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ABSTRACT

Universities’ food services are one of the largest sectors of the foodservice industry, and studies have shown that this market is a growing one, especially at universities. It has a goal to satisfy the people’s basic need for food as well as their minds’ appetite and nutritional/health knowledge. The study was conducted to evaluate the customer experience at the cafeteria, determining the nutritional challenges of customers and the diverse needs of its customers. People’s perception of a good quality cafeteria was also studied, and it was also aimed to share the empirical findings with the policymakers and implement them to create the ambiance and experience that are in demand by the students and workers of the institution. A descriptive survey was conducted at the cafeteria to collect data that would answer the aforementioned objectives. This study utilized a descriptive research design (cross-sectional standardized survey). The data collectors visited the cafeteria at different times, like from opening to closing hours or at certain intervals during the day. One thousand instruments were printed, between January–May 2018, 600 respondents were contacted, and 488 returned the standardized questionnaire among those. When the respondents were asked ‘Where do you normally get lunch on school days?’ the majority of the sampled respondents indicated that normally they consume food off the campus (47.3%) as compared to 37.1% who do so at the institution’s Cafeteria. Most of the respondents indicated that they eat at the Cafeteria 3–4 times a week compared to only 20.5%. The majority of the those who eat at the Cafeteria for the 5 months consumed sandwiches and wraps (30.9%) followed by deserts (24.2%), fruits (22.4%), main meal (12.6%), soups (8.7%) and lastly salads (1.1%). Respondents’ views on rating of the health content of the food are presented in a bar graph. The Cafeteria is a social agent that enhances students’ perception of him/her as well as the place of interaction. Therefore, peoples’ satisfaction with food is a factor in the discourse of human existence, and this means that food quality is a part of the general dialogue of university students’ satisfaction with the product offerings of the institution.
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Introduction
Abraham Maslow indicated that humans are driven by several categories of needs which are arranged in a pyramid with the basic/physiological needs being at the base of the pyramid (Maslow, 1953). Included among with physiological needs is the need for food. This means that where there are humans, food must be provided in order to cater to their basic needs (Hamburg, Finkenauer, and Schuengel, 2014). It follows that organizations should provide food courts or cafeterias that cater to their workers basic need for food. Universities are no different from other organizations that house human beings. A cafeteria is simply the organization’s recognition that providing for the food needs of its workers will allow for higher productivity and less inefficiencies.

A Cafeteria is a place (such as a restaurant or room in a school) where people are able to purchase food to satisfy one of their basic needs (Merriam-Webster, 2018). Ruetzler and Meyer (2005) emphasized that there is an urgent need for continual and integral improvement of campus dining operations because of outside market competition. Universities are forced to compete with other food providers including restaurants, delis and even small “cookshops”, which makes the need for them to modernize their operations apparent. Universities’ food services are one of the largest sectors of the food service industry (Lam & Heung, 1998; Andaleeb & Caskey, 2007), and studies have shown that this market is a growing one (College & University, 1997; Kim, Moreo, & Yeh, 2004; Knutson, 2000). This growing industry, especially at universities, has as its goal the satisfaction of people’s basic need for food as well as their minds’ appetite and nutritional/health knowledge (Peters, 2015).

Peters (2015) put into perspective the new food service industry in universities in this way:

“Led by vocal champions like Mr. Kenny and supported by national non-profit groups such as Meal Exchange, Canadian universities are questioning old assumptions about food and campus life. Some are overhauling their entire procurement approach. Others are testing a student-run garden or a farmers’ market. Many are embracing better quality and more sustainable food and are making wide-ranging connections between better diets and overall mental and intellectual health.”

Peters’ perspective brings into focus marketing mechanisms and how the food must be handled in universities like a holistic entity. Undoubtedly, the food service units at university is about joy, service, taste, and the community of eating among other people. Simply put, it is about the quality of the entire experience and not merely the food, which would suggest that a cafeteria at a university is a community and not merely a diner.

In fact, the most important reasons why customers return to a food service outlet have been identified as quality of food and fresh ingredients (Brumback, 1998). Food choice is crucial for health conscious consumers who always place the importance on healthy lifestyle and nutritional value products (Razan Elhassan, Eman Gamal, and Somiya Mohammed, 2013). Consumers are seeking quality for money which is not different for customers at universities. Even in the area of food, University customers are a direct satisfaction to the tangible and intangible products (Estepe et al., 2005). Students’ satisfaction with the university foodservice is indeed contingent on the quality of food sold in its cafeterias (Shanka and Taylor, 2005; Webber, 2004; Nadzirah, Ab Karim, Ghazali, and Othman, 2013). Cafeteria service quality is defined as high quality food that is highly varied, convenient, priced fairly, and has excellent taste (Liang & Zhang, 2009). Abdullah, Mansor, and Naba (2012) determined that the components for defining cafeteria services include food quality, price, and value. Universities are not only expected to meet the intangible needs of their students (i.e., an education), they are also to provide other services that will meet the general needs of their constituents including food choices (Center for Disease Control and Prevention, 2010; Schucker, Levy, Tenney and Mathews, 1992; Rodgers, Kessler, Portnoy, et al., 1994; Freedman and Connors, 2010; Briefel, Wilson and Gleason, 2009; Cason and Wenrich, 2002; National Prevention Council, 2011; Garcia, Sykes, Mathews, et al., 2010; Ogden, Carroll, Curtin, and McDowell, 2006).

The quality of the food service experience of students at universities has been the subject of several studies (Nadzirah, Ab Karim, Ghazali, and Othman, 2013). In a chosen location for research of Malaysia’s top public higher educational institutions, Serdang, Selangor, Nadzirah et al. found that students’ satisfaction level with their cafeteria experience was more “moderate” (56.5%) than “satisfied”. Furthermore, it can be deduced from the responses of the participants that the food service quality was not meeting the sampled students’ expectations.

University cafeterias cater to students with diverse diets, some shun certain kinds of food for health and religious purposes. Additionally, students depend on well-trained dining staff to prepare edible meals that satisfy both tastes and nutritious values (Peters, 2015). However, such expectations are a part of the students’ and workers’ experiences. Customers will scrutinize daily menus of food cafeterias including proper sanitary practices and their special demands based on health conditions, allergic reactions to foods and health conditions (Razan Elhassan, Eman Gamal, and Somiya Mohammed, 2013). Simply put, health consciousness and conditions are a part of the demand expectations students and workers that must be a part of educational institutions strategic planning.
A descriptive probability sample of 350 women from UPP and 6 schools at Ahfad University for Women. The participants studied medicine, pharmacy, health science, rural extension, psychology, and management sciences. The findings revealed that 46.3% of sampled respondents indicated that they were always healthy eaters and 65.1% were indicated that they found it difficult to eat healthy (Razan Elhassan, Eman Gamal, and Somiya Mohammed, 2013), indicating that universities must cater to the demands of diverse population.

There is a group of students and workers whom are healthy eaters and they demand more of cafeteria staffs than mere food service. In fact, some of them scrutinize even manufactured products’ labels in attempting to meet their expectations (Watson, 2014). A rationale for some students’ and workers’ choice in the content of their foods is based on their special health needs as well as religious affiliation (Webster University, 2018). The importance of the diversified eating behaviours have help to fashion equally multifaceted food spaces at universities. University of Delaware is one such institutions that has created a diversified eating centre that will cater to the demands of its student population (Adams, 2016). Adams succinctly caters this concept in these words “To make it work at scale, each station makes just one main course per meal so the culinary staff can focus on preparing it well. But, with more than a dozen stations, there is no shortage of choices. Among the stations are one that is strictly gluten-free and another that is strictly vegan. There is also a kosher station that uses strict preparation techniques, and the facility even keeps a mashgiach on staff, to monitor food preparation to ensure it meets kosher standards” (Adams, 2016).

Another important component in the food service industry at universities is ambience. Ambience includes: space, artifacts (items inside the facility), layout, design, cleanliness, lighting, other patron’s behavior and employee appearance (Bitner, 1992; Hoffman and Turley, 2002). Bitner (1992) also refers to ‘services cape’ as “all of the objective physical factors that can be controlled by the firm to enhance (or constrain) employee and customer actions” (p.45). Boone and Kurtz (2006) defined ‘Product’ as physical items, services or symbolic effects that offered to fulfill the needs of customers.

Technology has been offered as an available service to customers, irrespective of the customer and the service provider (Sur, 2008). There are many examples of this concept, and two examples will be highlighted to support the position. Food service outlets are 1) using computer chips in refrigerators and the customer is able to obtain fruits choices, and 2) timers that keeps track of the operations in the kitchen to include assessment of shrinkages. All these applications reduce over-cooked food and food waste while ensuring the cooked food are safe and perfectly done (Durocher, 2001).

Stein (2005) has also recognized the potential cost savings and convenience for institutions such as universities to be a “cashless campus” by using point-of-sale technologies for foodservice, like offering meal plans in ID cards linked to a prepaid account. For some time, students and staffers at studied institution have been agitated, displeased, frustrated and unsatisfied with cafeteria, which is supported by the number of people who purchase foods outside of this food service. The cafeteria has been languishing for decades and during this time the food service industry in Mandeville has become increasingly more competitive in an environment of higher expectation. The quality of service including the variety of foods have not kept abreast of nutritional requirements of the customers. This along with an unattractive ambience compound the negative experience of shoppers. This study will aid the university in its quest to examine all of its sectors, in an attempt to address the dwindling enrolment population.

The objectives of the research are 1) to evaluate the customer experience at the cafeteria, 2) determine nutritional challenges of customers and the diverse needs of its customers 3) examine people’s perception of good quality at the cafeteria, and 4) provide the policy makers with empirical findings that can be employed to create the ambience and experience that are so demanded by students and workers at the studied institution. As such, a descriptive convenient survey was conducted at the cafeteria to provide data that would allow for the answering of the aforementioned research objectives.

Methods and Materials

A research is a process that commences from topic followed by the epistemology of theoretical framework, methodology, methods, interpretation of data to the conclusion. Some methodologists including Neuman (2006), Babbie (2007), Creswell (2014) and Crotty (2005) have extensively written on the importance of research. In fact, Balashov and Rosenberg (2002) science is the ‘pursuit of truth’ that explains the importance of the methodology in accomplishing what is scientific, which was comprehensively forwarded by Thomas Kuhn (1996). Simply put, science is framed from the philosophical perspective that Crotty referred to as the epistemology (Crotty, 2005, pp. 1-12). Crotty went on to postulate that epistemology guides the theoretical perspective; the theoretical perspective frames the methodology; the methodology informs the choice of method, and that these go into making a research scientific or otherwise. Other scholars have argued that epistemology is the “study of the criteria by which we know what does and does not constitute warranted, or scientific, knowledge” (Johnson and Duberley, 2000, pp. 2-3), which
lays the premise for social science as what obtains in the natural sciences. It is such a perspective that was outlined decades ago by Max Weber. Weber opined that a discipline is scientific solely based on the principles, approaches, guidelines, and framework that are followed in coming to a conclusion. Hence, he set the stage for the science of sociology from a meaning perspective in the pursuit of truth (Weber, 1949, 1974, 1981). This opens the door for other epistemologies such as interpretivism, constructionism, feminism, discourse analysis, and post-modernism as suitable theoretical perspectives in scientific inquiries (Crotty 2005).

Traditionally, logical positivism was the most important movement of the philosophy of science and this occurred during the twentieth century (Balashov and Rosenberg, 2002). Logical positivism or logical empiricism was concerned with and objectivistic epistemology, impersonality, experiment, use of complex statistical tools and mathematics in arriving at conclusions. Balashov and Rosenberg (2002) opined “What logical positivists required to eliminate metaphysical nonsense from empirical science was an objective principle or test that could be applied to statements and terms from any discipline and that would decide about the cognitive significance of the claim or concept.” (p. 25).

They continued that these philosophers [logical positivists] searched for principles of meaningfulness that made no demands on the specific content of scientifically legitimate statements but required them to have a specified relation to actual and possible empirical evidence that could test them (Balashov and Rosenberg, 2002, p. 25). The perspective of Balashov and Rosenberg set the framework for scientists operated, and justify their reliance of objective testing of issues. This perspective that comes from objectivistic epistemology inform positivism as a theoretical framework, guides the employment of experimentation and survey research as methodological approaches, and requires certain methods such as sampling and measurement scale as well as statistical analysis and questionnaires in wanting to pursuit truth, which is the hallmark for scientific inquiry, this study employs objectivism.

As a result, the method and methodology were informed by the objectivistic epistemology that will be detailed in this section of work. Given that objective measurement and impersonality are feature of objectivism, a standardized instrument was developed that were to measure particular concepts. One of the approaches in objectivism is impersonality that explains the choice of survey research methodology (Fowler, 2009; Crotty, 2005). For this study, Paul Andrew Bourne and Charlene Lee Sharpe designed a standardized instrument. The instrument was developed and designed after much reading, review of methodology, review of psychometric properties of various instruments and survey methodology (Flower, 2009; Crotty, 2005; Hakim, 1989; Leedy and Ormrod, 2010; Bryman, 2001; Silverman, 2005; Goel, 1988; Denzin and Lincoln, 2005), within the context of the present topic.

Having read works on satisfaction, especially students, the researcher decided to forward items that would evaluate different issues on food service in an educational institution. The items were validated by being reviewed by scholars and, methodologists in the area of psychology and statistics. After the initial setting by other scholars, the instrument was given to some students for review. Corrections were made to the satisfaction scaling in keeping with comments from the aforementioned stakeholders. The next stage in the research process was data collection, which required establishing appropriate sampling design and frame. A challenge existed in determining the actual population of people who use the services of the cafeteria. This meant the inability to compute a sample frame, therefore making it difficult to scientifically determine a sample size. It is noted that proper sample size calculation has the potential to enhance the objectivity and generalizability of findings (Kish, 1956). Consequently, a decision was taken to employ a convenience sampling approach. Although this limits the generalizability of the finding, an extended timeframe was utilizing to provide credibility of the findings.

A team of data collectors were briefed on their roles and responsibilities in the research then assigned to actual Cafeteria sight for a period of five months. The data collectors visited the cafeteria at the following times: 1) from opening to closing hours on some days, 2) at certain intervals during the day (11:00am - 2:00pm, 3:00pm -7:00pm). One thousand instruments were printed, over the 5–month period (i.e., January to May 2018), some 600 respondents were contacted, of this amount 488 returned the standardized questionnaire.

To enhance completion and participation rate of the Cafeteria survey, prospective respondents were asked to complete and drop them off at designated office on the university campus. In keeping with the researcher’s desire to maintain anonymity of the respondents, no names or other identification was required. This proved to be beneficial as evidenced by the high response rate (81.3%) as well as the responses to the open ended items on the instrument.

The data were entered, stored, and retrieved using the Statistical Packages for the Social Sciences (SPSS), for Windows Version 25.0. Descriptive statistics, frequency polygons, graphs, and tables were used to present the data. A p value of ≤ 5% (or 0.05) was used to determine the level of significance. The data, therefore, provides critical
insights into user’s perspective, health conditions, and expectation as well as perception of the service delivered by the Cafeterias including Four Points.

Findings

The gender distribution of the sampled respondents is depicted in Figure 1. For this study 488 people were surveyed. Of the sampled respondents (n=488), 40.3% (n=190) were males compared to 59.7% (n=281) females.

Figure 1. Gender of Respondents

Of the sampled respondents (n=488), 88.9% (n=434) respondents to the question of ‘What is your age at last birthday?’ The age distribution of the sampled respondents is depicted in Figure 2, below. Almost 333% (n=154) of the respondents were teenagers (ages ≤ 19 years) compared to 0.9% elderly (ages ≥60 years), with the average age being 21 years (range = 64 years). Nine percent (n=39) of the valid respondents (n=434) ages were beyond 32 years.

Figure 2. Age distribution of sampled respondents

The responses in respect of SDA affiliation are depicted in Figure 3. Of the sampled respondents (n=488), 67.3% (n=317) indicated that they were members of the SDA faith compared to 32.7% (n=154) who responded no. This means the food service offered by the Cafeteria is less appealing to non-SDA members (i.e., 2 SDA to every 1 non-SDA person who visited the Cafeteria for the studied period (i.e., 5-month period).

Figure 3. Religious Affiliation of sampled respondents

The respondents were asked ‘How long have you been at institution?’ and their responses are shown on a line graph, Figure 4. Ninety-one percent (n=442) responded to the aforementioned question. The average duration of the sampled respondents at institution was 2 years (range = 27 years). Of the sampled respondents, 5.4% (n=24) have been at institution for at least 7 years compared to 20.1% (n=86) being here for less than 12 months.

Figure 4. Length of time at the studied institution

Are you a worker, student or other?

To the question ‘Are you a worker, student or other?’, the respondents’ views are depicted in Figures 5.1-5.3. Figure 5.1 shows the percent of the respondents who are workers; Figure 5.2 depicts the students and Figure 5.3 illustrates those who indicated Other.

Of the sampled respondents (n=488), 13.3% (n=63) were workers at studied institution (Figure 5.1).
Responses to the question ‘Are you a resident of any of the halls on institution’s campus?’ are showed in the bar graph, below (Figure 6). Almost 20% (i.e., 19.9%; n=94) indicated that they reside on one of the halls of residence at the institution. This means that 1 in every 5 respondents who use the Cafeteria over the studied period residents in a hall at the institution. It can be deduced from this result that those who reside in the hall are either eating in the dorms or off the campus.

Eighty-eight and two tenths percent (n=417) of the sampled respondents were students and/or student workers at institution. Figure 5.2 depicts the percent of those in the sampled who said yes or no to being in the Other category from worker or student at the studied institution. Only 3.3% (n=16) of the sampled respondents were visitors to the institution.

Item seven (question) on the instrument was a three-part question relating to i) do you eat meat? ii) do you consume dairy products? and iii) do you consume eggs? The responses to those questions are depicted in Figures 7.1-7.3, below. Of the sampled respondents, the response rate to each question was 96.9% (n=473).

**Do You Eat Meat?**

The responses to the aforementioned question, is depicts in Figure 7.1. 82.1% (n=384) of the sampled respondents consume meats compared to 18.8% (n=89) who are not consumers of meats.

**Do you consume Eggs?**

Eighty-nine percent (n=421) of the sampled respondents indicated that they consume dairy products compared to 11.0% (n=52) who indicated no to consuming dairy products.
in Figure 9. Of the sampled respondents, 94.5% (n=461) answered this question. Most of the respondents indicated that they eat at the Cafeteria 3-4 times per week compared to only 20.5% (n=94) who do so on a daily basis. Such a finding reveals that on a regular basis only 1 in every 5 person uses the Cafeteria.

Figure 8.Where do you normally get lunch on school days?

Summary: Consumption of meat, dairy products and eggs

Responses to the question ‘Where do you normally get lunch on school days?’ are presented in Figure 8, below. The majority of the sampled respondents indicated that normally consume food off the campus (47.3%, n=219) compared to 37.1% (n=172) who do so at instituion’s Cafeteria.

When the respondents were asked ‘How often do you eat the food at the Cafeteria?’ their responses are shown in Figure 9. The majority of the respondents (n=488), 81.4% (n=385) consume egg compared to 18.6% (n=88) who do not consume egg. The food preference of the sampled respondents is depicted in figure 7.1. For this study 488 people were surveyed. Of the sampled respondents (n=488), 30.9% (n=139) followed by deserts (24.2%, n=108), fruits (22.4%, n=100), main meal (12.6%, n=56), soups (8.7%, n=39) and lastly salads (1.1%, n=5).
“How would you describe the taste of the food at the Cafeteria” was answered by the respondents and those responses are shown Figure 11, below. Four hundred and fifty-eight (93.9%) people answered the previously mentioned question. Of the valid sampled respondents (n=458), most of them indicated that the food provided at the Cafeteria was moderately good 59.2% (n=271) compared to 2.2% (n=10) consider the food to be delicious, 10.9% (n=50) stated pretty good, 17.5% (n=80) considered the food to be not good, and 10.3% (n=47) mentioned that the food was very bad.

On the matter of the perceived rating of the health content of the food, the respondents’ views are captured in a bar graph (Figure 12), below. The question was “In general, how healthy do you think the Cafeteria food is?”, 4.3% (n=20) perceived the food to be very healthy, 21.4% (n=99) indicated healthy compared to 49.2% (n=228) who remarked a little healthy and 25.1% (n=116) mentioned unhealthy.

A follow up question was asked of the respondents that read ‘What changes would you suggest to improve the food served in the Cafeteria?’ and 75% of the respondents made suggestions. The suggestions were variety (i.e. healthy or natural foods), use of digit screen, include ackee and salted fish, serve chicken or fish, add more spices, reduce the oil usage, place workers in uniform(s), employ a dietician, address the lengthy time to be served including cashing, and serve less carbohydrates and more vegetables.

The question of ‘Do you think the ordering system works well? a pie graph is used to depict the response to this issue. Ninety-six and one tenth percent (n=469) people responded to this question. Marginally more of the respondents indicated yes (50.5%, n=237) compared to 49.5% (n=233) who said no.

When the respondents were asked ‘Is there always enough food available when you order? the responses are shown in Figure 14. The majority of the sampled respondents indicated no 63.5% (n=297) compared to 36.5% (n=171) who remarked yes on the availability of food at the Cafeteria.
To the question ‘Do you feel there is enough time to buy and eat your lunch’ and the majority of the respondents indicated no 56.9% (n=267) compared to 43.1% (n=202) who said yes (see Figure 15).

Figure 15. Sufficiency of time to buy and eat lunch

When the respondents were asked, using an open ended question, “What changes (for instance in the lunchroom) that you would improve for the overall dining experience?”, 54.9% (n=268) commented on the matter. The comments ranged from having television, music, lighting, better seating, audio-visual aids, water fountain, air conditioned room, aquarium, Wi-Fi, table mats, and more disposal containers.

The respondents’ perceptions on the matter of “Is there enough variety of foods in each week’s menu? 19.2% (n=90) said yes compared to 80.8% (n=379) of the respondents that there is not the variety in each week’s menu. This means that there are 4 respondents who is dissatisfied with the food variety to 1 satisfied customer.

Figure 16. Sampled respondents of variety in each week’s menu

The rating of the cafeteria personnel/staff by sampled respondents is depicted in Figure 21. Of the sampled respondents (n=488), 93.9% (n=458) responded to this issue. Four and one tenth percent (n=19) of the respondents gave the personnel staff an excellent rating, 25.3% (n=116) gave the personnel staff a good rating, 47.4% (n=217) rates the personnel at the Cafeteria as average, 16.2% (n=74) indicated not good, 4.8% (n=22) stated very bad, and 2.2% (n=10) of the respondents indicated don’t know.

“Is it your belief that an illness was associated with food consumed at the Cafeteria”, which was answered in Figure 19. Eighty-six and 7 tenths percent (n=423) of the sampled respondents (n=488) responded to the aforementioned question. Four percent (n=17) of the sampled customers answered always, 8.7% (n=37) answered most times, 51.8% (n=219) stated sometimes, and 35.5% (n=150) indicated never (Figure 19).

Figure 19. Sampled respondent’s belief of illness associated with cafeteria

To the question “On a daily basis, what time do you visit the Cafeteria?”, the responses in percentage points are shown in Figure 20, below. The majority of the sampled respondents visited the Cafeteria at 5:00 – 5:59 pm (16.9%, n=72) followed by 12:00-12:59 pm (16.4%, n=70), 1:00-1:59 pm (14.5%, n=62) and 6:00 – 6:59 pm (13.1%, n=56) compared to least after 6:00 pm and before 11:00 am.

Figure 20. Time of visit to Cafeteria
Seventy-eight and 5 tenths percent (n=383) of the sampled respondents to the question of “On average, how many times per day do you visit the Cafeteria/Four Points? (see Figure 21). Of the 383 valid respondents, the majority of them indicated once (49.4%, n=189) compared to twice (30.6%, n=117) and 52 (13.6%) indicated thrice.

Figure 21. Frequency of visitation to Café/Four Points
The average daily perceived expenditure at the Cafeteria/Four Points was Ja. $400 (range = Ja. $2,000.00), with the highest being Ja. $2,000.00. Figure 23 showed that 75 respondents indicated that their average daily expenditure at the Cafeteria/Four Points was Ja. $500-$502.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics for perceived expenditure at Cafeteria/Four Points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>510.0000</td>
<td>18.56628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% Confidence Interval for Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>473.4717</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>546.5283</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5% Trimmed Mean</td>
<td>478.9098</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>400.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>109961.478</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>331.60440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>2000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>2000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interquartile Range</td>
<td>210.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>2.010</td>
<td>.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>5.515</td>
<td>.272</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents’ rating of the aesthetics of the cafeteria are depicted in Figure 24. Of the sampled respondents (n=488), the response rate to ‘Rate the aesthetic (i.e., beauty or appearance of beauty) of the Cafeteria/Four Points was 91.4% (n=446). Two and 7 tenths percent (n=12) of the valid responses answered excellent, 16.8% (n=75) responded good, 50.7% (n=226) stated average, 22.0% (n=98) answered poor, and 7.8%(35) mentioned very poor to the previously stated issue. The respondents’ rating of the aesthetics of the cafeteria are depicted in Figure 24. Of the sampled respondents (n=488), the response rate to ‘Rate the aesthetic (i.e., beauty or appearance of beauty)
of the Cafeteria/Four Points was 91.4% (n=446). Two and 7 tenths percent (n=12) of the valid responses answered excellent, 16.8% (n=75) responded good, 50.7% (n=226) stated average, 22.0% (n=98) answered poor, and 7.8% (35) mentioned very poor to the previously stated issue.

Table 2, presents percent and frequency of respondents who answered various questions and/or statements. The questions and/or statements are presented in the extreme left of Table 2. To the question ‘Is the Cafeteria a hygienic place?’ 28.4% (n=128) at least somewhat agree compared to 16.5% (n=75) who at least somewhat disagree, with the majority (55.1%, n=249) being neutral on the matter. On the issue of ‘If you had a dietary concern, was it met by the food service staff’, 17.6% (n=77) at least somewhat agree compared to 39.5% (n=172) who at least somewhat disagree. Other issues are captured in the table (i.e., Table 2).

The respondents were asked the rate 1) the overall nutritional value of the food and 2) the quality of the food at the Cafeteria/Four Points, with 1 being poor to 5 being excellent, are depicted in Figures 25 and 26.

Table 3. Self-reported Health Conditions of sampled respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health Conditions</th>
<th>Frequency (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypertension</td>
<td>6 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes</td>
<td>5 (16.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Cholesterol</td>
<td>6 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heart Disease</td>
<td>1 (3.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinusitis</td>
<td>8 (26.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eczema</td>
<td>4 (13.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 24. Bar graph of aesthetic rating of Cafeteria

Table 2. Shows the attitude rate of the cafeteria/four points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEMS</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The atmosphere at the Cafeteria/Four Points</td>
<td>4.6% (n=21)</td>
<td>11.9% (n=54)</td>
<td>55.1% (n=249)</td>
<td>24.6% (n=111)</td>
<td>3.8% (n=17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The flow at the Cafeteria/Four Points was clear and logical.</td>
<td>7.8% (n=35)</td>
<td>16.5% (n=74)</td>
<td>49.8% (n=223)</td>
<td>21.2% (n=95)</td>
<td>4.7% (n=21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was everything clean and easily accessible at the Cafeteria/our Points?</td>
<td>4.5% (n=20)</td>
<td>16.5% (75)</td>
<td>37.5% (n=168)</td>
<td>31.5% (n=141)</td>
<td>9.8% (n=44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was nutritional information readily available?</td>
<td>33.3% (n=150)</td>
<td>20.9% (n=94)</td>
<td>31.8% (n=143)</td>
<td>10.9% (n=49)</td>
<td>3.1% (n=14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you had a dietary concern, was it met by the food service staff?</td>
<td>23.9% (n=104)</td>
<td>15.6% (n=68)</td>
<td>42.9% (n=187)</td>
<td>14.4% (n=63)</td>
<td>3.2% (n=14)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An open-ended item on the instrument sought to identify health conditions of those who use the Cafeteria and/or Four Points. The question asked was “Do you have any health conditions (i.e. asthma, hypertension diabetes, high cholesterol, etc.)?” and the responses are presented in percent in Table 3.

Discussion and Conclusion

A Cafeteria is more than a physical place where food is sold. It is a component in the total university experience of a student (Brown, Edwards and Hartwell, 2013; see also, Annex 1-5), and a place that needs equal attention as enrolment or finance. The food services at the studied institution is not generally satisfying the demands of workers and students, which is retarding the service quality. The Cafeteria, including Four Points, needs to re-examine its menu as the diversity of students and workers comes with health issues, demands, and expectations. If the Cafeteria is not satisfying customers’ demand, this will add to the high level of dissatisfaction with the overall product of the institution. Students satisfaction is associated with many facets of the university to include the Cafeteria (Andaleeb and Caskey, 2008; Haugaard and Lahteenmaki, 2017; Joung, Choi and Wang, 2016; Lee and Lyu, 2017; Kwun, 2011) and this must be addressed with urgency in order to enhance the general satisfaction of the customers, the students. A study revealed that “Participants were unanimous in their view that eating was both a physical and social act. There was consensus that eating involved socializing and building or cementing relationships, and that being in company enhanced the experience of eating. It was also seen as a more effective aid to physical and mental relaxation. Thus the emotional benefits to be gained from eating their meal were not attributable solely to the food consumed” (Brown, Edwards, and Hartwell, 2013, p. 202). This finding supports a change of the current social setting at the Cafeteria to include WiFi, music, other physical attributes - possibly an aquarium or water fountain.

The Cafeteria is a social agent that enhances students’ perception of him/herself as well as the place of interaction (Brown, et al, 2013). Brown and colleagues opined “Conversely, eating alone was associated with feelings of loneliness and even stigmatisation. It was therefore avoided where possible. When participants had to eat alone, they either ate too quickly to avoid discomfort, or they ate what they felt was poor quality take-away food. Consequently, eating alone was associated with negative impacts on both body and mind.” (p. 203). Brown et al. went further to state that eating place is well studied by anthropologists, suggesting that food service is potent in understanding human behaviours–physical and psychological states (see also, Hamburg, Finkenauer, and Schuengel, 2014; Oliver, 1997). Therefore, peoples’ satisfaction with food is a factor in the discourse of human existence (Zainol and Seladorai, 2016), and this means that food service must be a part of the general dialogue of university students’ satisfaction with the product offerings of the institution (Chang, Suki, & Nalini, A., 2014).
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