Student's Satisfaction Dimensions Contributing to Overall Satisfaction at the National University of Lesotho

Dr. Motšelisi C. Mokhethi[1], Mr. Mpheteli J. Malunga[2] & Dr. Regina M. Thetsane[3]

Abstract

As competition increases, funding agencies demanding more accountability and learners demanding quality education, higher education institutions have opted to be customer-centric to remain competitive. Customer/student satisfaction through provision of quality service has been pivotal in the higher education institutions. While a generic SERQUAL model has been applied to education setting, models specific to the education sector have been developed. However, there are still no agreements on the models and on the dimensions contributing to overall satisfaction. The National University of Lesotho (NUL) setting is used to identify students' satisfaction dimensions and to determine the components that significantly contribute to students' overall satisfaction. A sample of 240 students for a population size of 1508 was selected using a stratified random sampling approach. A total of 219 usable questionnaires were returned translating into a 91.3% response rate. The study identified three students' satisfaction dimensions namely, university environment and attractiveness, instructor factors and programme factors. The factors were all found to be significantly and positively related to students' satisfaction. The study has identified areas of strength and improvement and has shown that majority of students (65.3%) were not satisfied signaling need for the university to pay more attention on improving its service.

Keywords : Higher education, Satisfaction dimensions, Satisfaction model, Service quality

1. Introduction

As academic and educational options for students increase higher education institutions that want to gain competitive advantage establish effective ways to attract and retain customers. The challenge for higher institutions is compounded by their offerings that are becoming more and more similar in terms of fees and the content of modules. As such the quality of service to students remains one of the main factors that can provide institutions with distinctive competitive advantage. This means that higher education institutions have to deliver high quality service in order to satisfy and retain customers (Daniel, Liben & Adugna, 2017; Kara, Tanui & Kalai, 2016; Noor & Nasirum, 2013). Higher institutions' customers include parents, staff, community, funding agencies, employers and students and the latter is identified as the primary customer. Higher institutions adopt the commercial business approach of being student-centric and then focus on meeting or exceeding students (customers) expectations (Gruber, Fuß, Voss & Glaeser-Zikuda, 2010; Bedggood & Donovan, 2012). It is in this regard that student satisfaction is identified as a major source of competitive advantage consequently leading to students' retention and attraction of new students and positive word-of-mouth communication (Asaduzzaman, Hossain & Rahman, 2013; Bianchi, 2013; Vargo, Nagao, He & Morgan, 2007). The usefulness of student satisfaction survey is to inform institutions on whether they are providing an environment that is conducive for learning (Lo, 2010) consequently influencing the institutions ability to produce the quality of graduates they aim to (Tessema, Ready & Yu, 2012).

[1] B.Ed. MBA. PhD Entrepreneurship, Faculty of Social Sciences, National University of Lesotho, P.O. Roma. 180. Lesotho. @ motselisi05@yahoo.co.uk/mc.mokhethi@nul.ls, Tel: +266 – 63088826 /57544644
[2] B.A. MSc Statistics, National University of Lesotho, P.O. Roma. 180. Lesotho. Tel: +266 – 58925588
[3] B.Ed. MBA. PhD Business Admin, Faculty of Social Sciences, National University of Lesotho, P.O. Roma. 180. Lesotho. @ makoloithetsane@gmail.com / rm.thetsane@nul.ls   Tel: +266 – 62019536 /50225516

Wiers-Jenssen, Stensake and Grogaard (2002) indicate that assessing student satisfaction enables universities to focus directly on issues of quality development in order to ensure high educational standards. According to Bedggood and Donovon (2012) measuring and responding to student satisfaction is beneficial to universities and students alike as systems and processes can be adjusted to make the university experience more enjoyable for students. Importantly, it is noted that satisfaction of students influences positive behaviour such as student retention, student commitment and dedication to their studies, (Tessema et al., 2010; Bedggood & Donovon, 2012). According to Brown and Mazzarol (2009) research focusing on the drivers of customer's satisfaction amongst tertiary students and whether the provision of high quality in tertiary institutions is likely to produce tangible benefits in terms of customer satisfaction and customer loyalty is limited. In so far as researchers' knowledge is concerned, it would appear that NUL has not yet attempted to assess factors associated with the satisfaction of their customers/students so as to remain competitive in the education market. To this end this study is aimed at determining students' satisfaction components significant to overall students' satisfaction at NUL.

2. Problem statement

Of the fourteen higher institutions in Lesotho at the end of 2014/15 academic year NUL was the largest (accounting for a 42.6% of tertiary institution population having increased by 2% from 2013/14 academic year) (Council on Higher Education Report, (CHE), 2017). However, the percentage increase of student enrolment for NUL resulted in a lower enrolment as the number of students enrolled at higher institutions in Lesotho declined from 23545 to 21664 between 2013/14 and 2014/15 academic years. At the start of 2015/16 academic year another private university entered Lesotho market triggering further competition between and amongst universities and learners in the country by increasing options for students and shaking further the monopoly that the National University of Lesotho had been enjoying up to 2008 (Thetsane, Mokhethi & Bukenya, 2019). Additionally, the growth of e-commerce according to Gyamfi, Agyme and Otoo (2012) is also making it easy for potential learners to access tertiary education in other countries while at the comfort of their own homes exposing the local institutions to global competition. Universities compete for high performing students while learners fight for a place in a better performing university (Thetsane et al., 2019). Institutions also recognize that students pay a significant amount of money to acquire educational services and thus expect value for money (Archambault, 2008; Marginson, 2006; Thomas & Galambos 2004; Gruber et al., 2010). The diminishing funding and at times the increasing students' enrolment confronting universities hinder universities to deliver a fulfilling experience to graduates (Kara et al., 2016).

NUL is not immune to the numerous challenges that threaten the university's capacity to offer fulfilling education experience. The university has had to deal with the declining government subvention and the increasing competition. Mashinini (2019) reflects that government subvention into the university has declined from 135 million maloti in 2008 to 99 million maloti in 2018/2019 academic year. It is indicated that the 99 million maloti of subvention currently allocated to the university is equal to the subvention received in the 1990s when the student population was 2500 (The ticking time bomb at NUL, 2018). The University's student population trends since 2015 has been over 9000 range but moving more towards a decline (Mashinini, 2019). In 2015 the population was 9239, 9560 in 2016, 9460 in 2017 and down to 9263 in 2018 and one wonders whether the decline is a sign of the university's failure to remain competitive or not. It is imperative to the university to introspect in order to determine whether it is able to satisfy its customers/students by offering a fulfilling education experience.

A number of teaching and non-teaching factors affect students' satisfaction at the university. Components such as, academic quality resources, teaching quality, administrative service quality, and quality of student support services have been identified as factors that contribute to student satisfaction of tertiary education experience (Daniel et al., 2017). According to Bedggood and Donovon (2012) the personal and skills aspects of the instructor as well as the non-teaching aspects such as course difficulty, student demographics, life satisfaction and class size explains student satisfaction in universities. Tessema, et al., (2010) also indicate that student satisfaction has been conceptualized in a number of ways such as satisfaction with the quality of the instruction, satisfaction with an academic department, satisfaction with advising and satisfaction with assessment to mention a few. Farahmandian, Minavand and Afshardost (2013) found a positive and significant correlation between student satisfaction and curriculum, teaching quality, financial assistance, tuition cost, advising and facilities. It is noted that there is still no agreement on the students' satisfaction components and the findings are inconclusive on the dimensions that significantly contribute to the students' satisfaction (Kara et al., 2016; Douglas, J., Douglas, A., & Barnes, 2006; Khan, Ahmed & Nawaz, 2011; Wei & Ramalu, 2011).

This paper, therefore, intends to use NUL setting to identify students' satisfaction components and determine those components that significantly contribute to students' overall satisfaction.

3. Literature review

Due to hyper competition in the tertiary education sector, general public and governments demanding accountability on the taxes spend on tertiary education and complex student behaviours, student satisfaction has been one of the most research area by institution to justify their existence to stakeholders (Elliot & Healy, 2001; Gyamfi et al., 2012; Farahmandian, et al., 2013; Douglas, J., McClelland, Davies, & Douglas, A., 2014). Lo (2010) defines student satisfaction as a subjective perceptions of how well a learning environment supports academic success. Satisfaction comes about when a customer perceives that a service encounter has been good while the opposite will results into dissatisfaction (Weerasinghe & Fernando, 2017). According to Li and Kaye (1999) customer satisfaction is a confirmation or otherwise of one's expectations. Daniels et al., (2017) and Douglas et al., (2014) are in agreement that satisfaction or dissatisfaction is experienced when the students interact with the organisation during the "moments of truth". This means that students prior to enrolment would have built expectations which are either confirmed or not confirmed during service delivery. Satisfied students may attract new students by engaging in positive word-of-mouth communication to inform acquaintances and friends about the university, and they may return to the university to take other courses (Wiers-Jenssen et al., 2002).

According to Daniels et al., (2017) one way to capture customer satisfaction is to track it through the perceived level of service quality by the customers. In this regard the commonly adopted model to study satisfaction is SERQUAL model covering five service dimensions, namely, tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, assurance and empathy (Lam, Tung, Leng & Huat, 2012; Son, Ha & Khuyen, 2018; Daniel et al., 2017). The model explains student satisfaction from the service quality of the institution (Malik, Danish & Usman, 2010). Jayasundara, Ngulube and Minishi-Majanja (2009) indicate that the model defines service quality as a function of a gap between customer's expectation of a service and their perception of the performance of actual service delivery by the organization. According to Asaduzzamanetal (2013) SERQUAL model can be generalized to any type of service. Different studies applied SERQUAL model to explain student satisfaction in tertiary institutions.

The application of SERQUAL model in the education settings exhibited a statistical significant correlation between all the five dimensions and the student satisfaction for many studies were showing highest correlation for tangibles (Li & Kaye, 1999; Asaduzzaman et al., 2013; Son et al., Hossain, 2018). There were exceptions though as Hossain (2018) found reliability factor to rank highest among the five dimensions. Reddy & Karim (2014) found empathy to have the strongest relationship with satisfaction. Lam et al., (2012), who expanded the SERQUAL model to include the variable of cost found all the five variables that included costs to be significantly correlated to student satisfaction while responsiveness was found to be insignificant. Generally, however, the rank order of the dimensions of the SERQUAL model differed with regard to their correlation to university students' satisfaction. While Asaduzzaman et al., (2013) indicated that SERQUAL model can be generalized to any type of service Jayasundara et al., (2009) noted that studies of service quality in different contexts yeilded service quality domain structures specific to each study that differed from the five SERQUAL domains. The authors had carried out a service quality study in university libraries and came up with eight service quality domains that are likely to influence customer satisfaction namely, responsiveness, supportiveness, building environment, collection and access, furniture and facilities, technology, service delivery and web services.

Table: 1. Service quality dimensions specific to education setting

Author and Year	Findings
Thomas and Galambos (2004)	Predictors of students general satisfaction • academic experience • social integration • campus services and facilities • pre-enrollment opinions
Tessema et al., (2012)	Factors positively correlated with satisfaction with major curriculum • preparation for career or graduate school • academic advising **} have the highest impact on satisfaction with a major curriculum** • required course availability for major • quality of instruction • major course content • variety of courses • capstone experiences • overall college experience • class size or major courses • grading in major courses • course availability for electives in major
Kara et al., (2016)	Factors found to be reliable dimensions of educational service quality hence having a bearing on students' satisfaction are: • administrative service quality • quality of instructional practices • perceived learning gains • quality of students' welfare services • quality of teaching facilities • quality of library service environment • lecturer quality • provision of internet services • reliability of university examinations • quality of computer laboratory services • availability of text books in libraries in the universities
Douglas et al., (2014)	Factors considered critical determinants of quality in higher education • access • attentiveness • communication • availability • social inclusion • usefulness • value for money • achievement

Kara et al., (2016) are also in agreement that educational service quality is a multidimensional construct which is often approached from a range of indicators. It can also be observed in Balasubramanian, Konana and Menon (2003) that the conventional service quality dimensions identified in SERQUAL were not observable.

The study identified perceived trustworthiness, perceived environmental security and perceived operational competences as domains that impacts customer satisfaction in an online setting. Other studies carried out in the university setting identified different service quality dimensions that best explain the educational service quality as shown in Table 1. It is noted that various authors arrived at different list of service quality dimensions that are specific to education as such further studies are required to build consensus in service quality dimensions specific to education and therefore NUL setting is used to contribute to literature in this regard.

4. Methodology

A total of 240 students were selected into a sample from a total population of 1508 registered students from second to final year of study in the Faculty of Social sciences at NUL. study adopted a stratified simple random sampling approach. The strata were the nine undergraduate programmes offered in the faculty. A total of 219 usable self-administered questionnaires were received translating into 91.3 per cent response rate. The study selected students starting from the second year of study to the final year because it is ideal to measure satisfaction of students who have at least spent a year at the university, who have sufficient experience to answer to questions asked in the student satisfaction survey (Kao, 2007). In addition to demographic variables a survey instrument measured overall student satisfaction and assessed the components of satisfaction using measures adopted from four authors namely, Tessema et al., (2012), Bedggood and Donovan (2014), and Gruber et al., (2010). Overall student satisfaction and components of satisfaction were measured on a 5-point Likert scale. In order to determine the structure of the components of satisfaction a factor analysis was performed while descriptive statistics was used to answer the research goal.

5. Findings and discussion

5.1. Demographic profile

Table 2 displays demographic profile of the respondents. The results show that there were 88(40.2%) male and 131(59.8%) female students. Females respondents represents majority and this is a common tendency in many studies (Martirosyan, Saxon & Wanjohi, 2014; Elliott & Healy, 2001). The students were in the 18 to 25 year age range with frequency of 187(85.4%). Age groups; below 18 and those from 36 and above were in the minority. The respondents were from year two to year 4 of study. Year 2 was represented by 86(39.3%) of the respondents, year 3 by 62(28.3%) and finally year 4 by 71(32.4%) students. Finally the demographic results showed that the majority of the students came from the Bachelor of Commerce programme with 55(25.1%). Certificate in statistics was represented by just one student, placing the programme in the minority.

Table 2: Demographic profile of the respondents

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percent
Gender	Male	88	40.2
	Female	131	59.8
	Total	**219**	**100.0**
Age	Below 18	2	0.9
	18- 25	187	85.4
	26- 35	29	13.2
	36 and above	1	0.5
	Total	**219**	**100.0**
Year of Study	Year 2	86	39.3
	Year 3	62	28.3
	Year 4	71	32.4
	Total	**219**	**100.0**
Programme	Bachelor of Commerce	55	25.1
	Bachelor of Economics	38	17.4
	Bachelor of Statistics and Demography	4	1.8
	Bachelor of Political Sciences	49	22.4
	Bachelor of Public Administration	6	2.7
	Bachelor of Sociology	8	3.7
	Bachelor of Urban and Regional Planning	26	11.9
	Bachelor of Social Work	32	14.6
	Certificate in Statistics	1	0.5
	Total	**219**	**100.0**

5.2. **Satisfaction results**

Students overall satisfaction was measured by one question where respondents were asked to rate on a 5-point likert scale their overall satisfaction with the university experience. The responses ranked 1 up to 3 were grouped as not satisfied while responses ranked 4 up to 5 were grouped as satisfied. The results show that majority (65.3%) of respondents were not satisfied while 34.7 percent of the respondents were satisfied with the university experience (Table 3).

Table 3: Overall satisfaction

		Frequency	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not satisfied	143	65.3	65.3	65.3
	Satisfied	76	34.7	34.7	100.0
Total		**219**	**100.0**	**100.0**	

5.3. Factor analysis

Principal factor analysis with varimax rotation was conducted to assess the underlying structure of the thirty five items identified as components of students' satisfaction.

Table 4: Factor Loadings from Principal Factor Analysis

Item	Factor Loading			Communalities
	University environment and attractiveness	Instructor factor	Programme factor	
Lecture theatres	0.734			0.543
Library	0.697			0.521
University buildings	0.660			0.450
Computer equipment	0.608			0.370
Administrative and student services	0.596			0.413
Refectory/Cafeteria	0.586			0.353
The extent to which you would choose the university for a post-graduate programme	0.549			0.373
The extent to which you would recommend the university to your friend	0.498			0.346
Attractiveness of the surrounding city	0.475			0.245
Fairness of the instructor(s)		0.760		0.631
Friendliness of the instructor(s)		0.723		0.559
Helpfulness of instructor(s): [Attitude of instructor, personal attention provided, way instructor responds when you ask for help]		0.648		0.454
Ability of instructor to explain things clearly		0.645		0.425
Fairness in marking system		0.598		0.379
Instructor's knowledge to subject matter		0.590		0.386
Degree to which you found the programme interesting			0.811	0.673
Degree to which you found the programme intellectually stimulating			0.747	0.559
Amount of study relative to grades			0.606	0.442
Contribution to academic development			0.564	0.365
Compulsory workload of the programme			0.559	0.344
Sequence of topics presented			0.525	0.351
Eigenvalues	**4.934**	**2.335**	**1.914**	
% of variance	**23.496**	**11.121**	**9.114**	

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.
a. Rotation converged in 5 iterations.

Based on the scree diagram of the factor analysis three factors emerged. After rotation, first factor accounted for 23.5% of the variance, the second factor accounted for 11.1% and the third factor accounted for 9.1%. Table 4 reflects the items and factor loadings for the rotated factors, with loadings less than 0.4 omitted to improve clarity. The first factor is made up of nine variables and is named university environment and attractiveness. The second factor made up of six variables is named instructor factor. Finally, the third factor was termed programme factor and was made up of six variables. To assess whether the items in the three factors formed a reliable scale, Cronbach's alpha was computed (Table 5). The alpha for the nine items in University environment and attractiveness was 0.796, which indicates that the items form a scale that has good internal consistency reliability. Similarly, the alpha for Instructor factor (0.764) and alpha Programme factor (0.749) indicated a good internal consistency.

Table 5: Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Statistics.

Variables	Cronbach's Alpha	Number of Items
University environment and attractiveness	0.796	9
Instructor factor	0.764	6
Programme factor	0.749	6

5.4. Descriptive statistics

Table 6: Ratings for satisfaction components

	Mean	Std. Deviation
University environment and attractiveness		
Library	2.36	1.175
Refectory/Cafeteria	1.61	.833
University buildings	2.34	.978
Lecture theatres	2.16	.889
Computer equipment	1.83	.855
The extent to which you would recommend the university to your friend	2.82	1.199
The extent to which you would choose the university for a post-graduate programme	2.44	1.197
Attractiveness of the surrounding city	1.95	1.092
Administrative and student support services	2.07	.915
Instructors Factor		
Fairness of the instructor(s)	3.38	.999
Friendliness of the instructor(s)	3.42	.980
Helpfulness of instructor(s): [Attitude of instructor, personal attention provided, way instructor responds when you ask for help]	3.54	.998
Ability of instructor to explain things clearly	3.34	.897
Fairness in marking system	3.20	1.083
Instructor's knowledge to subject matter	3.83	.887
Programme Factor		
Degree to which you found the programme interesting	3.84	1.060
Degree to which you found the programme intellectually stimulating	3.76	1.028
Amount of study relative to grades	3.00	.979
Contribution to academic development	3.59	.912
Compulsory workload of the programme	2.81	1.088
Sequence of topics presented	3.29	.968

The mean scores of satisfaction level for each variable (Table 6) indicate that students are not satisfied with all the components under university environment and attractiveness. With regard to instructor factor the scores are all above 3 which is the midpoint of 5-point likert measure used.

It means that respondents are satisfied with the components under this factor. In the case of Programme factor all components except two elements that of amount of grades relative to study and compulsory workload of the programme are above midpoint suggesting that respondents are satisfied with them. An independent t-test was also conducted to compare university environment and attractiveness factor, instructor factor and programme factor scores of students who were dissatisfied and those that are satisfied about their university experience thus far. On average, satisfied students experienced less dissatisfaction to university environment and attractiveness (Mean=2.341, Std.Error=0.072), than dissatisfied students to university environment and attractiveness (Mean=2.088, Std.Error=0.052) as revealed in Table 7. This difference was significant, t=-2.864, p<0.05 (Table 8). However, the standard deviation (SD) for satisfied students was higher than for those dissatisfied, indicating that scores for satisfied students were more variable. The results further revealed that on average, satisfied students experienced greater satisfaction to Instructor factor (M=3.599, Std.Error=0.066) than dissatisfied students to Instructor factor (M=3.418, Std.Error=0.056). The magnitude of the difference in the means was significant, t= -2.099, p<0.05. The standard deviation (SD) for students who are dissatisfied was more variable than for satisfied students because SD was higher for students who are dissatisfied compared to satisfied students. There was also a significant difference in score between two groups of students in relation to programme factor, t= -3.077, p<0.05 with satisfied students (M=3.548, Std.Error=0.059) scoring higher than dissatisfied students in relation to programme factor. It means that the satisfied students experienced greater satisfaction to programme factor than students who are dissatisfied with programme factor.

Table 7: Descriptive Statistics for the three factors

	Overall Satisfaction	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
University environment and attractiveness factor	Not Satisfied	141	2.088	.61776	.05202
	Satisfied	76	2.341	.62732	.07196
Instructor factor	Not Satisfied	143	3.418	.66703	.05578
	Satisfied	76	3.5987	.57231	.06565
Programme factor	Not Satisfied	142	3.2822	.75004	.06294
	Satisfied	76	3.5482	.51698	.05930

Table 8: Independent Samples Test for the three factors

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means							
		F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		
									Lower	Upper	
University envro. & attractiveness factor	Equal variances assumed	1.209	0.273	-2.864	215	0.005	-0.253	0.088	-0.427	-0.079	
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.851	151.694	0.005	-0.253	0.089	-0.429	-0.078	
Instructor factor	Equal variances assumed	3.944	0.048	-2.004	217	0.046	-0.181	0.090	-0.359	-0.003	
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.099	174.379	0.037	-0.181	0.086	-0.351	-0.011	
Programme factor	Equal variances assumed	10.071	0.002	-2.760	216	0.006	-0.267	0.096	-0.456	-0.076	
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.077	202.479	0.002	-0.266	0.086	-0.437	-0.096	

6. Conclusion and recommendation

The results revealed three students' satisfaction components, named university environment and attractiveness, instructor and programme factors. The three factors were found to be significantly and positively related to students' satisfaction as the difference in means between the satisfied and dissatisfied respondents was significant. The students that were satisfied reported higher mean scores on the components that they were pleased with compared to the means scores of students that were dissatisfied. On the other hand, the students that were satisfied recorded lower mean scores on the components that they were unhappy compared to students that were dissatisfied. The students' satisfaction components identified in this study are not completely similar to components found in previous studies but there were some commonalities. For instance, Kara et al., (2016) identified eleven factors while this study identified three and within the eleven found in Kara et al., (2016) one can find similarities to the three in this study. The results show that the majority of students on the overall are dissatisfied with university experience. The ratings on satisfaction components that contribute to overall satisfaction differed. All respondents (satisfied and dissatisfied) were not pleased with all elements under university environment and attractiveness factor. The results are consistent with previous studies. For instance, Gruber et al., (2010) found that students were mostly dissatisfied with university buildings and the quality of the lecture theatres. Daniel et al., (2017) also determined that students were not satisfied with facilities, such as computer and Internet facilities so it means that NUL challenge on facilities are not unique. It is noted however that the poor ratings on university environment and attractivenss did not influence the overall satisfaction of some students as they still reported an overall satisfaction with the university experience. According to Elliot and Healy (2001) some satisfaction components may not have a significant impact on the overall satisfaction of university students because they are not regarded as very important. Out of the eleven dimensions of service quality Elliot and Healy (2001) found student centeredness, campus climate and instructional effectiveness to be strong predictor of student satisfaction. According to Douglas et al., (2014) critical areas of quality in education likely to satisfy and dissatisfy students are access, attentiveness, communication and availability enjoyed from teaching and support staff in the organization. It is therefore not surprising that despite dissatisfaction ratings on the university environment and attractiveness factor a certain category of students felt satisfied with university experience possibly because university environment and attractiveness factor might not be of importance to them.

Furthermore, the findings shows that the satisfied and dissatisfied respondents were content with instructor factor variables same as with all but two programme factor variables. It is noted that the means scores on the two factors are above the midpoint for both the satisfied students and those that are dissatisfied but not necessarily reaching the highest satisfaction level. This is in line with Li and Kaye (1999) who argues that satisfaction is on continuum ranging from the ideal to the totally unacceptable level with some points along the continuum representing satisfactory quality. The results of this finding suggest that for some NUL students even though the performance of NUL on the two factors is not at the ideal level, in their assessment, it is at the point of satisfactory. The findings with regard to dissatisfied students suggest that though, that category of students is content with instructor factor and programme factor variables they have not reached an acceptable level on the satisfaction continuum.

6.1. Managerial implications

The study has identified the areas of strength as well as areas for improvement for the university. The respondents are clearly not satisfied with university environment and attractiveness factor possibly affecting their willingness to recommend the university to others and also their willingness to choose it for further studies. Additionally it is noted that programme workload is a major dissatisfaction within the programme factor. It is possible that the workload variable is affecting the variable of "the amount of study relative to grades" hence why learners feel that they are putting a lot of work but obtain grades that are not correlating to the effort. On the overall the performance of the university needs to be improved even in areas recorded as satisfactory as they are still rated at the lower high. It would be of interest for the future to investigate whether universities can determine the point of satisfaction on the students' satisfaction continuum so that they can make an effort to target that level so as to ensure that students are given pleasurable university experience.

References

Archambault, L.Z. (2008). Measuring service performance, student satisfaction and its impact on student retention in private, post-secondary institutions. Proceedings of Edu-com 2008 International conference Sustainability in Higher Education: Directions for change. Edith Cowan University Perth Western, Australia, November 19-21

Asaduzzaman., Hossain, M., & Rahmna, M. (2013). Service quality and student satisfaction: a case study on private universities in Bangladesh, International Journal of Economics, Finance and Management Sciences. 1(3), 128-135

Balasubramanian, S., Konana, P., & Menon, N.M. (2003). Customer satisfaction in virtual environments: A study of online investing. Management Science, 49(7), 871-889

Bedggood, R.E., & Donovan, J.D. (2012). University performance evaluation: what are we really measuring? Studies in Higher Education, 37(7), 825-842

Bianchi, C. (2013). Satisfiers and dissatisfiers for international students of higher education: An exploratory study in Australia. Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 35(4), 396-409

Brown, R.M., & Mazzarol, T.W. (2009).The importance of institutional image to student satisfaction and loyalty within education.Higher Education, 58, 81-95

Council of Higher Education. Report (2017). The Higher Education Statistical Bulletin 2014/15. Retrieved fromhttps://www.che.ac.ls/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/HE-Statistical-Bulletin-2014-15.pdf (September 5, 2019)

Daniel, D., Liben, G., & Adugna, A. (2017). Assessment of students' satisfaction: A case study of Dire Dawa University, Ethiopia, Journal of Education and Practice, 8(4), 111-120

Douglas, J., Douglas, A., & Barnes, B. (2006). Measuring student satisfaction in a UK university. Quality Assurance in Education, 14(3), 251-267

Douglas, J.A., McClelland, R., Davies, J., & Douglas, A. (2014). Understanding student satisfaction and dissatisfaction: An interpretive study in the UK Higher Education context. Studies in Higher Education, 1-21, DOI: 10.1080/03075079.2013.842217 Retrieved romhttp://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2013.842217 (November 13, 2019)

Elliot, K.M., & Healy, M.A. (2001). Key factors influencing student satisfaction related to recruitment and retention. Journal of Marketing for Higher Education, 10(4), 1-11

Farahmandian, S., Minavand, H., & Afshardost, M. (2013). Perceived service quality and student satisfaction in higher education.Journal of Business Management, 12(4), 65-74

Gruber, T., Fuß, S., Voss, R., & Glaeser-Zikuda. (2010). Examining student satisfaction with higher education services using a new measurement tool. International Journal of Public Sector Management, 23(2), 1-35DOI: 10.1108/09513551011022474

Gyamfi, D.A., Agyeman, A., & Otoo, B.K. (2012). Assessing the provision of quality students' service and satisfaction in tertiary institution in Ghana, Using Cape Coast Polytechnic as a case study. Asian Journal of Business and Management Sciences, 1(12), 20-32

Hossain, M. (2018). An empirical model of students' satisfaction and service quality of Jahangirnagar University. Journal of Social Science Research, 13, 2806-2814

Jayasundra, C., Ngulube, P., & Minishi-Majanja, M.K. (2009). A theoretical model to predict customer satisfaction in relation to servicequality in selected university libraries in Sri Lanka. SAJnl Libs &Info Sei 75(2), 179-194

Kao, T. (2007). University student satisfaction: an empirical analysis. Thesis. Lincol University. Retrieved from https://researcharchive.lincoln.ac.nz>bitstream>handle>kao_mcm (November 13, 2019)

Kara, A.M., Tanui, E., & Kalai, J.M. (2016). Educational service quality and students' satisfaction in public universities in Kenya. International Journal of Education and Social Sciences, 3(10), 37-48

Khan, M.M., Ahmed, I., & Nawaz, M.M. (2011). Student's perspective of service quality in higher learning institutions; an evidence based approach. International Journal of Business and Social Sciences, 2(11), 160-164

Lam, J.M.S., Tung, C.C.L., Leng, O.Y., & Huat, T.S. (2012). A study of students' satisfaction in Overseas Higher Educational Institution. A paper presented in the 2nd International Conference on Economic, Education and Management (ICCEEM): Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/316665941 (October/26/2019)

Li, R.Y., & Kaye, M. (1999). Measuring service quality in the context of teaching: A study on the longitudinal nature of students' expectations and perceptions. Innovation in Education and Training International, 36(2), 145-154

Lo, C.C. (2010). How student satisfaction factors affect perceived learning. Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 10(1), 47-54

Malik, M.E., Danish, R.Q., & Usman, A. (2010). The impact of service quality on students' satisfaction in Higher Education Institutes of Punjab. Journal of Management Research, 2(2), 1-11

Marginson, S. (2006). Dynamics of national and global competition in higher education. Higher Education, 52(1), 1-39

Martirosyan, M.N., Saxon, D.P., & Wanjohi, R. (2014). Student satisfaction and academic performance in Armenian Higher Education. American International Journal of Contemporary Research, 4(2), 1-5

Mashinini, V. (2019). Restructuring at the National University of Lesotho: Prospects and Challenges. International Journal of Education and Research, 7(9), 67-80

Noor, S.M., & Nasirun, N. (2013). Service quality and customer satisfaction in a natural monopoly company.Colloquium on Administrative Science & Technology. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net>publications>282630220_service_Quality_... (November/11/2019)

Reddy, E.L., & Karim, S. (2014). Service quality and student satisfaction: A case study in Private Management Institutions in Chittoor District of Andhra Pradesh. International Journal of Human Resource, 4(2), 1-8

Son, H.T., Ha, N.T., & Khuyen, P.T.M. (2018). Measuring students' satisfaction with higher education service - An experimental study at Thainguyen University. International Journal of Business Marketing and Management, 3(4), 21-34

Tessema, M.T., Ready, K., & Yu, E. W. (2012). Factors affecting college students' satisfaction with major curriculum: Evidence from nine years of data. International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, 2(2), 34-44

The ticking time bomb at NUL. (2018, May 11). The Post Newspaper. Retrieved from https://www.thepost.co.ls (Movember/21/2019)

Thetsane, R.M., Mokhethi, M.C., & Bukenya, P. (2019). Students Choice of a university: Case of the National University of Lesotho (NUL). Journal of Education and Social Policy, 6(2), 140-148

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

Vargo, S.L., Nagao, K., He. Y., & Morgan, F.W. (2007). Satisfiers, dissatisfiers, critical, and neutral: A review of their relative effects on customer (Dis)satisfaction. Academy of Marketing Science Review, 11(2), 1-19

Weerasinghe, I.S., & Fernando, R.L. (2017). Students' satisfaction in Higher Education: Literature review. American Journal of Educational Research, 5(5), 533-539

Wei, C.C., & Ramalu, S.S. (2011). Students' satisfaction towards the university; Does service quality matters. International Journal of Education, 3(2), 1-15

Wiers-jenssen, J., Stensaker, B., & Grogaard, J.B. (2002). Student satisfaction: towards an empirical deconstruction of the concept. Quality in Higher Education, 8(2), 183-195.