

Students Demographics and Satisfaction with Selected Academic Experiences: University of Arusha-Musoma, Tanzania

¹Lazarus Ndiku Makewa and ²Baraka Manjale Ngussa*

¹University of Eastern Africa, Baraton, P.O. Box 2500, Eldoret, Kenya

²University of Arusha, P.O. Box 7, Usa-River, Arusha, Tanzania

*Corresponding Author: ngussathe5th@yahoo.com +255753889912

Abstract

This study, investigated students' demographic backgrounds and satisfaction in selected academic experiences at University of Arusha- Musoma Centre. A sample of 62 students was randomly selected to fill the questionnaire. T-test and ANOVA determined differences in students' demographic factors and satisfaction with selected areas of academic experiences. The study established that the students under investigation had a mixed background of students. This kind of variations indicates a range of individual differences among learners that educators can use as an opportunity in their teaching in that different approaches, methods and strategies can be employed to meet the needs of students according to their varied range of characteristics. Educators should strive to improve key determinants of satisfaction in order to increase students' levels of satisfaction. They should also form collaborative learning groups of demographic differences so that learners of different characteristics can benefit from their counterparts.

Keywords: Student demographics, satisfaction, academic experiences.

1. Introduction

Student satisfaction refers to the attraction, pride, or positive feeling that students develop toward the program or institution (Danielson, 1998; Hatcher, et al., 1992). Stike (1984) indicated that the level of students' positive feeling or satisfaction is associated with students' being able to find adequate resources to meet their academic and social interests. The students' ability to project and implement their self concepts as students or viewing themselves as part of the institution is also related to their positive feeling of satisfaction (Sedlacek, 1987; Stikes, 1984).

Previous studies have shown that students who report positive academic and social experiences expressed greater satisfaction with their overall college experience (Bailey, et al., 1998; Danielson, 1998; Tinto, 1993). Other key determinants of student satisfaction include academic performance, quality of curriculum, quality of instruction, quality of academic advising, student satisfaction with major, and the level of isolation felt by the student (Aitken, 1982). Interaction between faculty members and students is also a factor affecting student satisfaction in their academic experiences (Betz, et al., 1971; Love, 1993; Tinto, 1993). This implies that sufficient and positive faculty-student interaction will contribute to overall student satisfaction (Danielson, 1998; Tinto, 1993). Interaction with fellow students is also associated with student satisfaction (Aitken, 1982).

Student satisfaction level has been found to be one of the factors that affects the quality and overall effectiveness of a university program (Aitken, 1982; Astin, Korn, & Green, 1987; Bailey, Bauman, & Lata, 1998; Love, 1993; Suen, 1983). In addition, while student recruitment and retention have always been the core activities of higher educational institutions, student satisfaction

has been identified as a factor that affects student recruitment and retention (Hatcher, et al., 1992; Love, 1993). This basically implies that the higher the level of satisfaction with the educational environment, the higher the likelihood that the student will stay at the educational institution and recommend the institution to others. As a result, student satisfaction has been integrated as a part of the discussion in respect of institutional effectiveness and student outcomes (Astin, Korn, & Green, 1987; Bailey, Bauman, & Lata, 1998)

The students' positive feeling and satisfaction is contingent to the students' academic and social experiences obtained at the particular institution (Aitken, 1982; Betz, Menne, Starr, & Klingensmith, 1971; Danielson, 1998; Hatcher, et al., 1992; Stikes 1984; Tinto, 1993), yet not much has been researched about students' level of satisfaction in relation to academic performance. A few related studies such as that of Olaitan (2012) and Ogunlade, Joshua and Ogunlade (2013) dealt with student satisfaction in relation to other factors than academic performance although level of satisfaction is an important factor that determines students' Level of success in academic performance. Olaitan (2012) supports this when he contends that academic attainments in higher institutions of learning can be considered as an outcome of school organization. Further, his study on the Effects of Background Characteristics and School Factors on College Students' Performance and Satisfaction established that performance is notably related to satisfaction with academic environment and services obtained. This study, therefore, investigates students' demographic backgrounds and satisfaction level in selected areas of academic experiences namely educational guidance/student counseling, studying arrangements, studying organizations, student assessment and self-assessment and time management.

2. Academic Experiences

There are different variables and academic experiences that the learner may encounter and which may affect the process of teaching and learning in a negative or positive way. These include, but not limited to educational guidance/ student counseling, studying arrangements and organizations, student assessment/ self-assessment and time management.

2.1 Educational Guidance/ Student Counseling

Educational guidance and counseling are important interrelated practices that affect students' life and particularly their academic performance. While different writers define guidance and counseling in different ways, Farrant (1999, p. 209) considers guidance as a subset of counseling. According to him, "counseling is the act of assisting an individual with advice, comfort or guidance in order to relieve or overcome problems that trouble him." He also suggests that guidance and counseling are of optimal importance in students' academic life because effective learning can only be possible when learners are free from worries or matters that interfere with the development of their personality.

Thungu, Wandera, Gachie and Alumande (2010) view counseling as a very important face-to-face interaction between the counselor and the learners that leads students to be free from worries, and therefore maximize their learning potentials. They regard teacher counselor as the key person in the school guidance and counseling program while maintaining that guidance is an activity that equips learners with procedures and processes that pertain to educational and career matters. This implies that counseling has to do with the present while guidance focuses on the bright future of student's life. Mutie and Ndambuki (2005) have it that guidance involves personal help and advice given by someone in order to assist learners to decide where they want to go, what they want to do, how to get to their destination and how to solve problems that affect their lives.

The importance of guidance and counseling in academic institutions cannot be underestimated. This is because students at universities have different backgrounds, challenges and even problems that if remain unsolved, may hinder effective learning. Because of this, Mutie and Ndambuki (2005, p. 14) suggest that “there is an agent need to introduce and strengthen the guidance services in schools and colleges so as to meet the various needs of students.” They go further mentioning the following benefits of guidance and counseling to students (pp. 14-19):

- To help in total development of students
- To enable students make proper choices.
- To help students choose, prepare for, enter and progress in career.
- To help students in vocational development.
- To help students make adjustments to the situations in schools and at home.
- To supplement the efforts at home
- To minimize the mismatch between education and employment and help in the efficient use of labor force.
- To identify and motivate the disadvantaged.
- To ensure proper use of time spent outside the classroom.
- To minimize the incidences of indiscipline.

Taylor and Buku (2006) are of the same view with Makinde (1984). They say the school provides various counseling services to students. They claim academic counseling aims at assisting pupils to make the most of their educational opportunities. This means offering pupils the assistance that will make them become cultivated individuals and at the same time preparing them for confident participation in life activities which will be socially useful and personally satisfying. They further explain that Academic counseling is for students of all categories. The gifted ones are given academic counseling to enable them realize their capabilities and the need to do more. Dull students are also helped to convince themselves of what they can do to perform well in school. Further, children who are physically challenged are helped to realize their potentialities for a happier life. Finally, they claim, academic counseling is for teachers as well. Teachers are helped to realize new and acceptable ways of handling or implementing new concept in the school to the benefit of the pupils.

2.2 Studying Arrangements and Organizations

Arranging the physical environment of the classroom is one way to improve the learning environment and to prevent behavioral problems before they occur. Research on the classroom environment has shown that the physical arrangement can affect the behavior of both students and teachers (Savage, 1999; Stewart & Evans, 1997; Weinstein, 1992), and that a well-structured classroom tends to improve student academic and behavioral outcomes (MacAulay, 1990; Walker, Colvin, & Ramsey, 1995; Walker & Walker, 1991). In addition, the classroom environment acts as a symbol to students and others regarding what teachers value in behavior and learning (Savage, 1999; Weinstein, 1992). If a classroom is not properly organized to support the type of schedule and activities a teacher has planned, it can impede the functioning of the day as well as limit what and how students learn. However, a well-arranged classroom environment is one way to more effectively manage instruction because it triggers fewer behavior problems and establishes a climate conducive to learning.

The spatial structure of the classroom refers to how students are seated, where the students and teacher are in relation to one another, how classroom members move around the room, and the

overall sense of atmosphere and order. The research on classroom environments suggests that classrooms should be organized to accommodate a variety of activities throughout the day and to meet the teacher's instructional goals (Savage, 1999; Weinstein, 1992). In addition, the classroom should be set up to set the stage for the teacher to address the academic, social, and emotional needs of students (MacAulay, 1990). The standards for determining what spatial lay-out is most appropriate to fulfill these functions include: ways to maximize the teacher's ability to see and be seen by all his or her students; facilitate ease of movement throughout the classroom; minimize distractions so that students are best able to actively engage in academics; provide each student and the teacher with his or her own personal space; and ensuring that each student can see presentations and materials posted in the classroom.

Most researchers agree that well-arranged classroom settings reflects the following attributes: Clearly defined spaces within the classroom that are used for different purposes and that ensure students know how to behave in each of these areas (Quinn, Osher, Warger, Hanley, Bader, & Hoffman, 2000; Stewart & Evans, 1997; Walker, Colvin, & Ramsey, 1995; Walker & Walker, 1991). For instance, classrooms will contain a high-traffic area around commonly shared resources and spaces for teacher-led instruction or independent work, such as rows of desks. A classroom for students with learning/behavior problems may have separate quiet spaces where a student can cool down or work independently (Quinn et al., 2000; Walker, Colvin, & Ramsey, 1995), personal spaces that each student can call his or her own (Rinehart, 1991; Quinn et al., 2000), and areas for large and small group activities that set the stage for specific kinds interactions between students and teacher (Rinehart, 1991; Walker, Colvin, & Ramsey, 1995). There may also be spaces to store items, computers, or audio-visual equipment. Seating students in rows facilitates on task behavior and academic learning; whereas more open arrangements, such as clusters, facilitate social exchanges among students (MacAulay, 1990; Walker & Walker, 1991). It is useful to strategically arrange the classroom to limit student contact in high-traffic areas, such as the space surrounding the pencil sharpener and wastebasket, and instructional areas; and, to seat easily distracted students farther away from high- traffic areas (Bettenhausen, 1998; Quinn et al., 2000; Walker, Colvin, & Ramsey, 1995; Walker & Walker, 1991). All students should have a clear view of the teacher and vice versa, at all times (Quinn et al., 2000; Rinehart, 1991; Stewart & Evans, 1997; Walker et al., 1995; Walker & Walker, 1991; Wolfgang, 1996). In addition, the traffic pattern in the classroom allows the teacher to be in close physical proximity to high maintenance students (Shores, Gunter & Jack, 1993; Wolfgang, 1996). There is some evidence that it is useful to limit visual and auditory stimulation that may distract students with attention and behavior problems (Bettenhausen, 1998; Cummings, Quinn et al., 2000). There is good reason to strategically place students with special needs or behavior problems in close proximity to the teacher's desk (Bettenhausen, 1998; Wolfgang, 1996). Shores and his colleagues (1993) recommend that this be done not only to monitor student problem behaviors, but also to facilitate teacher delivery of positive statements when compliant or otherwise appropriate behaviors are exhibited. Finally, it is advantageous to keep the classroom orderly and well organized (Bettenhausen, 1998; Stewart & Evans, 1997).

Thungu, ET al (2009) observe that class is a group of learners from different backgrounds and with different interests and abilities and suggest that the teacher should organize and manage the classroom well for effective teaching-learning process. This suggests that classroom organization is an important factor that can determines the level of success in students' performance. Bull and Solity (1992) support this when they maintain that teaching intentions will be conveyed effectively to pupils depending on the way the total classroom environment is organized. They also maintain that each component needs to be well planned and managed in a way that enables teachers to communicate effectively with their learners. Farrant (1999) holds that in order

for learning to be efficient, teachers need to make simple rules and to establish systematic procedures for dealing with different organizational routines at schools.

Cohen and Manion (1992) hold that proper organization of the classroom exerts a powerful influence on both teaching and learning. They also suggest that classroom organization involves the following (p. 105-118): arrangement of pupils, the physical environment, and the use of space, and resources.

2.3 Student Assessment and Self-Assessment

Assessment is the only means to establish what learners have achieved or whether they have achieved what has been planned and intended. Popham (2001) in Sowel (2005, p. 178) considers assessment as an activity that enables teachers to find out how long to continue to teach toward a particular instructional objective. Farrant (1999) views it as the process by which the quality of an individual's performance can be determined. Hammill (1986) defined assessment as the act of acquiring and analyzing information about students for some stated purposes, usually for diagnosis of specific problems and for planning instructional programs. Purposes for assessing students include screening students to find those who need special assistance, to diagnose their problems, to identify their instructional needs, to document their progress in special programs and to provide information for use in research projects.

Bruce (2001) observes that self-assessment is more accurately defined as a process by which students 1) monitor and evaluate the quality of their thinking and behavior when learning and 2) identify strategies that improve their understanding and skills. That is, self-assessment occurs when students judge their own work to improve performance as they identify discrepancies between current and desired performance (Rolheiser and Ross 2001). This aspect of self-assessment aligns closely with standards-based education, which provides clear targets and criteria that can facilitate student self-assessment. The pervasiveness of standards-based instruction provides an ideal context in which these clear-cut benchmarks for performance and criteria for evaluating student products, when internalized by students, provide the knowledge needed for self-assessment (Black and Wiliam 1998). Finally, self-assessment identifies further learning targets and instructional strategies (correctives) students can apply to improve achievement (Schunk 2004).

2.4 Time Management

Time management is a topic of importance to educators, researchers, and psychologists, as it relates to both academic and job performance (Liu, Rijmen, MacCann, & Roberts, 2009; Macan, 1994). Despite its growing popularity, a recent meta-analysis of 35 studies focusing on time management, time use, and time structure concluded that no agreed-upon definition of time management exists (Claessens, van Eerde, & Rutte, 2007). Time management involves determining one's needs, setting goals to meet needs, and prioritizing and planning to meet goals (Lakein, 1973). It has to do with goal setting, the mechanics of time management, and organization (Macan, Shahani, Dipboye, & Phillips, 1990).

Although the connection is intuitively clear, surprisingly little research has been conducted linking time management to academic performance. There is, however, a growing body of research which suggests that time management is positively related to academic performance (Adamson, Covic, & Lincoln, 2004; Britton & Tesser, 1991; Lahmers & Zulauf, 2000; Liu et al., 2009; Macan et al., 1990; Trueman & Hartley, 1996). For example, in a recent study of middle school students, Liu et al. (2009) found that the time management skills of planning and organization were

positively related to course grades. Further, researchers have theorized that time management strategies are important cognitive aspects of self-regulated learning that can lead to higher academic achievement (Dembo & Eaton, 1997; Eilam & Aharon, 2003; Zimmerman & Risemberg, 1997). High achievers are more able than average or low achievers to invest their efforts and abilities in time management related self-regulatory processes, such as planning (Eilam & Aharon, 2003; Mutie & Ndambuki, 2005). Furthermore, Britton and Tesser (1991) found that both the time management skill of short-term planning and time attitudes were related to academic achievement.

3. Research Methodology

The study employed descriptive research design. Research questions and hypotheses guided the study; questionnaire was the major instrument from which information was obtained. The research was conducted at University of Arusha, Musoma Centre (UoA- MEC) with the population of 184 Bachelor of Education, Bachelor of Business Administration and Diploma in Education students as target population. The researchers used a sample of 36% respondents, which is acceptable percentage in education and social sciences types of research. In order to obtain the sample size (n) of the target population, the researchers employed random sampling procedures by casting out ballots with 36% and 64% of marked and unmarked small pieces of papers respectively. Every single student had equal chance to participate in the study in that only those who randomly picked the marked pieces of papers participated in the study by filling the questionnaire.

The study was guided by two major research questions, one of which was developed into a number of null hypotheses for testing:

1. What are demographic characteristics of University of Arusha Musoma centre students?
2. Is there significant difference in satisfaction of University of Arusha students categorized according to age, program of study, academic performance, gender, nature of scholarship and financial sponsorship with academic experiences?

While five-interval scaled items appeared in the questionnaire, respondents ticked the appropriate options to indicate their level of satisfaction with selected areas of academic experiences: **4** denoted **Strongly Agree**, **3** denoted **Agree**, **2** denoting **Disagree**, **1** denoted **Strongly Disagree** while **0** denoted **No Experience**. The researchers coded the information and quantified it into descriptive units using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences ready for analysis.

3.1 Validity and reliability of the Instruments

To obtain content-related evidence of validity, the researcher, through their research experience looked at the content and format of the questionnaire before the actual data collection. They read over and over the items in the instrument and then adjusted accordingly, thus, the content-related validity was established, based on the objectives of the study. The researchers employed Cronbach's alpha to determine the internal- consistency of the questionnaire items. The analysis was done using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS), and a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of .907 was established. This is a very high reliability coefficient, denoting that the results obtained were highly reliable.

3.2 Statistical Treatment of Data

The information collected from the field through the questionnaire was analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences. Both descriptive and inferential statistics were employed in

doing the data analysis. Descriptive statistics was used to analyze demographic information of respondents while t-test and Analysis of Variance were used to analyze research questions that sought to determine differences among various groups of respondents.

4. Results and Discussion

The purpose of this study was to find out university students' demographics and satisfaction level in selected academic experiences. It also looked at the differences between students' demographic factors and level of satisfaction in selected areas of academic experiences.

Researchers first sought to solicit demographic characteristics of students in terms of gender, nature of scholarship, age group, year of study, program of study, sponsorship and academic performance- in terms of GPA. Results indicated that targeted students of University of Arusha, Musoma centre had a varied range of demographic characteristics. Majority of them (72.7%) were male as compared to the female counterparts (27.3%). This indicates great variation of students in terms of gender, suggesting a serious gender imbalance and disparity problem. As far as nature of scholarship is concerned, students are a mixed group of both fresh from High School and in-service students. Amid this range of characteristics, in-service students (59.1%) outnumbered the fresher from school counterparts (40.9%) suggesting that UoA MEC plays a big role in professional development of workers in the country. The age of students also varied in that majority (47%) were between the age of 26-33, followed by those in the age group of between 18-25 (36.5%) and those above the age of 33 (16.6%), suggesting that students at UoA MEC vary from adolescents, early adults and beyond. This is a very important factor to be considered by educators as far as individual difference and learning is concerned.

Statistical analysis indicated normal distribution of students in terms of year of study though the number of first (36.4%) and third year students (33.3%) was slightly higher than that of second years (30.3%). Students also varied in terms of program of study, Bachelor of Education students being the majority (84.8%) and therefore outnumbering their Diploma in Education (7.6% and Bachelor of Business Administration (7.6%) counterparts. Another demographic difference was in terms of sponsorship. While majorities (51.5%) were self-sponsored, minority of students (48.5%) were either government sponsored or sponsored by other organizations. As far as academic performance is concerned, majority of respondents (77.3%) were under the category of upper second followed by first class students (19.7%) and lower second students (3.0%) were the minority. This indicates that majority of students at UoA MEC perform well in their studies and is something worth appreciation.

Further, researchers tested if there was a significant difference in satisfaction with academic experiences by students categorized according the following characteristics:

- a. Age groups
- b. Academic program
- c. Academic performance
- d. Gender
- e. Nature of scholarship
- f. Sponsorship

This called for testing of several null hypotheses of the study, namely:

- a. *There is no significant difference in satisfaction of University of Arusha students categorized according to age with academic experiences.*

Due to three different age groups of respondents, One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to find out the differences in perception of satisfaction with academic experiences. Table 1 gives the results of the analysis. Table 1 indicates mean differences of students categorized according to three age groups. The mean score of all three groups fall within the range of 2.50 to 3.49 denoting that all groups of respondents agreed to be satisfied with academic experiences at University of Arusha. Further, a p value of .480, which is greater than the critical value, indicated no significant difference among respondents. This led to acceptance of the null hypothesis, concluding that there is no significant difference in satisfaction of students categorized according to age with academic experiences.

- b. *There is no significant difference in satisfaction of University of Arusha students categorized according to program of study with academic experiences.*

Initial analysis in Table 3 reveals a range of varied mean scores among students categorized according to program of study, Bachelor of Business Administration having the highest mean (3.4446) followed by Bachelor of Education with the mean of (3.0704) and Diploma in Education with the lowest mean score (2.8322). With this varied range of mean scores, however, the score of all three groups fell within the range of 2.50-3.49 suggesting agreement of satisfaction with academic experiences. The p value of .026 in Table 4 which is smaller than critical value, however, led researchers to reject the null hypothesis which states that there is no significant difference in satisfaction of University of Arusha students categorized according to program of study with academic experiences. This implies that students at the same institution but in different academic programs had different perceptions of their levels of satisfaction with selected academic experiences.

- c. *There is no significant difference in satisfaction of University of Arusha students categorized according to gender with academic experiences.*

This question called for t-test in Table 7 where researchers got slight different mean scores for male (3.1365) and female (2.9321). However, both mean scores were within 2.50-3.49, denoting agreeing to be satisfied with academic experiences. Table 8 revealed a sig. of .998, which is greater than critical value denoting acceptance of the null hypothesis and concluding that there is no significant difference in satisfaction of University of Arusha students categorized according to gender with academic experiences.

- d. *There is no significant difference in satisfaction of University of Arusha students categorized according to nature of scholarship with academic experiences.*

This question called for t-test in Table 9 where researchers got slight different mean scores for fresh from high school (3.0472) and in-service students (3.1039). However, both mean scores were within 2.50-3.49, denoting agreeing to be satisfied with academic experiences. Table 10, further reveals a sig. of .965, which is greater than critical value meaning acceptance of the null hypothesis and concluding that there is no significant difference in satisfaction of University of Arusha students categorized according to nature of scholarship with academic experiences.

- e. *There is no significant difference in satisfaction of University of Arusha students categorized according to financial sponsorship with academic experiences.*

To test this hypothesis, t-test was used as seen in Table 11 where researchers got slight different mean scores for sponsored (3.0363) and self-sponsored students (3.1226). Both mean scores, however, were within 2.50-3.49, denoting agreeing to be satisfied with academic experiences. Table 12, further revealed a sig. of .780, which is greater than critical value, meaning we accept the null hypothesis and conclude that there is no significant difference in satisfaction of University of Arusha students categorized according to financial sponsorship status with academic experiences.

Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

This section summarized results of the study and gave conclusions and recommendations. The purpose of the study was to find out university students' demographics and satisfaction in selected academic experiences. It also looked at differences between students' demographic factors and satisfaction in selected areas of academic experiences.

Amid a range of demographic differences, all groups of respondents in terms of age, academic performance, nature of scholarship, and financial sponsorship agreed to be satisfied with educational guidance and counseling, arrangement of physical environment, assessment and proper time management at University of Arusha- Musoma centre, and there was no significant difference among students' satisfaction with academic experiences.

In harmony with Ngussa, Mukami, Njoroge, Kuboja and Makewa (2014) who contended that under normal circumstances, groups of learners are formed by people of different characteristics, the present study established a variety of demographic characteristics among UoA-MEC students in terms of gender, nature of scholarship, age, year of study, financial sponsorship, and academic performance. As far as nature of scholarship is concerned, for instance, UoA MEC has both fresher from high school and in-service students. This kind of mixed background can be of benefit to students who came directly from high schools in that they can benefit practical experiences from their counterparts who gained work experiences before joining their studies.

Another variety of characteristics was in terms of gender. Male students outnumbered their female counterparts. The fact that almost three quarters of students were males suggests serious gender imbalance and disparity problem that needs closer attention and further investigation. Further, UoA MEC has a mixed background of students ranging from adolescents to middle adults, suggesting that grown up students can guide adolescent students in academic and behavioral practices. In addition, UoA MEC had mixed ability groups of learners, ranging from first class, upper second and lower second scholars. This calls upon teachers to device strategies that will meet different groups of learning abilities in the teaching and learning transaction. This kind of variations indicates a range of individual differences among the learners that educators can use as an opportunity in their teaching in that different approaches, methods and strategies can be used to meet the needs of students according to their varied range of characteristics. Rue and Byars (1993) contend that teachers as immediate supervisors of instruction need to consciously encourage members of different characteristics to form and actively participate in group collaborative activities and interact well with group members of opposite characteristics in order to reach high performance goal.

Students in different academic programs had different mean scores in their satisfaction with selected academic experiences. Bachelor of Business Administration and Bachelor of Education students had higher mean scores (3.4446 and 3.0704) respectively than Diploma in Education students who had a mean score of 2.8322). This implies that the higher the education level, the

greater the level of satisfaction with academic experiences at UoA-MEC. Since the study of Stike (1984) indicated that the level of students' positive feeling or satisfaction is associated with students' being able to find adequate resources to meet their academic and social interests, the university administration and educators of diploma in education in particular, should provide students with adequate resources to meet their academic and social interests in order to increase their level of satisfaction with various academic programs. As argued by Aitken (1982), teachers should also strive to improve other key determinants of satisfaction such as academic performance, quality of curriculum and quality of academic advising.

With these findings the researchers recommend that teachers should make use of established range of individual demographic differences among University of Arusha student as an opportunity in their teaching in that varied range of approaches can be used to meet the needs of students according to their individual differences. Educators should also consider formation of collaborative learning groups of demographic differences so that learners of different characteristics should benefit from their fellow students with different characteristics. For example, in-service student-teachers should be encouraged to impart practical knowledge to their fresh from high school counterparts. Established gender disparity problem should be dealt with by encouraging more females to join different programs of study at University of Arusha- Musoma Centre so that to have male-female balance. Finally, University of Arusha- Musoma Centre educators should device strategies that will meet different groups of learning abilities in the teaching and learning transaction.

In addition to that, researchers recommend that further studies be conducted under the following topic: Students Demographics and Satisfaction Level in Selected Academic Experiences Across the country and in different levels of education.

Reference

- Adamson, B. J., Covic, T., & Lincoln, M. (2004). Teaching time and organizational management skills to first-year health science students: Does training make a difference? *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 28, 261–276.
- Aitken, N. D. (1982). College student performance, satisfaction and retention. *Journal of Higher Education*, 53, 32-50.
- Astin, A., Korn, W., & Green, K. (1987, Winter). Retaining and satisfying students. *Educational Record*, 36-42.
- Bailey, B. L., Bauman, C., & Lata, K. A. (1998). *Student retention and satisfaction: The evolution of a predictive model*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 424797).
- Bettenhausen, S. (1998). Make proactive modifications to your classroom. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, 33(3), 182-183.
- Betz, E. L., Menne, J. W., Starr, A. M., & Klingensmith, John E. (1971). A dimensional

- analysis of college student satisfaction. *Measurement and Evaluation in Guidance*, 4(2), 99-106.
- Black, P., and D. Wiliam. 1998. "Assessment and Classroom Learning." *Assessment in Education* 5(1): 7-74.
- Britton, B. K., & Tesser, A. (1991). Effects of time-management practices on college grades. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 83, 405-410.
- Bruce, L. B. 2001. "Student Self-Assessment: Making Standards Come Alive." *Classroom Leadership* (5)1. Retrieved from <<http://www.ascd.org/portal/site/ascd/template.MAXIMIZE/menuitem.29d4046bbea38f2eb>>.
- Bull, S. L and Solity, J. E (1992). *Classroom management: Principles to practice*. London. Routledge.
- Claessens, B. J. C., van Eerde, W., & Rutte, C. G. (2007). A review of the time management literature. *Personnel Review*, 36, 255-274.
- Cohen, L and Manion, L (1992). *A guide to teaching pactice* (3rd ed.). London. Routledge.
- Cummings, C. (2000). *Winning strategies for classroom management*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Danielson, C. (1998). Is satisfying college students the same as decreasing their dissatisfaction? (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 422812)
- Dembo, M. H., & Eaton, M. J. (1997). School learning and motivation. In G. D. Phye (Ed.), *Handbook of academic learning: Construction of knowledge* (pp. 65-103). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Eilam, B., & Aharon, I. (2003). Students planning in the process of self-regulated learning. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 28, 304-334.
- Farrant, J. S (1999). *Principles and Practice of Education*. Singapore: Longman.
- Hammill, D.D (1986). *Assessing the abilities and instructional needs of students*. Texas: Industrial Oaks Boulevard.
- Hatcher, L., Kryter, K., Prus, J. S., & Fitzgerald, V. (1992). Predicting college student satisfaction, commitment and attrition from investment model constructs. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 22(16), 1273-1296.
- Lahmers, A. G., & Zulauf, C. R. (2000). Factors associated with academic time use and academic performance of college students: A recursive approach. *Journal of College Student Development*, 41, 544-556.
- Lakein, A. (1973). *How to get control of your time and life*. New York, NY: NAL Penguin.

- Liu, O. L., Rijmen, F., MacCann, C., & Roberts, R. (2009). The assessment of time management in middle-school students. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 47, 174–179.
- Love, B. J. (1993). Issues and problems in the retention of Black students in predominately White institutions of higher learning. *Equity and Excellence in Education*, 26(1), 27-37.
- MacAulay, D. J. (1990). Classroom environment: A literature review. *Educational Psychology*, 10(3), 239-253.
- Macan, T. H. (1994). Time management: Test of a process model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 381–391.
- Macan, T. H., Shahani, C., Dipboye, R. L., & Phillips, A. P. (1990). College students' time management: Correlations with academic performance and stress. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82, 760–768.
- Makinde, O. (1984). *Fundamentals of guidance and counseling*. London: Macmillan Education Ltd.
- Mutie, E. K and Ndambuki, P. N (2005). *Guidance and counseling for schools and colleges*. East Africa: Oxford.
- Ngussa, B. M; Mukami, D; Njoroge, S; Kuboja, J and Makewa, L. N 2014. *Student Attitude Towards group collaborative learning experiences and frustration: A case of University of Eastern Africa, Baraton- Kenya*. Baraton Annual Interdisciplinary Research Journal in May, 2014.
- Ogunlade, O; Joshua and Ogunlade, A (2013). Assessment of Internet Service Quality and Customers' Satisfaction in University of Ilorin, Ilorin, Nigeria. *Journal of Education and Practice* www.iiste.org ISSN 2222-1735 (Paper) ISSN 2222-288X (Online) Vol.4, No.20, 201381
- Olaitan, A. W (2012). *The Effects of Background Characteristics and School Factors on College Students' Performance and Satisfaction*. *Journal of Education and Practice* www.iiste.org ISSN 2222-1735 (Paper) ISSN 2222-288X (Online) Vol. 3, No.8, 2012251
- Quinn, M. M., Osher, D., Warger, C. L., Hanley, T. V., Bader, B. D., & Hoffman, C. C. (2000). *Teaching and working with children who have emotional and behavioral challenges*. Longmont, CO: Sopris West.
- Rinehart, J. (1991). Organization of the environment. In Morgan, S. R. & Rinehart, J. (Eds.) *Interventions for students with emotional disorders*. Austin, TX: Pro-Ed.
- Rolheiser, C., and J. A. Ross. 2001. "Student Self-Evaluation: What Research Says and What Practice Shows." Retrieved from <http://www.cdl.org/resource-library/articles/self_eval.php?type=subject&id=4>.
- Rue, L. W and Byars, L. L (1993). *Supervision: Key link to productivity (4th ed)*. USA: Richard D. Salomon (1989)

- Savage, T. V. (1999). *Teaching self-control through management and discipline*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Schunk, D. H., 2004. *Learning Theories: An Educational Perspective*. Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Merrill Prentice/Hall.
- Sedlacek, W. E. (1987). Black students on White campuses: 20 years of research. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 28(6), 484-495.
- Shores, R. E., Gunter, P. L., & Jack, S. L. (1993). Classroom management strategies: Are they setting events for coercion? *Behavioral Disorders*, (18)2, 92-102.
- Sowel, E. J (2005, p. 27). *Curriculum: An integrated introduction* (35r ed.). New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Stewart, S. C. & Evans, W. H. (1997). Setting the stage for success: Assessing the instructional environment. *Preventing School Failure*, 41(2), 53-56.
- Stikes, C. S. (1984). *Black students in higher education*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Suen, H. K. (1983). Alienation and attrition of Black college students on a predominately white campus. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 24(2), 117-121.
- Taylor, A. I. & Buku, K. (2006). *Basics in guidance and counseling*. (2nd ed.). Accra: Salt 'N' Light.
- Tinto, V. (1993). *Leaving college*. (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Thungu, Wandera, Gachie and Alumande (2010). *Mastering PTE Education*. Nairobi: Oxford University Press, East Africa, LTD.
- Trueman, M., & Hartley, J. (1996). A comparison between the time management skills and academic performance of mature and traditional-entry university students. *Higher Education*, 32, 199–215.
- Walker, H. M., Colvin, G., & Ramsey, E. (1995). *Antisocial behavior in school: Strategies and best practices*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.
- Walker, H. M. & Walker, J. E. (1991). *Coping with noncompliance in the classroom: A positive approach for teachers*. Austin, TX: Pro-Ed.
- Weinstein, C. S. (1992). *Designing the instructional environment: Focus on seating*. Bloomington, IN: Proceedings of Selected Research and Development Presentations at the Convention of the Association for Educational Communications and Technology. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 348 039)

Wolfgang, C. H. (1996). *The three faces of discipline for the elementary school teacher: Empowering the teacher and students*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Zimmerman, B. J., & Risenberg, R. (1997). Self-regulatory dimensions of academic learning and motivation. In G. D. Phye (Ed.), *Handbook of academic learning: Construction of knowledge* (pp. 105–125). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Table 1 and 2: Satisfaction of Students by Age with academic experiences

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
18-25	24	3.0102	.41502	.08472	2.8349	3.1854	2.00	3.68
26-33	31	3.1334	.32072	.05760	3.0157	3.2510	2.49	3.62
Above 33	11	3.0864	.41128	.12401	2.8101	3.3627	2.46	3.89
Total	66	3.0807	.37096	.04566	2.9895	3.1719	2.00	3.89

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.206	2	.103	.742	.480
Within Groups	8.739	63	.139		
Total	8.945	65			

Table 3 and 4: Satisfaction of students by program with academic experiences

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Bachelor of Education	56	3.0704	.36313	.04853	2.9732	3.1677	2.00	3.68
Diploma in Education	5	2.8322	.20937	.09363	2.5722	3.0922	2.49	3.03
Bachelor of Business Administration	5	3.4446	.36746	.16433	2.9883	3.9009	2.89	3.89
Total	66	3.0807	.37096	.04566	2.9895	3.1719	2.00	3.89

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.977	2	.488	3.861	.026
Within Groups	7.968	63	.126		
Total	8.945	65			

Table 5 and 6: Satisfaction of students by GPA with academic experiences

GPA	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
4.4-5.0	13	3.0529	.28593	.07930	2.8801	3.2257	2.51	3.65
3.5-4.3	51	3.0912	.39456	.05525	2.9802	3.2021	2.00	3.89
2.7-3.4	2	2.9962	.38753	.27402	-.4856	6.4781	2.72	3.27
Total	66	3.0807	.37096	.04566	2.9895	3.1719	2.00	3.89

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.030	2	.015	.106	.900
Within Groups	8.915	63	.142		
Total	8.945	65			

Table 7 and 8: Satisfaction of students by gender

What is your gender?		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
SATISFACTION	Male	48	3.1365	.34818	.05026
	Female	18	2.9321	.39852	.09393

		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
SATISFACTION	Equal variances assumed	.000	.998	2.042	64	.045	.20441	.10012	.00441	.40442
	Equal variances not assumed			1.919	27.316	.066	.20441	.10653	-.01405	.42288

Table 9 and 10: Satisfaction of students by nature of scholarship

Nature of scholarship		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
SATISFACTION	Fresh from school	27	3.0472	.37720	.07259
	In-service	39	3.1039	.36972	.05920

		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
SATISFACTION	Equal variances assumed	.002	.965	-.607	64	.546	-.05669	.09333	-.24313	.12975
	Equal variances not assumed			-.605	55.338	.548	-.05669	.09367	-.24439	.13101

Table 11 and 12: Satisfaction of students by sponsorship

Sponsorship	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
SATISFACTION Sponsored	32	3.0363	.36379	.06431
Self-sponsored	34	3.1226	.37816	.06485

		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
SATISFACT ION	Equal variances assumed	.079	.780	-.944	64	.349	-.08634	.09144	-.26902	.09634
	Equal variances not assumed			-.945	63.967	.348	-.08634	.09133	-.26880	.09612