



ESI Preprints

Not Peer-reviewed

## Student Satisfaction with Hostel facilities: A Case Study of Njala University, Njala Campus, Sierra Leone

*Samuel Maxwell Tom Williams*

*Augustus Osborne*

*Camilla Bangura*

Department of Biological Sciences,  
School of Environmental Sciences, Njala University, Sierra Leone

*Jonathan Johnny*

*Ibrahim A. Bakarr*

Department of Wildlife Management and Conservation,  
School of Natural Resources Management, Njala University, Sierra Leone

*Alusine Hassan Koroma*

Department of Biological Sciences,  
School of Environmental Sciences, Njala University, Sierra Leone

*Janet Boynah Saidu*

*Jonathan Aruna Musa*

Department of Wildlife Management and Conservation,  
School of Natural Resources Management, Njala University, Sierra Leone

*George Mayeh Fefegula*

Department of Biological Sciences,  
School of Environmental Sciences, Njala University, Sierra Leone

Doi: [10.19044/esipreprint.11.2022.p1](https://doi.org/10.19044/esipreprint.11.2022.p1)

Approved: 06 November 2022

Posted: 08 November 2022

Copyright 2022 Author(s)

Under Creative Commons BY-NC-ND

4.0 OPEN ACCESS

Cite As:

Williams S.M.T., Osborne A., Bangura C., Johnny J., Bakarr I.A., Koroma A.H., Saidu J.B., Musa J.A. & Fefegula G.M. (2022). *Student Satisfaction with Hostel facilities: A Case Study of Njala University, Njala Campus, Sierra Leone*. ESI Preprints.

<https://doi.org/10.19044/esipreprint.11.2022.p1>

### Abstract

**Aim and Scope:** The importance of students' social environments in their day-to-day lives cannot be overstated. The extent to which students are happy in their hostel depends on its facilities' availability, adequacy, and functionality. A case study of Njala University, Njala campus, was used to determine the amenities provided and the level of satisfaction the students

derived from those amenities. **Methods:** A cross-sectional research design was used to conduct the research through in-field observations and a standardized questionnaire. The study's sample size was estimated at 482 total students. SPSS version 26.0 was used for the data analysis. **Result:** The study revealed that 82.0% of the respondents were within the age group 20-29 years, and more than two-thirds (70.7%) of the respondents were living in overcrowded rooms with a population of more than the required number of persons per room; this is attributed to the squatting phenomenon among the hostel occupants with the attendant implications of increasing pressure on the available facilities. Equally, students were reasonably satisfied with hostel facilities such as recreational grounds, security status, Library/ICT, waste management and electricity. Results showed respondents were unhappy with the adequacy and performance of certain facilities such as the drainage system, foam, toilet, water supply, kitchen, room size, laundry, and firefighting device. **Conclusion:** For student convenience, as enrollment continues to rise, the paper suggests that public-private partnerships be established to fund the construction of other hostels with updated designs and amenities.

---

**Keywords:** Hostel, Facility, Students, Satisfaction, and Sierra Leone

## Introduction

The success or failure of a nation can be traced back to the standard of its higher education system. Higher education is seen as one of the most valuable resources for a country's economic and technological development. The success of universities depends on the satisfaction of their students (Rahman et al., 2020a), which can be increased through the provision of high-quality educational services (Kalam & Mahonta, 2017). A hostel is a form of student housing, an essential aspect of learning institutions in all cultures and climates (Adebisi et al., 2017). According to Adewunmi et al., (2011), academic productivity greatly relies on indicators such as facilities available to students and other hostel support services. The campuses' physical settings should be taken into account as well. Most universities usually provide student housing in residential halls, hostels, apartments, dormitories, etc. Price et al., (2003) posited that prospective students consider the forms of hostel facilities, among others, when choosing institutions. Therefore, academic institutions such as universities must pay good attention to providing functional hostel facilities with adequate water supply, electricity, good road networks, security, and recreational facilities.

Sierra Leone's higher education system has a lot of untapped potentials to contribute to raising people's living standards and boosting the economy. Student enrolment in higher institutions has been increasing in

recent times, and it is estimated that there has been about a 160% increase in tertiary education globally (Sharma, 2012). However, in many countries like Sierra Leone, providing accommodation facilities for tertiary students remains a challenge for the government (CGD, n.d.). However, one of the essential concerns to education management in higher institutions is the issue of students' accommodation globally. The provision of accommodation for the student population in higher institutions takes three models, which are non-residential (no provision of housing on-campus), residential (all students are housed on-campus) and dual-residential (YUSUFF, 2011), but Njala University adopted the residential model. Still yet, due to the inadequate hostel facilities, other students had to go out and lodge in off-campus accommodations.

Each university's primary focus should be on its students. The happiness of one's students is crucial to the success of any educational institution. Students' levels of contentment serve as a barometer for the relative success of colleges and universities. In this case, students' levels of contentment are influenced by aspects of educational services (such as the quality of instruction, extracurricular opportunities, and other academic offerings). As such, it's fair to say that students' happiness is tied to more than just academics. High levels of student satisfaction in higher education can be achieved through providing high-quality educational services (Coleman, 2005; Kalam & Mahonta, 2017).

Over the past decade, Sierra Leone's higher education system has undergone rapid change. The number of colleges and universities in Sierra Leone has skyrocketed in recent decades. In addition, the Sierra Leonean government and other players in the higher education system have prioritized students' happiness. The various services universities provide ensure that their students receive an excellent education. However, research into whether or not students at Sierra Leone universities are happy with the support they receive is lacking. That's why we're conducting this research: to find out how content students are with the available facilities at Njala University's Njala campus.

## **Methodology**

### **Study Area**

The study was conducted at Njala University, Njala campus (latitude 8.115736, and longitude -12.06818) in the Moyamba district of Sierra Leone. Njala University (or simply Njala as it is fondly called) has had a rich history since its establishment in 1964 as a university college based on the American Land Grant University model (MTHE, n.d.). With the passing of the Universities Act 2005 in Sierra Leone, Njala University became an autonomous university with two campuses, the main campus at Njala in the

Moyamba district and the Bo campus at two locations, Torwama and kowama in the Bo district. It also operates at a location on Henry Street in Freetown. Since its establishment, Njala University has metamorphosed into one of the leading universities in the country, preparing undergraduate and postgraduate students for careers in a wide variety of specializations.

Njala campus has thirteen functional hostel blocks. Female students occupy six (6) blocks of the hostels, and the males occupy the remaining seven (7) blocks. The female hostels are Winters, Florence Carew 1, Florence Carew 2, Tourist, Matturi Block D and Quadrangle. The male hostels are Tokpombu, Matturi Block A, B, C, E, F and H. The number of bed spaces in the rooms differs depending on the hostel size.

### Data Collection

The study used a descriptive random survey with both primary and secondary data sources. The primary data were obtained from field observations and a questionnaire survey. On the other hand, secondary data were collected from students' records documented in the registry from the office of the Dean of Students Affairs and Registrar. The primary and secondary data collected include information for only registered students for the 2021/2022 academic year. The questionnaire consisted of questions relating to the condition of the hostel facilities on the scale of "Very Poor to Very Good" and the level of satisfaction on the scale of "Strongly dissatisfy to Satisfy Strongly".

Using Cochran's formular to calculate for an unknown population (Cochan Estimator, n.d.), assuming maximum variability of  $p = 0.5$ , at 95% confidence, and at least 5 percent plus or minus precision. A 95 % confidence level gives us Z values of 1.96, per the normal tables,

- ❖  $n_0$  = expected sample size
- ❖  $e$  is the desired level of precision (i.e. the margin of error),
- ❖  $p$  is the (estimated) proportion of the population which has the attribute in question,
- ❖  $q$  is  $1 - p$ .

$$n_0 = \frac{z^2 pq}{e^2}$$

$$((1.96)^2 (0.5) (0.5)) / (0.05)^2 = 385.$$

But the size was however increase to 4 82 to compensate for statistical significance

### Data Analysis

The research is descriptive and relies on data collected from respondents through the use of closed-ended questionnaires. Data were analyzed using SPSS Version 28. Residents' satisfaction level was assessed on a 5-point Likert scale without a neutral option to any questions. As advised by Hassanain, (2008) and Toyin Sawyerr & Yusof, (2013), this approach would give the respondent a precise standpoint while responding to questions. Consequently, the scales were measured as 5 – indicating "Strongly Satisfied", 4 – "Satisfied", 3 – "Fairly Satisfied", 2 – "Dissatisfied", and 1 representing "Strongly Dissatisfied". The data analysis was undertaken using both the Relative Satisfaction Index (RSI) for the level of satisfaction for hostel facilities and the Weighted Mean Score (WMS) for the status of hostel facilities.

$$\text{Given RSI} = (5n_5 + 4n_4 + 3n_3 + 2n_2 + 1n_1) / 5N$$

Where: n1 is the number of criteria with strongly dissatisfy

n2 is the number of criteria with dissatisfy

n3 is the number of criteria with fairly satisfy

n4 is the number of criteria that satisfying

n5 is the number of criteria that strongly satisfy

$$\text{Given WMS} = (5n_5 + 4n_4 + 3n_3 + 2n_2 + 1n_1) / N$$

Where: n1 is the number of criteria with "Very Poor"

n2 is the number of criteria with "Poor"

n3 is the number of criteria with "Undecided"

n4 is the number of criteria that "Good"

n5 is the number of criteria that "Very Good"

The values obtained from RSI on each analysis variable were interpreted based on Clement & Oloruntoba, (2012) and Agyekum et al., (2016) where 1 – 20% represents "Strongly Dissatisfied", 21 – 40% means "Dissatisfied", 41 -60% represent "Fairly Satisfied", 61 -80% indicate "Satisfied (S)" and 81 – 100" representing "Strongly Satisfied". A One-Way ANOVA was conducted to test for the relationship between the sex of the students and the status and level of satisfaction they derived from the hostel facilities

### Results

A total of 482 students were interviewed in the research comprising of but males and females. The female hostels have a total of 41 single-bed

spaces and 200 double-bed spaces, giving 241-bed spaces available for lodging female students. The male hostels have a total of 53 single bed spaces and 318 double bed spaces, which gives 371-bed spaces available for lodging male students. The majority of the students (respondents) (82.0%) were within the age group 20-29 years, and more males (60.4%) than females (39.6%) were interviewed (Table 1). The majority of the respondents were single (91.9%), followed by married (7.3%), divorced (0.6%) and widow/widower (0.2). Most of the respondents were in the school of Agriculture (43.2%), followed by the School of Environmental Sciences (22.6%), School of Technology (14.7%), School of Social Sciences and Law (8.9%), School of Natural Resources Management (5.4%) and School of Education (5.4%) (Table 1).

**Table 1.** Social characteristics of respondents

	Variables	Frequenc y	Perce nt
Age	10-19 years	58	12
	20-29 years	395	82
	30-39 years	24	5
	40-49 years	5	1
Sex	Female	191	39.6
	Male	291	60.4
Marital Status	Divorced	3	0.6
	Married	35	7.3
	Single	443	91.9
	Widow	1	0.2
School	School of Agriculture	208	43.2
	School of Education	25	5.2
	School of Environmental Science	109	22.6
	School of Natural Resource Management	26	5.4
	School of Social Sciences	43	8.9
	School of Technology	71	14.7

The study demonstrates that the cost of living in hostel facilities is more expensive than renting an apartment from a private lodging because most respondents stated that these hostel lodgings are very expensive (34.4%), expensive (32.4%), moderately expensive (30.3%), and cheap (2.9%) (Table: 2). The analysis also shows that at least four students occupy rooms for two legitimate students. Students who do not have access to dormitories or who cannot afford off-campus housing typically make

arrangements with and squat with colleagues. Each legalized student who successfully obtained a room for two people will bring a companion. As a result, four students will be living in the room intended for two people, which causes overcrowding and problems for both the residents and the hostel's amenities. Congestion harms the residents' health and well-being since it makes it impossible to guarantee the safety of indoor air quality in such a setting. According to Table 2, 70.7% of respondents concurred that they accept unpermitted residents, while 29.3% disagree.

**Table 2.** Cost of university hostels to private accommodations

Cost of owning a hostel bed space		
	Frequency	Per cent
Cheap	14	2.9
Expensive	156	32.4
Moderately Cheap	146	30.3
Very Expensive	166	34.4
Total	482	100
Illegality lodging		
	Frequency	Per cent
No	341	70.7
Yes	141	29.3
Total	482	100

Table 3 shows the overall students' satisfaction level with the hostel facility. It can be seen that students are fairly satisfied with facilities such as; Recreational grounds, Security status, Library/ICT, Waste Management and Electricity, with an RSI of 49.2%, 47.8%, 47.0%, 45.4% and 43.1%, respectively. These findings reveal that the students are fairly satisfied with these facilities with a satisfactory index range from 41-60%, indicating "Fairly Satisfied. The study also reveals that students are dissatisfied with the following facilities; drainage system, foam, toilet, water supply, kitchen, room size, laundry, and fire extinguisher, as they fall within the RIS percentage range of 20-40%.

**Table 3.** Level of satisfaction of students with the available facilities

Facilities	Strongly Satisfied (5)	Satisfied (4)	Undecided (3)	Dissatisfied (2)	Strongly Dissatisfied (1)	RSI (%)	Rank
Recreational	7	154	49	116	156	49.2	1
Security	4	150	32	139	157	47.8	2
ICT/Library	19	132	36	107	188	47.0	3
Waste Management	17	78	34	243	110	45.4	4
Electricity	21	78	33	172	178	43.1	5
Drainage System	0	44	46	254	138	39.8	6
Foam/mattress	2	50	23	225	182	37.8	7
Toilet	2	45	25	221	189	37.2	8
Water	22	29	22	133	276	34.6	9
Kitchen	1	6	16	181	278	29.8	10
Room size	3	13	11	132	323	28.5	11
Laundry	3	12	13	111	343	27.7	12
Fire Extinguishing	0	15	21	80	366	26.9	13

The study investigates the relative and actual experiences of the students on the facilities and services provided in the hostels within the university, and Table 4 presents their assessment. The finding reveals general contentment with most of the services and facilities. For example, security-wise, electricity supply, ICT/Library, and waste management were rated in ascending order of their weighted mean score. This means that the students have actual acceptance for these facilities but do not necessarily meet their expectations, as availability does not mean accessibility. Furthermore, the finding shows that respondents were not happy with the status of the drainage system, recreational grounds, toilet, room size, mattress/foam, water supply, kitchen, and fire extinguisher.



**Table 4.** Condition of hostels facilities

Facilities	Very Good (5)	Good (4)	Fair (3)	Poor (2)	Very Poor (1)	Weighted Average	Rank
Security	17	223	0	145	97	2.83	1
Electricity	14	101	49	219	99	2.40	2
ICT/Library	31	75	47	179	150	2.29	3
Waste Management	14	114	48	120	186	2.27	4
Drainage System	2	60	28	270	122	2.07	5
Recreational	6	50	48	163	215	1.9	6
Toilet	6	53	31	145	247	1.81	7
Room Size	6	53	31	145	247	1.81	7
Mattress/Foam	7	51	39	122	263	1.79	8
Water	2	20	42	223	195	1.78	9
Laundry	2	12	7	249	212	1.64	10
Kitchen	2	12	2	171	295	1.45	11
Fire extinguisher	2	18	5	132	325	1.42	12

Table 5 demonstrates a significant association between gender and the state of the hostels' kitchen, restroom, fire extinguisher, room size, and mattress or foam. Furthermore, there is a strong correlation between gender and how satisfied students were with the hostel's room size, toilet, fire extinguisher, laundry, and waste management. It was observed that most of the facilities in the student hostels were in bad shape, which could be attributed to the low-level satisfaction. From field observation, the administration is renovating most of the old facilities to keep up with the current trend of hostel conditional services.

**Table 5.** One-Way ANOVA test between sex and the satisfaction the students derived from the status of the hostel facilities

Facilities / Variables	P-value	
	Status	Level of Satisfaction
Security status	0.66	0.104
Electricity supply	0.855	0.166
Water supply	0.087	0.141
Waste disposal	0.453	0.012
Kitchen	0.02	0.427
Toilet	0.025	0.037
Drainage system	0.622	0.196
Recreational facility	0.362	0.088
Laundry	0.865	0.005
ICT and reading room	0.145	0.142
Fire extinguisher	0	0
Mattress/Foam	0.01	0.051
Room size	0.025	0.003

## Discussion

The analysis showed that accommodation facilities are the major influence on student satisfaction. Results of the residents' satisfaction with the accommodation provided in the hostel indicate the state of the facilities in terms of room size, foam/mattress, kitchen, toilet, water supply, electricity, drainage, waste management, internet facility (ICT), laundry, fire control device, recreational grounds and security status. These are primary spaces the users interact, and they are important determinants of satisfaction. Residents' satisfaction is fairly satisfactory, unlike what obtains in the non-privately owned hostels in the institution, as reported by Ajayi et al., (2015)jayi et al. (2015). The findings from the study present a low rating as it can be concluded that the hostel buildings are structurally archaic, with a smaller rooms ranging from 12 by14 square feet to 14 by 18 square feet. Most of the hostels are relatively old since they were last renovated in 2007 before the university was transferred from Freetown to its original campus after the rebel war. Hence there is a need to maintain the building structure to prevent further deterioration (Ajayi et al., 2015; Amole, 2008).

According to several studies, there is a direct association between a resident's quality of life and the standard of their home (Ozdemir, 2002; Oladapo, 2006), and a poor living environment is detrimental to a resident's (Adeyinka Adetunji et al., 2015; Wan & Su, 2016). According to Agbola, (1998), housing, regardless of its form, has an impact on both the lives of those who live in it and the lives of the nation. For this reason, nature and society attach considerable importance to the roles housing plays in fostering human comfort. The attainment of superior learning and academic results at the institution has been influenced significantly by adequate student housing with functioning amenities. As a result, there is a pressing need to upgrade the hostel amenities since education cannot be comfortably pursued without suitable housing for the students. The hostel's amenities, such as the laundromat, kitchen, standard rooms, access to water, and reliable power and internet connectivity, are crucial to the well-being of the students. Most frequently, the administration constantly worries about the cost of maintaining these amenities. This helped clarify why it was essential to get the students' input on adequately maintaining the hostel facilities.

Finally, this study also found that recreation and sports facilities influence students' satisfaction. This is in line with Manzoor, (2013), showing that sports facilities positively impacted students' satisfaction. The finding of (Rahman et al., (2020b) is similar to this study, which found that recreation and sports facilities contribute significantly to higher student satisfaction. This is because Njala University provides a sufficient budget for sports activities to the students. Besides that, Njala University also arranges inter-campus sports activities regularly and has enough playgrounds for

sports for the students.

### **Conclusion**

Most students were fairly satisfied with the inside room facilities, such as recreational grounds, security status, Library/ICT, waste management and electricity. Other significant problems faced by students were the drainage system, foam/mattress, poor toilet condition, lack of kitchen and no laundry space. For example, the cleanliness of the toilets should be improved by making the cleaners work, and the internet facility should be upgraded to assist students' academic performance and many more. This study is significant to help the university identify the satisfaction level and problems faced by students when staying at the hostel provided by the university, thus allowing the university to improve these facilities constantly. For this reason, the study urges the University administration to construct more dormitories for male and female students to accommodate the expanding student body. Additionally, it is essential to build using superior construction techniques that will shorten the distance to restrooms. Hostels must be regularly inspected and maintained, and enough money should be allocated to maintain them.

### **Declarations**

**Ethics approval and consent to participate:** Njala University Ethical Review Committee gave permission and authorisation to conduct the survey. The participants signed a consent form indicating that they were aware of the study's objective and goals and that they were comfortable participating.

**Competing interests:** The authors declared no conflict of interest.

**Funding:** No funding was obtained for this study.

**Contribution of authors:** SMTW and AO contributed to designing the study, conducted the analysis, interpreted the results, and wrote the first draft of the manuscript. CB, and JJ contributed to designing the study, analyzing the results, and writing the manuscript. IAB, JBS, JM, GMF, and AHK participated in interpreting the results and editing the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

### **References:**

1. Adebisi, O. S., Oletubo, A. A., Alade, T. J., & Aghogho, E. (2017). Perspectives of Students on Private Hostel Facilities in Proximity to the Federal University of Technology, Akure, Nigeria. *Journal of*

- Poverty, Investment and Development*, 33(0), 31–36.  
<https://www.iiste.org/Journals/index.php/JPID/article/view/36219>
2. Adewunmi, Y., Omirin, M., Famuyiwa, F., & Farinloye, O. (2011). Post-occupancy evaluation of postgraduate hostel facilities. *Facilities*, 29(3), 149–168.  
<https://doi.org/10.1108/02632771111109270/FULL/XML>
  3. Adeyinka Adetunji, M., Isaac Atomode, T., & Okino Isah, I. (2015). Assessment of Solid Waste Management in Lokoja, Nigeria. *Jordan Journal of Earth and Environmental Sciences*, 7(2).
  4. Agbola, T. (1998). The Housing of Nigerians : A Review of Policy Development and Implementation. *Research Report Number 14, the Development Policy Centre*, 2–4.  
<https://searchworks.stanford.edu/view/4308355>
  5. Agyekum, K., Ayarkwa, J., & Amoah, P. (2016). POST OCCUPANCY EVALUATION OF POSTGRADUATE STUDENTS' HOSTEL FACILITIES AND SERVICES. *Journal of Building Performance*, 7(1), 2180–2106.  
<https://spaj.ukm.my/jsb/index.php/jbp/article/view/202>
  6. Ajayi, M., Nwosu, A., & Ajani, Y. (2015). STUDENTS' SATISFACTION WITH HOSTEL FACILITIES IN FEDERAL UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY, AKURE, NIGERIA. *European Scientific Journal*, 11(34), 1857–7881.
  7. Amole, D. (2008). Residential Satisfaction and Levels of Environment in Students' Residences. <Http://Dx.Doi.Org/10.1177/0013916508322175>, 41(6), 866–879.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0013916508322175>
  8. CGD. (n.d.). *Rich World, Poor World: A Guide to Global Development | Center for Global Development | Ideas to Action*. Center for Global Development. Retrieved October 3, 2022, from <https://www.cgdev.org/page/rich-world-poor-world-guide-global-development>
  9. Clement, O. I., & Oloruntoba, kayode. (2012). Public Housing Provision and User Satisfaction in Ondo State Nigeria. *Undefined*.
  10. Coleman, S. (2005). The Impact of Human Capital Measures on Firm Performance: A Comparison by Gender, Race and Ethnicity. *The Journal of Entrepreneurial Finance*, 10(2).  
<https://digitalcommons.pepperdine.edu/jef/vol10/iss2/3>
  11. Hassanain, M. A. (2008). On the performance evaluation of sustainable student housing facilities. *Journal of Facilities Management*, 6(3), 212–225.  
<https://doi.org/10.1108/14725960810885989/FULL/XML>

12. Kalam, A., & Mahonta, H. C. (2017). Measuring Service Gap of Higher Education in Bangladesh: A comparative study between Public University and Private University. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM)*, 49–55. <https://www.iosrjournals.org/iosr-jbm/papers/Vol19-issue11/Version-4/F1911044955.pdf>
13. Manzoor, H. (2013). Measuring Student Satisfaction in Public and Private Universities in Pakistan. *Type: Double Blind Peer Reviewed International Research Journal Publisher: Global Journals Inc, 13*.
14. MTHE. (n.d.). *MTHE Institution: Njala University*. MTHE (Ministry of Tertiary and Higher Education). Retrieved October 3, 2022, from <https://www.mthe.gov.sl/NjalaUniversity.aspx>
15. Price, I., Matzdorf, F., Smith, L., & Agahi, H. (2003). The impact of facilities on student choice of university. *Facilities*, 21(10), 212–222. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02632770310493580/FULL/XML>
16. Rahman, S. M. M., Mia, M. S., Ahmed, F., Thongrak, S., & Kiatpathomchai, S. (2020a). Assessing Students' Satisfaction in Public Universities in Bangladesh: An Empirical Study. *The Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business*, 7(8), 323–332. <https://doi.org/10.13106/JAFEB.2020.VOL7.NO8.323>
17. Rahman, S. M. M., Mia, M. S., Ahmed, F., Thongrak, S., & Kiatpathomchai, S. (2020b). Assessing Students' Satisfaction in Public Universities in Bangladesh: An Empirical Study. *The Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business*, 7(8), 323–332. <https://doi.org/10.13106/JAFEB.2020.VOL7.NO8.323>
18. *Sample Size in Statistics (How to Find it): Excel, Cochran's Formula, General Tips - Statistics How To*. (n.d.). Retrieved September 24, 2022, from <https://www.statisticshowto.com/probability-and-statistics/find-sample-size/>
19. Sharma, Y. (2012, March 13). *Fast pace of higher education enrolment growth predicted to slow*. <https://www.universityworldnews.com/post.php?story=2012031308172724>
20. Toyin Sawyerr, P., & Yusof, N. A. (2013). Student satisfaction with hostel facilities in Nigerian polytechnics. *Journal of Facilities Management*, 11(4). <https://doi.org/10.1108/JFM-08-2012-0041>
21. Wan, C., & Su, S. (2016). Neighborhood housing deprivation and public health: Theoretical linkage, empirical evidence, and implications for urban planning. *Habitat International*, 57. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.habitatint.2016.06.010>

22. YUSUFF, O. S. (2011). Students Access to Housing: A Case of Lagos State University Students – Nigeria. *Journal of Sustainable Development*, 4(2). <https://doi.org/10.5539/jsd.v4n2p107>