



STUDENT SATISFACTION WITH FACILITY PROVISION AND QUALITY IN NUHU BAMALLI POLYTECHNIC ZARIA, KADUNA STATE, NIGERIA

¹Sadiya Danjuma, ²Maryam M. Salihu & ³Muhammad Hassan

¹ & ³Department of Estate Management and Valuation,
Nuhu Bamalli Polytechnic, Zaria.

²Department of Estate Management and Valuation,
Abubakar Tafawa Balewa University, Bauchi.

ABSTRACT

Despite the fact that measures are being taken to improve the educational system in Nigeria attractive and functional, there is a growing concern over the alarming rate of students' low satisfaction with facilities in school. Therefore, the study analyzed student satisfaction with facilities provision and quality in Nuhu Bamalli Polytechnic, Zaria with a view to enhance the quality of facilities management practice. The study adopted a quantitative approach, where data was collected using questionnaires from 341 students which were randomly selected from 4 schools in Nuhu Bamalli Polytechnic, Zaria: School of Environmental Studies, School of Engineering Technology, School of Applied Science and School of Liberal Studies. The data were analyzed using descriptive statistics. The study revealed that Students in Nuhu Bamalli Polytechnic, Zaria were averagely satisfied with ICT, sports, health, classroom, library, and laboratory facilities. While their satisfaction level with hostel, securities, workshop and studio facilities were low. It was recommended that The management of the Polytechnic should focus on policies that target adequate provision of facilities and services that the students were not satisfied with in the Polytechnic. The Polytechnic should be responsive to the expectations and needs of the students in order to improve their satisfaction.

KEY WORDS: Student, Satisfaction, Provision, Quality, Higher Institution

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Students are one of the key strategic entities of any higher education on which an institution also depends. Satisfying them is important in a competitive environment in order to attract more students for future programs. Elliot and Shin (2002) define student satisfaction as students' disposition by subjective evaluation of educational outcomes and experience. Student satisfaction is a short-term feeling, resulting from an evaluation of educational



experiences, services and facilities, encountered by a student during the learning process (Weerasinghe & Dedunu, 2017; Weerasinghe & Fernando, 2018).

Facilities are essential for attracting new students in higher institution and for providing environments for learning activities (Price, Matzdorf, Smith & Agahi, 2003). In which high quality and standard are perceived as having a strong influence on students' choice of academic institution (Price *et al*, 2003). However, higher institutions worldwide are facing increasing pressures to produce 'knowledge workers', to respond to perceived competition dynamics, and to maintain and improve quality standards (Khalil *et al.*, 2012). The cultural and social vibrancy of cities brings students to life (Andrea & Benjamin, 2013). Low quality, unsuitable facilities have been found to damage and reduce student satisfaction in higher education (Hanssen & Solvoll, 2015). Wijesiri (2014) noted that inadequate maintenance of services and infrastructure in universities affects students' satisfaction in most developed countries.

In Nigeria today, there is a growing concern by the public on the quality of higher education and its relevance to national development. Part of the problems attributed to these setbacks include: poor funding; lack of infrastructures, lack of frequent curriculum review, inadequate staff training and welfare, students overpopulation, frequent strikes by both the academic and supporting staff and so on (Babatofe, 2010). It is very unfortunate that necessary facilities such as sufficient power supply, enough and decent lecture halls, basic chemicals and equipment in laboratories and properly equipped libraries are lacking (Ogundele & Moronfoye, 2013). However, inadequate structures and facilities, inadequate housing, overcrowded classrooms and inadequacy of reading materials has vital impact on education outcomes (Uko, 2015). Therefore this study intends to examine the effect of facilities provision and quality on student satisfaction.

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Higher Education Institution Facilities Provision

Higher institution facilities can be categorised into two types, permanent and semi-permanent structures; for examples, laboratory equipment, teachers' tools, machinery, teaching aid and other equipment and tools as well as consumables (Oduyemi, 2000). As noted by Akinsola (2004); Komolafe and Adesua (2016) higher Institution facilities provision range from the blocks of classrooms, libraries, workshops, laboratories, equipment, electricity, water, desks, chairs, audio-visual and visual aids, toilets and storage space that would likely motivate students towards learning.

Asiabaka (2008) had classified school facilities provision into two types namely facilities for academic and non-academic. Some examples of non-academic are games and sports facilities, farms and gardens. Other non-academic facilities include information and communication technologies (ICT), toilets, transportation and securities.

Furthermore, Asiabaka (2008) stated that the purpose of providing a decent facility at Higher Institution is to enhance the learning activity, and it is a booster to increase students'



Satisfaction Similarly, (Emetarom 2004) stated that facilities promote effective learning and teaching at schools.

Meanwhile, (Henderson 2002) found that satisfaction of students can be measured and defined in several ways and it has to be according to their age and grades. Poor lighting in the classroom, noise, low air quality and building conditions are some of the factors for poor performance (Cheryan, Meltzoff and Kim 2011,; Shuaib 2013. Berner 1993) found that building conditions can influence satisfaction because it was discovered that students score better when they learn in well-built buildings compared with poorly constructed and equipped buildings. (Cheryan, Meltzoff and Kim 2011) mentioned that the design of classrooms is another important criterion that could improve students' satisfaction. Furthermore, class layout or the arrangement of the furniture in class will also influence the satisfaction of students. Henderson and Mapp (2002) are in the view that student accomplishment can be improved by enhancing several things such as the quality of teachers, size of the schools and programmes held by schools. In short, the improvement of facilities is crucial to facilitate student satisfaction and develop the competitive environment among them (Cheryan, Meltzoff & Kim 2011).

Previous studies Adeogun(2001) found that there are significant relationships between school environment and students attitudes to schooling likewise ,there is a better record of student performance if the schools are well coordinated and maintained. The conducive environment at schools also encourages the students' involvement in academic activities.

At the same token, Wilcokson (1994) and Akinsolu (2004) found that poor maintenance and inefficient management of the school facilities affect learning. This shows that the facility management such as managing building and technical system is vital to ensure the operation and the management of facilities run smoothly and effectively (Fenker 2004). Asiyai (2012) stated that the budget and maintenance cost must be allocated appropriately to ensure smooth running and to have an effective management on the maintenance of the facilities. In sum, a proper attention towards system management on school facilities is very important to help the organisation to accomplish the educational goals and objectives (Asiabaka 2008). Another study conducted by Duran-Narucki (2008) concluded that inadequate facilities lead to poor student attendance, which can result in lower student satisfaction. (Bosch 2003) also supported the view that inadequate school facility can give the negative effect on students' achievement and attendance. Lacking fresh air, glaring and hot or cool temperature are some aspects of school facilities that give negative impact to the students' education (Lyons 2001). Simons and Francis (2012) found that schools which have poor indoor air quality will cause the inability of students to concentrate in the classrooms, drowsiness and lethargy. Some of the students have to miss the class because of their health condition.

2.2 The Higher Education Institution Facilities Quality

Primary and secondary education studies such as these published by CABE (2002), Green and Turrell (2005) and Uline and Tschannen-Moran (2008) have highlighted the importance of learning spaces in teaching and learning and confirmed a positive link between the quality of school facilities and student achievement. In contrast, the study of learning space in higher education has not attracted particular attention (Price *et al.*, 2003; Hamid *et al.*, 2007; Temple, 2008). To assess the quality of HEI facilities several studies have adopted a post occupancy evaluation (POE) approach. A comprehensive review of POE techniques was provided by Riley *et al.* (2010) who highlighted that notwithstanding the recent interest on POE only a few methods are specifically suited to evaluate the performance of educational facilities. Amaratunga and Baldry (1999) carried out an assessment of facilities management (FM) performance against functional, financial, technical and behavioural criteria. Similarly, Fianchini (2006) carried out a POE to evaluate the fitness for purpose of university buildings according to functional factors including accessibility, layout, flexibility for different uses and future needs, and functional equipment. A facility audit approach was also utilised by Lavy (2008) who evaluated the performance of a HEI building identifying future needs in terms of maintenance, repair and, more importantly, a FM system which ensures the building maintains its usage status.

The above studies in general reveal the potential of FM to evaluate existing facility quality in order to improve the physical performance and appearance of a building and its systems, increase operational efficiency and offer higher levels of user satisfaction. Indeed, identifying, evaluating and reporting the condition of buildings, grounds, utilities and equipment are essential aspects of the facilities assessment process (Kaiser, 1989) and critical elements in order for FM to “provide a safe and efficient working environment, which is essential to the performance of any business” (BIMF, 2011). However, assessing the performance of existing facilities reveals little information as to the value for money that they can deliver to a HEI. Indeed, unless information is available about the impact of facilities on their business it is doubtful that HEIs will be in a position to confidently allocate capital investment on estates and facilities.

2.3 Student’s Satisfaction with Higher Education Institution Facilities

According to the Advanced English Dictionary (Microsoft Corporation, 2014), the word ‘satisfaction’ means, “the contentment one feels when one has fulfilled a desire, need, or expectation” or “state of being gratified or satisfied”. Therefore satisfaction can easily be understood as an act whereby there must be one party that can give or has an obligation of giving the other party some kind of experience be it from a service or some goods or combination of both. Or, as a phenomenon which individual person experience in relation to his or her personal needs or expectations concerning the realization of those needs or/and expectation.



The way people perceive things is different things is different from one another; that is, what satisfied one might not satisfy other person. Satisfaction is defined in Explanatory Dictionary of the Romanian Language (2005) as a feeling of contentment and pleasure. Therefore, satisfaction is the consequences of the effectiveness, and the laborious effort of identifying the values, attitudes and students' expectations and achieving them. This is necessary to ensure quality in the high education.

Student satisfaction has become a central objective of the university and has been used to develop a culture of continuous quality improvement by stimulating student choice and institutional competition (DBIS, 2011; Williams, 2013). Several studies have developed measurement tools to reveal the drivers for student satisfaction at undergraduate level (Douglas, McClelland & Davies, 2008; Douglas *et al.*, 2014). For example, Douglas, McClelland & Davies (2008) introduced a conceptual model that used critical incident techniques to analyze student satisfaction. One strong belief is that the focus on student satisfaction could enable universities to adapt to student needs and develop systems to meet those needs more effectively (Letcher & Neves, 2010). Growing institutional interest in satisfaction surveys also reflects an awareness that such surveys are influential in aggregate rankings (Gibbons, Neumayer & Perkins, 2013). Moreover, the measurement of student satisfaction at PhD level education has been focused on institutional and departmental responsibilities for doctoral student progress and success (Barnes & Randall, 2012; Ehrenberg *et al.*, 2009), instead of looking into the nature of student satisfaction and how individual students understand that. This ignores the fact that university study is not always an easy or happy experience, as students may encounter experiences which are emotionally challenging, but essential for their intellectual development (Collini, 2012).

The complexity of student satisfaction is further evidenced in the lack of consensus about how satisfaction can be measured and assessed from an academic perspective (Giese & Cote, 2000). One view is that satisfaction could be an outcome of a consumption activity or experience (Parker & Mathews, 2001), and that it represents the sum of a student's academic, social, physical, and spiritual experiences (Elliott & Shin, 2002). A common approach is the student survey which assesses students' satisfaction with different educational experiences and then aggregates these assessments into an overall satisfaction score (Douglas *et al.*, 2014).

However, studies reveal that it is difficult to attach student satisfaction to any specific educational outcomes, because satisfaction can be a fulfillment response and a state of mind felt by a student who has experienced an outcome that meets their expectations (Kotler & Clarke, 1987; Baron & Corbin, 2012). For example, students may be satisfied with their academic programmes, but may be disappointed at tuition prices or with the academic support provided

(Kotler & Fox, 1995; Tuan, 2012). This implies that satisfaction can be a short-term attitude, resulting from the assessment of one's specific educational experience at one point in time, rather than their overall long-term experience (Summers, Waigandt & Whittaker, 2005). This emphasis on the short-term suggests that satisfaction is essentially a subjective attitude, similar to the main argument of expectancy-value theory. However, feelings and emotions are rarely taken into account as variables in measurements of student satisfaction (Wirtz & Bateson, 1999; Bolliger & Halupa, 2012), despite the fact that satisfaction has been used to show how students believe that the use of the educational services can generate positive feelings (Sumaedi, Bakti & Metasari, 2011).

3.0 METHODOLOGY

The study adopted a quantitative approach, where data was collected from 341 students which were randomly selected from 4 schools in Nuhu Bamalli Polytechnic, Zaria: School of Environmental Studies, School of Engineering Technology, School of Applied Science and School of Liberal Studies. The sample frame of these respondents was obtained from ICT department of Nuhu Bamalli Polytechnic, Zaria. Structured questionnaires with close-ended questions was administered to gather primary data for the research. Response on both the independent variables and the dependent variable was obtained using a 5-point Likert scale based questions. The questionnaire was divided into five (4) sections. Section A was the demographic information of the respondents, section B was questions on provision of facilities, section C facilities quality and final section D questions on students satisfaction. The data collected were analysed using descriptive statistical tools such as frequency distribution and mean ranking.

4.0 RESULT AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Profile of Respondents

In order to ensure the reliability of the data for the study, the questionnaire sought information on the characteristics of the respondents.

Table 5 indicates that 64% of the respondents are male as against 36% female respondents. The majority of the respondents (54%) are between 21-30 years, followed below 20 years (24%), while only 8% of the respondents are above 41 years.

Table 1: Demographic Information of Respondents

VARIABLES	OPTIONS	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE
Gender	Male	181	64
	Female	102	36
Age	Below 20 years	67	24
	21 – 30 years	152	54
	31 – 40 years	41	14
	41 and above	23	8

4.4 Analysis of Results

4.4.1 Students' Satisfaction with Facilities Provision and Quality in Nuhu Bamalli Polytechnic, Zaria.

Table 8 shows the level of satisfaction with facilities provision and quality in Nuhu Bamalli Polytechnic, Zaria. It indicated that students were moderately satisfied with ICT facilities (M=3.22,SD=1.34) ranked 1st, sports facilities (M=3.13,SD=1.31) ranked 2nd, health facilities (M=2.99,SD=1.30) ranked 3rd, classroom facilities (M=2.92,SD=1.36) ranked 4th, library facilities (M=2.91,SD=1.22) ranked 5th, and laboratory facilities (M=2.89,SD=1.86) ranked 6th. It also indicated that hostel facilities (M=2.60,SD=1.26) ranked 7th, securities facilities (M=2.60,SD=1.19) ranked 8th, workshop facilities (M=2.32,SD=1.21) ranked 9th and studio facilities (M=2.27,SD=1.20) ranked 10th were the facilities with the low students' satisfaction in the study area.

The finding of this study support the findings of Oluwunmi, Ajibola, Iroham and Eluyele (2017) who revealed students were averagely satisfied with library, ICT, laboratory and classroom facilities. The finding on library facilities also support the finding of Nasir and Bizi (2021) who found that students were moderately satisfied with e-resources in libraries of College of Education in Nigeria. It is imperative for the polytechnic management to ensure that library, ICT, classroom, sports, health laboratory and other facilities are in excellent condition, besides providing excellent electricity service and sufficient quantity and quality of furniture in order to increase students' satisfaction when using these facilities.

The analysis also indicated that hostel facilities, securities facilities, workshop facilities and studio facilities were the facilities with the least students' satisfaction in the study area. This support the finding of Abdu, Bichi and Adam (2017) who revealed that students were dissatisfied with hostel and security facilities in Kano University of Science and Technology. It also support the finding of Ajayi, Nwosu, and Ajani (2015), who revealed that students were dissatisfied with hostel facilities in Federal University of Technology, Akure.

However, the results contradict the finding of Christian, Fredrick, Olufemi and Adekunle (2022) and Nwanekezie and Mendie (2019) who revealed that students were averagely satisfied with hostel facilities in Universities of Southern Nigeria. These findings imply that higher education institution should focus on policies that target adequate provision of facilities and services that the students were not satisfied with in the polytechnic. Attention needs to be paid especially to the facilities which students expressed their dissatisfaction. It is believed that the provision of these facilities would enhance the quality of life and academic performance of the students.



Table 2: Descriptive Statistics on Students’ Satisfaction with Facilities Provision and Quality

Table with 5 columns: Infrastructures, Mean, Std. Deviation, Rank, Remark. Rows include ICT centre, Sports, Health care centre, Classroom, Library, Laboratory, Hostel, Security, Workshop, Studio.

5.0 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Students in Nuhu Bamalli Polytechnic, Zaria were averagely satisfied with ICT, sports, health, classroom, library, and laboratory facilities. While their satisfaction level with hostel, securities, workshop and studio facilities were low. This support the findings of Oluwunmi, Ajibola, Iroham and Eluyele (2017) who revealed students were averagely satisfied with library, ICT, laboratory and classroom facilities.

- 1. The management of the Polytechnic should focus on policies that target adequate provision of facilities and services that the students were not satisfied with in the Polytechnic. The Polytechnic should be responsive to the expectations and needs of the students in order to improve their satisfaction.
2. Student property developers and management of the polytechnic should formulate an accommodation policy that would ensure that more students have access to hostel accommodation in the polytechnic by constructing more hostels. And also find ways of effecting a ban on squatting in the hostels so as to reduce pressure on the limited available facilities.
3. The management of the polytechnic should improve the security services of the polytechnic in order to safe guard the students from any danger by putting CCTV cameras and alarm to enhance student satisfaction with security.
4. Effort should be made by the management of the polytechnic and other relevant stakeholders to ensure the facilities are in good condition with efficient management programmes that will ensure a conducive academic environment for students at the Polytechnic.

5. Facilities which might have suffered neglect as a result of carelessness, ignorance, lack of commitment and lack of resources for management, should receive attention from the Polytechnic management. This will prevent the loss and replacement within a short period of procurement. The polytechnic management should be responsive to the expectations and needs of the students in order to improve their satisfaction.

References

1. Andrea, I. & Benjamin, S., (2013). University students' needs and satisfaction with their host city. *Journal of Place Management and Development*, 6.(3), 178-191.
2. Asiabaka, I. (2008). The need for effective facility management in schools in Nigeria. *New York Science Journal, special issue 10-23*
3. Adeogun, A. A. (2001). Instructional resources and school effectiveness in private and public secondary schools in Lagos State. *Lagos Journal of Educational Administration and Planning* 1, 74 – 81.
4. Babatofe, B.A. (2010), “Problems of facilities in South-West Nigerian universities and the way forward” *Journal of Education Administration and policy studies* vol. 2.(2), 039-043
5. Dawit, D., Getachew, L. and Ashenafi, A. (2016). Assessment of Students' Satisfaction: A Case Study of Dire Dawa University, Ethiopia. *Journal of Education & Practice*. ISSN 2222-1735(paper) ISSN 2222-288X(online) vol.8,no.4.
6. DeShields Jr, O. W., Ali, K. and Erdener, K., (2015). Determinants of business student satisfaction and retention in higher education: applying Herzberg's two-factor theory. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 19(2), pp. 128-139.
7. Dilanthi, A. and David B. (2000). Facilities Management performance in Higher Education Properties/Facilities, Vol. 18, No. 7/8, Pp. 293-301.
8. Douglas, J., Douglas, A. and Barnes, B. (2006). “Measuring student satisfaction at a UK university”, *Quality Assurance in Education*, Vol. 14 No. 3, pp. 251-267.
9. Emetarom, U. G. (2003). Provision and management of facilities in primary schools in Nigeria: Implications for policy formulation. *Paper presented at the annual National Conference of NAEAP*, University of Ibadan, and October 28th – 31st.
10. Elliott, K. and Shin, D. (2002). “Student satisfaction: an alternative approach to assessing this important concept”, *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, Vol. 24 No. 2, pp. 97-109.
11. Fenker, M. (2004). Organizational Change, Representations and Facilities. In *Facilities Management: Innovation and Performance*. Alexander, K. (ed.) U.K. Taylor Francis.



12. Hanssen, T.-E.S. and Solvoll, G. (2015). "The importance of university facilities for student satisfaction at a Norwegian University", *Facilities*, Vol. 33 Nos 13/14, pp. 744-759.
13. Hasbullah, A, Isma'il, M and Wan, Y. (2010). School committee performance using community based facility management (CBFM) in the education system of Batabura district in Indonesia. 2nd International congress on engineering education; transforming engineering education to produce quality engineers.
14. Hashim H., Saleh A. A., Kamarulzaman N., Hashim S.Z. (2012) Assessment of Facilities Management (FM) Performance in International Islamic University Malaysia (IIUM). *Universiti Teknologi MARA (Perak), Seri Iskandar, Perak, Malaysia*
15. Henchy, A. (2013). The perceived benefits of participating in campus recreation programs and facilities: A comparison between undergraduate and graduate students. *Recreational Sports Journal*, 37(2), 97-105.
16. Honyenuga BQ (2013). Polytechnics education in Ghana: A Change Management Perspective. *Int. J. Soc. Sci. Int. Res.* 2(1):22-35
17. Khalil, N., Husin, H.N. and Nawawi, A (2012). An Evaluation and concept of building performance towards sustainability in Malaysian higher institution. *Journal of environment behavior studies*, vol. 3, no.8
18. Lawanson OA, Gede NT (2011). Provision and management of school facilities for the implementation of UBE programme. *J. Educ. Soc. Res.* 1(4):35-45.
19. Lindsey, R. R. (2012). The benefits and satisfaction of participating in campus recreational sports facilities and programs among male and female African American students: A pilot study. *Recreational Sports Journal*, 36(1), 13-24.
20. Lindsey, R., and Sessoms, E. (2013). Assessment of a campus recreation program on student recruitment, retention, and frequency of participation across certain demographic variables. *Recreational Sports Journal*, 30(1), 30-39.
21. Lindsey, R., Sessoms, E., and Willis, G. (2012). Impact of campus recreational sports facilities and programs on recruitment and retention among African American students: A pilot study. *Recreational Sports Journal*, 33(1), 25-34.
22. Martirosyan, N., (2015). An examination of factors contributing to student satisfaction in Armenian higher education. *International Journal of Educational Management*, - 29(2), pp. 177-191.
23. Melchor Cardona, M., and Bravo, J. J. (2012). Service quality perceptions in higher education institutions: The case of a Colombian University. *Estudios Gerenciales*, 28(125), 23-29. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0123-5923\(12\)70004-9](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0123-5923(12)70004-9)
24. Memon, M. A. Solangi, S. Abro (2019). analysis of research journal science series. Sindh university research journal (sci ser) vol.50(001) <http://doi.org/1026692/sing/2018.0100> student satisfaction with hostel facilities.



25. Mohammed, Y. (2010). An Analysis of Management of Students Hotels: A Case Study of Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria and Kaduna Polytechnic Main Campus, Zaria.
26. Muhammad, H. M, Hafazah, A. K, and Ishak, C. A. (2012). Satisfaction of students' living Environment between on Campus and Off-Campus Settings: A conceptual overview. *Future Communities: Socio-Cultural and Environmental Challenges*.
27. Mukhtar, U., Anwar, S., Ahmed, U. and Baloch, M. A. (2015). Factors affecting the service quality of public and private sector universities comparatively: an empirical investigation. *Arts, Science & Commerce*, pp. 132-142.
28. Napitupulu D., Rahim R., Abdullah D., Setiawan M.I, Abdillah L.A, Ahmar A.S, Simarmata J., Hidayat R., Nurdianto H., and Pranolo A. (2019). Analysis of Student Satisfaction Toward Quality of Service Facility. *Journal of physics.conference series 2019* .doi: 10.1088/1742-6596/954/1/012019
29. Ndirangu, M. and Udoto, M. O. (2011). Quality of learning facilities and learning environment'' *Journal of quality assurance in education, Vol. 19 No. 3.Pp. 208-223*.
30. Nimako, S.G., and Bondinuba F.K. (2013). Relative Importance of Students Accommodation Quality in Higher Education. *Current Research Journal of Social Sciences 5(4): 134-142*. ISSN: 2041-3238, e-ISSN: 2041-3246.
31. Ogundele, M. O. and Moronfoye, S. A (2013). Infrastructural facilities and academic goals achievement of Kwara state tertiary institutions, Nigeria. *Journal of vocational education & technology, Vol.10, Nos. 1&2*
32. Onclin, W. (2014). How Student Accommodation Impacts the International Student's Experience. Retrieved from <http://www.eaie.org/blog/student-accommodation-impactsexperience/> on 20 August 2021.
33. Osifila, G. I. (2004). Provision and management of physical plants as correlates of academic performance in Lagos State public secondary schools. *Unpublished M.Ed Dissertation, University of Lagos*.
34. Osman, R. W., Cole, S. T., and Vessell, C. R. (2016). Examining the role of perceived service quality in predicting user satisfaction and behavioral intentions in a campus recreation setting. *Recreational Sports Journal, 30(1), 20-29*.
35. Ouenegu, S.O, Akinsola, O.E, Hussaini P.O., and Fatokun, A.O. (2012). Maintenance of university facilities: a case study of lagos state university, Ojo, Nigeria. *Mediterranean journal of social sciences 3(11), 69-75*.
36. Owolabi, B. O. (2015). The Effects of Students Housing on Academic Performance at the University of Ibadan in Nigerian. *International Journal of Scientific & Engineering Research*. Volume 6, Issue 3, ISSN 2229-551
37. Price, I., Matzdorf, F., Smith, L. and Agahi, H. (2003). "The impact of facilities on student choice of university", *Facilities*, Vol. 21 No. 10, pp. 212-222.



38. Simon Gyasi Nimako and Francis Kwesi Bondinuba (2012). Relative Importance of Student Accommodation Quality in Higher Education. Current Research Journal of Social Sciences ISSN: Maxwell Scientific Organization, 2012.
39. Rai, A.K (2013).customers relationship management concepts and cases.Banars Hindus university press ISBN: 978-81-203-4695-6.
40. Rehman, S. U., Shafique, F., and Mahmood, K. (2011). A Survey of User Perception and Satisfaction with Reference Services in University Libraries of Punjab. *Library Philosophy and Practice*. (Online)
41. Saeed, H., Muhammad, J., Zawar, H., Zainab, R. and Aamir, S. (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, DOI:10.19026/rjaset.7.806 ISSN: 2040-7459; e-ISSN: 2040-7467. Maxwell Scientific Publication Corp.
42. Saleh A.A., Kamarulzaman N., Hashim H., and Hashim S.Z. (2011). An Approach to Facilities Management (FM) Practices in Higher Learning Institutions to Attain a Sustainable Campus (Case Study: University Technology Mara). *Universiti Teknologi MARA Perak, Seri Iskandar,32610 Perak, Malaysia*. The 2nd International Building Control Conference 2011
43. Salinda, I.M., Lalitha R., and Fernando S. (2017) Students' Satisfaction in Higher Education. Literature Review. *American journal of educational research.vol.5,no. 5,33-539* doi- 1012691/education-5-5-9.
44. Sharma, Y. (2012). Fast pace of higher education enrolment growth predicted to slow". *University world news* Issue No: 213,
45. Simon Gyasi Nimako and Francis Kwesi Bondinuba (2012). Relative Importance of Student Accommodation Quality in Higher Education. Current Research Journal of Social Sciences ISSN: Maxwell Scientific Organization, 2012.
46. Solomon B.J and Ofori A. (2014). Capacity building: implications for sustainable development in Ghanaian Polytechnics. *Int. J. Innov. Res. Dev.* 3(3): 206-212
47. Syed, A. Haris, S. M. and Hamimah A. (2008). Facility management challenges and opportunities in the Malaysian property sector. *Journal of Sustainable Development* 1 (2).
48. Uko, E.S. (2015). Principalship and effective management of facilities in secondary school in Cross River state Nigeria" *International journal for academic research and reflection* 3(1). Available at www.idpublication.org
49. Wijesiri, B. (2014). "Assessment of factors causing student satisfaction upon service delivery in the newish universities in Sri Lanka", *Wayamba Journal of Management*, 2.(4), 1-8.