

Students' Housing and Academic Performance in University of Ibadan, Nigeria.

*Lekan SANNI, Ph.D. and Oyinlola Olukemi OMOTAYO

*Department of Urban and Regional Planning, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria.

Constrained by inadequate bed spaces for her teeming students population, the management of the University of Ibadan evolved a policy ensuring that, on the average, each undergraduate student is accommodated on-campus in the first and final years while intervening years are spent off-campus. The study investigated the effects of this students' housing programme on academic performance. Faculty of the Social Sciences was randomly selected, from where all final year undergraduate students were purposively sampled for the study, using a set of pre-tested questionnaires and in-depth interviews. Only 195 of the 230 copies of the questionnaire administered were returned and analyzed for the study. Secondary data were also obtained from both published and unpublished sources. Both descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyze the data collected. Significant differences were not found in academic performances of on-campus and off-campus students. While analysis of quantitative data revealed no significant relationships between indicators of students' housing quality and academic performance, qualitative data from in-depth interviews identified diverse challenges posed by these indicators to students' academic performance in the university. Strategies were proposed to address the identified challenges.

Key words: students' housing; on-campus; off-campus; squatting; academic performance.

Introduction

Since the inauguration of the first university, University College, Ibadan, in Nigeria in 1948, government's policy on students housing in Nigerian universities have witnessed three major eras. In the first era, a hundred percent accommodation was planned and provided for students, mainly on-campus, and / or on properties rented by the universities for students accommodation. In this era, all conveniences like cafeteria with heavily subsidized meals, butteries, reading rooms and the like facilities were provide for the convenience of the accommodated students, within their halls of residence.

This era lasted till late 1970s when the nation started experiencing economic down turn and could

not adequately provide required bed spaces for the teeming students population. The universities had to shed their initial policy of accommodating all the students in the universities' (owned or rented) properties, and evolve the second era where bed spaces were rationed among the students. A major practice here is adopting "the '3F' formula": giving preference to students in First and Final years, and Foreign students, in allocating bed spaces in the various halls of residence, after which the remaining bed spaces are rationed out through balloting. This practice is still very much in vogue in most Federal universities in Nigeria.

The third era, synonymous with a hundred percent off-campus policy, emerged in the 1980s,



and is associated more with States' (as against Federal) owned universities. In universities practicing this policy, students are expected to source accommodation privately within, or around, the university town, from where they are expected to commute to and from the university campuses for their academic pursuits.

Casual observations reveal that these students' housing practices might have varying contributory effects on students' academic performances. Investigating this insinuation empirically is the main thrust of the present study. University of Ibadan is purposively chosen for the study because, apart from being the oldest university in the country, the '3F formula' adopted in the university in allocating bed spaces, ensures an average student is accommodated in the students' halls of residence only in the first and final years, with the intervening years spent off-campus. The practice thus provides ample opportunities for the researchers to readily find students occupying (or that have occupied) diverse houses in the course of their studies.

Conceptualization and Review of the Literature

The term "students' housing" as used in the study, relates to residential accommodation occupied by students in Nigerian universities. The housing is either located within the university's campus and owned or managed by the university's authority (on-campus) or located outside the university's campus and owned by other organization(s) (off-campus).

Five categories of students' housing status are also readily identifiable within Nigerian universities. The first are students that are officially allocated accommodation spaces within the university's halls of residence. Students in this category are classified 'halls' in the present study. The second category, tagged 'Squatters' are students not officially allocated bed spaces in the halls of residence but who, illegally, share bed spaces with friends and colleagues. The third category are

students accommodated in private owned (as against government owned) hostels within the university campus. The fourth category are Students occupying personally rented room(s) outside the university campus. In the present study, students in this category are tagged 'Rented Apartment'. The last category, termed 'home' in the present study, is used for students residing with parents or guardians within or outside the university. In this category are also students residing in the Boys' Quarters in the staff quarters in the university campus, irrespective of whether they are related to the staff or not.

Since 1970s and early 1980s, various researches have been conducted on the benefits of students living on-campus as against living off-campus. Findings of these researches could be classified into two: researchers that concluded that students residing on-campus perform better academically than those living off-campus (Astin, 1973; Astin, 1975; Astin, 1977; Blimling, 1989; Blimling, 1993a; Chickering, 1974; Herndon, 1984; Hountras and Brant, 1970; Levin & Clowes, 1982; Levitz & Noel, 1989; May, 1974; Moos & Lee, 1979; Nowack & Hanson, 1985; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991; Pascarella, Terenzini, & Blimling, 1994; Rinn, 2003; Rinn, 2004; Scott, 1975; Simono, Wachowiak, & Furr, 1984; Tinto, 1993; Upcraft & Gardner, 1989); and, those that concluded that students living on-campus do not perform better than those living off-campus. (Blimling, 1989; Clodfelter, Furr & Wachowiak, 1984; Grosz & Brandt, 1969; Hountras and Brant, 1970; Paine, 2007; Snyder, Kras, Bressel, and Reeve, 2011).

In their investigations on relations of student's residence to academic achievement in five colleges of an upper Midwest university, Hountras and Brant (1970) found that the combined group of students residing in residence halls had higher mean grade point averages (GPA'S) than did students residing at home or off-campus. Chickering (1974) found on-

campus living had a significant positive effect on completion of the bachelor's degree, even when controlling for individual differences such as academic ability. In addition, living on campus increases students' chances for aspiring to attain a graduate or professional degree (Astin, 1977). Though several socio-economic, socio-cultural and psycho-social attributes might influence a student's academic performance, Astin (1977) showed, empirically, that living in a residence hall contributes to about 12% of the variance involved in attaining a bachelor's degree. Blimling (1989) found students living in residence halls seem to perform better academically than students who live at home. However, when prior academic achievement was controlled, research did not generally support the notion that students living in residence halls would perform better academically than students living at home. High-achieving students still performed well regardless of their living arrangements. In his meta-analysis of nine studies that compared residence hall students with students living in fraternity or sorority houses, those students living in residence halls were likely to perform better academically than students living in fraternity or sorority houses. Other researchers have found a clear correlation between living in residence halls and academic achievement in the form of grade point average (Astin, 1973; Astin, 1977; Chickering, 1974; Herndon, 1984; Rinn, 2003; Rinn, 2004; Scott, 1975). In addition to the role that residence halls play in the lives of students, the first semester of a student's college career has been noted to be crucial in regard to his/her success at the university (Tinto, 1993; Levitz & Noel, 1989; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991; Upcraft & Gardner, 1989).

In similar vein, various studies have also observed no difference in academic performance of on-campus and off-campus students (Clodfelter, Furr, & Wachowiak, 1984; Grosz & Brandt, 1969; Hountras & Brandt, 1970). Clodfelter, Furr and Wachowiak. (1984) present two studies which surveyed college students (N=304 and 448) to examine the impact of living environment on

academic performance. Contrary to previous research, students living off-campus reported higher grade point averages than on-campus students. A meta-analysis of 34 studies by Blimling (1989) found that in most cases where findings showed that residence hall students performed better than commuters, there was no adjustment made for past academic performance. Once academic performance was statistically controlled for, there did not seem to be an appreciable difference on measures of academic achievement between these two groups. From her empirical investigations on first year students living in three different types of residence hall environments, Paine (2007) concluded that there were no significant differences in the social and academic integration, academic performance, involvement, or persistence among students living in these three different types of residence halls.

From the literature reviewed, it is observed that no clear-cut all-embracing conclusion has been established on the effects of students housing on academic performance. There is therefore a dire need to contribute to the existing knowledge in this area of study by investigating empirically the existing relationships between students' housing and academic performance in a developing nation like Nigeria, to help shed lights on the grey areas in students' housing that might be of great assistance in evolving the best students housing policy for the nation. Achieving this is the main thrust of the present study. Though the study is based on university of Ibadan, Nigeria, we strongly believe that the research's findings and recommendations will be of immense benefit to nations aspiring to provide the most conducive housing for their students.

The Study Area

From the humble beginning as a war camp in the 19th century, Ibadan became the arrow-head of Yoruba's military might in late 19th century. With



colonialism and the administrative headquarters of Southwestern Nigeria being situated in Ibadan, the city grew in leaps and bounds, becoming the nodal city for the whole region and beyond, second in importance only to Lagos, the industrial and commercial nerve centre of Nigeria. With the establishment of the University College in the city in 1948, the city of Ibadan has become a symbol of national unity and one of the chief repositories of Nigerian culture, and not only politically and commercially, but also educationally (Mabogunje, 1968).

With a very modest intake of students in 1948, students population in University of Ibadan has, by 2007/2008 academic session, grown to 17,248, comprising 12,248 in undergraduate and 5,037 in post graduate programmes. Thirteen students' halls of residence, twelve owned by the government and one privately owned, all with maximum bed space capacity of 8,860, are available within the university campus, to provide residential accommodation for the students (Authors' field work, 2008). Existing student : bed space ratio in the university is thus 2:1, signifying short supply of housing accommodation in relation to the students' population.

Realizing the fact that the available bed spaces are not adequate to accommodate all students within the university campus, the university adopted a strategy to ensure equity in allocation of bed spaces for the students. The strategy adopted involves giving preferences to students in their First and Final years, and Foreign students (the so called 'FFF formula') in allocating bed spaces, after which the remaining bed spaces are allocated, mainly through balloting. With this arrangement, an average student is expected to spend maximum of two sessions in the halls of residence, while the remaining sessions are spent off-campus.

Casual observations reveal that this students' housing arrangement might have some adverse effects on their academic performance.

Investigating empirically the extent to which this insinuation might be true is the main thrust of the present study.

Research Methodology

Both primary and secondary data were sourced for the study. Secondary data were obtained from both published and unpublished documents on students enrolment in the past six years; available accommodation, in terms of bed spaces, over the past six years; university's policies and programmes on students' accommodation; and, academic results of the students as approved by the university's senate in the past six years. In selecting the sampled students for the study, all the students in the university were first clustered into their faculties and a faculty was randomly selected. Faculty of The Social Sciences was selected. All registered final year students in each of the five departments offering undergraduate programmes in the Faculty were then purposively selected. These totaled 230 in all, ranging from 38 in department of sociology, through 45 in the department of Sociology, to 55 in the department of Political Science. All the 230 final year students were sampled with the aid of a set of pre-tested questionnaires. The breakdown of the sampled students based on departments is presented in Table 1. Of the 230 copies of pre-tested set of questionnaires, only 195 copies were adequately filled and returned, and ultimately used for data analysis for the study. In-depth interviews were also conducted on a cross-section of final year students in the faculty.

Table 1: Distribution of samples by departments

Department	Level	Sample Frame	Sample size
Economics	400	50	50
Geography	400	42	42

Students' Housing and Academic Performance in University of Ibadan, Nigeria.

Political Science	400	55	55
Sociology	400	45	45
Psychology	400	38	38
Total		230	230

As contributory factors to students academic performance. These are: sex; age; marital status; place of residence in years one, two, three and four; choosing course of study; interest in the course of study; readiness to change course of study; and, satisfaction with accommodation. The breakdown of the results of investigations on the distributions of sampled students in terms of the eight factors is presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Contributory factors to students' academic performance

S/ N	Contributory Factors	Department										Total	
		Economics		Geography		Pol Science.		Psychology		Sociology		Pop.	%
		Pop.	%	Pop.	%	Pop.	%	Pop.	%	Pop.	%		
1.	Sex												
	Male	27	62.7	21	65.6	29	58.0	27	67.5	20	66.7	124	63.6
	Female	16	37.2	10	31.3	18	36.0	11	27.5	10	33.3	65	33.3
	No Response	-	-	1	3.1	3	6.0	2	5.0	-	-	6	3.1
	Total	43	100.0	32	100.0	50	100.0	40	100.0	30	100.0	195	100.0
2.	Age (in years)												
	19 - 25	37	86.0	27	84.4	37	74.0	28	70.0	14	46.7	143	73.0
	26 - 30	6	13.9	5	15.6	11	22.0	10	25.0	13	43.3	45	23.1
	More than 30	-	-	-	-	1	2.0	-	-	2	6.7	3	1.5
	No Response	-	-	-	-	1	2.0	2	5.0	1	3.3	4	2.0
	Total	43	100.0	32	100.0	50	100.0	40	100.0	30	100.0	195	100.0
3.	Marital Status												
	Single	39	90.7	30	93.8	42	84.0	34	85.0	27	90.0	172	88.2
	Married	4	9.3	2	6.2	7	14.0	1	2.5	1	3.3	15	7.7
	No Response	-	-	-	-	1	2.0	5	12.5	2	6.7	8	4.1
	Total	43	100.0	32	100.0	50	100.0	40	100.0	30	100.0	195	100.0
4.	Residence in Year 1												
	Hall	27	62.8	22	68.8	46	92.0	31	77.5	26	86.7	152	77.9
	Private Hostel	5	11.6	1	3.1	0	0.0	1	2.5	0	0.0	7	3.5
	Rented Apartment	4	9.3	2	6.3	2	4.0	2	5.0	2	6.7	12	6.2
	Home	2	4.7	5	15.6	1	2.0	3	7.5	1	3.3	12	6.2
	No Response	5	11.6	2	6.3	1	2.0	3	7.5	1	3.3	12	6.2
	Total	43	100.0	32	100.0	50	100.0	40	100.0	30	100.0	195	100.0
5.	Residence in Year 2												
	Hall	25	58.1	12	37.5	10	20.0	10	25.0	14	46.7	71	36.4
	Private Hostel	4	9.3	2	6.3	3	6.0	4	10.0	1	3.3	14	7.2
	Rented Apartment	7	16.3	7	21.9	9	18.0	8	20.0	5	16.7	36	18.5
	Home	5	11.6	4	12.5	3	6.0	4	10.0	4	13.3	20	10.2
	Squatting	0	0.0	4	12.5	16	32.0	10	25.0	4	13.3	34	17.4
	No Response	2	4.7	3	9.4	9	18.0	4	10.0	2	6.7	20	10.3

	Total	43	100.0	32	100.0	50	100.0	40	100.0	30	100.0	195	100.0
6.	Residence in Year 3												
	Hall	22	51.1	20	62.5	9	18.0	14	35.0	17	56.7	82	42.1
	Private Hostel	4	9.3	1	3.1	3	6.0	3	7.5	1	3.3	12	6.2
	Rented Apartment	7	16.3	3	9.4	12	24.0	8	20.0	4	13.3	34	17.4
	Home	8	18.6	1	3.1	2	4.0	5	12.5	4	13.3	20	10.2
	Squatting	0	0.0	3	9.4	14	28.0	6	15.0	2	6.7	25	12.8
	No Response	2	4.7	4	12.5	10	20.0	4	10.0	2	6.7	22	11.3
	Total	43	100.0	32	100.0	50	100.0	40	100.0	30	100.0	195	100.0
7.	Residence in Year 4												
	Hall	26	60.5	24	75.0	45	90.0	21	52.5	19	63.3	135	69.2
	Private Hostel	4	9.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	2.1
	Rented Apartment	7	16.3	1	3.1	3	6.0	5	12.5	3	10.0	19	9.7
	Home	4	9.3	1	3.1	1	2.0	3	7.5	1	3.3	10	5.1
	Total	43	100.0	32	100.0	50	100.0	40	100.0	30	100.0	195	100.0
8.	Choice of course												
	Yes	29	67.4	19	59.4	29	58.0	23	57.5	21	70.0	121	62.0
	No	14	32.6	13	40.6	21	42.0	13	32.5	8	26.7	69	35.4
	No Response	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	10.0	1	3.3	5	2.6
	Total	43	100.0	32	100.0	50	100.0	40	100.0	30	100.0	195	100.0
9.	Interest in course												
	Yes	14	32.6	11	34.3	28	56.0	19	47.5	7	23.3	79	40.5
	No	4	9.3	2	6.3	2	4.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	8	4.1
	No Response	25	58.1	19	59.4	20	40.0	21	52.5	23	76.7	108	55.4
	Total	43	100.0	32	100.0	50	100.0	40	100.0	30	100.0	195	100.0
10.	Change of course												
	Yes	2	4.6	0	0.0	1	2.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	1.6
	No	38	88.4	18	56.3	39	78.0	19	47.5	12	40.0	126	64.6
	No Response	3	7.0	14	43.7	10	20.0	21	52.5	18	60.0	66	33.8
	Total	43	100.0	32	100.0	50	100.0	40	100.0	30	100.0	195	100.0
11.	Satisfaction with accommodation												
	Yes	28	65.1	26	81.3	40	80.0	28	70.0	10	33.3	132	67.7
	No	3	7.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	6.7	5	2.6
	No Response	12	27.9	6	18.7	10	20.0	12	30.0	18	60.0	58	29.7
	Total	43	100.0	32	100.0	50	100.0	40	100.0	30	100.0	195	100.0

Table 3 reveals that more than a half of the sampled students strongly agree that water supply (54.9%), electricity (53.8%) and proximity to the library(54.9%) have effects on their academic performances. The percentage distribution of the

sampled population strongly agreeing that each of the remaining indicators of students' housing quality have effects on their academic performances is as follows: Reading room (41.5%), Transportation (35.9%), Health clinic (33.8%), Security (33.8%), Bathroom (25.6%), Toilet (24.5%), Sanitation

Students' Housing and Academic Performance in University of Ibadan, Nigeria.

(20.5%), Cafeteria (16.4%), and, Kitchen (11.3%).

A clearer picture of the ratings of these housing quality indicators in terms of their perceived effects on students academic performance is presented when the ratings are categorized in terms of the percentage that 'at least agree' that each indicator influences academic performance. Results of the investigations, based on their scores from the highest to the lowest, are presented in Table 4.

Table 4: Perception on Contributory Effects of Housing Quality on Academic Performance

Indices	At least Agree	
	Pop	%
Library	180	92.3
Water Supply	179	91.8
Electricity	179	91.8
Reading room	178	91.3
Security	165	84.6
Transportation	163	83.6
Health clinic	163	83.6
Sanitation	144	73.9
Bathroom	143	73.3
Toilet	140	71.8
Café	123	63.1
Kitchen	47	47.7

Source: Authors computations from Table 3

Table 4 reveals that access to the library is rated highest among the students (92.3%) as a major contributor to students' academic performance in the study area. Next in order of perceived contributions are: water supply (91.8%), electricity (91.8%), reading room (91.3%), security (84.6%), transportation (83.6%), health clinic (83.6%), sanitation (73.9%), bathroom (73.3%), toilet (71.8%) and, kitchen (47.7%).

Considering the observed high scores accorded reading spaces in form of library and reading rooms to students academic performance among the sampled students, further investigations were conducted on where students usually study. The results are presented in table 4.

Table 4 reveals that as high as 76.4 percent of the sampled students usually study either in the Library or the Reading room. This observation might owe much to the fact that most of the lecture rooms are locked up by 6.00 p.m. every working day and are seldom opened on weekends. The students thus have to make do with the Reading rooms located in every hall of residence, and existing Library facilities in the Central Library and Faculty of the Social Sciences Library.

The sole indicators for measuring students' academic performance are the Cumulative Grade Point Average (CGPA). The breakdown of academic performance of the students from their first to third year in their various Departments in the Faculty, as obtained from the University's Examinations and Records Unit. is presented in Table 5

Table 5: Academic Performance

Year of Study	No of Respondents	Minimum CGPA	Maximum CGPA	Mean CGPA
100 level	190	0.70	6.50	3.3989
200 level	195	0.40	6.40	3.2865
300 level	195	0.60	6.50	3.2218

Source: Author's fieldwork 2008.

Table 5 reveals that in the students' first year, out of 190 students, the minimum Cumulative Grade Point Average (CGPA) was 0.70, the maximum was 6.50, and the mean score was 3.40. At the end of the second year, out of 195 students, the minimum CGPA was 0.40, the maximum was 6.40 and the mean score was 3.29. At the end of the third year, the minimum CGPA was 0.60, the maximum was 6.50, and the mean score was 3.22. It should be mentioned in the passing that, after the first year, there appears to be positive association between percentage of students residing in the halls of residence and the minimum CGPA of students in the selected Faculty. For instance, when the percentage



of students residing in the university's halls of residence dropped from 77.9% in year one to 53.8% (for both legal and squatting residents), in year two, the minimum CGPA of the students dropped from 0.70 to 0.40, and maximum CGPA dropped from 6.50 to 6.40. In similar vein, increase in percentage of students residing in halls of residence from 53.8% to 54.9% from second year to the third year brings about changes in minimum CGPA from 0.40 to 0.60, and changes in maximum CGPA from 6.40 to 6.50. These indicate that students housing status, especially being on-campus resident, might have significant influence on their academic performance.

A major shortcoming of measuring students' academic performance with the Cumulative Grade Point Average (CGPA), as done in this study, is that the CGPA is the cumulative assessment of students over the selected time period, that is, for both on-campus and off-campus seasons. The use of Grade Point Average (GPA) for each year might have provided a better result. The decision to use the CGPA in the study is hinged on unavailability of reliable data. It is our belief that the fluctuations in the students' academic performance in relation to

proportion of students living on- and off-campus that we set out to depict in the study has been achieved despite our using the CGPA.

Regression model was developed to ascertain the significance or otherwise of causal factors of academic performance among students for each of the academic years for which results were available. These factors are : sex, age, marital status, accommodation type, choice of course, interest in course, change of course, satisfaction with accommodation, and facilities. Since great variations in the percentage of the sampled students that are housed on-campus over the years, regression models are prepared for students' academic performance and indicators of academic performance, for each of the students' first three years. The regression model for the first year, 100 level, is presented in Table 6.

The Regression model in Table 6 revealed that, in the students' first year in the university, all the investigated students' housing indicators (sex, age, marital status, accommodation type, choice of course, interest in the course, interest in changing course of choice, satisfaction with accommodation,

Table 4: Where the Respondents Usually Study.

Department	At Home	Reading Room	Library	No Response	Total
Economics	11(25.6%)	13(30.2%)	19(44.2%)	-	43(100%)
Geography	7(21.9%)	8(25.0%)	17(53.1%)	-	32(100%)
Pol. Science	8(16.0%)	13(26.0%)	29(58.0%)	-	50(100%)
Psychology	7(17.5%)	14(35.0%)	16(40.0%)	3(7.5%)	40(100%)
Sociology	10(33.3%)	17(56.7%)	3(1.0%)	-	30(100%)
Total	43(22.1%)	65(33.3%)	84(43.1%)	3(1.5%)	195(100%)

Source: Author's field work 2008



Table 6: Causal factors at 100 Level

Indicators	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t-value	Significance
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
Sex	.226	.227	.076	.995	.321
Age	-.044	.246	-.015	-.178	.859
Marital Status	-.615	.406	-.121	-1.512	.132
Accommodation type	-.051	.308	-.013	-.166	.868
Choice of course	.526	.296	.181	1.779	.077
Interest in course	-.136	.299	-.048	-.455	.650
Change of course	.042	.839	.004	.050	.960
Satisfaction with accommodation	.110	.247	.036	.445	.657
Facilities	.420	.269	.120	1.560	.121

Source: Author's fieldwork 2008.

Table 7: Causal Factors at 200 Level

Factors	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t-value	Significance
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
Sex	.105	.222	.036	.475	.635
Age	-.037	.241	-.013	-.151	.880
Marital Status	-.671	.402	-.133	-1.671	.097
Accommodation type	-.034	.294	-.009	-.115	.908
Choice of course	.430	.292	.149	1.470	.143
Interest in course	-.254	.295	-.090	-.861	.391
Change of course	-.200	.829	-.018	-.242	.809
Satisfaction with accommodation	.219	.241	.074	.909	.365
Facilities	.412	.263	.119	1.564	.120

Source: Author's fieldwork 2008.

Table 8: Causal Factors at 300 Level

Factors	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t-value	Significance
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
Sex	.039	.216	.014	.181	.857
Age	.108	.235	.039	.461	.645
Marital Status	-.647	.391	-.133	-1.656	.100
Accommodation type	.135	.286	.037	.471	.638
Choice of course	.333	.285	.120	1.169	.244
Interest in course	-.139	.287	-.051	-.0483	.630
Change of course	-.611	.807	-.058	-.756	.450
Satisfaction with accommodation	.076	.234	.027	.326	.745
Facilities	.226	.256	.068	.883	.379

Students' Housing and Academic Performance in University of Ibadan, Nigeria.

In the second year, regression model presented in Table 7 reveals that the order in which the factors were insignificant, beginning from the most to least, as factors affecting academic performance, is: 'accommodation type', 'age', 'changes of course' and 'sex'.

Further, Regression test on the third year's academic performance showed that 'sex', 'satisfaction with living condition', 'age', 'accommodation type' and, 'interest in course' were the most insignificant in that order. Even though these factors do not affect significantly academic performance on individual basis, they are all confirmed to affect academic performance (Table 8)

Further empirical investigations were conducted on relationships between housing quality and students' academic performance among the sampled students by proposing and testing a set of research hypotheses with the aid of Student t- test. The hypotheses are :

H0: There is no significant relationship between the status of students housing and their academic performance; and H1: There is significant relationship between the status of students housing and their academic performance.

The results of the Student t-test is presented in Table 9.

Year	Students' Housing Status					
	On Campus			Off Campus		
	Group Mean	t	p	Group Mean	t	p
1 st	3.2583	0.507	0.719	3.400	0.478	0.683
2 nd	3.2152	0.814	0.712	3.3929	0.813	0.700
3 ^d	3.1065	1.234	0.342	3.3712	1.248	0.337

Source: Authors Fieldwork, 2008.

Table 9 reveals that that there is no significant difference between the status of students housing and their academic performance.

Findings from the study are found to be in tandem with those of earlier studies, especially those of Clodfelter, Furr, and Wachowiak (1984), Grosz and Brandt (1969) and Hountras and Brandt (1970) earlier reviewed in the study.

Further investigations were then conducted on unraveling factors that might be very significant in explaining the existing relationships between students' housing and academic performance in the study area. This was done by conducting in-depth interviews on randomly selected final year undergraduates in the Faculty of the Social Sciences. Twelve factors were identified by the generality of the interviewed students as contributing to their academic performances are: library facilities; water supply; electricity supply; reading room; security; transportation; health clinic; sanitation; bathroom; toilet; cafeteria; and, kitchen facilities.

General consensus among the sampled students is that the existing library facility in the university is not adequate enough for the existing student population. The inadequacy is both in terms of space, and facilities/ amenities. For instance the space within the library is said to be inadequate for the teeming population of students that eagerly throng into it for academic studies. The existing facilities, like electricity, fans, air conditioners, tables and chairs for reading, that are expected to make reading very pleasurable are, at best, inadequate. Considering the fact that lecture rooms are not available for students' use at weekends, the students prayed that the library should open from 8.00 in the morning to 10.00 in the night every day of the week. In addition to the library, the students also prayed that the decision to make lecture room inaccessible to students outside lecture times, should be revisited to enable students have more spaces to study in privacy and enjoy higher concentration and retention.

Electricity supply to the halls of residence are,



, at best, epileptic. Most nights, according to the students, are without electric supply and candle lights used as alternatives, make the rooms too hot for comfort, not mentioning great dangers they pose to life and properties. The case of water supply, as presented by the students, is also rather pathetic: dry taps are very common features in many of the halls of residence, resulting in poor hygienic conditions, especially in the case of toilets and bathrooms that stink unbearably.

Though reading rooms are provided for very hall of residence, none of them is planned to accommodate the present population of students that now have to make use of them, especially in the evenings when the lecture rooms are locked. The condition becomes more pathetic when the library closes in the night and students have to struggle for the few available spaces in the reading room. General consensus among the students is that more spaces be provided for students reading rooms in the hostels or the authority makes the lecture rooms available for the students' use all round the clock.

Closely related with the case of reading room and use of classrooms is the security issue. General consensus among the students is that the security of life and properties on the campus is rather too porous. Even if the classrooms were made available throughout the nights, with the present level of perceived security on the campus, there is little guarantee that many students will venture to stay alone for long in any secluded part of the campus, or walk the streets of the university alone in the middle of the night. The students earnestly pray for the need to beef up security on the campus, especially in the areas students are expected to journey to and from reading areas throughout the day and, especially, night period.

Though most of the students praised the university's authority for the intra-campus transportation system, general consensus among them is that the practice of most of these vehicles not

plying the academic areas in the evenings and weekends discourages students making use of corridors within the precincts of the locked-up lecture rooms for group discussions in evenings and weekends.

General consensus among the students is that the university authority provides very efficient and commendable healthcare services for the students. The presence of very affordable, neat and comfortable cafeteria and kitchen facilities provided within and outside the halls of residence are all hailed as contributing immensely to students academic performance in the university.

Recommendation

Considering the myriads of challenges the existing state of indicators of students' housing pose to students academic performance in the study area, it is observed that concerted efforts should be made to enhance the students' welfare in general and their academic performance in particular. To this end the following strategies are recommended.

While efforts are made to improve the services of the existing libraries in the university by providing the required adjunct facilities, amenities and services, the university should strive to consider extending the libraries' service period to 8.00 in the morning to 10.00 in the evening. In addition to this, the university's management should reconsider the policy of locking up lecture rooms after lecture hours, and make these rooms available for students to conduct private studies. Doing this requires political will on the part of the university's authority as adequate security must be provided on the campus to encourage the use of these rooms by the students, and prevent the rooms being vandalized.

Concerted efforts should also be made by the university's authority to overall provision of basic amenities, especially electricity and water supply within the campus. This will help a lot in bringing about qualitative improvements in the living

condition of both the staff and students in the university.

Conclusion

The study has investigated possible relationships between students' housing and academic performance in University of Ibadan, Nigeria. Both primary and secondary data were sourced for the study. The study found no significant differences between academic performances of on-campus and off-campus students. Analysis of quantitative data revealed no significant relationships between indicators of students' housing quality (library facilities; water supply; electricity supply; reading room; security; transportation; health clinic; sanitation; bathroom; toilet; cafeteria; and, kitchen facilities) and academic performance. Qualitative data from in-depth interviews, on the other hand, identified diverse challenges of indicators of students' housing quality to academic performances in the university.

The research has therefore established, the importance of bringing about significant qualitative and quantitative improvement in the indicators of students' housing in the university to enhance the students' overall academic performance.

References

- Astin, A. W. (1973). The impact of dormitory living on students. *Educational Record*, 54, 204-210.
- Astin, A. W. (1975). *Preventing students from dropping out*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Astin, A. W. (1977). *Four critical years*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Blimling, G. S. (1989). A meta-analysis of the influence of college residence halls on academic performance. *Journal of College Student Development*, 30, 298-308.
- Blimling, G. S. (1993a). Challenges and goals for residential life programs. In R. B. Winston and S. Anchors, and Associates (Eds.), *Student housing and residential life* (pp. 1-20). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Chickering, A. W. (1974). *Commuters versus residents*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Clodfelter, I., Furr, S., and Wachowiak, D. (1984) Student living environments and their perceived impact on academic performance. *Journal of College and University Student Housing*, 14, 18-21
- Grosz, R.D, and Brandt, K. (1969). Student residence and academic performance. *College and University*, 44(3), 240-243.
- Herndon, S. (1984). Recent findings concerning the relative importance of housing to student retention. *Journal of College and University Student Housing*, 14, 27-31.
- Houstras, P., and Brandt, K. (1970). Relation of student residence to academic performance in college. *Journal of Educational Research*, 63, 351-354.
- Levin, B., and Clowes, D. (1982). The effect of residence hall living at college on attainment of the baccalaureate degree. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 23, 99-104.
- Levitz, R., and Noel, L. (1989). Connecting students to institutions: Keys to retention and success. In M. L. Upcraft and J. N. Gardner, and Associates (Eds.), *The freshman year experience: Helping students survive and succeed in college*, 65-81. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Mabogunje, A.L. (1968): *Ibadan, A Traditional Metropolis*. London University Press Limited.
- May, E.P. (1974). Type of housing and achievement of disadvantaged university students. *College Student Journal*, 8 (2), 48-51.
- Moos, R.H. and Lee, E. (1979). Comparing residence hall and independent living settings. *Research in Higher Education*, 11, 207-221.
- Nowack, K.W. and Hanson, A.L. (1985). Academic achievement of freshmen as a function of residence



Paine, Dorothy E., "An exploration of three residence hall types and the academic and social integration of first year students" (2007). *Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 2314.

<http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/etd/2314>

Pascarella, E. T., and Terenzini, P. T. (1991). *How college affects students*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Pascarella, E.T., Terenzini, P.T., and Blimling, G. S. (1994). The impact of residential life on students. In C.C. Schroeder and P. Mable and Associates (Eds.), *Realizing the educational potential of residence halls*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Rinn, A. N. (2003, November). *Pros and cons of living in honors residence halls*.

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Collegiate Honors Council, Chicago, IL.

Scott, S.H. (1975). Impact of residence hall living on college student development. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 16, 214-219

Simono, R.B., Wachowiak, D.G., and Furr, S. (1984). Student living environments and their perceived impact on academic performance: A brief follow-up. *The Journal of College and University Student Housing*, 14 (1), 22-24

Snyder, E.M., Kras, J.M., Bressel, E. and Reeve, E.M. (2011): The Relationship of Residence to Academic Performance in NCAA Division I Freshman Athletes *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, 2011, 4, 105-119 105 © 2011 College Sport Research Institute

Tinto, V. (1993). *Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition* [2nd ed.] Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Upcraft, M. L. and Gardner, J.N. (1989). A comprehensive approach to enhancing freshman success. In M. L. Upcraft and J. N. Gardner, and Associates (Eds.), *The freshman year experience: Helping students survive and succeed in college*, 1-12. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Biographical Note

Lekan Sanni obtained BSc and MSc in Urban and Regional Planning from the University of Ife (now Obafemi Awolowo University) Ile-Ife, and PhD from University of Ibadan. He has published extensively in peer-reviewed international Journals on topical issues in planning, most especially on development and housing, which are his areas of specialization. He is currently the Acting Head, Department of Urban and Regional Planning, University of Ibadan.

E-mail: sanni.lekan@yahoo.com