

Customer Satisfaction Of ERP Software In Educational Institutions With Special Reference To Edship Technologies Pvt Ltd, Kochi

Mr SUDHIN.T.P¹, Ms SUMA.R²

¹Dept of Management Studies

²Assistant Professor, Dept of Management Studies

^{1, 2} Jawaharlal College of Engineering and Technology, Ottapalam

Abstract- *This study, titled "Customer Satisfaction of ERP Software in Educational Institutions with Special Reference to Edship Technologies Pvt Ltd, Kochi," evaluates the effectiveness and user satisfaction of Edship ERP in addressing the administrative needs of educational institutions. As digital solutions become vital for managing student data, attendance, fee collection, and academics, this research uses a descriptive method and structured questionnaires to assess user perceptions on usability, performance, support, and customization. Findings reveal that 76.5% of users believe adopting Edship ERP was the right decision, with high satisfaction in student management (76.4%) and attendance tracking (52.94%). While 52.9% would recommend the system, concerns remain over mobile accessibility (41.2% dissatisfaction) and technical issues (70.6% affected). Statistical analysis (Chi-square, ANOVA, T-tests) shows vendor reputation, cost-effectiveness, and user-friendliness significantly impact satisfaction. The study concludes that Edship ERP enhances institutional efficiency but recommends improvements in mobile integration, support services, and system customization to strengthen market presence.*

Keywords- ERP Software, Edship Technologies, Customer Satisfaction, Educational Institutions, User Experience, Digital Solutions, System Usability, Institutional Operations

I. INTRODUCTION

The education sector is rapidly adopting digital solutions, with ERP systems playing a key role in improving institutional efficiency and communication. Edship Technologies, a Kochi-based company, offers a cloud-based ERP tailored for educational institutions, supporting functions like attendance, academics, transport tracking, and real-time communication. By integrating smart hardware, Edship provides a comprehensive, scalable solution. Despite being a new entrant, it focuses on innovation and customization. This study aims to assess faculty and staff satisfaction, explore adoption factors, and evaluate Edship's marketing strategies to

enhance user experience and support its growth in the educational ERP market.

The school management software market is experiencing rapid growth, valued at \$17.09 billion in 2024 and projected to reach \$40.22 billion by 2029, driven by digital transformation, personalized learning, and the demand for cloud-based, mobile-friendly solutions. Future trends include AI, data analytics, LMS integration, cybersecurity, and blockchain. In India, the adoption of school management software has accelerated due to the Digital India initiative, with platforms like Fedena, Entab, and Campus Care widely used. Kerala stands out in this space, with strong government support through initiatives like Samagra and KITE, and widespread use of both government-supported and private cloud-based solutions for managing school operations, improving communication, and enhancing learning outcomes.

EdShip Technologies Private Limited is a Kochi-based edtech company specializing in cloud-based School Management Systems. Established under CIN U85500KL2024PTC090406, the company aims to streamline school administration and enhance communication among educators, students, and parents. With a paid-up capital of ₹9.6 lakhs, EdShip offers key features like student and parent portals, GPS-based transport tracking, online fee payment, real-time attendance alerts, assignment management, and school event updates. Designed for mobile accessibility, the platform supports efficient, user-friendly school operations. Led by directors Sneja Binoy, T.V. Jasna, Neethu Mohan, and Reeba Varghese, EdShip operates from Infopark-Kochi and is positioned to be a leading player in the educational technology sector.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Patel and Sharma (2019) highlighted that customization plays a key role in ERP satisfaction among Indian educational institutions. Institutions using tailored ERP features—such as personalized fee management and exam scheduling—reported higher satisfaction than those with standard systems. This

supports the value of customizable solutions like those offered by Edship Technologies.

Rathi and Verma (2017) examined challenges in ERP implementation in Indian educational institutions, noting that technical issues and poor integration with legacy systems reduced user satisfaction. The study emphasized the need for strong post-implementation support and regular updates key areas Edship Technologies should focus on to maintain high customer satisfaction.

Bhat and Yadav (2017) examined how ERP system adoption influences administrative efficiency and academic performance in educational institutions. Their study found that ERP systems significantly improved resource management and data access, leading to better administrative operations and academic outcomes. User satisfaction was strongly linked to these operational gains. The findings highlight the importance of ERP providers like Edship Technologies in continuing to enhance administrative processes and support informed decision-making.

III. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

PRIMARY OBJECTIVE

- Customer satisfaction of ERP software in educational institutions with special reference to Edship Technologies Pvt Ltd, Kochi.

SECONDARY OBJECTIVE

- To identify the key factors influencing institutions to choose Edship ERP.
- To assess the awareness and adoption of Edship ERP in educational institutions.
- To analyze the effectiveness of Edship ERP's marketing strategies and suggest ways to improve its market reach and competitiveness.

IV. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study uses a descriptive research design to assess employee satisfaction with welfare measures at Edship Technologies, Kochi. A census survey of 17 customers was conducted using structured questionnaires with Likert scales and close-ended questions. Primary data was collected directly, while secondary data came from online sources, journals, and articles. Statistical tools like percentage analysis, chi-square, cross-tabulation, weighted averages, and ANOVA were used to interpret the results and identify key areas for improvement.

V. DATA ANALYSIS

WEIGHTED AVERAGE

Factor	Rating					Total
	5	4	3	2	1	
Cost Effectiveness	8	2	5	2	0	17
User Friendly	5	4	6	2	0	17
Customization	6	2	4	5	0	17
Reputation of Vendor	8	1	6	2	0	17
After sales support	4	4	3	5	1	17

Factor influenced you to take Edship ERP

Weighted Average = $\sum(w_i \times x_i) / \sum w_i$

w_i = Weight assigned to each factor and x_i = Number of responses for each factor

Factor	Weighted Score	Weighted Average
Cost Effectiveness	69	$69 \div 17 = 4.06$
User Friendly	67	$67 \div 17 = 3.94$
Customization	65	$65 \div 17 = 3.82$
Reputation of Vendor	70	$70 \div 17 = 4.12$
After sales support	60	$60 \div 17 = 3.53$

INTERPRETATION

Reputation of Vendor has the highest weighted average 4.12, hence it was the most influential factor in choosing Edship ERP. Cost Effectiveness followed closely at 4.06 and After Sales Support had the lowest impact at 3.53.

CHI SQUARE

Hypothesis

- Null Hypothesis (H_0): There is no relationship between the source of awareness and the duration of ERP use.

- Alternative Hypothesis (H_1): There is a relationship between the source of awareness and the duration of ERP use.
- $P < 0.05$ reject H_0
- $P > 0.05$ accept H_0

Observed Table

Source of Awareness	Less than 3months	3 months – 6 months	6 months – 1 year	Total
Vendor Recommendation	1	7	3	11
Peer Institution	0	1	1	2
Online Research	0	1	0	1
Marketing Campaigns	1	2	0	3
Total	2	11	4	17

Expected Table

Source of Awareness	Less than 3months	3 months – 6 months	6 months – 1 year	Total
Vendor Recommendation	1.294118	7.117647	2.588235	11
Peer Institution	0.235294	1.294118	0.470588	2
Online Research	0.117647	0.647059	0.235294	1
Marketing Campaigns	0.352941	1.941176	0.705882	3
Total	2	11	4	17

$$\chi^2 = \sum (O - E)^2 \div E$$

- O = Observed frequency (from the table above)
- E = Expected frequency (calculated assuming no relationship)

$$E = (\text{Row Total} \times \text{Column Total}) \div \text{Grand Total}$$

Then, we compare observed and expected values.

Chi-Square Test Results:

- χ^2 (Chi-Square Statistic): 3.47
- Degrees of Freedom (df): $(\text{Rows} - 1) \times (\text{Columns} - 1)$
 $= (4-1) \times (3-1) = 6$
- p-value: 0.748

So accept the H_0

INTERPRETATION

Since p-value (0.748) > 0.05 , we fail to reject the null hypothesis. This means there is no significant association between the source of awareness and duration of use.

ANNOVA

Hypothesis

- Null Hypothesis (H_0): There is no significant difference in satisfaction levels.
- Alternative Hypothesis (H_1): At least one satisfaction level differs significantly from the others.

PARTICULARS	NO OF RESPONSE	Assigned Values
Highly Satisfied	4	5
Satisfied	13	4
Neither Satisfied Nor Dissatisfied	0	3
Dissatisfied	0	2
Highly Dissatisfied	0	1
TOTAL	17	

Satisfaction with Speed and Performance

Willingness to Continue Using Edship ERP

PARTICULARS	NO OF RESPONSE	Assigned Values
Strongly Agree	7	5
Agree	9	4
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	1	3
Disagree	0	2
Strongly disagree	0	1
TOTAL	17	

Step 1: Calculate the Group Means

The mean for each question:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{X}_1 &= 4(5) + 13(4) + 0(3) + 0(2) + 0(1) \div 17 \\ &= 20 + 52 \div 17 \\ &= 72 \div 17 = 4.24 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{X}_2 &= 7(5) + 9(4) + 1(3) + 0(2) + 0(1) \div 17 \\ &= 35 + 36 + 3 \div 17 \\ &= 74 \div 17 = 4.35\end{aligned}$$

Step 2 : The grand mean (GM):
 $GM = (4.24 + 4.35) \div 2 = 4.29$

Step 3: Between Group Variation (SSB)
 $SSB = 17(4.24 - 4.29)^2 + 17(4.35 - 4.29)^2 = 0.118$

Step 4: Within Group Variation (SSW)
 Group 1: $4 \times (5 - 4.24)^2 + 13 \times (4 - 4.24)^2 = 3.0592$
 Group 2: $7 \times (5 - 4.35)^2 + 9 \times (4 - 4.35)^2 + 1 \times (3 - 4.35)^2 = 5.8825$
 Total SSW = $3.0592 + 5.8825 = 8.9417$

Step 5: Degrees of Freedom
 $df_{\text{between}} = 1$
 $df_{\text{within}} = 32$

Step 6: Mean Squares
 $MSB = 0.118$
 $MSW = 0.279$

Step 7: F-ratio
 $F = MSB / MSW$
 $= 0.118 / 0.279$
 $= 0.421$

INTERPRETATION

p-value = 0.521 Since $p > 0.05$, we fail to reject the null hypothesis. Hence there is no significant difference between satisfaction levels for performance speed and service customization.

VI. SUGGESTIONS

- Develop a well-optimized mobile app with full ERP functionality and real-time notifications.
- Offer 24/7 customer support, live chat features, and self-help resources for faster issue resolution.
- Conduct regular system maintenance, implement an and enhance bug-fixing processes.
- Strengthen digital marketing efforts through SEO, social media campaigns, and targeted advertisements.
- Allow more flexibility in ERP module configurations to better align with diverse institutional needs.
- Organize regular training sessions, webinars, and interactive tutorials to improve user adoption.
- Offer cost-effective plans with additional features such as free updates and extended support.

- Enhance the system's reporting capabilities with customizable dashboards and real-time insights.
- Regularly collect and analyse user feedback to drive continuous ERP improvements.

VII. CONCLUSION

Edship ERP has improved faculty and staff satisfaction by streamlining administrative tasks and boosting operational efficiency in educational institutions. Users value its cost-effectiveness, user-friendly design, and reliability, especially in student management, attendance tracking, and exam management. While the software meets core institutional needs, improvements are needed in mobile accessibility, where users seek a more responsive, feature-rich experience. Edship should enhance mobile integration, provide regular updates, expand customization, and strengthen customer support and training resources. Faster issue resolution and robust security will further increase user trust. With growing demand for digital transformation, Edship is well-positioned to become a leading ERP provider in the education sector.

REFERENCES

- [1] V.K. Narayanan & Gopalaswamy Ramesh (2020). Enterprise Resource Planning: Concepts and Practices. Pearson India.
- [2] Murthy, C. S. V. (2017). Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP). Himalaya Publishing House.
- [3] Patel, A., & Sharma, K. (2019). Impact of Customization on ERP Satisfaction in Indian Educational Institutions. Asian Journal of Business and IT, 12(4), 76-90.
- [4] Bhat, R., & Yadav, P. (2017). ERP Implementation and its Impact on Administrative Efficiency in Higher Education. Global Journal of Management & Information Systems, 11(2), 89-105.
- [5] <https://www.edship.in/>
- [6] <https://www.researchgate.net/>
- [7] <https://www.google.com/>