

# Open Access Repository www.ssoar.info

## Effect of Physical Characteristics on Resident Satisfaction in Medium Density Area of Kaduna Metropolis, Nigeria

Musa, Hadiza AbdulKadir; Othman, Maryamu Sarki; Gobir, Rahma

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

#### Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Musa, H. A., Othman, M. S., & Gobir, R. (2023). Effect of Physical Characteristics on Resident Satisfaction in Medium Density Area of Kaduna Metropolis, Nigeria. *Path of Science*, *9*(8), 3010-3015. <u>https://doi.org/10.22178/pos.95-34</u>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter einer CC BY Lizenz (Namensnennung) zur Verfügung gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zu den CC-Lizenzen finden Sie hier: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/deed.de Terms of use:

This document is made available under a CC BY Licence (Attribution). For more Information see: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0





## Effect of Physical Characteristics on Resident Satisfaction in Medium Density Area of Kaduna Metropolis, Nigeria

### Hadiza AbdulKadir Musa<sup>1</sup>, Maryamu Sarki Othman<sup>1</sup>, Rahma Gobir<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Kaduna Polytechnic Polytechnic Road, P. M. B. 2021, Kaduna, Nigeria

<sup>2</sup> Abubakar Tafawa Balewa University Tafawa Balewa Way, P. M. B. 0248, Bauchi, 740272, Nigeria

DOI: 10.22178/pos.95-34

JEL Classification: 018

Received 31.07.2023 Accepted 28.08.2023 Published online 31.08.2023

Corresponding Author: Hadiza AbdulKadir Musa hadiza4musa@yahoo.com

© 2023 The Authors. This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License 🖭 Abstract. This study aimed to determine ways to reveal the significant association in Kaduna between a resident's physical features and housing happiness. The study used a quantitative approach. A questionnaire was created and mailed to 126 Household Heads, and 94 replies were received. Households were guestioned using systematic random sampling to obtain socioeconomic characteristics and housing satisfaction data. The data was examined with descriptive statistics and a linear regression model using SPSS to investigate the effect of factors. According to the findings of the study, physical features have a significant impact on home happiness in the studied area. Toilet facilities, rendered and painted walls, tiles, an efficient kitchen, no finishing wall, electricity, and a generator as a substitute option for lighting a kitchen without modern facilities, concrete and a pit toilet are several variables that influence residents' satisfaction, according to the study. It was also revealed that restroom facilities, rendered and painted walls, and tiles had the highest mean score. The government was advised to provide the deficient communal facilities and repair the decaying ones as soon as possible. Proper regular management of social facilities needs to be implemented to promote residents' satisfaction in the area under investigation region.

**Keywords**: Physical Characteristics; Housing; Housing Satisfaction; Kaduna; Nigeria.

#### INTRODUCTION

Housing is regarded as a basic need as well as a requirement for the survival of humans, making it among the most essential basic infrastructure elements in the growth of any society [1]. Housing affects both individual's and the nation's lives; as a result, nature and culture highly emphasise its role in maintaining human comfort [2]. According to [3], housing is one of human's most basic needs, and the entitlement to sufficient housing is an obligation acknowledged globally and in over 100 national laws around the globe. Notwithstanding this privilege, numerous individuals are 'homeless,' 'inadequately housed,' or 'evicted' in cities and rural places worldwide. Housing is integrally linked to one's happiness in life. It is affected by various elements such as money, employment, schooling, balance between work and life, fulfilment in life, and one's impression of society [4, 5]. Housing has been dubbed "the predictor of quality of life" given that it is the only means of one's fulfilment [6].

Residents' impressions of their community and living conditions affect their housing-related happiness. This suggests a low level of dissatisfaction and a high level of concurrence between anticipated and actual needs, as well as being satisfied with tenants' daily housing standards. On the other hand, inconsistency between their present and ideal home situations may result in discontent [7, 8]. Families with low incomes, on the contrary, are more inclined than those with middle incomes to be content with more deficient housing [9, 10, 11]. Low income is a big challenge

Physical characteristics may impact resident pleasure [1, 13]. Biological factors may affect homeowner happiness, whether beneficial or detrimental; for example, when the state of social amenities or infrastructure amenities is considered good, satisfaction is significantly higher, and vice versa. Most people in developing countries remain without bare essentials such as shelter, health care, a robust road network, portable water, and consistent energy, to name a few. Many people cannot meet their fundamental necessities due to leaders' unqualified management of public funds, inadequate workforce to effectively use available resources, political upheaval, and local institutions' lack of planning [14, 15]. As a result, an area of need has been identified, and this study aims to provide solutions to concerns about the impact of physical attributes on resident satisfaction in Kaduna Metropolis.

This *study aims* to investigate the impact of physical qualities on satisfaction with residents in a high-density area of the Kaduna metropolis to uncover the effect of physical characteristics on residents' housing satisfaction.

1. To identify the physical features of the populace at Kaduna metropolis

2. To investigate the level of satisfaction amongst residents in the research region.

3. To determine the impact of physical attributes on residents' contentment in the research area.

#### METHODOLOGY

In this inquiry, quantitative research approaches were used. Respondents were provided with a survey to complete and return. One hundred twenty-six questionnaires were given out, with ninety-four valid copies completed and born out of 126. Other social sciences researchers in Nigeria have used sample size selection to determine sample size (for example, [16, 1, 9, 16]. Each of these residential communities had a total of 126 residences sampled. Unguwar Sarki and Unguwar Kanawa, two medium-density suburban districts, were chosen. The method employed was systematic random sampling, which is the most fundamental method and assures that every subject in the sample has an equal likelihood of being selected. After comprehensive data collection, descriptive, mean ranking, and multiple regression analyses were performed on the data collected in the field by using SPSS Version 22.

### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS**

Table 1 shows the socioeconomic characteristics of the respondents. Men made up the vast majority of responders in the study area. Similarly, the study revealed that people under 30 represented around half the population.

Table 1 – Demographic Data of the Respondents					
Parameters	Ν	%			
Gender					
Male	75.3	80.2			
Female	18.7	19.8			
Age					
Less than 30 years	50	53.19			
between 31-40 years	20	21.28			
between 41-50 years	18	19.15			
above 50 years	6	6.38			
Marital status					
Single	31	32.98			
Married	63	67.02			
Education					
Primary school	14	14.90			
0 level	29	30.85			
OND/NCE	32	34.04			
HND	12	12.77			
BSC	5	5.32			
MSC	1	1.06			
PHD	1	1.06			
Occupation	-	100			
Farming	17	18.09			
Civil Servant	29	30.85			
Business	9	9.57			
Retired	14	14.89			
Artisan	25	26.60			
Religion	_0	20.00			
Islam	82	87.23			
Christianity	12	12.77			
Income					
Less than #30,000	27	28.72			
#31,000- #60,0000	39	41.49			
#61,0000-#91,000	18	19.15			
#91,000 and above	10	10.64			
Household Size					
6-10	51	54.26			
11-15	23	24.47			
16-20	14	14.89			
21 persons and above	6	6.38			
Tribe	-				
Yoruba	78	82.98			
Hausa	10	10.64			
Igbo	6	6.38			
-0	5	0.00			

#### Table 1 - Demographic Data of the Respondents

Furthermore, most people who replied to the survey (63 %) were married. According to the households' employment, around 30.85 % of the people who took part worked as civil servants. Retirees, students, craftspeople, and artisans account for 69.15 % of total respondents in the overall research region. This implies that the vast majority of respondents in the research area have a source of income. In addition, according to a household income analysis, most participants earn between N31,000 and N60,000. The bulk of the people in the area practice Islam.

Table 2 – Physical characteristics in Medium Density Area of Kaduna Metropolis (N=94)

	(N=94) S Std	Rank	Remark
incan		Tunit	i temai K
4.0851		1	Good
			Good
			Good
			Good
5.0005	1.20002	1	uoou
3 7553	1 19754	5	Good
0.7000	1.1 / / 0 1	0	uoou
3.7234	1.13027	6	Good
		7	Good
		8	Good
		9	Good
			Good
		11	Good
			Good
		13	Good
		14	Fair
3.4043	1.11026	15	Fair
3.3404	1.10281	16	Fair
3.2021	1.23201	17	Fair
		18	Fair
3.0745	1.25501	19	Fair
3.0745	1.54669	20	Fair
3.0213	1.31965	21	Fair
2.9681	1.22213	22	Fair
0.0555			
2.8723	1.17532	23	Fair
	10-1		
2.6809	1.27180	24	Fair
	4.0213 3.8723 3.8085 3.7553 3.7234 3.7234 3.7234 3.7234 3.7021 3.6915 3.6702 3.6383 3.4894 3.4787 3.4043 3.4043 3.4043 3.3404 3.2021 3.0745 3.0745 3.0213	Deviation4.08511.022964.02131.005133.87231.099703.80851.255323.75531.197543.72341.030763.72341.030763.72341.030763.70211.143753.69151.984033.67021.194873.63831.045743.48941.094903.47871.044483.40431.264223.40431.264223.40431.102813.20211.232013.1915.975803.07451.255013.07451.546693.02131.319652.96811.222132.87231.17532	Deviation4.08511.0229614.02131.0051323.87231.0997033.80851.2553243.75531.1975453.72341.302763.72341.0307673.70211.1437583.69151.9840393.67021.19487103.63831.04574113.48941.09490123.47871.04448133.40431.26422143.40431.1026153.34041.10281163.07451.25501193.07451.54669203.02131.31965212.96811.22213222.87231.1753223

Table 2 represents the housing conditions in medium-density neighbourhoods of Kaduna. The homes in the study area agreed that the WC toilet was in good functioning order (M=4.08 SD=1.02) and ranked first. Tiles under their floor finishes were also in good condition (M=4.02 SD=1.00), and terrazzo was ranked third (M=3.87 SD=1.00), rendered and painted walls ranked fourth (M=3.80 SD=1.25), and a well-equipped kitchen ranked fifth (M=3.75 SD=1.19). Toilet and bathroom facilities were ranked 20th (M=3.07 SD=1.54), and waste disposal facilities were ranked 21st (M=3.02 SD=1.31). A kitchen without contemporary facilities was ranked 22nd (M=2.96 SD=1.22). Clay/mud block was ranked 23rd (M=2.87 SD=1.17). Buildings with no finishing ranked 24th (M=2.68 SD=1.27), suggesting that most physical characteristics of housing conditions in the Kaduna metropolis's highdensity districts were in excellent shape, with only a few in poor condition.

Table 3 - Ranking Re	sidents Satisfaction	(N=94)	)
----------------------	----------------------	--------	---

Characteristics     Deviation       Toilet and Bathroom Facilities     3.6809     1.88248     1       Bathroom Facilities     3.5745     1.20473     2       Painted     3.5745     1.20473     2       Painted     3.5426     1.48588     3       Well Equipped     3.5000     1.41231     4       Kitchen     -     -     -       No finishing at all     3.3617     1.12500     5       Electricity from the public main     3.3404     1.21419     6       Generator     3.2872     1.20592     7       kitchen without     3.1596     1.24696     8       modern Facilities     -     -     -       Sandcrete     3.1489     1.48075     9       Pit Toilet     3.0957     1.38400     10       Waste Disposal     3.0213     1.42918     11       Facilities     -     -     -       Burnt Bricks     2.9574     1.45849     14       Borehole     2.8723     1.45346	Table 3 – Ranking Residents Satisfaction (N=94)					
Toilet and Bathroom Facilities   3.6809   1.88248   1     Rendered and Painted   3.5745   1.20473   2     Painted   3.5745   1.20473   2     Tiles   3.5426   1.48588   3     Well Equipped Kitchen   3.5000   1.41231   4     No finishing at all   3.3617   1.12500   5     Electricity from the public main   3.3404   1.21419   6     Generator   3.2872   1.20592   7     kitchen without   3.1596   1.24696   8     modern Facilities	Physical	Mean	Std.	Ranking		
Bathroom Facilities     Image: Market of the sector of the secto	Characteristics		Deviation			
Rendered and Painted   3.5745   1.20473   2     Painted   3.5426   1.48588   3     Well Equipped Kitchen   3.5000   1.41231   4     No finishing at all   3.3617   1.12500   5     Electricity from the public main   3.3404   1.21419   6     Generator   3.2872   1.20592   7     kitchen without modern Facilities   3.1596   1.24696   8     Sandcrete   3.1489   1.48075   9     Pit Toilet   3.0957   1.38400   10     Waste Disposal Paint   3.0213   1.42918   11     Facilities   -   -   -     Rendered without Paint   2.9787   1.42164   13     Burnt Bricks   2.9574   1.45849   14     Borehole   2.8723   1.45346   15     Aluminium   2.6809   1.71152   16     Cemented   2.6596   1.50664   17     Well   2.6170   1.52475   18     Terrazo   2.4681   1.47890   19 <t< td=""><td>Toilet and</td><td>3.6809</td><td>1.88248</td><td>1</td></t<>	Toilet and	3.6809	1.88248	1		
Painted     Image: Matrix of the state of the s	<b>Bathroom Facilities</b>					
Tiles   3.5426   1.48588   3     Well Equipped   3.5000   1.41231   4     Kitchen   3.3607   1.12500   5     No finishing at all   3.3617   1.12500   5     Electricity from the public main   3.3404   1.21419   6     generator   3.2872   1.20592   7     kitchen without   3.1596   1.24696   8     modern Facilities	Rendered and	3.5745	1.20473	2		
Well Equipped Kitchen   3.5000   1.41231   4     No finishing at all   3.3617   1.12500   5     Electricity from the public main   3.3404   1.21419   6     Generator   3.2872   1.20592   7     kitchen without   3.1596   1.24696   8     modern Facilities   1.24696   8     Sandcrete   3.1489   1.48075   9     Pit Toilet   3.0957   1.38400   10     Waste Disposal   3.0213   1.42918   11     Facilities   -   -   -     Rendered without   2.9787   1.42164   13     Paint   -   -   -     Burnt Bricks   2.9574   1.45849   14     Borehole   2.8723   1.45346   15     Aluminium   2.6809   1.71152   16     Cemented   2.6596   1.50664   17     Well   2.6170   1.52475   18     Terrazo   2.4681   1.47890   19     Clay/Mud Block   2.2979   1.48708   20 </td <td>Painted</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	Painted					
Kitchen     Image: state	Tiles	3.5426	1.48588	3		
No finishing at all     3.3617     1.12500     5       Electricity from the public main     3.3404     1.21419     6       generator     3.2872     1.20592     7       kitchen without     3.1596     1.24696     8       modern Facilities     -     -     -       Sandcrete     3.1489     1.48075     9       Pit Toilet     3.0957     1.38400     10       Waste Disposal     3.0213     1.42918     11       Facilities     -     -     -       Rendered without     2.9787     1.42164     13       Paint     -     -     -       Burnt Bricks     2.9574     1.45849     14       Borehole     2.8723     1.45346     15       Aluminium     2.6609     1.50664     17       Well     2.6170     1.52475     18       Terrazo     2.4681     1.47890     19       Clay/Mud Block     2.2979     1.48050     21       Sheet     -     -	Well Equipped	3.5000	1.41231	4		
Electricity from the public main   3.3404   1.21419   6     public main   3.2872   1.20592   7     Generator   3.2872   1.20592   7     kitchen without   3.1596   1.24696   8     modern Facilities   -   -   -     Sandcrete   3.1489   1.48075   9     Pit Toilet   3.0957   1.38400   10     Waste Disposal   3.0213   1.42918   11     Facilities   -   -   -     Rendered without   2.9787   1.42164   13     Paint   -   -   -     Burnt Bricks   2.9574   1.45849   14     Borehole   2.8723   1.45346   15     Aluminium   2.6809   1.71152   16     Cemented   2.6596   1.50664   17     Well   2.6170   1.52475   18     Terrazo   2.4681   1.47890   19     Clay/Mud Block   2.2979   1.48708   20     Corrugated Iron   2.2234   1.43050   21 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>						
Electricity from the public main   3.3404   1.21419   6     public main   3.2872   1.20592   7     Generator   3.2872   1.20592   7     kitchen without   3.1596   1.24696   8     modern Facilities   -   -   -     Sandcrete   3.1489   1.48075   9     Pit Toilet   3.0957   1.38400   10     Waste Disposal   3.0213   1.42918   11     Facilities   -   -   -     Rendered without   2.9787   1.42164   13     Paint   -   -   -     Burnt Bricks   2.9574   1.45849   14     Borehole   2.8723   1.45346   15     Aluminium   2.6809   1.71152   16     Cemented   2.6596   1.50664   17     Well   2.6170   1.52475   18     Terrazo   2.4681   1.47890   19     Clay/Mud Block   2.2979   1.48708   20     Corrugated Iron   2.2234   1.43050   21 <td>No finishing at all</td> <td>3.3617</td> <td>1.12500</td> <td>5</td>	No finishing at all	3.3617	1.12500	5		
Generator     3.2872     1.20592     7       kitchen without     3.1596     1.24696     8       modern Facilities     1.24696     8       Sandcrete     3.1489     1.48075     9       Pit Toilet     3.0957     1.38400     10       Waste Disposal     3.0213     1.42918     11       Facilities     1     11     11       Facilities     1     142918     11       Rendered without     2.9787     1.42164     13       Paint     2.9574     1.45849     14       Borehole     2.8723     1.45346     15       Aluminium     2.6809     1.71152     16       Cemented     2.6596     1.50664     17       Well     2.6170     1.52475     18       Terrazo     2.4681     1.47890     19       Clay/Mud Block     2.2979     1.48708     20       Corrugated Iron     2.2234     1.43050     21	Electricity from the	3.3404	1.21419	6		
kitchen without   3.1596   1.24696   8     modern Facilities   3.1489   1.48075   9     Sandcrete   3.1489   1.48075   9     Pit Toilet   3.0957   1.38400   10     Waste Disposal   3.0213   1.42918   11     Facilities   -   -   -     Rendered without   2.9787   1.42164   13     Paint   -   -   -     Burnt Bricks   2.9574   1.45849   14     Borehole   2.8723   1.45346   15     Aluminium   2.6809   1.71152   16     Cemented   2.6170   1.52475   18     Terrazo   2.4681   1.47890   19     Clay/Mud Block   2.2979   1.48708   20     Corrugated Iron   2.2234   1.43050   21     Sheet   -   -   -   -	public main					
modern Facilities     I.48075     9       Sandcrete     3.1489     1.48075     9       Pit Toilet     3.0957     1.38400     10       Waste Disposal     3.0213     1.42918     11       Facilities     Image: Constraint of the state of the s	Generator	3.2872	1.20592	7		
Sandcrete   3.1489   1.48075   9     Pit Toilet   3.0957   1.38400   10     Waste Disposal   3.0213   1.42918   11     Facilities   -   -   -     Rendered without   2.9787   1.42164   13     Paint   -   -   -     Burnt Bricks   2.9574   1.45849   14     Borehole   2.8723   1.45346   15     Aluminium   2.6809   1.71152   16     Cemented   2.6170   1.52475   18     Terrazo   2.4681   1.47890   19     Clay/Mud Block   2.2979   1.48708   20     Corrugated   Iron   2.2234   1.43050   21	kitchen without	3.1596	1.24696	8		
Pit Toilet   3.0957   1.38400   10     Waste Disposal   3.0213   1.42918   11     Facilities   1   11   11     Facilities   2.9787   1.42164   13     Rendered without   2.9787   1.42164   13     Paint   2   14   14     Burnt Bricks   2.9574   1.45849   14     Borehole   2.8723   1.45346   15     Aluminium   2.6809   1.71152   16     Cemented   2.6170   1.52475   18     Terrazo   2.4681   1.47890   19     Clay/Mud Block   2.2979   1.48708   20     Corrugated Iron   2.2234   1.43050   21     Sheet	modern Facilities					
Waste Disposal Facilities   3.0213   1.42918   11     Facilities   2.9787   1.42164   13     Rendered without Paint   2.9787   1.42164   13     Burnt Bricks   2.9574   1.45849   14     Borehole   2.8723   1.45346   15     Aluminium   2.6809   1.71152   16     Cemented   2.6596   1.50664   17     Well   2.6170   1.52475   18     Terrazo   2.4681   1.47890   19     Clay/Mud Block   2.2979   1.48708   20     Corrugated   Iron   2.2234   1.43050   21	Sandcrete	3.1489	1.48075	9		
Facilities   Image: style st	Pit Toilet	3.0957	1.38400	10		
Rendered without   2.9787   1.42164   13     Paint   14   14     Burnt Bricks   2.9574   1.45849   14     Borehole   2.8723   1.45346   15     Aluminium   2.6809   1.71152   16     Cemented   2.6596   1.50664   17     Well   2.6170   1.52475   18     Terrazo   2.4681   1.47890   19     Clay/Mud Block   2.2979   1.48708   20     Corrugated Iron   2.2234   1.43050   21	Waste Disposal	3.0213	1.42918	11		
Paint Image: mark set of the set of	Facilities					
Burnt Bricks2.95741.4584914Borehole2.87231.4534615Aluminium2.68091.7115216Cemented2.65961.5066417Well2.61701.5247518Terrazo2.46811.4789019Clay/Mud Block2.29791.4870820CorrugatedIron2.22341.4305021Sheet </td <td>Rendered without</td> <td>2.9787</td> <td>1.42164</td> <td>13</td>	Rendered without	2.9787	1.42164	13		
Borehole2.87231.4534615Aluminium2.68091.7115216Cemented2.65961.5066417Well2.61701.5247518Terrazo2.46811.4789019Clay/Mud Block2.29791.4870820Corrugated Iron2.22341.4305021Sheet	Paint					
Aluminium2.68091.7115216Cemented2.65961.5066417Well2.61701.5247518Terrazo2.46811.4789019Clay/Mud Block2.29791.4870820Corrugated Iron2.22341.4305021Sheet	Burnt Bricks	2.9574	1.45849	14		
Cemented2.65961.5066417Well2.61701.5247518Terrazo2.46811.4789019Clay/Mud Block2.29791.4870820CorrugatedIron2.22341.4305021Sheet </td <td>Borehole</td> <td>2.8723</td> <td>1.45346</td> <td>15</td>	Borehole	2.8723	1.45346	15		
Well     2.6170     1.52475     18       Terrazo     2.4681     1.47890     19       Clay/Mud Block     2.2979     1.48708     20       Corrugated     Iron     2.2234     1.43050     21       Sheet	Aluminium	2.6809	1.71152	16		
Terrazo     2.4681     1.47890     19       Clay/Mud Block     2.2979     1.48708     20       Corrugated     Iron     2.2234     1.43050     21       Sheet     -     -     -     -	Cemented	2.6596	1.50664	17		
Clay/Mud Block     2.2979     1.48708     20       Corrugated     Iron     2.2234     1.43050     21       Sheet     21     21     21	Well	2.6170	1.52475	18		
CorrugatedIron2.22341.4305021Sheet	Terrazo	2.4681	1.47890	19		
CorrugatedIron2.22341.4305021Sheet	Clay/Mud Block	2.2979	1.48708	20		
Sheet		2.2234	1.43050	21		
korosono Lamp 1 0004 1 20750 22						
Kerusene Lanip   1.3034   1.30730   22	kerosene Lamp	1.9894	1.30750	22		
Security 1.8191 1.29484 23		1.8191	1.29484	23		
Pipe Borne 1.6915 1.20952 24		1.6915	1.20952	24		

Table 3 shows the contentment of households in Kaduna Metropolis's low-density area. According to them, the family's degree of contentment is modest. The Toilet and Bathroom Facilities came first with (M=3.68, S=1.88) points. Rendered and Painted came in second with (S=3.57, S=1.20). The Tiles came in third place with (M=3.54, S=1.48). Their rating for Well Equipped Kitchen was also reasonable (M=3.50, S=1.41), placing it fourth. They were dissatisfied with their Kerosene, which came in 22nd (M=1.98, S=1.30). Asbestos was classified 23rd with (S=1.81, 1.29) and Pipe-borne was ranked 24th with (M=1.69, S=1.20). As a consequence, the table demonstrates that the vast majority of household members are fairly satisfied with their physical attributes. They are, however, displeased with some of their physical features.

Table 4 – Model Summary

Model	R	R <sup>2</sup>	Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	Std. Error of the
				Estimate
1	.723a	.623	.581	.47384

In the model summary table above, the R<sup>2</sup> value reflects how much variation in the dependent variable (resident happiness in the study region) has been explained by the model (which includes physical features variables). The model explains 62.3 % of the variation in resident contentment in the study area.

Table 5 – ANOVA

Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
10	1.744	12.476	.000b
114	.140		
124			

The table above shows the statistical significance of the analysis. The table shows that the highly significant value is ".000," less than 05 (p.0005). It demonstrates that the regression model is correct and appropriate for the analysis.

According to the correlation table earlier, physical factors significantly impact resident happiness.

#### Table 6 - Coefficient Table

Table 6 – Coefficient Table							
		dardised	Standardised				
Model	Coeff	Coefficients Coeffici		Т	Sig.		
110001	В	Std.	Beta		- 0		
Constant	042	Error		4 1 2 0	000		
Constant	.943	.228		4.130	.000		
Ranking							
Toilet and			1 - 0				
Bathroom	.116	.050	.170	2.295	.024		
Facilities in							
the area							
Ranking							
Rendered							
and Painted	.159	.040	.298	3.949	.000		
walls in the							
area							
Ranking Tile	072	020	170	2 402	014		
in the area	.073	.029	.179	2.483	.014		
Ranking Well							
Equipped							
Kitchen	.115	.029	.303	4.024	.000		
facilities in							
the area							
Rankin their							
no finishing	.059	.032	.139	1.860	.065		
wall	.057	.052	.157	1.000	.005		
Ranking							
•							
electricity from the	.056	.025	.149	2.188	.031		
public main							
Ranking							
Generator as	010	0.2.6	000	227			
a source of	.012	.036	.022	.327	.744		
Lightning in							
the area							
Ranking their							
kitchen							
without	.020	.035	.043	.585	.560		
modern			.015		.000		
facilities in							
the area							
Ranking				_			
sandcrete in	056	.029	134	1.943	.055		
the area				1.943			
Ranking / Pit							
Toilet	042	020	100	1 4 4 2	152		
condition in	.042	.029	.100	1.443	.152		
the area							
				I	1		

Toilet facilities, rendered and painted walls, tiles, a well-equipped kitchen, no finishing wall, electricity, and the generator as an alternative means of lighting were the physical characteristics that significantly influenced resident satisfaction, with Beta values of .298, .303, .179, .170, .149, .134 and .139, respectively, and p-values of .000, .014, .024, .031, .055 and .065 While kitchens without contemporary facilities, concrete, and pit toilets have Beta values of .100, .043, .022, with p values of .152, .560, and .744, they were proven to have less influence. As a result, it is reasonable to infer that the physical qualities that adversely affected residents' satisfaction with sanitary services were rendered with painted walls, a well-equipped kitchen, and access to power.

#### CONCLUSIONS

As was noted in the preceding study and discussion (SPSS), physical attributes and resident satisfaction were examined using the Statistical Package for Social Science. According to the survey, toilet facilities with plastered and painted walls and tiles, a well-equipped kitchen, no finishing wall, power and generator, a kitchen lacking modern amenities, concrete, and a pit latrine have all affected house happiness. It also illustrates that physical features significantly impact resident satisfaction in the researched location.

Because a neighbourhood's physical qualities impact resident contentment, the government must provide more and better social amenities to improve resident satisfaction. Because most households in the community think that their security is terrible, the government or policymakers must develop better measures to help the area become more secure. Proper routine management of social amenities should be implemented to ensure acceptable neighbourhood conditions and resident satisfaction in the research area.

#### REFERENCES

- 1. Musa, H., Bello, M., & Kayode, S. (2021). Effect of Neighbourhood Characteristics on Resident's Satisfaction in Doya Area of Bauchi Metropolis. *Path of Science*, *7*(4), 6001-6005. doi: 10.22178/pos.69-8
- 2. Jinping, X. (2017, October 18). Secure a decisive victory in building a moderately prosperous society in all respects and strive for the great success of socialism with Chinese characteristics for a new era. Retrieved from http://www.xinhuanet.com/english/download/Xi\_Jinping's\_report\_at\_19th\_CPC\_National\_Congr ess.pdf
- 3. May, J., & Daly, E. (2020). *Dignity rights for a Pandemic*. Retrieved from https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=3661019
- 4. Rašticová, M., Birčiaková, N., Kolářová, I., & Rampulová, K. (2016). Seniors' Life Satisfaction in Regions of the Czech Republic. *Lecture Notes of the Institute for Computer Sciences, Social Informatics and Telecommunications Engineering*, 898–908. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-33681-7\_80
- 5. Uwaezuoke, N. I., Sani, G. S., Igoche, F. O., Akaehomhen, O. N., & Sakariyau, J. K. (2022). Hedonic Modelling of Residential Rental Values in Ilorin Metropolis. International Journal of Latest Technology in Engineering, Management & Applied Science, 11(4), 01-09.
- 6. Rašticová, M., & Kolářová, I. (2015). Myths about ageing population. In *Innovation Vision 2020: from Regional Development Sustainability to Global Economic Growth*. Amsterdam: International Business Information Management Association (IBIMA).
- Mohit, M. A., Ibrahim, M., & Rashid, Y. R. (2010). Assessment of residential satisfaction in newly designed public low-cost housing in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. *Habitat International*, 34(1), 18–27. doi: 10.1016/j.habitatint.2009.04.002
- Olufemi, O. O., Ishiyaku, B., Salihu, M. M., & Kayode, S. J. (2021). Effect of Military Housing Condition on Housing Preference and Adequacy in Shadawanka Barrack Bauchi, Bauchi State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Latest Technology in Engineering, Management & Applied Science, 10*(12), 01–06. doi: 10.51583/ijltemas.2021.101201
- Kayode, S., Muhammad, M., & Bello, M. (2021). Effect of Socio-Economic Characteristics of Households on Housing Condition in Bauchi Metropolis, Bauchi State, Nigeria. *Path of Science*, 7(7), 2001–2013. doi: 10.22178/pos.72-6

- Sakariyau, J. K., Muhammad, S. M., Bello, M. U., Aliyu, A. A., & AbdulRazak, R. (2023). Socio-Economic Characteristics of Households Determining Housing Satisfaction in Bauchi Metropolis, Bauchi State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Real Estate Studies*, 17(1), 59–69. doi: 10.11113/intrest.v17n1.318
- Umar, M., Oyeleke, O., Adeleke, M., & Ojeniyi, S. (2021). Effect of Socio-Economic Attributes on Resident's Satisfaction in Low-Density Area of Bauchi Metropolis. *Path of Science*, 7(6), 2001-2005. doi: 10.22178/pos.71-9
- 12. Hashim, H. (2017). Linking the past to the present: housing history and the sense of home in temporary public rental housing in Sarawak (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from https://rest.neptune-prod.its.unimelb.edu.au/server/api/core/bitstreams/755db4e8-c565-5f6ba67e-ba037ad2c902/content
- Kayode, S., Jamiu, Ngozi Ifeanyi, U., & Temitope Komolafe, O. (2021). Housing Affordability among Civil Servants in Ekiti State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Research and Review*, 8(10), 383–390. doi: 10.52403/ijrr.20211051
- 14. Akinola, A. O. (2018). The Structure and Nature of the Nigerian State. *Globalization, Democracy and Oil Sector Reform in Nigeria*, 87–143. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-70184-4\_5
- 15. Yusuf, R., Muhammad, I., Otunola, A., & Kayode, S. (2021). Effect of Accessibility on Commercial Property Rental Values Performance in Oja Oba Market, Ilorin Metropolis. *Path of Science*, 7(12), 2001-2006. doi: 10.22178/pos.77-7
- 16. Bello, A., & Egresi, I. (2017). Housing Conditions in Kano, Nigeria: A Qualitativeassessment of Adequacy. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/319504314\_Housing\_conditions\_in\_Kano\_Nigeria\_A\_ qualitative\_assessment\_of\_adequacy