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A B S T R A C T

This paper presents the dataset that estimate the effect of factors on students' satisfaction and their academic performance. The questionnaire with a five-Likert scale were adapted and developed from prior researches. The sample consisted of 430 fulfilled respondents using stratified random sampling, which recruited from eight private universities in the North of Vietnam. A quantitative method was employed to examine the data. Cronbach's Alpha, Exploratory Factor Analysis, Confirmatory Factor Analysis were utilized to test the reliability and validity of each variable as well as the model fit. Then, the structural equation modeling was used to estimate path coefficients, which can serve as a good reference for further researches.
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Specifications Table

| Subject               | Social sciences           |
|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| Specific subject area | Education                 |
| Type of data          | Tables and figures        |
| How data were acquired| Survey with questionnaire |
| Data format           | Raw and analysed statistical data |
| Parameters for data collection | Participants who are full-time students at private universities in Vietnam decided to take part in the survey voluntarily. |
| Description of data collection | Data were collected by stratified random sampling and based on Internet platforms. The survey was designed by Google Form and the questionnaire was distributed to students who are studying at private universities in Vietnam. The data set consisted of 430 valid responses. |
| Data source location  | City/Town/Region: Private universities, which located in the North of Vietnam. |
| Data accessibility    | Country: Vietnam |
|                       | Latitude and longitude (and GPS coordinates, if possible) for collected samples/data: 21.028511, 105.804817; 21.18608, 106.07631; 20.959902, 107.042542. |
|                       | https://data.mendeley.com/datasets/hmp8vbyw5m/draft?a=6bfc6425-332e-414a-9899-762aa8802d0e |

Value of the Data

• This data reflects the satisfaction and academic performance among students at private universities in Vietnam.
• This data presents useful information on key factors related to student satisfaction and their academic performance.
• This data can be served as a reference source for researchers who are interested in the educational sector.
• Examining the influence of factors, including education program, quality of academic staff, service accessibility, training environment and university facilities, on student satisfaction and academic performance not only enables universities and educational administrators to have better solutions to boost the satisfaction and academic performance among students, but it can also help policymakers to propose the appropriate policy to enhance the educational quality of universities.

1. Data Description

Student satisfaction and academic performance has been a main focus of both scholars and policymakers in the competitive studying environment [1,2]. Surveying student perception is also considered the most common approach to examine and improve the educational quality of universities [3]. Thus, the vital role of factors such as education program, quality of academic staff, service accessibility, training environment and university facilities in shaping student satisfaction and their academic performance is interested and acknowledged in the education literature [4]. However, there are limited datasets of primary data which is available to explore the effect of factors on satisfaction and academic performance among students at universities.

Moreover, the supplementary role of primary data in that case bases on the multidimensional nature of student satisfaction, academic performance as well as how to quantify it. Firstly, the dataset aims to provide raw data, which was directly surveyed from students, to estimate their academic performance, satisfaction. Secondly, it aims to provide the statistical evidence on the effect of education program, quality of academic staff, service accessibility, training environment and university facilities on students' satisfaction and academic performance. In order to reach these objectives. A questionnaire has been developed and administered to students who attended undergraduate programs at private universities in Vietnam. An outline of fundamental insights utilizing descriptive statistics, exploratory factor analysis (EFA),
confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), and structural equation modeling (SEM) is represented in following sections.

Section A: Testing the validity and reliability through Cronbach’s Alpha, exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA).

Table 1 shows that the Cronbach’s alpha of all scales are higher than 0.63 with the lowest level reaching 0.852 (Universities Facilities). Also, the factor loading of each variable is over 0.5.

| Variable                          | Cronbach’s Alpha (α) | Factor loading (λᵢ) |
|----------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| Education Program (UP)           | 0.897                | (1) 0.737          |
| EP1                              |                      | (2) 0.731          |
| EP2                              |                      | (3) 0.711          |
| EP3                              |                      | (4) 0.691          |
| EP4                              |                      | (5) 0.676          |
| EP5                              |                      | (6) 0.669          |
| EP6                              |                      |                     |
| EP7                              |                      |                     |
| EP8                              |                      |                     |
| EP9                              |                      |                     |
| EP10                             |                      |                     |
| Quality of academic Staff (QS)   | 0.921                | (1) 0.759          |
| QS1                              |                      | (2) 0.729          |
| QS2                              |                      | (3) 0.681          |
| QS3                              |                      | (4) 0.672          |
| QS4                              |                      | (5) 0.653          |
| QS5                              |                      | (6) 0.632          |
| QS6                              |                      |                     |
| QS7                              |                      |                     |
| QS8                              |                      |                     |
| QS9                              |                      |                     |
| QS10                             |                      |                     |
| Service Accessibility            | 0.907                | (1) 0.769          |
| SA1                              |                      | (2) 0.750          |
| SA2                              |                      | (3) 0.720          |
| SA3                              |                      | (4) 0.718          |
| SA4                              |                      | (5) 0.718          |
| SA5                              |                      | (6) 0.621          |
| SA6                              |                      |                     |
| Training Environment             | 0.896                | (1) 0.756          |
| TE1                              |                      | (2) 0.745          |
| TE2                              |                      | (3) 0.720          |
| TE3                              |                      | (4) 0.718          |
| TE4                              |                      | (5) 0.616          |
| TE5                              |                      | (6) 0.585          |
| University Facilities            | 0.852                | (1) 0.749          |
| UF1                              |                      | (2) 0.721          |
| UF2                              |                      | (3) 0.706          |
| UF3                              |                      | (4) 0.655          |
| UF4                              |                      | (5) 0.649          |
| UF5                              |                      |                     |
| Academic Performance             | 0.864                | (1) 0.794          |
| AP1                              |                      | (2) 0.749          |
| AP2                              |                      | (3) 0.737          |
| AP3                              |                      | (4) 0.673          |
| AP4                              |                      |                     |
| Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy (KMO) | 0.944 |
| Sig. Of Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity | 0.000     |
| Cumulative (%)                  |                     | 62.105             |
Fig. 1. The result of Confirmatory Factor Analysis.

Table 2
Path coefficients and Regression weights.

| Path coefficients                  | Estimate | S.E. | C.R. | P-value |
|------------------------------------|----------|------|------|---------|
| Service Accessibility → Academic performance | 0.153    | 0.054| 2.863| 0.004   |
| Quality of academic Staff → Academic performance | 0.286    | 0.060| 4.776| *****    |
| University Facilities → Academic performance | 0.126    | 0.044| 2.886| 0.004   |
| Education Program → Academic performance | 0.122    | 0.048| 2.526| 0.012   |
| Training Environment → Academic performance | 0.094    | 0.049| 1.892| 0.058   |
| Academic performance → Student Satisfaction | 0.114    | 0.044| 2.609| 0.009   |
| Service Accessibility → Student Satisfaction | 0.180    | 0.039| 4.590| *****    |
| Quality of academic Staff → Student Satisfaction | 0.389    | 0.050| 7.813| *****    |
| University Facilities → Student Satisfaction | 0.099    | 0.036| 2.764| 0.006   |
| Education Program → Student Satisfaction | 0.081    | 0.039| 2.069| 0.039   |
| Training Environment → Student Satisfaction | 0.109    | 0.040| 2.699| 0.007   |

Note: N = 430.

** *** < 0.001.

It means that the value of the factor loading estimated from latent variables via observed items and reliability coefficient.

The results of model fit test via using Chi-square, CMIN/DF, GFI, AGFI, CFI, TLI, GFI and RMSEA are summarized in Fig. 1. Although GFI = 0.861 and AGFI = 0.842, almost other values ≥ 0.9. Thus, the model fit is satisfactory, the validity and reliability of all variables are reached [6].

Section B: path coefficients estimated through structural equation modeling (SEM).

The result of structural equation modeling (SEM) is represented in Fig. 2, while Table 2 describes the regression weights, which can be utilized to examine the linkage between statistical variables in the structural model. Results indicates that quality of academic staff has the strongest effect on students’ academic performance ($\beta = 0.286$; $p$-value < 0.001), followed by
Fig. 2. Measurement and structural equation model.

Table 3
The results of direct, indirect and total effect.

| Path                        | Direct effect | Indirect effect (AP mediator) | Total effects |
|-----------------------------|---------------|-------------------------------|---------------|
| Service Accessibility → Student Satisfaction | Estimate | P-value | Estimate | P-value | Estimate | P-value |
| Quality of academic Staff → Student Satisfaction | 0.180 | *** | 0.017 | 0.030 | 0.197 | 0.002 |
| University → Student Satisfaction | 0.389 | *** | 0.022 | 0.010 | 0.441 | 0.003 |
| Facilities → Student Satisfaction | 0.099 | 0.006 | 0.023 | 0.001 | 0.122 | 0.002 |
| Education Program → Student Satisfaction | 0.081 | 0.039 | 0.051 | 0.002 | 0.132 | 0.001 |
| Training Environment → Student Satisfaction | 0.109 | 0.007 | 0.028 | 0.004 | 0.137 | 0.009 |
| Academic performance → Student Satisfaction | 0.114 | 0.009 | – | – | 0.114 | 0.009 |

Note: N = 430.
*** < 0.001.

service accessibility (β = 0.153; p-value < 0.01), university facilities (β = 0.126; p-value < 0.01), and education program (β = 0.112; p-value < 0.05). However, students’ academic performance is not related to training environment (p-value > 0.05).

Also, student satisfaction is most strongly affected by quality of academic staff (β = 0.389; p-value < 0.001). Service accessibility (β = 0.180; p-value < 0.01), academic performance (β = 0.114; p-value < 0.01), university facilities (β = 0.099; p-value < 0.01), education program (β = 0.081; p-value < 0.05), and training environment (β = 0.109; p-value < 0.01) is positively related to student satisfaction.

1000 bootstrap samples with a confident degree of 90% is utilized to estimate indirect paths. Table 3 presents direct, indirect and total impacts of factors on student satisfaction. Results show that all linkages between service accessibility, quality of academic staff, university facilities, education program, training environment and student satisfaction are mediated by academic performance.
2. Experimental Design, Materials and Methods

The questionnaire has already been adapted and developed from previous researches [5]. The questions were rated in a 5 Likert-type format from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree. The survey was performed through the second semester of the academic year 2019–2020. The sample included a total number of 430 students recruited from 8 private universities utilizing stratified random sampling with three-phase procedure. First, eight private universities, including Hanoi University of Business and Technology (HUBT), Phuong Dong University (PDU), Phenikaa University (PU), Thang Long University (TLU), Dai Nam University (DNU), University of Technology and Management (UTM), FPT University (FPT), and Thanh Do University (TDU) were randomly selected from twenty-six ones located in the North of Vietnam. Secondly, five classes at each private university were randomly sampled that based on their studying field. Finally, the research directly distributed the questionnaires to emails of participants at these classes with the supports of teachers. Students were informed that they can take part in the survey voluntarily and their information will be secure and only utilize for the research purpose. Although the sample size only accounted for 430 respondents, however, that is enough for structure equation modeling and the stratified random sampling approach can improve the confidentiality and representativity of the sample [6].

The quantitative analysis was conducted to analyze the data. Particularly, the Cronbach’s alpha, exploratory factor analysis (EFA), and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) were utilized to examine the internal reliability and validity of each scales, then structural equation modeling (SEM) was conducted to explore path coefficients, which was seen as the most appropriate and efficient estimation of the methods for multiple regression analysis. Data is processed using SPSS 23.0 and AMOS 23.0.
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