



Research Article

© 2024 Vu Ha et al.
This is an open access article licensed under the Creative Commons
Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License
(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>)

Received: 19 May 2024 / Accepted: 30 June 2024 / Published: 5 July 2024

Student's Satisfaction with the Structuring of Educational Training Activities at the National Academy of Educational Management

Le Vu Ha^{1,2*}

Pham Ngoc Long¹

Cao Xuan Lieu¹

Tran Thi Thom¹

Nguyen Thi Thanh Mai¹

¹National Academy of Educational Management,
Hanoi, Vietnam

²School of Interdisciplinary Sciences and Arts,
Hanoi National University Hanoi,
Vietnam

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36941/ajis-2024-0141>

Abstract

This quantitative study examines student satisfaction with the organization of university training activities at the National Academy of Educational Management, Vietnam during the 2020-2021 academic year. A convenience sampling method yielded a sample size of 175 undergraduate and graduate students from diverse academic programs. Participants completed a survey assessing satisfaction levels across various components of university training activities. Descriptive analysis using SPSS was conducted, revealing insights into student perceptions and satisfaction levels. Across planning training, class registration, testing and assessment, the organization of internships, projects, graduation theses, and other administrative activities, students' perceptions offer valuable insights into the effectiveness of institutional policies and procedures. While indications of overall satisfaction exist, particularly with instructor guidance during internships and project work, opportunities for enhancement are identified, particularly in class registration processes and the evaluation of training results. Leveraging these insights and implementing targeted interventions can further optimize student experiences, fostering a supportive learning environment conducive to academic success. This study contributes to the literature on educational management, providing actionable recommendations for institutions aiming to improve student satisfaction and academic outcomes.

Keywords: Student Satisfaction; University Training; Educational Management; Institutional Policies; Academic Success

1. Introduction

The effectiveness of educational management practices extends beyond shaping the quality of the learning experience; it profoundly impacts student outcomes within academic institutions

(Leithwood et al., 2004; Li & Zhang, 2023; Shore & Wright, 2003). Thus, understanding student perceptions and their satisfaction levels across various facets of educational management is crucial for institutions to discern areas of success and those needing improvement. This study specifically delves into student satisfaction concerning educational management practices at the National Academy of Educational Management, Vietnam meticulously examining dimensions such as planning training, class registration, testing and assessment, and other administrative activities. By conducting a thorough analysis of student satisfaction levels and identifying key areas for enhancement, this study aims to provide invaluable insights to inform institutional strategies aimed at enhancing the overall educational experience for students.

In the realm of planning training, student satisfaction serves as a crucial benchmark for evaluating the efficacy of institutional endeavors in curriculum design and delivery. Extensive research underscores the pivotal role of well-structured training plans in not only guiding student learning but also fostering academic success (Ashari et al., 2022; Kress et al., 2004; Pozo-Rico et al., 2024). Moreover, the efficient scheduling of final exams is paramount as it ensures students have adequate time for preparation while minimizing stress levels, thereby facilitating optimal academic performance (Cho & Chan, 2020; Schreiner et al., 2020). However, challenges associated with class registration processes can significantly impact student satisfaction levels and impede academic progress. These challenges underscore the pressing need for continuous refinement and optimization of administrative procedures to streamline registration processes and enhance overall student experience (Avella et al., 2016; George & Wooden, 2023). By addressing these challenges, institutions can better align their administrative processes with student needs, thus fostering a more supportive and conducive learning environment.

Moreover, testing and assessment procedures represent integral components of the educational process, serving as pivotal mechanisms for providing valuable feedback to students and guiding instructional decisions. Extensive research has consistently demonstrated that timely and constructive feedback significantly enhances student learning outcomes and motivation (Fluckiger et al., 2010; Hatziapostolou & Paraskakis, 2010). Additionally, robust support structures, such as instructional documents and instructor guidance during internships and project work, are instrumental in facilitating experiential learning opportunities and fostering student engagement (Coker et al., 2017; Collins et al., 2014; Wurdinger & Carlson, 2009). A comprehensive understanding of student satisfaction with these support mechanisms is paramount for institutions to allocate resources efficiently and effectively support student success in their academic endeavors. By prioritizing these aspects of educational management, institutions can enhance the overall educational experience and contribute to the academic growth and achievement of their students.

Furthermore, institutional policies and procedures pertaining to the approval and recognition of graduation, management of violations of exam regulations, and evaluation of training results are vital for upholding academic standards and fostering accountability within educational institutions. Effective evaluation practices are indispensable for safeguarding the validity and reliability of assessment processes, ensuring that students receive fair and accurate evaluations of their academic performance (Darling-Hammond, 2015; Johnson et al., 2008; Shinkfield & Stufflebeam, 2012). However, it is imperative to recognize that continuous monitoring and enhancement of these processes are necessary to uphold institutional integrity and ensure sustained student satisfaction (Bryson, 2018; Harvey, 2002). By proactively addressing these key dimensions of educational management practices, institutions can cultivate a supportive learning environment that not only promotes student success but also enhances the overall educational experience for all stakeholders involved. This holistic approach to educational management contributes to a culture of excellence, accountability, and continuous improvement, ultimately benefiting students, faculty, staff, and the broader educational community.

Understanding student satisfaction with various dimensions of educational and business management practices is indispensable for institutions to identify areas of strength and those requiring improvement (Cheong Cheng & Ming Tam, 1997; Huang et al., 2019). Through conducting a

comprehensive analysis of student perceptions and satisfaction levels, this study aims to provide invaluable insights aimed at informing institutional strategies tailored towards enhancing the overall educational experience for students at the National Academy of Educational Management. By delving deep into the nuances of student satisfaction, institutions can pinpoint specific aspects of their educational management practices that contribute positively or negatively to the student experience. Subsequently, by implementing targeted interventions based on these insights and perpetually evaluating their effectiveness, institutions can iteratively refine their approaches to educational management, thereby cultivating a supportive learning environment conducive to student success. Ultimately, this iterative and student-centric approach equips students with not only the necessary academic knowledge but also the critical skills and competencies needed to excel in their future academic and professional endeavors.

2. Methods

2.1 Participants

For this quantitative study, a sampling survey was conducted with a sample size of $N=175$ students from the National Academy of Educational Management, Vietnam during the 2020-2021 school year. The survey sample was selected using the convenience sampling method, which facilitated the inclusion of participants based on their accessibility and availability. This method was preferred to increase the response rate of respondents and ensure overall representation across various demographic groups within the student population. The participants comprised both undergraduate and graduate students enrolled in diverse academic programs and representing various years of study at the National Academy of Educational Management. This heterogeneous composition of participants allowed for a comprehensive examination of student satisfaction with the organization of university training activities, capturing diverse perspectives and experiences within the student sample.

2.2 Measurements

The development and validation of the survey assessing student satisfaction with the organization of university training activities at the National Academy of Educational Management in Vietnam involved using a Likert scale ranging from 1 to 5, categorizing satisfaction levels into five distinct classifications ("Very Dissatisfied" to "Very Satisfied"), and calculating average ratings for each component to interpret and target areas for improvement and enhancement. This scale provided a structured framework for students to express their satisfaction levels across various components of university training activities. To interpret the results, average ratings were calculated for each component. Based on these average ratings, satisfaction levels were categorized into five distinct classifications.

According to the classification criteria, ratings falling within the range of 1.00 to less than 1.80 were categorized as "Very Dissatisfied." This classification indicates a significant level of dissatisfaction among students with the organizational aspects of university training activities, signaling areas requiring urgent attention and improvement. Conversely, ratings falling within the range of 1.80 to less than 2.60 were classified as "Not Satisfied," indicating dissatisfaction but perhaps not at the lowest level. These ratings still suggest areas of concern but may not require immediate intervention compared to the "Very Dissatisfied" category.

For ratings falling within the range of 2.60 to less than 3.40, students were classified as "Relatively Satisfied." This classification suggests a moderate level of satisfaction with the organization of university training activities. While there may be areas for improvement, students in this category generally perceive the organization of training activities positively. Ratings falling within the range of 3.40 to less than 4.20 were classified as "Satisfied," indicating a satisfactory level of

satisfaction among students.

Finally, the highest level of satisfaction was denoted by ratings falling within the range of 4.20 to 5.00, categorized as "Very Satisfied." Students in this category expressed a high degree of contentment with the organizational aspects of university training activities. This classification highlights areas of strength within the National Academy of Educational Management's training activities and serves as a testament to the effectiveness of existing organizational practices.

These classifications offer a comprehensive framework for understanding student satisfaction levels with the organization of university training activities. By categorizing satisfaction levels into distinct classifications, institutions can identify areas of improvement and areas of excellence, allowing for targeted interventions and continuous enhancement of the educational experience for students.

2.3 Procedures

To evaluate student satisfaction with the organization of university training activities at the National Academy of Educational Management, a series of structured steps were implemented. Initially, a comprehensive survey questionnaire was designed, aligning with the Likert scale from 1 to 5 to gauge satisfaction levels accurately. Before the main survey administration, a pilot test was conducted with a small sample of students to refine the survey instrument based on feedback regarding clarity, relevance, and effectiveness. Subsequently, the finalized survey questionnaire was administered to a representative sample of students at the institute. Clear instructions were provided to students to ensure consistent completion of the survey, with an emphasis on confidentiality and anonymity of responses.

Upon completion of data collection, responses were systematically recorded to maintain accuracy and consistency. The collected data were then analyzed to calculate average ratings for each component of university training activities. These average ratings served as the basis for classifying satisfaction levels according to predefined criteria. The results of the data analysis were interpreted alongside these classifications to identify areas of strength and areas requiring improvement. A detailed report summarizing the findings was prepared, outlining recommendations to address areas of dissatisfaction and enhance overall student satisfaction.

The recommendations derived from the analysis aimed to inform institutional strategies and initiatives for continuous improvement. By following these structured procedures, the assessment of student satisfaction with the organization of university training activities was conducted systematically and comprehensively. This approach facilitated informed decision-making and the implementation of targeted interventions to enhance the educational experience for students at the National Academy of Educational Management.

2.4 Data Analysis

In evaluating student satisfaction with the organization of university training activities at the National Academy of Educational Management, data analysis was conducted utilizing SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences). The process commenced with data preparation, where survey responses were imported and subjected to cleaning procedures to rectify missing values, outliers, and inconsistencies, ensuring data integrity. Descriptive statistics were then computed to summarize the distribution and dispersion of satisfaction ratings among students for each component of university training activities. Measures of central tendency, such as mean and median, along with measures of variability like standard deviation and range, provided a comprehensive overview of satisfaction levels. Frequency analysis was employed to determine the frequency and percentage of students falling into each satisfaction level category (e.g., very dissatisfied, not satisfied, relatively satisfied, satisfied, very satisfied) for each component. This facilitated an understanding of the overall distribution of satisfaction levels among students, shedding light on prevailing

sentiments. Cross-tabulation analysis was conducted to explore the relationship between satisfaction levels and demographic variables such as student year, program of study, or gender. This analysis helped identify any significant differences or patterns in satisfaction levels across different student groups, enabling a nuanced understanding of student perceptions. Graphical representations, including histograms, bar charts, or pie charts, were utilized to visually present the distribution of satisfaction ratings and highlight any notable trends or patterns in the data. This visual aid enhanced the interpretability of findings and facilitated communication of results. Interpretation of the findings from the descriptive analysis allowed for the identification of areas of strength and areas requiring improvement within the organization of university training activities. Insights gleaned from the analysis informed institutional strategies and initiatives aimed at enhancing student satisfaction and optimizing the overall educational experience.

3. Results

The study examined the satisfaction levels of students enrolled in planning training courses offered by the National Academy of Educational Management, focusing on four specific areas: developing training plans, arranging the schedule for each semester, opening classes each semester, scheduling final exams, and arranging lecturers into module classes. The mean satisfaction scores, standard deviations, and the percentage of satisfaction for each aspect were analyzed to gain a comprehensive understanding of student perceptions.

Table 2. Student satisfaction level with planning training from the National Academy of Educational Management

| <i>Developing training plans</i> | <i>Mean (M)</i> | <i>Standard Deviation (SD)</i> | <i>Percentage (%)</i> |
|--|-----------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|
| How to arrange the schedule for each semester | 3.09 | 1.02 | 33.01% |
| Plan to open classes each semester | 2.76 | 1.09 | 39.49% |
| Schedule for final exam | 3.43 | 0.97 | 28.28% |
| How the Academy arranges lecturers into module classes | 3.57 | 1.07 | 29.97% |
| <i>Total</i> | <i>3.21</i> | <i>0.83</i> | <i>25.93%</i> |

In terms of developing training plans, students showed a moderate level of satisfaction, with a mean score of 3.09 and a standard deviation of 1.02. This aspect garnered a satisfaction rate of 33.01%, indicating that a third of the students were content with how training plans were developed. The satisfaction levels regarding arranging the schedule for each semester and opening classes each semester were slightly lower. For scheduling each semester, the mean satisfaction score was 2.76, with a standard deviation of 1.09, and 39.49% of students reported satisfaction. While for opening classes, the mean score was slightly lower at 2.76, with a standard deviation of 1.09, yet still, a substantial 39.49% of students expressed satisfaction. On the other hand, satisfaction with scheduling final exams yielded a higher mean score of 3.43 and a standard deviation of 0.97, with 28.28% of students satisfied. This aspect showed a higher level of contentment among students compared to the previous two areas. The highest satisfaction level was observed in how the Academy arranges lecturers into module classes, with a mean score of 3.57 and a standard deviation of 1.07. Nearly 30% of students reported being satisfied with this aspect of the training plan, indicating a relatively higher level of contentment. The overall mean satisfaction score across all aspects was 3.21, with a standard deviation of 0.83, suggesting a moderate level of satisfaction among students regarding the planning training provided by the National Academy of Educational Management. Approximately 25.93% of students expressed satisfaction with the overall training program. These findings provide valuable insights for the academy to further refine and improve its planning training curriculum to better meet the needs and expectations of its students.

The analysis aimed to provide a nuanced understanding of student satisfaction with the organization of class registration processes at the National Academy of Educational Management. Three key dimensions were scrutinized: the time allocated for registration, the use of software for registration, and the conditions influencing class openings. By examining mean satisfaction scores, standard deviations, and the percentage of satisfaction for each dimension, a comprehensive picture emerged.

Table 3. Level of student satisfaction with the organization of registration for classes of the Academy of Educational Management

| <i>Organizing registration for classes</i> | <i>Mean (M)</i> | <i>Standard Deviation (SD)</i> | <i>Percentage (%)</i> |
|--|-----------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Time to register for classes | 3.45 | 1.07 | 31.01% |
| Register for classes through the software | 3.93 | 0.97 | 24.68% |
| Conditions for opening classes | 3.31 | 1.12 | 33.84% |
| <i>Total</i> | <i>3.56</i> | <i>0.78</i> | <i>21.98%</i> |

Firstly, in terms of the time allocated for registration, students expressed a relatively high level of satisfaction, as evidenced by a mean score of 3.45 and a standard deviation of 1.07. This suggests that the majority of students found the time provided for registration to be sufficient, with approximately 31.01% indicating satisfaction in this aspect. However, the relatively high standard deviation indicates some variability in student opinions, suggesting that while many were satisfied, there may be room for improvement to accommodate differing preferences or needs. Secondly, the utilization of software for class registration yielded even higher satisfaction levels among students, with a mean score of 3.93 and a standard deviation of 0.97. This indicates a strong approval of the use of technology for registration processes, with 24.68% of students reporting satisfaction with this method. The lower standard deviation suggests a more consistent agreement among students regarding the efficacy and convenience of software-based registration systems. Lastly, satisfaction with the conditions dictating class openings was moderately high, with a mean score of 3.31 and a standard deviation of 1.12. Approximately 33.84% of students expressed satisfaction with the conditions set for class openings, indicating a noteworthy level of contentment in this area. However, the higher standard deviation implies greater variability in student perceptions, suggesting that while many were satisfied, there may be areas within class opening policies that could be refined or clarified to enhance satisfaction across the board. The total mean satisfaction score across all dimensions of class registration organization was 3.56, with a standard deviation of 0.78. Approximately 21.98% of students reported satisfaction with the overall organization of class registration processes within the Academy of Educational Management. These findings provide valuable insights into areas of strength and potential improvement in the organization of class registration, offering opportunities for enhancing the student experience and optimizing administrative efficiency within the academy.

The analysis aimed to provide a detailed understanding of student satisfaction with the organization of testing and assessment of learning outcomes at the Academy of Education Management. Four key dimensions were scrutinized: formative assessment, module-end evaluations, timeliness of final exam score announcements, and the handling of student complaints regarding academic results. By examining mean satisfaction scores, standard deviations, and the percentage of satisfaction for each dimension, a comprehensive picture emerged.

Table 4. Level of student satisfaction with the organization of testing and assessment of learning outcomes at the Academy of Education Management

| Examining, assesment | Mean (M) | Standard Deviation (SD) | Percentage (%) |
|--|----------|-------------------------|----------------|
| Check out the formative assessment | 3.76 | 0.70 | 18.62% |
| Check and evaluate at the end of each module | 3.81 | 0.76 | 19.95% |
| Time to announce final exam scores | 3.24 | 1.17 | 36.11% |
| Handling student complaints about academic results | 2.95 | 1.17 | 39.66% |
| Total | 3.44 | 0.73 | 21.20% |

Firstly, regarding formative assessment, students demonstrated a notable level of satisfaction, as evidenced by a mean score of 3.76 with a standard deviation of 0.70. Approximately 18.62% of students expressed contentment with this aspect, indicating a moderate but noteworthy level of satisfaction in the ongoing assessment process, which aids in monitoring student progress and providing feedback. Similarly, satisfaction with module-end evaluations was relatively high, with a mean score of 3.81 and a standard deviation of 0.76. Approximately 19.95% of students reported satisfaction with these evaluations, which occur at the conclusion of each module. This suggests that students appreciate the opportunity for comprehensive assessment and feedback at key points in their academic progression. However, concerns were raised regarding the timeliness of final exam score announcements, with a mean satisfaction score of 3.24 and a standard deviation of 1.17. Despite this, a substantial 36.11% of students expressed satisfaction with the promptness of final exam score announcements, indicating that while improvements could be made, a significant proportion of students were content with this aspect. In contrast, handling student complaints about academic results yielded a lower satisfaction level, with a mean score of 2.95 and a standard deviation of 1.17. Despite the lower mean score, a relatively high percentage of students, 39.66%, reported satisfaction with the process of addressing complaints about academic results. This suggests that while there may be room for improvement in the handling of complaints, many students feel that their concerns are adequately addressed by the institution. The total mean satisfaction score across all dimensions of testing and assessment organization was 3.44, with a standard deviation of 0.73. Approximately 21.20% of students reported satisfaction with the overall organization of testing and assessment processes within the Academy of Education Management. These findings offer valuable insights into areas of strength and areas for potential improvement in testing and assessment procedures, providing a foundation for enhancing the student experience and optimizing academic administration within the academy.

The study meticulously assessed student satisfaction levels concerning the organization of re-study, improved study methods, and additional study opportunities at the Academy of Education Management. Across five specific dimensions, including organizing re-study sessions, arranging retests, facilitating study improvement programs, offering additional study opportunities, and organizing study abroad programs, mean satisfaction scores, standard deviations, and the percentage of satisfaction were thoroughly analyzed to provide a nuanced understanding.

Table 5. Level of student satisfaction with the organization of re-study, improved study, and additional study at the Academy of Education Management

| Organize re-study, re-test, study improvement | Mean (M) | Standard Deviation (SD) | Percentage (%) |
|---|----------|-------------------------|----------------|
| Organize re-study | 3.57 | 1.10 | 30.81% |
| Organize retest | 3.64 | 0.86 | 23.63% |
| Organize study improves grades | 3.67 | 0.97 | 26.43% |
| Organize additional studies | 3.68 | 0.83 | 22.55% |
| Organize study abroad | 3.69 | 0.84 | 22.76% |
| Total | 3.69 | 0.70 | 28.87% |

Firstly, the provision of re-study sessions garnered considerable satisfaction among students,

evidenced by a mean score of 3.57 with a standard deviation of 1.10. Approximately 30.81% of students expressed contentment with these sessions, indicating their recognition of the value in revisiting course materials and reinforcing understanding. Similarly, satisfaction with the organization of retests was notable, with a mean score of 3.64 and a standard deviation of 0.86. Around 23.63% of students reported satisfaction with the opportunity for reevaluation, suggesting its perceived importance in allowing students to address areas of weakness and strive for improvement. Furthermore, the institution's efforts in facilitating study improvement programs were positively received, as indicated by a mean score of 3.67 and a standard deviation of 0.97. Approximately 26.43% of students expressed satisfaction with these initiatives, emphasizing the acknowledgment of the institution's commitment to supporting students in enhancing their academic performance through targeted interventions and resources. Additionally, the provision of additional study opportunities received favorable feedback, with a mean score of 3.68 and a standard deviation of 0.83. Approximately 22.55% of students reported satisfaction with the availability of supplementary resources and activities, indicating their appreciation for the flexibility and support provided to enrich their learning experiences beyond the standard curriculum. Moreover, satisfaction with the organization of study abroad programs was notable, with a mean score of 3.69 and a standard deviation of 0.84. Approximately 22.76% of students expressed satisfaction with the opportunities to engage in international academic experiences, highlighting the recognition of the value of global perspectives and cultural immersion. The total mean satisfaction score across all dimensions of re-study, improved study, and additional study organization was 3.69, with a standard deviation of 0.70. Approximately 28.87% of students reported satisfaction with the overall organization of these initiatives at the Academy of Education Management. These findings underscore the importance of providing diverse and effective support mechanisms to enhance student learning experiences and academic success within the institution, while also identifying areas for further enhancement and refinement.

The analysis delved into student satisfaction levels regarding the organization of internships at the Academy of Educational Management, scrutinizing six key dimensions: the internship plan and time allocation, instructional documents for internships, supervision of the internship process by instructors, evaluation of internship results, support provided to students during internships by the Academy, and the guidance offered by instructors throughout the internship period. By examining mean satisfaction scores, standard deviations, and the percentage of satisfaction for each dimension, a comprehensive understanding emerged.

Table 6. Level of student satisfaction with the organization of internships for students of the Academy of Educational Management

| Organize internships | Mean (M) | Standard Deviation (SD) | Percentage (%) |
|---|----------|-------------------------|----------------|
| Internship plan and time | 3.64 | 0.91 | 25.00% |
| Instructional documents for internship | 3.45 | 0.97 | 28.12% |
| Supervise the internship process from the instructor | 3.60 | 0.96 | 26.67% |
| Evaluate internship results | 3.73 | 0.91 | 24.40% |
| Support students during their internship from the Academy | 3.43 | 1.09 | 31.78% |
| Instructor's guidance during the internship | 3.72 | 1.02 | 27.42% |
| Total | 3.59 | 0.82 | 22.85% |

Students expressed notable satisfaction with the internship plan and timing, reflected in a mean score of 3.64 with a standard deviation of 0.91. Approximately 25.00% of students reported contentment with this aspect, indicating significant approval for the planning and scheduling of their internship experiences. Similarly, satisfaction with instructional documents for internships was noteworthy, evidenced by a mean score of 3.45 and a standard deviation of 0.97. Around 28.12% of students expressed satisfaction with these resources, highlighting their perceived effectiveness in guiding students through their internship responsibilities and objectives. Furthermore, the

supervision provided by instructors during the internship process received positive feedback, with a mean score of 3.60 and a standard deviation of 0.96. Approximately 26.67% of students reported satisfaction with this dimension, emphasizing the importance of instructor involvement in ensuring students' progress and learning during their internships. Moreover, satisfaction with the evaluation of internship results was notable, as indicated by a mean score of 3.73 and a standard deviation of 0.91. Around 24.40% of students expressed satisfaction with the evaluation process, underscoring the value of constructive feedback in helping students reflect on and improve their internship performance. Additionally, the support provided to students during their internships by the Academy received positive feedback, with a mean score of 3.43 and a standard deviation of 1.09. Approximately 31.78% of students reported satisfaction with this support, highlighting the importance of the Academy's role in facilitating a conducive environment for student growth and development during internships. Moreover, the guidance offered by instructors throughout the internship period was well-received, as evidenced by a mean score of 3.72 and a standard deviation of 1.02. Approximately 27.42% of students expressed satisfaction with this aspect, emphasizing the crucial role of instructors in providing mentorship and advice to students navigating their internship experiences. The total mean satisfaction score across all dimensions of internship organization was 3.59, with a standard deviation of 0.82. Approximately 22.85% of students reported satisfaction with the overall organization of internships at the Academy of Educational Management. These findings underscore the importance of comprehensive support and guidance in ensuring the success and effectiveness of internship programs, providing valuable insights for further enhancing the internship experience for students within the institution.

The analysis provided an in-depth examination of student satisfaction levels regarding the organization of projects and graduation theses at the Academy of Educational Management, focusing on four critical dimensions: conditions for registration, faculty support, instructor guidance, and evaluation of results. By scrutinizing mean satisfaction scores, standard deviations, and the percentage of satisfaction for each aspect, a comprehensive understanding of student perceptions emerged.

Table 7. Level of student satisfaction with the organization of projects and graduation theses of students of the Academy of Educational Management

| Organize projects and graduation theses | Mean (M) | Standard Deviation (SD) | Percentage (%) |
|---|-------------|-------------------------|----------------|
| Conditions for students to register for graduation projects and theses | 3.67 | 0.95 | 25.89% |
| Support from the Faculty while students are working on projects and graduation theses | 3.74 | 0.92 | 24.60% |
| Instructor's guidance while students are working on projects and graduation theses | 3.76 | 0.89 | 23.67% |
| Evaluate the results of projects and graduation theses | 3.76 | 0.74 | 19.68% |
| Total | 3.67 | 0.90 | 24.49% |

Students expressed notable satisfaction with the conditions for registering for graduation projects and theses, indicated by a mean score of 3.67 and a standard deviation of 0.95. Approximately 25.89% of students reported contentment with the registration process, suggesting that the guidelines and requirements for project and thesis registration were perceived as clear and appropriate. Similarly, satisfaction with faculty support during project work was noteworthy, with a mean score of 3.74 and a standard deviation of 0.92. Around 24.60% of students expressed satisfaction with the support received, underscoring the importance of faculty involvement in guiding and assisting students throughout their project and thesis endeavors. Furthermore, instructor guidance during project work received positive feedback, evidenced by a mean score of 3.76 and a standard deviation of 0.89. Approximately 23.67% of students reported satisfaction with this aspect, emphasizing the significant role of instructors in providing mentorship and direction to students as they navigate the

complexities of their projects and theses. Moreover, satisfaction with the evaluation of project and thesis results was notable, with a mean score of 3.76 and a standard deviation of 0.74. Approximately 19.68% of students expressed satisfaction with the evaluation process, suggesting that students perceived the feedback provided on their project and thesis outcomes as constructive and valuable for their academic development. The total mean satisfaction score across all dimensions of project and thesis organization was 3.67, with a standard deviation of 0.90. Approximately 24.49% of students reported satisfaction with the overall organization of projects and graduation theses at the Academy of Educational Management. These findings underscore the significance of comprehensive support, guidance, and evaluation mechanisms in ensuring the success and quality of projects and theses, providing valuable insights for further enhancing the project and thesis experience for students within the institution.

The study rigorously assessed student satisfaction levels regarding the approval and recognition of student graduation, the handling of violations of exam regulations, and the evaluation of students' training results at the National Academy of Educational Management. Across three critical dimensions, mean satisfaction scores, standard deviations, and the percentage of satisfaction for each aspect were analyzed to provide a comprehensive understanding.

Table 8. Level of student satisfaction with the approval and recognition of student graduation, handling violations of exam regulations, and evaluating training results of the National Academy of Educational Management

| Other activities | Mean (M) | Standard Deviation (SD) | Percentage (%) |
|---|----------|-------------------------|----------------|
| Approving and recognizing graduation for students | 3.69 | 0.92 | 24.93% |
| Handling students who violate exam regulations | 3.72 | 0.96 | 25.81% |
| Evaluating students' training results | 3.98 | 0.82 | 20.60% |
| Total | 3.82 | 0.79 | 20.60% |

Regarding the approval and recognition of graduation for students, students expressed notable satisfaction, with a mean score of 3.69 and a standard deviation of 0.92. Approximately 24.93% of students reported contentment with the process, indicating significant approval for the procedures and criteria utilized by the institution to recognize students' completion of their educational programs. Similarly, satisfaction with the handling of students who violate exam regulations was noteworthy, evidenced by a mean score of 3.72 and a standard deviation of 0.96. Around 25.81% of students expressed satisfaction with the disciplinary measures taken, suggesting that students perceived the institution's response to violations as fair and appropriate, contributing to the maintenance of academic integrity. Furthermore, satisfaction with the evaluation of students' training results was particularly high, with a mean score of 3.98 and a standard deviation of 0.82. Approximately 20.60% of students reported satisfaction with the evaluation process, indicating significant approval for the methods employed to assess students' learning outcomes and competencies acquired during their training. The total mean satisfaction score across all dimensions of approval and recognition processes, handling violations of exam regulations, and evaluating training results was 3.82, with a standard deviation of 0.79. Approximately 20.60% of students reported satisfaction with these aspects of institutional operations at the National Academy of Educational Management. These findings underscore the importance of effective administrative procedures and evaluation mechanisms in maintaining the quality and integrity of educational programs, providing valuable insights for further enhancing student satisfaction and academic excellence within the institution.

4. Discussion

The discussion of student satisfaction with various dimensions of educational management practices at the National Academy of Educational Management reveals both strengths and areas for

improvement within the institution. Across planning training, class registration, testing and assessment, organization of internships, projects and graduation theses, and other administrative activities, students' perceptions offer valuable insights into the effectiveness of institutional policies and procedures. While there are indications of overall satisfaction with certain aspects such as instructor guidance during internships and project work, there are also opportunities for enhancement, particularly in areas such as class registration processes and the evaluation of training results. By leveraging these insights and implementing targeted interventions, the institution can further optimize student experiences and foster a supportive learning environment conducive to academic success.

In the realm of planning training, students generally expressed moderate levels of satisfaction, particularly regarding the development of training plans and the scheduling of final exams. These findings resonate with prior research stressing the crucial role of well-structured training plans in fostering student success (Ahmad et al., 2023; Kramarski, 2017; Wang, 2017). A meticulously crafted training plan not only provides students with a clear roadmap for their academic journey but also instills a sense of direction and purpose, facilitating focused learning and goal attainment (Nichols, 2005; Quinn et al., 2019). However, the relatively lower satisfaction levels related to class registration processes highlight the imperative for ongoing refinement and optimization of administrative procedures. Aligning these processes more closely with student preferences and streamlining registration systems can significantly enhance the overall academic experience, ensuring smoother transitions and reducing unnecessary barriers to enrollment (Fong & Faude, 2018; Walker, 2023).

Furthermore, satisfaction levels with testing and assessment procedures highlight the significance of timely feedback and support mechanisms in facilitating student progress and academic achievement. This aligns with previous research emphasizing the pivotal role of feedback in guiding student learning and improving outcomes (Clark, 2012; McMillan & Hearn, 2008). Effective assessment practices not only measure student understanding but also inform instructional decisions, enabling educators to tailor their teaching to meet student needs more effectively (Kamalov et al., 2023; McTighe & Ferrara, 2021; Stronge, 2018). Additionally, the high satisfaction levels observed with instructional documents and instructor guidance during internships and project work underscore the importance of robust support structures in facilitating experiential learning opportunities. Engaging in real-world projects under the guidance of experienced mentors not only enhances students' practical skills but also fosters critical thinking, problem-solving, and professional development (Almazroui, 2023; Zheng, 2024). Such hands-on experiences are invaluable in preparing students for their future careers and equipping them with the necessary competencies to succeed in their chosen fields.

Moreover, the findings pertaining to the approval and recognition of graduation, the handling of violations of exam regulations, and the evaluation of training results suggest the effectiveness of institutional policies and procedures in upholding academic standards and fostering accountability (Christensen Hughes & Eaton, 2022). This echoes the findings of Holden et al. (2021); Sotiriadou et al. (2020), who emphasized the importance of robust institutional policies in maintaining academic integrity and ensuring the validity and reliability of assessment processes. However, continuous monitoring and enhancement of these processes are imperative to ensure institutional integrity and sustained student satisfaction. As highlighted by Golden (2020); Zuhairi et al. (2020), ongoing evaluation and improvement of institutional policies and procedures are essential to adapt to evolving educational landscapes and meet the changing needs of students and stakeholders. By regularly reviewing and refining these processes, institutions can uphold their commitment to excellence and provide students with a high-quality educational experience that meets their expectations and prepares them for success in their academic and professional endeavors.

The insights garnered from this comprehensive analysis of student satisfaction with various dimensions of educational management practices at the National Academy of Educational Management hold significant implications for both institutional stakeholders and educational policymakers. Firstly, the identification of areas where student satisfaction levels are high, such as

instructor guidance during internships and project work, underscores the importance of continuing to prioritize and invest in robust support structures. Institutions should consider allocating resources to further strengthen these areas, including providing additional training and professional development opportunities for instructors to enhance their mentoring skills and support students effectively. Secondly, the recognition of areas with lower satisfaction levels, such as class registration processes, highlights the urgent need for administrative reforms. Institutions should undertake a thorough review of registration procedures to identify bottlenecks and streamline processes. Implementing user-friendly online registration systems, providing clearer communication regarding course availability and prerequisites, and offering personalized assistance to students navigating registration challenges are potential strategies to improve satisfaction in this area. The implications of these findings emphasize the need for a holistic approach to educational management that prioritizes student satisfaction, academic integrity, and continuous improvement. By addressing areas of concern identified through student feedback and implementing targeted interventions to enhance support structures and administrative processes, institutions can foster a positive learning environment that promotes student success and satisfaction. Additionally, collaboration between institutions, policymakers, and educational researchers is vital to share best practices and drive systemic improvements that benefit students and the broader educational community.

Despite the valuable insights gained from this study, several limitations should be acknowledged to provide a balanced interpretation of the findings and guide future research endeavors. Firstly, the study's reliance on self-reported data from student satisfaction surveys may introduce response bias. Students may be inclined to provide socially desirable responses or may not accurately represent their true sentiments. Additionally, the sample size and composition could impact the generalizability of the findings. Future research could consider employing mixed-method approaches, including interviews or focus groups, to gain a deeper understanding of student experiences and perceptions. Secondly, the study focused primarily on student satisfaction without exploring the underlying factors contributing to satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Further investigation into the specific aspects of educational management practices that influence student perceptions could provide more nuanced insights and inform targeted interventions for improvement. Moreover, the study's cross-sectional design limits its ability to capture changes in student satisfaction over time or assess the causal relationships between variables. Longitudinal studies tracking students' satisfaction levels throughout their academic journey and examining the impact of interventions on satisfaction could offer valuable insights into the dynamics of student satisfaction and inform evidence-based decision-making. Additionally, the study's scope was limited to a specific institution, potentially limiting the generalizability of the findings to other contexts. Variations in institutional characteristics, student demographics, and cultural factors may influence student satisfaction levels differently. Replicating the study across diverse institutional settings could provide a more comprehensive understanding of student satisfaction and inform context-specific strategies for improvement. Lastly, while the study focused on student satisfaction as a key outcome measure, other factors such as academic performance, retention rates, and post-graduation outcomes also play a crucial role in assessing the effectiveness of educational management practices. Future research could explore the relationships between student satisfaction and these broader indicators of educational quality to provide a more holistic assessment of institutional performance.

Based on the study findings, institutional stakeholders at the National Academy of Educational Management, Vietnam, can enhance educational training activities by refining class registration processes, adopting user-friendly systems, and providing additional support during registration. Improvements in evaluation methods, such as incorporating formative assessments and timely feedback, can ensure fair and transparent assessments. Strengthening mentorship programs for internships and projects, formalizing support structures, and ensuring effective planning and communication of training activities are crucial. Streamlining administrative processes and establishing continuous feedback mechanisms will help institutions stay responsive to student needs. Additionally, providing regular professional development for educators on the latest teaching

methodologies and student engagement strategies can further enhance student satisfaction and academic outcomes.

5. Conclusion

This study provides valuable insights into student satisfaction with various dimensions of educational management practices at the National Academy of Educational Management. While the findings indicate areas of strength, such as instructor guidance during internships and project work, they also highlight opportunities for improvement, particularly in administrative processes like class registration. Addressing these areas of concern through targeted interventions and ongoing evaluation is essential to enhance the overall educational experience and promote student success. By prioritizing student satisfaction, academic integrity, and continuous improvement, institutions can create a supportive learning environment that prepares students for success in their academic and professional endeavors. Collaborative efforts between institutions, policymakers, and educational researchers are crucial in driving systemic improvements that benefit students and the broader educational community.

References

- Ahmad, N., Rashid, S., & Ali, Z. (2023). Investigating primary school teachers' perceptions about professional development and its impact on students achievement. *Journal of Social Sciences Review*, 3(1), 809-823.
- Almazroui, K. M. (2023). Project-based learning for 21st-century skills: An overview and case study of moral education in the UAE. *The Social Studies*, 114(3), 125-136. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00377996.2022.2134281>
- Ashari, R., Sukrisna, C., Budiman, A., Zarkasyi, A., & Wajdi, M. B. N. (2022). The Integrative Curriculum Management with a Boarding System in High Schools. *QALAMUNA: Jurnal Pendidikan, Sosial, Dan Agama*, 14(1), 483-496. <https://doi.org/10.37680/qalamuna.v14i1.4398>
- Avella, J. T., Kebritchi, M., Nunn, S. G., & Kanai, T. (2016). Learning analytics methods, benefits, and challenges in higher education: A systematic literature review. *Online Learning*, 20(2), 13-29.
- Bryson, J. M. (2018). *Strategic planning for public and nonprofit organizations: A guide to strengthening and sustaining organizational achievement*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Cheong Cheng, Y., & Ming Tam, W. (1997). Multi-models of quality in education. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 5(1), 22-31. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09684889710156558>
- Cho, E. Y.-N., & Chan, T. M. (2020). Children's wellbeing in a high-stakes testing environment: The case of Hong Kong. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 109, 104694. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2019.104694>
- Christensen Hughes, J., & Eaton, S. E. (2022). Academic misconduct in higher education: Beyond student cheating. In *Academic integrity in Canada: An enduring and essential challenge* (pp. 81-102). Springer International Publishing Cham.
- Clark, I. (2012). Formative assessment: Assessment is for self-regulated learning. *Educational Psychology Review*, 24, 205-249. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-011-9191-6>
- Coker, J. S., Heiser, E., Taylor, L., & Book, C. (2017). Impacts of experiential learning depth and breadth on student outcomes. *Journal of Experiential Education*, 40(1), 5-23. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1053825916678265>
- Collins, D., Weber, J., & Zambrano, R. (2014). Teaching business ethics online: Perspectives on course design, delivery, student engagement, and assessment. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 125, 513-529. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-013-1932-7>
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2015). *Getting teacher evaluation right: What really matters for effectiveness and improvement*. Teachers College Press.
- Fluckiger, J., Vigil, Y. T. Y., Pasco, R., & Danielson, K. (2010). Formative feedback: Involving students as partners in assessment to enhance learning. *College Teaching*, 58(4), 136-140. <https://doi.org/10.1080/87567555.2010.484031>
- Fong, K., & Faude, S. (2018). Timing is everything: Late registration and stratified access to school choice. *Sociology of Education*, 91(3), 242-262. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0038040718785201>
- George, B., & Wooden, O. (2023). Managing the strategic transformation of higher education through artificial intelligence. *Administrative Sciences*, 13(9), 196. <https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci13090196>
- Golden, G. (2020). Education policy evaluation: Surveying the OECD landscape. <https://doi.org/10.1787/19939019>
- Harvey, L. (2002). The end of quality? *Quality in Higher Education*, 8(1), 5-22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13538320220127416>

- Hatziapostolou, T., & Paraskakis, I. (2010). Enhancing the impact of formative feedback on student learning through an online feedback system. *Electronic Journal of E-learning*, 8(2), 111-122.
- Holden, O. L., Norris, M. E., & Kuhlmeier, V. A. (2021). Academic integrity in online assessment: A research review. *Frontiers in Education*, 6, 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2021.639814>
- Huang, S. T. T., Tran-Chi, M. V. L., Wang, F. B., & Van Le, M. Q. (2019). A structural equation modeling analysis on practicum satisfaction of the Vietnamese business students. *The Journal of Social Sciences Research*, 5(1), 172-182. <https://doi.org/10.32861/jssr.51.172.182>
- Johnson, R. L., Penny, J. A., & Gordon, B. (2008). *Assessing performance: Designing, scoring, and validating performance tasks*. Guilford Press.
- Kamalov, F., Santandreu Calonge, D., & Gurrib, I. (2023). New era of artificial intelligence in education: Towards a sustainable multifaceted revolution. *Sustainability*, 15(16), 12451. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su151612451>
- Kramarski, B. (2017). Teachers as agents in promoting students' SRL and performance: Applications for teachers' dual-role training program. In *Handbook of self-regulation of learning and performance* (pp. 223-239). Routledge.
- Kress, J. S., Norris, J. A., Schoenholz, D. A., Elias, M. J., & Seigle, P. (2004). Bringing together educational standards and social and emotional learning: Making the case for educators. *American Journal of Education*, 111(1), 68-89.
- Leithwood, K., Seashore, K., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). Review of research: How leadership influences student learning.
- Li, C., & Zhang, C. (2023). Transformative Perspectives in Physical Education Evaluation: Empowering Diverse Stakeholders for Holistic Learning Experiences in the Era of Big Data. *Journal of the Knowledge Economy*, 1-27. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13132-023-01637-7>
- McMillan, J. H., & Hearn, J. (2008). Student self-assessment: The key to stronger student motivation and higher achievement. *Educational Horizons*, 87(1), 40-49.
- McTighe, J., & Ferrara, S. (2021). *Assessing student learning by design: Principles and practices for teachers and school leaders*. Teachers College Press.
- Nichols, J. O. (2005). *A road map for improvement of student learning and support services through assessment*. Agathon Press.
- Pozo-Rico, T., Scott, R., Båk, M., Castejón, J.-L., & Gilar-Corbi, R. (2024). Riding the wave towards flourishing in STEM education: Enhancing teaching efficacy through a K-12 training program. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 143, 104564. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2024.104564>
- Quinn, J., McEachen, J., Fullan, M., Gardner, M., & Drummy, M. (2019). *Dive into deep learning: Tools for engagement*. Corwin Press.
- Schreiner, L. A., Louis, M. C., & Nelson, D. D. (2020). *Thriving in transitions: A research-based approach to college student success*. The National Resource Center for The First-Year Experience.
- Shinkfield, A. J., & Stufflebeam, D. L. (2012). *Teacher evaluation: Guide to effective practice* (Vol. 41). Springer Science & Business Media.
- Shore, C., & Wright, S. (2003). Coercive accountability: the rise of audit culture in higher education. In *Audit cultures* (pp. 69-101). Routledge.
- Sotiriadou, P., Logan, D., Daly, A., & Guest, R. (2020). The role of authentic assessment to preserve academic integrity and promote skill development and employability. *Studies in Higher Education*, 45(11), 2132-2148. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2019.1582015>
- Stronge, J. H. (2018). *Qualities of effective teachers*. Ascd.
- Walker, J. R. (2023). *The Transition Experience of Dual Enrollment Students: Navigating the Transition to Postsecondary Institutions* [Florida Gulf Coast University].
- Wang, X. (2017). Toward a holistic theoretical model of momentum for community college student success. In *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory Research: Published under the Sponsorship of the Association for Institutional Research the Association for the Study of Higher Education* (pp. 259-308).
- Wurdinger, S. D., & Carlson, J. A. (2009). *Teaching for experiential learning: Five approaches that work*. R&L Education.
- Zheng, Z. (2024). Practice and Thinking of Innovation and Entrepreneurship Education in Vocational Colleges. *Advances in Vocational and Technical Education*, 6(1), 175-182. <https://doi.org/10.23977/avte.2024.060127>
- Zuhairi, A., Raymundo, M. R. D. R., & Mir, K. J. A. A. o. O. U. J. (2020). Implementing quality assurance system for open and distance learning in three Asian open universities: Philippines, Indonesia and Pakistan. 15(3), 297-320.