



## **Factors Leading to Student Dissatisfaction in The Education Sector; A Study of Google Reviews from The Higher Education Industry in Sri Lanka**

**C. Janathanan**

Horizon Campus, [chrishankar@horizoncampus.edu.lk](mailto:chrishankar@horizoncampus.edu.lk)

### **ABSTRACT**

**Purpose:** The research is focused on the higher education institutes, and non-state sector in Sri Lanka. The study aims to understand perspectives presented by the positive and negative reviews on sixty-four (64) higher education institutions.

**Design/methodology/approach:** A total of Two Thousand Five Hundred (2500) reviews have been studied. The research study aims to recognize, define, and determine the factors in the non-state higher education institution space leading to student dissatisfaction.

**Findings:** The literature review covers (1) Word of Mouth (WOM) & Electronic Word of Mouth (eWOM) (2) Digital media marketing (3) Review sites (4) the Sri Lankan higher education system and players (5) Student Dissatisfaction and its determinants. The methodology will involve a positivist research philosophy, the deductive approach, and the survey-based research study that is focused upon with cross cross-sectional timeline. From the results, it is identifiable that only 29.6% of the teams had a responsive Google Business page. These are institutions that respond to reviews. The top concerns noted by the students/public were (1) Lack of student support (2) Delay in certificates (3) Poor management practices (4) Lack of academic quality.

**Originality:** This research outlines the perspectives from Sri Lankan, non-state Higher Education Institutions (HEI). A newer area of research and perspective in digital media.

**Implications:** This research adds to the existing literature and specifically focuses on aspects of Google Reviews. Google reviews are relatively new to Sri Lanka, where the masses may rely on word of mouth. Managing the reviews allows for HEIs to show confidence and capability in handling media.

**Keywords:** Digital Marketing, Google Reviews, Higher Education Institution, Student satisfaction, Word of Mouth

---

**Corresponding Author:** C. Janathanan, Senior Lecturer, Horizon Campus, Colombo, Sri Lanka,  
Email: [chrishankar@horizoncampus.edu.lk](mailto:chrishankar@horizoncampus.edu.lk)

## **INTRODUCTION**

The research is focused on understanding the non-state sector, private sector higher education institutions in Sri Lanka. An understanding of the positive and negative Google reviews that are presented by the public, students (consumers) or parents (customers). Any organisation that is in the public space, servicing the B2B and B2C marketplace has to be aware of the market and businesses have to fulfil the needs of the marketplace. The market is being influenced by both positive and negative factors leading to and shaping the way the market operates. In the new digital world, consumer behaviour has been fuelled with more transparency compared to a decade before. (Kemp et al, 2021) There are more conversations online, transactions online have increased with Tesla cars (2023) being bought online, more access to international purchases and understanding of global brands increasing. The global marketplace has increased the transparency associated with product quality (Sinha, 2021). Organisation's service standards are often influenced by the ability of the organisation to fulfil the customer requirements, and several theoretical models like SERVQUAL, SERVPERF, RATER model, and GAP model provide for clarification to understand the gaps in service standards. The amount of theory that exists and the approaches taken by the non-state higher education institution space have been understood.

### **Research Problem**

There are a number of reviews that are generated daily which includes both positive and negative reviews. However, it will be important for an organisation in the private higher education space, to understand the different "expectations" built by the customer and their respective attitudes and attributes gathered. These expectations are brought in by the advertising, word of mouth and key opinion leader comments (Chen & Yuan, 2020; Doveston & Keenaghan, 2006).

Secondly, there is a gap in the digital marketing literature addressing the current perspectives of reviews gathered. (Deeley et al, 2019; Douglas et al, 2022; Ferri et al, 2020). The approach taken to reviews, the responses gathered and the understanding that it leaves with the firm. The existing literature does not state methodology or a frame of reference to tackle reviews. Instead, have often been generic in identifying customer/consumer reviews are important for the aspects of digital marketing.

### **Research Aim**

The aim of the research study is to recognize, define and determine the factors in the non-state higher education institution space leading to student dissatisfaction.

### **Significance**

The research illustrates the influence of student's feedback, in gaining insights for the marketing team. To understand the digital marketing and pro-

activeness of the marketing team in dealing with concerns arising from the online space. To recognise the benefits and approaches undertaken by Google reviews, allowing for better strategies to drive more positive feedback than negative feedback on the online space. Finally, this research helps both the academia and the practitioners in understanding the role of digital marketing in managing dissatisfaction.

## **Objectives of the Study**

### **General Objectives**

The following general objectives are set to understand the pathway of the study.

1. To establish determinants of the student dissatisfaction and the primary reasons for dissatisfaction.
2. To recognise the usage of Google review site and their resulting response mechanisms from marketers
3. To enable suitable strategies to counter negative dissatisfaction that are set out.

### **Specific Objectives**

The following specific objectives are set to understand the pathway of the study

1. To establish the different determinants of dissatisfaction and to recognise the key areas of problems identified in the industry
2. To pin point exact issues that are identified on the front end (website, social media pages) with digital media
3. To identify suitable pages and tools used by the users, customers, consumers on concerns
4. To evaluate the effectiveness and pin point specific strategies adopted by organizations in handling concerns.

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

The literature review section of this report is divided into five (5) sections. First section sets out on the WOM and e-WOM. The focal area of the research is on word of mouth (WOM). Secondly, digital media marketing is being provided. Third area covered is on review sites. Fourth area is on the Sri Lankan higher education system and players. Finally, student dissatisfaction and its determinants are studied

### **WOM & eWOM**

Word of mouth marketing is defined as the Why, How and When of creating social influence for your brand (Berger, 2013). Baer and Lemin (2018) identify word of mouth as the informal communication between individuals about products, services, or companies that is sparked by a unique, unexpected, or remarkable

customer experience. The aggregate of all person-to-person communication about a particular product, service, or company at any point in time (Rosen, 2010). Most of the definitions have conformity, to identify specific practices and enablers in the organisation. The necessary evolution has been the transformation from traditional physical communication to the online space. The recent authors and books on word of mouth have all addressed this content of Electronic Word of Mouth (eWOM) (Chen & Yuan, 2020; Allard et al, 2020; Verma & Yadav, 2021). Word of mouth to be created needs to have (1) an Unexpected and surprising outcome that is positive or negative (2) Memorable to communicate (3) Sharable customer experience, that is in person or online (4) Repeatable experience (Baer & Lemin, 2018).

### **Digital Media Marketing**

Increased internet coverage in Sri Lanka at 52.58% (TRCSL, 2023). Covid lockdowns and the necessity to bring in safe purchases have influenced the rapid adoption of technology (Habib & Hamdenah, 2021). Digital media marketing has peaked with the available online tools and platforms. Digital media marketing has become a more vital channel for organisations and institutions to facilitate purchases, customer opinion, generate attention and keep post-purchase momentum positively attributed to organisations (Homborg & Wieglos, 2019). The role of digital marketing has become quite significant that the search term “digital marketing agency” and “digital marketing courses” draws in close to 100,000 keywords daily (Google Keyword Planner, 2023). The smartphone adaptation and cheaper internet have been a true motivator for the adaptation of digital media (Sharmin et al, 2021). This has led to increased participation in social media, online consumption and remote work opportunities (Ferri et al, 2020).

### **Online review platforms**

Online review portals have been present since the early days of the internet. However, the evolution has been rapid with WEB 2.0 and the increased affiliation of social media. Social media has influenced increased in User Generated Content (Haigh & Wigley, 2015). Review platforms have facilitated users to share ratings, comments, share pictures, and provide reviews of facilities/services available. Yelp which was launched in 2004 and Trip Advisor in 2000 has immensely facilitated the role of review sites. Google Reviews has been operational since 2009. This was included into the “Google Local Business Centre” feature. However, the brand has immensely facilitated the growth of reviews, and necessity for brands to focus on the relevant challenges.

The below table 01 indicates that close to 81% of the customers read reviews from Google prior to visiting the outlet. Google reviews have a higher penetration due to the product being packaged with search, maps and connectivity for a business. (Google Business, 2023) The different statistics provide for the available resources for the enablement of key attributes.

**Table 01: Online Review Platform Statistics**

<b>Review platform</b>	<b>% of Customers read reviews</b>	<b>% of Customers make buying decision</b>	<b>% Response to negative review</b>
Google	81	93	24
Yelp	53	86	NA
TripAdvisor	45	85	30

*Source: Review Trackers (2022)*

### **Sri Lankan higher education system and players**

Sri Lankan higher education system is driven by both the public sector investments from the government and the non-state sector (private sector) investing in initiatives such as the setting up of universities, and offering of professional qualifications. There are seventeen (17) public universities and eleven (11) non-state HEIs offering academic degree programmes. Tertiary and Vocational Education Commission (TVEC) (2023) offers standardisation and quality assurance services to ensure compliance of the non-state institutions involved in developing locally built curriculum with certificates, advanced certificates, diplomas and higher diplomas. There are over 1,549 registered institutes in Sri Lanka. (TVEC, 2023) The increased competition and the penetration being higher, it will become important for the higher education institution (HEI) to focus on the Sri Lankan market space much better. Student satisfaction and quality orientation are most important to gauge the quality of output and different considerations that are to be made.

### **Student dissatisfaction and its determinants**

Student dissatisfaction is the negative attitudes carried by a student with reference to the educational experience (Douglas et al, 2015). The role of the student in the education system. The Office of Qualifications and Examinations Regulation (Ofqual) regulations have prescribed calling a student a “learner” since 2019 (Ofqual, 2023). Gradually it's observable that some centres often include the learners as partners in the progress of learning, calling the learners as learning partners. Nevertheless, in an educational set-up, there is a quasi-relationship where the consumer (Student), customer (Parent or company sponsoring the programme) is provided with the right set of updates and satisfaction from the programmes that are being derived. In analysing the above content, it could be identified that a number of factors lead to student dissatisfaction.

From the outset, it could be identified from the literature the following range of factors (Table 02) will influence student dissatisfaction.

**Table 02: Student dissatisfaction drivers**

<b>Driver</b>	<b>Authors</b>
Quality of e-resources	Ranaweera (2021)
Motivation inspired by university professionals	Douglas et al (2015)
Praise/reward	Douglas et al (2015)
Social inclusion	Douglas et al (2015)
Usefulness of the course	Douglas et al (2015)
Value of money	Douglas et al (2015)
Fellow student behaviour	Douglas et al (2015)
Assessments and feedback	Deely et al (2019)
Professor's characteristics	Gruber et al (2012)

Social inclusion covers the aspect of meeting new people with the faculty and departments (Doveston & Keenaghan, 2006). The social inclusion provides for the different aspects. The usefulness of the course that is prescribed with the value that is driven by the course. The value derived from the course. Fellow student behaviour does provide for the overall productivity and consideration leading to the results. Deely et al (2019) outline the role of assessment communication and feedback as another pointed area which drives student dissatisfaction to be identified. Gruber et al (2012) do provide that the professor's approach will influence the way students are motivated and uses the KANO model as a reference point. KANO model is quite prescriptive on the aspects of: Must haves, Satisfiers, Delighters, Indifferent Attributes, and Dissatisfiers. The KANO model provides a holistic view of the service industry – to understand the expectations of the consumers and make sufficient changes in the product development stages. The Kano model since its inception in 1980s by Dr Noriaki Kano has further evolved to adopt "Kano+1" approach. "Must not have" or "Unwanted attributes" that a product/service should not offer. Nevertheless, the theoretical perspective is of course with criticism, that the "attractive" become "must-have" features over time, due to competitors catching phase.

Similarly, SERVQUAL and SERVPERF models have attempted to identify customer satisfaction and dissatisfaction perspectives. Zeithaml (2002) have outlined gaps that could arise during service delivery, service expectation development (customer perception), Communication and execution itself. It could be observed from the literature, that there are generic models and theories available that can influence the approaches taken in managing student satisfaction. Nevertheless, the research work of authors such as Gruber et al (2012) have been very prescriptive pinpointing on professor's ability to (1) communication skills (2) enthusiasm (3) rapport (4) use of real-life examples of in class; can lead to better satisfaction for students. The research methodology will account for the aspect of probing each of the negative reviews submitted by the learners and gauge the aspects set about.

## METHODOLOGY

The research philosophy adopted by the researcher focused on Positivism. The positivist aspect focuses on the objective reality. The theory does provide to enable for specific insights that are gathered allowing for conformity and the scientific process of conforming facts that are gathered with secondary research. The validity of the research is focused on certainty and reliability indicating the results that are reproduced. The research approach is focused on the deductive approach. The deductive approach is based on the well-grounded literature review variables which indicates the conclusions that are to be made. The research is focused on survey-based research strategy. This research is carried out with a cross sectional timeline has been used. Data collection method involved a total of 64 HEIs and the study of 2,500 reviews posted by the students. The entire population of institutions were studied and institutions that have more than five (5) Google reviews were taken up to research. The population of non-state higher education institutions are available on Tertiary and Vocational Education Commission (2024), University Grants Commission (2024) websites. Judgemental sampling methodology which falls under the non-probability sampling strategy has been used in this research. The research will involve only Google reviews and restricted to the feedback that is shared. Sample selection of reviews have been conducted by reading all the reviews that were existing on each of the HEI's Google Business Page (2024). The research was carried out with a manual process. Thematic analysis was carried out with the information collected and coded.

## DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

In the first part of this section descriptive statistics is used as a primary tool of analysing results. While the detailed statistical analysis will facilitate the hypothesis testing set out. The below table is ordered from highest to lowest volume of ratings.

**Table 03: Centre wise review**

Centre name	Overall Rating	Number of reviews	Number of 1-star reviews	Responded to review
SLIIT	4.6	1669	72	No
NSBM	4.6	974	47	No
AAT	4.4	607	16	Yes
CINEC	4.4	612	58	No
ICBT	4.2	557	59	No
Cambridge College	4.9	563	4	YES
KDU	4.6	550	46	No
NIBM	4.5	405	28	No
Aquinas	4.5	395	26	No
CA Sri Lanka	4.3	382	36	No

FACTORS LEADING TO STUDENT DISSATISFACTION IN THE EDUCATION SECTOR; A STUDY OF GOOGLE REVIEWS FROM THE HIGHER EDUCATION INDUSTRY IN SRI LANKA

CIPM	4.2	308	42	No
<b>Centre name</b>	<b>Overall Rating</b>	<b>Number of reviews</b>	<b>Number of 1-star reviews</b>	<b>Responded to review</b>
ESOFT	4.2	301	39	Yes
ACBT	4.0	294	43	No
SLTC	4.4	269	25	No
ANC	3.7	234	57	Yes
Achievers	4.4	220	14	No
BMS	4.5	218	19	No
KIU	3.6	215	54	No
IIHS	4.0	190	38	No
PIM**	4.6	188	6	No
APIIT	4.4	186	15	No
Metropolitan College	4.0	175	42	No
AMDT	4.3	167	24	No
Saegis	4.6	159	7	No
Horizon	4.5	144	10	No
Nawaloka College	4.2	142	22	Yes
Oxford College of Business	4.5	136	12	No
AOD	4.2	116	13	No
APIDM	4.9	110	0	Yes
SIBA campus	4.6	102	4	Yes
IIHE	3.9	97	33	No
SLIM	3.8	96	22	No
<b>Centre name</b>	<b>Overall Rating</b>	<b>Number of reviews</b>	<b>Number of 1-star reviews</b>	<b>Responded to review</b>
WinSys networks	4.3	96	12	Yes
IDM Nations	4.2	96	16	No
AOG campus	4.3	88	11	No
York Graduate Campus	4.6	88	5	No
American College	4.2	70	6	Yes
Next Campus	4.8	66	2	Yes
UTS college SL	4.6	65	5	No
Louis Preston	4.8	64	2	No
CMA	4.0	63	13	No
UCL	4.2	62	9	No

C. JANATHANAN

SLIATE**	4.3	57	2	Yes
IDM Colombo	4.2	56	10	No
AIC	4.3	55	8	No
AIBS	4.9	52	1	Yes
AIB	4.8	45	1	Yes
BSC Colombo	4.0	43	8	No
ENC	4.3	38	7	No
Aspire College	4.6	34	3	Yes
SANASA	4.4	31	2	Yes
BCAS	3.2	31	12	Yes*
IIT	4.5	30	4	No
<b>Centre name</b>	<b>Overall Rating</b>	<b>Number of reviews</b>	<b>Number of 1-star reviews</b>	<b>Responded to review</b>
Lanka Institute of Fashion Technology	4.4	26	3	Yes
CSBM	4.6	26	1	Yes
Study World Lanka Campus	4.7	23	0	No
Lyceum	4.7	22	1	Yes
Imperial College	4.3	18	3	No
BIMT Campus	4.9	17	0	No
Gateway GS (HEI)	4.4	17	2	No
AIBT	4.8	13	0	No
Singer Fashion Academy	5.0	9	0	No
Transmind Campus	4.9	7	0	No
Winfield	4.2	5	1	Yes

\*BCAS is having two locations where the reviews are picked up. One account has administrator involvement, the other does not. Similarly, Singer Fashion Academy is having several branches with mini-branch based operational model. \*\*PIM and SLIATE are government institutions. However, their approach to qualifications is equivalent to non-state sector. Therefore, taken for analysis. Response for reviews was accounted for only twelve-month period of activity. It could be seen that some of the centres such as ICBT have had different strategies to approach the Google Business Profile page (2023). Three (3) years before the response from the “owner” (administrator) received, currently is inactive.

## DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

Out of the centres studied only 29.6% of the centres were responding to the learner/public feedback that was stated on the Google reviews.

**Table 04: An analysis of Negative reviews and frequency**

Concerns noted in 1*reviews	Frequency	Concerns noted in 1*reviews	Frequency
Unprofessional conduct	48	Delayed certificate	239
Poor student support	348	Infrastructure, Facilities concerns	84
Cross-departmental politics	1	Discipline	8
Exam questions being out of syllabus	12	3 <sup>rd</sup> Party linked with the centre	1
Canteen Food quality	11	Refund policy	138
Employee concerns	92	Poor management	272
Excessive fees	31	Academic issues	224
Value for money	129	Poor administration	257
Unannounced fees	81	Call centre and call issues - unreachable	181
Lack of extra-curricular activities	11		

The concerns of administration involve the way the system is organised to facilitate students. Students in their 1-star reviews have confirmed the poor time tabling, class cancellation, affiliation with poor tailor standards – for centres associated with military.

Facilities oriented concerns often involved poor parking facilities, poor hostels (by those centres providing services). Often parking facilities were cited as necessity. Premium schools that charged over LKR 1.4 million/programme, often cited parking issues. While, infrastructure complaints from students through loan scheme or military academy – often highlighted concerns with reference to hostels.

Academic issues pointed out on the reviews highlight poor standard of lecturers, lecturing, Favouritism, Assignments without deadline, improper approvals for programmes, marking/exam results delay, unclear explanation of subjects & working (Accounting subjects).

Learners often pointed out management; for concerns of fees, appropriate managers in place to talk to, when a concern persists. Often the concept of “management doesn’t care” was propping up. This is reflective of the student’s expecting the

management to give an ear. “Money oriented” is another complaint, where students often referred to having to pay hidden fees.

Call centre and call related issues highlights not answering calls.

Learner often complained of unannounced fees charged by institutions for attestation, steep graduation fees.

Poor administration issues covered issues with certificates, poor set up for students to follow up on concerns, not uploading lecture material on time, letters and support systems are lacking, the improper registration of students to right programmes.

Student support is synonymous with customer service in the corporate industry. A HEI has to cater to the requirements of industry, learner aspirations and also fulfil the requirements of the job market, regulatory.

Unprofessional staff standards refer to poor response by staff members, decretory statements made, untruthful information provided to students upon enrolment.

**Table 05: An analysis of B\*\* reviews**

Concerns noted in 1*reviews	Frequency	Positives noted in 5* review	Frequency
Unprofessional conduct	1	Admissions in Northumbria University UK & Study abroad	8
Poor student support	1	Student support	24
Cross-departmental politics	1	Academic quality	18
Exam questions being out of syllabus	1		
Canteen Food quality	1		
Employee concerns	1		
Excessive fees	1		
No comments	12		

A total of 50 positive reviews were studied out of 168 reviews available. Only 19 reviews were in one star for BMS. Google reviews which allow to display reviews without comments there were a total of 9.

It could be identified that any centre has three (3) key negatives and three (3) key positives that are available to transform and facilitate the reviews that are generated

### **Future Research Areas**

Future research could understand the different perceptions, emotions of trust, reliability associated by prospects due to seeing a review. Student decision choice of

a HEI due to reviews could be further explored. In terms of managerial contribution, this pilot study persuades FinTech marketers to give the centre of attention on engaging/thinking more as regards current pre-experience delivery on MarTech in order to reduce the gap between customers' MarTech usage intention and behaviour in the FinTech industry. Further, this study put forward a new triggering concept, but it's not yet tested. In the logic of practical scenarios, it gives valuable implications and interesting ideas for FinTech marketers. In the case of 'current pre-experience, when the customers' usage behaviour differs from their usage intention, FinTech marketers must put more effort to offer superior current pre-experience to their customers (Bueno et al., 2019) (e.g., by increasing the organization's reputation, visualizing something similar to social media timeline, offering alternative, competitive and comparable services (Chahal & Dutta, 2015) and facilitating support chat and personal assistance). Furthermore, FinTech marketers can trigger the customers' usage intention as actual usage behaviour through positional experience and reputational experience as their experiential marketing strategy (e.g., create loyal customers through greater service experiences by personal banker, giving compatible positional experience, increase the banks' recognition through reputation).

## **CONCLUSION & CONTRIBUTIONS**

The findings from the research could be listed out as below.

- Finding 1: Extreme satisfaction or dissatisfaction noted with detailed comments

Those whom were extremely satisfied or dissatisfied often posted concerns in a very detailed manner. Often the number of words on average exceeded 23 words. The displeasure or the positive experience was experience.

- Finding 2: Digital orientation of marketers within the HEI

Marketing strategy when warranted focus on Google reviews, there has been a consistent focus on Google reviews. It is visible that the involvement of digital agencies and digital roles within the organisation, has led to participation and involvement of the management. The ratio of positive reviews over negative reviews, led to a positive "halo effect".

- Finding 3: Management engagement in reviews increases positive reviews

When the learners identify that the management is concerned about the reviews, there is an overall attitude to show gratitude, and also thank the subject lecturers. Often learners mentioned specific names of the student support staff, lecturers to thank for their services. Often recommendations were made to future students, showcasing their competency.

- Finding 4: Google reviews and their review quality may differ

Google never screens the review for quality of review. A person who has not been a student, can also comment on the place. When a new prospect looks at it, it could deviate the choices being made.

- Finding 5: Google local guides in education category are less than 1% of reviews

“Google local guide” is a name label given by Google to identify and promote reviews. Google Maps become sharper with the participation of Google Local Guides (2023).

- Finding 6: If Google reviews are not managed, the platform becomes biased with only negative reviews

It is observable that rarely management, involved to show positive affirmation. This could be because of a lack of digital orientation. There is a higher possibility for negative reviews and poor rating when management or the marketing team is not involved.

- Finding 7: Students become brand advocates

In Google, it was visible that students were advocating for the HEIs. Often showcasing their gratitude, student activities and participation. This was a clear difference between management/marketing motivated Google reviews and those which were focused by the students. In some instances, it was observable that the Google Business Page was managed by a student than the campus. Example SLIIT – where one of the negative reviews were responded by a student perspective.

- Finding 8: HEIs with branches did not have a specific strategy to centralise review feedback

ESOFT has had several operations such as that in the Marine drive, Computer study centres and Metro branches which have been focused on a “franchising” model. However, the different reviews both positive and negative have not been centralised to harbour benefit. The research composes of Metro branch block E to signify the recent building where new reviews are placed.

- Finding 9: Specific centre issues needs to be addressed

It was identifiable that students from AOD felt value for money was not met. This was the highest response. Students from AOG campus felt that the management did not have enough structure and standard of work. Highlighting specific concerns around it. Student support services were extremely lacking and phone calls were not answered as per reviews from Aquinas. Chairman who was in the lecture panel was harming the learning experience of Achievers Lanka. This leads to specific understanding.

FACTORS LEADING TO STUDENT DISSATISFACTION IN THE EDUCATION SECTOR; A STUDY OF GOOGLE REVIEWS FROM THE HIGHER EDUCATION INDUSTRY IN SRI LANKA

- Finding 10: Responding to only negative reviews and not having a system in place to capture positive reviews

It was noticeable that some centres such as UCL and NCHS had a habit of responding only to negative complaints. Therefore, it was visible that most learners took their complaints to the Google Business Page to vent their concerns. Probably a speedy solution could be encouraged when taken online. This harms the internal processors, and shows lack of quality-oriented practices within the centre.

### Recommendations

The following range of recommendations could be set out.

**Table 06: Strategies for handling NR**

Strategies for handling NR	Recommendations
Have a well-studied response	Provide the public/students with appropriate responses with exact response. Be polite, but firm in the approach taken, if the student is misinformed.
If any errors on the HEIs ensure appropriate corrections	Errors on the HEIs, ensure appropriate corrections, which is able to meet the proper discussions.
Engage with negative review	Provide your side of the story. It allows for a user/prospect to look at the situation objectively, beyond Negative review
Be active with social media and digital media	Often HEIs focused on ad placement. However, it was identifiable that centres that focused on ads, lacked the focus on managing the reviews.

### Contribution

This research adds to the existing literature and specifically focuses onto aspects of Google Reviews. Google reviews are relatively new to Sri Lanka, where the masses may rely on word of mouth. Managing the reviews, allows for HEIs to show confidence and capability, handling media. This research also provides for specific strategies that could be implemented by the digital marketing/marketing teams in an HEI.

### Limitations

Firstly, this research is undertaken with secondary source of references, with the researcher using Google reviews as the main source of information. Secondly, the research does involve the feedback gained from the reviews. Some of the reviews can be biased, placed by competition or by individuals whom do not know how to place an accurate review. This explains that over 82% of the reviews placed for 1 star do not explain, why a one-star review is placed. Some institutions do have branches such as ESOF and BCAS. Therefore, only the reviews from the main campus or metro branch are taken for analysis. Another significant area of concern in this research, is the validity of the complaints. Only a limited number of institutions were responding

to complaints. Of those who responded, WINSYS (2023) had an effective approach in countering the concerns that were raised. A one-star review, only proves student/public dissatisfaction. However, does not show the real situation & ground realities may differ.

## **ACKNOWLEDGMENT**

Dedicated to my Family! Colleagues! Peers! All the good people whom have made my study & livelihood possible!

## **CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

The authors declared no conflict of interest.

## **REFERENCES**

- Allard, T., Dunn, L. H., & White, K. (2020). Negative reviews, positive impact: Consumer empathetic responding to unfair word of mouth. *Journal of Marketing*, 84(4), 86-108.
- Baer, J., & Lemin, D. (2018). *Talk triggers: The complete guide to creating customers with word of mouth*. Penguin.
- Berger, J. (2013). *Contagious: How to build word of mouth in the digital age*. Simon and Schuster
- Chen, Z., & Yuan, M. (2020). Psychology of word of mouth marketing. *Current opinion in psychology*, 31, 7-10.
- Deeley, S. J., Fischbacher-Smith, M., Karadzhov, D., & Koristashevskaya, E. (2019). Exploring the 'wicked' problem of student dissatisfaction with assessment and feedback in higher education. *Higher Education Pedagogies*, 4(1), 385-405.
- Douglas, J. A., Douglas, A., McClelland, R. J., & Davies, J. (2015). Understanding student satisfaction and dissatisfaction: an interpretive study in the UK higher education context. *Studies in Higher Education*, 40(2), 329-349.
- Doveston, M., & Keenaghan, M. (2006). Improving classroom dynamics to support students' learning and social inclusion: A collaborative approach. *Support for Learning*, 21(1), 5-11.
- Ferri, F., Grifoni, P., & Guzzo, T. (2020). Online learning and emergency remote teaching: Opportunities and challenges in emergency situations. *Societies*, 10(4), 86.
- Google Business (2023) *Home*. Google.
- Google Business Profile (2023) *Manage now* (online) Accessed: [https://www.google.com/intl/en\\_uk/business/](https://www.google.com/intl/en_uk/business/)

FACTORS LEADING TO STUDENT DISSATISFACTION IN THE EDUCATION SECTOR; A STUDY  
OF GOOGLE REVIEWS FROM THE HIGHER EDUCATION INDUSTRY IN SRI LANKA

Google Keyword Planner (2023) *Keyword analysis*. Google.

Google Local Guide (2023) *General Conditions of Recognition* (online) Accessed:  
<https://maps.google.com/localguides/>

Gruber, T., Lowrie, A., Brodowsky, G. H., Reppel, A. E., Voss, R., & Chowdhury, I. N. (2012). Investigating the influence of professor characteristics on student satisfaction and dissatisfaction: A comparative study. *Journal of Marketing Education, 34*(2), 165-178.

Habib, S., & Hamadneh, N. N. (2021). Impact of perceived risk on consumers technology acceptance in online grocery adoption amid covid-19 pandemic. *Sustainability, 13*(18), 10221.

Haigh, M. M., & Wigley, S. (2015). Examining the impact of negative, user-generated content on stakeholders. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal, 20*(1), 63-75.

Homburg, C., & Wielgos, D. M. (2022). The value relevance of digital marketing capabilities to firm performance. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 50*(4), 666-688.

Kemp, E., Porter III, M., Albert, C., & Min, K. S. (2021). Information transparency: examining physicians' perspectives toward online consumer reviews in the United States. *International Journal of Healthcare Management, 14*(4), 1050-1056.

OFQUAL (2023) *General Conditions of Recognition* (online) Accessed:  
<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/ofqual-handbook/section-g-setting-and-delivering-the-assessment>

Ranaweera, H. M. B. P. (2021) Students' satisfaction towards the use of e-resources available in selected Sri Lankan universities during covid-19 pandemic. *Journal of Business, 8*(2), 2021-51.

Review Trackers (2022) *Review sites*. Review Tracker.  
<https://www.reviewtrackers.com/reports/>

Rosen, E. (2010). *Buzz: real-life lessons in word-of-mouth marketing*. Profile Books.

Sharmin, F., Sultan, M. T., Badulescu, D., Badulescu, A., Borma, A., & Li, B. (2021). Sustainable destination marketing ecosystem through smartphone-based social media: The consumers' acceptance perspective. *Sustainability, 13*(4), 2308.

Sinha, I. (2000). Cost transparency: The net's real threat to prices and brands. *Harvard Business Review, 78*(2), 43-43.

Slanshei (2023) *Non State Higher Education providers* (online) Accessed:  
<https://slanshei.lk/>

TRCSL (1 July, 2023) *Statistics*. TRCSL.

TVEC (2023) *Home*. TVEC. <https://www.tvec.gov.lk/>

Verma, S., & Yadav, N. (2021). Past, present, and future of electronic word of mouth (EWOM). *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 53, 111-128.

Zeithaml, V. A., Parasuraman, A., & Malhotra, A. (2002). Service quality delivery through web sites: a critical review of extant knowledge. *Journal of the academy of marketing science*, 30(4), 362-375.