Pegem Journal of Education and Instruction, Vol. 14, No. 1 , 2024 (pp. 270-283)

RESEARCH ARTICLE WWW.PEGEGOG.NET

Replacing Face-To-Face With Online Meetings: Public and Private University Students' Satisfaction on Academic Advising During Covid-19 Pandemic

Sitti Khadijah[1]*. Bambang B. Wiyono[2], Ach Rasyad[3], Ahmad Y. Sobri[4]

[1-4]Education Administration Department, Universitas Negeri Malang, Malang, Indonesia

Abstract

The COVID-19 virus pandemic has caused all governments to implement distance learning by utilizing information technology, including in academic advising. Studies conducted during the pandemic have shown changes in higher education institutions and students. This study aimed to find out and analyse the level of students' satisfaction with academic advising during the COVID-19 pandemic at public and private universities using five satisfaction indicators, namely tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy. The survey was conducted online, involving 1158 students from a total of 6 public and private universities in the city of Banjarmasin, Kalimantan Island, Indonesia. The data findings showed that in relation to the academic advising given during the COVID-19 pandemic, the students' satisfaction levels toward the provision of academic advising at both public and private universities during the COVID-19 pandemic were in the same category, which was "very satisfied". Thus, students' satisfaction levels toward academic advising at the university in Banjarmasin were very high, the demographic characteristics of the students, academic advisors, frequency of academic advising meetings and method of the academic advising meetings explained the significant differences in the students' satisfaction levels toward academic advising during COVID-19.

Keywords: academic advising, covid-19 pandemic, face-to-face, online meetings, satisfaction

Introduction

Advances in information technology had occurred in various parts of the world before the outbreak of the COVID-19 virus. Society has experienced rapid social change with advances in technology 4.0, including in the world of higher education. While millions of people around the world have to stay at home to prevent the spread of the virus, advances in information technology have helped provide solutions to keep education possible. The condition where students do not need to meet face-to-face and for a certain time with their lecturers, or in the form of distance education, does not only occur in teaching and learning activities but also in academic advising. In the conditions of the COVID-19 pandemic, the availability of information technology is very much needed because the end of this pandemic is not yet known (Murphy, 2020).

Several studies conducted during the COVID-19 pandemic have shown changes in higher education institutions and students. Hung & Wati (2020) stated that the challenge for education during the pandemic is to make education more "humanist" and "content" by making a balance between the use of technology and humans. Toquero (2020) states that during the pandemic, higher education needs to make efforts to strengthen its evidence-based practices, provide health services, especially mental health services, and create a curriculum that is responsive to the COVID-19 situation. Some higher education studies have found that the COVID-19 pandemic condition has resulted in differences in student perspectives on distance learning between students who have computers and internet networks other than cell phones and students who do not (Ince et al., 2020). The pandemic has made students feel bored and have additional expenses for purchasing internet data (Leuwol & Gaspersz, 2020), while the research conducted by Susilana et al. (2020) on students' perceptions of online learning at 10 universities from 8 provinces in Indonesia found that during the pandemic, students tended to have negative perceptions of online learning and considered that online learning was more difficult than face-to-face learning, as well as experienced additional internet data usage than before (Andini et al., 2021). It is true that the purpose of implementing distance learning is to break the chain of COVID-19, but because students still have to attend lectures, they feel that learning from home is harder than before (Christiana, 2020).

Corresponding Author e-mail: djkhadijah73@gmail.com

https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2045-0231

How to cite this article: Khadijah S, Wiyono BB, Rasyad A (2024). Replacing Face-To-Face With Online Meetings: Public and Private University Students' Satisfaction on Academic Advising During Covid-19 Pandemic. Pegem Journal of Education and Instruction, Vol. 14, No. 1, 2024, 279-283

Source of support: Nil

Conflict of interest: None.

DOI: 10.47 750/pegegog.14.01.30

Received: 06.01.2023

Accepted: 15.07.2023 **Publication:** 01.01.2024

Academic advising is one of the important programs for the academic and student affairs sectors in higher education. The quality of academic advising in higher education is one of the factors that determines student success and student satisfaction with higher education institution services. (Kuh, 2008). Satisfaction is a joy feeling when students get an appreciation for themselves (Chamdani et al., 2022). An academic advisor (AA) is someone who is responsible for helping and directing students to understand academic rules and requirements (Baker & Griffin, 2010). The main task of an AA at higher education institutions is to help provide advice and direction related to studies undertaken by students or related to the academic field and to provide motivation or encouragement to students to maintain or improve their academic and non-academic achievements. In Indonesia, academic advising services for students are provided by faculties who are appointed by the university as part of their duties as professional educators (Sriyani & Rosadi, 2015), and their role was proven to be one of the factors that determines student learning success (Fakhrudin & Safrianti, 2017). In the chaos of the COVID-19 pandemic, academic advising at universities must also be provided using information technology. Hu's (2020) research on the use of information technology to provide academic advising during the COVID-19 pandemic has shown that, with the presence of technological media, academic advising can still be carried out and is very effective if it is used to facilitate interactions between academic advisors and students. Academic advising through equalized technology-mediated advice, such as having a virtual connection via smartphone notifications or social media, can build the relationship between academic supervisors and students more flexibly. The existence of technology in smartphone applications and social media can provide interactive communication between academic supervisors and students who are classified as "digital natives" and are very proficient with them as well as accustomed to using them (Wishnoebroto, 2010). However, continuous support from AA to students via the Internet is crucial for student success (Van et al., 2020).

Student satisfaction is getting more attention in today's competitive learning environment. Student satisfaction is a multidimensional construct that is influenced by several factors (Weerasinghe & Fernando, 2018). Satisfaction can be defined as feeling happy or unhappy, satisfied or dissatisfied, relieved or not relieved by something or someone. This feeling arises after the individual compares what he or she experienced or received with what they expected. If what he or she received or experienced exceeded his or her expectations, the individual will feel satisfied. Conversely, if the reality he or she receives is lower than his or her expectations, the individual will feel dissatisfied. Based on this understanding, student satisfaction can be interpreted as a state of being fulfilled or not fulfilling the desires, hopes, or needs of students (Gistituati et al., 2017). However, Elliot & Healy (2001) define student satisfaction in the context of education as a short-term attitude that occurs as a result of an evaluation of their educational experience.

Findings from studies about student satisfaction with academic services in tertiary institutions, including academic advising, have shown various results. Most freshmen were satisfied and stated that they benefited from having an academic advisor (Chan, 2016), and there was a positive and significant influence of the quality of academic services on student satisfaction (Martasubrata & Suwatno, 2016). However, research findings from Khairun and Hakim (2017) showed that there were several obstacles faced by academic advisors in providing academic advising, including the limited time, the imbalance of the ratio between academic advisors and students, and the student's discipline to meet the academic advising schedule. In 2018, Saifudin's research showed that the role of academic advisers is significant in supporting the success of students' studies, but the results of Tasalim et al. (2018) showed that students needed academic advisers to remember their names, be able to communicate effectively, have an empathetic attitude, provide support, help determine interventions, and provide a safe and comfortable environment during the advising process.

Purpose of Research

Since the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic, cities in Indonesia had to apply large-scale social restrictions based on the Decree of the Minister of Health of the Republic of Indonesia that was signed on April 19, 2020. Face-to-face teaching and learning activities have shifted to online activities at all levels of education, including universities. Academic advising was also shifted online, and students must have been prepared for this format. However, an exception was made for universities that have teaching and learning activities that could not be replaced by online learning, such as health study programs like nursing, midwifery, and pharmacy. These study programs were allowed to carry out offline teaching and learning activities or in a blended (mixed) method according to the health protocol stated in the guideline for learning during the COVID-19 pandemic period. This study aims to find out the level of students' satisfaction with academic advising during the COVID-19 pandemic at public and private universities in Banjarmasin, Kalimantan Island, Indonesia.

Method

This is an observational study that employs a cross-sectional design. Using Parasuraman's SERVICE QUALITY (or SERVQUAL) survey, which aimed to assess service quality by comparing perceptions to expected reality (Abdullah, 2006; Mattah et al., 2018), The survey was conducted to assess

university student satisfaction with academic advising by asking direct questions with the expressions of dissatisfied, less satisfied, quite satisfied, satisfied, and very satisfied (Rangkuti, 2002) and utilizing 5 indicators (Dewi & Sudarwati, 2020), namely: 1) Tangibles or physical form, which includes physical facilities, equipment, means of communication, and the appearance of the person who provides services; 2). Reliability or trust, which is the ability to provide and implement promised services accurately, timely, and reliably; 3). Responsiveness, which includes the ability to respond or be ready to help and provide services as well as convey information clearly and understandably; 4). Assurance, which includes knowledge, politeness, and the ability to cultivate trust and confidence, as well as a combination of three dimensions of competence, politeness, and credibility; and 5). Empathy, which refers to a willingness to care, to give special personal attention, to be easy to make relationships with, and to understand the needs of students.

Non-probability sampling techniques of accidental sampling were used in the study (Mukhadis, 2016), as the samples taken based on non-probability sampling techniques can not represent the population (Sumargo, 2020), which is aligned with the focus of this study, that is to find out and analyze the level of students' satisfactions towards academic advising during the Covid-19 pandemic at public and private universities in Banjarmasin, Kalimantan, Indonesia. The researcher tried to collect information related to students' satisfaction with the conditions of academic advising from the start of the COVID-19 outbreak in March 2020 to October 2020 and analyze the level of satisfaction based on the characteristics of the students and academic advisors (AAs) at the public and private universities. The questionnaire was developed by researchers according to conditions related to the COVID-19 pandemic and was distributed online using a Google Form to six public and private university students in the city of Banjarmasin from November 18 to December 15, 2020.

The questionnaire uses a Likert scale with five alternative answers about student satisfaction towards academic advising during the COVID-19 pandemic. A series of numbers from 1 to 5 indicates the feelings of dissatisfied, less satisfied, quite satisfied, satisfied, and very satisfied. The respondents were asked to provide answers to the 25 questions given, so the scores used to interpret the results of the research are as follows:

- Total score 101-125 (means score 5.0) = Very Satisfied (VS)
- Total score 76-100 (means score 4.0 – 4.9) = Satisfied (S)
- Total value 51-75 (means score 3.0 – 3.9) = Quite Satisfied (QS)
- Total score 26-50 (means score 2.0 – 2.9) = Dissatisfied (DS)
- Total score 0-25 (means score 1.0 – 1.9) = Very Dissatisfied (VDS)

The completion of this questionnaire was voluntary. On the first page of the questionnaire, the researcher provided the research informed consent to be read and understood by respondents before they filled out the questionnaire. After the questionnaire was collected, the research data were processed using SPSS version 24. In addition, this study used bivariate analysis analyse the correlation between demographic characteristics and students' satisfaction on acamdemic advising during covid-19.

The researchers received a total of 1183 questionnaires back from 3 private and 3 public university students. However, 25 of them were incomplete, so only 1158 questionnaires or respondents were carried forward to the analysis stage. Before being distributed, the questionnaire's validity and reliability had been tested on 30 respondents (university students). The validity and reliability test procedure in this study is by distributing the instrument to 30 respondents, who are university students, then analyzed the validity and reliability coefficients using Cronbach alpha using SPSS 24. The reliability value on this questionnaire was found to be above 0.70 which proven that this questionnaire is reliable. All items in each indicator were valid and reliable. The validity and reliability of the questionnaire are presented in tables 1 and 2.

Results

Apart from the five indicators of student satisfaction, the research questionnaires also tried to get a description of the students' characteristics. Table 3 describes the characteristics of the respondents by type of tertiary education (public or private), study program, level of education, semester, gender, age, first generation to college family history, city and province of origin, and satisfaction.

Table 3 shows the results of the research: 386 students who gave their responses came from public universities and 772 students came from private universities in the city of Banjarmasin. The characteristics of 386 students as respondents from public universities showed that most of them came from the education study program (63.5%), were at the bachelor level (91.2%), and studied in the first semester (40.2%). Regarding their ages, most of the students from public universities were 18–19 years old (46.4%) and female (68.1%). The responses of students from public universities about the history of first-generation college families revealed that 58.5% of them were not first-generation college students, which meant that they had a family member (father, mother, brother, or sister) who attended college. Based on their area of origin, it was found that most of the students came from outside the city of Banjarmasin (58.3%), but were still within the province of South Kalimantan (82.4%). Table 3 also provides

Table 1. Validity and Reliability Test Results of Student's Satisfaction Indicators towards Academic Advising during the Covid-19 Pandemic

No.	*Item and Indicator*	*Validity*	*Reliability*
Tangibles			
1	AA's readiness to use information technology media for academic advising during Covid-19 pandemic (T1)	0.595	0.984
2	It is easy to make appointment to meet AA in person if you are on campus (T2)	0.770	0.982
3	It is easy to contact AA through the media of information technology if I am not on campus (T3)	0.760	0.982
4	The availability of Academic Advising Guidelines in the form of paper or online during the Covid-19 pandemic (T4)	0.791	0.982
5	The availability of online media or information systems or a place to meet the AA for academic advising meeting on campus provided by the university during the Covid-19 pandemic (T5)	0.818	0.982
Reliability			
6	The accuracy of appointment time according to the timeliness made by AA to give academic advising (Rel1)	0.782	0.982
7	The velocity of replying to a chat or answering student questions (Rel2)	0.818	0.982
8	The accuracy of answers given by AA to student's questions during advising process (Rel3)	0.861	0.982
9	The clarity of AA's explanations in conveying the matters related to academic or lectures (Rel4)	0.883	0.982
10	AA delivers academic advising patiently (Rel5)	0.736	0.983
Responsiveness			
11	The fulfilment of academic advising appointment time with the appointment time agreed by AA (Res1)	0.893	0.982
12	AA's readiness to change the advising schedule if the schedule that has been agreed experiences a constraint (Res2)	0.905	0.982
13	The willingness of AA to have flexible time to provide advising if the students need it (Res3)	0.937	0.981
14	The ability of AA to provide explanations that are easily understood by students (Res4)	0.925	0.981
15	The feedbacks given by AA to students during the advising process (Res5)	0.948	0.981
Assurance			
16	AA's knowledge of academic matters such as: academic and non-academic regulations, electives courses, course requirements and strategies for success in college (As1)	0.904	0.982
17	The ability of AA to show who should be see or consult when students experience academic or student affairs problems (As2)	0.895	0.982
18	AA's knowledge about career or work's related matters when the students finish their college (As3)	0.887	0.982
19	AA's ability to foster student's self-confidence in making decision on the best solutions of their academic problems (AS4)	0.924	0.981
20	AA's politeness when providing academic advising (AS5)	0.842	0.982
Empathy			
21	AA's concerns with the feelings and health conditions of students during Covid-19 pandemic (Em1)	0.903	0.982
22	AA's willingness to listen to student complaints (Em2)	0.785	0.982
23	AA's friendly and sincere attitudes during the academic advising process (Em3)	0.888	0.982
24	AA's willingness to provide solutions to academic or personal problems faced by students during Covid-19 pandemic (Em4)	0.861	0.982
25	AA's ability to understand the difficulties faced students during the Covid-19 pandemic (Em5)	0.725	0.983

Table 2. The result of the questionnaire's reliability coefficient

N of items	*Cronbach Alpha*
25	0.983

the characteristics of 772 students who came from private universities, where most of them came from the health study program (69.3%), were at the bachelor level (88.6%), and studied in the first (33.3%) and third semester (34.3%). In terms of age, most of the students were 18–19 years old (52.3%) and female

Table 3. Characteristics and level of Satisfaction of the Research Respondents Based on The University Status (Public or Private University)

	Public Universities (N=386)		*Private Universities (N=722)*	
Item	*Frequency*	*%*	*Frequency*	*%*
Research respondents	386	100.0	772	100.0
Study Program				
Religion	19	4.9	0	0.0
Science	9	2.3	0	0.0
Engineering	1	0.3	65	8.4
Education	245	63.5	13	1.6
Humanity	3	0.8	1	0.1
Social	68	17.6	12	1.5
Economic	41	10.6	145	18.8
Health	0	0.0	535	69.3
Agriculture	0	0.0	1	0.1
Education Level				
Bachelor	352	91.2	684	88.6
Diploma	34	8.8	88	11.4
Semester				
1	155	40.2	257	33.3
3	50	13.0	265	34.3
5	91	23.6	151	19.5
7	57	14.8	97	12.5
9	14	3.6	1	0.1
>9	19	4.8	1	0.1
Gender				
Male	123	31.8	137	17.7
Female	263	68.2	635	82.3
Age				
<18 years old	13	3.4	21	2.7
18-19 years old	179	46.4	404	52.3
20-21 years old	146	37.8	255	33.0
22-23 years old	36	9.3	50	6.5
24-25 years old	11	2.8	15	1.9
>25 years old	1	0.3	27	3.5
First Generation to College's History				
Yes	160	41.5	249	32.3
No	226	58.5	523	67.7
City of Origin				
Banjarmasin	161	41.7	207	26.8
Out of Banjarmasin	225	58.3	565	73.2
Province of Origin				
South Kalimantan	318	82.4	432	56.0
Central Kalimantan	42	10.9	295	38.2
Out of South/Central Kalimantan	26	6.7	45	5.8

(82.3%). In terms of first-generation students and their families' college experiences, 67.7% of students at private universities were not the first generation to attend college. Based on their place of origin, most of the private university students came from outside the city of Banjarmasin (73.2%) but were still within the province of South Kalimantan (56.0%).

Other information related to academic advising explored through the research questionnaires is the characteristics of academic advisors' age and gender at public and private universities, as shown in table 4.

According to information related to the gender of academic advisors (AA) in this study based on Table 4, the largest number of AAs at public universities were male (55.2%) while those at private universities were female (82.3%). In terms of the age of AAs, students from public universities gave various responses, but most of them answered 31–40 years old (26.4%) and "do not know about the age of AAs" (28.2%). Similarly, students from private universities responded that the age of their AAs was between 31 and 40 years old (37.0%), and they "cannot tell or do not know" about the age of AAs (29.4%).

The results of research respondents' answers about the frequency and methods of academic advising meetings obtained by public and private university students during the COVID-19 pandemic can be seen in table 5.

Table 5 showed the frequencies to meet AAs at public universities were mostly "never" (17.4%) and "1-2 times" (62.4%), while the frequencies to meet AAs at private universities were mostly "1-2 times" (38.7%) and "3-4 times" (28.0%). The method of meeting with AAs at public universities was mostly through the media or online (89.9%). At the private universities, the method used was mixed or blended (38.7%), but the dominant method used was media or online (42.4%) too.

Based on their university status, the level of student satisfaction towards academic advising during the COVID-19 pandemic, according to respondents' answers, can be seen in table 6.

Based on table 6, students' satisfactions with academic advising during the COVID-19 pandemic at public universities were in the range of "satisfied" (40.9%) and "very satisfied"

Table 4: Characteristics of Academic Advisors (AAs) based on Gender and Age in Public and Private Universities According to the Research Respondents

Item	*Public Universities (N=386)*		*Private Universities (N=722)*	
	Frequency	*%*	*Frequency*	*%*
Gender				
Male	213	55.2	137	17.7
Female	173	44.8	635	82.3
Age				
25-30 years old	43	11.1	171	22.2
31-40 years old	102	26.4	286	37.0
41-50 years old	85	22.0	81	10.5
>50 years old	47	12.2	7	0.9
Don't know	109	28.2	227	29.4

Table 5: Frequency and Method of Academic Advising at Public and Private Universities during the Covid-19 Pandemic.

	Public Universities (N=386)		*Private Universities (N=722)*	
Item	*Frequency*	*%*	*Frequency*	*%*
Academic advising meetings				
Never	67	17.4	63	8.2
1-2 times	241	62.4	299	38.7
3-4 times	50	13.0	216	28.0
>4 times	28	7.3	194	25.1
Method of meeting with AA				
Face-to-face/offline	10	2.6	146	18.9
Through a media/online	347	89.9	327	42.4
Mixed/blended	29	7.5	299	38.7

Table 6: Student Satisfaction Levels with Academic Advising at Public and Private Universities during the Covid-19 Pandemic

Students' Satisfactions	*Public University*	*%*	*Private University*	*%*	*Total*	*%*
Very Satisfied (VS)	182	47.2	708	91.7	890	75.8
Satisfied (S)	158	40.9	60	7.8	218	18.8
Quite Satisfied (QS)	43	11.1	3	0.4	46	4.0
Dissatisfied (DS)	2	0.5	1	0.1	3	0.3
Very Dissatisfied (VDS)	1	0.3	0	0.0	1	0.1
Total	386	100.0	722	100.0	1.158	100.0

Table 7. Student Satisfaction of Public and Private Universities with Academic Advising Services during the Covid-19 Pandemic based on Questionnaire Items

Questionnaire's Indicators and Items	*Public Universities*		*Private Universities*	
	Means	*category*	*means*	*Category*
Tangibles				
T1	3.9	Quite Satisfied	4.2	Satisfied
T2	3.7	Quite Satisfied	4.2	Satisfied
T3	3.9	Quite Satisfied	4.2	Satisfied
T4	3.8	Quite Satisfied	4.2	Satisfied
T5	3.7	Quite Satisfied	4.1	Satisfied
Reliability				
Rel1	3.9	Quite Satisfied	4.2	Satisfied
Rel2	3.7	Quite Satisfied	4.0	Satisfied
Rel3	4.0	Satisfied	4.3	Satisfied
Rel4	4.1	Satisfied	4.3	Satisfied
Rel5	4.2	Satisfied	4.4	Satisfied
Responsiveness				*Satisfied*
Res1	4.0	Satisfied	4.2	Satisfied
Res2	3.9	Quite Satisfied	4.1	Satisfied
Res3	3.9	Quite Satisfied	4.2	Satisfied
Res4	4.1	Satisfied	4.3	Satisfied
Res5	4.0	Satisfied	4.2	Satisfied
Assurrance				
As1	4.1	Satisfied	4.3	Satisfied
As2	3.9	Quite Satisfied	4.3	Satisfied
As3	3.9	Quite Satisfied	4.2	Satisfied
As4	4.0	Satisfied	4.3	Satisfied
As5	4.3	Satisfied	4.4	Satisfied
Empathy				
Em1	4.1	Satisfied	4.3	Satisfied
Em2	4.0	Satisfied	4.3	Satisfied
Em3	4.2	Satisfied	4.4	Satisfied
Em4	4.0	Satisfied	4.3	Satisfied
Em5	4.0	Satisfied	4.3	Satisfied

(47.2%), but at private universities, the students' satisfactions were mostly in the "very satisfied" condition (76.8%). There was no student at the private universities who gave a "very dissatisfied" response, but there was one student (0.3%) who

gave a "very dissatisfied" response at the public universities. The details of the average (mean) respondent's response to each questionnaire item can be seen in table 7.

Based on Table 7, the responses for each item of satisfaction indicators for academic advising during the COVID-19 pandemic at the private universities were all at the "satisfied" level, which was different from the various satisfaction levels at the public universities. However, in terms of empathy from AAs, both public and private universities have the same satisfaction level, namely "satisfied".

To find out more detail about the difference in students' satisfactions, bivariate analytics were done based on the students' characteristics in both public and private universities, as seen in table 8.

Table 8 shows that students' satisfaction with academic advising differed between public and private universities during the COVID-19 pandemic.It was found that there are significant differences in the satisfaction levels of the students based on their study programs (Asymp-Sig of 0.000), their education levels (Asymp-Sig of 0.043), their semesters (Asymp-

Table 7. Student Satisfaction of Public and Private Universities with Academic Advising Services during the Covid-19 Pandemic based on Questionnaire Items

Questionnaire's Indicators and Items	*Public Universities*		*Private Universities*	
	Means	*category*	*means*	*Category*
Tangibles				
T1	3.9	Quite Satisfied	4.2	Satisfied
T2	3.7	Quite Satisfied	4.2	Satisfied
T3	3.9	Quite Satisfied	4.2	Satisfied
T4	3.8	Quite Satisfied	4.2	Satisfied
T5	3.7	Quite Satisfied	4.1	Satisfied
Reliability				
Rel1	3.9	Quite Satisfied	4.2	Satisfied
Rel2	3.7	Quite Satisfied	4.0	Satisfied
Rel3	4.0	Satisfied	4.3	Satisfied
Rel4	4.1	Satisfied	4.3	Satisfied
Rel5	4.2	Satisfied	4.4	Satisfied
Responsiveness				*Satisfied*
Res1	4.0	Satisfied	4.2	Satisfied
Res2	3.9	Quite Satisfied	4.1	Satisfied
Res3	3.9	Quite Satisfied	4.2	Satisfied
Res4	4.1	Satisfied	4.3	Satisfied
Res5	4.0	Satisfied	4.2	Satisfied
Assurrance				
As1	4.1	Satisfied	4.3	Satisfied
As2	3.9	Quite Satisfied	4.3	Satisfied
As3	3.9	Quite Satisfied	4.2	Satisfied
As4	4.0	Satisfied	4.3	Satisfied
As5	4.3	Satisfied	4.4	Satisfied
Empathy				
Em1	4.1	Satisfied	4.3	Satisfied
Em2	4.0	Satisfied	4.3	Satisfied
Em3	4.2	Satisfied	4.4	Satisfied
Em4	4.0	Satisfied	4.3	Satisfied
Em5	4.0	Satisfied	4.3	Satisfied

Note: Range of means 5.0 = Very Satisfied, 4.0 – 4.9 = Satisfied, 3.0 – 3.9 = Quite Satisfied
2.0 – 2.9 = Dissatisfied, 1.0 – 1.9 = Very Dissatisfied

Table 8: Bivariate Analysis Betwee n Students' Characteristics and their Satisfaction

	VDS	*DS*	*QS*	*S*	*VS*		*Difference*
Characteristics	*n*	*n*	*n*	*n*	*n*	*Total*	*Asymp-Sig*
Study Program							
Religion	0	0	7	9	3	19	
Science	0	0	3	2	4	9	
Engineering	0	1	10	26	29	66	
Education	2	6	55	110	85	258	
Humanity	0	0	1	1	2	4	0.000
Social	1	0	20	36	23	80	
Economic	0	3	47	86	50	186	
Health	0	1	52	252	230	535	
Agriculture	0	0	0	1	0	1	
Total	3	11	195	523	426	1158	
Education level							
Bachelor	3	10	174	454	395	1036	
Diploma	0	1	21	69	31	122	0.043
Total	3	11	195	523	426	1158	
Semester							
1	2	5	74	176	155	412	
3	0	2	45	135	133	315	
5	0	1	44	123	74	242	
7	1	3	28	79	43	154	0.001
9	0	0	3	5	7	15	
>9	0	0	1	5	14	20	
total	3	11	195	523	426	1158	
gender							
Male	1	3	56	118	82	260	
Female	2	8	139	405	344	898	0.123
Total	3	11	195	523	426	1158	
Age							
<18	0	1	8	14	11	34	
18-19	2	5	94	253	229	583	
20-21	1	3	69	204	124	401	0.097
22-23	0	2	18	30	36	86	
24-25	0	0	4	8	14	26	
>25	0	0	2	14	12	28	
Total	3	11	195	523	426	1158	
First generation to college History							
Yes	1	5	67	189	147	409	0.931
No	2	6	128	334	279	749	
Total	3	11	195	523	426	1158	
City of origin							

	VDS	*DS*	*QS*	*S*	*VS*		*Difference*
Characteristics	*n*	*n*	*n*	*n*	*n*	*Total*	*Asymp-Sig*
Banjarmasin	1	4	73	171	119	368	0.192
Out of Banjarmasin	2	7	122	352	307	790	
Total	3	11	195	523	426	1158	
Province of Origin							
South Kalimantan	2	10	146	342	250	750	0.002
Central Kalimantan	1	1	34	153	148	337	
Out of South/ Central Kalimantan	0	0	15	28	28	71	
Total	3	11	195	523	426	1158	

Table 9. Bivariate Analysis Between Students' Satisfactions and Their Academic Advisors' Characteristics

	VDS	*DS*	*QS*	*S*	*VS*	*Total*	*Difference*
Characteristics	*n*	*n*	*n*	*n*	*n*		*Asymp-Sig*
AA's Gender							
Male	2	6	100	219	161	488	0.022
Female	1	5	95	304	265	670	
Total	3	11	195	523	426	1158	
AA's Age							
25 – 30	0	0	27	102	82	211	
31 – 40	0	2	62	177	145	386	
41 – 50	0	4	27	87	50	168	0.015
> 50	1	3	14	23	14	55	
Can't tell/don't know	2	2	65	134	135	338	
Total	3	11	195	523	426	1158	

Sig of 0.001), and their province of origin (Asymp-Sig of 0.002). However, the study showed that there are no significant differences in the satisfaction levels of the students based on their gender (Asymp-Sig of 0.123), their age (Asymp-Sig of 0.097), their status as first-generation college students or not (Asymp-Sig of 0.931), or their city of origin (Asymp-Sig of 0.192).

A bivariate analysis was also done between students' satisfaction with academic advising and their academic advisors' (AA) characteristics of gender and age in both public and private universities, as seen in table 9.

As seen in Table 9, the research found significant differences in the satisfaction levels of students based on their AAs' characteristics of gender (Asymp-Sig of 0.022), where the majority of the female AAs got very satisfied responses from the students. There is also a significant difference in satisfaction based on AAs' age (Asymp-Sig of 0.015). Students between the ages of 31 and 40 received the most positive responses from the students.

Discussion and Conclusion

According to the data in Table 3, there are some similarities in the majority of the characteristics of research respondents from public and private universities, despite the fact that the number of respondents is not the same. These parallels are related to a bachelor's degree level of education, gender (female), and age (18–19 years). According to Indonesia's Higher Education Database, the number of undergraduate study programs exceeds the number of diploma study programs, as does the number of female students, which exceeds the number of male students (PDDikti, 2020). According to the data, the majority of respondents are between the ages of 18 and 19, which corresponds to the

semesters in which the majority of respondents are, which are semesters 1 and 3. Students at public and private universities share another trait: the majority of them come from families where members have previously attended college or are not the first generation to college students. Students who have family members who have college experience will benefit from this situation because they will be able to integrate socially and academically in higher education (Aruguete, 2017). Students who are not the first generation to attend college can obtain information about lectures and academic activities from family members, making it easier for them to navigate the higher education system (Dong, 2019). According to the data in Table 2, the majority of students did not come from Banjarmasin but rather from other places in the province of South Kalimantan. Despite the fact that learning in tertiary institutions had been transformed into distance learning and the majority of students had returned to their hometowns due to the COVID-19 pandemic, students from both public and private universities did not appear to have a problem with academic advising that was no longer done face-to-face. South Kalimantan Province is one of Kalimantan's provinces that already has adequate internet and telecommunications networks. The availability of the internet and telecommunication networks allows students to communicate and interact using information technology media, unless they live in inland areas (Persada, 2020).

Table 4 shows that the majority of AAs (55.2%) at public universities are male, while the majority of AAs (82.3%) at private universities are female. In terms of AA age, respondents from public universities stated that their AAs are approximately 31-50 years old (total: 48.4%), whereas respondents from private universities stated that their AAs are approximately 25-40 years old (total: 59.2%). This study yielded an intriguing piece of data regarding the percentage of public and private university students who stated that they did not know the age of their AAs. 28.2% of public university students and 29.4% of private university students said they had no idea how old their AAs were. Gender and age are cultural factors that can influence advising in Indonesia. Knowing other people's ages and genders will help students interact with their AAs. Both parties, AAs and students, are expected to try to understand their differences in order for the relationship and communication to run smoothly (Mufrihah, 2014).

Regarding the academic counseling provided during the COVID-19 pandemic from March to October 2020, students at public universities received no academic advising (17.4%) to 1-2 times (62.4%), while those at private universities received 1-2 times (38.7%) and 3-4 times (28.0%). The method of AAs' meetings with the students during the COVID-19 pandemic was mostly online in public universities (89.9%). The students from public universities received never (17.4%) to 1-2 times of academic advising (62.4%), while those from private universities received 1-2 times (38.7%) and 3-4 times (28.0%). During the COVID-19 pandemic, the majority of AA meetings with students took place online (89.9%), but students at private universities received online academic advising (42.4%) and mixed/blended academic advising (38.7%). According to the government's directive letter, activities at tertiary institutions in Indonesia have been shifted to a form of distance learning or online learning, which has affected both public and private universities. According to data, 38.7% of students in private universities receive mixed or blended online and offline academic advising. If we correlate this data with the students' study program, this happened because most students in the private universities were from the health study programs (69.3%), which still have offline or face-to-face learning activities on campus. During the COVID-19 pandemic, teaching and learning activities were allowed on campus in Indonesia based on the joint decision of four Indonesian ministries signed on June 15, 2020. The teaching and learning activities can be done on campus if they cannot be replaced by online meetings, such as to carry out laboratory or practical tasks and conduct research in the laboratory, but they should be carried out according to health protocols, namely washing hands with soap, wearing masks, and maintaining distance. The situations in which the students from health study programs still had to come to their campus to attend the teaching and learning activities made them able to meet their academic advisors in person or offline.

Based on table 6, both students from public (47.2%) and private (91.7%) universities mostly gave very satisfied responses towards the academic advising they got during the COVID-19 pandemic. This means that the academic advising provided by AAs from March to October 2020 is still very satisfying for students. Face-to-face meetings that were replaced by online forms turned out not to be a problem for students at both types of universities. As found by Weerasinghe & Fernando (2018), students' satisfaction with services such as academic advising can be influenced by several factors. This research showed that the factor might come from the age of the respondents, who are mostly between 18 and 21 years old. Students who are between the ages of 18 and 21 are classified as "digital natives," people who grew up with digital technology where the internet, smartphones, e-mail, instant messaging, and social media are integral parts of their lives (Wishnoebroto, 2010). The very high satisfaction percentage given by respondents from private universities is very high when compared to public universities. This can happen since what constitutes quality service varies from one academic institution to the others (Mattah & Kwarteng, 2018). Tuition from students provided revenue for private universities. For that reason, they were trying hard to keep the quality of their services by providing facilities for their students, otherwise they might lose them during the COVID-19 pandemic.

The average of the student's response to each questionnaire item in Table 7 showed that the satisfaction level of academic advising according to the responses from public and private university students is different. Students from private universities gave "satisfied" responses to all the questioner's items. The public university students gave various satisfaction responses to the items of the questionnaire, from "quite satisfied" to "satisfied." However, there are similarities between public and private university students' responses on the item of empathy, where both public and private university students gave the same response, namely "satisfied." The data found in this research supports the results of research by Hung & Wati (2020), which found that the educational efforts needed during the pandemic are more "humanist" and "content." This means that AAs from both public and private universities have empathy for their students during the COVID-19 pandemic. There are significant differences related to students' satisfactions between public and private universities in terms of the physical form of services (tangibles), which include the readiness of AAs to use information technology media, the ease with which they can meet or contact AAs, the availability of guidelines, online media, or offline meeting places. Students from public universities responded that they were quite satisfied, while students from private universities responded that they were satisfied. This shows that the readiness of AAs and facilities provided by public and private universities in Banjarmasin are different.

Based on the results of bivariate analysis in table 8, differences are found to be significant based on the students' study program with an asymptotic significance level of 0.000. The majority of students in the health study program were very satisfied with their academic advising. These types of students, such as those in nursing, midwifery, or pharmacy programs, have their AAs as well as their lecturers, whom they meet intensively in the classrooms or laboratories. During the COVID-19 pandemic, students in health study programs had their classes and AA's meetings using mixed methods (blended learning), so they may have had opportunities to meet and share with their AAs both offline and online. There is an Asymp-Sig 0.0043 difference in student satisfaction based on their level of education, with students from diploma programs reporting higher satisfaction than those from bachelor degree programs. The diploma program has more practical activities where they have more chances to meet with their lecturers in person and have discussions where these lecturers can probably also be their AAs. During the COVID-19 pandemic, diploma programs had to run their classes in mixed or blended systems to maintain their students' skills. In terms of study level, there is also a significant difference in satisfaction among first semester students, with the majority of them giving very satisfied answers and an asymptotic significance of 0.0001. This happens because as freshmen, students in the first semester are more intent and enthusiastic with their college classes as well as their contacts with their AAs, although they are actually in a COVID-19 pandemic situation. Regarding the students' place of origin, students from South Kalimantan are mostly very satisfied with their academic advising with Asymp-Sig 0.002. However, this research found that there are no significant differences in satisfaction among the university students based on their gender (Asymp-Sig of 0.123), their age (Asymp-Sig of 0.097), whether they are first-generation to college students or not (Asymp-Sig of 0.931), or their residence (Asymp-Sig of 0.192). This research also found that, based on the students' responses, there are significant differences in satisfaction levels based on the academic advisors' gender (Asymp-Sig of 0.022), where the female academic advisors mostly got very satisfied responses from the students. This might be because the female advisors are more attentive and care for their students during the COVID-19 pandemic. There is also a significant difference in students' satisfaction based on their AAs' age (Asymp-Sig of 0.015). Students gave very satisfied respond to their AAs whose age between 31-40 years old. Academic advisors in this age range may provide students with more relaxed and easy situations in their contacts and meetings because their age gap with the students is not too great, and they are also comfortable using online methods of interacting with their students.

Overall, the differences in student satisfaction discovered in this study are consistent with Mattah & Kwarteng (2018), who discovered that satisfaction and quality of service to students differ between higher education institutions. For this reason, higher education institutions need to pay attention to the quality of their services (Salman et al., 2022) based on student perspectives. However, as a limitation of this study, the difference in student satisfaction levels in this study may be caused by the different characteristics of the research respondents and the unbalanced number of respondents between public and private universities since the sampling method used was convenience sampling. Also, the online survey using a Google Form without being able to know whether the respondent's answer was in accordance with the actual conditions may have contributed to the results of this study. Finally, research findings related to differences in characteristics and their relation to students' satisfactions with academic advising are still limited, so there is no data to be compared to this research.

In conclusion, while student satisfaction with academic advising at public and private universities in Banjarmasin city during the COVID-19 pandemic was mostly "very satisfied," some significant differences were discovered based on the characteristics of the students and their AAs. This study found that students at the two tertiary institutions were generally pleased with the tangibles, dependability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy provided by AAs during the COVID-19 pandemic. When students compare

what they have experienced or received to what they expected, they discover that what they have experienced has exceeded their expectations. Students believe that academic advising provided by AAs has met their desires, hopes, or needs, but this is a short-term attitude based on an evaluation of what students received or experienced during their education. Unlike previous research on learning during the COVID-19 pandemic, which revealed students' boredom or distress, this study demonstrates that the type of online academic advising used during the COVID-19 pandemic is not a problem, particularly for students of the digital generation and their AAs who are comfortable using online methods. Thus, it can even be a very effective interaction.

The study discovered that students from private universities gave "satisfied" responses to all of the questioner's items, whereas students from public universities gave varying satisfaction responses to the questionnaire items regarding academic advising provided during the COVID-19 pandemic, ranging from "quite satisfied" to "satisfied." This disparity must be addressed by public universities. When we looked at the questionnaire's satisfaction indicator items, we found that the tangibles at public universities are all in the "quite satisfied" category. This means that university leaders must pay attention to and improve the quality of their services related to academic supervisors' readiness to use information technology media, the ease with which AA can be seen or contacted, the availability of guidelines, and the availability of online media or offline meeting places at their universities. Several factors, including inadequate provision of facilities for students both offline and online, the high workloads of AAs, the large number of students that must be advised, and the availability of internet connections or data owned by AA, were thought to be the cause of lower student satisfaction scores on tangibles, which need to be proven by further research.

Based on the findings, some recommendations are made to public university leaders, such as providing an information system or media for online academic advising, providing safe and convenient meeting places for AAs and students if the meeting must be held offline, providing training for AAs on the use of information technology, and providing adequate human resources (HR) as academic advisors for students. Suggestions for AAs at public universities include keeping track of indicators that have satisfied students. AAs must also improve matters related to the student satisfaction indicator of tangibles, which include fulfilling promises and responding quickly to students, making time to meet with students, directing them to parties who can help students with problems on campus, and increasing their knowledge about careers or jobs that students can do after they graduate from college.

References

Abdullah, F. (2006). Measuring service quality in higher education: HEdPERF versus SERVPERF. Marketing Intelligence & Planning, 24(1), 31-47. https://doi.org/10.1108/02634500610641543

Andini, D. W., Hufad, A., Rahayu, A., Sumiyati, Y., Rahim, A., & Taryatman, T. (2021). Teachers' Readiness to Accommodate Diverse Students Through Distance Learning in an Inclusive Setting. Journal of ICSAR, 5(2), 54-57.

Aruguete, M. S. (2017). Recognizing challenges and predicting success in first-generation university students. Journal of STEM Education: Innovations and Research, 18(2), 40-44.

Baker, V.L & Griffin, K.A. (2010). Beyond mentoring and advising: Toward understanding the role of faculty "developers" in student success. About Campus, 14(6), 2-8.

Chamdani, M., Salimi, M., & Fajari, L. E. W. (2022). Perceptions of first-year students in online lectures in the Covid-19 pandemic era viewed from learning motivation. Pegem Journal of Education and Instruction, 12(2), 179–192. https://doi.org/10.47750/pegegog.12.02.18

Chan, Z. C. (2016). A qualitative study of freshmen's and academic advisors' perspectives on academic advising in nursing. Nurse education in practice, 18, 23-29.

Christiana, E. (2020). Burnout Akademik Selama Pandemi Covid 19. In Prosiding Seminar Bimbingan dan Konseling (pp. 8-15).

Dewi, A.P & Sudarwati, W. (2020). Startegi peningkatan kepuasan mahasiswa terhadap proses Pendidikan pada program studi Teknik industry Universitas Muhammadiyah Jakarta. JISI: Jurnal Integrasi Sistem Industri, 7(1), 1-12.

Dong, S. (2019). The effects of First-Generation Status on Student Engagement and Outcomes at Liberal Atrs Colleges. Journal of College Student Development, 60 (1), 17-34.

Elliott, K. M., & Healy, M. A. (2001). Key factors influencing student satisfaction related to recruitment and retention. Journal of marketing for higher education, 10(4), 1-11.

Fakhruddin, F., & Safrianti, E. (2017). Pelayanan Penasehat Akademik (Pa) Dalam Meningkatkan Prestasi Mahasiswa. Al-Idarah: Jurnal Manajemen dan Administrasi Islam, 1(1), 105-118.

Gistituati, N., Effendi, Z. M., & Susanti, L. (2017, January). KEPUASAN MAHASISWA PROGRAM PASCASARJANA (PPs) TERHADAP LAYANAN AKADEMIK DOSEN DI UNIVERSITAS NEGERI PADANG. In Prosiding Seminar Nasional Pascasarjana Unsyiah.

Hu, X. (2020). Building an Equalized Technology-Mediated Advising Structure: Academic Advising at Community Colleges in the Post-COVID-19 Era. Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 44(10-12), 914-920.

Hung, R., & Wati, U. A. (2020). 'Digital Home Schooling'During the Pandemic: Possibilities and Challenges. Knowledge Cultures, 8(2), 36-43.

İnce, E. Y., Kabul, A., & Diler, İ. (2020). Distance education in higher education in the COVID-19 pandemic process: A case of Isparta Applied Sciences University. International Journal of Technology in Education and Science (IJTES), 4(4), 343-351

Khairun, D. Y., & Al Hakim, I. (2018). Analisis Asesmen Kebutuhan Mahasiswa Terhadap Layanan Dosen Pembimbing Akademik. Indonesian Journal of Educational Counseling, 2(2), 179-186.

Kuh, G.D (2008) Advising for student success. In V.N. Gordon. W.R. Habley, & T.J. Grites (Eds.), Academic advising: A comprehensive handbook (2nd ed.) (pp.68-84). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Leuwol, N., & Gaspersz, S. (2020). Perubahan Karakter Belajar Mahasiswa Di Tengah Pandemik Covid-19. Civic-Culture: Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan PKN dan Sosial Budaya, 4(1), 32-44.

Martasubrata, N., & Suwatno, S. (2016). Mutu layanan akademik sebagai determinan kepuasan mahasiswa. Jurnal Pendidikan Manajemen Perkantoran (JPManper), 1(1), 136-143.

Mattah, P.A.D & Kwarteng, A.J (2018). Indicators of Service Quality and satisfaction among graduating students of Higher Education Institution (HEI) in Ghana.

Mufrihah, A. (2014). Implikasi prinsip bimbingan dan konseling terhadap kompetensi multikultural konselor. Jurnal Pelopor Pendidikan, 7(1), 73-85.

Mukhadis, A. (2016). Metodologi Penelitian Kuantitatif (1 ed.). Aditya Media Publishing.

Murphy, M. P. (2020). COVID-19 and emergency eLearning: Consequences of the securitization of higher education for post-pandemic pedagogy. Contemporary Security Policy, 1-14.

PDDikti. (2020). Pangkalan Data Pendidikan Tinggi. 28 December 2020. Retrieved fromhttp:// PDDikti - Pangkalan Data Pendidikan Tinggi (kemdikbud.go.id)

Persada, A (2020). Abdi Persada News. 28 December 2020. Retrived from http:// Disdikbud Kalsel Akui Keterbatasan Akses Internet di Pedalaman

Rangkuti F (2002). Customer Satisfaction. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

Saifudin, M. F. (2018). Pola Pembimbingan Akademik Dosen Wali Sebagai Upaya Efektivitas Masa Studi Mahasiswa. JMKSP (Jurnal Manajemen, Kepemimpinan, dan Supervisi Pendidikan), 3(2).

Salman, I., Badrujaman, A., Tola, B., Tjalla, A., Widodo, A., Anwar, S., & Saepudin, J. (2022). Quality of education improvement in Raudhatul Athfal based on strategic plan of Ministry of Religious Affairs 2015-2019. Pegem Journal of Education and Instruction, 12(3), 237-244.

Sriyani, A., & Rosadi, R. (2015). Hubungan Peran Pembimbing Akademik Dengan Hasil Belajar Mahasiswa Tingkat Ii D-Iii Kebidanan Stikes Ranah Minang Padang Tahun 2014. Pedagogi: Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan, 15(1), 58-64.

Sumargo, B. (2020). Teknik sampling. Unj press.

Susilana, R., Hutagalung, F., & Sutisna, M. R. (2020). Students' Perceptions toward Online Learning in Higher Education in Indonesia during COVID-19 Pandemic. Elementary Education Online, 19(4), 9-19.

Tasalim, R., Rochmawati, E., Wardaningsih, S., & Sari, N. K. (2018). Identifikasi Kebutuhan Mahasiswa Dalam Layanan Bimbingan Akademik Di STIKES Sari Mulia. Dinamika Kesehatan: Jurnal Kebidanan Dan Keperawatan, 9(2), 652-663.

Toquero, C. M. (2020). Challenges and Opportunities for Higher Education Amid the COVID-19 Pandemic: The Philippine Context. Pedagogical Research, 5(4), 1-5.

Van, N. T., Said, H., Nor, F. M., Rameli, M. R. M., & Alhassora, N. S. A. (2020). Remote Online Academic Advising During The Covid-19 Pandemic: A Malaysian Public University Experience. Palarch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology, 17(7), 4622-4634.

Weerasinghe, I.M.S., & Fernando, R.L.S. (2018). Critical factors affecting students' satisfaction with higher education in Sri Lanka. Quality Assurance in Education, 26(1), 115-130. https://doi.org/10.1108/QAE-04-2017-0014

Wishnoebroto, W. (2010). Human Vs. Machine: Why Young Learners Need New Ways for Learning. Humaniora, 1(2), 586-595.