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Abstract

Education plays an important role in the development of any country, in the economic better of that country, upgrading the standards of living of people, etc. Every country tries to develop such institutions which produce high quality professionals in every field. Greece is also trying to develop its people with respect to their standard of living, by delivering more and more education, and by setting up modern education institutions. The aim of this article is to find how student’s satisfaction may be affected by the quality of academic staff, course administration, teaching method and learning environment.

Keywords: student satisfaction, teacher’s performance, communication, interaction, course evaluation.

1. Introduction

Education for many countries is a very prestigious, high returning and rewarded in multiple ways investment. The educational systems that are effective and efficient provide greater performance to their students. The institutions, who have improved administration system and are willing to provide high quality facilities and services, often provide high performer and talented students.

In the context of education, student’s satisfaction refers to the favor-ability of the student’s subjective evaluations of the various outcomes and experiences associated with education. As satisfaction is based on experience, student satisfaction is constantly being influenced by the students’ overall experiences and our findings confirmed these suggestions.

Palacio et al. (2002) says that in order to make the institutions more students highly efficient and effective, the students’ expectations, motivations, academic preferences and perceptions about quality of the institutions environment or atmosphere should be kept higher by the institutions. The students, particularly at secondary level, need more high-quality services and facilities in order to be motivated to study at high level education. This happens because high quality services satisfies their esteem and develops them with all the essentials and capabilities to be an effective education personality.

The students seek empathy, responsiveness, assurance during their academic development process which then equips them with confidence and motivation to compete in the education market place. It is therefore the effectiveness, the high performance of the teachers, the
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high quality of education, the quality to learn and the personal grooming that help the students to achieve their learning goals to the maximum (Hassan et al., 2013).

Researchers argue that students high motivation and involvement in learning is linked to minimize the dropout rates and increases the success quality of the institutions environment or atmosphere level of students (Kushman et al., 2000). Some studies regarding the motivation of students have demonstrated that the student’s engagement at their school level decreases as they get older and that they show lack of interest. Therefore, retaining the student’s interest in their learning and motivating them to achieve success are the issues that must be solved.

This article provides findings to understand student satisfaction with a public school in Greece.

2. Study’s results

2.1 Data description

The study population was selected from a public secondary school of Thessaloniki. The questionnaires were handed directly to students by their teacher. Students were given 20 minutes to voluntarily answer 22 questions along with filling in their demographic backgrounds on the questionnaire.

The questions in the survey were designed to be short, simple and easy to follow.

The most difficult part of the procedure was contacting the school office, getting their approval and managing a free time between studying periods to conduct the survey.

A total of 159 copies of the questionnaires were distributed to students and 150 valid responds were received. The respondent’s attitudes were cooperative during the process of the survey. Several invalid responds were mainly resulted from unintentional mistakes such as skipping questions or choosing multiple answers.

The first section of the survey result provides basic information about the demographic background of the interviewees. Table 1 demonstrates the gender distribution of respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 displays the educational level of respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26.67</td>
<td>26.67</td>
<td>26.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>62.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>37.33</td>
<td>62.67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40 students were attending 9th grade (26.7%), 54 students were in 10th grade (36.0%) and 56 students were in 11th grade (37.33%).
2.2 Descriptive analyses

Results from the analysis of empirical data collected for the total group of studied students through the Questionnaire, are presented below.

First, we will discuss the results on the scale “Academic Staff” which contains 4 statements.

Regarding the statement “Teachers process good teaching skills”, 37.33% (n = 56) of the total studied group have answered with “Agree”, 42.66% have answered with “Neutral” (n = 64), and the rest 20.00% (n = 30) – with “Disagree” (Figure 1).

Teachers process good teaching skills
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Figure 1. Statement 1

Regarding the statement “Teacher set out clear goals for student”, 37.33% (n = 56) of the total studied group have answered with “Agree”, 36.00% have answered with “Neutral” (n = 54), and the rest 26.70% (n = 40) – with “Disagree” (Figure 2).

Teacher set out clear goals for student
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Figure 2. Statement 2

Regarding the statement “Appropriate workload were given to learner”, 24.67% (n = 37) of the total studied group have answered with “Agree”, 29.33% have answered with “Neutral” (n = 44), and the rest 46.00% (n = 69) – with “Disagree” (Figure 3).
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Figure 3. Statement 3

The statement “Teacher made appropriate assessment of learner ability” — 44.00% (n = 66) of the total studied group have answered with “Agree”, 29.33% have answered with “Neutral” (n = 44), and the rest 26.70% (n = 40) — with “Disagree” (Figure 4).
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Figure 4. Statement 4

The statement “Teacher put emphasis on student independence” — 26.70% (n = 40) of the total studied group have answered with “Agree”, 27.33% have answered with “Neutral” (n = 41), and the rest 52.66% (n = 79) — with “Disagree” (Figure 5).
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Figure 5. Statement 5
Regarding the statement “The school what student expect from the program”, 40.67% (n = 61) of the total studied group have answered with “Agree”, 34.67% have answered with “Neutral” (n = 52), and the rest 24.47% (n = 37) – with “Disagree” (Figure 6).

The school what student expect from the program
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Figure 6. Statement 6

Regarding the statement “School office is helpful to student”, 24.47% (n = 37) of the total studied group have answered with “Agree”, 52.66% (n = 79) have answered with “Neutral”, and the rest 22.67% (n = 34) – with “Disagree” (Figure 7).
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Figure 7. Statement 7

Regarding the statement “The course curriculum has a logical progression”, 61.33% (n = 92) of the total studied group have answered with “Agree”, 22.67% (n = 34) have answered with “Neutral”, and the rest 16.0% (n = 24) – with “Disagree” (Figure 8).

The course curriculum has a logical progression
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Figure 8. Statement 8
Regarding the statement “Procedures for assessment is fair and transparent”, 64.00% (n = 96) of the total studied group have answered with “Agree”, 16.0% (n = 24) have answered with “Neutral”, and the rest 20.00% (n = 30) – with “Disagree” (Figure 9).
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Figure 9. Statement 9

Regarding the statement “Classroom facilities is adequate for studying purpose”, 67.33% (n = 101) of the total studied group have answered with “Agree”, 25.33% have answered with “Neutral” (n =38), and the rest 7.33% (n = 11) – with “Disagree” (Figure 10).
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Figure 10. Statement 10

Regarding the statement “Library services is useful to leaner”, 19.33% (n = 29) of the total studied group have answered with “Agree”, 56.00% have answered with “Neutral” (n =84), and the rest 24.67% (n = 37) – with “Disagree” (Figure 11).
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Figure 11. Statement 11
Regarding the statement “Students have easy access to computing services and facilities”, 52.67% (n = 79) of the total studied group have answered with “Agree”, 39.33% have answered with “Neutral” (n = 59), and the rest 8.00% (n = 12) – with “Disagree” (Figure 12).
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**Figure 12. Statement 12**

Regarding the statement “Academic advising services is supportive helpful”, 18.00% (n = 27) of the total studied group have answered with “Agree”, 54.00% have answered with “Neutral” (n = 81), and the rest 28.00% (n = 42) – with “Disagree” (Figure 13).
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**Figure 13. Statement 13**

Regarding the statement “Non-faculty staffs have friendly attitude toward students”, 72.00% (n = 108) of the total studied group have answered with “Agree”, 16.00% have answered with “Neutral” (n = 24), and the rest 12.00% (n = 18) – with “Disagree” (Figure 14).
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**Figure 14. Statement 14**
Regarding the statement “Proportion between theory and practice is well balanced”, 51.33% (n = 77) of the total studied group have answered with “Agree”, 34.00% have answered with “Neutral” (n = 51), and the rest 14.67% (n = 22) – with “Disagree” (Figure 15).

Figure 15. Statement 15

Regarding the statement “Documentation provided is practical and sufficient”, 30.67% (n = 46) of the total studied group have answered with “Agree”, 54.00% have answered with “Neutral” (n = 81), and the rest 15.33% (n = 23) – with “Disagree” (Figure 16).

Figure 16. Statement 16

Regarding the statement “Diverse teaching methods are applied”, 18.67% (n = 28) of the total studied group have answered with “Agree”, 48.67% have answered with “Neutral” (n = 73), and the rest 32.67% (n = 49) – with “Disagree” (Figure 17).

Figure 17. Statement 17
Regarding the statement “Level which subjects were discussed is suitable for student level”, 41.33% (n = 62) of the total studied group have answered with “Agree”, 32.67% have answered with “Neutral” (n = 49), and the rest 26.00% (n = 39) – with “Disagree” (Figure 18).
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**Figure 18. Statement 18**

Regarding the statement “The extent and distribution of the subjects in the program is appropriate”, 52.00% (n = 78) of the total studied group have answered with “Agree”, 25.33% have answered with “Neutral” (n = 38), and the rest 22.67% (n = 34) – with “Disagree” (Figure 19).

The extent and distribution of the subjects in the program is appropriate
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**Figure 19. Statement 19**

Regarding the first statement “The program fulfill all student expectation”, 40.67% (n = 61) of the total studied group have answered with “Agree”, 40.67% have answered with “Neutral” (n = 61), and the rest 19.67% (n = 28) – with “Disagree” (Figure 20).

The program fulfill all student expectation
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**Figure 20. Statement 20**
Regarding the statement “Student is willing to recommend the institution to other friends or acquaintances”, 61.33% (n = 92) of the total studied group have answered with “Agree”, 16.67% have answered with “Neutral” (n = 25), and the rest 22.00% (n = 33) – with “Disagree” (Figure 21).
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**Figure 21. Statement 21**

Regarding the statement “Student is satisfied with the overall experience”, 60.00% (n = 90) of the total studied group have answered with “Agree”, 20.67% have answered with “Neutral” (n = 31), and the rest 19.33% (n = 29) – with “Disagree” (Figure 22).
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**Figure 22. Statement 22**

### 2.3 Independent – Sample t-test analysis

Results from the **Independent – Sample T-Test Analysis** of empirical data collected for the total group of studied students through the Questionnaire, are presented below in Tables 3 – 7.

First, we will discuss the results on the scale “Academic Staff” which contains 4 statements.
Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACADEMIC STAFF</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factors</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good teaching</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1,173</td>
<td>0,30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear goals</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1,106</td>
<td>0,24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate workload</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1,173</td>
<td>0,33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate assessment</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0,806</td>
<td>0,23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on independence</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1,16</td>
<td>0,36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1,084</td>
<td>0,29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from the Table 3, from all factors that affect Academic Staff, Good teaching (Mean = 1.173; SD = 0.30) and Appropriate workload (Mean = 1.173; SD = 0.33) are the factors that have the highest mean values which means the majority of respondents are satisfied with these dimensions. In contrast, Appropriate assessment (Mean = 0.806; SD = 0.23) is the factor that has the lowest mean value which means the majority of respondents are dissatisfied with this dimension.

Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE ADMINISTRATION</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factors</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowing student</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1,162</td>
<td>0,33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expectation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpfulness of</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1,021</td>
<td>0,29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logical progression of</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1,452</td>
<td>0,42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures for</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1,441</td>
<td>0,45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1,20</td>
<td>0,37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from the Table 4, from all factors that affect Course Administration, Logical progression of work (Mean = 1.452; SD = 0.42) and Procedures for assessment (Mean = 1.441; SD = 0.45) are the factors that have the highest mean values which means the majority of respondents are satisfied with these dimensions. In contrast, Helpfulness of school office (Mean = 1.028; SD = 0.29) is the factor that has the lowest mean value which means the majority of respondents are dissatisfied with this dimension.
Table 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom facilities</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library services</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computing services</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic advising services</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude of staff</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from the Table 5, from all factors that affect **Learning environment** Classroom facilities (Mean = 1.60; SD = 0.41) and Attitude of staff (Mean = 1.60; SD = 0.44) are the factors that have the highest mean values which means the majority of respondents are satisfied with these dimensions.

In contrast, Academic advising services (Mean = 0.90; SD = 0.22) and Library services (Mean = 0.95; SD = 0.26) are the factors that has the lowest mean values which means the majority of respondents are dissatisfied with these dimensions.

Table 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theory and practice</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation provided</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching methods</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of subjects</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution of the subjects</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from the Table 6, from all factors that affect **Teaching method** Distribution of the subjects (Mean = 1.60; SD = 0.38) is the factor that have the highest mean value which means the majority of respondents are satisfied with this dimension.

In contrast, Documentation provided (Mean = 0.95; SD = 0.21) is the factor that has the lowest mean value which means the majority of respondents are dissatisfied with this dimension.
Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comparison to expectations</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommending the institution</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Satisfaction</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from the Table 7, from all factors that affect Overall Satisfaction, Student Satisfaction (Mean = 1.41; SD = 0.38) is the factor that has the highest mean value which means the majority of respondents are satisfied with this dimension.

In contrast, Comparison to expectations (Mean = 1.22; SD = 0.19) is the factor that has the lowest mean value which means the majority of respondents are dissatisfied with this dimension.

Finally, we will compare the mean values of the 4th scales of the questionnaire, except the scales Overall satisfaction, i.e. we will compare the mean values of Academic Staff, Course Administration, Learning environment, and Teaching methods, with the aim to see the rating of these factors regarding the power of their influences on the satisfaction of students with the public school quality. The results are presented in Table 8.

Table 8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Staff</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1.084</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Administration</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning environment</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching methods</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1.209</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As it is shown in the Table 8, Learning environment (Mean = 1.30; SD = 0.34) is the factor with the biggest influence on satisfaction of studied students in public schools of Greece, followed by Teaching methods (Mean = 1.25; SD = 0.31) and then by Course Administration (Mean = 1.20; SD = 0.37). In contrast, Academic Staff (Mean = 1.084; SD = 0.29) is the factor with the lowest influence on satisfaction of studied students in public schools of Greece.
3. Conclusion

This article was designed with the purpose to find the answer to the research question, which was: What are the perceptions of students in a Greek secondary public school regarding their satisfaction with the public school quality?

One hundred and fifty students were interviewed through a questionnaire survey.

As education is a form of service, student satisfaction could be considered a type of customer satisfaction. Our hypothesis was that student satisfaction may be affected by the quality of academic staff, course administration, teaching method and learning environment. The received results confirmed our hypothesis.

According to the results, students’ satisfaction with the public school quality is influenced by all 3 groups of items in decreasing order as follows: learning environment, teaching methods, course administration and academic staff.

As a whole, our results are consistent with the results obtained in previously conducted studies on this issue indicating that the satisfaction of Greek students with the public school quality is similar to those of students in other countries, which in turn suggests that the parameters of school quality in Greek secondary schools and its defying variables such as Academic Staff, Course Administration, Learning environment, and Teaching methods are similar to those in other nationalities.

In conclusion – it is difficult for us to interpret in depth the obtained results, but obviously, the findings outlined some tendencies that could be taken into account by the schools’ principals with the aim to improve the school the public school quality.
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