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**INTRODUCTION**

Hostel is an important place for the students, who come to live far away from their homes leaving their families. Hostel life can be very much different for them compared to their life at home. Life in the hostel makes them depend upon themselves and makes them smart, active, and disciplined too. However, it is an obvious question whether the hostel life makes an impact on the student’s academic performance or not as their ultimate aim for staying in a hostel is to acquire knowledge and skills.

College life is an exciting and challenging phase that offers many opportunities for personal and academic growth. One of the most significant decisions that students make when they join college is whether to stay in the college hostel or opt for private accommodation. Living in a college hostel or paying guest (PG) accommodation is a common choice for many college students as it provides a sense of community, convenience, and safety. However, not all students are willing to stay in college hostels or PGs, and there are several factors that can influence their decision.

This research paper aims to identify the factors that affect the willingness of college students to stay in college hostels or PG’s. The study will focus on various factors such as the quality of facilities, location, cost, safety, and personal preferences, among others. Understanding these factors can help college administrations and hostel/Pg management to improve the quality of services and facilities provided to students. The research will be conducted through a questionnaire survey of college students. The sample size will be selected from various colleges, universities, and institutions across different regions to ensure diversity in the data collected. The study will also take into account the demographic and academic background of the participants to identify any potential correlations with their willingness to stay in college hostels or PG’s. Overall, the findings of this study will provide valuable insights into the factors that influence college students' decisions to stay in college hostels or PG’s. The results can be used to improve the quality of services and facilities provided to students, ultimately enhancing their overall college experience. Here are some important facts by the government of India about why hostels are important in our country for example- India has the world’s largest 5-24 years age bracket population (about 500 million). Although the student age cohort varies from one state to another, the college-going population is expected to reach 140 million by 2030 (Higher Education in India: Vision 2030, EY). This is also visible in a report published by the All India Survey on Higher Education (2018-2019), according to which, 37 million students are currently enrolled in 993 universities and 50 thousand plus colleges and stand-alone institutions in India.

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

There are many types of research related to the choice of accommodation for students in countries around the world. That shows a lot of interest in this research. Most of these studies share a common perception that housing factors are most influential in the choice of housing, studies by Liu, Mingyang, and He, Ritong (2013) show positive relationships. The location of residence influences the student's choice of accommodation, or Oyetunji Abiodun Kolawolea, Abidoye Rotimi Boluwatifeb (2016), Adilieme, Chibuiken Michael (2019), Fatemeh Khozaei, Nadi A Ayub, Ahmed Sanusi Hassan, Zahara Khozaei (2010), suggests that accommodation near the campus is an important factor influencing student choice. Nurul Ulyani Mohd Najib, Nor Aini Yusof, and Zulkifli Osman (2011) argue that the infrastructure factor will determine the choice of accommodation when accommodation costs are the same. Cleanliness also plays a huge role in the choice of accommodation as suggested by Gavin Edward (2010),M. MEMON, M. A. SOLANGI, and S. ABRO (2018), Lawrence Kwaku Armah, Stephen Kwame Armah (2021).

**-**Zairina Ibrahim, Normy Rafida Abdul Rahman, Md Gapar Md Johar (2019), Firdouse Rahman Khan , Najat Said Hamad Alshekili, Aida Said Al Badi & Hakeema Aamir Al Khanbashi (2020), Adilieme Chibuiken Michael (2019), Gavin Edward (2010), Lawrence Kwaku Armah, Stephen Kwame Armah (2021) had founded that safety is most crucial part before making the choice accommodation. Oyetunji and Abidoye (2016), Raheem W. M and Jimoh M.Y (2019) mentioned in their studies that rental value of the property is a core element in which students take most of the accommodation decisions. Quality of service is one of the factors mentioned in most studies related to the choice of accommodation in general and the accommodation of students in particular. Liu, Mingyang, and He Ritong (2013) accommodation services will be a decisive factor in the choice of accommodation. Tumaini J.W found that age of the students, education level of the student affect student willingness to choose accommodation. Oyetunji and Abidoye (2016) evaluated the factors influencing the choice of housing among students of Federal University of Technology Akure using the weighted mean score and discriminant function analysis. The study noted that neighbourhood attributes are not an influencing factor.

**RESEARCH OBJECTIVES**

The main objectives of our research paper are as follows:

* To determine the factors that drives or influence the willingness of the students to stay in the college Hostel/PG.
* To investigate security issue from student decision-making.
* To understand the cleanliness issue in relation to student decision-making.
* To identify protection issues affecting student decision-making.

**RESEARCH MODEL**

**Proximity to Campus**

**Rental Value of the Property**

**Willingness of the college students to stay in a college hostel/PG**

**Cleanliness**

**Security**

**Quality of Facilities**

**RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

The study will conduct a sample survey to better understand the factors that will affect the willingness of the students to stay in the college hostel. A quantitative survey will be employed for this study. The source of data collection will be primary, and the data will be collected through a questionnaire. Questionnaires will be used as feedback research for the chosen research topic. There are many ways to develop a questionnaire, and the study will use multiple-choice questions and closed-ended questions by asking the respondents. A questionnaire will be the easiest way to gather data from each and every respondent. It is also a less expensive method, and the study can save time and effort as compared to the interview and observation methods. Besides, data can be gathered from many respondents in a short amount of time. For the survey, a convenience sample of 200 students will be selected from the population of all Delhi NCR college-going students. College students are most likely to be the same age as typical hostel users. This sampling method will be selected due to resource availability, including budget, time, and resource availability. The descriptive research design will be applied to the research methodology of the study.

**HYPOTHESIS**

H1: Proximity to campus has a positive influence willingness of the college students to stay in the college hostel/PG.

H2: Rental value has a positive influence on willingness to stay in the college hostel/PG.

H3: Security has a positive influence willingness of the college students to stay in the college hostel/PG.

H4: Cleanliness has a positive influence willingness of the college students to stay in the college hostel/PG.

H5: Quality of facilities has a positive influence willingness of the college students to stay in the college hostel/PG.

**DATA INTERPRETATION**

Table 1 (Demographic Profile)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Age** | | | | | |
|  | | **Frequency** | **Percent** | **Valid Percent** | **Cumulative Percent** |
|  | **15\_20\_year\_old** | **20** | **19.4** | **19.4** | **19.4** |
| **21\_25\_year\_old** | **59** | **57.3** | **57.3** | **76.7** |
| **26\_30\_years\_old** | **24** | **23.3** | **23.3** | **100.0** |
| **Total** | **103** | **100.0** | **100.0** |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Gender** | | | | | |
|  | | **Frequency** | **Percent** | **Valid Percent** | **Cumulative Percent** |
|  | **male** | **53** | **51.5** | **51.5** | **51.5** |
| **female** | **50** | **48.5** | **48.5** | **100.0** |
| **Total** | **103** | **100.0** | **100.0** |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Education** | | | | | |
|  | | **Frequency** | **Percent** | **Valid Percent** | **Cumulative Percent** |
|  | **Master's\_degree** | **4** | **3.9** | **3.9** | **3.9** |
| **Bachelor\_Degree** | **39** | **37.9** | **37.9** | **41.7** |
| **Ph.D\_or\_higher** | **48** | **46.6** | **46.6** | **88.3** |
| **High\_school** | **12** | **11.7** | **11.7** | **100.0** |
| **Total** | **103** | **100.0** | **100.0** |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Hostel time duration** | | | | | |
|  | | **Frequency** | **Percent** | **Valid Percent** | **Cumulative Percent** |
|  | **Less than\_a\_year** | **36** | **35.0** | **35.0** | **35.0** |
| **1\_3\_years** | **30** | **29.1** | **29.1** | **64.1** |
| **4\_6\_years** | **30** | **29.1** | **29.1** | **93.2** |
| **above\_6\_years** | **7** | **6.8** | **6.8** | **100.0** |
| **Total** | **103** | **100.0** | **100.0** |  |

Table 1 showed the demographic profile of the respondents, who participated in the survey. The majority of the participants within the age group of 21-25 years. The results showed that the majority of the participants were having education qualification of PhD or Higher i.e., 88.3%. And hostel time duration is off 4-6 years i.e,93.2%.

**Correlations**

Table 2

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Correlations** | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | **Education** | **Hostel time duration** | **Proximity** | **Hygiene** | **Security** | **Rental Value** | **Internet facilities** | **Age** | **Gender** |
| **Spearman's rho** | **Education** | **Correlation Coefficient** | **1.000** | **-.251\*** | **.362\*\*** | **-.053** | **.004** | **.024** | **-.029** | **.333\*\*** | **-.090** |
| **Sig. (2-tailed)** | **.** | **.011** | **.000** | **.592** | **.968** | **.810** | **.767** | **.001** | **.366** |
| **N** | **103** | **103** | **103** | **103** | **103** | **103** | **103** | **103** | **103** |
| **Hostel time duration** | **Correlation Coefficient** | **-.251\*** | **1.000** | **-.142** | **.154** | **.113** | **.120** | **.034** | **-.130** | **-.113** |
| **Sig. (2-tailed)** | **.011** | **.** | **.153** | **.121** | **.254** | **.229** | **.731** | **.190** | **.255** |
| **N** | **103** | **103** | **103** | **103** | **103** | **103** | **103** | **103** | **103** |
| **Proximity** | **Correlation Coefficient** | **.362\*\*** | **-.142** | **1.000** | **.016** | **.122** | **.155** | **.120** | **.178** | **-.170** |
| **Sig. (2-tailed)** | **.000** | **.153** | **.** | **.872** | **.219** | **.117** | **.226** | **.073** | **.086** |
| **N** | **103** | **103** | **103** | **103** | **103** | **103** | **103** | **103** | **103** |
| **Hygiene** | **Correlation Coefficient** | **-.053** | **.154** | **.016** | **1.000** | **.457\*\*** | **.354\*\*** | **.189** | **.073** | **-.059** |
| **Sig. (2-tailed)** | **.592** | **.121** | **.872** | **.** | **.000** | **.000** | **.056** | **.465** | **.553** |
| **N** | **103** | **103** | **103** | **103** | **103** | **103** | **103** | **103** | **103** |
| **Security** | **Correlation Coefficient** | **.004** | **.113** | **.122** | **.457\*\*** | **1.000** | **.492\*\*** | **.389\*\*** | **.020** | **-.076** |
| **Sig. (2-tailed)** | **.968** | **.254** | **.219** | **.000** | **.** | **.000** | **.000** | **.840** | **.448** |
| **N** | **103** | **103** | **103** | **103** | **103** | **103** | **103** | **103** | **103** |
| **Rental Value** | **Correlation Coefficient** | **.024** | **.120** | **.155** | **.354\*\*** | **.492\*\*** | **1.000** | **.289\*\*** | **.036** | **.015** |
| **Sig. (2-tailed)** | **.810** | **.229** | **.117** | **.000** | **.000** | **.** | **.003** | **.719** | **.879** |
| **N** | **103** | **103** | **103** | **103** | **103** | **103** | **103** | **103** | **103** |
| **Internet facilities** | **Correlation Coefficient** | **-.029** | **.034** | **.120** | **.189** | **.389\*\*** | **.289\*\*** | **1.000** | **.035** | **-.152** |
| **Sig. (2-tailed)** | **.767** | **.731** | **.226** | **.056** | **.000** | **.003** | **.** | **.723** | **.125** |
| **N** | **103** | **103** | **103** | **103** | **103** | **103** | **103** | **103** | **103** |
| **Age** | **Correlation Coefficient** | **.333\*\*** | **-.130** | **.178** | **.073** | **.020** | **.036** | **.035** | **1.000** | **.150** |
| **Sig. (2-tailed)** | **.001** | **.190** | **.073** | **.465** | **.840** | **.719** | **.723** | **.** | **.130** |
| **N** | **103** | **103** | **103** | **103** | **103** | **103** | **103** | **103** | **103** |
| **Gender** | **Correlation Coefficient** | **-.090** | **-.113** | **-.170** | **-.059** | **-.076** | **.015** | **-.152** | **.150** | **1.000** |
| **Sig. (2-tailed)** | **.366** | **.255** | **.086** | **.553** | **.448** | **.879** | **.125** | **.130** | **.** |
| **N** | **103** | **103** | **103** | **103** | **103** | **103** | **103** | **103** | **103** |
| **\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **\*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).** | | | | | | | | | | | |

In Table 2, the correlation between willingness to continue in college hostel/PG and Security, hygiene and rental value were 0.968,0.872 and 0.810 respectively. Also, the correlation between security and education, security and age, hostel time duration and internet facilities were 0.968,0.84,0.731 respectively. As all the values are greater than 0.7, so, they were said to be strongly correlated.

Now, in the Table 2, the correlation between willingness to continue in college hostel/PG and education and hygiene, gender and hygiene were 0.592 and 0.553 respectively. All these were moderately correlated and their values lies between 0.5 to 0.7.

In Table 2, the correlation between proximity to campus and rental value was 0.117 and correlation between internet facilities and hygiene, internet facilities and security and internet facilities and rental value were 0.56,0.00 and 0.03 respectively as their values were less than 0.5 hence, they were weakly correlated.

The relationship between willingness to continue in college hostel/PG security, hygiene and internet facilities has a positive relationship with each other and between dependent variable, Hence others are insignificant in this situation.

**REGRESSION ANALYSIS**

Table 3

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Model Summaryb** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Model** | **R** | **R Square** | **Adjusted R Square** | **Std. Error of the Estimate** | **Change Statistics** | | | | | **Durbin-Watson** |
| **R Square Change** | **F Change** | **df1** | **df2** | **Sig. F Change** |
| **1** | **.647a** | **.419** | **.376** | **.935** | **.419** | **9.775** | **7** | **95** | **.000** | **1.805** |
| **a. Predictors: (Constant), Internetfacilities, Hosteltimeduration, Proximity, Hygiene, Education, RentalValue, Security** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **b. Dependent Variable: intensiontostay** | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ANOVAa** | | | | | | |
| **Model** | | **Sum of Squares** | **df** | **Mean Square** | **F** | **Sig.** |
| **1** | **Regression** | **59.814** | **7** | **8.545** | **9.775** | **.000b** |
| **Residual** | **83.040** | **95** | **.874** |  |  |
| **Total** | **142.854** | **102** |  |  |  |
| **a. Dependent Variable: intension to stay** | | | | | | |
| **b. Predictors: (Constant), Internet facilities, Hostel time duration, Proximity, Hygiene, Education, Rental Value, Security** | | | | | | |

In Table 3, 37% of the variation in the dependent variable was caused by the independent variables which are considered in this paper. (0.376\*100=37%(approx). In this respect, ANOVA shows that the regression model is highly significant at the level of (0.000).

**COEFFICIENTS**

Table 4

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Coefficientsa** | | | | | | |
| **Model** | | **Unstandardized Coefficients** | | **Standardized Coefficients** | **t** | **Sig.** |
| **B** | **Std. Error** | **Beta** |
| **1** | **(Constant)** | **-.917** | **.570** |  | **-1.611** | **.111** |
| **Education** | **.289** | **.137** | **.179** | **2.101** | **.038** |
| **Hosteltimeduration** | **.135** | **.101** | **.109** | **1.337** | **.184** |
| **Proximity** | **.190** | **.084** | **.195** | **2.262** | **.026** |
| **Hygiene** | **.210** | **.095** | **.202** | **2.213** | **.029** |
| **Security** | **.093** | **.103** | **.092** | **.901** | **.370** |
| **RentalValue** | **.060** | **.103** | **.055** | **.587** | **.559** |
| **Internetfacilities** | **.373** | **.087** | **.373** | **4.290** | **.000** |
| **a. Dependent Variable: intension to stay** | | | | | | |

Table 4, represented that the independent variable (Education,Proximity,Hygiene) were significant as their values were less than 0.05 and whereas independent variable (Hostel time duration,Security,Rental Value) were found to be insignificant as their values were greater than 0.05.

**RELIABILITY TEST**

Table 5

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Reliability Statistics** | |
| **Cronbach's Alpha** | **N of Items** |
| **.543** | **9** |

In Table 5, Cronbach’s Alpha value i.e., 0.543 shows that the scale is strongly reliable.

**CONCLUSION**

The study provides valuable insights into the factors that influence the willingness of college students to continue living in hostels/PGs. The results indicate that security, hygiene, and rental value are strongly correlated with the dependent variable, while education and gender are moderately correlated, and proximity to campus and internet facilities have weak correlations.

The study also highlights the positive relationship between security, hygiene, and internet facilities with each other and the dependent variable. Furthermore, the independent variables considered in the study explain 37% of the variation in the dependent variable, indicating that they are significant factors.

The analysis reveals that education, proximity, and hygiene are significant independent variables, while hostel time duration, security, and rental value are not significant. Finally, the study confirms the strong reliability of the scale used to measure the dependent variable.

Overall, the findings suggest that improving security, hygiene, rental value, education, proximity, and hygiene could enhance the quality of living for college students and increase their willingness to continue living in hostels/PGs. The study provides valuable insights for policymakers and hostel/PG administrators in developing strategies to improve the living conditions of college students.
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