Transnational Journal of Science and Technology

December 2012 edition vol.2, No.11

USER'S SATISFACTION WITH RESIDENTIAL FACILITIES IN NIGERIAN PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES: A STUDY OF COVENANT UNIVERSITY

Oluwunmi, Adedamola Olufunke Akinjare, Omolade Adedoyin

Department of Estate Management, School of Environmental Sciences, College of Science & Technology, Covenant University, Ogun State, Nigeria

Izobo-Martins Oladunni Oluwatoyin

Department of Architecture, School of Environmental Sciences, College of Science & Technology, Covenant University, Ogun State, Nigeria

Abstract:

This study aims at ascertaining the satisfaction derived by residents of the staff residential estate of a Nigerian private university from its facilities with a view of ensuring the functionality and optimal performance of facilities in Universities. In achieving the aim of the study, one hundred and ninety six (196) questionnaires were distributed to the residents of Covenant University's staff quarters made up of diverse housing units for various cadre of its faculty using the non-probability sampling technique. A total of one hundred and twenty-four (124) questionnaires were returned representing a response rate of 63.26% and collated data was analysed accordingly using the weighted arithmetic mean coupled with the relative importance index. Findings showed that the inhabitants of the university staff quarters were majorly satisfied with the services of five out of the eight principal university facilities maintained by the Physical Planning and Development (PPD) unit. Three other systems were in need of attention as indicated by the relative importance index. Conclusively, the PPD was admonished to continually pay attention on the services of the University's priced assets which on the long run, would foster an increased satisfaction level for residents of the estate

Keywords: Users' Satisfaction, Facilities, Residential, Staff Quarters, Covenant University

Introduction

Staff housing has for long been thought of as a vital component of university campuses. According to Hassanain (2008), a well planned out housing facilities promotes desirable educational outcomes and help to achieve the broader objectives such as social cohesion and responsible citizenship. Hassanain (2007) confirmed that Universities worldwide have realized the contribution of development facilities and infrastructure make towards achieving their objectives. According to the author, campus housing facilities operate as an integral component of the university which contributes to it achieving its overall mission.

Although, this line of thought can be considered proper if first demonstrated in the provision of hostels for student, the same may as well be true for university staff quarters. Oluwunmi *et al.* (2012) affirmed that adequate provision of staff quarter accommodation buildings in a university have notable advantage which include: punctuality to classes as against having to come from outside the university campus, which most times, is prone to traffic congestion fostering perpertual lateness to work. The authors also confirmed that the peace and tranquillity derivable from a campus environment is also very important in an institution where adequate housing is being provided as faculty from various parts of the country would be attracted because of infrastructural provision such as security, internet connectivity, functional public utility e.g. constant power supply and portable water. This, the author believes will ultimately increases human productivity in terms of output.

It is crucial to note that staff residents must not only be adequately provided for in relation to the staff population of a university, but it must also be able to satisfy their needs if the best is to be appropriated from them. Satisfaction being a process of evaluation between what was received and what was expected is the most widely adopted description of user satisfaction in the current literature (Parker and Mathews, 2001). Satisfaction evaluation study within a University staff quarters reflect staff's perception of such quarters.

Satisfying users of any facility (including staff resident facility) should be one of the main objectives of providing such facility in the first instance. Singh (2006) believes that user satisfaction has a positive effect on an organisation's profitability, educational institution inclusive. Some authors further state that it is not enough to merely satisfy users but importantly, ensure users are extremely satisfied (Sivadas and Baker-Prewitt, 2000; Bowen and Chen, 2001).

Despite the importance of satisfying users including users of University staff quarters, not much literature is available on users' satisfaction residential staff quarters unlike those of

student resident (Amole, 2009; Adewunmi et al, 2011). This study, therefore seeks to investigate users' satisfaction with residential facilities in Covenant University, Ota, Ogun state.

Study Area

Covenant University being one of the six private tertiary institutions in Ogun State was founded in 2002 by the Living Faith Church Worldwide aka Winners Chapel located in Canaanland, Ota. The University has two main Colleges housing 20 Departments. The Colleges are: the College of Development Studies (CDS) and the College of Science and Technology (CST). Originally established on 560 acres land, the evident need to accommodate its ever growing manpower and student population, fostered the additional acquisition of 82 acres of land. The University's mapped out sections include: the academic area, student hostels, recreational areas, staff quarters, circulation areas, sewage treatment / disposal areas and a landfill. For the effective productivity of particularly the students and academic staff, the area zoned for staff residence is at the rear where serenity is of an utmost level. However, to accommodate the various cadres of academic staff, this area is further zoned into various staff quarters. These staff quarters consist of:

- 2.1 The Graduate Assistants Quarters: This residence comprise a set of 10 buildings with six flats each, culminating to a total of 60 flats. These flats have the following appurtenances: a living room/dinning, kitchenette and en-suite bedroom.
- 2.2 Post Graduate Halls: These comprise of six, three storied blocks of twenty flats each, totalling one hundred and twenty flats. Of the twenty flats, eight are one bedroom flats while sixteen others are two bedroomed. Each two bedroom flats each have the following appurtenances: living room, dinning area, kitchen, toilet and bath.
- 2.3 Three Bedroom Luxury Apartments: This set of apartment consists of nine, three storey blocks, with each block having eight luxury flats. Appurtenances of each flat comprise: a living room, three bedrooms (en-suite), dinning section, kitchen and store.
- 2.4 Professors Village: This section is made up of a set of twenty-two, four bedroom detached houses each having steward quarters comprising two bedrooms, a kitchen and convenience. The duplex has the following spaces: Family lounge, main lounge, guest toilet, kitchen, dinning area, visitor's room, master bedroom and two other bedrooms (all rooms en-suite).

2.5 Terraced Suites: These are two bedroom terrace buildings totalling thirty six in number originally meant to cater for the accommodation needs of academic staff on sabbatical leave. The buildings have the following spaces: 2 bedrooms (en-suite), kitchen, visitor's convenience, main lounge and dinning section.

Apart from the above accommodation, the University in a bid to cater for more of its staff established and partially completed a new estate in January 2010. Having different types of housing units, the new residential estate consist of:

- 2.6 Twenty-Six Number Detach Houses: These houses were built with the exact specification of houses in the Professor's Village as aforementioned.
- 2.7 Blocks of Two Bedroom Flats: These consist of thirty-two flats in four blocks of eight flats. The appurtenances of each flat include: Living room, dinning area, kitchen, visitor's toilet inclusive of an ensuite two bedroom.
- 2.8 Blocks of Three Bedroom Flats: These comprise forty-eight flats in twelve blocks, each having four flats with the following spatial provisions: a living room, three bedrooms, (en-suite master bedroom), dinning section, visitor's toilet, kitchen and store.

Previous literature

Though not many studies exist on users satisfaction with staff residential facilities in Nigeria. This maybe due to the behaviour of people showing indifference and adapting to the general poor performance of social services (Adewunmi et al, 2010). Hence, literature for this current attempt was drawn from users satisfaction and factors that determine or predict these satisfaction with housing facilities in general.

Bruin and Cook (1997) explored measures of psycho-social characteristics of residents and compared the contributions of the measures to predict housing and neighbourhood satisfaction. The research is to better understand the factors that contribute to housing and neighbourhood satisfaction among low-come single-parent women. The results suggested that personality characteristics are powerful predictors of housing satisfaction, whereas residential characteristics, feeling safe and having friends in the neighbourhood pose as powerful predictors of neighbourhood satisfaction.

Liu (1999) in another study presented factors (on both physical and social levels) which influence residential satisfaction of a sample of occupants in a chosen residential area

in Hong Kong. Findings showed that there exists a high level of dissatisfaction amongst the public housing occupants. However, the major concerns of the public housing occupants lie in the areas of maintenance and cleanliness of the building estate, integrity of the building fabric and ease of access by public transport while the major concerns of the private housing occupants lie in the lack of facilities for the disabled as well as for recreational, elderly and childcare facilities. Djebarni and Al-Abed (2000) reported on the occupants' satisfaction of the three housing schemes with their neighbourhood factors. It was found that the most determinant factor of the three housing environment variables (dwelling unit, the neighbourhood, and community service) affecting overall housing satisfaction was the neighbourhoods than with the other two variables. The most important factors affecting the level of satisfaction were: privacy, distance to work, location of schools and provision of amenities.

Potter *et al.* (2001) was a comparative case study that focused on resident satisfaction in three buildings renovated for housing. Index variables used were: management, perception, wayfinding, safety, comfort and adequacy. Findings from this study revealed that there was a significant relationship between resident satisfaction and age for one of the buildings, safety and perception are significant and common contributors to resident satisfaction. Safety and perception were significant for all buildings. The authors stated that safety, perception and comfort were significant to resident satisfaction in different settings and age is a factor that may contribute to resident satisfaction.

Grzeskowiak *et al.* (2003) empirically tested a 5-stage model that integrates the relationships among important determinants and outcomes of residents' satisfaction with community services. Results from their survey showed that satisfaction with community services is directly influenced by residents' satisfaction with community conditions, residents' satisfaction with their neighbourhood. Also, satisfaction in other lower order residential life domains, such as housing satisfaction indirectly influence satisfaction with community services. Finally, the model linked satisfaction in other life domains, such as social life, family life, work life, and financial life to satisfaction with community services and the results showed that social life, as the most proximate antecedent to community satisfaction, is most directly affected by satisfaction with community services and other areas of residential well-being.

In Malaysia, Mustafa (2012) attempted to develop an extended conceptual framework of house buyers' satisfaction in Malaysia. The study employed the Expectancy

Disconfirmation Paradigm Theory (EDP), the Purchase Buying Behavior Model and the Gap Analysis Model. The author also developed two new constructs which are the delivery system as independence variable and the house buyers' characteristics as a moderating variable. According to the author, this would potentially allow private housing developers to understand the factors that would increase customer satisfaction especially with the "Build then Sell" (BTS) delivery system of seeking competitive advantage in the market place.

Hui and Zheng (2010) identified and analyzed crucial variables of customer satisfaction towards residential facility management (FM) service in Hong Kong. This was done with a view to enable FM companies to deliver high quality services. The authors divided FM service into two interrelated clusters which were denoted by two latent variables, and then a specific structural equation model was developed for identifying and quantifying the influence of service and management quality on customer satisfaction and clarifying the causal relationships between these latent and observed variables. The research revealed that both service and management quality have significant positive effect on customer satisfaction, and the effect of service quality is larger than that of management quality when the indirect effect is taken into account. Their research also revealed that service quality is a crucial latent variable influencing customer satisfaction and it has a significant direct effect on management quality.

Another carried out by Jaafar *et al.* (2005) in various locations in Penang Island and Seberang Perai revealed that project type, price of house and length of residency had a significant influence on housing satisfaction and that gender did not influence housing satisfaction. Kellekci and Berkozd (2006) study however showed that the most significant factors increasing level of satisfaction are centrality in the subject of accessibility, maintenance of the environment in the subject of inhabited environmental features, satisfaction in the recreation areas in the subject of environmental quality variants, structural-environmental security of the housing in the subject of security, good neighbour relationships in the subject of neighbour relationships, and physical appearance in the subject of housing environment and physical appearances. Consequently, centrality, maintenance of the environment, satisfaction in the recreation areas, structural-environmental security of the housing, neighbour relationships, and physical appearance are the most influential factors to increase user satisfaction in housing and environmental quality in mass housing areas in Istanbul Metropolitan Area.

A further study is that of Vera-Toscano and Ateca-Amestoy (2007) which investigated the determinants of individual housing satisfaction paying particular attention to

the potential effect of social interactions. The study used the Survey on Living Conditions and Poverty in Andalucia (Spain) and an ordered probit model in its empirical analysis. The results of the study indicated that housing satisfaction is affected by an array of individual, housing and neighbourhood attributes. Also, the type of place one lives in affect housing satisfaction as residents of private housing surrounded by public housing are according to the authors likely to feel less satisfied with their housing.

The research of Salleh (2008) in Malaysia on private low-cost housing indicated that satisfaction levels are generally higher with dwelling units and services provided by the developers than neighbourhood facilities and environment. However, the contributing factors for the low level of satisfaction with neighbourhood facilities and environment were poor public transportation and lack of children playgrounds, community halls, car parks, security and disability facilities. In another study in Japan, Frank and Enkawa (2009) investigated whether aggregate income enhances dwelling satisfaction over time. The paper discovered that aggregate income positively influences dwelling satisfaction. Moreover, environmental satisfaction, customer satisfaction and satisfaction with family relations also positively impact dwelling satisfaction and mediate influences of aggregate income and that the mediated effects are stronger than the direct effect of aggregate income on dwelling satisfaction.

Hipp (2009) provided a robust test of the determinants of neighborhood satisfaction, taking into account the census tracts in 24 metropolitan areas over four time points. The study revealed that the presence of racial/ethnic heterogeneity and single-parent households consistently reduced neighborhood satisfaction. Those perceiving more social or physical disorder were considerably less satisfied with the neighborhood, and perceiving more crime showed an accelerating negative effect on satisfaction. Furthermore, the effect of perceiving crime was exacerbated in tracts with a distressed labor market or the presence of disengaged youth. There was consistent evidence that those with more economic investment (homeowners) or social investment (married residents and parents) in the neighborhood are more satisfied. On the other hand, longer-term residents did not report more satisfaction, nor did general residential stability in the tract increase satisfaction.

Ariffin *et al.* (2010) investigated the factors which are likely to affect residential satisfaction in low-cost housing in Malaysia's urban area using a case study of the Klang Valley. The authors also compared resident's satisfaction level between different housing areas in the study area. The findings revealed that the occupants of low-cost housing are dissatisfied with the facilities provided by private developers and almost all dwelling unit

features affect residential satisfaction except number of socket and dwelling size. This finding is contradictory to several studies that find dwelling size as one of the important factors determining residential satisfaction (Djebarni and Al-Abed, 2000; Mohit *et al.* 2010 e.t.c.).

Blair and Larsen (2010) followed the results proposed by Jaafar *et al.* (2005) and investigated the impact of relations among neighbours on housing prices while controlling for other housing characteristics in Dayton, Ohio. The results indicated that, ceteris paribus, satisfaction with neighbours and housing prices were positively related and that resident satisfaction with their neighbours is an important determinant of property value.

In Hong Kong, Hui and Zheng (2010) identified and analyzed crucial variables of customer satisfaction towards residential facility management (FM) service, this is to enable FM companies to deliver high quality services. The research surveyed customer's satisfaction of one residential property and the findings revealed that: both service and management quality have significant positive effect on customer satisfaction, and the effect of service quality is larger than that of management quality when the indirect effect is taken into account. It further showed that service quality is a crucial latent variable influencing customer satisfaction and it has a significant direct effect on management quality; how the individual observed variables work together to characterize the corresponding latent variables from an empirical point of view, and some key variables that should be focused on by facility managers in the housing sector.

Dekker *et al.* (2011) study took a different dimension by focusing on the determinants of housing and estate satisfaction in post-Second World War housing estates. Multi-level linear regression models were applied to estimate the impacts of individual, dwelling and estate characteristics on resident satisfaction levels, using a unique dataset from 25 post-Second World War estates in nine European countries. The outcome of the study revealed that satisfaction with the dwelling was higher for the elderly and residents with higher incomes, and in situations where the dwelling has been renovated and is sufficiently large. However, the presence of children and a longer duration of stay have negative impacts, and renters are generally more negative than owners. Estate satisfaction is highest among immigrant households or when the dwelling is renovated, and among lower educated inhabitants. Individual characteristics and opinions on the estate are more important than estate characteristics in explaining estate satisfaction. In summary, the study concluded that attempts to improve post-second World War areas may result in new areas which may not necessarily improve the overall satisfaction.

Studies in public housing units on users satisfaction showed that residents are dissatisfied with most of their accommodation (Kaitilla, 1993; Ukoha and Beamish, 1997). Kaitilla (1993) study in particular reported the findings of an investigation of urban households' satisfaction with public housing in West Taraka, one of the low-income housing suburbs in the city of Lae. The results of the study suggested that the occupiers were significantly dissatisfied with their houses. Aspects of dissatisfaction referred to are; the size of houses, number of rooms and living/dining areas, lack of storage space, poorly laid out and badly designed kitchen, toilets and bathroom facilities. Another study by Ukoha and Beamish (1997) examined the resident satisfaction with public housing and the relationship of satisfaction with specific housing features to overall housing satisfaction. The authors sampled 1,089 households in public housing units in Abuja. Residents expressed dissatisfaction with their overall housing situation; they were dissatisfied with structure types, building features, housing conditions, and housing management, however, they were satisfied with the neighbourhood facilities. A study in Soweto, South Africa by Westaway (2006) on personal and environmental quality of life of four (4) groups of residents revealed that the group from the squatter camp had the lowest levels of satisfaction with their personal and environmental quality of life. The group was found to be the most disadvantaged in this regard when compared with the relocated, the awaiting relocation and the site tenure allocated groups. Oktay and Orcunoglu (2007) provided an overview in Ozankoy in terms of traditional-recent relationship by considering users' thoughts and desires. When the traditional and recent houses were evaluated from the users' point of view it is found that the traditional house users do not want to move to recent houses which are more luxurious than the traditional houses even though, the users' satisfaction in the traditional houses is not on the highest level due to some maintenance problems or lack of rooms. However, users prefer to live in the traditional houses. They do not expect to move to more decent houses because of extra cost for thermal comfort, lack of village pattern, not suitable for their social lives, lack of neighbourhood relations.

Another study in South Korea by Ha (2008) on satisfaction with social housing estate showed that the residents were satisfied with neighbourhood amenities (health clinics, stores, banks, post office, etc.) but highly dissatisfied with parking facilities and landscape architecture. It revealed that a total of 51% were satisfied with their accommodation while almost 11% of the residents expressed their dissatisfaction. The findings of research of Fatoye and Odusami (2009) in Nigeria on the evaluation of housing performance based on occupiers' satisfaction approach showed that the occupiers were most satisfied with criteria

under design such as the number of rooms in their houses, the ceiling height, the location of different rooms, and nearness to religion (worship) location. They were least satisfied with the criteria under the subsystems of estate layout and site location, and access to local facilities and city-wide services such as nearness of house to fire-fighting stations. The study recommended an improvement in the provision and maintenance of housing essential facilities. Furthermore, Mohit et al. (2010) provided an assessment of residential satisfaction of newly designed public low-cost housing dwellers of Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, with fortyfive variables grouped into five components – dwelling unit features, dwelling unit support services, public facilities, social environment and neighbourhood facilities. Findings from the study indicated that residents were moderately satisfied with dwelling unit support services, followed by public and neighbourhood facilities than dwelling unit features and social environment, which have higher percentage of respondents with low level of satisfaction. Also, residential satisfaction index has high positive correlations with dwelling unit features, social environment, support services and public facilities, and low positive correlation with neighbourhood facilities and socio-economic attributes of the residents such as age, family size, working wives, previous residence are negatively correlated with residential satisfaction, whereas residents' race, employment type, floor level and length of residency are positively correlated with residential satisfaction. The study of Ibem (2011) on the evaluation of public housing in Ogun State revealed that most of the residents perceived high levels of adequacy and dissatisfaction with the housing. However, majority of the residents were satisfied with life in the housing estates.

Within educational institutions, several studies have been carried on students' satisfaction with residential facilities. For instance, Kayas and Erkip (2001) investigated the influence of physical attributes of campus accommodation on student satisfaction in Bilkent University, Ankara. The outcome of this study revealed that students living on the highest floor perceived their rooms larger and found them less crowded in comparison to those on the lowest floor. This perception according to the authors led to an increase in the level of students' satisfaction with their living condition. An earlier study by Karlin, et al. (1979) also confirmed that hostel room size can indeed influence students' level of satisfaction. Hence, their study showed that students who lived in triple sharing rooms were less satisfied and unhappier with their living conditions than students residing in double sharing rooms.

Amole (2009) reported the results of a study of residential satisfaction in students' housing in Nigeria. The study examined how satisfied students were and the factors which predicted residential satisfaction. Specifically, it examined whether the morphological

configurations of the halls of residence would predict residential satisfaction. Data were obtained from questionnaires distributed to a sample of 1124 respondents from all the halls of residences in four residential universities in Southwestern Nigeria. More than half (53%) of the respondents were dissatisfied with their residences and the variables which explained satisfaction were the social qualities of the residences, especially, the social densities; the kitchenette, bathroom and storage facilities and some demographic characteristics of the students. The morphological configuration of the halls of residence was also found to be a predictor of satisfaction and the characteristics which appeared most significant were the plan form and the length of the corridor. The regression model explained 65% of the variance in R2. An instructive finding was that satisfaction appeared most critical in the bedroom.

Another research by Najib *et al.* (2011) investigated the level of student satisfaction with campus student housing facilities (SHF) at Malaysian research universities (RUs) and the relationship between satisfaction and loyalty behaviour. The student residential satisfaction (SRS) framework was proposed to investigate residential satisfaction from the students' viewpoint. Questionnaires were distributed to respondents in three RUs. In general, students are satisfied with the provided SHF with the SRS index of 2.96 or 74 per cent satisfaction level and there is a significant relationship between overall satisfaction and loyalty behaviour. The results also confirmed that the proposed model was an adequate instrument to measure SRS.

The study of Adewunmi *et al.* (2011) adopted an investigative approach to post-occupancy evaluation using major technical and functional criteria of performance on the facilities of a postgraduate hostel at the campus of the University of Lagos, Akoka, Yaba, Lagos, Nigeria. Data collection was based on a survey through self-administered questionnaires in which users of the building were asked to report on their perceptions and experience of the facility. The user satisfaction survey was developed based on the students' feedback on their experience with 29 identified performance criteria obtained from a review of the literature and an interview with a member of the university's hall management committee. The user satisfaction survey identified areas of deficiency, particularly in maintenance and facilitated the assessment of the overall performance of the building.

From the foregoing, it is obvious that there is little or no reasearch efforts on staff satisfaction with residential facilities in educational institutions in Nigeria. Hence, there is an urgent need for research efforts to be devoted towards this direction in order to ascertain if staff are satisfied with their residential facilities or not. This research therefore seeks to

undertake an in-depth investigation on staff's satisfaction with residential facilities in Covenant University in Ogun State, Nigeria.

Methodology

Data for this study was generated from 124 retrieved questionnaires out of the 196 questionnaires administered on the staff of the University, residing in the various apartment types within the University's residential estate. Table 1 below elaborates the administration and retrieval of questionnaires for the study within the residential estate.

Table 1. Questionnaire Administration within Covenant University Residential Estate.

	No. of	No. of	Percentage
Type of Property	Questionnaires	Questionnaires	(%) Level
	Administered	Returned	of Responses
Graduate Assistant Quarters	18	14	77
Post Graduate Hall	60	40	66
3Bedroom Luxury Apartments	36	18	50
Professors Village	11	7	63
Terraced Suites	18	12	66
Detached Houses (New Estate)	13	8	61
2Bedroom Flats (New Estate)	16	12	75
3Bedroom Flats (New Estate)	24	13	54

Source: Author's Survey, 2011

The collated data were then subjected to analysis in order to generate conclusive results for the study.

Data Analysis and Discussion

In a bid to understand the study area, the researcher asked respondents to identify the facilities available in the quarters and the resultant analysis is as shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Facilities Available in the Staff, Post Graduate and 3Bedroom Luxury Quarters.

Facilities	Staff	Quarters		Graduate uarters		3Bedroom Luxury Quarters		
racillues	Available Not		Available Not		Available	Not		
		Available		Available		Available		
Water	14	0	40	0	18	0		
supply								
Sewage	14	0	40	0	18	0		
Disposal								
Electricity	14	0	40	0	18	0		
Supply								
Water	0	14	40	0	18	0		
Treatment								
Plant								
Living	14	0	40	0	18	0		
Room								
Kitchen	14	0	40	40 0		0		
Dinning	0	14	40	0	18	0		
Area								
Toilet and	0	14	40	0	18	0		
Bath								
Store	0	14	0	40	18	0		
Visitors	0	14	0	40	0	18		
Room								
Family	0	14	0	40	0	18		
Lounge								
Main	0	14	0	40	0	18		
Lounge								
Guest	0	14	0	40	0	18		
Toilet								
Study	0	14	0	40	0	18		
Elevator	0	14	0	40	0	18		
Hot/Cold	14	0	40	0	18	0		

Water						
Supply						
Lawns	14	0	40	0	18	0
Internet	14	0	40	0	18	0
Connectio						
n						
Street	14	0	40	0	18	0
Light						
Parking	14	0	40	0	18	0
Lot						
Ceiling	14	0	40	0	18	0
Fan						
Air	0	14	0	40	0	18
Condition						
ers						
Reception	0	14	0	40	0	18
Intercom	0	14	0	40	0	18
Garage	0	14	0	40	0	18
Kitchen	0	14	0	40	0	18
Pantry						

Source: Author's Survey, 2011

Table 2 shows the facilities available in the Graduate Assistant Quarters, Post Graduate Quarters and 3bedroom luxury flats of the university, some of which are; water supply, sewage disposal, electricity supply, lawns, internet connectivity amongst others marked available while unavailable facilities consist of; reception, elevator, kitchen pantry, garage, guest toilet, main lounge and other facilities labelled zero availability. The Table also shows the facilities available in the Post Graduate Quarters of the university, some of which are; water supply, sewage disposal, electricity supply, lawns, internet connection, toilet and bath, dinning area, kitchen amongst others, while unavailable facilities consist of; reception, kitchen pantry, garage, guest toilet, main lounge, study amongst other facilities labelled zero availability.

Lastly, for the 3bedroom luxury quarters of the university, the Table shows the facilities available in them, some of which are; water supply, sewage disposal, electricity supply, lawns, internet connection, toilet and bath, dinning area, kitchen amongst others, while unavailable facilities consist of; reception, kitchen pantry, garage, guest toilet, main lounge, study, intercom facilities labelled zero availability.

Table 3. Facilities Available in 2Bedroom luxury & 3Bedroom (New Estate) and Professors Village.

Facilities		m Luxury arters		oom New tate	Professor	rs Village
	Available	Not Available	Available	Not Available	Available	Not Available
Water	12	0	13	0	7	0
Supply						
Sewage	12	0	13	0	7	0
Disposal						
Electricity	12	0	13	0	7	0
Supply						
Water	12	0	13	0	7	0
Treatment						
Plant						
Living	12	0	13	0	7	0
Room						
Kitchen	12	0	13	0	7	0
Dinning	12	0	13	0	7	0
Area						
Toilet and	12	0	13	0	7	0
Bath						
Store	0	12	13	0	7	0
Visitors	0	12	0	13	7	0
Room						
Family	0	12	0	13	7	0
Lounge						
Main	0	12	0	13	7	0

Guest Toilet 0 12 0 13 7 0 Study 0 12 0 13 7 0 Elevator 0 12 0 13 0 7 0 Hot/Cold Water Supply 12 0 13 0 7 0 Lawns 12 0 13 0 7 0 Internet Connectivity 12 0 13 0 7 0 Connectivity 12 0 13 0 7 0 Street Light 12 0 13 0 7 0 Ceiling Fan 12 0 13 0 7 0 Condition ers 12 13 0 7 0 Reception 0 12 0 13 0 7 Intercom 0 12 0 13 0 7 Garage 0 12	Lounge						
Study 0 12 0 13 7 0 Elevator 0 12 0 13 0 7 Hot/Cold 12 0 13 0 7 0 Water Supply 12 0 13 0 7 0 Internet 12 0 13 0 7 0 Connectivity 12 0 13 0 7 0 Light 12 0 13 0 7 0 Ceiling 12 0 13 0 7 0 Fan 12 0 13 0 7 0 Condition ers 12 13 0 7 0 Reception 0 12 0 13 0 7 Intercom 0 12 0 13 0 7 Garage 0 12 0 13	Guest	0	12	0	13	7	0
Elevator 0 12 0 13 0 7 Hot/Cold 12 0 13 0 7 Water Supply Lawns 12 0 13 0 7 Internet 12 0 13 0 7 Connectivity Street 12 0 13 0 7 Light Parking 12 0 13 0 7 Ceiling 12 0 13 0 7 Fan Air 0 12 13 0 7 Condition ers Reception 0 12 0 13 0 7 Intercom 0 12 0 13 0 7 Garage 0 12 0 13 7 0 Kitchen 0 12 0 13 7 0	Toilet						
Hot/Cold Water Supply 12 0 13 0 7 0 Lawns 12 0 13 0 7 0 Internet 12 12 0 13 0 7 0 Connective ity 12 0 13 0 7 0 Light 12 0 13 0 7 0 Lot Ceiling 12 0 13 0 7 0 Fan Air 0 12 13 0 7 0 Condition ers 8 0 12 0 13 0 7 Intercom 0 12 0 13 0 7 Garage 0 12 0 13 7 0 Kitchen 0 12 0 13 7 0	Study	0	12	0	13	7	0
Water Supply Lawns 12 0 13 0 7 0 Internet 12 0 13 0 7 0 Connective ity 12 0 13 0 7 0 Light 12 0 13 0 7 0 Lot Ceiling 12 0 13 0 7 0 Fan Air 0 12 13 0 7 0 Condition ers 8 0 12 0 13 0 7 Intercom 0 12 0 13 0 7 Garage 0 12 0 13 7 0 Kitchen 0 12 0 13 7 0	Elevator	0	12	0	13	0	7
Supply Lawns 12 0 13 0 7 0 Internet 12 0 13 0 7 0 Connective ity 12 0 13 0 7 0 Light 12 0 13 0 7 0 Lot Ceiling 12 0 13 0 7 0 Fan Air 0 12 13 0 7 0 Condition ers Reception 0 12 0 13 0 7 Intercom 0 12 0 13 0 7 Garage 0 12 0 13 7 0 Kitchen 0 12 0 13 7 0	Hot/Cold	12	0	13	0	7	0
Lawns 12 0 13 0 7 0 Internet 12 0 13 0 7 0 Connective ity 12 0 13 0 7 0 Light 12 0 13 0 7 0 Parking Lot 12 0 13 0 7 0 Ceiling Fan 12 0 13 0 7 0 Condition ers 0 12 0 13 0 7 Intercom 0 12 0 13 0 7 Garage 0 12 0 13 7 0 Kitchen 0 12 0 13 7 0	Water						
Internet 12 0 13 0 7 0 Connective ity 12 0 13 0 7 0 Light 12 0 13 0 7 0 Lot Ceiling 12 0 13 0 7 0 Fan Air 0 12 13 0 7 0 Condition ers 2 12 0 13 0 7 0 Reception 0 12 0 13 0 7 Garage 0 12 0 13 7 0 Kitchen 0 12 0 13 7 0	Supply						
Connective ity Ity Street 12 0 13 0 7 0 Light 12 0 13 0 7 0 Parking 12 0 13 0 7 0 Ceiling 12 0 13 0 7 0 Fan Air 0 12 13 0 7 0 Condition ers 0 12 0 13 0 7 Intercom 0 12 0 13 0 7 Garage 0 12 0 13 7 0 Kitchen 0 12 0 13 7 0	Lawns	12	0	13	0	7	0
ity Street 12 0 13 0 7 0 Light 12 0 13 0 7 0 Parking 12 0 13 0 7 0 Ceiling 12 0 13 0 7 0 Fan Air 0 12 13 0 7 0 Condition ers 0 12 0 13 0 7 Intercom 0 12 0 13 7 0 Kitchen 0 12 0 13 7 0	Internet	12	0	13	0	7	0
Street Light 12 0 13 0 7 0 Parking Lot 12 0 13 0 7 0 Ceiling Fan 12 0 13 0 7 0 Condition ers 12 13 0 7 0 Reception 0 12 0 13 0 7 Intercom 0 12 0 13 0 7 Garage 0 12 0 13 7 0 Kitchen 0 12 0 13 7 0	Connectiv						
Light Parking 12 0 13 0 7 0 Lot Ceiling 12 0 13 0 7 0 Fan Air 0 12 13 0 7 0 Condition ers Reception 0 12 0 13 0 7 Intercom 0 12 0 13 0 7 Garage 0 12 0 13 7 0 Kitchen 0 12 0 13 7 0	ity						
Parking Lot 12 0 13 0 7 0 Ceiling Fan 12 0 13 0 7 0 Air O 12 13 0 7 0 Condition ers 0 12 0 13 0 7 Intercom 0 12 0 13 0 7 Garage 0 12 0 13 7 0 Kitchen 0 12 0 13 7 0	Street	12	0	13	0	7	0
Lot Ceiling 12 0 13 0 7 0 Fan 12 13 0 7 0 Condition ers 0 12 13 0 7 Reception 0 12 0 13 0 7 Intercom 0 12 0 13 0 7 Garage 0 12 0 13 7 0 Kitchen 0 12 0 13 7 0	Light						
Ceiling Fan 12 0 13 0 7 0 Air Air O Condition ers 12 13 0 7 0 Reception O 12 0 13 0 7 Intercom O 12 0 13 0 7 Garage O 12 0 13 7 0 Kitchen O 12 0 13 7 0	Parking	12	0	13	0	7	0
Fan Air 0 12 13 0 7 0 Condition ers 0 12 0 13 0 7 Reception 0 12 0 13 0 7 Intercom 0 12 0 13 0 7 Garage 0 12 0 13 7 0 Kitchen 0 12 0 13 7 0	Lot						
Air 0 12 13 0 7 0 Condition ers 0 12 0 13 0 7 Reception 0 12 0 13 0 7 Intercom 0 12 0 13 0 7 Garage 0 12 0 13 7 0 Kitchen 0 12 0 13 7 0	Ceiling	12	0	13	0	7	0
Condition ers Condition Condition </td <td>Fan</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	Fan						
ers Intercom 0 12 0 13 0 7 Intercom 0 12 0 13 0 7 Garage 0 12 0 13 7 0 Kitchen 0 12 0 13 7 0	Air	0	12	13	0	7	0
Reception 0 12 0 13 0 7 Intercom 0 12 0 13 0 7 Garage 0 12 0 13 7 0 Kitchen 0 12 0 13 7 0	Condition						
Intercom 0 12 0 13 0 7 Garage 0 12 0 13 7 0 Kitchen 0 12 0 13 7 0	ers						
Garage 0 12 0 13 7 0 Kitchen 0 12 0 13 7 0	Reception	0	12	0	13	0	7
Kitchen 0 12 0 13 7 0	Intercom	0	12	0	13	0	7
	Garage	0	12	0	13	7	0
Pantry	Kitchen	0	12	0	13	7	0
Sources Anthonia Superor 2011	Pantry						

Source: Author's Survey, 2011

Table 3 shows the facilities available in the 2bedroom luxury quarters of the university, some of which are; water supply, sewage disposal, electricity supply, lawns, internet connectivity, toilet and bath, dinning area, kitchen amongst others marked available while unavailable facilities consist of; reception, kitchen pantry, garage, guest toilet, main lounge, family lounge, study, intercom amongst others. Also, the Table identifies the

facilities available in the 3bedroom luxury flats located in the universitys' new estate. Some of which are; water supply, sewage disposal, electricity supply, lawns, internet connection, toilet and bath, dinning area, kitchen amongst others marked available while unavailable facilities consist of; reception, kitchen pantry, garage, guest toilet, main lounge, family lounge, study, intercom amongst other facilities labelled zero availability.

Lastly, the Table identifies the facilities available in the Professors Village of the university, some of which are; water supply, sewage disposal, electricity supply, lawns, internet connectivity, toilet and bath, dinning area, kitchen, study, garage, guest toilet amongst others, while unavailable facilities consist of; reception, intercom amongst other facilities labelled zero availability.

Table 4. Facilities Available in Terraced Suites and Detached Houses (New Estate).

	Terrac	ed Suites	Detached House New Estate		
Facilities	Available	Not Available	Available	Not Available	
Water Supply	12	0	8	0	
Sewage disposal	12	0	8	0	
Electricity Supply	12	0	8	0	
Water Treatment Plant	12	0	8	0	
Living Room	12	0	8	0	
Kitchen	12	0	8	0	
Dinning Area	12	0	8	0	
Toilet and Bath	12	0	8	0	
Store	0	12	8	0	
Visitors Room	0	12	8	0	
Family Lounge	0	12	8	0	
Main Lounge	12	0	8	0	
Guest Toilet	12	0	8	0	
Study	0	12	8	0	
Elevator	0	12	0	8	
Hot/Cold Water Supply	12	0	8	0	
Lawns	12	0	8	0	
Internet Connectivity	12	0	8	0	

Street Light	12	0	8	0
Parking Space	12	0	8	0
Ceiling Fan	12	0	8	0
Air Conditioners	12	0	8	0
Reception	0	12	0	8
Intercom	0	12	0	8
Garage	0	12	8	0
Kitchen Pantry	0	12	8	0

Source: Author's Survey, 2011

Table 4 shows the facilities available in the terraced suites of the university, some of which are; water supply, sewage disposal, electricity supply, lawns, internet connectivity, toilet and bath, dinning area, kitchen, air conditioners, guest toilet, main lounge amongst others marked available, while unavailable facilities consist of; reception, kitchen pantry, garage, family lounge, study, intercom amongst others labelled zero availability.

Lastly, the Table again shows facilities available in the detach houses in the university's new estate. Some of which are; water supply, sewage disposal, electricity supply, lawns, internet connectivity, toilet and bath, dinning area, kitchen, kitchen pantry amongst others marked available while unavailable facilities consist of; reception, garage, guest toilet, main lounge, family lounge, study, intercom amongst others facilities marked unavailability.

Level of User's Satisfaction

In a bid to establish the level of staff satisfaction with the available facilities in the staff quarters, the researcher assigned various numbers to the respective variables as can be noted in Table 4.5.

- 5- Highly Satisfactory represented as "HS"
- 4- Satisfactory represented as "S"
- 3- Undecided represented as "U"
- 2- Fairly Satisfactory represented as "FS"
- 1- Poor represented as "P"

Table 5. Residents Level of Satisfaction of Available Facilities.

Facilities	Percentage	5	4	3	2	1	Mean	Ranking
Electricity	HS-20.4, S-79.6	22	86	0	0	0	4.2037	1st
Supply/Installatio								
ns								
Water	HS-7.4, S-85.2	8	93	8	0	0	4.0370	3rd
Supply/Installatio	U-7.4							
ns								
Sanitation/ Waste	HS-18.5, S-63.0	20	68	20	0	0	4.0000	5th
Disposal Systems	U-18.5							
Maintenance	S-11.1, U-39.8	0	12	43	53	0	2.6203	7th
Mechanisms	FS-49.1							
Security	HS-13.9, S-86.1	15	93	0	0	0	4.1388	2nd
Facilities								
&Formations								
Fumigation	S-12.0, U-56.5	0	13	61	26	8	2.9166	6th
Service	FS-24.1, P-7.4							
Lawn/Garden/Flo	HS-1.9, S-98.1	2	106	0	0	0	4.0185	4th
wer								
Hedge								
Maintenance								
Internet	HS-11.1, U-7.4	12	0	8	88	0	2.4074	8th
Connectivity	FS-81.5							

Source: Author's Survey, 2011

Table 4.5 analyses and identifies the various levels of satisfaction for major facilities in the staff quarters. The satisfaction derived from electricity was ranked highest with a mean of 4.2037. 20.4% of residents were highly satisfied by the available electricity supply within the residential area while another 79.6% rated the service as satisfactory.

Security facilities and formations were judged second most satisfactory within the residential area of the university as 13.9% of residents rated the it highly satisfactory while another 86.1% rated the service satisfactory culminating in a mean of 4.1388. Water supply was judged third most satisfactory with a mean of 4.0370 as 7.4% of residents rated the

service highly satisfactory. Another 85.2% rated the service satisfactory while 7.4% of the residents were undecided about on their level of satisfaction of this service.

Residents were asked to rate the aesthetic complementality of the lawns to the built environment and the same was rated fourth with a mean of 4.0185 as 1.9% of staff opined it was highly satisfactory while another 98.1% were merely Satisfied with its availability and importance.

The services of other facilities such as Sanitation/ Waste Disposal Systems, Fumigation Service, Maintenance Mechanisms and Internet connectivity were respectively rated; fifth, sixth, seventh and eighth in order of user's satisfaction as their individual mean ranking were computed as 4.0, 2.9166, 2.6203 and 2.4074 respectively.

Findings

A tête-à-tête session with personnels of the indegeneous Project Planning Department (PPD) provided unparralled evidence of enormous private investment in a bid to facilitate optimum service provision. This was evident by the presence of huge diesel-powered generating plants dotting the university landscape in a bid to augment the epileptic effort of the Power Holding Company of Nigeria (PHCN), huge over head and surface tanks supported by about 40 boreholes serving various parts of the residential community with water and the services of the indigeneous security outfit inclusive of the uniqueness of its tactical formation was also applauded and rated second best. The use of watch towers for the constant monitoring of the both the immediate vicinity beyond and within the perimeter wall as well as the excellence and professionalism exhibited by the operatives were brought to the fore.

In creating a balance between the built and natural environment, adequate machinery had been put in place in enabling frequent manicuring of flower hedges, lawns and gardens. In all, the services of five of the eight notable facilities in the residential estate were highly satisfying to residents with the exemption of fumigation services, maintenance mechanisms and internet connectivity.

Recommendation

In order to ensure a high level of satisfaction for users of facilities within the residential area of Covenant University (which also is indicative of the optimal functionality of these facilities), the study suggests that there is the need to map out an effective internal evaluation system in order to build a feedback mechanism by which the state of facilities and their performance can be monitored periodically. This system would aid the technicians/

management executives of the works department in having a right perception as to the satisfaction residents derive from usage of these facilities. Where residents are dissatisfied with a particular facility, such could signal the non functionality or inefficiency of a particular facility or in some rare cases the irrelevancy of such.

Lastly, the need for the measurement of the adequacy of facilities is of utmost importance. The PPD is encouraged to evolve and adopt suitable qualitative and quantitative techniques perculiar to the Covenant University setting in measuring the adequacy of the facilities in relation to human occupancy ratio.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the study has been able to achieve to a reasonable extent, the aim set out at the commencement of the study as this research has shown that the PPD unit of the university is capable of managing the facilities of the Covenant University staff quarters as indicated by the satisfaction derived index table. More importantly, there is the need to sustain the performance of installed facilities such as maintenance mechanisms and internet connectivity which ranked lowest at least optimally, over their life-span to get value for money. To this end, the call for more attention on the University's priced assets cannot be over-emphasised in order to increase/achieve optimal satisfaction for every facility servicing residents of the estate.

References:

Adewunmi, Y., Omirin, M. and Famuyiwa, F. (2011) Post-Occupancy Evaluation of Postgraduate Hostel Facilities, Facilities Vol. 29 No. 3/4, pp. 149-168.

Amole, D. (2009) Residential Satisfaction in Students' Housing, Journal of Environmental Psychology Vol. 29, pp. 76–85.

Ariffin, R. N. R., Zahari, R. K. and Nadarajah, S. (2010) Residential Satisfaction In Private Low-Cost Housing in the Urban Area: A Case Study of the Klang Valley, Malaysia, 22nd International Housing Research Conference, ENHR 2010, 4-7 July, Istanbul.

Blair, J. P. and Larsen, J. E. (2010) Satisfaction with Neighbours and Neighbourhood Housing Prices Journal of Place Management and Development, Vol. 3 No. 3, pp. 194-204.

Bowen, J. T. and Chen, S. L. (2001), The Relationship Between Customer Loyalty and Customer Satisfaction, International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, pp. 213-217.

Bruin, M. J. and Cook, C. C. (1997) Understanding Constraints and Residential Satisfaction Among Low - Income Single - Parent Families, Environment and Behavior, Vol. 29, pp. 532-553.

Dekker, K., Vos, S., Musterd, S. and Kempen, R. (2011) Residential Satisfaction in Housing Estate in European Cities: A Multi-level Research Approach, Houing Studies, Vol. 26, pp. 479-499.

Djebarni, R. and Al-Abed, A. (2000) Satisfaction Level with Neighbourhoods in Low-income Public Housing in Yemen, Property Management, Vol. 18 No. 4, pp. 230-242.

Fatoye, E. O. and Odusami, K. T. (2009) Occupants' Satisfaction Approach to Housing Performance Evaluation: The Case of Nigeria, RICS COBRA Research Conference, University of Cape Town, 10-11th September, pp 985-997.

Frank, B. and Enkawa, T. (2009) Economic Drivers of Dwelling Satisfaction: Evidence from Germany, International Journal of Housing Markets and Analysis, Vol. 2 No. 1, pp. 6-20.

Grzeskowiak, M. Sirgy, J and Widgery, R. (2000) Residents' Satisfaction with Community Services: Predictors and Outcomes Stephan, The Journal of Regional Analysis and Policy, Vol. 33, pp. 1-36.

Ha, S. K (2008) Social Housing Estates ans Sustainable Community Development in South Korea, Habitat International, Vol. 32, pp349-369.

Hassanain, M. A. (2007) Post-Occupancy Indoor Environmental Quality Evaluation of Student Housing Facilities, Architectural Engineering and Design Management, Vol.3, pp. 249–256.

Hui, E. C. M. and Zheng, X. (2010) Measuring Customer Satisfaction of FM Service in Housing Sector: A Structural Equation Model Approach, Facilities, Vol. 28 No. 5/6, pp. 306-320.

Hipp, J. R. (2009) Specifying the Determinants of Neighborhood Satisfaction: A Robust Assessment in 24 Metropolitan Areas Social Forces, Volume 88, Number 1, pp. 395-424.

Ibem, E. O. (2011) Evaluation of Public Housing in Ogun State, Nigeria, Unpublished PhD Thesis of the Department of Architecture, Covenant University, Ota, Ogun State, Nigeria.

Jaafar, M., Hasan, N. L., Mohamad, O. Ramayah, T. (2009) The Determinants of Housing Satisfaction Level: A Study On Residential Development Project by Penang Development Corporation (PDC).

Kaitilla, S. (1993) Satisfaction with Public Housing in Papua New Guinea: The Case of West Taraka Housing Scheme Environment and Behavior Vol. 25, pp. 514-545.

Karlin, R. A., Rosen, L. S., and Epstein, Y. M. (1979). Three into Two doesn't go: A Follow-up on the Effects of Overcrowded Dormitory Rooms. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 5(3), 391-395.

Kayas, N., and Erkip, F. (2001). Satisfaction in a Dormitory Building: The Effects of Floor on the Perception of Room Size and Crowding Environment and Behaviour, 33(1), 35-53.

Kellekci, O. L. and Berköz, L. (2006) Determinants of User Satisfaction in Housing and Environmental Quality: Sample of Istanbul Metropolitan Area

Liu, A. M. M. (1999) Residential Satisfaction in Housing Estates: A Hong Kong Perspective, Automation in Construction, Vol. 8, pp. 511–524.

Mohit, M. A., Ibrahim, M. and Rashid, Y. R. (2010) Assessment of Residential Satisfaction in Newly Designed Public Low-Cost Housing in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, Habitat International, Vol. 34, pp. 18–27.

Mustafa, A. and Maznah, G. (2012) House Buyers' Satisfaction and Housing Projects in Malaysia: A Conceptual Framework, Educational Research, Vol. 3 pp. 509 -513.

Najib, N. U. M., Yusof, N. A. and Abidin, N. Z. (2011) Student Residential Satisfaction in Research Universities, Journal of Facilities Management, Vol. 9, pp. 200-212.

Oktay, M. and Orcunoglu, H. (2007) Evaluation of Traditional and Recent Residential Environments from Users' Point of View: The Case of Ozankoy, North Cyprus, International Conference on Sustainable Urban Area, 26-28 June.

Parker, C. and Mathews, B.P (2001). Customer Satisfaction: Contrasting Academic and Consumers' Interpretations, Marketing Intelligence & Planning, 19 (1): 38-46.

Potter, J. J, Chiconie, J. L and Speicher, K. E. (2001) Predicting Residential Satisfaction: A Comparative Case Study, The Environmental Design Research Association (EDRA), Vol. 32, pp. 75-83.

Salleh, A.G (2008) Neighbourhood Factors in Private Low Cost Housing in Malaysia, Habitat International, Vol. 32, pp. 485-493.

Singh, H. (2006) The Importance of Customer Satisfaction in Relation to Customer Loyalty and Retention, pp. 1-7.

Sivadass, E. and Baker-Prewitt, J. L. (2000), An Examination of the Relationship Between Service Quality, Customer Satisfaction, and Store Loyalty, International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management, 28 (2), pp. 73-82.

Ukoha, O. and Beamish, J. O. (1997) Assessment of Residents' Satisfaction with Public Housing in Abuja, Nigeria, Habitatitnl., Vol. 21, No 4, pp 445-460.

Vera-Toscano, E. and Ateca-Amestoy, V. (2007) The Relevance of Social Interactions on Housing Satisfaction,

Westaway, M. S. (2006) A Longitudinal Investigation of Satisfaction with Personal and Environmental Quality of Life in an Informal South African Housing Settlement, Doornkop, Soweto, Habitat International, Vol. 30, pp. 175–189.