Students' Satisfaction with the University of Cape Coast Residential and Academic Experiences

Michael Boakyi-Yiadom
Institute for Educational Planning and Administration
University of Cape Coast, Ghana

Abstract

The purpose of the study is to explore students' satisfaction with the University of Cape Coast experience. The study adopted a sequential explanatory mixed-method design and used current students as the population of the study. A sample size of 420 students was used for the study. The study used questionnaires and focus group interview guides to obtain data from participants. The study used descriptive statistics and a thematic analysis approach to analyse the data obtained. The study revealed that students are less satisfied with residential services and attributed this to irregular water supply, unsanitary toilet and urinal facilities, congestion in student rooms. Furthermore, the study showed that students were less satisfied with some academic services. The study recommended that the leadership of departments, faculties and colleges need to review their curriculum with the approval of the Academic Board to enhance students' practical experiences in their academic programmes.

Keywords: academic, resident, higher education, service, student satisfaction

Introduction

Schools, colleges and universities have no value without students. Students are the most essential asset for any educational institute. Demands of students towards higher education institutions have drastically increased as they are more aware of the high tuition fees that they have to pay during their courses (Jones, 2006). The massification of higher education with a greater range and variety of students has also contributed to complex levels of student expectations and explanatory variables that influence and increase student satisfaction levels at universities.

Fortino (2012) claimed the creation of prepared minds of students as the purpose of higher education. Hence, higher education institutions are increasingly recognising and placing greater emphasis on meeting the expectations and needs of their customers; that is, the students (DeShields Jr, Ali, & Erdener, 2005). So, successful completion and enhancement of students' education are the major reasons for the existence of higher educational institutions. This positive development in higher education shows the importance of educational institutions understanding student satisfaction in a competitive environment

(Yusoff, McLeay, & Woodruffe-Burto, 2015). Now the higher education industry is strongly affected by globalisation. This has increased the competition among higher education institutions to adopt market-oriented strategies to differentiate themselves from their competitors to attract as many students as possible satisfying current students' needs and expectation.

In non-compulsory higher education systems, students are considered the primary customers of a university (Douglas, McClelland & Davies, 2008). Hence, a critical need for universities to compete is identifying factors that drive students' satisfaction levels with their learning environments (Alvis & Raposo, 2006). The student satisfaction level relies on educational experiences, services and facilities students encounter during the learning process (Elliott & Shin, 2002; Weerasinghe & Dedunu, 2017; Weerasinghe & Fernando, 2017). The student satisfaction level is a function of the relative level of experiences and perceived performance of educational services provided by higher educational institutions (Mukhtar, Ahmed, Anwar & Baloch, 2015).

Student satisfaction definitions have varied widely depending on the research approach and focus. In this study, student satisfaction was examined from an educational perspective. Elliott and Healy (2001) defined student satisfaction as a temporary attitude from an evaluation of a student's educational experience and claimed that student satisfaction was achieved when their actual experiences or performances met or exceeded their initial expectations. Aldridge and Rowley (1998) divided student satisfaction evaluations into two categories, with the first being focused on classroom teaching and learning evaluation and the second being focused on the comprehensive student experience. For this study, student satisfaction is defined as student happiness or contentment with their overall college experience. Elliott and Shin (2002) define students' satisfaction as the favourability of a students' subjective evaluation of the various outcomes and experiences associated with education, student satisfaction is being shaped continually by repeated experiences in campus life.

Kotler, Lane, Koshy, and Jha (2009) define satisfaction as a person's feeling of pleasure that results from comparing a product's perceived performance (or outcome) to their expectation. It means if the performance matches the expectation, the customer will be satisfied. In the context of higher education, the matter of satisfaction is what students expect from their educational institution, in fact, everything that makes them eligible to become productive and successful person in their practical lives. Reid (2008) has classified a few

basic characteristics that employers normally seek from university graduate. Reid further states that these include knowledge, intellectual abilities, working in modern organisations, interpersonal skills, and communication skills. Besides, there are other invisible characteristics required by the market and that includes the willingness to learn, be participative and positive to work in teams, problem-solving skills, analytical abilities, leadership qualities, adaptability, flexibility, ability to summarise key issues, and last but not least the ability to be productive and loyal team/organisational member. The attainment of these skills and abilities is what parents expect when they decide to send their children to higher education in universities.

One of the issues under consideration is whether university graduates are provided with the necessary facilities that make their experience conducive and the attainment of the necessary competencies and skills possible. This is crucial not only to students' success but to the growth of the national economy of the country. In this regard, Umbach and Porter (2002) argued that the institutional impact on the students' outcome is still unknown, and if anything is known, that is somewhat contradictory. Moreover, it is worth mentioning that different academic disciplines vary in terms of their application of practical problems, cognitive processes, faculty time commitment and scholarly output.

Students' satisfaction is a multidimensional process that is influenced by different factors. According to Walker-Marshall and Hudson (as cited in Weerasinghe & Fernando, 2017), Grade Point Average (GPA) is the most influential factor in student satisfaction. Appleton-Knapp & Krentler (2006) identified two groups of influences on student satisfaction in higher education as personal and institutional factors. Personal factors include age, gender, employment, preferred learning style, student's GPA and institutional factors cover quality of instructions, promptness of the instructor's feedback, clarity of expectation and teaching style. Wilkins and Balakrishnan (2013) identified quality of lecturers, quality of physical facilities and effective use of technology as key determinant factors of student satisfaction. Besides, student satisfaction in universities is greatly influenced by the quality of the classroom, quality of feedback, lecturer-student relationship, interaction with fellow students, course content, available learning equipment, library facilities and learning materials (Sojkin, Bartkowiak, & Skuza, 2012). In addition to that, teaching ability, flexible curriculum, university status and prestige, independence, caring of faculty, student growth and development, student-centeredness, campus climate, institutional effectiveness and social conditions have been identified

as major determinants of student satisfaction in higher education (DeShields Jr, Ali, & Erdener, 2005; Palacio, Meneses & Perez-Perez, 2002).

According to Khurshid and Arshad (2012), there are many factors affecting students' satisfaction related to their educational institute. These are:

1. Faculty Approachability: The relationship between students and faculty is very important for the success of the student and the institute, and to facilitate this relationship approachability is very important. It involves accessibility and approachability of faculty or teachers inside and outside of the institute for the student.

2. Learning Experiences: Providing meaningful learning experiences to students is the important mission of educational institutes. It helps to produce economically independent and civic responsible citizens. When meaningful learning experiences are absent, then students become dissatisfied.

3. Learning Environment: Satisfaction with the learning environment of the institute positively affect the learning of students. If the educational institution provides a healthy environment student will be more comfortable and satisfied.

4. Students' views and participation: The approach of students' satisfaction emerges from the belief that students' views matter. At higher level education students should be recognised as a key stakeholder as such freedom should be given to students for feedback because it is very important for quality assurance.

5. Instructional Effectiveness: Effectiveness of instruction and teachers are very important in and out of the class for students' satisfaction.

Students' different types of experiences and characteristics affect satisfaction level. Academic experiences and faculty preparedness directly affect campus services (Thomas & Galambos, 2004). Many studies have identified the factors influencing student satisfaction in higher education. Napoli and Wortman (1998) assessed that psychological measures, that is life events during university, self-esteem, social competence, social support, personal conscientiousness, psychological well-being and satisfaction of the academic, administrative and social systems of universities have an impact on university persistence among students. However, it is not known what the situation is at the University of Cape Coast (UCC).

The impact of educational services provided by UCC on the satisfaction level of its students has largely been an area that remains unexplored. Higher education institutions especially universities are similar to practice grounds where students learn and acquire all the necessary skills and abilities that potential employers in the job market seek. To ensure that this is the case, UCC tends to package its services which include i) core services i.e. knowledge, intellectual abilities, interpersonal and communication skills; ii) actual services i.e. degrees like undergraduate and postgraduate through regular teaching and research; and iii) augmented services including infrastructure i.e., building, transportation facilities, libraries, labs, computer labs, hostel/residence facilities, medical, sports, and lecture facilities coupled with administrative support. The underlying question in this study is whether UCC students are satisfied with the services. To measure personal satisfaction of the university students' experience, this study was initiated to empirically measure the phenomenon taking UCC as a case.

Research Questions

1. How are students at the University of Cape Coast satisfied with residential services?

2. How are students at the University of Cape Coast satisfied with academic services?

Method

Study Design

The study aimed at exploring, understanding, documenting, explaining and reporting students' satisfaction with the University of Cape Coast experience. In line with this, the study explored both quantitative and qualitative data in the form of insights from semi-structured face-to-face interviews, focus group interviews and questionnaire from students will be collected for analysis. A sequential explanatory mixed-method design was therefore preferred for this study (Creswell & Plano, 2011). This method begins with qualitative phase of data collection and analysis, followed by a phase of quantitative data collection and analysis, with a final stage of integration of data from the two separate types of data. This, we believe, was the most appropriate design to enable the researchers to explain quantitative results by using qualitative data to explore certain findings. This helped to explain unexpected results (e.g., using follow-up focus group discussions to understand better the results of a quantitative study).

Population

The population of the study was made of all undergraduate students at the University of Cape Coast. According to the Directorate of Academics Affairs, the estimated target population was 18,679 students for the 2018/2019 academic year. The target population consisted of Level 100 (5,001 students), Level 200 (4,919 students), Level 300 (4,348 students) and Level 400 (4,411 students). Furthermore, there were 11,438 males and 7,241 female students at the University of Cape Coast. These students were used for the study because the researchers believe that these students have benefited from the services and would therefore have better ideas about the University of Cape Coast experience. Table 1 presented the level and gender characteristics of the target population.

Table 1
Distribution of Estimated Target Population

Level	Male	Female	Total
100	2919	2082	5001
200	2889	2030	4919
300	2663	1685	4348
400	2967	1444	4411
Total	11438	7241	18679

Source: Students Records, UCC (2019)

Sample Size and Sampling Strategy

Recognising the importance of sample size and sampling strategy in research as they determine how participants of a study are selected. The researchers employed a sample size and sampling strategy that best offers the needed information for data-driven findings that inform policy, practice and further research. Sample and sampling refer to the process of learning about the population of a study based on a part drawn from it (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2011). The study used stratified, simple random and purposive sampling techniques to select sample size for the study. The stratified sampling technique was used to group the students into four levels (Level 100, Level 200, Level 300 and Level 400). The purposive sampling was used to 20 students for the focus group (FG) discussions (five students from each level). Finally, the simple random sampling technique was used to select students from various levels. Considering the purpose of the study, the research questions, the choice of mixed-method design, and taking into account Krejcie and Morgan's (1970) formula for selecting sample size for research studies, the sample size for the proposed study was 400 participants.

The equation below expresses how samples were selected from each Level:

$$Sample\ size\ (LEVEL) =$$

$$\frac{Total\ population\ at\ a\ Level}{Total\ population\ of\ students} \times\ sample\ size\ required$$

Table 2 presents sample size representation based on Level and gender.

Table 2
Distribution of Sample Size Based on Level and Gender

Level	Male	Female	FG	Total
100	63	44	5	112
200	62	43	5	110
300	57	36	5	98
400	64	31	5	100
Total	246	154	20	420

Source: Field data (2019)

The researchers used stratified sampling and simple random sampling techniques to select the sample for the research. Participants were stratified according to level and gender. The simple random sampling technique was used to select 400 students (246 male and 154 female students). An overall sample size of 420 participants (survey=400, focus group discussion=20) was used for the study.

Data Collection Instruments
The study used a questionnaire and focus group guide were used to data. The researcher designed the instruments. The questionnaire contained 14 items. Triangulation was used in this study to enhance the validity and reliability of the instruments. The instruments were content-validated by two experts in the field of Higher Education (one each from the Centre for Diversity and Inclusion in Higher Education at the University of Maryland, USA; and Institute for Educational Planning and Administration, UCC). The questionnaire was pilot tested on 60 students comprising 35 males and 25 females at the University of Ghana. The Cronbach's alpha for the questionnaire was 0.89. Furthermore, a field test was conducted to ascertain the trustworthiness and credibility of the interview and focus group discussion guides. This served as a justification and precursor to this study. The pilot study and field test revealed the flaws in the research design were corrected to make the study research design much

better. The validity and reliability of the findings of this study were ensured and assured by following through with the necessary research follow-up activities and analytical procedures to ground the findings in the evidence generated.

Data Collection Approach

A questionnaire, interview guide and focus group interview guide were the data collection instruments employed to gather data from the 400 participants who are undergraduate students of the University of Cape Coast. With approval and permission from the UCC Institutional Review Board, the researcher administered the questionnaires to students at their lecture rooms. The completed questionnaires were retrieved the same day. The researchers conducted 4 thirty-five minutes focus group discussions with 5 students from each level.

Data Management and Analytical Approach

The study aimed at exploring students' satisfaction with the University of Cape Coast experience. Quantitative data from the study were analysed by using descriptive statistics (frequencies, percentages, means and standard deviation). The criterion for judging the satisfaction or otherwise of service was that a mean of means scores of 2.50 or higher showed that students were satisfied with the service while a score less than 2.50 indicated that students were not satisfied with the service offered. Data derived through semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions with the participants was analysed qualitatively using NVivo. This ensured that responses from the focus group and face-to-face interviews are analysed thematically, drawing out key issues, observations and lessons that helped gain insights into students' satisfaction with the University of Cape Coast experience.

Findings

This section is the presentation of data obtained from participants which gave rise to a wealth of information and richness of themes that fell both within and beyond the scope of this research exercise. Data was analysed based on research questions. The descriptive statistics tools (means and standard deviation) were used to analyse the quantitative data. The qualitative data (focus group discussion) was analysed using content analysis. The themes arising out of the data analysis are presented below:

Students' Satisfaction with Residential Services

Research Question one sought to determine how students at the University of

Cape Coast were satisfied with residential services. The data obtained from the respondents were analysed using means and standard deviation. A cut-off point of 2.5 was used to establish the level of satisfaction as against the means and mean of means. A higher mean above the cut-off point implies that most of the participants agreed to the statement and vice versa. The results are presented in Table 3.

Table 3

Residence Services

Statement	M	SD
Rooms are spacious and conducive	1.57	.50
Good water, toilet and urinal facilities	1.57	.50
Facilities are disability-friendly	2.09	.75
Free and high-speed internet facility	1.56	.75
Total	1.70	.63

Source: Field survey (2019)

The purpose of this research question was to determine students' satisfaction with residential services. It can be seen from the table that the item 'facilities are disability friendly' recorded the highest mean of 2.09 and a standard deviation of 0.75. Next to this, good water supply, toilet and urinal facilities (M=1.57, SD=0.50), rooms are spacious and conducive (M=1.57, SD=0.50), and free and high-speed internet facility (M=1.56, SD=0.75). Again, the majority of the participants indicated that all the traditional halls apart from SRC and Superannuation - i.e., bedbugs' infestation, sockets repairs, etc. (388 [97%]), study areas i.e., projector, fans etc. (376 [94%]), washrooms (400 [100%]), internet (340 [85%]), and utilities (372 [93%]) – need improvement in the provision of residential services.

The overall mean and standard deviation scores obtained in this section were as follows; M=1.70 and SD=0.63. The overall mean score of students' satisfactions with residential service fell below the cut-off point of 2.5 indicating poor residential services with regards to facilities and service delivery. This was similar to the views of students during the focus group discussion. Some of the critical statements of the participants are:

> As for the residential services, it depends on some parts of the campus. Some students stay at good hostels and others stay at very bad hostels. In some halls, for instance, the furniture, the beds and other items don't make you feel comfortable. I entered some hostels and the ventilation was

very bad. How the hostel was situated and structured, when I entered the heat was unbearable so I think the university authorities should check that because it is not the best. (Participant 1, Level; 300)

Even with the halls on campus, they don't give full attention to students because you lodge a complaint and they won't mind you because they feel you came to meet it and then people have been living with it so why can't you cope with it that seems to be the system here. I see this to be a very bad practice because that is what have been affecting the whole country, we have a poor maintenance culture and if the university is not able to provide these basic services at the end of the day there will be deterioration in facilities. (Participant 3; Level 200)

Students' Satisfaction with Academic Services

Research question two sought to determine the satisfaction of students at the University of Cape Coast with academic services. The data obtained from the respondents were analysed using means and standard deviation. This research question had two sections; Section 'A' elicited views of students on academic instruction based on their colleges, whiles Section 'B' elicited responses on academic activities. A cut-off point of 2.5 was used to establish the level of satisfaction as against the means and mean of means. A higher mean above the cut-off point implies that most of the participants agreed to the statement and vice versa. The results are presented in Table 4.

Table 4
Students' Satisfaction with Academic Services

Statement	M	SD
How satisfied have you been with the quality of instruction in:		
Humanities, Art and Legal Studies	2.62	.80
Education Studies	2.82	.66
Agriculture and Natural Science	2.44	.97
Health and Allied Sciences	2.68	.60

During the current academic year, how often have you done each of the following activities:		
Participated in class discussion	2.55	.96
Participated in hands-on activities (lab work, experiments, project-based experiences, etc.	2.38	1.00
Attended a campus lecture, conference, symposium or arts event required by a course	2.52	.93
Used a computer to analyse data (statistics, forecasting, etc.)	2.34	1.07
Total	2.45	.99
How satisfied have you been with your undergraduate education so?		
Overall Satisfaction	**2.21**	**.65**

Source: Field survey (2019)

The purpose of this research question was to determine students' satisfaction with academic services. From Table 6, College of Education Studies recorded the highest mean 2.82 and a standard deviation of 0.66, College of Health and Allied Sciences (M=2.68, SD=0.60), College of Humanities, Art and Legal Studies (M=2.62, SD=0.80), and College of Agriculture and Natural Science (M=2.44, SD=0.97). This implies that all the colleges (College of Education Studies, College of Health and Allied Sciences and College of Humanities, Art and Legal Studies) offer satisfactory academic instruction except College of Agriculture and Natural Science that needs improvement.

Furthermore, it can be seen from the table that the item 'participated in class discussion' recorded the highest mean of 2.55 and a standard deviation of 0.96. Next, to this, attended a campus lecture, conference, symposium or arts event not required by a course (M=2.52, SD=0.93), participated in hands-on activities [lab work, experiments, project-based experiences, etc.] (M=2.38, SD=1.00), and used a computer to analyse data (statistics, forecasting, etc.) (M=2.34, SD=1.07). The overall mean and standard deviation scores obtained in this section were as follows; M=2.45 and SD=0.99. The overall mean score of students' satisfactions with academic services fell below the cut-off point of 2.5, indicating poor services with regards to academic activities. Again, the overall satisfaction (M=2.22, SD=0.65) of students concerning their undergraduate education fell below the cut-off point. These findings were similar to the views of students expressed during the focus group discussion. Some of the critical statements of the participants are:

For me, I am not satisfied at all. My programme of study is supposed to be more practical but then we are being taught more of the theoretical aspect and then we are asked to do an internship after Level 300 during the long break which lasts for a month or something. So, my problem has to do with the practical aspect. (Participant 1; Level 300)

I would say they are not satisfied with academic services because most students, especially, new students (freshers) find it hard to cope with the academic services on campus. (Participant 4; Level 400)

I am not satisfied with the academic as my programme happens to be a new one and me being part of the first batch of the student. The lecturers had to improvise with teaching some courses which were new to them as such had a challenge grasping concept yet alone knowledge. (Participant 2; Level 100)

Discussion

The study revealed that students are not satisfied with residential services concerning water, toilet and urinal facilities; rooms spacious and conduciveness; and disability friendliness of facilities. Again, the majority of the participants indicated that all the traditional halls apart from SRC and Superannuation provided sufficient residential facilities like bedbugs, sockets repairs, fans, lighting system, washrooms, internet, and services. The emerging issues in the study confirm the findings of Wilkins and Balakrishnan (2013) that the quality of residential facilities and effective use of technology is key determinant factors of students' satisfaction. According to these scholars, residential facilities include the provision of quality utility services, resident halls, good lighting system, high-speed internet.

The study further agrees with the findings of Elliot and Shin (2002) that all services provided by academic and non-academic staff to students as well have touched residential facilities and other related services being offered to students in a university environment. Elliott and Shin stressed that residential satisfaction as the favourability of a students' subjective evaluation of the various outcomes and experiences associated with campus life as a result of using facilities provided. Again, the findings are in line with the findings of Khurshid and Arshad (2012) that satisfaction with quality residential facilities of an institution positively affects the learning of students.

Furthermore, the study showed that students were not satisfied with academic services with regards to activities such as participation in hands-on activities such as laboratory work, experiments, project-based experiences, etc., computer-based data analysis (statistics, forecasting, etc.), attendance of campus conferences, symposia or art event required by a course. Again, the study revealed that all the colleges (College of Education Studies, College of Health and Allied Sciences and College of Humanities, College of Arts and Legal Studies) offer satisfactory academic instruction except College of Agriculture and Natural Science that needs improvement. Additionally, the majority of the students were not satisfied with their undergraduate education.

The emerging issues of the study confirm the findings of Sojkin, Bartkowiak and Skuza (2012) and DeShields Jr, Ali and Erdener (2005) that students' satisfaction in university's academic service is greatly influenced by the quality of classroom, quality of feedback from lecturers, lecturer-student relationship, interaction with fellow students, course content, available learning equipment, library facilities and learning materials. Similarly, the findings are in line with the findings of Palacio et al. (2002) that teaching ability, flexible curriculum, university status and prestige, independence, caring of faculty, student growth and development, student-centeredness, campus climate, institutional effectiveness and social conditions have been identified as major determinants of student satisfaction in higher education academic services. In addition to that, the study findings agree with the findings of Wilkins and Balakrishnan (2013) that identified quality of lecturers, quality of physical facilities and effective use of technology as key determinant factors of student satisfaction in academic service.

Implications for Practice

From the findings, leadership and management of Ghanaian higher educational institutions need to pay attention to services such as academic and residential to ensure continuity and innovation to enhance students' learning experience. In offering services, leaders need to be guided by the university's guidelines. To ensure positive satisfaction, augment facilities need to be expanded as well as training of staff. Leaders need to understand the changing dimensions of Ghanaian higher educational institutions such as changing student characteristics, the call for restructuring of the academic curriculum from theory to practice as well as student-centred. This understanding fosters effective collaboration among students and related industries.

Conclusion

The question under consideration here is whether students are provided with the necessary services and facilities that make their experience conducive and the attainment of necessary skills and competencies possible. Overall results reveal that university students are satisfied with library services, room allocation procedures, peer support and roommate relationships on campus. On the other hand, students expressed their dissatisfaction with academic services (instructional methodology and academic activities), the behaviour of some academic and administrative staff especially, student-staff relationships. The study further indicated that students feel strongly about the need to expand residential facilities on campus. Based on the above-stated facts, it can be concluded that the majority of the students studying at the University of Cape Coast are dissatisfied with the services currently offered. This confirms what is in the literature that seems to suggest that enhancing service quality has the potential of improving the students' satisfaction, and that should be a priority of higher educational institutions because they have to create a conducive campus environment that fosters student development and success.

Recommendations

1. The Academic Board of the University of Cape Coast should encourage academic departments to redesign their curriculum to be skills and competencies centred. Similarly, the management of the University of Cape Coast should empower departments to have affiliations with industries.

2. The University management should prioritise improving upon residential facilities. The University of Cape Coast Management should strengthen existing policies to regulate non-residential facilities (private hostels) on campus more effectively.

Suggestion for Future Research

1. The study suggests that further research is needed to ascertain the experiences of differently abled-students regarding residential facilities.

2. Similarly, future study should be conduction to establish the impact of residential services on academic performance in the University of Cape Coast.

References

Aldridge, S., & Rowley, J. (1998). Measuring customer satisfaction in higher education. *Quality Assurance in Education Journal, 6*(4), 197-204.

Alves, H., & Raposo, M. (2006). Conceptual model of student satisfaction in higher education. *Total Quality Management*, *18*(5), 571-588.

Appleton-Knapp, S., & Krentler, K. (2006). Measuring student expectations and their effects on satisfaction: the importance of managing student expectations. *Journal of Marketing Education, 12,* 254-264.

Creswell, J. W., & Plano, C. V. (2011). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cohen, L., Manion L., & Morrison, K. (2010). *Research methods in education*. (6th ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

DeShields Jr, O. W., Ali, K., & Erdener, K. (2005). Determinants of business student satisfaction and retention in higher education: Applying Herzberg's two-factor theory. *International Journal of Educational Management, 19*(2), 128-139.

Douglas, J., McClelland, R., & Davies, J. (2008). The development of a conceptual model of student satisfaction with their experience in higher education. 11th ICIT Conference TQM & Corporate Governance at Hang Seng School of Commerce, Hong Kong.

Elliott, K., & Healy, M. (2001). Key factors influencing student satisfaction related to recruitment and retention. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education, 2,* 3-11.

Elliot, K., & Shin, D. (2002). Student satisfaction: an alternative approach to assessing this important concept. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 197-209.

Fortino, A. (2012). *The purpose of higher education: To create prepared minds*. Retrieved from https://evolution.com/opinions/the-purpose-of-higher-educationto-create-prepared minds.

Jones, P. R. (2006). Using groups in criminal justice courses: Some new twists on a traditional pedagogical tool. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 17*(1), 87-101.

Kotler, P., Lane, K. K., Koshy, A., & Jha, M. (2009). *Marketing management - A South Asian perspective*: New York City, NY: Pearson Publication.

Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 30,* 607-610.

Khurshid, F., & Arshad, M. (2012). Students' satisfaction with campus facilities. *Age*, *22*(26), 27-31.

Mukhtar, U., Anwar, S., Ahmed, U., & Baloch, M. A. (2015). Factors affecting the service quality of public and private sector universities comparatively: An empirical investigation. *Researchers World*, *6*(3), 132-153.

Palacio, A. B., Meneses, G. D., & Perez-Perez, P. J. (2002). The configuration of the university image and its relationship with the satisfaction of students. *Journal of Educational Administration, 40*, 486-509.

Peyton, R., Pitts, S., & Kamery, H. (2003). *Consumer satisfaction/dissatisfaction: A review of the literature prior to the 1990s.* Proceedings of the Academy of Organizational Culture.

Reid, N. (2008). *Quality assurance in higher education in Pakistan - Focus on the learner.* Paper presented at the 2nd International Conference on Assessing Quality in Higher Education.

Sojkin, B., Bartkowiak, P., & Skuza, A. (2012). Determinants of higher education choices and student satisfaction: The case of Poland. *Higher Education*, *63*(5), 565-581.

Thomas, E. H., & Galambos, N. (2004). What satisfies students? Mining student-opinion data with regression and decision tree analysis. *Research in Higher Education*, *45*(3), 251-269.

Umbach, P. D., & Porter, S. R. (2002). How do academic departments impact student satisfaction? Understanding the contextual effects of departments. *Research in Higher Education, 43*(2), 209-233.

Weerasinghe, I. M. S., & Dedunu, H. (2017). University staff, image and students' satisfaction in selected regional universities in Sri Lanka. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, *19*(5), 34-37.

Weerasinghe, I. S., & Fernando, R. L. (2017). Students' satisfaction in higher education. *American Journal of Educational Research*, *5*(5), 533-539.

Wilkins, S., & Balakrishnan, M. S. (2013). Assessing student satisfaction in transnational higher education. *International Journal of Educational Management, 11*, 146-153.

Yusoff, M., Mcleay, F., & Woodruffe-Burton, H. (2015). Dimensions driving business student satisfaction in higher education. *Quality Assurance in Education, 23*(1), 86-104.