

IMPACT OF ACCOMMODATION ON JOB PERFORMANCE AT CALEB UNIVERSITY, IMOTA-LAGOS STATE, NIGERIA.

Ademakinwa, Olasunmbo Olajumoke¹
olasunmbo.ademakinwa@calebuniversity.edu.ng,

Onamade, Akintunde O².
onamadeakintunde@gmail.com,

Onamade, Bamidele. J³.
bamidele.adewumi@calebuniversity.edu.ng,

Adenubi, Olufunmilola O⁴.
olufunmilola.adenubi@calebuniversity.edu.ng

Alagbe, Oluwole. A⁵.
oluwole.alagbe@calebuniversity.edu.ng

^{1,2,3,4,5}Department of Architecture, Caleb University, Imota Lagos

Abstract

Every employer is saddled with performance expectations from all employees while all employees desire job satisfaction for maximum productivity. Several factors have been known to affect staff performance. They are rewards, accommodation, promotion opportunities, work conditions, workgroup and interpersonal relationships, leadership styles and performance appraisal in various organizations, etc. This study aims to examine the impact of the accommodation on the staff performance at Caleb University, Imota, Lagos with a view to suggesting possible means of resolving them. Well-structured questionnaires were administered to randomly sampled 95 staff of Caleb University, Imota comprising 48.4% academic staff, 50.5% non-academic staff and 1.1% others. Results showed that (69)72.6% of the staff do not have accommodation on campus while (26)27.4% have accommodation on campus. Also, there is a significant correlation relationship of .559 between the comfort of accommodations and staff performance which is greater than .05, and there is a significant difference of .420 between the quality of accommodations and staff performance. Therefore, this study concludes that attention and priority should be given to staff accommodation and the quality of accommodation for excellent staff job performance in the study area.

Keywords: Accommodation, Caleb University, Housing, Job Performance, Productivity.

1.0 Introduction

Housing affects the totality of man from socioeconomic, cultural and political development (Jiboye 2010), to increased productivity (Kolawole 2015) and standard of living as well as alleviating poverty among inhabitants. (Lee & Park 2010; Mohit &

Nazyddah, 2011). Housing encompasses the activity of enclosing something or providing a residence which includes apartments to accommodate human lives and activities. Accommodation is used to refer to buildings or rooms where people live or stay, a type of building solely for residential purposes. Staff accommodation, therefore, is a dwelling unit for occupation by employees of a business. Employee housing according to Law Insider is defined as an attached or detached dwelling unit that is intended to serve as affordable housing for working households which derive at least 70% of their household income from gainful employment. Staff housing means all places where department employees reside on institution grounds including state-owned houses, apartments, mobile homes, mobile home spaces and rooms or officers' quarters. For long-staying staff, administrations of establishments should provide staff housing, especially for academic staff of an institution such as tertiary institutions. Keeping employees satisfied in order to be successful has become a matter of great concern for all types of enterprises. The type and quality of housing being offered have a significant impact on the health of wealth of the occupants. Jiboye, (2010) affirmed that housing operates in three forms. These are public, private and social housing. Private housing can be defined as property developed and owned by private entities and individuals. Campus Housing, a type of private housing, is very important for staff and students alike for the university to achieve efficiency. Housing as a necessity of life is not debatable for humanity's survival. Aside from providing shelter from inclement weather and security from other dangerous conditions and elements of nature in the environment, housing can also be an incentive towards productivity and positive job performance (Olawunmi et al, 2012; Asaju et al.,, 2024). Constant punctuality to classes, provision of security, internet connectivity, constant power supply and portable water are notable advantages of staff being accommodated on site adequately, therefore, it is believed these advantages increase human productivity in terms of output.

Studies (Faquia Hanif *et al*, 2021; Kim et al., 2020; Sulaiman, 2019; Metzler & Mann, 2016; Jovita *et al* 2015) have shown several factors which affect employee job satisfaction. These factors include rewards, work itself, promotion opportunities, work conditions, workgroup and interpersonal relationships, leadership styles, performance appraisal in various organizations, etc (Faquia Hanif *et al*, 2021). One of the variables of work conditions includes accommodation and proximity of such accommodation to workplace. This paper aims to examine the impact of accommodation on the job performance of staff at Caleb University Imota- Lagos. To achieve this, the specific objectives are to;

- (i) identify the demographic characteristics of the respondents,
- (ii) investigate staff accommodated on campus,
- (iii) evaluate the relationship between staff accommodation and staff productivity.

There are challenges facing staff accommodation which include; non-availability, inaccessibility, non-affordability, insecurity and unfavourable/ inconvenient housing and proximity to workplaces. The nature of housing demand in higher institutions ranges from administrative, residential, financial, specialized, recreational, social and even religious, which all encapsulate into a community called the academic community, say Jovita et al (2015). Murray and Arajuo (2014) observed that the performance of the

academia who lived within the first generation of tertiary institutions was higher in those with staff housing than those without such arrangements. Many staff of Caleb University live off the campus, shuttling many kilometers daily to their place of work what impact does it have on staff productivity that is the thrust of this study.

2.0 Conceptual Framework

Accommodation-

University staff accommodation refers to the housing facilities and support provided by universities to their faculty and staff members. This type of accommodation aims to address the housing needs of staff, particularly for those who are relocating or working in areas with limited housing options. University staff accommodation can have various forms, which includes on-campus housing, rental assistance, or guidance in finding suitable housing options in the local community. The provision of university staff accommodation serves several purposes. Firstly, it helps attract and retain talented faculty and staff members by providing them with convenient and affordable housing options. Research has shown that access to suitable housing plays a crucial role in faculty recruitment and retention (Bracco, 2004).

University staff accommodation also contributes to employee well-being and job satisfaction. Living in close proximity to the workplace reduces commuting time and provides a sense of belonging within the campus community. This proximity can enhance work-life balance and enable staff to actively participate in campus activities and engage with students and colleagues (Metzler & Mann, 2016).

Furthermore, university staff accommodation can help mitigate the challenges faced by staff members who relocate for employment. Relocation assistance, which may include financial support or guidance in finding housing, can ease the stress associated with moving to a new location (Matheny & Spector, 2013). It is important to note that the specific accommodation policies and practices vary across universities and countries. Some universities provide housing exclusively for staff members, while others may have limited availability or prioritize certain groups such as new faculty members or international staff and some had difficulty in the gender allocation findings in academia showed that female representation is increasing, particularly in junior faculty positions (Johnson, 2017; National Center for Education Statistics, 2021).

Quality of Accommodation

Studies have shown that the quality of accommodation provided to employees can have a significant impact on their job performance (Sulaiman, 2019; Kim et al., 2020). According to Sulaiman (2019), employees who are satisfied with their accommodation tend to be more productive and have better job satisfaction. Kim et al. (2020) found that the quality of accommodation was positively related to job satisfaction and organizational commitment among academic staff in the university.

Job Performance

Job performance is a crucial aspect of assessing the effectiveness and efficiency of university staff members. It encompasses the ability to fulfil assigned responsibilities, meet job-related objectives, and contribute to the overall goals and mission of the institution. Evaluating job performance in an academic setting involves considering various factors, such as teaching effectiveness, research output, administrative

contributions, and service to the university community. The length of service contributes to institutional stability and knowledge retention (Kezar & Sam, 2011). However, high turnover in early years showed broader trends of early career mobility (Hom et al., 2017).

Teaching and Research Output

Teaching effectiveness is a significant component of job performance for university staff, particularly for faculty members. Numerous studies have emphasized the importance of effective teaching in higher education. For instance, Hattie and Marsh (1996) conducted a meta-analysis of research studies and found that teacher effectiveness has a substantial impact on student achievement.

Research productivity is another critical aspect of job performance among university staff, particularly for faculty members in research-oriented institutions. Research output is typically evaluated based on criteria such as the number of publications, quality of journals, citation counts, and external funding. A study by Moed *et.al* (1995) examined the relationship between research performance and academic career advancement, highlighting the significance of research productivity in academic settings.

Administrative Contributions

Apart from teaching and research, administrative contributions play a vital role in job performance of university staff. Administrative staff members contribute to the efficient functioning of various university departments and support academic and operational activities. A case study by Sinha (2004) explored the role of administrative staff in a university and highlighted their impact on organizational effectiveness.

Service to the University Community

Engagement in service activities within the university community is another aspect of job performance. University staff members, including faculty and administrative personnel, often participate in committees, task forces, and other service-oriented roles. Such involvement contributes to the overall functioning and development of the institution.

A study by Tierney and Bensimon (1996) examined the role of faculty service in institutional governance, shedding light on the significance of service in higher education.

Conclusively, job performance among university staff is a multidimensional construct that encompasses teaching effectiveness, research output, administrative contributions, and service to the university community which staff accommodation could be a factor that hinders their productivity.

Caleb University is a citadel of learning whose vision is to raise the next generation of students with innovative mind and high performance within society and in order to achieve this, staff productivity and performance is very important. However, staff productivity and performance are hinged on several parameters, hence this study aimed at assessing the impact of staff accommodation on Caleb University, Lagos staff performance with a view to suggesting possible means of resolving the challenges knowing the impacts.

3.0 Methodology

The random sampling technique was used in the selection of 95 respondents comprising academic staff, non-academic staff and technologists from all the colleges within the

Imota campus from the total population of 600 workforce. A well-structured questionnaire was electronically distributed on different platforms among the staff from different units and colleges. The result was analysed using descriptive and inferential statistical tools.

4.0 Result of findings

Table 1: Demographic characteristics of the respondents

Gender	Frequency	Per cent	Cumulative Percent
Female	38	40.0	40.0
Male	57	60.0	100.0
Total	95	100.0	

Length of employment	Frequency	Per cent	Cumulative Percent
2-3 years	18	18.9	18.9
4-5 years	17	17.9	36.8
a year and less	20	21.1	57.9
above 6 years	40	42.1	100.0
Total	95	100.0	

College/Unit	Frequency	Per cent	Cumulative Percent
ADMIN	18	18.9	18.9
CASMAS	26	27.4	46.3
COLENSMA	17	17.9	64.2
COPAS	18	18.9	83.2
COPOS	4	4.2	87.4
ESTABLISHMENT	5	5.3	92.6
LIBRARY	2	2.1	94.7
OTHERS	5	5.3	100.0
Total	95	100.0	

Position	Frequency	Per cent	Cumulative Percent
Academic Staff	46	48.4	48.4
Non- Academics staff	48	50.5	98.9
Others	1	1.1	100.0
Total	95	100.0	

Source: Field study, 2023.

Table 1 provides a breakdown of several demographic variables within the sample population, including gender, length of employment, college/unit, and position.

Gender: The data shows a distribution of genders within the sample, with 38 respondents (40.0%) identifying as female and 57 respondents (60.0%) identifying as male. This indicates a slight male majority within the sample population.

Length of Employment: Respondents' length of employment varies, with the largest proportion (42.1%) having been employed for over 6 years. Additionally, 21.1% of respondents have been employed for a year or less, while 18.9% have been employed for 2-3 years and 17.9% for 4-5 years. This distribution suggests a diverse range of employment tenures within the sample population.

College/Unit: The data illustrates the distribution of respondents across different colleges/units within the institution. The largest proportions of respondents are from CASMAS (27.4%) and COPAS (18.9%), followed by COLENSMA (17.9%) and ADMIN (18.9%). Smaller proportions represent other colleges/units, such as COPOS, ESTABLISHMENT, LIBRARY, and OTHERS. This indicates a varied representation of respondents across different academic and administrative units within the institution.

Position: The majority of respondents are split between academic staff (48.4%) and non-academic staff (50.5%), with a small proportion (1.1%) categorized as "Others."

This suggests a balanced representation of academic and non-academic roles within the sample population, with a diverse range of positions represented.

Table 2: Investigation of staff accommodated on campus

Live on Campus		Frequency	Per cent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	69	72.6	72.6	72.6
	Yes	26	27.4	27.4	100.0
Total		95	100.0	100.0	

Table 2 presents an investigation into the accommodation status of staff members within the campus. The data is categorized into two groups: those who live on campus and those who do not.

According to the findings, the majority of staff members, constituting 72.6% of the sample, do not reside on campus. This indicates that a significant portion of the staff commute to work from off-campus locations. In contrast, 27.4% of staff members are accommodated on campus. This suggests that there is a considerable number of staff members who reside within the campus premises, potentially in staff quarters or housing facilities provided by the institution.

This information provides insights into the housing arrangements and commuting patterns of staff members. Staff accommodation on campus may offer convenience and

proximity to workplace facilities, while those living off-campus may experience longer commutes but potentially have access to a wider range of housing options and amenities. Understanding the accommodation status of staff members is essential for institutions to plan and allocate resources effectively, especially in terms of housing facilities, transportation infrastructure, and support services. It also sheds light on the institution's role in providing housing support for its employees and ensuring their well-being and satisfaction.

Table 3: Evaluating the relationship between staff accommodation and staff performance.

Correlations		Accommodation Comfort off or on campus	Staff job performa nce	Quality of accommodation
Accommodation Comfort off or on campus	Pearson Correlation	1		
	Sig. (2-tailed)			
	N	94		
Staff job performance	Pearson Correlation	.559**	1	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		
	N	94	94	
Quality of accommodation	Pearson Correlation	.255*	.420**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.014	.000	
	N	92	92	92

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 3 presents correlations among three variables: accommodation comfort (whether off or on campus), staff job performance, and quality of accommodation. Each correlation coefficient indicates the strength and direction of the relationship between two variables.

Firstly, there is a significant positive correlation between accommodation comfort and staff job performance ($r = 0.559$, $p < 0.01$). This suggests that staff members who report higher levels of comfort in their accommodation, regardless of whether it's on or off campus, tend to exhibit better job performance. This finding underscores the

importance of comfortable living conditions in fostering employee satisfaction and productivity.

Secondly, there is a significant positive correlation between staff job performance and the quality of accommodation ($r = 0.420$, $p < 0.01$). This indicates that higher job performance is associated with better-quality accommodation. Employees who perceive their accommodation as high-quality are more likely to perform well in their roles. This suggests that the physical environment and amenities provided in accommodation can impact staff morale and performance positively.

Lastly, there is a significant positive correlation between accommodation comfort and the quality of accommodation ($r = 0.255$, $p < 0.05$). This implies that staff members who find their accommodation comfortable also tend to perceive it as higher in quality. This relationship underscores the interplay between subjective comfort and objective quality in shaping perceptions of accommodation.

The correlations indicate that accommodation comfort, staff job performance, and the quality of accommodation are interrelated factors. Institutions should consider investing in comfortable and high-quality accommodation options for staff, as this can positively influence job performance and overall satisfaction among employees. Additionally, the findings suggest the importance of considering both subjective comfort and objective quality when assessing accommodation options for staff members.

4.0 Discussion of finding

The findings in gender participation shows a male majority (60%), which aligns with some studies indicating male dominance in specific sectors or institutions. However, it contrasts with findings in academia where female representation is increasing, particularly in junior faculty positions and student enrollment (Johnson, 2017; National Center for Education Statistics, 2021). The gender distribution showing a male majority is an important demographic characteristic that could influence institutional policies on gender equity and representation. Contrasting this with trends of increasing female representation in academia, it suggests a need for targeted recruitment and retention strategies to achieve gender balance. The diverse range of employment tenures, with a significant portion (42.1%) employed for over six years, aligns with studies suggesting longer tenures contribute to institutional stability and knowledge retention (Kezar & Sam, 2011). However, high turnover in early years (21.1%) reflects broader trends of early career mobility (Hom et al., 2017). The variation in employment tenure indicates a stable core of long-term employees, crucial for maintaining institutional memory and stability. However, the notable proportion of respondents with less than a year of employment reflects a dynamic workforce with potential challenges in employee retention and orientation processes.

The balanced representation of academic (48.4%) and non-academic staff (50.5%) is consistent with literature emphasizing the importance of both roles in institutional operations (Kezar & Sam, 2011). This balance ensures comprehensive support for institutional missions and goals (Szekeres, 2011). The diverse representation across colleges/units illustrates the institution's broad academic and administrative landscape, ensuring varied perspectives and contributions to institutional decision-making. This

aligns with the concept of a well-rounded institution that values interdisciplinary collaboration and administrative support.

The finding result showed that there is a significant positive correlation between accommodation comfort and staff job productivity which Sulaiman, (2019) in his study on accommodation and job performance concluded that quality of accommodation provided to employees can have a significant impact on their job performance. Also, another study found out that the quality of accommodation was positively related to job satisfaction and organizational commitment among academic staff in the university (Kim et al., 2020).

5.0 Conclusion and Recommendations

The research results provide insight into the demographic characteristics, accommodation arrangements, and the impact of accommodation on staff performance within the institution and it concludes as follows. Firstly, the sample population shows a slight male majority (60%) and includes a diverse range of employment tenures, with the largest group having over six years of employment (42.1%). The respondents are well-distributed across various colleges/units, notably CASMAS (27.4%) and COPAS (18.9%), with a balanced representation of academic (48.4%) and non-academic staff (50.5%).

Secondly, the majority of staff (72.6%) reside off-campus, indicating a significant portion commute to work, while 27.4% live on campus. This distribution highlights the need for the institution to address commuting challenges and possibly expand on-campus housing facilities to enhance convenience and support for staff. Lastly, the correlation analysis reveals significant positive relationships between accommodation comfort, staff job performance, and the quality of accommodation. Higher comfort levels in accommodation are linked to better job performance ($r = 0.559$, $p < 0.01$), and better-quality accommodation is associated with higher job performance ($r = 0.420$, $p < 0.01$). Additionally, there is a positive correlation between accommodation comfort and quality ($r = 0.255$, $p < 0.05$). These findings emphasize the importance of providing comfortable and high-quality living conditions to enhance staff productivity and satisfaction.

Overall, the research underscores the importance of considering accommodation as a critical factor in employee well-being and performance. The institution should prioritize investments in high-quality, comfortable housing options to foster a supportive and productive work environment. This approach not only improves job performance but also enhances overall employee satisfaction, contributing to the institution's success.

References

- Adeyemo, D. A., & Adekola, B. A. (2018). The impact of accommodation on the job performance of academic staff in Nigerian universities. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 40(4), 401-410.
- Akanmu, W.P., Nunayon, S.S. & Eboson, U.C., 2021. Indoor environmental quality (IEQ) assessment of Nigerian university libraries: A pilot study. *Energy and Built Environment*, 2(3), 302-314.
- Asaju, O. A., Onamade, A. O., Chukwuka, O. P. & Odefadehan, C. T.(2024). *IEQ* of studio environment on academic performance of Architectural Student in Caleb

- University, Lagos *Middle Eastern Journal of Research* 5(1).
<https://doi.org/10.47631/mejress.v5i1.672>
- Babalola, O.D., Ibem, E.O., Olotuah, A.O., Opoko, A.P., Adewale, B.A. & Fulani, O.A. (2020). Housing quality and its predictors in public residential estates in Lagos, Nigeria. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, 22(5), 3973-4005
- Hanif, F., Alwi, S. K., Malik, M., & Farooqui, M. (2021). Factors affecting job satisfaction: a case study of private universities of Pakistan. *Journal of Contemporary Issues in Business and Government* 27(2).
- Hattie, J., & Marsh, H. W. (1996). The relationship between research and teaching: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 66(4), 507-542.
- Hom, P. W., Lee, T. W., Shaw, J. D., & Hausknecht, J. P. (2017). One hundred years of employee turnover theory and research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102(3), 530.
- Jiboye, A. D. (2010); Evaluating tenants' satisfaction with Public Housing in Nigeria. *Town Planning and architecture* 33(4), 239-247.
- Johnson, H. (2017). Women in academic leadership positions: Trends, challenges, and opportunities. *Journal of Higher Education Management*, 32(1), 43-58.
- Kezar, A., & Sam, C. (2011). Understanding the new majority of non-tenure-track faculty in higher education. *ASHE Higher Education Report*, 36(4), 1-133.
- Kim, Y. S., Lee, S., & Kim, S. Y. (2020). Effects of accommodation quality on job satisfaction and organizational commitment among university faculty in South Korea. *Journal of Facility Management*, 18(4), 277-291
- Lee, E. & Park, N. (2010). Housing Satisfaction and Quality of Life among Temporary Residents in the United States. *Housing and Society*, 37 (1), 43-67
- McGuire, D. & McLaren, L. (2007): The Impact of Physical Environment on Employee Commitment in Call Centres: The Mediating Role of Employee Well-Being, *Team Performance Management*, 14(5/6).
- Moed, H. F., De Bruin, R. E., & Van Leeuwen, T. N. (1995). New bibliometric tools for the assessment of national research performance: Database description, overview of indicators and first applications. *Scientometrics*, 33(3), 381-422.
- Mohit, M. A. & Nazyddah, N. (2011). Social Housing Programme of Selangor Zakat Board and Housing Satisfaction. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, 26 (1), 123-142.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2021). The condition of education 2021. U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences.
- Olawunmi, A. O., Akinjare, O. A., & Izobo-Martins O. O. (2012). Users' Satisfaction with Residential Facilities in Nigerian Private Universities; A Case Study of Covenant University. *Transitional Journal of Science and Technology*, 2(11), 89-112
- Romasanta, A. (2021). Employee Satisfaction and Job Performance in the Accommodation Sector: Basis for Human Resource Plans. *European Journal of Management Issues*, 29(3), 117-124.
- Sinha, P. (2004). Role of the administrative staff in a university: A case study. *Journal of the Research University*, 2(2), 119-129.

- Sinha, P. (2004). Role of the administrative staff in a university: A case study. *Journal of the Research University*, 2(2), 119-129.
- Szekeres, J. (2011). Professional staff carve out a new space. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 33(6), 679-691.
- Umar, O. S., Abdulwahab O. O., Nathaniel, O. O., Simeon O. F. & Samuel, A. O. (2019). Residents' Satisfaction with Public Housing in Lagos, Nigeria. *Ghana Journal of Geography*, II (1), 180-200.
- “<https://www.lawinsider.com/dictionary/employee-housing>”>Employee housing Definition