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Abstract

The concept of customer satisfaction has attracted much attention in recent years. Nowadays, organizations still try to analyze this concept begin with understanding of various customer satisfaction models exist. This paper emphasis existing customer satisfaction models for assessing the relationship of overall satisfaction towards organization/company product or services. This paper gives an overview of various models customer satisfaction from the any perspective to suits in knowledge management practices and library customer satisfaction at Malaysian universities. Coverage is thus limited to materials published in library literature. However, this paper discusses the relevance material from existing models which is suitable to apply in a domain of library customer satisfaction.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Much has been written in the past few years on Customer Satisfaction measurement models in order to study the relationship and the impact of customer switching barriers (Fornell 1992) in terms of customer satisfaction Index (CSI). There are numerous ways a person or individual can satisfy their information need, including visiting a library, calling someone on the phone, or searching digital resources. In existence, research conceptualizes customer satisfaction as a cumulative construct that is affected both by service expectations and performance perceptions in the current time period, as well as in prior time periods (Ha and Janda, 2008). Satisfaction plays a particularly important role in competitive environments such as in academic libraries in the world because of its impact on customer loyalty. Thus, it is not surprising that many practical and theoretical models of customer retention have
considered satisfaction as a key determinant in consumer decisions to continue/discontinue their relationship with a given product or service.

2. RELATED WORK
Many studies have related overall customer satisfaction with some product or services. Malthouse et. al. (2004) stated that customers may explain their satisfaction with a product or service in terms of specific aspects such as the product attributes, process, customer service, or a combination of these various features. Sauerwein, et. al. (1996) indicates that, in Kano (1984) has made a distinction between three types of product requirements which influence customer satisfaction in different ways.
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Figure 1. Kano’s model of customer satisfaction (Sauerwein, et. al., 1996)

(a) One-dimensional requirements:
With regard to these requirements, customer satisfaction is proportional to the level of fulfillment - the higher the level of fulfillment, the higher the customer's satisfaction and vice versa. One-dimensional requirements are usually explicitly demanded by the customer.

(b) Attractive requirements:
These requirements are the product criteria which have the greatest influence on how satisfied a customer will be with a given product. Attractive requirements are neither explicitly expressed nor expected by the customer. Fulfilling these requirements leads to more than proportional satisfaction. If they are not met, however, there is no feeling of dissatisfaction.
Hsu, Chen and Hsueh (2006) stated that knowing what customers value most in a company especially in library products or services helps to optimize resource utilization in areas for continuous improvement based on their needs and wants. However, The American Customer Satisfaction Index (CSI) model has been used to measure and construct customer expectation in the ACSI has less impact (Johnson et al, 2001; Martensen et al, 2000). Al-Nasser (2003) said that customer satisfaction model is a complete path model, which can be depicted in a path diagram to analyse a set of relationships between variables. It also measures the quality of the goods and services as experienced by the customers that consume them (Fornell, et. al., 1996). The CSI model shows in figure 2 below and the European customer satisfaction index model, which is an economic indicator, represents in Figure 3.

![Figure 2: The CSI model](image)

![Figure 3: The European Customer Satisfaction Framework](image)

McDougall and Levesque (2000) purposed one model to test a more comprehensive model of customer satisfaction in service setting, which one that incorporates perceived value. The model proposes that perceived quality and perceived value influence satisfaction, which in turn influences future intentions in Figure 4. Customer satisfaction is viewed as the overall
assessment of the service provider while future intentions are the stated likelihood of returning to the service provider.

![Diagram](image)

**Figure 4. Purposed drivers of customer satisfaction and future intentions**

From a managerial perspective, these investigations of the dimensions of service quality have assisted managers in identifying the importance of ensuring that efforts are made to "get the service right the first time" and to "meet or exceed customer expectations in the delivery of the service". Malthouse, et al. (2004) said that it seems clear that increasing customer satisfaction give beneficial especially to marketing manager whereas other research examined customer satisfaction in a single organization or across several organizations using SERVQUAL.

Recently, researcher attempts to evaluate overall library performance from the patrons' perspective focusing directly on measuring service quality rather than satisfaction (Anthony and Mackoy, 1998). This is the knowledge gap which has to explore why service quality is more important rather than satisfaction. Even though satisfaction is about human behavior but yet it has to be fair. King and Ory (1981) also looked at changes in student perceptions, which indicated that library instruction increased students’ sense of confidence and competence in their use of the library. A study of library literacy of undergraduate students at the University of Northern Colorado (UNC) found that students’ confidence levels increased with increased exposure to the library and its services, although tested overall proficiency did not increase significantly (Greer, Weston, and Alm, 1991).

To fill this gap in knowledge, the researcher develops and tests a student satisfaction model in the Austrian university environment. The primary customers of the universities are the students and so Higher Education "is increasingly recognizing that it is a service industry and is placing greater emphasis on meeting the expectations and needs of students" (Elliott & Shin,
2002; Jurkowitsch, Vignali, and Kaufmann, 2006). According to author, the need for a student satisfaction model is based on the following reasons which are:

(a) the student is a special customer in a special service environment;

(b) the student is part of the product development;

(c) the students' satisfaction rate is always varying over the student time and beyond;

(d) the student is the one who transports the "picture" of the university worldwide;

(e) no student satisfaction model could be found after researching the existing literature, only alumni or employee satisfaction models were available; and

(f) the students are mostly not part of this development but those are the customers who can influence potentials students and society.

According to these reasons, a holistic concept for measuring student satisfaction would help to set new steps and activities (Jurkowitsch, Vignali, and Kaufmann, 2006). Therefore, the model in Figure 5 was developed based on an exchange framework.

![Diagram of a model showing interconnections between service performance, university performance, relationships, student satisfaction, and promotion.](image)

Figure 5. Pre-conceptualised model
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