# Residents' Perception of Off-Campus Students' Housing Performance In Ile-Ife, Nigeria

Akingbohungbe, Davies Olugbenga[1]. and Akinluyi, Muyiwa[2] Lawrence. Department of Architecture, Joseph Ayo Babalola University, (JABU), P.M.B 5006, Ikeji-Arakeji, Osun State, Nigeria.
*E-mail:doluakingbohungbe@gmail.com     Phone no:08032078215

**Abstract**
The emergence and growth of commercial Off-campus Students' Housing across Nigerian public university towns are recent but significant phenomena stimulated by student population explosion and prevailing lull in On-campus Students' Housing development. Performance evaluation of physical and environmental developments is a key component of sustainable development. This work thus reports the result of a survey of residential satisfaction of this Off-campus Students' Housing in Ile-Ife through an empirical case study of some randomly selected types using structured questionnaires and personal observations. The result reflected different perceptions of performance and residential satisfaction based on the levels of facilities provided. It recommended strict control mechanism for the enforcement of professional design parameters and environmental considerations to enhance better performance of such developments.
**Keywords**: Residents' perception, performance evaluation, students' housing, off-campus housing, on-campus housing, residential satisfaction

## 1.0     Introduction.

Housing specifically refers to residential structures where people live in and grow (Amole, 2002 and Aluko, 2004). It is in response to man's natural and legitimate need for a conducive and safe environment for living (Akingbohungbe and Ojo, 2005). One variant of this is the Students' Housing (otherwise known as Hostel) which is an essential component of institutions of learning in all cultures and climates. It was conceived in step with the philosophy of close and complementary relationship of living and learning.

In Nigeria, students' housing was traditionally and almost exclusively on-campus. With time, however, student population explosion and paradigm shift in university on-campus accommodation policy combined to give rise to spontaneous development of commercial Off-campus Students' Housing (Hostel) in university towns across the country. The increasing rate of this kind of development has been very significant thus requiring evaluation of the performance of such structures. Post occupancy evaluation of this type is recognized and valued as a process capable of providing the basis for improvement of existing structures and development of better ones (Presier et al, 1988) as well as give feedback on their residential satisfaction towards the enhancement of the life-cycle value of the buildings.

The aim of this work is to evaluate the performance and residential satisfaction of these private off-campus housing (hostel) in Ile-Ife. The set objectives of the work are: (i) to examine the socio-economic characteristics of the residents of the private hostels. (ii) to evaluate the facilities provided in the hostels (iii) to determine the factors that influence the performance of the hostels (iv) to assess the residential satisfaction of residents in the hostels and proffer appropriate recommendations to enhance their life cycle benefits.

## 2.0   Conceptual Issues and Review of Literature

The concept of performance in building process is central and borne out of the assumption that a building is designed and built to support and enhance the goals and activities of the occupants (Wolfgang and Preiser, 1988). The value of such development according to Akingbohungbe and Ojo (2005) usually transcends the borders of its scenic image and involves a whole range of its functional and behavioral impacts on the residents. A study of use and response is imperative because it helps in the measurement of the degree of success of a building with reference to the quality of design. Amole (1988) argued that this serves as a springboard for future designs and enhances the standard of living within any given building. A study of use and response also helps in determining how an existing space functions and the extent to which the design objectives have been achieved in the building. Most importantly, such study offers a feedback on several assumptions, prediction and decisions implemented during the design phase and how they eventually turn out during occupancy.

Oxford and Cambridge Universities initiated the earliest and most popular examples of student housing as a building type followed later by Harvard University. Yale University also established a similar housing program in 1933 and a few years later, Princeton University established what is commonly referred to as the 'Quadrangle Plan' (Amole, ibid). All these models focused on joining the classroom experience with the out-of-class experiences in the halls of residence. The goal was to bring faculty and students into closer contact to promote an

environment that allowed students increased opportunities to discuss classroom subjects and other academic topics with pears in their residences.

Institutions of higher learning around the world, including Nigeria, have successfully incorporated student housing schemes in their master plan in an effort to integrate the formal aspect of learning with the informal and yet, no less important aspect. Therefore student housing has become an inherent part of campus planning (Amole, ibid). By providing general student accommodation, she averred that differences in backgrounds could be near equalized through the fusion of living and learning by common standard.

Most universities in Nigeria were primarily residential until emerging situations of population increase on campuses leading to unacceptable incidences of overcrowding and unhealthy accessibility to legitimate accommodation on-campus became prevalent. Students then turned to the town for accommodation and, in no time, private individuals and groups responded to these needs by providing off-campus accommodation for students' need through refurbishment of old buildings and construction of new ones. The resulting off-campus housing thus presented unregulated and varying levels of facilities.

## 3.0 The **Study Area**

The study area of this work is Ile-Ife, an ancient traditional town, established around seventeen century. Ile-Ife is regarded as the ancestral town of the Yorubas and has a very rich culture and notable arts traditions. The king is called the Ooni or Oonile, that is, the one who owns the land. A university was established in the town by the old Western Region of Nigeria in the year 19 67.The university was called the University of Ife but later renamed Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife after the late founding father, the premier of the old western region, by President Babangida, the then Head of state of Nigeria. Ile-Ife thus assumed the status of a university town in addition to some other developments like the Mokuro Water Works and The Seventh Day Adventist Hospital which constituted pull factors that gave rise to influx of people to the town.

Administratively, the old Ife division metamorphosed into Oranmiyan Local Government which later became Ife Central Local Government, Ife South, Ife North and lastly Ife East Local Government Areas. While Ife South and North are a bit removed from the town, the other two, Ife-Central and Ife East are within the centre of the ancient town.

## 4.0 Research Methodology

Primary data used for this work were generated from responses of resident students in the randomly selected off-campus hostels around the neighborhood of the university. A preliminary survey by the author spout off-campus housing in the town into "purpose-built" and "adapted" or "converted" buildings and twenty five percent samples of each type were randomly selected for study. The structured questionnaires administered were designed to elicit the socio-economic characteristics of the residents, the facility analysis of the hostel, the factors influencing the hostel performance and the residential satisfaction of the respondents.

## 5.0 Findings and Discussion

From user responses, it was clear that purpose- built off-campus housing is better planned and hence more comfortable resulting in higher residential satisfaction than the adapted ones.If attention is paid to services, such adapted ones could, however, be made more satisfactory for the residents. Hostels, as living spaces should offer adequate services as well as functional and aesthetic satisfaction to students. From the findings the private hostels evaluated performed just above average as good quality ratings of the aspects used in the evaluation outweighed the poor quality ratings. Also Findings showed that, lack of good road facilities, car parks, adequate ventilation, and sanitary condition together with delay in responses to maintenance demands, crowding, sheared facilities are major issues highlighted by the students as constrains of their hostels. These issues fall into three categories namely: design, maintenance and management matters.

**Table 1:    Socio-Economic Characteristics of the Hostels Residents**

| Socio-Economic Characteristics | | Frequency No | Percentage % |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Sex** | | | |
| | Male | 37 | 45.7 |
| | Female | 44 | 54.3 |
| | Total | 81 | 100 |
| **Age** | | | |
| | 15-20 | 28 | 34.56790123 |
| | 21-25 | 44 | 54.32098765 |
| | 26-30 | 7 | 8.641975309 |
| | Total | 79 | 97.5308642 |
| **Level of Study** | | | |
| | 100 | 3 | 3.703703704 |
| | 200 | 31 | 38.27160494 |
| | 300 | 27 | 33.33333333 |
| | 400 | 8 | 9.87654321 |
| | 500 | 12 | 14.81481481 |
| | Total | 81 | 100 |
| **Religion** | | | |
| | Christianity | 75 | 92.59259259 |
| | Islam | 6 | 7.407407407 |
| | Total | 81 | 100 |
| **Ethnicity** | | | |
| | Yoruba | 65 | 80.24691358 |
| | Igbo | 4 | 4.938271605 |
| | others | 12 | 14.81481481 |
| | Total | 81 | 100 |
| | | | |
| | Single | 78 | 96.2962963 |
| **Marital status** | Married | 3 | 3.703703704 |
| | Total | 81 | 100 |
| | | | |
| | Less Than 6000 | 21 | 25.92592593 |
| | 6000-10000 | 39 | 48.14814815 |
| | 11000-20000 | 17 | 20.98765432 |
| | Above 20000 | 4 | 4.938271605 |
| **Income in categories** | Total | 81 | 100 |

Source: Authors Field Work (2011).

The above table shows the distribution table of   the socio-economic characteristics of hostels residents indicating that more than half of the respondents about 54% are male students and about 46% are female students. The table also shows that   54% of the respondents are within age 21-25, while those within 15-20 years are 35% and of those 26-30years, are 9% with 3% non-response. The table also   shows that, 4% of the respondents are in 100 Level, while 38% of them are in 200 Level, 33% are in 300 level, 10% are in 400 level and 15% in 500 level. Based on the religion of the respondents, the distribution of the table above shows that, a greater percentage of the students 93% practice Christianity while only 7% practice Islam. From the table, Distribution by ethnicity also shows that 80% which is the majority of the respondents are Yoruba, Igbo is 5% and other tribes are 15%. The frequency table above reveals that 96% of the respondents are singles, while only 4% are married. The table also shows that almost halve of the respondents spend a monthly income between 6000 and 10000, 25% spends less than 6000, 20% spend between 11000 and 20000 while just 4% spend an income over 20000.

**Table 2:    Facilities Provided for the Residents**

| Faculties Provided for the Residents | | Frequency No | Percentage % |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Have you lived in a private hostel before** | | | |
| | Yes | 53 | 65.43209877 |
| | No | 28 | 34.56790123 |
| | Total | 81 | 100 |
| | | | |
| | Anglican | 11 | 13.58024691 |
| | Unifecs | 20 | 24.69135 |
| | Ebenezer | 10 | 12.34567901 |
| | Rectas | 11 | 13.58024691 |
| | Fine Touch | 28 | 34.56790123 |
| **Hostel name** | Total | 81 | 100 |
| | | | |
| | Excellent | 20 | 24.7 |
| | Good | 35 | 43.2 |
| | Average | 20 | 24.7 |
| **Room fixtures and furniture** | Fair | 6 | 7.4 |
| | Total | 81 | 100.0 |
| | | | |
| | Excellent | 23 | 28.39506173 |
| | Good | 29 | 35.80246914 |
| **Toilet and Bath Rating** | Fair | 20 | 24.69135802 |
| | Poor | 9 | 11.11111111 |
| | Total | 81 | 100 |
| | | | |
| **Do You Share Your Toilet** | Yes | 57 | 70.37037037 |
| | No | 24 | 29.62962963 |
| | Total | 81 | 100 |
| | | | |
| | Excellent | 12 | 14.81481481 |
| | Good | 51 | 62.96296296 |
| **Level    of Artificial Lightning    in The Room** | Fair | 14 | 17.28395062 |
| | Poor | 4 | 4.938271605 |
| | Total | 81 | 100 |
| | | | |
| | Excellent | 12 | 14.81481481 |
| | Good | 35 | 43.20987654 |
| | Fair | 30 | 37.03703704 |
| | Poor | 4 | 4.938271605 |
| **Level    of Ventilation In The Room** | Total | 81 | 100 |
| | | | |
| | Excellent | 14 | 17.28395062 |
| | Good | 46 | 56.79012346 |
| | Fair | 17 | 20.98765432 |
| | Poor | 4 | 4.938271605 |
| **Level of Availability of Water** | Total | 81 | 100 |
| | | | |
| | Excellent | 39 | 48.14814815 |
| | Good | 27 | 33.33333333 |
| | Fair | 12 | 14.81481481 |
| | Poor | 3 | 3.703703704 |
| **Level of Availability of Electricity** | Total | 81 | 100 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Excellent | 13 | 16.04938272 |
| | Good | 50 | 61.72839506 |
| | Fair | 14 | 17.28395062 |
| | Poor | 4 | 4.938271605 |
| **Rating of The Level of Drainage** | Total | 81 | 100 |
| | | | |
| | Regular | 33 | 40.74074074 |
| **Ratings of The Level of Waste Disposal** | Very Regular | 33 | 40.74074074 |
| | Fairly Regular | 13 | 16.04938272 |
| | Irregular | 2 | 2.469135802 |
| | Total | 81 | 100 |
| | | | |
| | Excellent | 19 | 23.45679012 |
| | Good | 32 | 39.50617284 |
| | Fair | 25 | 30.86419753 |
| | Poor | 5 | 6.172839506 |
| **Rating of The Level of Parking Facilities** | Total | 81 | 100 |
| | | | |
| | Excellent | 8 | 9.87654321 |
| | Good | 25 | 30.86419753 |
| | Fair | 32 | 39.50617284 |
| | Poor | 16 | 19.75308642 |
| **Rating of The Level of Road Facilities** | Total | 81 | 100 |
| | | | |
| | Excellent | 17 | 20.98765432 |
| | Good | 49 | 60.49382716 |
| | Fair | 14 | 17.28395062 |
| **Rating of The Level of Comfort ability** | Poor | 1 | 1.234567901 |
| | | | |
| | Accessible | 34 | 41.97530864 |
| | Very Accessible | 43 | 53.08641975 |
| | Poorly Accessible | 4 | 4.938271605 |
| **Rating of The Ease of Accessibility** | Total | 81 | 100 |
| | | | |
| | Excellent | 10 | 12.34567901 |
| | Good | 49 | 60.49382716 |
| | Fair | 21 | 25.92592593 |
| | Poor | 1 | 1.234567901 |
| **Rating of The Level of Security** | Total | 81 | 100 |

Source: Authors' Field Work (2011).

According to the frequency table above, it shows that 65% of the respondents have lived in a private hostel before while 35% have never lived there before. The table also the different types of hostel used as a case study in this project it shows that 14% of the respondents live in Anglican hostel, 25% live in unifecs, 12% live in Ebenezer hostel, 14% live in rectas, and 35% live in fine touch hostel. Based on the room fixtures and furniture as shown in the table below, 25% of the respondents claimed that they are excellent, while 43% claimed they are good, 25% claimed they are average and 7% claimed they are fair. From the table larger percentage of respondents 36%, rated the bathrooms of their respective hostels good, 28% rated them excellent, one-quarter rated them fair while about 11% rated them poor. Close to three- quarter (70%) of the respondents claimed they do not share toilets, while the remaining claimed they share toilets. It can be seen that more than halve of the respondents about 63% responded that the level of artificial lightning in their room is good, 12% indicated it is excellent, 14% indicated it is fair while 4% indicated it is poor. Majority of the respondents 43% responded that the level of ventilation in their room is good, 37% indicated it is fair, 12% indicated it is excellent, while 4% indicated it is poor. The distribution shows that more than halve of the respondents 57% indicated that the level of water availability in their hostel is good, 20%

agreed with the fact that the level is fair, 17% claimed that the level is excellent, while 4% indicated that the water availability level is poor. Also majority of the respondents 48%, responded that the level of availability of electricity is excellent, 33% responded it is good 15% responded it is fair while 3% indicated it is poor. The frequency table shows that 61% of the respondents said the drainage system in their hostel is good, 17% indicated it is fair, 16% indicated it is excellent, while 4% indicated it is poor. 48% of the respondents indicated that the waste in the hostel they live is been disposed regularly and very regularly respectively. 16% indicated they it is fairly regular while 2% claimed it is irregular. it can be observed that 40% and 31% of the respondents indicated that the parking facilities in their hostel is good and fair r respectively, 23% indicated it is excellent, while 5% indicated it is poor. It can also be observed that 31% and 40% of the respondents indicated that the road facilities in their hostel is good and fair respectively, 19% indicated it is poor, while 10% indicated it is excellent. The table also rates the level of comfortability of the respondents in their various hostels. It can be observed that 61% and 21% of the respondents indicated that the comfort level in the hostel is good and excellent respectively. 17% indicated it is fair while just 1% indicated it is poor. It also indicates that more than halve of the respondents about 53% indicated their hostels are very accessible, 42% indicated they are accessible, while 4% indicated it is poorly accessible. The distribution table reveals that more than halve of the respondents 60% indicated that the security level of the hostels is good, 12% indicated it is excellent, 21% indicated it is fair while 1% indicated it is poor.

**Table 3: Space Analysis**

| Space Analysis | | Frequency No | Percentage % |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Excellent | 9 | 11.11111111 |
| | Good | 47 | 58.02469136 |
| | Average | 21 | 25.92592593 |
| | Fair | 4 | 4.938271605 |
| **Room Size** | Total | 81 | 100 |
| | 1-2 | 63 | 77.77777778 |
| | 3-4 | 18 | 22.22222222 |
| **No in The Room** | Total | 81 | 100 |
| | Excellent | 28 | 34.56790123 |
| | Good | 35 | 43.20987654 |
| | Fair | 14 | 17.28395062 |
| | Poor | 4 | 4.938271605 |
| **Ease of Movement Within The Room** | Total | 81 | 100 |
| | Too Small | 10 | 12.34567901 |
| | Not Well Ventilated | 13 | 16.04938272 |
| | Improper Maintenance | 13 | 16.04938272 |
| | None | 45 | 55.55555556 |
| **Dislike about Room** | Total | 81 | 100 |
| | Spacious | 15 | 18.51851852 |
| | Privacy | 20 | 24.69135802 |
| | Convenient | 14 | 17.28395062 |
| | All of The Above | 21 | 25.92592593 |
| | None | 11 | 13.58024691 |
| **Like About Your Room** | Total | 81 | 100 |

Source: Authors Field Work (2011).

According to the distribution table above, 11% of the respondents rated the room size as excellent, 58% claimed it is good, 26% claimed it is average while 5% claimed it is fair. Also 78% of the respondents stay in rooms that accommodate only one or two persons while 22% stay in rooms that accommodate three to four people. Majority of the respondents 43%, responded that the ease of movement within the room they occupy is good, 34% indicated it is excellent, 17% indicated it is fair while just about 4% of the respondents indicated it is poor. About 25% of the respondents indicated privacy is what they like about their room , 19% claimed that the room is spacious and 17% indicated its because of it conveniences while 26% indicated it is due to all the points mentioned above. It can also be viewed from the table that more than halve of the respondents claimed there is nothing to be disliked about their room, 16% indicated it non ventilation, and improper maintenance respectively while just about 12% indicated that the room is small.

**Table 4: Residential Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction Table**

| Residential Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction Table | | Frequency No | Percentage % |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Proximity To School | 11 | 13.58024691 |
| | Convenience | 26 | 32.09876543 |
| | Privacy | 15 | 18.51851852 |
| | Security | 7 | 8.641975309 |
| | Constant Electricity And Water | 10 | 12.34567901 |
| | All of the Above | 8 | 9.87654321 |
| | None | 4 | 4.938271605 |
| **Likes   About Your Hostel** | Total | 81 | 100 |
| | Sharing Facilities | 7 | 8.641975309 |
| | Poor Hygiene Condition | 19 | 23.45679012 |
| | Delay Response to Complaints | 10 | 12.34567901 |
| | Poor Maintenance | 11 | 13.58024691 |
| | Crowd | 10 | 12.34567901 |
| | All of the Above | 8 | 9.87654321 |
| | None | 16 | 19.75308642 |
| **Dislike About Hostel** | Total | 81 | 100 |

Source: Authors Field Work (2011).

The above distribution table expressed the students satisfaction with the hostels: It shows that majority of the respondents 32% indicated that the reason why they like the various hostels they belong is because of its convenience, 14% claimed it is because of its proximity to the school, 18% indicated it is because of it privacy, while 10% indicated it is because of all the factors mentioned above. They also expressed what they dissatisfied about their hostels: It shows that about 23% of the respondents indicated what they dislike about their hostel is poor hygiene condition, 20% indicated there is nothing to dislike about their hostel, 13% indicated its poor maintenance, 12% indicated its delay response to complaints.\

**6.0 Recommendations.**

Although analyses show that off-campus students' housing is successful in its performance, more could still be done to enhance better residential satisfaction and ultimately improve the learning process of the students. For optimal performance of off-campus student housing, the design, maintenance and management require clinical intervention. To this end, the following recommendations are made:

- The issue of quacks, charlatans and dilettantes in the building design profession has to be tackled headlong towards eliminating sub-standard designs while the approving body is also restructured to allow appropriate professional to handle appropriate aspects of the approval process. This will ensure minimum design standards.
- Maintenance Control akin to Development Control should be institutionalized in the appropriate government ministry to ensure adequate maintenance is given to all buildings including students' housing.
- Operators of all students' housing should be required to carry out such services through professional Estate Managers who would be required to enforce occupancy and maintenance standards for such buildings to avoid overcrowding and unsanitary conditions.

**7.0    Conclusion.**

This paper has critically examined the performance evaluation of the selected private students' housing in Ile-Ife. From the result of the study, it can be concluded that, much problem is not being faced by the occupants (students) in the use of the hostel facilities.  To an average extent, the performance of the hostels was satisfactory. Also with very slightest differences, behavioural aspect was quite average and there were only little differences in the hostels.

Post-occupancy is a dynamic model, and changes overtime can cause different effects. From the information gathered and result obtained, it may be safely inferred that the users of private hostels are satisfied. A good level

of satisfaction in student hostels is central to the pursuance of academic excellence. In view of the findings of this study, it will be worthwhile and complementary that further work is done to evaluate the performance of on-campus student housing and the residential satisfaction.

## References

Akingbohungbe, D. O. and Ojo, F. K. (2005). Post occupancy evaluation of students' hostel environment: A focus on Rufus Giwa Polytechnic, Owo Nigeria. *Interworld Journal of Management and Development Studies*, 2 (1), 10 – 20.

Aluko,Ola (2004). Housing and urban development in Nigeria.Ibadan: Kins Publications Series.

Amole, D. (2002). Gender issues in low-income urban housing in South-western Nigeria. Department of Architecture, ObafemiAwolowo University, Ile-Ife.

Amole, O.O.(1998). The Challenge of student housing in Nigeria. *Journal of environmental design and management,* ObafemiAwolowo university, Ile-Ife vol. 1 No 1 and 2.

Amole, O.O (2005). Environment Behaviour and Design: a course manual on Environment Psychology, Department of Architecture, ObafemiAwolowo University, Ile-Ife.

Building Research Board , (1987). Post Occupancy Evaluation Practice in the building process: "*Opportunities for Improvement"*, National Academy Press, Washington. D.C

Francescato, G, Weldmann S, Anderson J.R. ,(1989). Evaluating the Built Environment From the Users Point of View: an attitudinal model of Residential Satisfaction. In W.F.E Preiser (ed): *Building evaluation* (pp.181-198), London: Prenum Press.

Hewitt, D, Higgins, C, Heathery, P, (2005). A Market - Friendly Post Occupancy Evaluation Building Performance Report, new Buildings Institute, Inc. and Cethy Turner.

Kayamandi , (2006). Post Occupancy Evaluation of State subsidized Housing Units in Thesis of Irene darkwa 'Master of Consumer Science University of Stellenbosch.

Laurence, R.J. (1997). Housing dwelling and hostel designs theory research practices John Wiley London.

Preiser, Wolfgang, F.E, Rabinowtx, Harvy, (1988). White, Edward T.S "Post - occupancy Evaluation "Van Westland Reinhold, New York.

Review of Building Quality, (2003).Using Post - Occupancy Evaluation.*Journal of Programme Educational Building* 35:1-5.. Watson, D.C.

Zimring, Rosenheck, (2001). Learning from our Buildings.