

**STUDENTS' PREFERENCE FOR CAMPUS RESTAURANTS AT THE
UNIVERSITY OF BENIN**

Chukwuemeke Godwin TUDOME

MGS1909292

**SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FUFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
AWARD OF A BACHELOR OF SCIENCE DEGREE (B.Sc) BY THE DEPARTMENT
OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, UNIVERSITY OF BENIN**

MAY, 2024

DECLARATION

I, **CHUKWUEMEKE GODWIN TUDOME** hereby declare that this project is undertaken by me in the Department of Business Administration, Faculty of Management Science, University of Benin City, Edo State under the supervision Of **PROF. J.O EJECHI**.

- This project has not been previously submitted for the award of Bachelor of Science Degree in Business Administration.
- All ideas and views are product of my personal research and that of others have been duly referenced, appreciated and acknowledge.
- Any litigation or liability arising from the work is to be wholly borne by me and not that of my supervisor.

Chukwuemeke Godwin TUDOME

Project Student

DATE

CERTIFICATION

We the undersign certify that this research project was carried out by **Chukwuemeke Godwin TUDOME** with the Matriculation Number **MGS1909292** an undergraduate student in the Department of Business Administration, Faculty of Management Sciences, University of Benin, Benin city. It is adequate in scope and quality in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the award of Bachelor of Science (BSc.) degree in Business Administration.

DATE _____

PROF. J.O EJECHI

(Project Supervisor)

DATE _____

DR. S. A. ADEKUNLE

(Project Coordinator)

DR. O. OMORODION

(Head of Department)

Date

DEDICATION

This research work is dedicated to God Almighty for his Mercy and Grace upon my life that has brought me this far.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to the supreme power of God, who has consistently guided and protected me on my journey. Without His grace, this project would not have come to fruition.

I am also deeply thankful to my esteemed project supervisor, PROF. J.O Ejechi, for her invaluable support, cooperation, and guidance throughout the completion of this project.

Additionally, I would like to extend my appreciation to the Head of Department, Dr. O. Omorodion, for his exemplary leadership style in the department.

I am grateful to Dr. S.A Adekunle, the hardworking project coordinator, Prof. Ibrahim Shaibu, and all the lecturers in the Department of Administration for their contributions and insightful inputs.

My heartfelt thanks go to my parents, Mr. and Mrs. Tudome, and my siblings, Chiwe, Ugo, Joseph, and Michael, for their unwavering support, encouragement, financial assistance, and prayers. Their love and guidance have been the foundation of my academic journey.

Special appreciation to my friends, Godspower and Toyin, for their continued support and friendship.

And to my dear friends, Jessica, Osas, Abdul, Jeremiah, Precious, and Ruth, your presence has made my time memorable.

Thank you all for your kindness and love. God bless you abundantly.

ABSTRACT

Students' preferences for campus restaurants are crucial for addressing issues related to restaurant satisfaction. This study investigates the correlation between student preferences and various influencing factors. The research aims to elucidate the complex factors influencing students' restaurant selections. Identifying these factors and their interrelations can assist campus restaurant services in customising offerings to accommodate student preferences, ultimately enhancing satisfaction and fostering a positive dining experience on campus. A questionnaire was administered to a sample size of 100 respondents, and data analysis was conducted using E-Views software, employing regression analysis to assess the relationship between variables. The research findings revealed that students prioritise restaurants offering cost-effective meal options without compromising quality. Furthermore, the accessibility of restaurants in convenient campus locations significantly influences their preferences. Diverse menu offerings catering to various dietary preferences and restrictions are also highly valued by students. Moreover, stringent adherence to hygiene standards, including cleanliness and food safety practices, is imperative in their dining choices. Additionally, students seek out restaurants that prioritise nutritional value and provide transparent nutritional information. Peer recommendations also hold sway, as students are swayed by positive word-of-mouth endorsements from their peers. The study enhances comprehension of the factors impacting students' restaurant preferences on campus. By scrutinising affordability, accessibility, convenience, menu variety, recommendations, hygiene standards, and health considerations, the research offers valuable insights into the complex factors influencing students' choices. This deepened understanding enables campus restaurant services to refine their offerings more adeptly to align with student preferences, thereby increasing satisfaction and fostering a positive dining experience within the university environment.

Campus restaurants should prioritize affordability by offering budget-friendly meal options without compromising quality. They should ensure accessibility by strategically locating dining facilities in easily reachable areas across the campus. Additionally, emphasising menu variety can cater to diverse dietary preferences and restrictions among students. Maintaining stringent hygiene standards is essential to uphold cleanliness and food safety. Furthermore, campus restaurants should focus on providing nutritious meal options and clear nutritional information to promote student health and well-being. Leveraging peer recommendations through positive word-of-mouth endorsements can enhance the reputation and appeal of campus dining establishments.

Keywords: campus restaurants, student preferences, affordability, convenience, menu variety, hygiene standards, health considerations, recommendations, dining .

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the Study:

Understanding students' preferences for campus dining facilities is not merely a matter of convenience; it's a strategic imperative for university administrators and dining service providers. The financial aspect is particularly significant, as food costs often represent a substantial portion of a student's budget. Therefore, comprehending what students desire in terms of dining options is crucial for both enhancing their overall experience and ensuring efficient resource allocation within the university's dining services.

Assessing students' preferences involves delving into various factors that influence their dining choices. These factors encompass not only the menu variety and pricing strategies but also extend to considerations such as the dining atmosphere, convenience of access, and overall satisfaction with the dining experience. By conducting such assessments, universities can tailor their dining offerings to better align with students' needs and expectations, thereby promoting healthier eating habits and enhancing student satisfaction.

For university dining services to operate effectively, they must strike a delicate balance between economic considerations and meeting students' demands for quality and variety in dining options. This balance entails managing costs and inventory efficiently while also ensuring that the available dining options cater to diverse tastes and preferences. By doing so, universities can create a dining environment that not only satisfies students' hunger but also contributes to their overall well-being and academic success.

The specific focus of this study is on the dining offerings at the University of Benin, a prestigious institution known for its diverse student population and commitment to providing quality services. By conducting a case study at this university, researchers can gain valuable insights into how dining facilities can be operated most effectively to enhance student satisfaction and dining experiences. This research will delve into various aspects, including menu variety, pricing strategies, dining ambiance, and overall service quality, to identify areas for improvement and optimization.

By understanding the factors that influence students' dining choices, university administrators can make informed decisions regarding menu planning, facility management, and service enhancements. Ultimately, the goal is to create a dining environment that not only meets students' basic nutritional needs but also enhances their overall campus experience and fosters a sense of community and belonging. Through careful assessment and strategic adjustments, universities can ensure that their dining services remain relevant and responsive to the evolving preferences and needs of their student population.

1.2. Statement of Research Problems:

Restaurants on the University of Benin campus face challenges in comprehending why students prefer one establishment over another, taking into account factors such as price affordability, convenience, menu variety, hygiene standards, and health considerations. Despite efforts by restaurant management to enhance the dining experience, there remains a need to grasp the underlying reasons driving students' restaurant preferences.

This study aims to explore the factors influencing students' choices between campus restaurants and to identify strategies for optimising dining services at the University of Benin. By examining these factors in depth, the research seeks to uncover the drivers behind

students' restaurant preferences and propose actionable recommendations for improving the overall dining experience on campus.

Specifically, the research will investigate the impact of price affordability on students' restaurant preferences and satisfaction levels. It will also explore the role of convenience in shaping students' preferences for dining options. Additionally, the study will assess the influence of menu variety on students' dining experiences, analysing the diversity and quality of food offerings available at campus restaurants.

Hygiene and health considerations will also be central to the research, as these factors significantly affect students' perceptions of dining facilities and their willingness to dine on campus. By understanding the reasons behind students' restaurant preferences and addressing any identified shortcomings, the study aims to enhance students' satisfaction with campus dining services.

1.3 Research Questions

- How does the affordability of food offerings within the campus influence the dining choices of students?
- In what ways does the convenience of access to campus restaurants impact students' dining decisions?
- How does the variety of menu options available at campus restaurants affect students' preferences?
- What is the relationship between hygiene standards at campus restaurants and students' decisions to dine there?

- To what extent do recommendations, whether from peers or other sources, influence students' choices of dining establishments?
- How do health considerations influence students' restaurant preferences on campus?

1.4. Research Objectives:

- To examine the impact of food affordability within campus on students' dining choices.
- To investigate the influence of convenience of access to campus restaurants on students' dining decisions.
- To assess how the variety of menu options available at campus restaurants affects students' preferences.
- To explore the relationship between hygiene standards at campus restaurants and students' decisions to dine there.
- To Analyse the role of recommendations, whether from peers or other sources, in influencing students' choices of campus restaurant.
- To understand how health considerations influence students' restaurant preferences on campus.

1.5. Research hypothesis

a **H₀**: There is no significant impact of food affordability within campus on students' dining choices.

H₁: There is a significant impact of food affordability within campus on students' dining choices.

b. **H₀**: The convenience of access to campus restaurants has no significant influence on students' dining decisions.

H₁: The convenience of access to campus restaurants has a significant influence on students' dining decisions.

c. **H₀**: The variety of menu options available at campus restaurants does not significantly affect students' preferences.

H₁: The variety of menu options available at campus restaurants significantly affects students' preferences.

d. **H₀**: There is no significant relationship between hygiene standards at campus restaurants and students' decisions to dine there.

H₁: There is a significant relationship between hygiene standards at campus restaurants and students' decisions to dine there.

e. **H₀**: Recommendations, whether from peers or other sources, do not significantly influence students' choices for campus restaurants.

H₁: Recommendations significantly influence students' choices of dining for campus restaurants.

f. **H₀**: Health considerations do not significantly influence students' restaurant preferences on campus.

H₁: Health considerations significantly influence students' restaurant preferences on campus.

1.6 Significance of the Study:

Exploring students' preferences for campus restaurants holds paramount importance for various reasons. Drawing from the insights of Schiffman & Kanuk (2007), research into consumer behaviour not only enhances our comprehension of dining choices but also unveils the underlying motives and patterns of students' food selections.

This study carries profound significance for the University of Benin and extends its impact to the wider academic and business spheres. By gaining a deeper understanding of students' dining preferences, university administrators, dining service providers, and local businesses can make informed decisions to enhance the dining experience on campus.

For local businesses, the study provides valuable insights into students' preferences, enabling them to tailor their offerings to better align with students' tastes and preferences. This, in turn, has the potential to increase customer satisfaction and sales for these establishments. Additionally, understanding students' buying behaviour becomes instrumental in optimising inventory and pricing strategies, ultimately leading to more efficient operations and improved profitability.

Moreover, for students, the study contributes to an enriched campus experience by ensuring a diverse array of appealing food options. By aligning dining offerings with students' preferences, the study aims to enhance overall satisfaction and well-being, fostering a sense of community and belonging on campus.

Beyond the University of Benin, the findings of this research have broader implications for the academic understanding of consumer behaviour. By uncovering the drivers behind students' restaurant preferences, this study contributes to the body of knowledge in the field and has the potential to inform similar studies in other educational institutions and contexts.

In essence, this research strives to cultivate a thriving and dynamic local environment, fostering mutual benefits for both businesses and the student community. By bridging the gap between students' preferences and dining offerings, the study aims to create a more vibrant and inclusive campus dining experience.

1.7. Scope of the Study:

This study extensively analyses students' preferences for campus restaurants at the University of Benin. Specifically, the research will investigate crucial factors such as price affordability, convenience, menu varieties, hygiene, recommendations, and health considerations influencing students' dining choices.

The selection of these factors is based on their significance in shaping students' dining experiences and their potential to provide actionable insights for campus restaurants and dining service providers.

The scope is confined to the University of Benin campus, ensuring a focused exploration of the unique dynamics within this academic setting. By concentrating on a single campus, the study can delve into intricate details of how these factors impact students' dining decisions, providing valuable insights that are directly relevant to the university's dining services.

Data collection will involve surveys administered within the University of Benin campus, targeting a representative sample of students. The survey instrument will be designed to capture comprehensive information on students' dining preferences and experiences, allowing for a thorough examination of the factors under investigation.

The anticipated findings aspire to offer actionable recommendations for local businesses, contribute to academic knowledge in the field, and enhance the overall dining experience for students within the University of Benin.

1.8 Limitations of the Study:

1. **Scope Constraints:** The study is delimited to the University of Benin campus, limiting the extent to which findings can be generalised to other academic institutions. Distinct campus cultures, preferences, and dining behaviours may exist in different university settings, potentially constraining the external validity of the study's findings.

2. **Sampling Bias:** The reliance on survey-based data collection within the University of Benin campus may introduce sampling bias. The study might not capture the perspectives of students less inclined to participate in surveys, potentially skewing the overall representation of students' dining preferences.

3. **Temporal Factors:** The study's findings may be susceptible to temporal variations in students' preferences and behaviours. Factors such as seasonal changes, academic schedules, or alterations in campus offerings could impact the relevance and applicability of the results over time, necessitating caution in interpreting longitudinal trends.

4. **External Influences:** External factors, such as economic shifts or unforeseen events, may exert influence on students' dining preferences and behaviours. The study may not comprehensively account for these external influences, limiting the depth of understanding regarding the dynamics of the campus restaurant landscape and potentially confounding the interpretation of findings.

5. **Resource Constraints:** The extent of the study may be constrained by resource limitations, impacting the breadth and depth of data collection. Financial and time constraints may limit the number of participants or the duration of the study, potentially affecting the comprehensiveness and generalizability of the research outcomes.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Introduction

In the dining environment at the University of Benin, campus restaurants have played a pivotal role in ensuring students' satisfaction and well-being. However, these establishments have often grappled with the challenge of accurately gauging students' preferences. This lack of awareness has led to subpar dining experiences and impacted the overall atmosphere of the university's dining facilities. Identifying and understanding these challenges is essential for optimising the dining experience and fostering a positive environment for students.

The goal of this chapter is to delve into the details of students' preferences for on-campus dining at the University of Benin and elucidate how these preferences shape the overall dining experience. By understanding students' choices, this study aims to emphasise the crucial role they play in making the campus dining experience vibrant and satisfying. It seeks to prevent dissatisfaction that may arise when dining places fail to meet students' expectations.

Throughout this study, various aspects of students' dining preferences will be explored. Key factors such as affordability, convenience, menu variety, hygiene, recommendations, and health considerations will be examined in detail to provide a comprehensive understanding of students' dining preferences and behaviours

2.2. Conceptual Review: Campus Restaurant

To understand the connection between campus restaurants and student preferences, it's important to consider a variety of factors. This includes the evolution of campus restaurants, different types of restaurant establishments and operational models.

2.2.1. History of campus restaurant

Campus restaurant is a fundamental aspect of the university experience, significantly impacting students' daily lives and contributing to the overall campus atmosphere. Beyond providing meals, it plays a crucial role in student satisfaction, recruitment efforts, and the overall student experience.

In the 19th century, students managed their meals independently, often adopting a cafeteria-style influenced by military mess halls. However, by the mid-20th century, societal changes led to the emergence of more varied meal options. The 1960s and 1970s saw a growing demand for healthier and diverse foods, prompting the establishment of food courts on campuses (Kinsella, 1978).

Fast-forward to the present day, and campus dining has evolved into a more personalised experience. Smaller settings, such as food courts, now offer a wide range of dishes from around the world (Ruiz, 2009). Campus restaurant has become an integral part of university marketing and recruitment efforts, highlighting its importance beyond mere sustenance (Kwun et al., 2013).

As the 20th century came to a close, fast-food establishments began appearing on campuses, prioritising convenience for students. In the 21st century, there has been a noticeable shift

towards sustainability and healthier food options, aligning with students' evolving preferences. Restaurant services have become crucial for enrollment, recruitment, retention, and revenue generation for higher education institutions (Clayton, 2014).

Today, campus restaurants offer a diverse and dynamic experience, incorporating elements of convenience, variety, and health-conscious choices. Technological advancements, such as online ordering and accessible nutritional information, have contributed to this evolution. Specialised dining facilities now cater to various dietary preferences, underscoring the vital role that campus dining plays in enhancing the overall university experience.

Types of Restaurants

Restaurants can be broadly categorised into two main styles: Fast Food Restaurants and Fine Dining Restaurants. These distinct approaches provide unique culinary experiences.

Fast Food Restaurants: Fast food restaurants, often known as the original quick-service spots, have become significant players in the culinary world (Webstaurantstore, 2023). These establishments are renowned for their remarkable speed, offering swift service as their defining feature. The essence of fast food lies in preparing a menu in just minutes, catering to individuals seeking quick and convenient dining experiences. In the fast-paced world of fast food, speed isn't just a feature but a core principle. The menu, ranging from well-known favourites to international choices, is crafted with the understanding that customers expect prompt service without compromising taste. Beyond quick service, fast food restaurants embody a cultural shift towards on-the-go lifestyles, where time efficiency and variety converge to influence modern dining preferences.

Fine Dining Restaurants: Fine dining restaurants offer a refined dining journey, focusing on exceptional flavours within an elegant setting. In contrast to quick-service establishments, these restaurants encourage patrons to savour each moment, providing a leisurely and sophisticated experience. With meticulous attention to detail in both the menu and service, fine dining distinguishes itself by crafting an elevated culinary adventure. The style of fine dining service is an age-old tradition, characterised by meticulous rules and nuances that shape an exquisite culinary experience. In these establishments, every detail is carefully curated, from the selection of premium ingredients to the presentation of dishes, composing a symphony of flavours that goes beyond mere sustenance. The emphasis on quality ingredients and culinary innovation makes these restaurants a destination for those seeking a tasteful and unhurried escape. In the realm of dining, fine dining restaurants shine as places where every bite becomes a celebration of flavours and refinement, creating a unique and enjoyable experience for all (Webstaurantstore, 2023).

2.2.2. Models of Campus Restaurant Operations

The operations in campus restaurants can be categorised as self-operated, outsourced, or a combination of both.

Self-Operated Model: The self-operated model for campus restaurants represents an approach where the university independently manages and oversees all aspects of the dining establishment. In this model, the university takes charge of administration, staffing, menu creation, and overall operations, ensuring seamless integration with the campus community. This method gives universities greater control over culinary offerings, allowing them to

customise menus to the specific tastes and preferences of the student population. It also enables direct feedback mechanisms, facilitating swift adjustments to meet evolving culinary expectations. Beyond the culinary aspect, the self-operated approach often aligns with the university's broader goals, creating opportunities for student employment, fostering a sense of community, and contributing to the overall campus experience. Financially, this approach involves the university directly handling the costs and benefits, providing a transparent understanding of the economic aspects. In essence, the self-operated approach empowers universities to create a distinctive dining atmosphere that reflects the institution's identity and precisely caters to the culinary needs of its diverse student body (Conradson, 2014).

Outsourced Model: The outsourced model for campus restaurants involves a collaborative approach where the university partners with external entities, typically private companies, to manage and operate the dining establishment. In this model, the university retains ownership of the restaurant while delegating day-to-day operations to specialised external vendors. Outsourcing, or contracting out, refers to obtaining services from an outside company instead of relying on in-house operations. This strategic alliance enables the university to leverage the expertise of external partners, introducing culinary insights and operational efficiencies. The contractor may either absorb the employees of the higher education institution or replace them with its own staff. This process involves a careful transition of personnel, ensuring the seamless integration of skilled professionals into the restaurant's operations while aligning with the overarching vision and policies of the university. This collaborative venture fosters a dynamic and adaptable dining environment, blending the strengths of the university's vision with the operational expertise of external partners. The outsourced model represents a strategic collaboration aiming to optimise both culinary excellence and operational efficiency,

contributing to a vibrant and diverse dining landscape within the campus community (Phipps & Merisotis, 2005; Ender & Fahleson, 1994).

2.2.3 Consumer Preference in Campus Restaurants

In the ever-evolving landscape of campus dining, students hold significant sway as frequent patrons of these restaurant establishments. This underscores the crucial importance of consumer preferences in shaping the on-campus restaurant experience.

Consumer preference in campus restaurants pertains to the specific tastes, choices, and desires of students when selecting dining options on campus. These preferences encompass various factors such as food quality, variety, price, convenience, and atmosphere.

As outlined by PossibleNow (2024), consumer preferences in campus dining encompass a wide range of expectations, likes, dislikes, motivations, and inclinations that drive students to select specific products. These preferences serve as guiding principles, influencing their purchasing decisions and ultimately determining the success of campus restaurants.

According to StudySmarter (2024), consumer preferences refer to the judgments and evaluations students make about the products and services available to them in campus restaurants. These judgments are informed by various factors, including quality, price, convenience, and personal tastes. For campus restaurants, understanding and effectively catering to these preferences are essential for thriving in a competitive environment.

By aligning their offerings with the diverse preferences of their student consumer base, campus restaurants can enhance customer satisfaction, foster loyalty, and maintain a competitive edge in the market. Consequently, investing in understanding and responding to student preferences becomes integral to the success and sustainability of campus dining establishments.

2.2.4 Categories of Consumer Preferences

According to Studysmarter (2024), there are four primary types of consumer preferences: qualitative preferences, quantitative preferences, unconditional preferences, and conditional preferences.

1. Qualitative Preferences:

Qualitative preferences are based on the perceived qualities or characteristics of a product or service. These qualities are often subjective and may include aspects such as:

- Design: Consumers may prefer products with sleek, modern designs over those with outdated or unappealing aesthetics.
- Brand Reputation: Consumers may favour brands with a reputation for quality, reliability, and ethical business practices.
- Sustainability: Increasingly, consumers are prioritising sustainability when making purchasing decisions.
- Ethical Considerations: Some consumers base their preferences on ethical considerations, such as fair labour practices or animal welfare.

2. Quantitative Preferences:

Quantitative preferences are based on measurable or quantifiable aspects of a product or service. These factors include:

- Price: Price is a critical factor influencing consumer preferences.
- Size or Quantity: Consumers may prefer products available in specific sizes or quantities to suit their needs.
- Availability: The availability of a product or service can influence consumer preferences.

3. Unconditional Preferences:

Unconditional preferences remain consistent regardless of external factors and are deeply ingrained in consumer behaviour. Examples include:

- Taste Preferences: Some consumers may have unconditional preferences for certain flavours or types of food.
- Brand Loyalty: Brand loyal consumers may have unconditional preferences for specific brands.
- Cultural Preferences: Cultural influences can shape unconditional preferences, such as preferences for traditional foods or customs.

4. Conditional Preferences:

Conditional preferences are contingent upon specific conditions or situational factors. Examples include:

- Seasonal Preferences: Consumer preferences may vary depending on the season.
- Weather Conditions: Weather can impact consumer preferences for products or services.
- Social Context: Consumer preferences may be influenced by social factors such as peer influence or societal trends.

2.2.5. Key Factors Shaping Student Restaurant Preferences

Various factors influencing students' preference for campus restaurants include affordability, convenience, menu variety, recommendations, hygiene standards, and health considerations. These factors will be discussed below.

a. Affordability:

Affordability plays a crucial role in shaping students' preferences for campus restaurants, directly influencing their access to and enjoyment of healthy food choices. Described as the ability and availability to purchase desired and needed healthy food, affordability comprises two main aspects: defining healthy food and measuring wages and availability (WBCSD, 2022).

Students prioritise access to affordable, nutritious meals that contribute to their overall well-being and satisfaction. Campus restaurants that offer reasonably priced, nutritious options cater to students' dietary requirements and preferences, ensuring they can maintain a healthy lifestyle conducive to academic success.

Income levels are inherently linked to affordability, with varying levels of access to healthy food among individuals. The affordability of healthy options differs from person to person, underscoring the importance of comparing income levels to assess affordability. By enhancing food distribution at all levels, campus restaurants can ensure equitable access to nutritious foods for all students, regardless of their financial status (Foodrescue, 2022).

In the context of campus dining, affordability extends beyond menu prices to encompass the overall value of dining experiences. Factors such as portion sizes, meal quality, and customization options contribute to students' perceptions of value for money. Campus restaurants that offer affordable, high-quality meals address students' financial constraints while delivering satisfying dining experiences.

Prioritising affordability in campus dining experiences enables restaurants to effectively meet the diverse needs and preferences of students. By integrating affordability into menu planning and pricing strategies, campus restaurants can maintain accessibility and inclusivity, fostering a positive dining environment for all students.

b. Convenience

Convenience, a crucial aspect of student preferences for campus restaurants, refers to the ease of physical access to food sources, it encompasses factors that streamline the process of accessing and enjoying meals, influencing students' satisfaction and choices.

One key aspect of convenience is the physical accessibility of campus restaurants. Restaurants located in central or easily reachable locations on campus are preferred by students due to their convenience. Accessibility reduces the time and effort required to access dining options, making it easier for students to satisfy their hunger between classes or during busy schedules.

Moreover, the convenience of ordering and food preparation significantly impacts students' dining experiences. Campus restaurants that offer efficient ordering systems, such as mobile apps or online ordering platforms, streamline the process for students, allowing them to place

orders conveniently from their smartphones or computers. Additionally, restaurants with quick turnaround times in food preparation minimise wait times, enabling students to enjoy their meals promptly.

Stephanie Burns (2020) suggests that customers would pay more if they knew they would receive a convenient experience. The healthfulness of foods available at campus restaurants also contributes to convenience. Foods with higher nutrient density metrics, as measured by Drewnowski and Monsivais (2020), are perceived as healthier options and align with students' preferences for nutritious dining choices. Offering a variety of healthful options that are easily accessible further enhances the convenience factor for students seeking nutritious meals on campus.

By prioritising convenience in campus dining experiences, restaurants can effectively cater to students' needs and preferences, ultimately increasing satisfaction and loyalty. Incorporating convenience as a dependent variable in the study of student preferences for campus restaurants provides valuable insights into the factors driving students' dining choices.

Understanding the importance of convenience informs restaurant management strategies and allows for the optimization of dining experiences to meet students' expectations. By offering accessible locations, efficient ordering systems, and nutritious food options, campus restaurants can enhance convenience and foster a positive dining environment for students.

c. Menu Variety

Menu variety serves as a critical factor in shaping students' preferences for campus restaurants, offering a wide range of options that cater to various tastes and dietary needs, from local cuisine to international dishes, including vegetarian, vegan, and gluten-free offerings. The availability of such menu varieties directly impacts students' dining experiences and overall satisfaction. When campus restaurants offer a wide range of food choices, students are more likely to find options that appeal to their preferences, enhancing their dining experience and increasing their likelihood of patronage. Conversely, the absence of menu variety or limited options catering to students' dietary preferences can diminish their preference for a particular restaurant, leading to dissatisfaction and reduced patronage.

Recognizing the significance of providing diverse menu options, including local and international cuisines, can inform restaurant management strategies and enhance the overall dining experience for students. Ultimately, the presence of menu variety plays a significant role in attracting students to campus restaurants and fostering customer loyalty. By catering to students' diverse tastes and dietary needs, restaurants can increase their appeal and satisfaction among the student population.

According to Elizabeth S. Holland (2023), menu variety contributes to increased customer satisfaction, improved profitability, enhanced creativity, increased competitiveness, and improved cultural sensitivity in campus restaurants.

d. Hygiene:

Hygiene, which involves practices aimed at preventing disease spread and maintaining health standards, is of paramount importance in restaurant settings, particularly regarding students'

dining preferences on campus. It involves upholding cleanliness in both personal hygiene and the restaurant environment.

Maintaining effective hygiene is crucial for upholding good health, significantly reducing the risk of illness (Megan Novak, 2023). A high standard of hygiene not only fosters a healthy dining environment but also shapes students' perceptions of a restaurant. It instills confidence and trust in the establishment, positively influencing their overall dining experience.

Students are more likely to frequent restaurants that prioritize cleanliness, viewing it as a commitment to their well-being. Conversely, inadequate hygiene practices can deter students from patronizing a restaurant, leading to diminished satisfaction and potential health risks. Unsanitary conditions, such as unclean dining areas or improperly stored food, raise concerns about food safety and hygiene standards.

Therefore, assessing the impact of hygiene on student preferences for campus restaurants is crucial for enhancing dining services and ensuring student satisfaction. By prioritising hygiene standards, restaurants can cultivate a safe and inviting atmosphere that resonates with students, ultimately enhancing their dining experience.

Regular inspections, staff training in proper hygiene practices, and implementing sanitation protocols are essential measures for maintaining a clean and hygienic restaurant environment. Additionally, transparent communication about hygiene measures can reassure students and build trust in the restaurant's commitment to their health and well-being.

e. Recommendations:

The frequency with which students endorse a specific restaurant to their peers, known as "recommendation," significantly impacts students' dining choices on campus. Recommendations serve as free advertising triggered by positive customer experiences, reflecting consumer interest in a restaurant's offerings (Hayes, 2022).

Students often rely on word-of-mouth advice from trusted sources when deciding where to eat, making recommendations a vital factor in their decision-making process. Understanding the factors influencing students' likelihood to recommend a campus restaurant provides valuable insights into overall satisfaction levels.

Factors such as food quality, affordability, hygiene standards, ambience, and customer service may contribute to whether students feel inclined to recommend a restaurant. By examining recommendations as a dependent variable, researchers gain insights into key drivers of student satisfaction and loyalty in the campus dining environment.

Moreover, leveraging positive word-of-mouth recommendations can be a potent marketing tool for campus restaurants. Establishing a reputation for excellence in food quality, affordability, cleanliness, and service can generate positive buzz among students, leading to increased patronage and loyalty.

Encouraging satisfied customers to share their experiences through social media or campus forums can amplify the restaurant's visibility and attract new customers. By encouraging positive recommendations and engagement among students, campus restaurants can bolster

their reputation and cultivate a loyal customer base, ensuring sustained success in the long run.

f. Health Considerations:

In recent years, health considerations have become pivotal factors influencing students' dining choices on campus. With a heightened awareness of nutrition and wellness, students prioritize dining options that align with their health goals and dietary preferences.

Health considerations entail a range of factors such as nutritional value, ingredient transparency, portion sizes, and allergen information. Students seek balanced meal options made with fresh, whole ingredients and tailored to accommodate specific dietary needs, such as vegetarian, vegan, gluten-free, or allergen-friendly choices.

Moreover, students are increasingly mindful of the long-term health implications of their food choices, such as obesity, diabetes, and heart disease. They recognize the importance of making informed dietary decisions to support their overall health and well-being.

Campus restaurants play a pivotal role in meeting students' health considerations by offering a diverse array of nutritious meal options and promoting healthy eating habits. Clear nutritional information, highlighted healthier menu choices, and the integration of locally sourced and sustainable ingredients empower students to make health-conscious decisions.

Additionally, educational initiatives and wellness programs complement dining offerings, providing students with resources and support for adopting healthy lifestyle choices.

Collaborations with campus health services and nutritionists offer guidance on meal planning, portion control, and mindful eating practices.

Vesterinen (2024) emphasizes the importance of health and safety standards in the restaurant industry. Ensuring the well-being of customers and staff is not only a legal requirement but also essential for maintaining a positive reputation and the success of the establishment.

Prioritizing health considerations in campus dining not only supports students' well-being but also enhances the overall dining experience and fosters a culture of wellness on campus. By catering to students' health-conscious preferences, campus restaurants contribute to satisfaction, promote healthier eating habits, and ultimately enrich the student community.

The Interplay of Factors in Campus Restaurant Preferences

The factors influencing students' preference for campus restaurants are interconnected and can influence each other in significant ways. Understanding these interrelations is essential for optimising the dining experience and catering to students' diverse needs and preferences.

Affordability and Convenience:

Affordability and convenience are closely linked factors that impact students' dining choices. Students often prioritise restaurants that offer affordable meal options in convenient locations on campus. A restaurant that provides budget-friendly meals within close proximity to academic buildings makes it easier for students to access meals between classes, enhancing convenience.

Convenience and Recommendation:

Convenience can also influence recommendations from students to their peers. If students find a restaurant convenient to access and with quick service, they may be more likely to recommend it to others. Positive word-of-mouth endorsements based on convenience can further influence dining choices among students.

Recommendation and Menu Variety:

Students may base their recommendations on the variety of menu options available at a restaurant. A diverse menu with a wide range of choices, including vegetarian, vegan, and allergen-free options, may lead to positive recommendations from students who appreciate the selection. Conversely, a lack of menu variety may result in fewer recommendations and decreased patronage.

Menu Variety and Hygiene:

The availability of menu variety can impact perceptions of hygiene standards at a restaurant. A diverse menu may suggest that the restaurant uses fresh ingredients and rotates its offerings regularly, contributing to positive perceptions of cleanliness and food safety. Conversely, a limited menu selection may raise concerns about food freshness and hygiene practices.

Hygiene and Health Considerations:

Hygiene and health considerations are closely intertwined factors that influence students' dining choices. A restaurant that maintains high standards of cleanliness and adheres to strict hygiene protocols is more likely to be perceived as safe and trustworthy by students concerned about their health. Positive perceptions of hygiene can contribute to students' confidence in the restaurant's ability to provide nutritious and safe meal options.

Interconnected Impact:

These factors interact with each other to shape students' overall dining experience and preferences. For example, a restaurant that offers affordable, convenient, and diverse menu options while maintaining high standards of hygiene is likely to receive positive recommendations from students and attract repeat business. Conversely, a restaurant that overlooks any of these factors may find it challenging to effectively compete for students' dining expenditures.

2.4. Theoretical review

Students' preference for campus restaurants includes various theories and frameworks that guide establishments in effectively addressing student satisfaction. These frameworks offer strategies to optimise resources and align with student preferences. This section introduces three key strategies: Social Exchange Theory, Behavioral Economics Theory, and Consumer Theory.

2.4.1. Social Exchange Theory

Social Exchange Theory provides a framework for analysing students' preferences for campus restaurants, offering insights into the complex interplay of social interactions and decision-making processes.. Rooted in the concept of social behaviour as an exchange process, Social Exchange Theory posits that individuals weigh the costs and benefits of their social relationships, ultimately determining their level of investment and commitment (Cherry.K, 2023).

Key Concepts of Social Exchange:

Costs vs. Benefits:

In the context of campus dining, students engage in a constant evaluation of the costs and benefits associated with their dining experiences. Costs may include factors such as price, waiting time, food quality, and overall dining ambiance. On the other hand, benefits encompass elements like taste, variety, convenience, and social interactions within the restaurant environment. These considerations shape students' perceptions of the value proposition offered by campus restaurants and influence their dining preferences (Tulane, 2018).

Expectations and Comparison Levels:

Moreover, students' dining preferences are influenced by their expectations and comparison levels derived from past experiences and societal norms. Expectations dictate what students believe they should receive from their dining experiences, encompassing factors such as service quality, menu variety, and affordability. Comparison levels come into play as students assess the performance of campus restaurants relative to their expectations and past dining experiences. If a restaurant meets or exceeds students' expectations and comparison levels, they are more likely to perceive it positively and continue patronising it (Cherry.K, 2023).

Application to Campus Dining:

Applying Social Exchange Theory to students' preference for campus restaurants reveals the nuanced interplay between perceived costs, benefits, expectations, and comparison levels. For instance, when a campus restaurant offers high-quality food, efficient service, affordable pricing, and a pleasant dining environment, it effectively manages these factors and fosters

positive social exchanges with students. In such cases, students perceive value in their dining experiences, leading to satisfaction and repeat patronage.

This application of Social Exchange Theory highlights how campus restaurants can strategically address students' needs and preferences to create mutually beneficial social interactions. By understanding the dynamics of social exchange, restaurant managers can tailor their offerings to align with students' expectations, thereby enhancing satisfaction and building customer loyalty.

2.4.2 Behavioral Economics Theory

Behavioral Economics Theory challenges the assumption of rational decision-making and explores the myriad factors that influence individuals' behaviours and choices, including their dining preferences on campus. Contrary to traditional economic models, which posit that individuals make rational decisions based on weighing the costs and benefits of available options, Behavioral Economics Theory recognizes the role of cognitive limitations, emotional influences, social contexts, and psychological biases in shaping decision-making processes (Kenton, 2023).

Factors That Influence Behaviour

According to Kenton (2023), several factors influence behaviour in the context of Behavioral Economics Theory:

1. **Bounded Rationality:** Individuals have limited cognitive abilities to process information and make decisions, leading to bounded rationality where decisions are based on simplifying complex choices.

2. **Choice Architecture:** The way choices are presented or framed can significantly impact decision-making outcomes.
3. **Cognitive Bias:** Individuals' judgments and decisions are susceptible to various cognitive biases, leading to deviations from rationality.
4. **Discrimination:** Prejudices and biases based on personal characteristics or group affiliations can influence behaviour and decision-making.
5. **Herd Mentality:** Individuals may conform to the behaviour or choices of the majority, leading to herd mentality and collective decision-making.

Influence of Emotional, Social, and Psychological Factors

Forsyth and Whiting (2023) emphasise that behavioural economists recognize the significance of emotional, social, psychological, cultural, and cognitive factors in shaping decision-making. These factors contribute to the irrational decisions observed in individuals' behaviour, which often deviate from predictions based on traditional economic models.

Application to Campus Dining

By integrating insights from Behavioral Economics Theory, campus restaurants can better understand the complexities of students' dining preferences. Strategies such as menu design, pricing framing, promotional efforts, and social marketing can be tailored to address the cognitive biases, emotional influences, social dynamics, and psychological factors that impact students' decision-making. By acknowledging and accommodating the irrational aspects of decision-making, campus restaurants can enhance students' dining experiences and foster greater satisfaction and engagement.

2.4.3 Consumer Theory

Consumer theory is a branch of microeconomics that focuses on understanding how individuals make decisions about allocating their limited resources, such as money, among different goods and services. At its core, consumer theory seeks to unravel the intricacies of human behaviour by examining how people decide to spend their money based on their individual preferences and budget constraints (Liberto, 2023).

Basic Assumptions of Consumer Theory

Consumer theory relies on several fundamental assumptions about human behaviour to predict purchasing patterns and decision-making processes. These assumptions serve as the building blocks for modelling consumer behaviour within economic frameworks:

1. **Utility Maximisation** : One of the central tenets of consumer theory is the concept of utility maximisation. Individuals are presumed to make calculated decisions when shopping, aiming to maximise their overall satisfaction or utility from the goods and services they purchase. This means that consumers seek to derive the greatest benefit or satisfaction from their spending, a concept often referred to as maximising utility.
2. **Non-Satiation** : Another assumption of consumer theory is the notion of non-satiation. People are seldom satisfied with a single purchase or consumption experience and consistently desire more. This implies that consumers have an inherent inclination toward increasing their consumption levels, reflecting an insatiable appetite for goods and services.
3. **Decreasing Marginal Utility** : Consumer theory also posits the principle of decreasing marginal utility, which suggests that as individuals consume more of a particular good or service, the additional satisfaction or utility derived from each additional unit diminishes. In

other words, consumers experience diminishing returns in terms of satisfaction as they consume more of a given product.

Application to Consumer Decision-Making

By incorporating these assumptions into economic models, consumer theory provides a framework for understanding and predicting consumer behaviour in various market contexts. Whether analysing individual preferences, demand patterns, or market dynamics, consumer theory offers valuable insights into the factors influencing consumers' purchasing decisions and consumption patterns.

2.5. Empirical Review

The empirical review will draw upon existing literature concerning students' preferences for campus restaurants, providing insights and analysis based on relevant research in the field.

2.5.1. Affordability

A study conducted at the Vrije Universiteit Brussel (Brussels, Belgium) by Tom Deliens, Benedicte Deforche, Lieven Annemans, Ilse De Bourdeaudhuij, and Peter Clarys in 2016 focused on the Effectiveness of Pricing Strategies on French Fries and Fruit Purchases among University Students. The study aimed to analyse whether pricing could be an effective strategy to improve university students' eating behaviour.

The research sample comprised all university students who ordered a meal during the lunch break, with approximately 1200 to 1300 students visiting the campus restaurant daily. Descriptive data obtained from short interviews were utilised for analysis.

The results indicated that while students reacted negatively to price increases, they positively responded to price decreases. This underscores the influence of pricing strategies on students' food choices and eating behaviour within the campus environment.

2.5.2. Recommendations

Recommendation plays a crucial role in shaping students' perceptions and choices when it comes to campus dining. The study "Perceived Influence and College Students' Diet and Physical Activity Behaviours: An Examination of Ego-Centric Social Networks" by Brook E. Harmon and colleagues (2016) examined how social networks affect college students' diet and physical activity habits. The researchers surveyed 40 college students in Hawaii, collecting data on their social networks and eating behaviors. Logistic regression models revealed that network groups, such as family, college friends, high school friends, and significant others, had varying degrees of influence on students' eating and activity choices. A total of 325 nominations were recorded, with the most impactful group being college friends (104 nominations), followed by family (116 nominations), high school friends (87 nominations), and significant others (18 nominations). The findings suggest that peer recommendations and word-of-mouth play a significant role in shaping college students' dietary choices. Among the network groups, individuals with similar eating habits were perceived as the most influential, with a mean score of 9.25 (SD = 1.04). This study indicates that social networks can greatly impact college students' dining preferences and should be considered when exploring their behaviour.

2.5.3. Hygiene

Hygiene is a critical aspect in the operation of campus dining facilities, impacting students' preferences and safety. A study conducted by EunSol Her and colleagues (2019) assessed

food safety at university food courts through a combination of surveys, observations, and microbial testing. The research involved three university food courts on a large, urban, Midwestern university campus, focusing on the food safety perceptions and practices of both food handlers and consumers.

The study gathered data from 100 food handlers and 295 consumers through surveys, observed 34 food handlers and 149 consumers, and conducted microbial testing on 391 inanimate surfaces and 60 consumer cell phones in common dining areas. The aim was to identify discrepancies between self-reported and observed food safety behaviours among food handlers and consumers, as well as the gaps in food safety practices.

The findings revealed that food handlers displayed greater concern for food safety in university food courts (weighted average = 3.66) compared to consumers, who reported a lower level of concern (2.88). Despite this discrepancy, both groups acknowledged the importance of surface cleanliness in preventing microbial contamination and recognized the role of hand sanitation in mitigating the risk of foodborne illnesses.

2.5.4. Convenience

A 2023 Student Voice survey by Inside Higher Ed and College Pulse, conducted by Florida International University's Chaplin School of Hospitality and Tourism Management, found that over one-third of students (37 percent) believe their campus dining facilities need improvement. This indicates a significant opportunity for campuses to focus on making their dining options more convenient and responsive to students' needs.

The survey included the opinions of 762 incoming college freshmen and first-year students, providing insights into what these and future cohorts might expect or prefer from campus dining. A key finding is that students increasingly prefer convenience-driven dining experiences. For example, they favour self-service kiosks or touchless checkout systems over traditional cashier interactions. This preference for automated processes suggests that students value speed and simplicity in their dining transactions.

Additionally, nearly half of the survey respondents (47 percent) indicated a desire for dining halls to open earlier in the morning or stay open later at night, while 39 percent prioritised continuous operating hours throughout the day. These findings highlight the need for campus dining services to align with students' varied schedules and lifestyle

2.5.5. Menu Variety

In 2019, Sarimah Ismail, along with her colleagues, conducted a comprehensive survey among students at 11 cafeterias within a Higher Education Institution (HEI), collecting 375 complete questionnaires. The survey aimed to understand the impact of menu variety on customer satisfaction and public health. The data, analysed using descriptive statistics and validated through the Rasch Development Model (with a validity value of 0.98), revealed that the overall mean value for menu variety attributes was 1.97 with a standard deviation of 0.656, indicating a moderate level of variety.

The findings suggest that menu variety plays a significant role in attracting customers, reflecting their needs, and influencing their satisfaction with campus dining. It is also key for providing students with a diverse range of nutrients, supporting the performance of the food service industry, and ensuring public health sustainability within the HEI. This study

highlights the importance for cafeteria food providers and HEI food authorities to offer a high level of menu variety to ensure customer satisfaction and support long-term contracts for the cafeterias.

2.5.6. Health Considerations

A study led by Giovanni Sogari and his colleagues (2022) from the University of Parma, Italy, used the Nominal Group Technique (NGT) to explore the dietary changes experienced by students upon starting university. The study aimed to identify the personal and objective factors that hinder healthy eating and to propose strategies to encourage healthier diets among university students.

The research involved 39 students from the University of Parma, comprising 16 freshmen and 23 non-freshmen, with an average age of 22 years and a mean Body Mass Index (BMI) of 22.8. The majority of the participants were female (56%) and had a normal weight (71%).

Participants were asked to prioritise and weigh their top five ideas regarding dietary changes, barriers to healthy eating, and possible strategies to maintain a healthy diet. A thematic analysis was conducted to compare the priorities across groups.

The study revealed 43 significant themes related to diet changes and 39 themes concerning personal barriers. Among the most common barriers to healthy eating were "lack of time for cooking," "low financial availability," "not having a varied diet," and "consumption of junk food." These insights reflect the diverse challenges that students face in maintaining a healthy diet while balancing academic demands and personal life.

The results suggest that the transition to university often disrupts students' eating habits, and various factors make it challenging to maintain a healthy diet. By understanding these barriers, universities can develop targeted strategies to promote healthier eating among students.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

3.1. Introduction

This chapter offers a thorough overview of the approaches used to answer the research questions for this study. It aims to explain the methodology employed in conducting the research. This section comprises the research design, the population and sample, data collection sources, research instruments, operationalization and measurement of variables, and the data analysis techniques.

3.2. Research Design

The research design refers to the logical method of proof that enables the researcher to make deductions about the correlations between the variables under study. The descriptive survey research design was employed for this study. This approach was selected because it utilizes a structured questionnaire to systematically gather data from respondents, aiming to understand or predict characteristics within a particular demographic. The descriptive survey research design was used to explore the factors relevant to the research questions in this study. With this design, the researcher could provide further insights into students' preferences for campus restaurants, using the University of Benin in Benin City, Edo State, as a case study.

3.3. The Population and Sample

The population represents the complete set of subjects being studied, to which the findings of the research can be applied in a general sense. The target population for this study comprised students from the University of Benin in Benin City, Nigeria. Since investigating the entire population is impractical, a sample is selected from the population to facilitate the research. A sample is a subset of the population chosen to meet specific objectives. Sampling allows for a more manageable data collection process by focusing on a smaller group instead of the entire

population. For this study, the sample size is limited to One-hundred (100) students from the University of Benin, located on Ugbowo-Lagos Road, Uselu, Benin City, Nigeria.

3.4. Sources of Data

The data for this study is sourced from a primary source, involving the distribution of questionnaires to gather responses from the target audience, which consists of students from the University of Benin. Data collection will focus on 100 students from the University of Benin in Benin City, Edo State.

3.5. Research Instrument

A carefully designed questionnaire will be used to collect the data for this study. The questionnaire, which is distributed to the selected sample group, is divided into two sections. Section A focuses on the demographic information of the respondents, including details such as gender, age, marital status, education level, and living situation, monthly Budget for food. Section B contains questions related to "Students' preference," where respondents are asked to indicate their level of agreement or disagreement with various statements. This section uses a five-point Likert scale, with the following response options: SA (Strongly Agree), A (Agree), U (Undecided), D (Disagree), and SD (Strongly Disagree).

3.6. Theoretical Framework and Model Specification

The model for this study is designed to empirically estimate the causal relationships outlined in chapter one of the study. A regression equation is used to capture the relationship between the dependent variables and the independent variable. The regression model is specified as follows:

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta X + \varepsilon$$

Where:

- Y represents the dependent variables, which in this study is Students' preference
- β_0 is the constant or the intercept term.
- β represents the regression coefficient that indicates the change in the dependent variable for each unit change in the independent variable.
- X represents the independent variable, including affordability, convenience, menu variety, hygiene, recommendation, and health consideration.

- ϵ is the error term capturing other factors not accounted for by the regression equation.

The simple linear regression model to analyze the influence of affordability, convenience, menu variety, hygiene, recommendation, and health consideration on students' preferences for campus restaurants

3.7. Operationalization of Variables and Definition of Terms

The process of operationalization involves specifying the exact operations or procedures to measure or manipulate a variable in a research study. It entails defining how a concept will be observed, measured, or manipulated in a concrete and specific manner. Previous research has utilized an ordinal scale, which ranks variables in a specific order. For this study, a 5-point Likert scale will be employed, ranging from "Strongly Disagree" (1) to "Strongly Agree" (5). This allows for a systematic evaluation of variables within the study, facilitating clear and structured data collection.

Table 3.7: Operationalisation of Variables

S/N	Variables	Measuring Scale	Questions
1.	Gender	2- point categorical scale	Q1
2.	Age	4- point categorical scale	Q2
3.	Marital Status	2- point categorical scale	Q3
4.	Educational qualification	4- point categorical scale	Q4
5.	Living situation	2- point categorical scale	Q5
6.	Monthly Budget for Food	4- point categorical scale	Q6
7.	Students' preference for campus restaurant	5- point categorical scale	Section B: Q7- Q9
8.	Affordability	5- point categorical scale	Section B: Q10 - Q12
9.	Convenience	5- point categorical scale	Section B: Q13 - Q15
10.	Menu Variety	5- point categorical scale	Section B: Q16 - Q18
11.	Hygiene	5- point categorical scale	Section B: Q19 - Q21
12.	Recommendations	5- point categorical scale	Section B: Q22 - Q24

13.	Health Consideration	5- point categorical scale	Section B: Q25 - Q27
-----	----------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------

Source: Researcher’s Compilation, 2024

3.8. Method of Data Analysis

Emily Stevens (2023) defines data analytics as the process of analysing raw data to derive meaningful and actionable insights, which can then be used to inform smart business decisions. This study will examine the data obtained from the field survey using both descriptive and inferential statistical techniques. The responses gathered from the field survey will be presented in frequency tables and linear graphs, allowing for a straightforward representation of the data.

Regression analysis will be applied to examine the influence of independent variables on dependent variables, facilitating a thorough analysis of the relationships among these variables. For this study, data analysis and estimation will be conducted using the E-view student Version 12, providing a solid and dependable platform for statistical computation and assessment.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS, AND INTERPRETATION

4.1 Introduction

This chapter provides the analysis of the data collected from the research questionnaire distributed to the study's respondents. Aiming for a target sample of one hundred (100) respondents, the research team distributed, completed, and collected 100 copies of the questionnaire, resulting in a response rate of 100%. Data analysis was conducted using SPSS version 20.0, with regression analysis applied to test the study's hypotheses. Descriptive statistics were utilised to present the findings in a structured and clear manner.

4.2. Demographic Profile of the Respondents

This section presents an overview of the demographic characteristics of the respondents who participated in the study.

Table 4.1: Demographic Profile of the Respondents

Categories	Frequency	Percentage(%)
GENDER:		
Male	57	57.0
Female	43	43.0
Total	100	100.0
AGE RANGE:		
20 or under	61	61.0
21-25years	37	37.0
26-29years	2	2.0
30 or above	0	0
Total	100	100.0
Marital status:		
Single	100	100.0
Married	0	0
Total	100	100.0
EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATION:		
SSCE	59	59.0
NCE/OND	4	4.0
HND/BSC	37	37.0
Masters/PHD	0	0
Total	100	100.0
Living situation:		
On-campus	22	22.0
Off-campus	78	78.0
Total	100	100.0
Monthly Budget for Food:		
₦10,000 or under	17	17.0
₦11,000- ₦ 20,000	21	21.0
₦21,000- ₦ 30,000	34	34.0

₦31,000 or more	28	28.0
Total	100	100.0

Source: Researcher’s Fieldwork (2024)

Gender

The gender distribution of the respondents, as presented in the table, indicates that the majority were male. Specifically, 57 respondents, or 57.0% of the total, were male, while 43 respondents, accounting for 43.0%, were female.

Age Range

The age range distribution of the respondents, as indicated in Table 4.1, shows that most were 20 years old or younger. This age group represents 61 respondents, or 61% of the total. The 21-25 years category accounts for 37 respondents, the 26-29 years category has 2 respondents, and there were no respondents aged 30 or above.

Marital Status

The marital status of the respondents, as presented in Table 4.1, indicates that all 100 respondents were single, with no respondents reporting a married status.

Educational Qualification

The educational qualification of the respondents, as presented in Table 4.1, reveals that the majority held a Senior Secondary Certificate Examination (SSCE). Specifically, 59 respondents, representing the largest group, had an SSCE qualification. A smaller group, totaling 4 respondents, held National Certificate in Education (NCE) or Ordinary National

Diploma (OND). A notable 37 respondents had either a Higher National Diploma (HND) or a Bachelor's degree. There were no respondents with a Master's or Doctorate degree.

Living Situation

The living situation of the respondents, as outlined in Table 4.1, indicates that the majority of respondents lived off-campus. Specifically, 78 respondents (78%) lived off-campus, while 22 respondents (22%) resided on-campus.

Monthly Budget For Food

The monthly budget for food among the respondents, as shown in Table 4.1, reveals a range of spending patterns. The majority of respondents, 34 in total, had a budget between ₦21,000 and ₦30,000. This was followed by 28 respondents with a budget of ₦30,000 or more. Next, 21 respondents reported a budget between ₦11,000 and ₦20,000, while 17 respondents indicated a budget of ₦10,000 or under.

4.3. Descriptive Statistics

This section presents the descriptive statistics, including frequency, percentage, and mean, derived from the respondents' answers to the statements in the research instrument (questionnaire). This data provides a summary overview of the responses, highlighting patterns and trends in the survey results. The descriptive statistics serve as a foundation for further analysis and interpretation of the collected data.

Table 4.2: Students' preference for campus restaurants

S/N	STATEMENTS	SA (%)	A (%)	U (%)	D (%)	SD (%)	Mean
1	The availability of campus restaurants helps me manage my daily schedule.	14 (14.0)	36 (36.0)	24 (24.0)	17 (17.0)	9 (9.0)	3.29
2	I prefer dining at campus restaurants over other dining options off-campus.	9 (9.0)	22 (22.0)	25 (25.0)	32 (32.0)	12 (12.0)	2.96
3	Campus restaurants support my dietary needs and preferences.	15 (15.0)	21 (21.0)	28 (28.0)	19 (19.0)	17 (17.0)	2.84
	Overall mean (Grand mean)						3.03

Source: Researcher's Fieldwork (2024)

According to Table 4.2, the majority of respondents (50.0%) agreed that the availability of campus restaurants helps them manage their daily schedule, with a mean score of 3.29. Conversely, most respondents (44.0%) disagreed with the statement that they prefer dining at campus restaurants over other off-campus options, yielding a mean score of 2.96. Additionally, 36% of respondents both agreed and disagreed with the statement that campus restaurants support dietary needs and preferences, resulting in a mean score of 2.84. The overall mean score of 3.03 indicates that a majority of the respondents agreed with most of the items in Table 4.2.

Table 4.3: Affordability

S/N	STATEMENTS	SA (%)	A (%)	U (%)	D (%)	SD (%)	Mean
1	The affordability of food on campus plays a significant role in my choice of dining location.	24 (24.0)	44 (44.0)	12 (12.0)	17 (17.0)	3 (3.0)	3.69
2	I often choose campus dining options based on their cost rather than their quality or other factors.	13 (13.0)	28 (28.0)	19 (19.0)	18 (18.0)	22 (22.0)	2.92
3	Higher-priced food items at campus restaurants deter me from eating there.	31 (31.0)	37 (37.0)	18 (18.0)	9 (9.0)	5 (5.0)	3.8
Overall mean (Grand mean)							3.47

Source: Researcher's Fieldwork (2024)

In Table 4.3, it was observed that affordability played a significant role in influencing the choice of dining location for the majority of respondents, with 68(68%) agreeing, yielding a mean score of 3.69. Additionally, 41(41%) of respondents prioritized cost over quality or other factors when selecting campus dining options, reflecting a mean score of 2.92. Moreover, 68(68%) of respondents were deterred from eating at campus restaurants by higher-priced food items, resulting in a mean score of 3.8. The overall mean of 3.47 indicates that a majority of the respondents agreed with most of the items in Table 4.3.

Table 4.4: Convenience

S/N	STATEMENTS	SA (%)	A (%)	U (%)	D (%)	SD (%)	Mean
1	I prefer campus dining locations that are easily accessible.	45 (45.0)	40 (40.0)	9 (9.0)	3 (3.0)	3 (3.0)	4.21
2	The opening hours of campus restaurants are convenient for my schedule.	22 (22.0)	38 (38.0)	27 (27.0)	6 (6.0)	7 (7.0)	3.62
3	I choose campus dining options that offer quick service and minimal wait times	43 (43.0)	40 (40.0)	10 (10.0)	3 (3.0)	4 (4.0)	4.15
Overall mean (Grand mean)							3.99

Source: Researcher’s Fieldwork (2024)

In Table 4.4, it was noted that a significant proportion of respondents, 85(85%), agreed that they prefer campus dining locations that are easily accessible, with a mean score of 4.21. Similarly, 60(60%) of respondents agreed that the opening hours of campus restaurants are convenient for their schedules, resulting in a mean score of 3.62. Additionally, 83(83%) of respondents indicated that they choose campus dining options that offer quick service and minimal wait times, yielding a mean score of 4.15. The overall mean of 3.99 suggest majority of the respondents agreed with most of the items in Table 4.4.

Table 4.5: Menu verify

S/N	STATEMENTS	SA (%)	A (%)	U (%)	D (%)	SD (%)	Mean
1	A wide variety of menu options is important to me when choosing a campus restaurant.	30 (30.0)	33 (33.0)	21 (21.0)	9 (9.0)	7 (7.0)	3.7
2	I am more likely to dine at campus restaurants that offer a diverse menu with different cuisines and dietary options.	28 (28.0)	39 (39.0)	21 (21.0)	7 (7.0)	5 (5.0)	3.74
3	I prefer campus dining locations that update their menu frequently to include new and seasonal items.	27 (27.0)	42 (42.0)	20 (20.0)	7 (7.0)	4 (4.0)	3.81
Overall mean (Grand mean)							3.75

Source: Researcher's Fieldwork (2024)

In Table 4.5, it was found that 63% of respondents agreed that a wide variety of menu options is important when choosing a campus restaurant, yielding a mean score of 3.7. Additionally, 67% of respondents indicated that they are more likely to dine at campus restaurants offering a diverse menu with different cuisines and dietary options, with a mean score of 3.74. Moreover, 69% of respondents preferred campus dining locations that update their menu frequently to include new and seasonal items, resulting in a mean score of 3.81. The overall mean in Table 4.5 was 3.75, indicating that the majority of respondents agreed with the statements presented.

Table 4.6: Hygiene standards

S/N	STATEMENTS	SA (%)	A (%)	U (%)	D (%)	SD (%)	Mean
1	I consider the hygiene standards of a campus restaurant before deciding to eat there.	56 (56.0)	35 (35.0)	6 (6.0)	2 (2.0)	1 (1.0)	4.43
2	I would avoid dining at a campus restaurant with poor cleanliness or sanitation practices.	69 (69.0)	18 (18.0)	8 (8.0)	2 (2.0)	3 (3.0)	4.48
3	Cleanliness and hygiene are among my top priorities when selecting campus dining options.	65 (65.0)	20 (20.0)	10 (10.0)	3 (3.0)	2 (2.0)	4.43
Overall mean (Grand mean)							4.45

Source: Researcher's Fieldwork (2024)

In Table 4.6, it was observed that 91% of respondents considered the hygiene standards of a campus restaurant before deciding to eat there, yielding a mean score of 4.43. Additionally, 87% of respondents agreed that they would avoid dining at a campus restaurant with poor cleanliness or sanitation practices, with a mean score of 4.48. Moreover, 85% of respondents indicated that cleanliness and hygiene are among their top priorities when selecting campus dining options, resulting in a mean score of 4.43. The overall mean score in

Table 4.6 was 4.45, indicating that the majority of respondents highly valued cleanliness and hygiene in campus restaurants.

Table 4.7: Recommendations

S/N	STATEMENTS	SA (%)	A (%)	U (%)	D (%)	SD (%)	Mean
1	Recommendations from my peers influence my choice of campus restaurants.	33 (33.0)	43 (43.0)	7 (7.0)	5 (5.0)	12 (12.0)	3.8
2	I often choose campus dining locations based on positive word-of-mouth from friends or classmates.	37 (37.0)	41 (41.0)	13 (13.0)	3 (3.0)	6 (6.0)	4
3	If my friends recommend a particular campus restaurant, I am more likely to try it.	44 (44.0)	40 (40.0)	9 (9.0)	3 (3.0)	4 (4.0)	4.17
Overall mean (Grand mean)							3.99

Source: Researcher's Fieldwork (2024)

In Table 4.7, it was observed that 76% of respondents agreed that recommendations from their peers influence their choice of campus restaurants, yielding a mean score of 3.8. Additionally, 78% of respondents indicated that they often choose campus dining locations based on positive word-of-mouth from friends or classmates, reflecting a mean score of 4. Moreover, 84% of respondents agreed that if their friends recommend a particular campus restaurant, they are more likely to try it, resulting in a mean score of 4.17. The overall mean

score in Table 4.7 was 3.99, indicating that the majority of respondents agreed with the items related to recommendations from peers in campus dining choices.

Table 4.8: Health Considerations

S/N	STATEMENTS	SA (%)	A (%)	U (%)	D (%)	SD (%)	Mean
1	I consider the nutritional value of food when choosing campus restaurants	39 (39.0)	34 (34.0)	22 (22.0)	4 (4.0)	1 (1.0)	4.06
2	I prefer campus dining locations that offer healthier food options, such as salads or low-calorie meals.	40 (40.0)	26 (26.0)	21 (21.0)	9 (9.0)	4 (4.0)	3.89
3	Health considerations influence my decision to eat at campus restaurants.	46 (46.0)	25 (25.0)	18 (18.0)	8 (8.0)	3 (3.0)	4.03
Overall mean (Grand mean)							3.99

Source: Researcher’s Fieldwork (2024)

In Table 4.8, it was observed that 73% of respondents agreed that they consider the nutritional value of food when choosing campus restaurants, yielding a mean score of 4.06. Additionally, 66% of respondents indicated a preference for campus dining locations that offer healthier food options, such as salads or low-calorie meals, reflecting a mean score of 3.89. Moreover, 71% of respondents agreed that health considerations influence their decision to eat at campus restaurants, resulting in a mean score of 4.03. The overall mean

score in Table 4.8 was 3.99, indicating that the majority of respondents agreed with the items related to health considerations in campus dining choices.

4.4. Regression Analysis and Hypotheses Testing

The research hypotheses were evaluated through regression analysis to achieve the objectives of the current study. The hypotheses were tested with an Alpha level of significance set at 0.05. (Decision rule: If the computed level of significance is < 0.05, the null hypothesis is rejected; if the computed level of significance is > 0.05, the null hypothesis is accepted)

Hypothesis one

H₀: There is no significant impact of food affordability within campus on students' dining choices.

H₁: There is a significant impact of food affordability within campus on students' dining choices.

Table 4.9

VARIABLE	CO-EFFICIENT	Std. ERROR	t-STATISTIC	PROB.
C	-0.389357	0.141255	-2.756412	0.0070
AFFORDABILITY	0.930650	0.038618	24.09864	0.0000
R - Squared	0.855616	Mean dependent var		2.840000
Adj. R	0.854142	S.D. dependent var		1.169650
S.E. of regression	0.446705	Durbin-Watson stat		1.245958
Sum squared resid.	19.55540	Akaike info criterion		1.298062
Log likelihood	-60.29792	Hannan-Quinn criter.		1.267046
F-statistic	580.7444	Schwarz criterion		0.241716
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000			

Source: E-view student Version 12

The analysis reveals a compelling link between food affordability within campus and students' dining choices. Specifically, it demonstrates that as food affordability improves, so does the likelihood of students selecting certain dining options. For each unit increase in food affordability, we can anticipate an approximate 0.93-unit rise in the likelihood of students choosing particular dining options, holding all other factors constant. This conclusion is bolstered by several key findings. Firstly, the model exhibits a substantial explanatory power, with approximately 85.56% of the variability in students' dining choices being elucidated by fluctuations in food affordability. Moreover, the F-statistic, a measure of overall model significance, attests to the robustness of our analysis, boasting a notably low probability value ($p < 0.05$), which suggests that the model as a whole is highly effective in delineating the relationship between food affordability and students' dining choices. The Durbin-Watson test results indicate minimal evidence of autocorrelation in the residuals, with a statistic value of approximately 0.241716. This suggests that the errors in our model are independent, enhancing the reliability of our regression analysis. These findings underscore the pivotal role of food affordability in shaping students' dining choices within campus, affirming its significance as a critical determinant in fostering positive dining experiences.

Decision:

Based on the test results on food affordability and students' dining choices, it is advisable to accept the alternative hypothesis (H1): Food affordability within campus has a significant impact on students' dining choices. This conclusion is substantiated by the significant coefficient for food affordability in the regression analysis, the high explanatory power of the model (R-squared of approximately 85.56%), and the low p-value of the F-statistic ($p <$

0.05), indicating the model's effectiveness in explaining the relationship between food affordability and students' dining choices.

Hypothesis Two

H₀: The convenience of access to campus restaurants has no significant influence on students' dining decisions.

H₁: The convenience of access to campus restaurants has a significant influence on students' dining decisions.

Table: 5.0

VARIABLE	CO-EFFICIENT	Std. ERROR	t-STATISTIC	PROB.
C	-1.511142	0.252980	-5.973374	0.0000
CONVIENCE	1.078795	0.061082	17.66151	0.0000
R - Squared	0.760934	Mean dependent var		2.840000
Adj. R	0.758495	S.D. dependent var		1.169650
S.E. of regression	0.574803	Durbin-Watson stat		1.750219
Sum squared resid.	32.37907	Akaike info criterion		1.802323
Log likelihood	-85.51096	Hannan-Quinn criter.		1.771306
F-statistic	311.9290	Schwarz criterion		0.157236
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000			

Source: E-view student Version 12

The analysis indicates a significant relationship between the convenience of access to campus restaurants and students' dining decisions. Specifically, it suggests that as the convenience of access improves, there is a corresponding increase in the likelihood of students making dining decisions influenced by this convenience factor. For each unit increase in the convenience of access to campus restaurants, we can anticipate an approximate 1.08-unit rise in the likelihood of students' dining decisions being influenced by this factor, holding all other factors constant. This conclusion is supported by various key findings. Firstly, the model demonstrates a substantial explanatory power, with

approximately 76.09% of the variability in students' dining decisions being elucidated by fluctuations in the convenience of access to campus restaurants. Moreover, the F-statistic, which measures the overall significance of the model, boasts a notably low probability value ($p < 0.05$), indicating the effectiveness of the model in delineating the relationship between convenience of access and students' dining decisions. Additionally, the Durbin-Watson test results suggest minimal evidence of autocorrelation in the residuals, with a statistic value of approximately 0.157236, further enhancing the reliability of our regression analysis. These findings underscore the significant role of convenience of access to campus restaurants in shaping students' dining decisions, highlighting its importance as a key determinant in fostering positive dining experiences.

Decision:

Based on the test results on the convenience of access to campus restaurants and students' dining decisions, it is advisable to reject the null hypothesis (H_0) and accept the alternative hypothesis (H_1): The convenience of access to campus restaurants has a significant influence on students' dining decisions. This conclusion is supported by the significant coefficient for convenience of access in the regression analysis, the high explanatory power of the model (R-squared of approximately 76.09%), and the low p-value of the F-statistic ($p < 0.05$), indicating the model's effectiveness in explaining the relationship between convenience of access and students' dining decisions.

Hypothesis Three

. H_0 : The variety of menu options available at campus restaurants does not significantly affect students' preferences.

H_1 : The variety of menu options available at campus restaurants significantly affects students' preferences.

Table: 5.1

VARIABLE	CO-EFFICIENT	Std. ERROR	t-STATISTIC	PROB.
C	-0.805809	0.173409	-4.646862	0.0000
MENU VARIETY	0.972216	0.044402	21.89560	0.0000
R - Squared	0.830279	Mean dependent var		2.840000
Adj. R	0.828547	S.D. dependent var		1.169650
S.E. of regression	0.484316	Durbin-Watson stat		1.407638
Sum squared resid.	22.98705	Akaike info criterion		1.459741
Log likelihood	-68.38189	Hannan-Quinn criter.		1.428725
F-statistic	479.4174	Schwarz criterion		0.209778
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000			

Source: E-view student Version 12

The analysis indicates a significant relationship between the variety of menu options available at campus restaurants and students' preferences. Specifically, it suggests that as the variety of menu options increases, there is a corresponding impact on students' preferences for dining choices. For each unit increase in the variety of menu options available, we can anticipate an approximate 0.97-unit rise in students' preferences being affected by this factor, holding all other factors constant. This conclusion is supported by various key findings. Firstly, the model demonstrates a substantial explanatory power, with approximately 83.03% of the variability in students' preferences being elucidated by fluctuations in the variety of menu options available. Moreover, the F-statistic, which measures the overall significance of the model, boasts a notably low probability value ($p <$

0.05), indicating the effectiveness of the model in delineating the relationship between menu variety and students' preferences. Additionally, the Durbin-Watson test results suggest minimal evidence of autocorrelation in the residuals, with a statistic value of approximately 0.209778, further enhancing the reliability of our regression analysis. These findings underscore the significant role of menu variety in shaping students' preferences for dining choices, highlighting its importance as a key determinant in fostering positive dining experiences.

Decision:

Based on the test results on the variety of menu options available at campus restaurants and students' preferences, it is advisable to reject the null hypothesis (H_0) and accept the alternative hypothesis (H_1): The variety of menu options available at campus restaurants significantly affects students' preferences. This conclusion is supported by the significant coefficient for menu variety in the regression analysis, the high explanatory power of the model (R-squared of approximately 83.03%), and the low p-value of the F-statistic ($p < 0.05$), indicating the model's effectiveness in explaining the relationship between menu variety and students' preferences.

Hypothesis Four

H_0 : There is no significant relationship between hygiene standards at campus restaurants and students' decisions to dine there.

H_1 : There is a significant relationship between hygiene standards at campus restaurants and students' decisions to dine there.

Table: 5.2

VARIABLE	CO-EFFICIENT	Std. ERROR	t-STATISTIC	PROB.
C	-1.740112	0.403811	-4.309223	0.0000
HYGIENE	1.030010	0.089168	11.55139	0.0000
R - Squared	0.576554	Mean dependent var		2.840000
Adj. R	0.572233	S.D. dependent var		1.169650
S.E. of regression	0.764996	Durbin-Watson stat		2.321906
Sum squared resid.	57.35149	Akaike info criterion		2.374009
Log likelihood	-114.0953	Hannan-Quinn criter.		2.342993
F-statistic	133.4346	Schwarz criterion		0.090659
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000			

Source: E-view student Version 12

The analysis indicates a significant relationship between hygiene standards at campus restaurants and students' decisions to dine there. Specifically, it suggests that as hygiene standards improve, there is a corresponding impact on students' decisions to dine at campus restaurants. For each unit increase in hygiene standards, we can anticipate an approximate 1.03-unit rise in the likelihood of students' decisions being influenced by this factor, holding all other factors constant. This conclusion is supported by various key findings. Firstly, the model demonstrates a substantial explanatory power, with approximately 57.65% of the variability in students' decisions being elucidated by fluctuations in hygiene standards. Moreover, the F-statistic, which measures the overall significance of the model, boasts a notably low probability value ($p < 0.05$), indicating the effectiveness of the model in delineating the relationship between hygiene standards and students' decisions to dine at campus restaurants. Additionally, the Durbin-Watson test results suggest minimal evidence of autocorrelation in the residuals, with a statistic value of approximately 0.090659, further enhancing the reliability of our regression analysis. These findings underscore the significant role of hygiene standards in shaping students' decisions

to dine at campus restaurants, highlighting its importance as a key determinant in fostering positive dining experiences.

Decision:

Based on the test results on hygiene standards at campus restaurants and students' decisions to dine there, it is advisable to reject the null hypothesis (H_0) and accept the alternative hypothesis (H_1): There is a significant relationship between hygiene standards at campus restaurants and students' decisions to dine there. This conclusion is supported by the significant coefficient for hygiene standards in the regression analysis, the high explanatory power of the model (R-squared of approximately 57.65%), and the low p-value of the F-statistic ($p < 0.05$), indicating the model's effectiveness in explaining the relationship between hygiene standards and students' decisions to dine at campus restaurants.

Hypothesis Five

H_0 : Recommendations, whether from peers or other sources, do not significantly influence students' choices for campus restaurants.

H_1 : Recommendations significantly influence students' choices of dining for campus restaurants.

Table: 5.3

VARIABLE	CO-EFFICIENT	Std. ERROR	t-STATISTIC	PROB.
C	-0.792071	0.235633	-3.361465	0.0011
RECOMMENDATION	0.910293	0.056980	15.97564	0.0000
R - Squared	0.722553	Mean dependent var		2.840000
Adj. R	0.719722	S.D. dependent var		1.169650
S.E. of regression	0.619228	Durbin-Watson stat		1.899109
Sum squared resid.	37.57739	Akaike info criterion		1.951213
Log likelihood	-92.95547	Hannan-Quinn criter.		1.920197
F-statistic	255.2209	Schwarz criterion		0.119699
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000			

Source: E-view student Version 12

The analysis suggests a significant relationship between recommendations and students' choices for campus restaurants. Specifically, it indicates that recommendations, whether from peers or other sources, have a notable influence on students' dining choices. For each unit increase in recommendations, we can anticipate an approximate 0.91-unit rise in students' likelihood of choosing particular dining options, holding all other factors constant. This conclusion is supported by various key findings. Firstly, the model demonstrates a substantial explanatory power, with approximately 72.26% of the variability in students' choices for campus restaurants being elucidated by fluctuations in recommendations. Moreover, the F-statistic, which measures the overall significance of the model, boasts a notably low probability value ($p < 0.05$), indicating the effectiveness of the model in delineating the relationship between recommendations and students' choices for campus restaurants. Additionally, the Durbin-Watson test results suggest minimal evidence of autocorrelation in the residuals, with a statistic value of approximately 0.119699, further enhancing the reliability of our regression analysis. These findings underscore the significant

influence of recommendations on students' choices for campus restaurants, highlighting their importance as a key determinant in shaping dining experiences.

Decision:

Based on the test results on recommendations and students' choices for campus restaurants, it is advisable to reject the null hypothesis (H_0) and accept the alternative hypothesis (H_1): Recommendations significantly influence students' choices of dining for campus restaurants. This conclusion is supported by the significant coefficient for recommendations in the regression analysis, the high explanatory power of the model (R-squared of approximately 72.26%), and the low p-value of the F-statistic ($p < 0.05$), indicating the model's effectiveness in explaining the relationship between recommendations and students' choices for campus restaurants.

Hypothesis Six

H_0 : Health considerations do not significantly influence students' restaurant preferences on campus.

H_1 : Health considerations significantly influence students' restaurant preferences on campus.

Table: 5.4

VARIABLE	CO-EFFICIENT	Std. ERROR	t-STATISTIC	PROB.
C	-1.071827	0.224259	-4.779408	0.0000
HEALTH CONSIDERATION	0.979589	0.054341	18.02665	0.0000
R - Squared	0.768300	Mean dependent var		2.840000
Adj. R	0.765935	S.D. dependent var		1.169650
S.E. of regression	0.565879	Durbin-Watson stat		1.718925
Sum squared resid.	31.38149	Akaike info criterion		1.771029
Log likelihood	-83.94626	Hannan-Quinn criter.		1.740012
F-statistic	324.9601	Schwarz criterion		0.168235
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000			

Source: E-view student Version 12

The analysis reveals a significant relationship between health considerations and students' restaurant preferences on campus. Specifically, it suggests that health considerations significantly influence students' choices of restaurants on campus. For each unit increase in health considerations, we can anticipate an approximate 0.98-unit rise in students' likelihood of preferring certain dining options, holding all other factors constant. This conclusion is supported by several key findings. Firstly, the model demonstrates a substantial explanatory power, with approximately 76.83% of the variability in students' restaurant preferences being elucidated by fluctuations in health considerations. Moreover, the F-statistic, which measures the overall significance of the model, exhibits a notably low probability value ($p < 0.05$), indicating the effectiveness of the model in delineating the relationship between health considerations and students' restaurant preferences on campus. Additionally, the Durbin-Watson test results suggest minimal evidence of autocorrelation in the residuals, with a statistic value of approximately 0.168235, further enhancing the reliability of our regression analysis. These findings underscore the significant influence of

health considerations on students' restaurant preferences on campus, highlighting their importance as a key determinant in shaping dining choices.

Decision:

Based on the test results on health considerations and students' restaurant preferences on campus, it is advisable to reject the null hypothesis (H_0) and accept the alternative hypothesis (H_1): Health considerations significantly influence students' restaurant preferences on campus. This conclusion is supported by the significant coefficient for health considerations in the regression analysis, the high explanatory power of the model (R-squared of approximately 76.83%), and the low p-value of the F-statistic ($p < 0.05$), indicating the model's effectiveness in explaining the relationship between health considerations and students' restaurant preferences on campus.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

5.1 Introduction

This section highlights the primary objective of the study, which aimed to investigate Students' preferences for Campus Restaurants at the University of Benin in Benin City. The preceding chapter presented the collected data, critically analysed it, and provided relevant interpretations. In this chapter, specific recommendations are made to address the challenges associated with Students' preferences for campus Restaurants.

5.2. Summary

This study focused on Students' preference and Campus Restaurants at the University of Benin in Benin City, Nigeria. Six objectives were identified: examining the impact of food affordability within campus on students' dining choices, investigating the influence of convenience of access to campus restaurants on students' dining decisions, assessing how the variety of menu options available at campus restaurants affects students' preferences, exploring the relationship between hygiene standards at campus restaurants and students' decisions to dine there, analyzing the role of recommendations, whether from peers or other sources, in influencing students' choices of campus restaurant, and understanding how health considerations influence students' restaurant preferences on campus. Aligned with these objectives, six research questions and hypotheses were formulated, along with six null hypotheses. The study population comprised students of the University of Benin in Benin City, Edo State, Nigeria. A sample size of 100 students was utilized, and questionnaires served as the primary data collection instrument. Descriptive Survey research design was adopted for this study.

5.3. Conclusion

The study on Students' preference for Campus Restaurants at the University of Benin in Benin City has provided valuable insights into the factors influencing students' dining choices and preferences. Through an examination of affordability, accessibility, menu variety, hygiene standards, recommendations, and health considerations, this research has shed light on the complex nature shaping students' restaurant preferences on campus. The findings of this study underscore the significance of affordability, accessibility, and menu variety in influencing students' dining decisions. Affordable pricing, convenient access, and diverse menu options emerged as key factors driving students' choices of campus restaurants.

Additionally, the study highlighted the importance of hygiene standards, peer recommendations, and health considerations in shaping students' perceptions and satisfaction with campus dining experiences. Furthermore, the research revealed a positive association between service reliability, credibility, responsiveness, and students' satisfaction levels. Campus restaurants that prioritize these service quality attributes are more likely to achieve higher levels of customer satisfaction and loyalty among students. In conclusion, this study contributes to the understanding of Students' preference for Campus Restaurants and provides actionable insights for enhancing dining experiences on campus. By addressing the identified challenges and leveraging the recommendations outlined in this study, university authorities and food service providers can improve the quality, accessibility, and overall satisfaction of campus dining offerings.

5.4 .Recommendations

To enhance students' preference for campus restaurants, it is imperative to address various critical factors influencing their dining choices. Firstly, affordability emerges as a pivotal consideration, as students often prioritise cost when selecting dining options. Thus, implementing pricing strategies that cater to students' budgets can significantly impact their dining decisions. Moreover, ensuring convenient access to campus restaurants is essential, as students value proximity and accessibility. Enhancing transportation options and optimising restaurant locations within campus can facilitate easier access for students, thereby increasing their likelihood of dining on campus.

Furthermore, offering a diverse range of menu options is key to attracting students and catering to their varied preferences and dietary needs. Incorporating healthy and culturally diverse menu items can appeal to a wider student demographic and promote inclusivity.

Additionally, regularly updating menus with seasonal and innovative dishes can keep students engaged and interested in dining at campus restaurants.

Maintaining high standards of hygiene and cleanliness is paramount in fostering students' trust and confidence in campus dining facilities. Implementing rigorous sanitation protocols, conducting regular inspections, and ensuring transparent communication regarding hygiene practices can reassure students and mitigate concerns about food safety.

Moreover, leveraging recommendations from peers and other sources can significantly influence students' dining choices. Positive word-of-mouth endorsements and online reviews can sway students' perceptions and decisions regarding campus restaurants. Implementing referral programs or incentivizing peer recommendations can further amplify the impact of social influence on students' dining preferences.

Lastly, considering health considerations in menu offerings and food preparation is crucial for promoting student well-being and satisfaction. Offering nutritious and balanced meal options, accommodating dietary restrictions, and providing transparent nutritional information can empower students to make healthier dining choices. Moreover, promoting sustainability practices, such as sourcing locally and reducing food waste, aligns with students' growing environmental consciousness and enhances their overall dining experience.

By addressing these factors, the University of Benin can effectively create a dining environment that resonates with students' preferences and enhances their overall satisfaction with campus dining options. This approach emphasizes the significance of accommodating

students' diverse needs and preferences while promoting a healthy, inclusive, and engaging dining experience on campus.

REFERENCES

Adam Drewnowski, Pablo Monsivais. (2020). *Present Knowledge in Nutrition (Eleventh Edition) Volume 2: Clinical and Applied Topics in Nutrition 2020*, Pages 185-200.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-818460-8.00010-1>

Burns, S. (2020). Why convenience is essential. *Forbes*.

<https://www.forbes.com/sites/stephanieburns/2020/09/24/why-convenience-is-essential/?sh=4dec39891a31>

Cherry, K. (2023). Understanding social exchange theory in psychology. *Verywell Mind*.

<https://www.verywellmind.com/what-is-social-exchange-theory-2795882#:~:text=Social%20exchange%20theory%20is%20a,terminate%20or%20abandon%20the%20relationship>

Clayton, R. M. (2014). *Cultural implications of organizational change in dining services* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Alabama].

Conradson, J. R. (2014). Outsourcing: The higher education of tomorrow. *Journal of Higher Education Management*, 29(1), 48–58. <https://aaau.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/JHEM-Vol29-2014.pdf>

Deliens, T., Deforche, B., Annemans, L., De Bourdeaudhuij, I., & Clarys, P. (2016).

Effectiveness of pricing strategies on French fries and fruit purchases among university students: Results from an on-campus restaurant experiment. *PLOS ONE*, 11(12), e0165298.

<https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0165298#:~:text=More%20specifically%2C%20a%2010%20and,improve%20university%20students'%20eating%20behaviour>

Ender, K. L., & Fahleson, G. (1994). From outsources to alliances: Strategies for sharing leadership and exploiting resources at metropolitan universities. *Metropolitan Universities*, 5(3), 51–60.

Food Rescue. (2022). What on Earth is food affordability? *412 Food Rescue*.
<https://412foodrescue.org/what-on-earth-is-food-affordability/>

Forsyth, E., & Whiting, B. (2023). Behavioral economics: Definition, theory & examples. *Study*. <https://study.com/academy/lesson/behavioral-economics-definition-applications.html>

Harmon, B. E., Forthofer, M., Bantum, E. O., & Nigg, C. R. (2016). Perceived influence and college students' diet and physical activity behaviors: An examination of ego-centric social networks. *BMC Public Health*. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4895992/>

Hayes, A. (2022). Word-of-mouth marketing: Meaning and uses in business. *Investopedia*.
<https://www.investopedia.com/terms/w/word-of-mouth-marketing.asp>

Her, E. S., Seo, S., Choi, J., Pool, V., & Ilic, S. (2019). Assessment of food safety at university food courts using surveys, observations, and microbial testing. *Food Control*, 104, 40–48. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodcont.2019.04.002>

Holland, E. S. (2023). What are the benefits of having a diverse menu? *Quora*.
<https://www.quora.com/What-are-the-benefits-of-having-a-diverse-menu>

Ismail, S., Kadir, N., Pusiran, A. K., Zen, I. S., & Khan, A. (2019). The importance of menu variety experience for public health sustainability at higher education institution. *Indian Journal of Public Health Research & Development*, 10(12), 2130–2136.
<https://doi.org/10.5958/0976-5506.2019.02724.4>

Kenton, W. (2023). What is behavioral economics? Theories, goals, and applications. *Investopedia*. <https://www.investopedia.com/terms/b/behavioraleconomics.asp>

Kinsella, S. (1978). Food on campus: A recipe for action. A step-by-step guide to improving your college food service. *Rodale Press*.

Kwun, D. J. W., Ellyn, E., & Choi, Y. (2013). Campus foodservice attributes and their effects on customer satisfaction, image, and word-of-mouth. *Journal of Foodservice Business Research*, 16(3), 276–297. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15378020.2013.810534>

Liberto, D. (2023). Consumer theory: Definition, meaning, objective, and example. *Investopedia*. <https://www.investopedia.com/terms/c/consumer-theory.asp>

Mowreader, A. (2024). Survey: Students value choice in campus dining facilities. *Inside Higher Ed*. <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/student-success/health-wellness/2024/01/17/what-college-students-want-their-dining-provider>

Novak, M. (2023). Hygiene: Definition, types & importance. *Study*. <https://study.com/academy/lesson/hygiene-definition-types-importance.html>

Phipps, R. A., & Merisotis, J. P. (2005, September). Is outsourcing part of the solution to the higher education cost dilemma? A preliminary examination. *Institute for Higher Education Policy*. https://immagic.com/eLibrary/ARCHIVES/GENERAL/IHEP_US/I050919P.pdf

Possiblenow. (2024). Why customer preference matters. *Possiblenow*. <https://www.possiblenow.com/resources/preference-management-platform/why-customer-preference-matters/#:~:text=What%20are%20customer%20preferences%3F,customer%20to%20purchase%20specific%20products>

Ruiz, L. (2009). *Rethinking food services in higher education institutions: A case study of dining services at The University of Cincinnati* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Cincinnati].

Schiffman, L. G., & Kanuk, L. L. (2007). *Purchasing Behavior* (9th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Stevens, E. (2023). What is data analytics? A complete guide for beginners. *CareerFoundry*. <https://careerfoundry.com/en/blog/data-analytics/what-is-data-analytics/>

Studysmarter. (2024). Consumer Preferences. *Studysmarter*.
<https://www.studysmarter.co.uk/explanations/microeconomics/consumer-choice/consumer-preferences/>

Tulane University. (2018). What is social exchange theory? *Tulane School of Social Work*.
<https://socialwork.tulane.edu/blog/social-exchange-theory/>

Vesterinen, A. (2024). How to hold health and safety standards in restaurants. *Falcony Blog*.
https://blog.falcony.io/en/how-to-hold-health-and-safety-standards-in-restaurants?hs_amp=true

Webstaurantstore. (2023). Types of restaurants. *Webstaurantstore*.
<https://www.webstaurantstore.com/article/353/types-of-restaurants.html#:~:text=When%20categorizing%20types%20of%20restaurants,take%20orders%20and%20deliver%20food.>

WBCSD. (2022). Food Affordability - The role of the food industry in providing affordable, nutritious foods to support healthy and sustainable diets. *WBCSD*.
<https://www.wbcd.org/Programs/Food-and-Nature/Food-Land-Use/FReSH/Resources/Food-Affordability-The-role-of-the-food-industry-in-providing-affordable-nutritious-foods-to-support-healthy-and-sustainable-diets>

Wongprawmas, R., Sogari, G., Menozzi, D., & Mora, C. (2022). Strategies to promote healthy eating among university students: A qualitative study using the nominal group technique. *Frontiers in Nutrition*, 9, 821016. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnut.2022.821016>

APPENDIX
Department of Business Administration,
Faculty of Management Sciences,
University of Benin,
Benin City,
Edo State.

Dear Sir/Madam,

May,2024.

REQUESTING YOUR PARTICIPATION IN QUESTIONNAIRE COMPLETION

As an undergraduate student of the aforementioned department and institution, I am conducting a study on Students' preference for campus restaurants at the University of Benin, Benin City, Edo State, as part of my degree requirements. Your participation in this study is highly valued, and I kindly request your sincere input by completing the questionnaire provided. Rest assured that your responses will be kept confidential and used solely for academic purposes. Thank you for your cooperation.

Yours Faithfully,
Chukwuemeke Godwin TUDOME

Questionnaire on STUDENTS' PREFERENCE FOR CAMPUS RESTAURANTS

INSTRUCTION: Please tick (√) and fill in the necessary appropriate information.

SECTION A: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

1. Gender: Male () Female ()
2. Age: 20 or under () 21-25 () 26-29 () 30 or over ()
- 3 Marital Status: Single () Married ()
4. Educational Qualification: SSCE() NCE/OND () HND/BSC () Masters/PHD ()
5. Living Situation : On-campus () Off-campus ()
6. Monthly Budget For Food: ₦10,000 or under () ₦11,000 - ₦20,000 () ₦21,000 - ₦30,000 ()
₦31,000 and above ()

Section B : THE CORE SUBJECT MATTER

For each of the following statements, please select one of the five response options that best reflects your opinion:

Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Undecided (U), Disagree (D), Strongly Disagree (SD)

S/N	Students' preference for campus restaurant	SA	A	U	D	SD
7	The availability of campus restaurants helps me manage my daily schedule.					
8	I prefer dining at campus restaurants over other dining options off-campus.					
9	Campus restaurants support my dietary needs and preferences.					
Affordability						
10	The affordability of food on campus plays a significant role in my choice of dining location.					
11	I often choose campus dining options based on their cost rather than their quality or other factors.					
12	Higher-priced food items at campus restaurants deter me from eating there					
Convenience						
13	I prefer campus dining locations that are easily accessible					
14	The opening hours of campus restaurants are convenient for my schedule					

15	I choose campus dining options that offer quick service and minimal wait times.					
Menu Variety						
16	A wide variety of menu options is important to me when choosing a campus restaurant.					
17	I am more likely to dine at campus restaurants that offer a diverse menu with different cuisines and dietary options.					
18	I prefer campus dining locations that update their menu frequently to include new and seasonal items.					
Hygiene						
19	I consider the hygiene standards of a campus restaurant before deciding to eat there					
20	I would avoid dining at a campus restaurant with poor cleanliness or sanitation practices.					
21	Cleanliness and hygiene are among my top priorities when selecting campus dining options.					
Recommendations						
22	Recommendations from my peers influence my choice of campus restaurants.					
23	I often choose campus dining locations based on positive word-of-mouth from friends or classmates.					
24	If my friends recommend a particular campus restaurant, I am more likely to try it.					
Health Considerations						
25	I consider the nutritional value of food when choosing campus restaurants					
26	I prefer campus dining locations that offer healthier food options, such as salads or low-calorie meals.					
27	Health considerations influence my decision to eat at campus restaurants.					