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Abstract: Private institutions in Nigeria are constantly challenged to improve on the quality of their facilities with a view to continually satisfy students, their primary consumer. This research examined the demographic factors that determine students’ satisfaction with academic facilities in private universities in Ogun State, Nigeria. The study is an exploratory cross-sectional survey which sampled seven hundred and seventy (770) students in selected universities. Five hundred and twenty-two (522) questionnaires were returned and analysed using Mann Withney-U test, Kruskal Walis and Cross-tabulation. The analyses showed that four out of the five demographic factors sampled have no effect on students’ satisfaction. The implication of these findings were discussed and appropriate recommendations made.
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1. Introduction

In educational setting, students’ satisfaction has been the focus of research efforts both in developed and developing countries. This is because studies have shown that satisfied students are more likely to be committed to their studies (as measured by a higher retention rate) than unsatisfied students, who are likely to be less willing to regularly attend classes, and are more likely to quit their studies (Borden, 1995; Jamelske, 2009).

Considering the importance attached to student satisfaction in educational institutions, several researchers have shown interest in examining factors that determine or enhance students’ satisfaction. A study by Carey, Cambiano and De Vore (2002) in the US compared campus satisfaction levels between students and faculty using the Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI) and the Institutional Priorities Survey (IPS). A total of 692 students and 174 faculties were sampled in Midwestern State University. Using a 7-point Likert scale, respondents’ expectation and satisfaction with service quality. The findings indicated that there were no
significant differences in satisfaction among gender, age groups and ethnicities.

Oldfield and Baron (2000) evaluated students’ perception of service over time revealed that the mean score for final year students was lower than those of the first year students. This suggests that, as students become more experienced in the higher educational settings, they tend to be more critical in their perceptions of the service quality. In Malaysia, Yusoff (2012) evaluated the drivers that influence business student satisfaction in private educational environment. The study sampled 1,200 undergraduate business students at four private educational institutions in Malaysia and a response rate of 69% was achieved. Findings from the study showed that there is a significant difference among the demographic factors (gender, year of study, nationality, programme of study and semester grade) and five out of the twelve factors that drive business students’ satisfaction (student support facilities, class sizes, classroom environment, business procedures and relationship with the teaching staff).

In the United States of America, Tessema, Ready and Malone (2012) carried out a study on the effects of gender on different college outcomes such as students’ satisfaction, ACT scores, and GPA at a mid-sized Midwestern public University. Selected demographic and attitudinal data were collected between 2001 and 2009 from a sample of 5,223 respondents in five colleges at the University (Business, Education, Liberal Arts, Nursing/Health Sciences and Science/Engineering). Findings showed that gender has a significant effect on student’s satisfaction, ACT scores and GPA. However, the effect of gender on satisfaction and ACT scores was minimal.

Another study in the US by Tessema, Ready and Yu (2012) assessed the extent to which eleven academically related factors affect the overall satisfaction with major curriculum at a midsized public University. Five thousand, two hundred and twenty-three (5223) questionnaires were returned and analysed. Using descriptive statistics, findings showed that five out of the eleven factors identified in the model (quality of instruction, capstone experience, academic advising, overall college experience and preparation for career or graduate school) showed a statistically significant positive impact in explaining satisfaction with major curriculum and were greater than or equal to $\beta = 0.089$. Moreover, the study revealed that both males and females were satisfied with the major curriculum and gender has a significant effect on satisfaction ($t_{5205} = -2.31, p<.05$), however, the study indicated that the size of the effect was small (Cohen’s d effect size=0.08); below 0.2, which is considered a small effect.

In Singapore, Min and Khoon (2014) investigated the role that demographic factors play in service quality evaluation in the higher education sector. The framework, used in this study, was adopted from Min, Khoon and Tan (2012) and consists of four key constructs, namely motivation, expectation, perception and satisfaction. Applying the Structural Equation Model (SEM) approach to data collected from a sample of 263 international students in a
private higher education institution in Singapore, the study found that motive of study has moderate relationship with expectation and perception of service quality. Satisfaction of students is also closely and significantly related with the perception of service quality. It was also found that demography impacted on the relationships among the elements of service quality. The study included four demographic variables (gender, age, nationality and current level of study) and it was found that nationality and gender have considerable impact on the weights of relationships. Hence, it was suggested that education marketers should take demographic factors into consideration in the design and development of education services.

In line with the suggestion made by Min and Khoon (2014), that the issue of demographic factors should be taken into consideration by education marketers, this study is set to examine the demographic factors that determine students’ satisfaction in private universities in Ogun State, Nigeria.

3. Research Methods
Data for this research was obtained from a survey of students from four private universities in Ogun State, Nigeria. Seven hundred and seventy (770) questionnaires were administered to students, with the help of trained field assistants, in each of the universities. A total of 522 valid questionnaires representing 68 per cent of the distributed questionnaires were retrieved for analysis. Questionnaires were analysed using Statistical Package for Social Scientists (SPSS). Mann Withney-U test was adopted to compare the mean of two groups of variables, Kruskal Wallis to compare the mean of more than two groups of variables and cross-tabulation to ascertain the relationship between each of the selected demographic factors and satisfaction.

4. Results and Discussion
4.1 Demographic Information of Students
Students’ demography were analysed based on their gender, age, year of study, religion and college. Five hundred and twenty-two students responded to the structured questionnaires in the selected private universities as presented in Table 1. The analysis showed that most of the students (51%) were male, between 16 and 25 years old (91%), in 400 level (30%), of their programmes, Christian (62%) and in the college of science and technology (53%).
### Table 1: Students' Demographic Information in the Selected Private Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Demographic Factors</th>
<th>Sub-headings</th>
<th>BU (F, %)</th>
<th>CU (F, %)</th>
<th>Bells (F, %)</th>
<th>CRE (F, %)</th>
<th>Mean %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>61 (45)</td>
<td>90 (56)</td>
<td>60 (52)</td>
<td>56 (52)</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>75 (55)</td>
<td>72 (44)</td>
<td>56 (48)</td>
<td>52 (48)</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>&lt;16 yrs</td>
<td>15 (11)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>10 (9)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16-20 yrs</td>
<td>85 (63)</td>
<td>39 (24)</td>
<td>53 (46)</td>
<td>49 (45)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21-25 yrs</td>
<td>29 (21)</td>
<td>123 (76)</td>
<td>59 (51)</td>
<td>41 (38)</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26-30 yrs</td>
<td>7 (5)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>4 (3)</td>
<td>6 (6)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; 30 yrs</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>2 (2)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Level of Study</td>
<td>100-Level</td>
<td>21 (15)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>9 (8)</td>
<td>11 (10)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>200-Level</td>
<td>43 (32)</td>
<td>6 (4)</td>
<td>14 (12)</td>
<td>51 (47)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>300-Level</td>
<td>23 (17)</td>
<td>17 (10)</td>
<td>61 (52)</td>
<td>19 (18)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>400-Level</td>
<td>42 (31)</td>
<td>76 (47)</td>
<td>23 (20)</td>
<td>23 (21)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>500-Level</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>63 (39)</td>
<td>9 (8)</td>
<td>4 (4)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spill Over</td>
<td>6 (4)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>Christianity</td>
<td>117 (86)</td>
<td>156 (96)</td>
<td>77 (66)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Islam</td>
<td>19 (14)</td>
<td>6 (4)</td>
<td>39 (34)</td>
<td>108 (100)</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Science &amp; Technology</td>
<td>44 (32)</td>
<td>81 (50)</td>
<td>86 (74)</td>
<td>62 (37)</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>44 (32)</td>
<td>32 (20)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>28 (26)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>48 (36)</td>
<td>49 (30)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>18 (17)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.2 Comparison of Students' Satisfaction with Demographic Factors

This analysis was considered in order to adduce explanations on students' level of satisfaction as assessed generally in the work. In order to establish if there is difference in mean satisfaction of the students based on their demographic information, the researchers compared the mean using Mann Whitney-U test and Kruskal Wallis. The analysis using these statistical tools for sex, age, year of study, religion and college of students are shown in Tables 2 to 5.

### Table 2: Comparison of Means Satisfaction using Mann-Whitney U Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Sum</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BU</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>65.70</td>
<td>4008.00</td>
<td>2117.00</td>
<td>-.830</td>
<td>.406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>70.77</td>
<td>5308.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>Christianity</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>67.18</td>
<td>7859.50</td>
<td>956.500</td>
<td>-1.083</td>
<td>.279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Islam</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>76.66</td>
<td>1456.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>78.32</td>
<td>7048.50</td>
<td>2953.50</td>
<td>-1.039</td>
<td>.299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>85.48</td>
<td>6154.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>16 – 20 yrs</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>82.50</td>
<td>3217.50</td>
<td>2359.50</td>
<td>-.164</td>
<td>.869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21 – 25 yrs</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>81.18</td>
<td>9985.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>Christianity</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>82.38</td>
<td>12851.0</td>
<td>331.000</td>
<td>-1.308</td>
<td>.191</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 indicates the group with the highest overall mean satisfaction using Mann-Whitney U Test. From data relating to gender of the students, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference in the mean of both groups in the selected Universities (Babcock University - $U = 2117$, $P = .406 > 0.05$; Covenant University - $U = 2953.5$, $P = .299 > 0.05$; Bells University - $U = 1547.5$, $P = .453 > 0.05$; and Crescent University - $U = 1395.5$, $P = .703 > 0.05$).

Considering religion, Table 2 shows that only the means of students in Babcock, Covenant and Bells Universities can be compared. The results from the Universities inferred that there is no significant difference between the means of both Christians and Muslims in Babcock University ($U = 956.5$, $P = .279 > 0.05$), Covenant University ($U = 331$, $P = .191 > 0.05$) and Bells University ($U = 1378$, $P = .459 > 0.05$).

Using Mann-Whitney and Kruskal Wallis test in Tables 2 and 3 to compare the age of students, the analysis revealed that in Babcock ($H(2) = 4.410$, $P = .220 > 0.05$), Covenant ($U = 2359.5$, $P = .869 > 0.05$), Bells ($H(2) = 0.169$, $P = .919 > 0.05$) and Crescent ($H(2) = 1.756$, $P = .780 > 0.05$) Universities, there is no significant difference in the satisfaction of the age groups. Based on these results, it can therefore be inferred that age difference of students have no effect on their level of satisfaction.
Table 3: Comparison of Age of Students using Kruskal Wallis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BU</td>
<td>&lt; 16yrs</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>76.43</td>
<td>4.410</td>
<td>.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 – 20yrs</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>65.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 – 25yrs</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>69.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26 – 30yrs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>91.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BELLS</td>
<td>16 – 20yrs</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>59.38</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>.919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 – 25yrs</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>57.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26 – 30 yrs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>62.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRE</td>
<td>&lt; 16yrs</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47.00</td>
<td>1.756</td>
<td>.780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 – 20 yrs</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>55.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 – 25 yrs</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>56.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26 – 30yrs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; 30yrs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>68.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The difference is significant if $P < 0.05$ *
* The difference is insignificant if $P > 0.05$ *

Table 4: Comparison of Means Satisfaction using Kruskal Wallis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BU</td>
<td>Science &amp; Technology</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>52.72</td>
<td>36.520</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>57.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>93.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU</td>
<td>Science &amp; Technology</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>68.54</td>
<td>16.432</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>85.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRE</td>
<td>Sciences &amp; Technology</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>48.55</td>
<td>16.984</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>50.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The difference in means for college of the students in Tables 2 and 4 indicated that in Babcock University ($H(2) = 36.520, P = .000 < 0.05$), Covenant University ($H(2) = 16.432, P = .000 < 0.05$), Bells University ($U = 744, P = .000 < 0.05$) and Crescent University ($H(2) = 16.984, P = .000 < 0.05$), college of students significantly affects students' level of satisfaction with facilities. This implies that the facilities available in a college that students is admitted to can determine their level of satisfaction. Hence, universities should make adequate provision for essential facilities in colleges available.

Table 5: Comparison of Means Satisfaction using Kruskal Wallis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BU</td>
<td>100 level</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>63.86</td>
<td>1.845</td>
<td>.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>200 level</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>65.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>300 level</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>72.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>400 level</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>72.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>500 level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spill Over</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>66.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU</td>
<td>200 level</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>95.50</td>
<td>10.494</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>300 level</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>98.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>400 level</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>87.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>500 level</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>68.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BELLS</td>
<td>100 level</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61.67</td>
<td>1.301</td>
<td>.861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>200 level</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>54.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>300 level</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>55.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>400 level</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>56.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>500 level</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>52.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRE</td>
<td>100 level</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35.77</td>
<td>7.807</td>
<td>.099</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 used to analyse the difference in mean of level of study of the students in the four (4) Universities revealed that there is no significance difference in Babcock University (H(2) = 1.845, P = .870 > 0.05), Bells University (H(2) = 1.301, P = .861 > 0.05) and Crescent (H(2) = 7.807, P = .099 > 0.05). However in Covenant University (H(2) = 10.494, P = .015 < 0.05), the difference is highly significant. This means that in Covenant University, students’ level can determine their level of satisfaction.

4.3 Relationship between Demographic Factors and Students’ Satisfaction with Facilities
To further establish if there is any relationship between students’ satisfaction and the selected demography, the researchers adopted cross-tabulation for the analysis. The outcome is presented in Tables 6 to 10.

### Table 6: Relationship between Gender and Student Satisfaction with Academic Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Symmetric Measures</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approx. Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BU</td>
<td>Phil</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cramer’s V</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU</td>
<td>Phil</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cramer’s V</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BELLS</td>
<td>Phil</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cramer’s</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRE</td>
<td>Phil</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>.254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cramer’s</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* .01 – .29 (Weak Relationship)*
* .30 – .49 (Moderate Relationship) *
* .50 – 1.0 (Strong Relationship) *

Table 6 revealed a weak relationship between gender and satisfaction of students in the selected private Universities [BU (Cramer's V = .080, p >
relationship between students’ gender and satisfaction with their facilities cannot be generalised to the entire population of students.

From Table 7, there is weak relationship between students’ level of study and satisfaction in the four (4) private Universities. The relationship between level of study and satisfaction cannot be generalised to the entire population of students sampled in BU (significance level = .239), Bells (significance level = .698) and CRE (significance level = .364), however in CU (significance level = .043), the relationship between level of study and their satisfaction is generalisable to the entire population of students in the University. That is in CU, students' level of study determine their satisfaction. However, considering the analysis across the Universities, level of study cannot predictor students’ satisfaction with their academic facilities.
Table 8: Relationship between Religion and Student Satisfaction with Academic Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Symmetric Measures</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approx. Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BU</td>
<td>Phil</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>.419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cramer’s V</td>
<td></td>
<td>.113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU</td>
<td>Phil</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>.562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cramer’s</td>
<td></td>
<td>.113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BELLS</td>
<td>Phil</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cramer’s</td>
<td></td>
<td>.145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* .01 – .29 (Weak Relationship)*  
* .30 – .49 (Moderate Relationship) *  
* .50 – 1.0 (Strong Relationship) *

In Table 8, it is observed that the relationship between religion and satisfaction cannot be generalised to the entire population of students in the selected private Universities [BU (significance level = .419); CU (significance level = .562) and Bells (significance level = .653)]. There is no close association between religion and level of satisfaction in BU (Cramer's V = .113, p > .419), CU (Cramer's V = .113, p > .562) and Bells (Cramer's V = .145, p > .653), thus religion is not a strong predictor of satisfaction in the Universities, however in Bells, religion is a better predictor than others.

**Note:** Crescent university students’ data cannot be computed because all the students that participated in the study were Muslims.

Table 9: Relationship between Age and Student Satisfaction with Academic Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Asymp. Std</th>
<th>Approx. T</th>
<th>Approx.Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BU</td>
<td>Gamma</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.556</td>
<td>.578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU</td>
<td>Gamma</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>-.160</td>
<td>.873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BELLS</td>
<td>Gamma</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>-.212</td>
<td>.832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRE</td>
<td>Gamma</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.389</td>
<td>.697</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* .01 – .29 (Weak Relationship)*  
* .30 – .49 (Moderate Relationship) *  
* .50 – 1.0 (Strong Relationship) *
Table 9 revealed that there is strong relationship between students' age and their level of satisfaction only in Babcock University (BU - Cramer's V = 0.72, p > .578), while other Universities have weak relationships (CU - Cramer's V = -.025, p > .873; Bells - Cramer's V = -.027, p > .832; CRE - Cramer's V = .045, p > .697). Thus, age is a stronger predictor of students' satisfaction in BU than others. However, the relationships in the four private Universities cannot be generalised to the entire population of students.

Table 10: Relationship between College and Student Satisfaction with Academic Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Symmetric Measures</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approx. Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BU</td>
<td>Phil</td>
<td>.525</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cramer's V</td>
<td>.327</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU</td>
<td>Phil</td>
<td>.394</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cramer's V</td>
<td>.279</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BELLS</td>
<td>Phil</td>
<td>.368</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cramer's V</td>
<td>.368</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRE</td>
<td>Phil</td>
<td>.441</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cramer's V</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* .01 – .29 (Weak Relationship)*
* .30 – .49 (Moderate Relationship) *
* .50 – 1.0 (Strong Relationship) *

Table 10 indicates that there is moderate relationship between student’s college and satisfaction in three out of the four Universities (BU - Cramer's V = .327, p < .000; Bells - Cramer's V = .368, p < .003 and CRE - Cramer's V = .312, p < .007 and CRA - Cramer's V = .322, p < .001), while in CU there is weak (Cramer's V = .279, p < .000) relationship. This relationship is generalisable to the population of students in the selected Universities. This finding buttress the outcome of analysis in Table 4 that suggested that college facilities significantly affects students’ level of satisfaction. Analysis in Table 10 further revealed that in Bells university with a Cramer's Value of .368, college of student, is a stronger predictor of students' satisfaction when compared to other universities.

5. Conclusion and Recommendations
Students’ satisfaction in their academic pursuit in universities has been a subject of discussion over the years. This study examined the demographic factors that determine students’ satisfaction in private universities in Ogun State,
Nigeria. Five (5) demographic factors were selected for analysis. Findings from this study showed that only college of student out of the five demographic factors (gender, age, level of study, religion and college) determines student satisfaction with their facilities. This outcome provide support to the work of authors like Ilias, Hasan, Rahman and Yasoa (2008). The authors suggest that the intake of students at any particular level should be a function of the available functioning facilities in each of the colleges in the universities. In addition, efforts should be made by university management to upgrade existing college facilities as well as making provision for any identified shortfalls of facilities within their colleges.
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