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ABSTRACT

This study examined the influence of infrastructural facilities on university life adjustment and mental health status of undergraduates in a Nigerian University. 203 participants made up of 96 males and 107 females were purposively selected and responded to School Infrastructure Questionnaire (SIQ), University Adjustment Scale (UAS), and the General Health Questionnaire (GHQ-12). Descriptive and inferential statistics were used for data analysis. 48% of the sample were well adjusted, 40.1% were moderately adjusted while 11.4% reported maladjustment. There was a 51.5% prevalence of poor mental health among the sample. No observed significant gender difference on University Life Adjustment (ULA); statistically significant gender influence was observed on poor mental health status with males reporting a higher mean score respondents \[ t (203) = 3.153, P < 0.05 \]. Conditions of school infrastructural facilities significantly predicted ULA \[ F (1, 203) = 13.33, P<0.05, R^2 = .062 \] as well as mental health status of the participants \[ F (1, 203) = 6.68, P<0.05, R^2 = .032 \]. There is a high prevalence of poor mental health and maladjustment among the sample. More research efforts on the influence of school climate on the mental health of members of university communities should be carried out.
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INTRODUCTION

Adjustment with university life is considered very important determinant to success in university. It serves as an indicator for the student’s ability to face the problems resulting from fulfilling academic, social and emotional needs. Through achieving adjustment with university life the students will be able to form a kind of good relationships with others in the university leading enhanced academic achievement. Moreover, adjustment with university life can be a strong indicator of the academic level of the students from one hand and the level of social relations development and achieving personal goals from the other hand.
The stage of university life is an important part of the student’s life as he moved from the total dependence on the teacher, family and curriculum into the complete independence. Moreover, many students move away from their cities into new places causing a change in their cultural, social and psychological environment, this may affect their adjustment with the university life (Al-shinawi & Abdurrahman, 1994). It is known that university life has its own demands and challenges, failure in meeting those demands and challenges can cause academic, psychological and social problems for the students who are mostly affected by those problems (Abu Baker, 1997). One important determinant of university adjustment as well as the mental health of students is the conditions of infrastructural facilities. This is because poor school facilities can be a major stressor which in turn disrupt university life and ultimately academic success.

**Conceptualizing Adjustment.**

There are many definitions of adjustment, for example Sufian (2004) stated that adjustment is the individual’s meeting of his psychological demands and accepting himself. There are many definitions of adjustment. Sufian (2004) defined it as the individual’s ability to fulfill his psychological needs and his self-acceptance as well as enjoying life without any types of conflicts and accepting social activities and participation in social activities. Or it is a behavior directed to overcome the obstacles or the techniques used by people to fulfill needs and satisfy motives as well as reducing pressure to achieve balance and satisfaction (Al-ananni, 2005).

Furthermore, Scott looked into adjustment as the behavioral process by which humans to maintain an equilibrium among their various needs or between their needs and the obstacles of their environments (Al-azza, 2004).

Adjustment emanates a number of interestingly similar views from a number of researchers. Rudwan (2002) indicated that adjustment and adaptation means the change in behaviour to solve problems faced in daily life. In addition, it means the ability to deal with different challenges effectively especially the difficult ones. He further added that it means the ability to control external and internal situations and stressors (Hmaidan & Al-Zoubi, 2014). Similarly, adjustment is used to emphasize the individual’s struggle to survive in his or her social and physical environment (Kyalo, 2011). This therefore indicates that adjustment is a harmonious relationship with the environment that includes a person’s ability to satisfy his biological and social needs. It encompasses many areas of a person’s life; there is self-adjustment, as well as social, family, marital and occupational adjustment (Hmaidan & Al-Zoubi, 2014). Sufian (2004) defined adjustment as an individual’s ability to fulfill his psychological needs and his self-acceptance, as well as enjoying life without any types of conflicts and accepting social activities and participation in social activities. This view further buttressed by Abu Hmaidan (2003) identifies an adjusted person as someone who is able to conduct appropriate behaviour to satisfy his or her
needs, and is able to amend that behaviour as the surrounding environmental variables change. Summarily, a common ground is that adjustment becomes imminent whenever a change occurs. Change on the other hand is a constant part of every individual’s life which may come as an environmental change, physical or emotional change, as well as a change in a particular situation or event. Life transitions, including new experiences and changes, naturally involve an adjustment process in the lives of individuals (Sevinc & Gizir, 2014). A notable transition many young adults face is their progress into the university. As Gall, Evans, & Bellerose (2000) indicated; entering the university may be a source of strain and an acute stressor. (Friedlander, Reid, Shupak, & Cribbie, 2007). The university is indeed characterized by academic, social as well as emotional demands. These demands can become stressful and problematic and consequently require coping strategies to manage, adapt or adjust to them.

Researchers have defined school adjustment as the degree to which children become interested, engaged, comfortable, and successful in the school environment (Ladd & Kochenderfer, 1996, p. 324 cited by Swenson, et al, 2008). The University involves an array of demands varying in kind and degree which requires a variety of coping responses or adjustments (Kayol, 2011). Baker and Siryk (1999) observed that there are two main aspects of adjustment to college or university which includes; academic adjustment and social adjustment (Kayol, 2011). Al-khatib, Awamleh, &Samawi, (2012) also specified a third aspect which involves personal (emotional) adjustment to college or university. Researchers have identified a number of factors that seemingly affect student’s adjustment to the university terrain. However, very little has been said on how the state of infrastructural facilities at a university plays a part on the adjustment of its students. A deep consideration into the fact that the education system in Nigeria is being plagued with a number of peculiar problems, one of which is the declining state of the infrastructural facilities in our universities.

Educational facilities or school infrastructure are those material things that facilitate teaching and learning processes in schools. Studies show that in many parts of the world, schools have grown larger and well-facilitated with modern teaching equipment (including labs, libraries, playgrounds, washrooms and flourished furniture) which results in better academic performance (Naz, et al., 2013). However, the breakdown and deterioration of facilities, shortages of new books, current journals in libraries, supply of laboratories equipment and learning facilities, infrastructure and facilities inadequate to cope with a system that is growing at rapid pace to mention a few are some of the plagues in Nigerian universities (Ripnung, Dantong, & Yaktor, 2012).

Based on available research, student’s performance and academic achievements in tests scores etc., are correlated with better building quality, newer school buildings, proper lighting and
thermal comfort and air quality along with advanced laboratories and libraries (McGuffey's, 1982, Earthman and Lemasters, 1998 cited by Naz, et al., 2013). Furthermore, Obasi (2005) identified that a student will become more focused in his academic pursuit without much direction if the environment is conducive and the facilities are available for studies.

Adjustment in university life is one important indicator of the academic adjustment and achievement in all university life aspects. Al-banna (2008) conducted a study to identify the common stressed survival situations at Al-Aqsa University students in Gaza city. The study sample was included conducted of (200) University students, (100 males) and (100) females. The study revealed that the commonest of the most common of stress survival situations were arranged in the following order: Emotional situations, studying situations, personality situations, healthy situations, economic situations, family, and social situations. There are no significant differences in stress survival situations except health situations in favor of female. Bosheet (2008) studied the academic problems that faces applied studies and community college at King Faisal University from students perception, and concluded that the most variables influencing the students' apprehension of the importance of the academic problems was the location variable.

Moreover, Dhkan & Al-Hajar (2006) studied the level of stress and its resources among Islamic university students and its relationship with their psychological hardness. The results also revealed that there were statistically significant gender differences among students in the level of stress except study and university environment stress.

In another study Barker (2004) aimed to two-fold; first, to examine the relationship between motivational orientations and adjustment to university, stress, and well-being in a sample of students during their second year of university and second, to assess the predictive value of motivational orientations in determining subsequent academic performance. Controlling for gender and age, motivated behaviors led to worse psychosocial adjustment to university, higher levels of perceived stress, and greater psychological distress while studying. In contrast, intrinsically motivated behaviors (to know) were associated with lower levels of stress. In relation to academic performance, neither extrinsic or intrinsic motivation, nor a motivation were related to subsequent academic achievement. Gender and entry qualifications significantly predicted performance.

Leel (1993) studied the differences in adjustment to university live in king Faisal University in Saudi Arabia according to gender, social and psychological status, major, residence, and college and study level. The findings returned no significant statistical differences in the adjustment except for gender and residence. In a study on university adjustment among Zambian students Wilson (2003) reported that there are problems in university adjustment due to the potentials and services of the university. Sulieman & Menezzel (1999) studied the degree of adjustment among
Sultan Qabous university students according to gender, achievement, residence and semester. The study concluded that there is adjustment to university live in all domains except for the social domain and there are differences in the personal domain attributed to gender for the favor of males. Al-amayra (1988) study applied on (582) male and female students at Yarmouk University showed that the most adjustment problems among students were the economic domain, the study domain, social domain, psychological domain and health domain. Moreover, there were no differences in adjustment problems due to college or living place while there were differences attributed to gender in the favor of males. Several researches found significant gender difference in university adjustment (Leel, 1993; Sulieman & Menezzel, 1999; Barker, 2004; Dhkan & Al-Hajar, 2006; Al banna, 2008)

**Stress induced school conditions and University life adjustment**

One distinctive determinant of adjustment to university life is the level of stress students are encountered with. One of the stressors affecting adjustments in universities is the conditions of infrastructures. According to Putwain (2007), there are two distinct ways to defining the term stress. Stress may either refer to the characteristics, stimuli or factors which are responsible for causing stress; or it may refer to the subjective, personal experience felt by persons, which usually includes feelings of anxiety, worry or guilt. Students at university may experience stress because of intense and demanding academic requirements (e.g., preparing and studying for upcoming exams or assignments, meeting deadlines, managing a high course load by attending lectures and tutorials, adjusting to a new university environment). Research also showed that students are likely to react differently to different stimuli – that is what may be stressful for one student (e.g., an upcoming final exam) may not be stressful for another (Omura, 2007).

Numerous studies have reported that there is a relationship between the level of stress experienced by students and adjustment to university (Anderson, 1994; Coffman & Gilligan, 2002-2003; Crede & Niehorster, 2012; Dyson & Renk, 2006; Gall, Evans, & Bellerose, 2000; Greer & Chwalisz, 2007; Petersen et al., 2009), and between experienced stress and academic performance at university (Akgun & Ciarrochi, 2003; Chow, 2007; Hackett, Betz, Casas, & Rocha-Singh, 1992; Neville, Heppner, Ji, & Thye, 2004; Pritchard & Wilson, 2003; Richardson et al., 2012; Struthers et al., 2000; Talib & Sansgiry, 2011). The above mentioned studies indicated that students with high levels of stress are less well adjusted to university life and perform less well academically than students with lower levels of stress.

Talib & Sansgiry (2011) in a study with 199 undergraduate and graduate students reported a significant negative relationship between stress and academic performance. Struthers et al. (2000) in a model testing the effects of stress, motivation and coping style to predict the academic performance of college students found that higher levels of stress were associated with
lower course grades. Stress directly and inversely predicted course grades (Struthers et al., 2000, p. 587). Similar findings were obtained by Neville et al. (2004) & Chow (2007). Neville et al. (2004, p. 611) found in their study of 260 black first to fourth year undergraduate students attending a predominantly white university, that academic stress predicted negatively students’ academic performance. Chow (2007), on the other hand, examined twelve different variables, among them stress, to predict the academic performance of Canadian university students. Results indicated that in a sample comprising 373 undergraduate students, financial stress and stress due to academic, social and work requirements were both negatively related to and predictive of students’ academic performance (Chow, 2007, p. 486).

Previous research further indicates that stress has a negative relationship with adjustment dimensions and that the relationship is highest for personal/emotional adjustment (Hunsberger, Pancer, Pratt, & Alisat, 1996; Wintre & Yaffe, 2000; Yaffe, 1997). Richardson et al. (2012) on factors related to academic performance and the meta-analysis by Crede & Niehorster (2012) on factors related to adjustment provided further evidence that stress is inversely related to students performance and adjustment at university. Findings from Crede & Niehorster (2012) revealed that overall adjustment to university had the strongest negative relationship with stress followed by personal/emotional adjustment, academic adjustment, social adjustment and institutional attachment. Previous research suggests that stress may have a stronger negative association with adjustment than with academic performance (i.e., Crede & Niehorster, 2012; Richardson et al., 2012). This trend was also found in the local study conducted by Petersen et al. (2009) where stress was found to be negatively related to and directly predictive of students adjustment to university but not to their academic performance. Based on the literature review perceived stress which includes condition of school infrastructures is expected to have negative associations with both adjustment and academic performance.

**Gender and University life adjustment**

Females at university experience higher levels of stress than males (Baker, 2003; Greer, 2008; Hudd, Dumlao, Erdman-Sager, Murray, Phan, Soukas, & Yokozuna, 2000; Michie, Glachan, & Bray, 2001; Misra & McKean, 2000; Misra, McKeen, West, & Russo, 2000). Misra et al. (2000) found that females reported a greater number of academic stressors than males; and that females had higher scores on reported self-imposed stressors than males. It is thus assumed that female students will demonstrate higher levels of perceived stress at university than male students. Bitzer & Troskie-De Bruin (2004) surveyed 1,868 first year students at the University of Stellenbosch about their perception of their academic workload at high school. Results indicated that more female students (7.4 %) than male students (3.9%) found their workload at high school overwhelming. Previous research reports gender differences for students in test-anxiety (e.g.,
Hembree, 1988; McDonald, 2001; Zeidner, 1998). Numerous findings indicate that female students score higher than male students in test-anxiety (Abdel-Khalek, 2000; Bandalos, Yates, & Thorndike-Christ, 1995; Cassady & Johnson, 2002; Chapell et al., 2005; McCarthy & Goffin, 2005; Mueller, Jacobsen, & Schwarzer, 2000; Rezazadeh & Tavakoli, 2009; Seipp & Schwarzer, 1996). A lot of literature exists on university adjustment in western and Asian countries, but very few is carried out on African universities, hence this study aims to fill this gap.

**Objectives**

1. Find out the degree of students adjustment to university life.
2. To find out the prevalence of poor mental health among the respondents.
3. Determine if gender will significantly influence university life adjustment and mental health status of undergraduates.
4. Find out if conditions of infrastructural facilities will significantly predict to university life adjustment and mental health status of undergraduates.

**Research Hypotheses**

1. Gender will significantly influence university adjustment
2. Gender will significantly influence psychological health status
3. Conditions of Infrastructural facilities will significantly university adjustment
4. Conditions of infrastructures will significantly influence mental health

**Justification of the Study**

Findings of this study will be useful for the Nigerian Universities Commission (NUC) in making policies regarding acceptable conditions of infrastructures in the Nigerian Universities. Also university authorities would be rightly informed on the influence of the conditions of infrastructures on the well being as well as performances of students. Also school psychologists would find this study useful in planning counseling and other therapeutic sessions and programmes for university students. Finally this study will add to the body of knowledge on issues of university adjustment and mental health of undergraduate students.

**METHODS**

A cross sectional survey design was employed in the study. The population comprised of undergraduate of Redeemer’s University (RUN) Osun state, Nigeria. A purposive sampling technique was adopted to select 203 participants made up of 96 males and 107 females.

**Measures**
Three instruments were used for data collection. They are: School Infrastructure Questionnaire (SIQ): This is a structured scale developed by the researcher to investigate various aspects of infrastructure available in the university such as: library, science laboratories, hostels, lecture rooms, school cafeteria, sports/recreational facilities, water supply and power supply. The SIQ consists of 3 domains that cover the area of availability of infrastructural facilities, maintenance culture as well as description of available infrastructure based on a Likert scale of Poor, Average and Excellent. The psychometric properties includes the Guttmann Split-Half Reliability which showed 0.74 reliability coefficient, a Cronbach’s Alpha value of 0.70 and a Spearman-Brown coefficient of 0.80.

The University Adjustment Scale (UAS): developed by Baker & Sirk, (1984) and adapted by Ali (2006) is a self-administered multidimensional scale to measure students’ adjustment to college. The scale consisted of (36) items distributed on four domains: academic adjustment, social adjustment, emotional adjustment and commitment to achieve goals. Alpha co-efficient of 0.74 and half-split spearman co-efficient of 0.02; and the General Health Questionnaire (GHQ-12) a 12 item instrument by Matthew Hankins (2008) to identify psychological distress. It has Guttmann Split-Half Reliability which showed 0.75 reliability coefficient, and a Cronbach’s Alpha value of 0.73 and a Spearman-Brown coefficient of 0.88.

RESULTS

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of Participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>52.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-20</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>65.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 level</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 level</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 level</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 level</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 shows the demographic distribution of the sample. Majority of the sample 52.7% were females while 47.3% were males. This is a reflection of the total population of the Redeemers University which has more female students. The mean age for the sample is 19.7 years. 30.5% of the respondents were 100 level students, 30% were 200 level students, 14.8% were 300 level students while 23.6% were 400 level students. Demographic distribution by religious affiliation revealed that 94.6% were Christian while 5.9% were Muslims this is to be expected since the school is a Christian faith based institution.

Table 2 shows the degree of adjustment to university life among the respondents. Result shows that 48.5% were well adjusted, 40.1% were moderately adjusted, while 11.4% were maladjusted.

Table 3 shows the prevalence of poor mental health. Result shows that 31.1% had mild psychological distress, 6.0% had moderate psychological distress, 14.4% had severe psychological distress, while 51.5% had overall psychological distress.
Table above shows a 51.5% prevalence of poor mental health. Among this sample result, 31.1% reported mild psychopathology, 6.0% had moderate psychopathology while 14.4% reported severe psychological distress which requires clinical intervention.

**Hypothesis 1:** Gender will significantly influence university life adjustment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>22.45</td>
<td>7.15</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>.454</td>
<td>&gt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>22.04</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 shows no significant gender difference on university life adjustment of the respondents \[t(.454) = 203, P > 0.05\]. This implies that adjustment to university life is not a function of one’s gender, hence the hypothesis is rejected.

**Hypothesis 2:** Gender will significantly influence psychological health status.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>32.42</td>
<td>7.26</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>3.153</td>
<td>&lt; 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>29.13</td>
<td>7.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 shows a significant gender influence on mental health status of the respondents \[t(203) = 3.153, P < 0.05\]. This indicates that mental health status is a function of one’s gender. The table also shows that the male participants recorded a higher mean score which indicates that male students had higher psychopathology. Based on this the hypothesis is accepted.

**Hypothesis Three:** Conditions of infrastructures will significantly predict university life adjustment.
Table 1.6: Simple Linear Regression Analysis of conditions of infrastructures as a predictor of university life adjustment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>519.44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>519.46</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>&lt; 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>7795.66</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>38.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8315.11</td>
<td>201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ F(1, 203) = 13.33, p<0.05, R^2 = .062 \]

A simple linear regression was calculated to predict university life adjustment based on conditions of infrastructures. A significant regression equation was found \( F (1, 203) = 13.33, P<0.05 \) with an \( R^2 \) of .062. This means that 62% variance of school infrastructural conditions predicted university life adjustment among the respondents.

**Hypothesis Four:** Conditions of infrastructures will significantly predict mental health status of respondents

Table 1.7: Simple Linear Regression Analysis of conditions of infrastructures as a predictor of mental health status.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>374.76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>374.76</td>
<td>6.676</td>
<td>&lt; 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>11283.43</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>56.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11658.187</td>
<td>202</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( R^2=.032, p<0.05 \) \[ F(1, 203) = 6.676, p<0.05, R^2 = .032 \]

A simple linear regression was calculated to predict mental health status of undergraduates based on conditions of school infrastructure. A significant regression equation was found \[ F (1, 203) = 6.676, P<0.05 \] with an \( R^2 \) of .032. This means that 32% variance of conditions of school infrastructure predicted mental health status among the respondents.

**DISCUSSIONS**

Findings returned a 51.5% prevalence of poor mental health status among the sample. This result shows a high rate of poor mental health among adolescents in Nigeria. This findings support previous research on the high rate of mental health disorder globally. WHO (2006, 2008)
estimates that about 154 million people suffer from depression, and 25 million people suffer from schizophrenia. Empirical studies also reveal that about 64 million Nigerians manifest psychological disorder (Abiodun, 2006; WHO, 2007; Owoyemi, 2013). Also Study carried out by Storrie, Ahern & Tuckett, (2010) on mental health problem among youths affirmed that nearly half the world's population is affected by mental illness with an impact on their self-esteem, relationships and ability to function in everyday life. 154 million people suffer from depression and 25 million people from schizophrenia; 91 million people are affected by alcohol use disorders and 15 million by drug use disorders (WHO 2008). As many as 50 million people suffer from epilepsy and 24 million from Alzheimer and other dementias (WHO 2006). Hundreds of thousands of people die by suicide every year (WHO 2003). In a related study Kelleher (2004) and WHO (2005, 2008) affirmed that approximately one in five children suffers from a mental disorder.

Also, this study found no significant gender difference on university life adjustment among the sample. There is a mixed report on the results of gender and university adjustment of undergraduates. Halamandaris & Power (1999) in a study of 183 first year undergraduate students found that females are better adjusted to university life than males. Leong et al. (1997) in a study of 161 first year students reported that female students were better adjusted academically and socially than male students. On the other hand some more recent researches indicated that male students are better adjusted to university than female students (Abdullah, Elias, Mahyuddin, & Uli, 2009; Enochs & Roland, 2006). Female students are reported to have a more positive attitude towards help-seeking, display higher levels of intrinsic motivation, demonstrate higher levels of perceived stress, show higher levels of academic overload, display higher levels of test-anxiety, report to receive more social support from their friends, and perform better academically than their male counterparts. Male students, on the other hand, are hypothesized to display higher levels of extrinsic motivation and motivation. No significant gender differences are hypothesized for the variable of self-esteem, self-efficacy and social support from family members. As previous research has found contradicting results, no prediction is made with regard to female or male students being better adjusted to university. There is however also other research which has reported no gender differences in academic and social adjustment to university (e.g., Jdaitawi, Ishak, & Mustafa, 2011).

Furthermore, the study returned a significant gender influence on mental health status of the respondents with females reporting lower mean scores than their male counterparts. previous researches indicates that females experience more negative impact than men as a result of stressful circumstances, including emotional/psychological consequences such as fear, anger, insult, stress, depression, anxiety attacks, shame, lowered self-esteem, sleeping problems, psychosomatic symptoms and post-traumatic stress symptoms, loss of time from work, and a
need to take extra security precautions (Mirrlees-Black 1999, Bunge & Locke 2000, Walby & Allen, 2004). According to WHO (2004, 2013) gender differences occur in the rates of common mental disorders such as depression, anxiety and somatic complaints with females being predominantly affected. In a previous study, Butler & Allnut (2003) found that institutionalized females were more likely than male inmates to suffer from psychiatric disorders. Unipolar depression, predicted to be the second leading cause of global disability burden by 2020, is twice as common in women. Depression is not only the most common women's mental health problem but may be more persistent in women than men (WHO, 2004, 2013). Depressive disorders account for close to 41.9% of the disability from neuropsychiatric disorders among women compared to 29.3% among men. Leading mental health problems of the older adults (majority of which are women) are depression, organic brain syndromes and dementias (WHO, 2013).

Conditions of infrastructures significantly predicted university life adjustment. Numerous studies have reported that there is a relationship between the level of stress experienced by students and adjustment to university (Anderson, 1994; Coffman & Gilligan, 2002-2003; Crede & Niehorster, 2012 Dyson & Renk, 2006; Gall, Evans, & Bellerose, 2000; Greer & Chwalisz, 2007; Petersen et al., 2009; Crede & Niehorster, 2012). Talib & Sansgiry (2011) in a study with 199 undergraduate and graduate students reported a significant negative relationship between stress and academic performance. Struthers et al. (2000) in a model testing the effects of stress, motivation and coping style to predict the academic performance of college students found that higher levels of stress were associated with lower course grades. Chow (2007), on the other hand, examined twelve different variables, among them stress, to predict the academic performance of Canadian university students. Results indicated that in a sample comprising 373 undergraduate students, financial stress and stress due to academic, social and work requirements were both negatively related to and predictive of students’ academic performance (Chow, 2007, p. 486).

CONCLUSIONS

There is a high prevalence of university life mal-adjustment and poor mental health status among undergraduate students. Also, there is no significant gender difference on university life adjustment among the sample. There is a significant gender influence on mental health status of the respondents and females report poorer mental health status when exposed to stress than their male counterparts. The Conditions of school infrastructure significantly predicts university life adjustment among undergraduate students. Finally the condition of school infrastructure has significant influence on the mental health status of undergraduate students.
RECOMMENDATIONS

University authorities should ensure that proper and adequate infrastructures are provided of the smooth running of universities. Also the Nigerian university’s commission should ensure that standard facilities are in place in our tertiary institutions. Proper counseling sessions and orientations should be given to new intakes to help them prepare for the life in the university. Further research in the area of school conditions should be carried out.
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