	TECHNOLOGY	166	166	166	166
	EDUCATION	166	166	166	166

Correlations

		IMAGE	SOCIAL	TECHNOLOGY	EDUCATION
Pearson Correlation	Overall satisfaction	.231	.185	.254	.152
	ACCOMMODATION	-.048	-.113	-.040	.273
	SAFETY	.377	.407	.408	.398
	CULTURE	.579	.604	.462	.322
	IMAGE	1.000	.766	.613	.380
	SOCIAL	.766	1.000	.648	.399
	TECHNOLOGY	.613	.648	1.000	.480
	EDUCATION	.380	.399	.480	1.000
Sig. (1-tailed)	Overall satisfaction	.001	.008	.000	.026
	ACCOMMODATION	.269	.074	.307	.000
	SAFETY	.000	.000	.000	.000
	CULTURE	.000	.000	.000	.000
	IMAGE	.	.000	.000	.000
	SOCIAL	.000	.	.000	.000
	TECHNOLOGY	.000	.000	.	.000
	EDUCATION	.000	.000	.000	.
N	Overall satisfaction	166	166	166	166
	ACCOMMODATION	166	166	166	166
	SAFETY	166	166	166	166
	CULTURE	166	166	166	166
	IMAGE	166	166	166	166
	SOCIAL	166	166	166	166
	TECHNOLOGY	166	166	166	166
	EDUCATION	166	166	166	166

Variables Entered/Removed^a

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	ACCOMMODATION ^b	.	Enter
2	SAFETY ^b	.	Enter
3	CULTURE ^b	.	Enter
4	IMAGE ^b	.	Enter
5	SOCIAL ^b	.	Enter
6	TECHNOLOGY ^b	.	Enter
7	EDUCATION ^b	.	Enter

- a. Dependent Variable: Overall satisfaction
b. All requested variables entered.

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.033 ^a	.001	-.005	1.25973
2	.211 ^b	.045	.033	1.23579
3	.217 ^c	.047	.030	1.23782
4	.270 ^d	.073	.050	1.22468
5	.270 ^e	.073	.044	1.22850
6	.299 ^f	.089	.055	1.22162
7	.299 ^g	.089	.049	1.22547

- a. Predictors: (Constant), ACCOMMODATION
b. Predictors: (Constant), ACCOMMODATION, SAFETY
c. Predictors: (Constant), ACCOMMODATION, SAFETY, CULTURE
d. Predictors: (Constant), ACCOMMODATION, SAFETY, CULTURE, IMAGE
e. Predictors: (Constant), ACCOMMODATION, SAFETY, CULTURE, IMAGE, SOCIAL
f. Predictors: (Constant), ACCOMMODATION, SAFETY, CULTURE, IMAGE, SOCIAL, TECHNOLOGY
g. Predictors: (Constant), ACCOMMODATION, SAFETY, CULTURE, IMAGE, SOCIAL, TECHNOLOGY, EDUCATION

ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	.282	1	.282	.178	.674 ^b
	Residual	260.254	164	1.587		
	Total	260.536	165			
2	Regression	11.608	2	5.804	3.800	.024 ^c
	Residual	248.928	163	1.527		
	Total	260.536	165			
3	Regression	12.319	3	4.106	2.680	.049 ^d
	Residual	248.217	162	1.532		
	Total	260.536	165			
4	Regression	19.062	4	4.765	3.177	.015 ^e
	Residual	241.475	161	1.500		
	Total	260.536	165			

5	Regression	19.062	5	3.812	2.526	.031 ^f
	Residual	241.475	160	1.509		
	Total	260.536	165			
6	Regression	23.251	6	3.875	2.597	.020 ^g
	Residual	237.285	159	1.492		
	Total	260.536	165			
7	Regression	23.255	7	3.322	2.212	.036 ^h
	Residual	237.281	158	1.502		
	Total	260.536	165			

a. Dependent Variable: Overall satisfaction

b. Predictors: (Constant), ACCOMMODATION

c. Predictors: (Constant), ACCOMMODATION, SAFETY

d. Predictors: (Constant), ACCOMMODATION, SAFETY, CULTURE

e. Predictors: (Constant), ACCOMMODATION, SAFETY, CULTURE, IMAGE

f. Predictors: (Constant), ACCOMMODATION, SAFETY, CULTURE, IMAGE, SOCIAL

g. Predictors: (Constant), ACCOMMODATION, SAFETY, CULTURE, IMAGE, SOCIAL, TECHNOLOGY

h. Predictors: (Constant), ACCOMMODATION, SAFETY, CULTURE, IMAGE, SOCIAL, TECHNOLOGY, EDUCATION

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	4.604	.258		17.854	.000
	ACCOMMODATION	.029	.068	.033	.422	.674
2	(Constant)	3.650	.432		8.444	.000
	ACCOMMODATION	-.005	.068	-.005	-.070	.944
	SAFETY	.247	.091	.212	2.723	.007
3	(Constant)	3.501	.485		7.215	.000
	ACCOMMODATION	-.002	.068	-.003	-.033	.974
	SAFETY	.226	.096	.194	2.353	.020
	CULTURE	.065	.096	.055	.682	.496
4	(Constant)	3.268	.492		6.637	.000
	ACCOMMODATION	.015	.068	.017	.215	.830
	SAFETY	.170	.099	.146	1.729	.086
	CULTURE	-.057	.111	-.048	-.516	.607
5	IMAGE	.199	.094	.205	2.120	.036
	(Constant)	3.268	.496		6.594	.000
	ACCOMMODATION	.014	.069	.017	.210	.834

6	SAFETY	.170	.101	.146	1.688	.093
	CULTURE	-.057	.116	-.048	-.490	.625
	IMAGE	.200	.119	.206	1.684	.094
	SOCIAL	-.001	.135	-.001	-.006	.995
	(Constant)	3.042	.511		5.954	.000
	ACCOMMODATION	.017	.069	.019	.244	.808
	SAFETY	.139	.102	.119	1.363	.175
	CULTURE	-.067	.116	-.057	-.582	.561
	IMAGE	.158	.121	.162	1.309	.192
	SOCIAL	-.068	.140	-.064	-.484	.629
	TECHNOLOGY	.197	.118	.175	1.676	.096
	(Constant)	3.056	.591		5.175	.000
	ACCOMMODATION	.018	.072	.020	.246	.806
	SAFETY	.140	.104	.120	1.349	.179
7	CULTURE	-.067	.116	-.057	-.579	.564
	IMAGE	.158	.121	.163	1.306	.194
	SOCIAL	-.067	.141	-.064	-.477	.634
	TECHNOLOGY	.199	.123	.176	1.618	.108

Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
7 EDUCATION	-.008	.158	-.005	-.048	.962

a. Dependent Variable: Overall satisfaction

Excluded Variables^a

Excluded Variables						
Model		Beta In	t	Sig.	Partial Correlation	Collinearity
						Statistics
		Tolerance				
1	SAFETY	.212 ^b	2.723	.007	.209	.967
	CULTURE	.117 ^b	1.503	.135	.117	1.000
	IMAGE	.233 ^b	3.063	.003	.233	.998
	SOCIAL	.191 ^b	2.473	.014	.190	.987
	TECHNOLOGY	.256 ^b	3.381	.001	.256	.998
2	EDUCATION	.154 ^b	1.914	.057	.148	.925
	CULTURE	.055 ^c	.682	.496	.053	.896
	IMAGE	.179 ^c	2.174	.031	.168	.844
	SOCIAL	.123 ^c	1.440	.152	.112	.798
	TECHNOLOGY	.204 ^c	2.454	.015	.189	.820

3	EDUCATION	.086 ^c	1.001	.318	.078	.799
	IMAGE	.205 ^d	2.120	.036	.165	.615
	SOCIAL	.130 ^d	1.269	.206	.100	.557
	TECHNOLOGY	.213 ^d	2.361	.019	.183	.701
4	EDUCATION	.076 ^d	.859	.392	.068	.752
	SOCIAL	-.001 ^e	-.006	.995	.000	.352
	TECHNOLOGY	.160 ^e	1.608	.110	.126	.573
5	EDUCATION	.037 ^e	.409	.683	.032	.715
	TECHNOLOGY	.175 ^f	1.676	.096	.132	.526
	EDUCATION	.038 ^f	.414	.679	.033	.696
6	EDUCATION	-.005 ^g	-.048	.962	-.004	.643

a. Dependent Variable: Overall satisfaction

b. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), ACCOMMODATION

c. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), ACCOMMODATION, SAFETY

d. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), ACCOMMODATION, SAFETY, CULTURE

e. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), ACCOMMODATION, SAFETY, CULTURE, IMAGE

f. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), ACCOMMODATION, SAFETY, CULTURE, IMAGE, SOCIAL

g. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), ACCOMMODATION, SAFETY, CULTURE, IMAGE, SOCIAL, TECHNOLOGY