



Students' Satisfaction with Major Academic Facilities in Private Universities in Ogun State, Nigeria

Oluwunmi, A. O¹., Ajibola, M. O¹.,
Iroham, C. O.¹ & Eluyele, P.²

¹Department of Estate Management, Covenant University,
Ota, Ogun State

²Department of Estate Management, Osun State College of Technology,
Esa Oke, Osun State

funke.oluwunmi@covenantuniversity.edu.ng

Abstract: Higher educational institutions, particularly privately owned institutions, in developing countries are constantly challenged to improve on the quality of their facilities. This is necessitated by the need to ensure students' patronage. This study, therefore, examines students' level of satisfaction with library, ICT laboratory and classroom facilities in five private universities in Ogun State, Nigeria. Seven hundred and seventy copies of a questionnaire were distributed while five hundred and twenty-two were returned and valid for further processing. Data analysis using frequency distribution and weighted mean revealed that the students were generally satisfied with electricity supply and furniture in all three facilities; however, they were not satisfied with the number of escape routes and toilets. The paper recommends amongst others that the managements of the universities should, as a matter of priority, make efforts to improve the facilities with low level of students' satisfaction.

Keywords: Students, Satisfaction, Academic Facilities, Private Universities, Nigeria

1. Introduction

Higher educational institutions that strive to be among the best in this highly competitive academic environment

should constantly improve on the quality of their teaching and physical facilities in order to attract more students to their respective institutions.

One of the most commonly used methods of obtaining students' perception of their facilities is the satisfaction survey. The satisfaction survey provides a true image, as perceived by the students, of the universities and colleges about their services and programmes. Satisfaction levels provide a more obvious picture of facilities and the environment provided to students. So the satisfaction of students with their educational facilities is an important tool to assess the quality of teaching and institutional effectiveness (Hussain, Jabbar, Hussain, Rehman & Saghir, 2014).

In most cases, satisfaction surveys are used by educational institutions to determine their strengths and weaknesses. It plays a major role in determining the originality and accuracy of a system especially the educational system. The higher the level of satisfaction, the higher will be the level of students' skill development, course knowledge and mentality (Malik, Danish & Usman, 2009). The success of any educational institution depends on the satisfaction of their students particularly with the facilities provided by such an institution. This is because students are the most important stakeholders and the primary consumers of the facilities in educational institutions and the satisfaction of all other stakeholders is dependent on the satisfaction of students (Khan, Ahmed & Nawaz, 2011; Marimuthu & Ismail, 2012).

In Nigeria, the increasing number of universities, particularly private universities, coupled with increasing students' population may have adverse effects on the state of facilities which might in turn affect students' patronage if they are not satisfied with the

facilities. Hence, this study focuses on students' satisfaction with three major academic facilities in private universities in Ogun State, Nigeria.

2. Literature Review

University facilities constitute the major components of both direct and indirect action elements in the learning environment. Such facilities include all types of buildings and equipment for academic and non-academic activities, areas for sports and games, landscaping, farms and gardens including trees, roads and paths. Others are furniture and toilet facilities, lighting, acoustics, storage facilities and parking lots, security, transportation, information and communication technology (ICT), cleaning materials, food services and special facilities for the physically-challenged persons (Asiabaka, 2008).

These facilities play a pivotal role in the actualization of educational goals and objectives by satisfying the physical and emotional needs of the users. Knezevich (1975) emphasized that physical needs are met through provision of safe structures, adequate sanitary facilities, a balanced visual environment, appropriate thermal environment, and sufficient shelter space for work and play while emotional needs are met by creating pleasant surroundings, a friendly atmosphere, and an inspiring environment.

It is on this premise that several studies have been conducted in developed and developing countries of the world to examine users' satisfaction with academic facilities (Chen, Hsiao & Lee, 2005; Olasehinde-Williams, 2006; Kelso, 2008; Gruber, Fub, Voss & Glaser-Zikuda, 2010; Coskun, 2014). For instance, the study conducted by Chen, Hsiao & Lee (2005) adopted relationship marketing perspective to

find the relationship between student satisfaction and student loyalty. Six hundred Technology and Vocational Education (TVE) seniors of Great Taipei area were surveyed and regression analysis was performed to establish a model to predict “student loyalty” using “student satisfaction” as independent variable. The result indicated four satisfaction factors - school administration, academic activities, interpersonal relationship and physical facilities, have positive influence on student loyalty, however, school administration has the strongest influence on student loyalty.

A research by Malik, Danish & Usman (2009) analysed the impact of different services quality on student satisfaction in higher educational institutes of a big division of Punjab province of Pakistan. The study included both public and private sector institutes and data were collected from 240 students of business courses either enrolled in Master’s degree programmes or undergraduate programmes in provincially chartered universities of the Gujranwala region. Using descriptive statistics to analyse the data, the results showed that students were overall satisfied with services of tangibility, assurance, reliability and empathy but not satisfied with parking facilities, computer labs, cafeteria services, complaint handling system.

The study conducted by Kassim (2009) assessed the library’s performance of an academic library in Malaysia by measuring users’ satisfaction with library services, infrastructure/place/space and collection/information provided. Six hundred and fifty (650) final year students from three faculties in a public university in Malaysia were sampled to seek their opinions on their satisfaction

level based on statements regarding the three dimensions. Using descriptive and inferential statistics, findings showed that on the average, the respondents were only satisfied with the library services, infrastructure/place/space, collection/information of the library. However, they were relatively satisfied with infrastructure/place/space, collection/information and library services to users in that order. The study also revealed significant differences on the satisfaction on services, infrastructure/place/space, and libraries’ collection/information among the respondents of the three faculties. The findings suggested amongst others that libraries should improve their service, infrastructure and collections so as to serve users’ learning and research needs. Gruber, Fub, Voss & Gläser-Zikuda (2010) investigated how students perceive the services they are offered at a German university and how satisfied they are with them. An evaluation study using a 15-dimension tool specifically developed to measure student satisfaction with services was conducted. A total of 374 copies of a questionnaire were distributed to students during 8 lectures for the pilot study and 544 students were given the questionnaire during 18 lectures for the main study. The outcome of the study revealed that students’ satisfaction with their university is based on a relatively stable person-environment relationship. Thus, the satisfaction of students seem to reflect quite well perceived quality differences of offered services and of the wider environment. Students were particularly satisfied with the school placements and the atmosphere among students but mostly dissatisfied with the university buildings and the quality of the lecture theatres.

The work by Rehman, Shafique & Mahmood (2011) looked at users' perception and satisfaction with reference services at Public Sector General University Libraries of the Punjab Province (Pakistan). A questionnaire-based cross-sectional survey research was designed using a 5-point Likert scale for the study. A total of 1,000 copies of a questionnaire were administered and a response rate of 51% was achieved. The study revealed that respondents were satisfied with the reference collection, staff, facilities and services provided but they were not satisfied with any category of reference service. The study recommended amongst others that libraries should consider the features of 'user friendliness' and 'helpfulness' while designing online or electronic services for their users.

In Pakistan, Khan, Ahmed & Nawaz (2011) conducted a study on the impact of quality of service on the satisfaction level of students and willingness to put more efforts. It considered five dimensions of service quality (SERVQUAL model) given by Parasuraman *et al.* (1988) i.e. assurance, empathy, reliability, tangibility and responsiveness. Out of 600 copies of a questionnaire distributed to students using simple random sampling technique, 495 were completed and found useful. Using descriptive and inferential statistics, the study showed that there is significant relationship between dimensions of service quality i.e. reliability, assurance, responsiveness and empathy with satisfaction while tangibility was having an insignificant relation with student satisfaction i.e. tangibility is not associated with the students' satisfaction. This means that the physical appearance of the educational institution is not considered

by students. In other words, students do not rate their institutions on the basis of building and physical appearance but on the grounds of quality of education. Findings also showed that the higher the level of students' satisfaction, the greater their willingness to put great efforts into their studies.

Al-Khattab & Fraij (2011) measured the satisfaction of the students at Al-Hussein Bin Talal University, Jordan, with the quality of e-services. It mainly concentrated on the students' satisfaction with the in-house developed Student Information System (SIS). A questionnaire was administered to a sample of 350 undergraduate students and a response rate of 74% was achieved. Using inferential statistics for analysis, the study showed that the students were satisfied with the transition to e-services and the SIS has a positive impact on the students' satisfaction. Also, the study indicated that students value all five dimensions of service quality, but they value the tangibles dimension, which deals with the physical facilities of the university, the most.

A study by Abbasi, Malik, Chaudhry & Imdadullah (2011) measured the level of student satisfaction with services offered by Bahauddin Zakariya University (BZU), Pakistan. General survey was guided by well-structured questionnaire through convenience sampling administered to 401 students and data were collected from eighteen different disciplines and/or programmes. Ten major constructs i.e. teaching, administrative/management support, transportation, library, computer labs and general labs, accommodation, medical, sports, prayer/religious facilities, and classroom facilities were used. Mean analysis reflected students

dissatisfaction with many core services and facilities like teaching, administrative support, library, labs, accommodation, medical, and sports, while satisfaction was reported only in three augmented areas i.e. transportation, classroom and prayer facilities. Quite interestingly, no significant differences of opinion was recorded between male and female respondents. Overall, satisfaction level was alarmingly low and results indicated dissatisfaction of university students with educational services offered by Pakistani universities.

The work of Iwhiwhu & Okorodudu (2012) on users' satisfaction with library information resources, facilities and services in Edo State Central library, Benin-City, Nigeria had a sample size of two hundred (200) using availability sampling technique. The data were analysed using percentages, frequencies and mean. Findings from the study showed that users were dissatisfied with the information resources but were only satisfied with the services in the library such as hours of service, labelling services and bindery services with a mean of 2.87, 2.32 and 2.88 respectively. They were also satisfied with the furniture available.

In Nigeria, Oluwunmi, Durodola & Ajayi (2015) measured students' satisfaction with classroom facilities in three (3) private Universities in Ado-Odo Ota Local Government Council Area of Ogun State. A questionnaire was administered to 570 randomly selected students and a response rate of 76% was achieved. Using descriptive statistics, the study revealed that students were satisfied with electricity supply, ceiling finishes, windows/doors and furniture in their classrooms but, dissatisfied with the provision and

availability of air-conditioning and internet facilities in classrooms.

Another study in Nigeria by Oluwunmi, Durodola & Ajayi (2016) analysed students' perception of the quality of facilities and services in four private university libraries in Ogun State. A modified SERVPERF questionnaire was developed and administered to seven hundred and forty-four (744) students and 70% response rate was achieved and analysed. Using SERVPERF dimensions (tangibility, responsiveness, reliability, assurance and empathy) the study revealed that students' general perception of library services in the four (4) universities is above average. However, some facilities in the libraries like parking space and escape routes were rated very low.

Judging from the review above on students' satisfaction with academic facilities in Nigeria and other countries, it is evident that many research efforts have focused on this issue. However, majority of the studies focused either on library, computer laboratory or classrooms facilities, only a few studies focused on these three academic facilities together. Hence, this study is designed to assess students' satisfaction with three academic facilities, in particular, libraries, classrooms and IT/ICT laboratories. This is because all students, irrespective of the category and discipline spend a considerable amount of time using these facilities (Wakefield & Blodgett, 1994; Leung & Ip, 2005).

3. Research Method

This study utilised a survey research method in which a questionnaire was administered to 770 students in four (4) private universities in Ogun State, Nigeria. The private universities selected for this research include

Babcock University (BU), Covenant University (CU), Bells University (Bells) and Crescent University (CRE). The questionnaire was designed to elicit information on students' satisfaction with three major academic facilities (library, ICT laboratory and classroom) in the private universities. Data were analysed using descriptive statistics specifically frequency distribution, percentages and mean/ranking. The frequency distribution and percentages showed the demographic information of the students and the mean/ranking showed the variables on students' satisfaction with their library, ICT laboratory and classroom facilities. Students' satisfaction was assessed based on nineteen variables in the library, twenty variables in the ICT laboratory and eighteen variables in the classrooms of the selected universities. The students were asked to rate the variables using a Likert scale of 1 – Strongly Dissatisfied, 2 - Dissatisfied, 3 - Indifferent, 4 - Satisfied and 5 - Strongly Satisfied. The mean was then

calculated for library [Appendices A - D], ICT laboratory [Appendices E - H] and classrooms [Appendices I - L]. Thereafter, the mean scores were used to rank the variables.

4. Results and Discussions

4.1 Students' Characteristics

Out of the 770 copies of the questionnaire distributed, a total of 522 (representing 68%) were retrieved for analysis. Information on the characteristics of students based on their gender, age, year of study and religion were sought. Responses are presented in Table 1 using frequency distributions and percentages. The result show that a higher percentage of the respondents were males (51%) with a higher proportion of the male respondents (56%) from Covenant University. Analysis on the age, year of study and religion of the respondents shows that majority of them were between 16 and 25 years of age (91%), between 200 - 400levels (78%) of their programmes and practice Christianity (62%).

Table 1: Students' Characteristics in the Selected Private Universities

S/N	Characteristics /Statistics	Sub – headings	BU	CU	Bells	CRE	Mean %
			F (%)	F (%)	F (%)	F (%)	
1	Gender	Male	61 (45)	90 (56)	60 (52)	56 (52)	51
		Female	75 (55)	72 (44)	56 (48)	52 (48)	49
2	Age	<16 yrs	15 (11)	0 (0)	0 (0)	10 (9)	5
		16-20 yrs	85 (63)	39 (24)	53 (46)	49 (45)	45
		21-25 yrs	29 (21)	123 (76)	59 (51)	41 (38)	46
		26-30 yrs	7 (5)	0 (0)	4 (3)	6 (6)	3
		> 30 yrs	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (2)	1
3	Year of Study	100-Level	21 (15)	0 (0)	9 (8)	11 (10)	8
		200-Level	43 (32)	6 (4)	14 (12)	51 (47)	24
		300-Level	23 (17)	17 (10)	61 (52)	19 (18)	24
		400-Level	42 (31)	76 (47)	23 (20)	23 (21)	30
		500-Level	1 (1)	63 (39)	9 (8)	4 (4)	13
		Extra Year	6 (4)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1
4	Religion	Christian	117 (86)	156 (96)	77 (66)	0 (0)	62
		Muslim	19 (14)	6 (4)	39 (34)	108 (100)	38

4.2 Students' Satisfaction with Academic Facilities in Private Universities

Students' were asked to state their level of satisfaction with regard to their library, ICT laboratory and classroom facilities. To further analyse their

response, the researchers assigned 5, 4, 3, 2 and 1 to “Strongly Satisfied”, “Satisfied”, “Indifferent”, “Dissatisfied” and “Strongly Dissatisfied” respectively. The mean calculated were then ranked as shown in Tables 2 to 4.

Table 2: Students' Satisfaction with Library Facilities in the Four Private Universities

Facilities	BU	CU	Bells	CRE	Mean Ranking	
	Ranking					
Furniture (e.g. tables, chairs e.t.c)	5 th	5 th	1 st	1 st	1 st	
Thermal comfort (indoor temperature)	8 th	8 th	2 nd	2 nd	3 rd	
Visual comfort (Natural and Artificial lighting)	11 th	8 th	3 rd	3 rd	4 th	
Air quality within the library	10 th	1 st	4 th	10 th	4 th	
Electricity supply	4 th	3 rd	4 th	4 th	2 nd	
Wall finishing	1 st	11 th	4 th	13 th	7 th	
Floor finishing	13 th	18 th	7 th	7 th	12 th	
Ceiling finishing	12 th	16 th	7 th	15 th	14 th	
Cooling System	A/C	3 rd	6 th	9 th	6 th	4 th
	Fan	15 th	6 th	9 th	5 th	8 th
E-library facilities	Workstations	17 th	11 th	11 th	18 th	16 th
	Speed of Internet access	7 th	3 rd	11 th	19 th	11 th
Acoustic comfort (sound proofing)		19 th	10 th	13 th	10 th	14 th
Library aesthetics		16 th	11 th	14 th	16 th	16 th
Library size		2 nd	11 th	15 th	8 th	8 th
Escape routes		18 th	19 th	16 th	17 th	19 th
Constant water supply in the toilets		13 th	16 th	17 th	14 th	18 th
No of toilets		8 th	11 th	18 th	12 th	13 th
Toilet facilities for male and female students		6 th	1 st	19 th	9 th	8 th

Based on the mean ranking presented in Table 2, majority of the students' were satisfied with furniture, electricity supply, indoor temperature, natural and artificial lighting, air-conditioning and air quality within the library. On the

other hand, they were less satisfied with the number of workstations in the e-library section, library aesthetic, number of escape routes and water supply in the toilets.

Table 3: Students' Satisfaction with ICT Facilities in the Four Private Universities

Facilities	BU	CU	Bells	CRE	Mean Ranking	
	Ranking					
No of workstations	8 th	9 th	1 st	15 th	7 th	
Speed of internet access	7 th	2 nd	2 nd	10 th	2 nd	
Thermal comfort (indoor temperature)	8 th	9 th	3 rd	7 th	4 th	
Electricity supply	4 th	2 nd	3 rd	2 nd	1 st	
Wall finishing	2 nd	15 th	5 th	1 st	3 rd	
Floor finishing	1 st	18 th	5 th	6 th	7 th	
Ceiling finishing	3 rd	9 th	7 th	8 th	4 th	
Cooling system	A/C	4 th	8 th	8 th	16 th	9 th
	Fan	10 th	7 th	9 th	12 th	11 th
Furniture (e.g. tables, chairs e.t.c)	12 th	1 st	10 th	3 rd	4 th	
Equipment (printer, computer)	6 th	18 th	11 th	4 th	11 th	
Visual comfort (Natural and Artificial lighting)	14 th	9 th	12 th	5 th	11 th	
Acoustic comfort (sound proof)	18 th	15 th	12 th	13 th	16 th	
Air Quality within ICT/IT lab	11 th	4 th	12 th	9 th	9 th	
ICT/IT lab aesthetics	13 th	4 th	15 th	11 th	14 th	
ICT/IT lab size	16 th	6 th	15 th	14 th	15 th	
Escape routes	20 th	20 th	17 th	17 th	20 th	
No of toilets	15 th	15 th	18 th	20 th	19 th	
Toilet facilities for male and female students	19 th	9 th	19 th	18 th	17 th	
Constant water supply in the toilets	17 th	9 th	20 th	19 th	17 th	

Table 3 provides the mean ranking, majority of the students' were satisfied with the electricity supply, speed of internet access, wall finishing, thermal comfort, ceiling finishing and furniture. In the order of least satisfaction, number of escape routes ranked 20th and toilet

facilities provision issues and water supply in the toilets ranked 19th to 17th. This measure of satisfaction with escape routes and toilets shows consonance with the work of Oluwunmi, Durodola & Ajayi (2016).

Table 4: Students' Satisfaction with Classrooms Facilities in the Four Private Universities

Facilities	BU	CU	Bells	CRE	Mean Ranking
	Ranking				
Electricity supply	2 nd	1 st	1 st	8 th	1 st
Furniture (e.g tables, chairs e.t.c)	5 th	3 th	2 nd	9 th	3 rd
Ceiling finishing	12 th	3 th	3 rd	2 nd	3 rd

Floor finishing		5 th	16 th	4 th	7 th	7 th
Wall finishing		3 rd	3 th	5 th	4 th	2 nd
Escape routes		18 th	14 th	6 th	18 th	15 th
Visual comfort (Natural and Artificial lighting)		1 st	1 st	7 th	15 th	5 th
Thermal comfort (indoor temperature)		8 th	12 th	8 th	5 th	7 th
Acoustic comfort (sound proof)		14 th	13 th	9 th	5 th	11 th
Air quality within the classrooms		13 th	11 th	9 th	3 rd	10 th
Classrooms aesthetics		3 rd	3 th	11 th	12 th	6 th
Classrooms size		9 th	9 th	12 th	1 st	7 th
No of toilets		11 th	3 th	13 th	13 th	11 th
Constant water supply in the toilets		14 th	3 th	13 th	17 th	13 th
Toilet facilities for male and female students		10 th	15 th	15 th	14 th	15 th
Cooling system	Fan	16 th	10 th	15 th	11 th	14 th
	A/C	7 th	18 th	17 th	16 th	17 th
Internet facilities		17 th	17 th	18 th	9 th	17 th

Table 4 is based on the mean ranking of students' satisfaction with classroom facilities. It is observed that majority of the students' were satisfied with the electricity supply (1st), wall finishing (2nd), furniture and ceiling finishing were ranked 3rd. While students are not satisfied with the fact that there are no air-conditioners and internet facilities in their classrooms (17th). It can therefore be deduced that a majority of the students in the four private universities enjoy constant electricity in their classrooms.

In all, following from the findings of this study, it can be concluded that majority of the students were satisfied with electricity supply and furniture in all three facilities. It also provides support to the findings of previous research in both developed and developing nations of the world which indicates that students were satisfied with the furniture available in their library (Kumar, Hussain, Fatima &

Tyagi, 2010; Hussain, Muzeeb & Fatima, 2011 Iwhiwhu & Okorodudu, 2012; Oluwunmi, Durodola & Ajayi, 2015).

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

This study examined students' satisfaction with three academic facilities in private universities in Ogun State, Nigeria. Findings from the study clearly showed that students were not satisfied with the number of escape routes and workstations, aesthetics and water supply in the toilets of their library; number of escape routes and toilets with water supply in the IT/ICT laboratory and air-conditioner, escape routes and internet facility in the classrooms. Based on these findings, it is suggested that:

1. The management of the universities should, as a matter of priority, make efforts to improve the facilities with low level of students' satisfaction. This can be achieved by allocating regular and sufficient fund in the

budget for the quality improvement of such facilities.

- Moreover, the universities should from time to time obtain feedback on the level of satisfaction students derive from the facilities as they can use this information to prioritise

spending on facilities' provision and maintenance. The feedback can be gotten from the students via their students' council or through an arm of the student affairs department in each university.

References

- Abbasi, M. N., Malik, A., Chaudhry, I. S. & Imdadullah, M. (2011). A Study on Student Satisfaction in Pakistani Universities: The Case of Bahauddin Zakariya University Pakistan, *Asian Social Science*, 7, 209 - 219.
- Al-Khattab, S., & Fraij, F (2011). Assessing Students' Satisfaction with Quality of Service of Students Information System. (Online) Available @ http://www.mnmk.ro/documents/2011/10_Iordania%20FFFF.pdf
- Asiabaka, I. P. (2008). The Need for Effective Facility Management in Schools in Nigeria, *New York Science Journal*, 1(2), 10 - 21.
- Chen, Y., Hsiao C., & Lee, W. (2005) How Does Student Satisfaction Influence Student Loyalty - From the Relationship Marketing Perspective. Available @ <http://www.ncue.edu.tw/ezcatfiles/b004/img/img/316/96-1-4p.doc>
- Coskun, L. (2014) Investigating the Essential Factors on Student Satisfaction: A Case of Albanian Private University, *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 4(1), 489 - 503.
- Gruber, T., Fub, S., Voss, R., & Glaser-Zikuda, M. (2010). Examining Student Satisfaction with Higher Education Services Using a New Measurement Tool. *International Journal of Public Sector Performance Management*, 23(2), 105 - 123.
- Hussain, S., Jabbar, M., Hussain, Z., Rehman, Z., & Saghir, A. (2014) The Students' Satisfaction in Higher Education and its Important Factors: A Comparative Study between Punjab and AJ&K, Pakistan, *Research Journal of Applied Sciences, Engineering and Technology*, 7(20), 4343 - 4348.
- Hussain, A., Muzeeb, U. & Fatima, N. (2011) A User Survey of Five Women's College Libraries in South Campus, University of Delhi, India. Available @ <https://www.webpage.s.uidaho.edu/~mbolin/hussain-muzeeb-fatima.pdf>
- Iwhiwhu, B. E. & Okorodudu, P. O. (2012). Public Library Information Resources, Facilities and Services: Users Satisfaction with Edo state Central Library, Benin-City, Nigeria. *Library Philosophy and Practice* (Online) Available @ http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1821&context=libphi_lprae
- Kassim, N. A. (2009). Evaluating Users' Satisfaction on Academic Library Performance. *Malaysian Journal of Library & Information Science*, 14(2), 101 - 115.
- Kelso, R. S. (2008). Measuring Undergraduate Student Perceptions of Service Quality in

- Higher Education. Graduate School Theses and Dissertations. (Online) Available @ <http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/etd/328>
- Khan, M. M., Ahmed, I., & Nawaz, M. M. (2011). Student's Perspective of Service Quality in Higher Learning Institutions: An Evidence Based Approach. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 2(11), 159 - 164.
- Knezevich, S. I. (1975). *Administration of Public Education*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Kumar, K., Hussain, A., Fatima, N. & Tyagi, S. (2010) The Use of Collections and Services at IIT Delhi library: A Survey, *International Journal of Library and Information Science*, 2(6), 114 - 123.
- Leung, M., Lu, X., & Ip, H. (2005). Investigating Key Components of the Facility Management of Secondary Schools in Hong Kong. *Facilities*, 23, 226 - 238.
- Malik, M. E., Danish, R. Q., & Usman, A. (2009). The Impact of Service Quality on Students' Satisfaction in Higher Education Institutes of Punjab. *Journal of Management Research*, 2, 1 - 11.
- Marimuthu, M., & Ismail, I. (2012). Service Quality in Higher Education: Comparing the Perceptions of Stakeholders, Ninth AIMS International Conference on Management, January 1-4, India.
- Olasehinde-Williams, O. (2006). Students' Perceptions of Full-time and Part-time Education Programmes in Nigerian University. *Journal of Sociology and Education in Africa*, 4, 97 - 110.
- Oluwunmi, A. O., Durodola, O. D. & Ajayi, C. A. (2015) Comparative Analysis of Students' Satisfaction with Classroom Facilities in Nigerian Private Universities, *Journal of Studies in Education*, 5(4), 242 - 257. Available@www.macrothink.org
- Oluwunmi, A. O., Durodola, O. D. & Ajayi, C. A. (2016) Students' Perceived Quality of Library Facilities and Services in Nigerian Private Universities, *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, 4(5), 41-50. Available@<http://jets.redfame.com>
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1988). SERVQUAL: A Multi- Item Scale for Measuring Consumer Perceptions of the Service Quality. *Journal of Retailing*, 64, 12 - 40.
- Rehman, S. U., Shafique, F., & Mahmood, K. (2011). A Survey of User Perception and Satisfaction with Reference Services in University Libraries of Punjab. *Library Philosophy and Practice*. (Online) Available @ http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1656&context=libphi_lprac
- Wakefield, K. L., & Blodgett, J. G. (1994). The Importance of Service-scapes in Leisure Service Settings. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 8(3), 66 - 76.

LIBRARY RANKING

APPENDIX A

Babcock University		
Facilities	Mean	Ranking
Wall finishing	4.52	1 st
Library size	4.49	2 nd
A/C	4.46	3 rd
Electricity supply	4.45	4 th
Furniture (e.g. tables, chairs e.t.c)	4.38	5 th
Separate toilet facilities for male and female students	4.36	6 th
Speed of Internet access	4.35	7 th
No of toilets	4.34	8 th
Thermal comfort (indoor temperature)	4.34	8 th
Air quality within the library	4.33	10 th
Visual comfort (Natural and Artificial lighting)	4.32	11 th
Ceiling finishing	4.31	12 th
Floor finishing	4.30	13 th
Constant water supply in the toilets	4.30	13 th
Fan	4.30	13 th
Library aesthetics	4.25	16 th
No of Workstations	4.20	17 th
Escape routes	4.18	18 th
Acoustic comfort (sound proof)	3.87	19 th

APPENDIX B

Covenant University		
Facilities	Mean	Ranking
Air quality within the library	4.93	1 st
Separate toilet facilities for male and female students	4.93	1 st
Electricity supply	4.92	3 rd
Speed of Internet access	4.92	3 rd
Furniture (e.g. tables, chairs e.t.c)	4.67	5 th
A/C	4.30	6 th
Fan	4.30	6 th
Acoustic comfot (sound proof)	4.04	8 th
Thermal comfort (indoor temperature)	4.04	8 th
Visual comfot (Natural and Artificial lighting)	4.04	8 th
No of toilets	3.44	11 th
Library aesthetics	3.44	11 th
Library size	3.44	11 th
Wall finishing	3.44	11 th
No of workstations	3.44	11 th
Constant water supply in the toilets	3.43	16 th
Ceiling finishing	3.43	16 th
Floor finishing	3.42	18 th
Escape routes	3.41	19 th

APPENDIX C

Bells University		
Facilities	Mean	Ranking
Furniture (e.g. tables, chairs e.t.c)	4.02	1 st
Thermal comfort (indoor temperature)	3.97	2 nd
Visual comfort (Natural and Artificial lighting)	3.96	3 rd
Air quality within the library	3.91	4 th
Electricity supply	3.91	4 th
Wall finishing	3.91	4 th
Floor finishing	3.90	7 th
Ceiling finishing	3.90	7 th
A/C	3.89	9 th
Fan	3.89	9 th
Workstations	3.88	11 th
Speed of Internet access	3.88	11 th
Acoustic comfort (sound proof)	3.87	13 th
Library aesthetics	3.81	14 th
Library size	3.79	15 th
Escape routes	3.77	16 th
Constant water supply in the toilets	3.72	17 th
No of toilets	3.69	18 th
Toilet facilities for male and female students	3.69	19 th

APPENDIX D

Crescent University		
Facilities	Mean	Ranking
Furniture (e.g. tables, chairs e.t.c)	4.08	1 st
Thermal comfort (indoor temperature)	3.85	2 nd
Visual comfort (Natural and Artificial lighting)	3.82	3 rd
Electricity supply	3.69	4 th
Fan	3.60	5 th
A/C	3.59	6 th
Floor finishing	3.55	7 th
Library size	3.47	8 th
Separate toilet facilities for male and female students	3.45	9 th
Acoustic comfort (sound proof)	3.44	10 th
Air quality within the library	3.44	10 th
No of toilets	3.41	12 th
Wall finishing	3.37	13 th
Constant water supply in the toilets	3.34	14 th
Ceiling finishing	3.32	15 th
Library aesthetics	3.31	16 th
Escape routes	3.21	17 th
Np of Workstations	3.09	18 th
Speed of Internet access	2.96	19 th

IT/ICT LABORATORY RANKING

APPENDIX E

Babcock University		
Facilities	Mean	Ranking
Floor finishing	4.53	1 st
Wall finishing	4.45	2 nd
Ceiling finishing	4.44	3 rd
A/C	4.43	4 th
Electricity supply	4.43	4 th
Equipment (printer, computer)	4.41	6 th
Speed of internet access	4.34	7 th
No of workstations	4.32	8 th
Thermal comfort (indoor temperature)	4.32	8 th
Fan	4.31	10 th
Air Quality within ICT/IT lab	4.29	11 th
Furniture (e.g. tables, chairs e.t.c)	4.26	12 th
ICT/IT lab aesthetics	4.23	13 th
Visual comfort (Natural and Artificial lighting)	4.12	14 th
No of toilets	4.11	15 th
ICT/IT lab size	4.11	15 th
Constant water supply in the toilets	4.09	17 th
Acoustic comfort (sound proof)	4.04	18 th
Separate toilet facilities for male and female students	4.02	19 th
Escape routes	3.97	20 th

APPENDIX F

Covenant University		
Facilities	Mean	Ranking
Furniture (e.g. tables, chairs e.t.c)	4.95	1 st
Electricity supply	4.94	2 nd
Speed of internet access	4.94	2 nd
Air Quality within ICT/IT lab	4.93	4 th
ICT/IT lab aesthetics	4.93	4 th
ICT/IT lab size	4.91	6 th
Fan	4.34	7 th
A/C	4.33	8 th
No of workstations	4.32	9 th
Thermal comfort (indoor temperature)	4.32	9 th
Ceiling finishing	4.32	9 th
Visual comfort (Natural and Artificial lighting)	4.32	9 th
Separate toilet facilities for male and female students	4.32	9 th
Constant water supply in the toilets	4.32	9 th
Wall finishing	4.31	15 th
Acoustic comfort (sound proof)	4.31	15 th
No of toilets	4.31	15 th
Floor finishing	4.30	18 th
Equipment (printer, computer)	4.30	18 th
Escape routes	3.09	20 th

APPENDIX G

Bells University		
Facilities	Mean	Ranking
No of workstations	4.00	1 st
Speed of internet access	3.96	2 nd
Thermal comfort (indoor temperature)	3.91	3 rd
Electricity supply	3.91	3 rd
Wall finishing	3.88	5 th
Floor finishing	3.88	5 th
Ceiling finishing	3.83	7 th
A/C	3.81	8 th
Fan	3.78	9 th
Furniture (e.g. tables, chairs e.t.c)	3.77	10 th
Equipment (printer, computer)	3.74	11 th
Visual comfort (Natural and Artificial lighting)	3.72	12 th
Acoustic comfort (sound proof)	3.72	12 th
Air Quality within ICT/IT lab	3.72	12 th
ICT/IT lab aesthetics	3.70	15 th
ICT/IT lab size	3.70	15 th
Escape routes	3.65	17 th
No of toilets	3.63	18 th
Toilet facilities for male and female students	3.62	19 st
Constant water supply in the toilets	3.61	20 th

APPENDIX H

Crescent University		
Facilities	Mean	Ranking
Wall finishing	3.74	1 st
Electricity supply	3.71	2 nd
Furniture (e.g. tables, chairs e.t.c)	3.63	3 rd
Equipment (printer, computer)	3.39	4 th
Visual comfort (Natural and Artificial lighting)	3.37	5 th
Floor finishing	3.30	6 th
Thermal comfort (indoor temperature)	3.28	7 th
Ceiling finishing	3.19	8 th
Air Quality within ICT/IT lab	3.13	9 th
Speed of internet access	3.09	10 th
ICT/IT lab aesthetics	3.07	11 th
Fan	3.06	12 th
Acoustic comfort (sound proof)	3.03	13 th
ICT/IT lab size	3.01	14 th
No of workstations	2.92	15 th
A/C	2.89	16 th
Escape routes	2.81	17 th
Separate toilet facilities for male and female students	2.78	18 th
Constant water supply in the toilets	2.66	19 th
No of toilets	2.55	20 th

CLASSROOM RANKING

APPENDIX 1

Babcock University		
Facilities	Mean	Ranking
Visual comfort (Natural and Artificial lighting)	4.53	1 st
Electricity supply	4.49	2 nd
Wall finishing	4.46	3 rd
Classrooms aesthetics	4.46	3 rd
Furniture (e.g tables, chairs e.t.c)	4.43	5 th
Floor finishing	4.43	5 th
A/C	4.40	7 th
Thermal comfort (indoor temperature)	4.39	8 th
Classrooms size	4.33	9 th
Separate toilet facilities for male and female students	4.32	10 th
No of toilets	4.31	11 th
Ceiling finishing	4.30	12 th
Air quality within the classrooms	4.29	13 th
Constant water supply in the toilets	4.22	14 th
Acoustic comfort (sound proof)	4.22	14 th
Fan	4.15	16 th
Internet facilities	4.11	17 th
Escape routes	3.85	18 th

APPENDIX J

Covenant University		
Facilities	Mean	Ranking
Electricity supply	4.34	1 st
Visual comfort (Natural and Artificial lighting)	4.34	1 st
Furniture (e.g tables, chairs e.t.c)	4.33	3 rd
Ceiling finishing	4.33	3 rd
Wall finishing	4.33	3 rd
Classrooms aesthetics	4.33	3 rd
No of toilets	4.33	3 rd
Constant water supply in the toilets	4.33	3 rd
Classrooms size	4.31	9 th
Fan	4.30	10 th
Air quality within the classrooms	3.73	11 th
Thermal comfort (indoor temperature)	3.70	12 th
Acoustic comfort (sound proof)	3.69	13 th
Escape routes	3.67	14 th
Internet facilities	3.10	15 th
Floor finishing	3.09	16 th
Separate toilet facilities for male and female students	3.08	17 th
A/C	1.00	18 th

APPENDIX K

Bells University		
Facilities	Mean	Ranking
Electricity supply	3.86	1 st
Furniture (e.g tables, chairs e.t.c)	3.84	2 nd
Ceiling finishing	3.83	3 rd
Floor finishing	3.81	4 th
Wall finishing	3.80	5 th
Escape routes	3.79	6 th
Visual comfort (Natural and Artificial lighting)	3.78	7 th
Thermal comfort (indoor temperature)	3.76	8 th
Acoustic comfort (sound proof)	3.72	9 th
Air quality within the classrooms	3.72	9 th
Classrooms aesthetics	3.71	11 th
Classrooms size	3.69	12 th
No of toilets	3.68	13 th
Constant water supply in the toilets	3.68	13 th
Toilet facilities for male and female students	3.66	15 th
Cooling system	Fan	3.66
	A/C	3.66
Internet facilities	3.62	18 th

APPENDIX L

Crescent University		
Facilities	Mean	Ranking
Classrooms size	3.44	1 st
Ceiling finishing	3.33	2 nd
Air quality within the classrooms	3.30	3 rd
Wall finishing	3.13	4 th
Thermal comfort (indoor temperature)	3.11	5 th
Acoustic comfort (sound proof)	3.11	5 th
Floor finishing	3.09	7 th
Electricity supply	3.02	8 th
Furniture (e.g tables, chairs e.t.c)	2.94	9 th
Internet facilities	2.94	9 th
Fan	2.90	11 th
Classrooms aesthetics	2.84	12 th
No of toilets	2.80	13 th
Separate toilet facilities for male and female students	2.78	14 th
Visual comfort (Natural and Artificial lighting)	2.76	15 th
A/C	2.73	16 th
Constant water supply in the toilets	2.63	17 th
Escape routes	2.20	18 th