

Housing Facility And Accommodation Of College Students: Inputs For Policy Development

JOSE RABBI B. MALAGA, Ph.D.

Abstract

Home circumstances set conditions that influence the educational experience of students. In this light, the current paper looked into the profile and compliance index of the on- and off-campus student housing facility and accommodation (SHFA) for students in a state college. Anchored on the Student Residential Satisfaction (SRS) framework, it adopted a descriptive survey design using 404 student-residents of the college dormitory and boarding houses in the surrounding premises. Data that addressed the research questions were gathered using a validated and reliability-tested survey questionnaire. Index formula, frequency, and percentage were used for the quantitative analyses of data. The findings revealed that the majority of students were renting a housing facility outside the college. Mostly were bed spacers staying in boarding houses that charged 1000 pesos or less as monthly rentals. The housing facilities they occupied were either made of concrete materials or mixed materials. The compliance index of SHFA for students was generally low. The specific item parameters in the areas of location and accessibility, facilities, treatment of boarders, and sanitation earned a moderately high index. Conversely, a low index was obtained in the areas of sanitation and cleanliness, and safety and security. On this ground, the college in cooperation with the local government may instigate responsive efforts that will lead to the improvement of the living condition and the full satisfaction of the residential experience of students availing of SHFA.

Keywords: housing accessibility, facilities, sanitation, safety, and security, descriptive, state college

Background of the Study

Life in college is truly diverse in that its many different facets blend to create a unique academic and personal experience for students. Besides studying different subjects and enduring painstaking course loads, they come into the stage of enjoying emancipation from home, particularly those whose place of living is situated far from the college or university they enrolled in. Accordingly, every academic institution that aspires to quality in its service delivery must address each aspect of the students' experience on campus. As Navarez puts it (2017), quality education is not only limited to the classroom experience but also extends to the student's interaction with the different non-academic

personnel and components in the university. One of these components is the housing accommodation of the college or university.

Student housing facility and accommodation (SHFA) has long been regarded as an essential component provided by the higher learning institutions in supporting students to expand their intellectual capabilities. According to Hassanain (2008), a well-planned student housing facility promotes desirable educational outcomes and helps in the achievement of broader objectives such as social cohesion and responsible citizenship. Staying in a boarding house makes them practice a substantial amount of independence where they learn to organize every aspect of their own life - managing school

timetable, balancing extra-curricular with your academic life, prioritizing schedule, and learning to communicate information to parents (Presbyterian Ladies' College, n.d.). Such experiences may offer venues for meeting new people, building new friendships, widening social experience.

While living away from home provides an outlet for new experiences, it is also considered a daunting venture (Varney, 2016). The study of Navarez (2017) underscored unsatisfactory results of surveys on student housing facilities and accommodation in one premier university in the Philippines. It revealed that the students' living condition does not meet the current needs and demands of the residents in terms of a learner-centered and quality-driven student housing facility wherein active and collaborative learning is encouraged, meaningful interaction with other students of diverse backgrounds and beliefs is present, and easy access to the community facilities and services is made available which directly support the educational and social goals of the university. Concerns related to privacy living are also unsatisfactory among the residents since rooms are crowded and that space for movement is minimal. Accordingly, this issue has been brought to the lower Congress for careful attention. The Senate Bill 1113 proposed by Senator Villar during the 15th Congress of the Republic of the Philippines underscored the far below normal standards of the living conditions in many dormitories or lodging houses despite the efforts to encourage and promote better facilities at reasonable rates (Office of the Senate 2012).

The above condition is held similar to the boarding houses that serve as temporary shelters for the state college students in Northern Negros. Perceptibly, students could only afford low-priced SHFA without being too particular with location, structures, sanitation, safety, and security. It may not be so apparent, but SHFA, directly or indirectly, can affect the capability and

well-being of the students. Price et al. (2003) related student interpersonal growth to adequate facilities.

The establishment and improvement of SHFA is a crucial task for the college. Currently, however, limited local studies are focusing on the quality of living environments among Philippine universities and colleges (Navarez, 2017). On this ground, the current paper proposes to survey the current status of SHFA on campus and the surrounding premises to form an integrative and evidence-based program that will improve the living condition of the college student-boarders.

Objective of the Study

The proposed paper aimed to profile and determine the compliance index of the on-campus and off-campus student housing facility and accommodation (SHFA) for state college students in Northern Negros in terms of location and accessibility, facilities, treatment of boarders, sanitation and cleanliness, and safety and security during the academic year 2019-2020.

Framework of the Study

The study borders on Student Residential Satisfaction (SRS) framework which was designed to investigate residential satisfaction from the students' viewpoint. Investigation on the level of SRS involves the communication between the customer and the services (Bitner, 1990). This places a compelling interest in how students consider the services and type of accommodation rendered by SHFA. Parasuraman et al. (1985) concur that the cycle of perceived service quality commences from the expectations shaped by word-of-mouth. Amole (2005) has defined satisfaction with student housing facilities as a pleasant feeling when the students' housing needs have been fulfilled especially with the existence of superior physical features. In addition, he affirmed that satisfaction with student housing facilities denote students' impression when their privacy needed in a room

has been met. Another meaning of satisfaction with students' housing facility is a good response from the students towards their house environments which promotes a positive socialization process, encourages study mood, and has adequate amenities. Satisfaction is a state felt by a person who has experience performance or an outcome that fulfills his/her expectation (Kotler & Clarke, 1987). Putting it simply, it is a function of the relative level of expectations and perceived performance.

In this study, the SHFA compliance index refers to the student's appraisal of the presence or absence of the desired conditions in their residential environment relative to their needs and expectations. Given the current atmosphere of the higher education marketplace, there is a new moral prerogative that students have become "customers" and therefore can reasonably demand that their views be heard and acted upon (William, 2002).

The basis for the SHFA survey index residential survey index is that satisfaction can be explained by overall housing satisfaction and loyalty behavior (Ulyani, et al., 2012). As a multidimensional concept, the SHFA encompasses five parameters that include location and accessibility, facilities, treatment of boarders, sanitation, and cleanliness, and safety and security. According to Navarez (2017), students' living condition consists of the type of accommodation, location/proximity, architectural aspects, internal dwelling facilities and features, usability and arrangement of space, size and physical condition of the dwelling, dwelling densities, storage and furniture, and maintenance. It shall also consider accessibility to campus, city center, health services, shopping, and municipal services, and availability and maintenance of services. Consequently, for this research, the SHFA model shall be formed from the synthesis of the related concepts and models proposed by the above authorities.

The SHFA data shall be analyzed to gain a better representation and understanding of the university student life and eventually employ strategy to improve the campus environment, and simultaneously create a campus more conducive to the development of students (Nayor, 2009; Survey Unit, 2008; Thomsen, 2008). SHFA compliance index shall be assessed based on the actual student experience during the residency period on-campus student housing.

Methodology

Research Design. The study utilized a descriptive survey design to obtain information concerning the current profile and quality of experience of students availing of the SHFA within and outside the college premises.

Participants. The respondents of the study were the 404 residents of the college dormitory and boarding houses in the surrounding premises. They were all college students enrolled during the academic year 2019-2020. The researcher employed the survey questionnaire to 70% of the qualified participants after the conduct of a pre-survey. An informed consent form was requested and secured prior to the giving out of the survey instrument. They were given a week to return the filled-out survey questionnaire.

Research Instrument. To address the basic questions advanced in the study, a survey instrument was developed by the researcher. In the writing of the items in the survey questionnaire, the researcher did a thorough review of the content of the instruments utilized in the previous studies of Muslim et al. (2012) and Navarez (2017). He also examined the stipulations specifying the policy and program guidelines for the operation and maintenance of dormitories and boarding houses indicated in the Senate Bill number 1113 proposed by Senator Manuel Villar during the 15th Congress and

Senate Bill number 2478 authored by Senator Jingoy Estrada during the 16th Congress of the Republic of the Philippines. Consequently, the framework from where the items will be based and the categorization of the survey items was determined. The items were subdivided into five areas that include location and accessibility, facilities, treatment of boarders, sanitation, and cleanliness, and safety and security. Each item in the instrument is answerable by a yes or no.

The instrument was subjected to face and content validation of five (5) college professors with known expertise in the field of evaluating school infrastructure, physical plants, and facilities. The result yielded 4.67, hence, the instrument was considered valid. Thereafter, the instrument was subjected to a test-retest method to ensure the stability of responses. It was tested on 20 students of a state college who were also renting a temporary residential house. The responses were processed using the Pearson r formula. The score obtained the alpha coefficient values of 0.82 for location and accessibility, 1.00 for facilities, 0.64 for treatment of boarders, 0.87 for sanitation and cleanliness, and 0.72 for safety

and security or higher; hence, the instrument was considered reliable.

Data Gathering Procedure. The researcher sought approval for the implementation of the study from the campus director of the college. He then coordinated with the instructors who facilitated the distribution and retrieval of the survey instrument. The participants were properly informed of the purpose, procedure, and type of information to be gathered. The researcher informed them of their right and requested them to sign the informed consent form. After a week of distribution, the survey instruments were gathered, collated, and encoded for a treatment analysis.

Ethical Considerations. The rights of the participants were reflected and enumerated in the study. The researcher explained to them that they can withdraw at any time without any disadvantage. The results are confidential, however, in the event of presenting or publication of the said research, the participants were assured that no personal and identifiable information about them will be shared.

Data Analysis. Answers were coded – 1 for yes and 2 for no. For each measured parameter in the SHFA, an index score was determined using the formula below:

$$\text{Index score} = \frac{\text{No. of respondents who responded yes} - \text{No. of respondents who answered no}}{\text{Total No. Of Respondents who answered yes and no}}$$

In the achievement of the results, the index score was interpreted using the following scale:

Index score	Interpretation
0.80 – 1.00	Very High
0.60 – 0.79	High
0.40-0.59	Moderately High
0.20-0.39	Low
0.19 and below	Very Low

Results and Discussion

Table 1 Profile of Housing Facility and Accommodation (SHFA) for Students of a State College in Northern Negros

Profile	f	%
Location		
On-campus	11	2.7
Off-campus	393	97.3
Type of Occupation		
Bed space	252	62.4
Room	106	26.2
Whole Unit	46	11.4
Type of Accommodation		
Boarding house	355	87.9
Dormitory	41	10.1
Apartment	6	1.5
Homestay	2	0.5
Type of Structure		
Concrete Materials	225	55.7
Mixed Materials	168	41.6
Light Materials	11	2.7
Rentals		
Free	77	19.1
1000 PHP and below per month	258	63.9
Above 1000 php per month	69	17.1
TOTAL	404	100.00

Table 1 presents the SHFA for students of a state college in Northern Negros during the academic year 2019-2020. The data reveal that 393 students comprising a remarkable 97.3% were renting a housing facility outside the college. Only 11 students (2.7%) were accommodated in the dormitory within the campus. The nature of their occupation was mostly bed spacing as indicated in 62.4% highest percentage (252 out of 404 students). Only 106 students (26.2%) occupied a room for housing and 46 students (11.4) were boarding a whole unit for housing. As to the type of accommodation, 355 students corresponding to 87.9% were staying in a boarding house, 41 students (10.1%) in a dormitory, 6 students (1.5%) in an apartment, and 2 students (0.5%) in a homestay. The housing facilities were mostly made of concrete materials

as indicated by 225 students (55.7%) and mixed materials (168 students, 41.6%). Very few facilities were made of light materials as represented by the lowest percentage (2.7% as responded by 11 students) in terms of the type of structure. The majority of them comprising 63.9% (258 students) were paying less than 1000 pesos for the monthly rentals. On the other hand, 17.1% (69 students) were paying more than 1000 pesos for the monthly rentals, and the rest (77 students, 19.1%) were availing of the free accommodation.

It could be gleaned from the data that the college could not accommodate boarding students in its dormitory within the campus. The students had to look for alternative boarding houses in areas nearby and accessible to the college. In consideration of the monthly rentals,

they opted for a cheaper bed spacing in a boarding house rather than having a room or an apartment for temporary lodging while schooling. In a worse situation, some of them settled in facilities and accommodation that were not fully furnished and secured.

Relative to this result, Amante and Ortiz (2019) in their study titled, “The Living Quarters for Students: A Call for regulation,” illustrate the sad condition of housing facilities of many learners in the country. They conducted a house-to-house visitation and the dormitory boarders and proprietors interviewed conveyed that only about 16% of the dormitories have a license to operate, 46% have only village-level business permits where building code requirements are

never imposed. The lack of financial capability of the students and the scarcity of boarding houses just outside of the college where they study forced them to occupy non-compliant and sub-standard housing facilities. The authors furthered that housing for non-resident students is a critical facility for many academic institutions. The facility and accommodation are expected to be a safe abode that is conducive to learning. Unfortunately, housing facilities for students are wanting in the Philippines, and students are left with no choice but to take them as their temporary dwelling. The unregulated facilities consequently expose students to many risk issues that relate to their health, safety, and well-being.

Table 2 Compliance Index of the On-campus and Off-campus Student Housing Facility and Accommodation (SHFA) in Terms of Location and Accessibility for Students of a State College in Northern Negros

Location and Accessibility	YES		NO		Not Applicable		Index Score	IN
	f	%	f	%	f	%		
1. The establishment is near to the place of work or school	295	73.0	108	26.7	1	0.2	0.46	MH
2. It has easy and near access to the police station, clinic/hospital, cafeteria, convenience store, etc.	359	88.9	43	10.6	2	0.5	0.79	H
3. It is accessible to transportation or beside the road passable by vehicle	203	50.2	195	48.3	6	1.5	0.02	VL
4. It is located in an area that is free from noise and pollution	344	85.1	49	12.1	11	2.7	0.75	H
As a Whole							0.50	MH

Note: 0.80-1.00 Very High (VH); 0.60-0.79 High (H); 0.40-0.59 Moderately High (MH); 0.20-0.39 Low (L); 0.00-0.19 (Very Low)

Table 2 reflects data that define the compliance index of on-campus and off-campus SHFA for students of a state college in Northern Negros in terms of location and accessibility. The housing facilities showed a high compliance index in terms of accessibility to police stations,

clinics/hospitals, cafeterias, convenience stores, and other amenities (index score = 0.79). They are also free from noise and pollution (index score = 0.75) indicating a high compliance index. Falling a bit lower is the accessibility of these facilities to schools obtaining a moderate

compliance index (index core = 0.46). Earning lower than the passable index is the accessibility of the facilities to transportation which garnered the index score of 0.02 interpreted as a very low compliance index. This means that the location of these facilities is not near or beside the road passable by the vehicle.

Proximity and location are the foremost considerations of students in choosing a boarding house or dormitory (Lindsey, 2008). As a consideration, this is not only limited to the distance of the student's boarding house and dormitory to school but also public places like

markets and malls, facilities like internet cafés and the like (Brillantes, et al., 2012). The location (Amole, 2009) and homelike environment (Thomsen, 2007) can contribute to the students' overall life satisfaction. Satisfactory environments in student housing are conceptualized where it can stimulate a silent, less crowding, private, and suitable room sizes (Cleave cited Navarez, 2017). Colleges and universities are practically expected to be close to community facilities and services such as the city center, health services, and shopping and municipal services.

Table 3 Compliance Index of the On-campus and Off-campus Student Housing Facility and Accommodation (SHFA) in Terms of Facilities for Students of a State College in Northern Negros

Facilities	YES		NO		Not Applicable		Index Score	IN
	f	%	F	%	f	%		
1. The structure of the boarding house is safe and secured.	300	74.3	94	23.3	9	2.2	0.52	MH
2. All rooms, passageways, and other parts of the premises especially those intended for reading and studying purposes are properly and adequately lighted by natural or artificial means or both in consonance with the standards of illumination practices	293	72.5	98	24.3	13	3.2	0.50	MH
3. All rooms are provided with adequate ventilation and enough space for comfort.	308	76.2	85	21.0	11	27.8	0.57	MH
4. All bedrooms have a window.	328	81.2	50	12.4	26	6.4	0.74	H
5. Beds are arranged in such a manner that provides adequate space for mobility to boarders.	331	81.9	65	16.1	8	2.0	0.67	H
6. The establishment has adequate toilet, bathroom, and washing facilities	221	54.7	166	41.1	17	4.2	0.14	VL
7. There are fire escapes and a directory in case of emergency	178	44.1	198	49	28	6.9	-0.05	VL

8. The entire building has a fire-fighting facility including but not limited to fire extinguishers and hose cabinet	163	40.3	175	43.3	66	16.4	-0.04	VL
9. For boarding houses having 20 or more borders, there is a study room for general use	286	70.8	89	22.0	29	7.2	0.53	MH
10. It is provided with lockers and cabinets for clothes and other supplies and materials	339	83.9	30	7.4	35	8.7	0.84	VH
As a Whole							0.44	MH

Note: 0.80-1.00 Very High (VH); 0.60-0.79 High (H); 0.40-0.59 Moderately High (MH); 0.20-0.39 Low (L); 0.00-0.19 (Very Low)

The data in Table 4 reflect that the compliance index of the on-campus and off-campus SHFA in terms of facilities for the state college students was generally moderately high (index score = 0.44). The highest index was achieved in the provision of lockers and cabinets for clothes and other supplies and materials (index score = 0.84) interpreted as very high. A high compliance index was earned in terms of the provision of bedrooms with windows (index score = 0.74) and adequate space for the mobility of boarders (index score = 0.67). The provision of safe and secured structure (index score = 0.52), good lighting (index score = 0.50), and ventilation (index score = 0.57) was moderately high. On the other hand, the paper underscored that the toilet, bathroom, and washing facilities were inadequate (index score = 0.14) and that there was no substantial fire escape (index score = -0.05) and fire-fighting facility (index score = -0.04).

Brillantes, et al. (2012) point out that there are some boarding houses and dormitories

that provide facilities that do not function well at all. These facilities include fire exits, fire extinguishers, alarm systems, study rooms, clotheslines, kitchens, laundry areas, and even bathrooms, among others. They further convey that these housing facilities, most of the time, fail to consider students' safety and welfare. The respondents themselves felt the deficiency in the provisions of safety and security facilities, especially on fire escapes or exits and fire extinguishers. For the background, most boarding houses are actually converted residential dwellings located particularly in areas near the college. For residents in these areas, a boarding house and/or dormitory operation is considered a good business and source of additional income. However, some operators of these boarding houses do not have permits to operate for reasons attributed to numerous requirements and the high costs of fees charged by the business bureau and fire department of the local city.

Table 4 Compliance Index of the On-campus and Off-campus Student Housing Facility and Accommodation (SHFA) in Terms of Treatment of Boarders for Students of a State College in Northern Negros

Treatment of Boarders	YES		NO		Not Applicable		Index Score	IN
	f	%	f	%	f	%		

1. The monthly rental, deposits, advances, and other terms and conditions are clearly and completely conveyed to the student at the start of the contract	297	73.5	30	7.4	77	19.1	0.84	VH
2. All boarders are treated in a just and humane manner	286	70.8	66	16.3	52	12.9	0.63	H
3. If a period is fixed for the lease of a room in the boarding house or similar dwelling units, neither the boarding house owner nor the boarder may terminate the contract before the expiration of the term, except for a just cause	102	25.4	225	55.6	77	19.00	-0.38	VL
4. A 10% special discount is given to students	280	69.3	47	11.6	77	19.1	0.74	H
5. The student is given a reasonable time to settle his/her dues	230	56.9	97	24.0	77	19.1	0.51	MH
As a Whole							0.47	MH

Note: 0.80-1.00 Very High (VH); 0.60-0.79 High (H); 0.40-0.59 Moderately High (MH); 0.20-0.39 Low (L); 0.00-0.19 (Very Low)

Based on the data in Table 4, the compliance index of the on-campus and off-campus SHFA in terms of treatment of student boarders was moderately high (index score = 0.47). The terms and conditions for the rentals and advances were clearly and completely relayed to them by the owners/operators as indicated by the very high index score in item 1 (index score = 0.84). The boarders experienced kind and humane treatment (index score = 0.63) and were given a special discount (index score = 0.74) for being students as reflected by scores of high compliance index. Students were also given a reasonable time to settle their dues (index score = 0.51 moderately high). Conversely, the stipulations in the contract period, particularly on the observance of the fixed period for lease, had a very low level of compliance index (index score = -0.38).

Despite the verbal and written agreement, the students felt the lack of assurance that they have a permanent place to stay for a

specific period of time. Their financial incapability to rent a comfortable dwelling with fixed contact and more expensive down payments and charges made them settle for a cheaper boarding house or bed space where they can be expelled anytime by the owner/operator. This eventually gave them a feeling of angst or anxiety.

Students need to have a safe and comfortable environment where they are treated fairly and in a humane way. According to Percy (cited in Jackson, et al., 2019), student accommodation plays a vital role in the experience and psychological development of young adults. Environments can encourage shared living and thriving communities where a friend is close to hand to talk over the stresses and challenges of student life. Accordingly, both living and learning environments will define the higher education experience for a diverse range of students as they leave home and start to make

their way in the world that is independent of the family home. On a subsequent note, their temporary abode can give them a sense of belonging to a new home.

Fields (2011) defines a

SHF as an accommodation specifically constructed to create an environment that

supports the living and learning experience of students while pursuing their education.

Thus, SHFs must be well resourced with all the amenities, i.e. the facility services and spaces, which would both promote students learning and support their living experience.

Table 5 Compliance Index of the On-campus and Off-campus Student Housing Facility and Accommodation (SHFA) in Terms of Sanitation and Cleanliness for Students of a State College in Northern Negros

Sanitation and Cleanliness	YES		NO		Not Applicable		Index Score	IN
	f	%	f	%	f	%		
1. The cleaning of common areas in the boarding house such as the kitchen and bathroom is regularly done	193	47.8	138	34.2	73	18.1	0.17	VL
2. At least one helper is employed for every 50 boarders or occupants to maintain the cleanliness and orderliness of the boarding house	280	69.3	95	23.5	29	7.2	0.49	MH
3. There are clear rules on the housekeeping and maintenance of cleanliness	262	64.9	130	32.2	12	3.0	0.34	L
4. All rooms are provided with garbage receptacles and cleaning tools	253	62.6	133	32.9	18	4.5	0.31	L
5. The occupants observe the proper segregation, collection, storage, and disposal of garbage	286	70.8	114	28.2	4	1	0.43	MH
6. The establishment has an adequate and potable water supply	292	72.3	103	25.5	9	2.2	0.48	MH
7. It is kept free from domesticated animals and fowls	143	35.4	199	49.3	62	15.3	-0.16	VL
As a Whole							0.27	L

Note: 0.80-1.00 Very High (VH); 0.60-0.79 High (H); 0.40-0.59 Moderately High (MH); 0.20-0.39 Low (L); 0.00-0.19 (Very Low)

In Table 5, the compliance index of the on-campus and off-campus SHFA was low (index

score = 0.27). The low index scores were achieved in keeping clear rules on housekeeping

maintenance and cleanliness (index score = 0.34) and the provision of garbage receptacles and cleaning tools (index score = 0.31). Keeping the housing facility from domesticated animals and fowls was rated very low (index score = -0.16).

Fields (2011) describes an SHF as an accommodation specifically constructed to create an environment that supports the living and learning experience of students while pursuing their education. Thus, student housing facilities must be well resourced with all the amenities and facility services and spaces which would both promote students learning and support their living

should also present a comfortable and clean environment. In relation to this, Fachrudin and Fachrudin study (2014) emphasizes that the cleanliness of the facility and safety of the community ground influence the student-tenants to renew their contract with their respective boarding houses. Along with this, Clarkson (2006) believes that college students are generally able to satisfy their needs of safety and security; nevertheless, this can only be achieved when they live in a favorable and familiar environment that is clean and free from danger.

Table 6 Compliance Index of the On-campus and Off-campus Student Housing Facility and Accommodation (SHFA) in Terms of Safety and Security for Students of a State College in Northern Negros

Safety and Security	YES		NO		Not Applicable		Index Score	IN
	f	%	f	%	f	%		
1. The boarding house maintains strong security measures through visitor logs and records	110	27.2	218	54.0	76	18.8	-0.33	VL
2. Censors or CCTV is in place to monitor the visitors or guests coming in and out of the premises	134	33.2	212	52.5	58	14.3	-0.23	VL
3. Basic first-aid medicine and equipment as may be necessary are provided for emergency purposes.	292	72.3	74	18.3	38	9.4	0.60	H
4. There is a curfew hour to ensure that the door or gate is safely locked by 10 pm	283	70	80	19.8	41	10.1	0.56	MH
5. The boarding house keeps important data-records and contacts of its boarders	268	66.3	108	26.7	28	6.9	0.43	MH
6. Quiet hours are observed from 10 in the evening onwards	279	69.1	90	22.3	35	8.7	0.51	MH
7. Liquors are not allowed within the premises	286	70.8	84	20.8	34	8.4	0.55	MH
8. Smoking is strictly prohibited within the premises	281	69.6	73	18.1	50	12.3	0.59	MH

9. The boarding house has secured business, mayor, fire, and sanitary permits	219	54.2	155	38.4	30	7.4	-0.17	VL
10. There are fire escapes and a directory in case of emergency	190	47.0	168	41.6	46	11.4	-0.06	VL
11. The entire building has a fire-fighting facility including but not limited to fire extinguishers and hose cabinet	204	50.5	142	35.1	58	14.4	0.19	VL
12. Communal rooms for male and female boarders are prohibited	136	33.7	252	62.4	16	0.4	-0.30	VL
As a whole							0.20	L

Note: 0.80-1.00 Very High (VH); 0.60-0.79 High (H); 0.40-0.59 Moderately High (MH); 0.20-0.39 Low (L); 0.00-0.19 (Very Low)

Table 6 indicates that the compliance index of the on-campus and off-campus SHFA in safety and security was generally low (index score = 0.20). The SHFA partly provided for the first-aid medicine and equipment (index score = 0.60 high), curfew hour (index score = 0.56 moderately high), logs and records for boarders (index score = 0.43 moderately high), quiet hour (index score = 0.51 moderately high), and prohibited liquors (index score = 0.55 moderately high) and smoking within the premises (index score = 0.59 moderately high). On the contrary, a very low index was garnered in terms of securing the needed business, mayor, fire, and sanitary permits (index score = -0.17) providing fire escapes and directories in case of emergency (index score = -0.06), fire fighting facility and equipment (index score = -0.19) and prohibiting communal rooms for male and female boarders (index score = -0.30).

Adequate security is a major issue that can affect students' performance. If students live in constant fear of danger or theft of properties, they are not fully able to concentrate on their studies (Student Accomod8, 2018). The student felt relayed the deficiency in the provisions of safety and security facilities, especially on fire escapes or exits and fire extinguishers. This

manifests that some boarding house or dormitory owners and operators in the country violate this basic requirement set under the Building Code of the Philippines (Brilliantes, 2012). It is sad to note that because students were left with no other option as restricted by their resources, they settled for the cheaper and unsafe dwelling.

Moving further, policies were normally set to set order in the housing facility for students. The implementation, however, is sometimes lax and inconsistent. Owners and operators also felt the need of setting specific rules in a mixed-gender boarding house/dormitory. These include the prohibition of both sexes to enter the opposite sex's rooms among other important rules. Similarly, curfew, visitation policies, and all others were intensified to ensure the security and safety of the boarders, particularly the females. Villanueva et. al. (2007) reports that looseness or laxity of the rules or policies and their implementation especially on visitation is one of the common causes why student-renters are deemed to involve in some worthless activities such as drinking spree and sexual activities among others. The authors also conclude that the concern of the landlord/landladies apparently is more focused on the bills and rentals and not merely on their welfare. Visitations are supposed

to be regulated, if not restricted, in boarding houses and dormitories especially those who are considered non-relatives (e.g. friends, boyfriends/girlfriends, classmates, etc.). They

can be allowed to visit but are to be entertained in the receiving area like the living room or terrace and not inside the room.

Table 7 Compliance Index of the On-campus and Off-campus Student Housing Facility and Accommodation (SHFA) for Students of a State College in Northern Negros when grouped According to Profile

Profile	Location & Accessibility		Facilities		Treatment of Boarders		Sanitation & Cleanliness		Safety & Security		As a Whole	
Location	Index Score	IN	Index Score	IN	Index Score	IN	Index Score	IN	Index Score	IN	Index Score	IN
On-campus	0.51	M H	0.41	M H	0.52	M H	0.33	L	0.30	L	0.41	M H
Off-campus	0.49	M H	0.48	M H	0.41	M H	0.20	L	0.10	VL	0.34	L
Type of Occupation												
Bed space	0.50	M H	0.40	M H	0.38	L	0.14	VL	0.22	L	0.33	L
Room	0.62	H	0.30	L	0.50	M H	0.19	VL	0.10	VL	0.34	L
Whole Unit	0.38	L	0.62	H	0.54	M H	0.49	M H	0.29	L	0.46	M H
Type of Accommodation												
Boarding house	0.51	M H	0.43	M H	0.47	M H	0.31	L	0.12	VL	0.37	L
Dormitory	0.89	VH	0.53	M H	0.69	H	0.14	VL	0.40	MH	0.53	M H
Apartment	0.33	L	0.80	VH	0.33	L	0.42	M H	0.03	VL	0.38	L
Homestay	0.25	L	0.00	VL	0.40	M H	-0.20	VL	0.25	L	0.22	L
Type of Structure												
Concrete Materials	0.56	M H	0.66	H	0.48	M H	0.33	L	0.33	L	0.47	M H
Mixed Materials	0.52	M H	0.36	L	0.45	M H	0.29	L	0.20	L	0.36	L
Light Materials	0.42	M H	0.31	L	0.49	M H	0.17	VL	0.08	VL	0.29	L
Rentals												
Free	0.44	M H	0.43	M H	0.49	M H	0.31	L	0.22	L	0.38	L

1000 php and below	0.48	M	0.42	M	0.44	M	0.22	L	0.06	VL	0.33	L
		H		H		H						
Above 1000	0.59	M	0.46	M	0.47	M	0.28	L	0.33	L	0.43	M
		H		H		H						H
TOTAL	0.50	M	0.44	M	0.47	M	0.27	L	0.20	VL	0.38	L
		H		H		H						

Note: 0.80-1.00 Very High (VH); 0.60-0.79 High (H); 0.40-0.59 Moderately High (MH); 0.20-0.39 Low (L); 0.00-0.19 (Very Low)

Taking the general picture, the compliance index of the on-campus and off-campus SHFA for the college students in all areas evaluated was low (index score = 0.38). In terms of location and accessibility, the residential units (index score – 0.38), the apartments (index score – 0.33), and homestays (index score – 0.25) had a low compliance index. The rooms (index score – 0.30) and structures with mixed (index score – 0.36) and light materials (index score – 0.31) had a low compliance index while the homestays had a very low compliance index (index score – 0.38) in terms of facilities. The treatment of boarders was very low for students occupying bed spaces (index score – 0.38) and apartments (index score – 0.33).

The sanitation and cleanliness area earned a low index score (index score – 0.20). The very low compliance index was seen in the bed spaces (index score – 0.14), room (index score – 0.19) dormitories (index score – 0.14), homestays (index score – 0.20), and structures made of light materials (index score – 0.17). Finally, the area of safety and security garnered the lowest index score (index score – 0.20) of the five parameters measured. The housing facilities off-campus (index score – 0.34), bed spaces (index score – 0.33), rooms (index score – 0.34), boarding houses (index score – 0.37), apartments (index score – 0.38), homestays (index score – 0.22), structures with mixed (index score – 0.36) and light materials (index score – 0.29), dwellings for free (index score – 0.38), and 1, 000 or less

monthly rentals (index score – 0.33) obtained a low level of compliance index.

The SHFA is one of the crucial aspects of students' life that is pivotal to their academic experience but not given attention to by the institutions and local governments. In the Philippines, the majority of the universities cater to commuting students, and very few others offer on-campus residential facilities. Living arrangements for Filipino students can vary in terms of types of accommodation, occupation, structures, and paying modes. Observably, most dormitories and boarding houses in the Philippines are privately owned, and that the quality of the facilities and living conditions are variables and mostly unregulated (Velasquez-Garcia and Garcia, 2016)

Most colleges and universities appear not to consider the quality of life of their students in these housing facilities. Their responsibility seems to be confined within the boundaries of the school and those off-campus are not within the sanction of their authorities, supervision, and monitoring. The preceding literature is in agreement that the environments and activities that happen outside the school premises can potentially affect students' behavior and performance. On this ground, Brillantes opines (2012) that it is imperative for school administrators to render proactive and precautionary measures to address the boarding house and dormitory-related living concerns of the students.

Conclusions

The students reside in off-campus bed paces and boarding houses due to the limited capacity of the college to house the growing number of boarders/dormers. Proximity, location, and amount of rentals are the primary considerations in choosing their temporary dwellings. The students' living condition does not meet the highest status of compliance with the desired SHFA in terms of location, facilities, treatment of boarders, sanitation and cleanliness, and safety and security. They have easy access to the community facilities and services but they occupy poor quality structures with no strict regulations and observance of local policies and ordinances that would ensure the welfare and well-being of the students. The richness of student residential life is not yet evident as there are no plans, programs, and/or initiatives that will lead to the improvement of their living condition and the full satisfaction of their residential experience. Summing it up, the appraisal of the overall conditions of their living environment in all aspects covered do not meet their needs and expectations.

Given the above results, the College may review its current operations, structure, and management of the on-campus and off-campus housing facility and implement changes that will result in a better and satisfactory living experience among its residents. The office of the student affairs may come up with integrative, evidence-based residential life programs that will respond to the personal, emotional, social, and educational development needs of the students residing in the SHFAs and address boarding house/dormitory-related issues; and implement a residential life program that will cater the needs of the students. The office may also collaborate and build good relationships with identified boarding house/dormitory owners/operators and jointly create initiatives that will consider the welfare of the student-residents. the guidance and counseling services office of the College may

develop an intervention program for the student-residents of SHFA that will take into account the social and emotional learning competencies of self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision-making skills. These program activities may include an initial interview, routine interview, crisis intervention, and exit interview. The office may also create and implement different learning sessions that will assist residents in managing residential life adjustment/transition. To carry out these activities, a residential life coordinator may be designated to keep the record and monitor students in SHFAs. He/she may further regularly conduct a satisfaction evaluation of student housing facilities as a basis for interventions and enhancements. Future researchers may explore the effect of the residential life of students on their academic, personal/social, and career development. Finally, the local government may formulate, pass, and implement a concrete ruling to govern and regulate the operations of student housing facilities.

References

1. Amante, L., and Ortiz, L. (2019). The Living Quarters of Students: A Call for Regulation. *Journal of Academic Research*, 4(1). Retrieved March 12, 2020, from <https://jar.ssu.edu.ph/index.php/JAR/article/view/27>.
2. Amole, D. (2005). Coping strategies for living in student residential facilities in Nigeria. *Environment and Behavior*, 37, 201-219.
3. Amole, D. (2005). Coping strategies for living in student residential facilities in

- Nigeria. *Environment and Behavior*, 37, 201-219.
4. Bitner, M.J. (1990). Evaluating service encounters: the effects of physical surroundings and employee responses. *Journal of Marketing*, 54, 69-82.
 5. Brillantes, R., et al. (2012). The Living Conditions of University Students in Boarding Houses and Dormitories in Davao City, Philippines. *International Journal of Social Science*. Retrieved November 12, 2019, from <https://www.termpaperwarehouse.com/essay-on/The-Living-Conditions-of-University-Students-in-Boarding-Houses-and-Dormitories-in-Davao-City-Philippines/222387>.
 6. Fields, T. 2011. A hedonic model for off-campus student housing: the value of location.
 7. Muncie: Bale State University.
 8. Clarkson, S. 2006 An introduction to student development theory. Central Michigan University. Retrieved November 12, 2019, from <http://www.82> <http://www.82> International Peer Reviewed Journal [reslife.cmicc.edu/rama/index.php?section=Experienced_Staff&category=Intro_to_Student_Development_Theory](http://www.82).
 9. Fachrudin, K, and Fachrudin, A. (2014). Khaira A. Fachrudin, Hilma T. Fachrudin. Tenant satisfaction in boarding house and its relationship to renewal in Medan city, Indonesia. *International Journal of Academic Research Part A*; 2014; 6(2), 97-101. Retrieved February 3, 2020, from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/314893685_Tenant_satisfaction_in_boarding_house_and_its_relationship_to_renewal_in_Medan_city_Indonesia.
 10. Fields, T. 2011. A hedonic model for off-campus student housing: the value of location. Muncie: Bale State University.
 11. Hassanain, M.A. (2008). On the performance evaluation of sustainable student housing facilities. *Journal of Facilities Management*, 6 (3), 212-25.
 12. Jackson, C. et al. (2019). Impact of Accommodation Environments on Student Mental Health and Wellbeing. Retrieved February 3, 2020, from <https://www.gallifordtry.co.uk/media/1154/accommodation-and-student-wellbeing-report-digital.pdf>.
 13. Kotler, P., & Clarke, R. N. (1987). *Marketing for health care organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
 14. Lindsey, A. (2008) Pros and cons of living in college dormitories at UTM. University of Tennessee at Martin, United States of America. Retrieved November 17, 2019, from <http://voices.yahoo.com/pros-cons-living-college-dormitoriesat-909277.html>.
 15. Muslim, M. et al. (2012). Satisfaction of Students' Living Environment Between OnCampus and Off-Campus Settings: A Conceptual Overview. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 68, 601 – 614.
 16. Navarez, J. (2017). Student residential satisfaction in an on-campus housing facility. Research Paper presented during the DLSU Student Congress

2017. Retrieved November 13, 2019, from <https://www.dlsu.edu.ph/wp-content/uploads/pdf/conferences/research-congress-proceedings/2017/LLI/LLI-I-006.pdf>
17. Naylor, G. (2009). Predictors of student persistence: Student satisfaction and aspects of the residential environment. Ph.D. 3400828, University of Virginia, United States -- Virginia. Retrieved November 11, 2019, from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/305011236?accountid=42518> ProQuest Dissertations & Theses (PQDT) database.
18. Office of the Senate. (2012). Senate Bill 1113. Retrieved September 11, 2017, from <https://www.senate.gov.ph/lisdata/86187173!.pdf>.
19. Office of the Senate. (2014). Senate Bill 2478. September 11, 2017, from <http://legacy.senate.gov.ph/lisdata/2016517276!.pdf>.
20. Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V., and Berry, L. (1985). A conceptual model of service quality and its implications for future research. *Journal of Marketing*, 49, 41-50.
21. Presbyterian Ladies' College (n.d.). Life as a boarder. Retrieved September 11, 2019, from <https://www.plc.nsw.edu.au/microsites/boarding/life-as-a-boarder>.
22. Price, I., Matzdorf, F., Smith, L., and Agahi, H. (2003). The impact of facilities on student Choice of the university. *Facilities*, 21(10), 212-22.
23. Student Accomodo8. (2018). The effects of student housing conditions on academic performance. Retrieved January 26, 2020, from <https://medium.com/@SAccommod8/the-effect-of-student-housing-conditions-on-academic-performance-9daf30f5cc49>.
24. Survey unit. (2008). Housing preferences for students at Nottingham's Universities (S. Unit, Trans.). University of Nottingham.
25. Thomsen, J. (2008). Student Housing Student Homes? Aspects of Student Housing Satisfaction. Philosophy Doctor, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim.
26. Ulyani, N., et al. (2011). Student residential satisfaction in research universities. *Journal of Facilities Management*, 9(3), 200-212.
27. Varney, K. (2016). Why student accommodation is more than you thought. Retrieved August 29, 2019, from <https://www.studyinternational.com/news/why-student-accommodation-is-more-important-than-you-thought/>.
28. Velasquez-Garcia, Z., and Garcia, J.A. (2016). OnCampus Living Experiences among Filipino University Students. *Philippine Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 18 (1), 30-45.
29. Villanueva, et. al (2010) Living away from home. *Boarding Students' Handbook*. All Saints' College Bathurst. Retrieved November 20, 2019, from

<http://www.saints.nsw.edu.au/assets/pdf/boardinghandbook/2009Boarders-Handbook-for-web-low-res.pdf>.

30. William, J. (2002). The student satisfaction approach: student feedback and its potential role in quality assessment and enhancement. 24th EAIR Forum, Prague, 8-11 September.