

Resident's Satisfaction and Preferences in Housing Provision by Public-Private Partnership and Private Developers in Abuja, Nigeria

Ojeniyi Sulaiman Adekunle¹, Oluwadare Joel Olaifa², Abubakar Idriss Mohammed³,
Aisha Ibrahim Biko⁴, Rukayya Abdulrazak⁴

¹ *Ecole Superieure Sainte Felicite University*

03 BP 4050, Godomey Houedonou Cotonou, Abomey-Calavi, Benin Republic

² *Joel Olaifa & Partners*

78 Ralph Sodeinde Street, Abuja, Nigeria

³ *Mai Idris Aloomu Polytechnic*

P. M. B. 1020, Geidam, Yobe State, Nigeria

⁴ *Abubakar Tafawa Balewa University*

Dass road, P. M. B. 0248, Bauchi, Nigeria

DOI: [10.22178/pos.84-2](https://doi.org/10.22178/pos.84-2)

JEL Classification: O18

Received 20.07.2022

Accepted 20.08.2022

Published online 31.08.2022

Corresponding Author:

Ojeniyi Sulaiman Adekunle

kunleoje@yahoo.com

© 2022 The Authors. This article is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)



Abstract. It is well known that housing demands ranked second in the hierarchy of human necessities after food. This study examined inhabitants' choices and satisfaction with housing provided by private developers and public-private partnerships in Abuja. Participants were given questionnaires at the public-private partnership and private developer estates; at the public estate, 300 questionnaires were distributed, of which 227 were retrieved. Of the 24 questionnaires served for the Private Developer development Ologunloye Estate, 11 were retrieved. According to the analysis. T-test analysis was also used to determine the difference between inhabitants' choices and contentment with dwellings provided by the government and PPP in the research area. At 0.06 and 0.011, which is smaller than the 0.05 significance level, the ANOVA findings likewise showed a significant difference in residence satisfaction between public housing estates and PPP. Building a bridge between residents' preferences and their own should be a goal of developers in both the public and private housing sectors. To boost resident appreciation and satisfaction, it would be best if the drainage systems, waste management, and sewage disposal were improved. The survey's findings indicate that respondents' contentment and preference for inhabitants are incredibly high, high, and moderate.

Keywords: housing; public-private partnership; private housing; Abuja; Nigeria.

INTRODUCTION

Housing was considered crucial to one's health and well-being and a sign of personal fulfilment [18]. One of the three basic requirements of humanity is housing. Its effectiveness should align with both general user expectations and technological requirements. The role of the home in supplying human comfort through humans and the environment is crucial since it has a significant impact on people's lives as well as the lives of the country [28]. Making sure that particular housing or other necessities are fulfilled at a

price or rent that does not subject people to excessive financial hardship is referred to as affordability in housing [39]. Housing is one of the three basic requirements of humanity. Its effectiveness should meet all general technical requirements and those set by users [39]. Residents' opinions of their surroundings and area impact how satisfied they are with their homes. The satisfaction of renters' basic housing needs is shown by the low degree of dissatisfaction and the high level of agreement between planned and actual circumstances [1]. Housing satisfaction is a

subjective assessment based on what a person perceives as the primary component of their current living situation [37].

Providing livable and satisfactory residential housing in terms of standards, quality, user needs, assumptions, and wishes is one of private and public real estate developers [25]. In developing nations like Nigeria, resident satisfaction remains a significant concern despite efforts from both corporate and state housing developers [26]. In the extended term, residents' satisfaction is related to a range of elements, including physical, social, and neighbourhood features, as well as psychological and socio-economic characteristics of the residents [7]. Maximizing citizens' well-being is the ultimate goal of a city's improvement [34].

Private involvement is necessary to control spatial growth connected to housing, especially in emerging nations like Nigeria. Maximizing citizens' well-being is the ultimate goal of a city's improvement [9]. To analyze and evaluate the significance and impact of investments in housing construction, inhabitants' preferences are necessary [3]. Housing preferences have been the subject of numerous studies because planners and other housing industry stakeholders are concerned about the influence of citizens. Authors [39] investigated housing provision and soldier housing preferences at Shadawanka Barrack in Bauchi to satisfy the housing needs of military soldiers in the research area. Data were gathered using a questionnaire instrument, a descriptive and exploratory research design, a quantitative technique, and a survey strategy. The barracks' overall or typical level of housing conditions was assessed as fair. In his work, [21] employed ordered probit analysis to investigate the relationship between some individual-related characteristics and the residential satisfaction of households. The main conclusions of this investigation indicate a complex relationship between house qualities, especially neighbourhood aspects, and residential satisfaction. Once housing and neighbourhood factors were considered, socio-demographic characteristics of individuals and households (including age, gender, and education) only had a minor impact. This study concentrated primarily on private estates. Authors [26] investigated how to deal with the difficulties of public-private partnerships (PPPs) for housing delivery in Nigeria; nevertheless, the author neglected to look at users' contentment and housing calibre. The quality of PPP housing, resident

happiness and choice in FCT Abuja were not the focus of any of the studies above. As a result of the arguments above, there is a gap in the body of literature about the performance of residential properties offered by private and public-private partnerships in the Federal Capital Territory of Abuja. To suggest strategies to increase inhabitants' satisfaction and preferences in the FCT Abuja, this research compares residential properties offered by public-private partnerships and private developers. The following are the study's goals:

1. To evaluate residents' satisfaction with housing provision by the Public Private Partnership and Private Developer in FCT Abuja.
2. To investigate the significant areas of residents' preferences in housing provision by the Public Private Partnership and Private Developer in the study area.
3. To assess the differences in residents' satisfaction and preferences in housing provision by the Public Private Partnership and Private Developer in the study area.

Literature review

Concept of Housing. Housing can be viewed as an economic good, a social good, or a fundamental human right, and it is evident that it has a profound impact on every single person [8]. According to [11], the term "housing" has been interpreted variously by different professions. However, each definition places equal emphasis on the function of housing in providing security and comfort to its occupants. The economy of the person, the local community, and the country are all significantly impacted by housing investments. It often represents a person's first significant financial commitment and life goal [23]. Housing costs a substantial percentage of a family's or business's budget, yet in terms of private and public investment, the built environment is a person's most tangible material asset [36]. Housing is also a crucial component of human settlement that satisfies a fundamental need. It significantly impacts a person's quality of life, health, welfare, and productivity [6]. Housing is more than just a place to live or utilize domestic utilities; it also incorporates environmental features like waste management, water supply, road access, and the user's socio-cultural and behavioural traits [15]. To meet the basic and social needs of the population and to ensure safety, sol-

ace, and easiness for the users, the process of providing a significant number of residential buildings permanently with adequate physical infrastructure and social services in planned, decent, safe, and sanitary neighbourhoods is known as housing [2]. It is impossible to overstate how important housing is to man, particularly regarding psychological happiness and socio-economic well-being. Housing thus promotes modern existence and morality in addition to individuals' mental and bodily well-being [16].

Concept of Satisfaction. "The satisfaction one feels comes from having one's wants and desires met." In Rai's opinion, satisfaction can be categorized as either cognitive or affective. Based on what is received in comparison to expectations, the experience is evaluated [35]. Customer satisfaction and customer delight are commonly linked. Customers receive desirable value from the goods or services that give them satisfaction, at least to a certain amount. According to ISO 10004, customer judgment and opinion constitute satisfaction. The degree of satisfaction is defined as the discrepancy between the customer's impression of the supplied goods and their expectations.

Residential Satisfaction. Residential contentment is the feeling of well-being one experiences when their requirements or wants are satisfied at home. Several studies have investigated it, and the findings are recognized as a significant factor in determining a person's assessment of the quality of a home and an indicator of how well government and non-governmental housing programs are working [24]. The idea of residential pleasure has therefore changed throughout time. The notion of residential happiness has evolved in recent years to encompass the complete fulfilment of tenants' fundamental housing needs, including structural and physical defects, in addition to the delivery of necessary facilities, tools, and installations, as well as access to sources of income, to make the area a secure and comfortable location for human settlement [25].

Concept of Public Private Partnership. Public Private Partnership (PPP) is a strategy for delivering governmental services and projects in conjunction with the private sector [32]. PFI (Private Finance Initiative), which is where the idea of PPP started in the United Kingdom in the 1960s, may be summed up as the general idea and comprehension of responsibility, sharing guidelines between the public and private sectors. Public-Private Partnership was further defined by [32]

as a relatively new idea that originated in the United Kingdom in the 1960s and involves carrying out public projects and services through "partnership arrangements with the private sector, particularly in the areas of facilities called PFI (Private Finance Initiative). PPP is described as a range of various contributions from both public and private arrangements. PPPs are a viable option for firms managed nearly exclusively by the public sector on one side of the spectrum to those controlled almost entirely by the private sector.

In Nigeria, PPPs have been used to increase the supply of urban housing whilst resolving difficulties with residential accessibility and affordability [14]. PPP is described by [20] as a group of joint ventures involving the public and private sectors. Private parties join the government to fund infrastructure in a public-private partnership (PPP). It describes a government program or for-profit enterprise that was created and is run as a result of an alliance between the government and one or more businesses from the private sector [4]. Public and private sector partnerships are essential to motivate the private sector to take a proactive role in tackling Nigeria's escalating urban housing issue. PPP is not the purchase of an item but rather the payment for a stream of services provided by rules and regulations. Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs), which take on various forms, are institutions where the private and public sectors share duties, benefits and risks in housing, infrastructure and service provision [14]. Urban infrastructure delivery through the private sector is anticipated to ease the financial strain on the public sector while assuring accountability, monitoring, and management [30]. The Public-Private Partnership (PPP) program was implemented in Nigeria to increase the supply of urban housing while solving housing accessibility and affordability [14].

Private Housing: Issues and Factors. Poor access to housing as barriers to land rights, high costs of building materials, planning restrictions and codes and issues with residential infrastructure are the main issues limiting the private sector's ability to provide housing [22]. The optimum way to enable private housing in Nigeria is by determining the dynamics of these issues and how they affect different kinds of private developers.

Access to finance. The private housing sector depends heavily on finance, and it faces severe challenges due to limited access to capital. Due to the country's deteriorating economic situation during the past one to two decades, over 70% of Nigerians are likely below the international poverty threshold [29]. The obvious consequence is that the self-help developers, responsible for most of the housing units in both urban and rural areas, have limited capacity. Additionally, this influential group of private housing developers typically lacks access to institutional financing and cannot obtain loans. Most funding for building homes comes from individual savings [5].

Building sites for residential development. In the process of developing dwellings, the land is crucial. However, it is difficult to obtain land for homes in Nigerian cities [27]. In many cities around the country, prospective homebuilders can find at least three land sources. The first is by buying construction sites from locations the government has already purchased. The potential developer often foots the bill for the crucial infrastructure the government supplies to these areas after negotiating the bureaucratic procedure of acquiring a Certificate of Occupancy. Traditional land holdings are a part of the second strategy. For instance, in conventional towns like Benin City, Ibadan, and Kano, the metropolitan areas are divided into quarters with chiefs or community heads appointed by traditional authorities. There may be land distribution committees in the quarters. The third includes purchasing land from individuals who have individual land pieces. These people are typically land speculators who buy property under the traditional land allocation process and then sell it for astronomical sums. It also includes the purchase or use of peri-urban land for homes, which helps explain suburban ad hoc unplanned communities. The city later starts to have these towns. The availability of land is frequently significantly impacted by this category. For instance, in the suburbs around Abuja, the federal capital, landowners provide 40% of the sources of land for small-scale house developers [38].

Planning and institutional issues. Planning regulations and building laws can restrict the nation's private sector's capacity to create housing [17]. Most Nigerian cities' building and planning regulations are derived from the Town and Country Planning Law documents. These laws were based on the Town Planning Act of 1959 and the Town and Country Ordinance of 1946. These were

primarily constructed using planning methods used during British colonial rule. Even while the Urban and Regional Planning Law 1992, which went into effect around three years ago and has yet to have the expected result, reflects an attempt to harmonize planning regulations among cities, it has not yet had the anticipated effect.

Residential infrastructure development. Infrastructure for residential use can promote the construction and supply of dwellings. It not only raises property values, which attracts home builders to a location but also assures orderly growth, preventing unfavourable environmental conditions brought on by a lack of ecological infrastructure services. Many Nigerian cities have few environmental facilities, especially in the suburbs. Although town planning law outlines the procedure for developing infrastructure, they are frequently executed exclusively in government-acquired areas [13]. Potential plot purchasers in government-owned lands are obligated to cover the costs of extending the areas' roads, drains, and water supply. Before a Certificate of Occupancy is granted, this is paid as a planning rate. In the regions around Abuja, this category of residential land supply makes up roughly 20%, whereas traditional lands and private land supplies make up 80% [30].

The discussion above provides an introductory lesson: many migrant households are not committed to metropolitan life and may have plans to move back to their hometowns. As a result, many like constructing their first homes close to where they live. Many Nigerian homes may never make it to the city because it is an expensive lifetime investment, at least in terms of income.

METHODOLOGY

Quantitative research techniques were applied in this investigation. The Abuja @ 30 housing estates (PPP) with 300 housing units, out of which 227 questionnaires were retrieved, and Olugunloye (private), which contains 24 housing units, were the study's target populations. Of the 24 questionnaires that were distributed, 11 were returned. Therefore, all residents of the two Estates are included in the study's population. After careful data collection, the field data was analyzed using SPSS Version 22 using descriptive, mean ranking, and multiple linear regressions.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In the Ministerial housing estate, respondents provided background data such as gender, age, household size, monthly income, and educational background. It was found that 63.6 % of the respondents were men and 36.4 % were women. This reveals that most people surveyed in the research region are male responders. The table shows that respondents under 30 make up 45.5 % of the total, and respondents between the ages of 31 and 60 make up 54.5 %.

Table 1 – Demographic information of respondents (Abuja @ 30 housing estate, PPP)

| Variables | Options | Frequency | % |
|-------------------------|---------------------------|-----------|------|
| Gender | Male | 132 | 58.1 |
| | Female | 95 | 41.9 |
| Age | Under 30 years | 24 | 10.6 |
| | 31 to 60 years | 179 | 78.8 |
| | Above 60 years | 24 | 10.6 |
| Household size | Below four people | 101 | 44.5 |
| | 5 to 8 people | 123 | 54.2 |
| | 9 to 12 people | 2 | 0.9 |
| | Above 13 people | 1 | 0.4 |
| Monthly income | Less than 50,000 | 23 | 10.1 |
| | N51,000–100,000 | 23 | 10.1 |
| | N101,000–150,000 | 69 | 30.5 |
| | N151,000–200,000 | 55 | 24.2 |
| | Above N20,000 | 57 | 25.1 |
| Education qualification | Informal education | 6 | 2.6 |
| | Primary/Secondary | 16 | 7 |
| | Diploma/NCE | 18 | 8 |
| | Degree/HND | 113 | 49.8 |
| | Master's Degree and above | 74 | 32.6 |

This indicates that the age range of most respondents in the study area is between 31 and 60. Table further showed that households with four or fewer members make up 9.1 % of all households, followed by those with five to eight members at 72.7 % and those with nine to twelve members at 18.2 %. This suggests that 5 to 8 persons make up the majority of households in the research area. Informal education makes up 9.1 % of the total education, with 9.1 % of respondents possessing a first leaving/secondary certificate, 18.2 % possessing a diploma/NCE, 45.5% possessing a first degree/HND certificate, and 18.2 % possessing a Master's degree or higher. This shows that degree/HND holders outweigh non-degree holders in the study region.

According to the table's depiction of the respondents' age distribution, 54.5% of respondents

were aged 31 to 60, and 45.5% were under 30. This shows that respondents in the research region are primarily between the ages of 31 and 60.

Table 2 – Demographic information of Respondents (Olugunloye Housing Estate, Private Developer)

| Variables | Options | Frequency | % |
|-------------------------|---------------------------|-----------|------|
| Gender | Male | 7 | 63.6 |
| | Female | 4 | 36.4 |
| Age | Under 30 years | 5 | 45.5 |
| | 31 to 60 years | 6 | 54.5 |
| Household size | Below four people | 1 | 9.1 |
| | 5 to 8 people | 8 | 72.7 |
| | 9 to 12 people | 2 | 18.2 |
| Monthly income | Less than 50,000 | 1 | 9 |
| | N51,000–100,000 | 4 | 36.4 |
| | N101,000–150,000 | 3 | 27.3 |
| | N151,000–200,000 | 3 | 27.3 |
| Education qualification | Informal education | 1 | 9.1 |
| | Primary/Secondary | 1 | 9.1 |
| | Diploma/NCE | 2 | 18.2 |
| | Degree/HND | 5 | 45.5 |
| | Master's Degree and above | 2 | 18.2 |

Table further showed that households with four or fewer members had a 9.1% rate, while those with 5 to 8 members had 72.7%, and those with 9 to 12 members had 18.2%. This demonstrates that most households in the study area have between 5 and 8 members. Informal education makes up 9.1% of respondents' educational backgrounds. Of those, 9.1% had their first leaving or secondary certificate, followed by 18.2% who had their diploma or NCE, 45.5% had their first degree or HND, and 18.2% had their master's degree or above. This shows that most people in the studied area have a degree or HND.

Text below describes and analyses the respondents' responses to questions about Abuja's residents' preferences and housing quality. A 5-point Likert scale was employed throughout the study, with several components having unique scale descriptors.

Research Question 1 – the level of Residents' Satisfaction with housing Provision by Public Private Partnership and Private Developer (Tables 3–4).

With mean scores of 4.08, 4.04, 4.01, 3.92 and standard deviations of 1.139, .859, .806 and .830, privacy, floor quality, window and wall conditions, respectively, ranked first, second, third,

and fourth in Table 3, while ventilation, toilets facilities, drainage system, and sewage disposal ranked eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth, respectively.

Table 3 – level of Residents’ Satisfaction in Abuja @ 30 Housing Estate (PPP)

| Variables | Mean | Std. Deviation | Ranking | Remarks |
|------------------------|------|----------------|---------|----------------------|
| Privacy | 4.52 | .796 | 1st | Extremely satisfied |
| Floor quality | 4.19 | .781 | 2nd | Very satisfied |
| Conditions of windows | 4.17 | .569 | 3rd | Very satisfied |
| Toilets facilities | 4.16 | .576 | 4th | Very satisfied |
| Roof | 4.14 | .603 | 5th | Very satisfied |
| Walls | 4.10 | .646 | 6th | Very satisfied |
| Doors | 4.08 | .661 | 7th | Very satisfied |
| Ceiling | 3.87 | 1.284 | 8th | Very satisfied |
| Parking space | 3.86 | .739 | 9th | Very satisfied |
| Paintings of the walls | 3.77 | .892 | 10th | Very satisfied |
| Sewage disposal | 3.55 | .944 | 11th | Very satisfied |
| Drainage system | 3.31 | 1.037 | 12th | Moderately satisfied |
| Ventilation | 3.29 | 1.059 | 13th | Moderately satisfied |
| Waste management | 3.19 | .987 | 14th | Moderately satisfied |

According to the rank ordering of the fourteen type constructs used to measure resident satisfaction with private housing developers, privacy, floor quality, window and wall conditions, and security received the highest rankings. Ventilation, restroom amenities, and privacy received the lowest orders. The sewage disposal and drainage system came in last. This result is in line with [16] study on the post-occupancy assessment of residential satisfaction in Lagos' Oniru Estate. Along with external visual quality, quality of maintenance, structural quality, quality of services, quality of estate roads, quality of the landscape and open spaces, environmental layout, and location, other factors are evaluated, including road accessibility, functionality, spatial efficacy and efficiency, aesthetics, safety, and confidentiality.

Table 4 – Level of Resident’s Satisfaction in Olugunloye Housing Estate (Private Developer)

| Variables | Mean | Std. Deviation | Ranking | Remarks |
|------------------------|------|----------------|---------|----------------------|
| Privacy | 4.08 | 1.139 | 1st | Very satisfied |
| Floor quality | 4.04 | .859 | 2nd | Very satisfied |
| Conditions of windows | 4.01 | .806 | 3rd | Very satisfied |
| Walls | 3.92 | .830 | 4th | Very satisfied |
| Parking space | 3.75 | .794 | 5th | Very satisfied |
| Roof | 3.67 | .868 | 6th | Very satisfied |
| Ceiling | 3.65 | 1.167 | 7th | Very satisfied |
| Paintings of the walls | 3.63 | 1.096 | 8th | Very satisfied |
| Doors | 3.50 | .933 | 9th | Very satisfied |
| Waste management | 3.04 | 1.042 | 10th | Moderately satisfied |
| Ventilation | 3.01 | 1.197 | 11th | Moderately satisfied |
| Toilets facilities | 2.92 | 1.248 | 12th | Moderately satisfied |
| Drainage system | 2.89 | 1.100 | 13th | Moderately satisfied |
| Sewage disposal | 2.83 | 1.090 | 14th | Moderately satisfied |

Table 4 showed that ventilation, sewage disposal, drainage system, and waste management were ranked 11-14th, respectively. In contrast, privacy, floor quality, conditions of windows, and walls were ranked first-fourth, respectively, with mean scores of 4.4203, 4.3188, 4.2174, and 4.2003 and standard deviations of .79346, .46944, .41549, and .40449. The fourteen type constructs on residents' preferences in the ministerial housing estate were ranked, and the results showed that privacy, floor quality, window and wall conditions, and ventilation received the highest rankings. In contrast, sewage disposal, drainage systems, and waste management received the lowest orders. The conclusions concur with [10]. The Changing Structure of Preferences and Housing-Related Attributes also show that residents favoured their privacy, a good waste disposal system, and appropriate ventilation.

Research Question 2 – Major Areas of Residents’ Preference in housing Provision by Public Private Partnership and Private Developers (Table 5–6).

Table 5 – Major Areas of Residents' Preference in Abuja @ 30 Housing Estate (PPP)

| Variables | Mean | Std. Deviation | Ranking | Remarks |
|------------------------|--------|----------------|---------|----------------------|
| Privacy | 4.4026 | .80097 | 1st | Highly preferred |
| Floor quality | 4.2987 | .45868 | 2nd | Highly preferred |
| Conditions of windows | 4.1991 | .40022 | 3rd | Preferred |
| Walls | 4.1983 | .40007 | 4th | Preferred |
| Doors | 4.0998 | .37683 | 5th | Preferred |
| Parking space | 4.0996 | .30007 | 6th | Preferred |
| Roof | 4.0779 | .56182 | 7th | Preferred |
| Ceiling | 3.7922 | 1.08352 | 8th | Preferred |
| Paintings of the walls | 3.7576 | .79242 | 9th | Preferred |
| Toilets facilities | 3.7143 | .98498 | 10th | Preferred |
| Sewage disposal | 3.2944 | 1.00862 | 11th | Moderately preferred |
| Ventilation | 3.2597 | 1.01813 | 12th | Moderately preferred |
| Drainage system | 3.1948 | .98297 | 13th | Moderately preferred |
| Waste management | 3.0048 | .98007 | 14th | Moderately preferred |

With mean scores of 4.3750, 4.3333, 4.2083, 4.2013 and standard deviations of .82423, .48154, .41485 and .41243, privacy, floor quality, conditions of windows, and walls were ranked first, second, third, and fourth respectively. According to Table 5, sewage disposal, ventilation, drainage system and waste management were ranked eleventh, twelve, thirteenth, and fourteenth, respectively. The ranking of the fourteen types of constructions on residents' preferences for private housing developers showed that the most significant orders were for privacy, floor quality, windows and wall conditions and privacy. While waste management, ventilation, drainage, and sewage disposal received the lowest rankings. This result is consistent with [12], which showed that residents of low-cost housing schemes typically favour homes with good floor qualities, good drainage systems, proper waste management, parking space and privacy.

Difference between Residents' Satisfaction and Residents' Preferences in the Housing Provision by Public Private Partnership (PPP) and Private Developer in the Study Area. According to Table 7, the test for homogeneity of variance found that all significant levels are above 0.05, indicating

that the outcome is consistent across the two constructs.

Table 6 – Major Areas of Residents' Preference in Olugunloye Housing Estate (Private Developer)

| Variables | Mean | Std. Deviation | Ranking | Remarks |
|------------------------|--------|----------------|---------|----------------------|
| Privacy | 4.3750 | .82423 | 1st | Highly preferred |
| Floor quality | 4.3333 | .48154 | 2nd | Highly preferred |
| Conditions of windows | 4.2083 | .41485 | 3rd | Preferred |
| Walls | 4.2013 | .41243 | 4th | Preferred |
| Doors | 4.1982 | .41135 | 5th | Preferred |
| Roof | 4.1250 | .53670 | 6th | Preferred |
| parking space | 4.0833 | .28233 | 7th | Preferred |
| Ceiling | 3.7917 | 1.02062 | 8th | Preferred |
| Paintings of the walls | 3.7197 | .72106 | 9th | Preferred |
| Toilets facilities | 3.7083 | 1.04170 | 10th | Preferred |
| Sewage disposal | 3.2500 | .98907 | 11th | Moderately preferred |
| Ventilation | 3.2083 | 1.02062 | 12th | Moderately preferred |
| Drainage system | 3.1667 | .96309 | 13th | Moderately preferred |
| Waste management | 3.0017 | .96301 | 14th | Moderately preferred |

Table 7 – Test of Homogeneity of Variances

| | Levene Statistic | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
|-------------------------|------------------|-----|-----|------|
| Residents' satisfaction | 2.849 | 2 | 319 | .059 |
| Residents Preferences | .060 | 2 | 321 | .942 |

Table 7's significance of ANOVA reveals a significant difference between residents' preferences and resident satisfaction at 0.00, below 0.05.

Table 8 shows the degree of individual type comparison for private and PPP. There is no discernible difference between private and PPP housing options regarding resident preferences. Residents' satisfaction shows a substantial difference between private and PPP at 0.011, below the suggested 0.05.

According to the study's findings, respondents at the Olugunloye and Abuja @ 30 housing estates (private). The respondents said they were delighted with their living situation in the study locations.

Table 8 – ANOVA

| Dependent Variable | | Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|-------------------------|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|------|
| Residents' satisfaction | Between Groups | 4.889 | 2 | 2.445 | 7.797 | .000 |
| | Within Groups | 100.017 | 319 | .314 | | |
| | Total | 104.906 | 321 | | | |
| Residents Preferences | Between Groups | .061 | 2 | .030 | .109 | .896 |
| | Within Groups | 88.990 | 321 | .277 | | |
| | Total | 89.051 | 323 | | | |

Table 9 – Tukey HSD Multiple Comparisons

| Dependent Variable | (I) Type | (J) Type | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error | Sig. | 95% Confidence Interval |
|-------------------------|----------|----------|-----------------------|------------|------|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | Lower Bound |
| Residents' satisfaction | Private | PPP | -.22517* | .07770 | .011 | -.4081 |
| | PPP | Private | .22517* | .07770 | .011 | .0422 |
| | Private | PPP | .03292 | .07224 | .892 | -.1372 |
| Residents Preference | PPP | Private | -.03292 | .07224 | .892 | -.2030 |

According to the survey, residents of Abuja @ 30 Housing Estate (PPP) and Olugunloye Housing Estate (private) favoured resident preference in the studied regions.

The difference in residents' tastes and satisfaction with the homes offered by the PPP and Private Developers in the study region was also determined using t-test analysis. According to the ANOVA results, there is a significant difference in residence satisfaction between PPP and public housing estates at 0.06 and 0.011, below the 0.05 level.

CONCLUSIONS

The study was conducted at a period when the need for shelter among humans has always been a problem for both those in need of housing and those in charge of building or planning it. It is well known that housing needs come in second

to food in the hierarchy of human needs. According to the results of the poll, replies about resident satisfaction and preference are very high, high and moderate, respectively. The study showed no discernible difference between homeowners' preferences and their satisfaction with the homes offered by private and public developers in the study area.

The study makes the following recommendations to help improve residents' satisfaction and preferences in FCT Abuja in light of the findings and inferences from the study. Since waste management and drainage are essentially the least popular services in the two selected estates, it is urgently necessary for developers in public and private sectors to significantly enhance them. Developers should narrow the gap between resident preferences and those in public and private housing sectors.

REFERENCES

- Alabi, O. T., Kayode, S. J., Misbahu, A., & Olaifa, O. J. (2021). Effect of Physical Characteristics on Resident's Satisfaction in a High-Density Area of Ilorin Metropolis. *Path of Science*, 7(9), 1001–1006. doi: [10.22178/pos.74-1](https://doi.org/10.22178/pos.74-1)
- Amao, F. L. (2012). Housing quality in informal settlements and urban upgrading in Ibadan, Nigeria (A case study of Apete in Ibadan). *Developing Country Studies*, 2(10), 68–80.
- Ambarwati, L., Verhaeghe, R., van Arem, B., & Pel, A. J. (2017). Assessment of transport performance index for urban transport development strategies – Incorporating residents' preferences. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review*, 63, 107-115. doi: [10.1016/j.eiar.2016.10.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eiar.2016.10.004)
- Awodele, O. A. (2012). *Framework for managing risk in privately financed market projects in Nigeria* (Doctoral dissertation), Heriot-Watt University.

5. Ayedun, C. A., & Oluwatobi, A. O. (2011). Issues and challenges militating against the sustainability of affordable housing provision in Nigeria. *Business Management Dynamics*, 1(4), 1–8.
6. Babalola, D. O., Ibem, E. O., Olotuah, A. O., & Fulani, O. (2016). Residents' perception of quality of public housing in Lagos, Nigeria. *International Journal of Applied Environmental Sciences*, 11(2), 583–598.
7. Balestra, C., & Sultan, J. (2013). *Home Sweet Home: The Determinants of Residential Satisfaction and its Relation with Well-being*. doi: [10.1787/5jzbcx0czc0x-en](https://doi.org/10.1787/5jzbcx0czc0x-en)
8. Ball, M. (2017). *Housing policy and economic power: the political economy of owner occupation*. London: Routledge.
9. Biko, A. I., Musa, H. A., Muhammad, B. A., & Aliyu, A. M. (2022). Resident's Satisfaction and Preferences in Housing Provision by Government and Private Partnership in Abuja. *Path of Science*, 8(6), 1019–1027. doi: [10.22178/pos.82-1](https://doi.org/10.22178/pos.82-1)
10. Chiwuzie, A., Dabara, D., Prince, E., Ajiboye, B., Olawuyi, S. (2020). Housing-Related Attributes and the Changing Structure of Preferences. *African Journal of Built Environment Research*, 4(1), 37–58.
11. Dalil, M., & Yamman, U. (2013). Private sector participation in the provision of urban services: an overview of housing supply in Minna, Niger state, Nigeria. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention*, 2(4), 51–58.
12. De Zoysa, S. H. M., Ridmika, K. I., Seneviratne, L. D. I. P., & Perera, B. A. K. S. (2021). Alterations' impacts on sustainability of low-cost housing schemes in Sri Lanka: the occupants' perspective. *International Journal of Construction Management*, 1–11. doi: [10.1080/15623599.2021.1943628](https://doi.org/10.1080/15623599.2021.1943628)
13. Ekpodessi, S. G. N., & Nakamura, H. (2018). Land use and management in Benin Republic: An evaluation of the effectiveness of Land Law 2013-01. *Land Use Policy*, 78, 61–69. doi: [10.1016/j.landusepol.2018.06.025](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2018.06.025)
14. Ibem, E. O. (2011). Public-Private Partnership (PPP) in Housing Provision in Lagos Megacity Region, Nigeria. *International Journal of Housing Policy*, 11(2), 133–154. doi: [10.1080/14616718.2011.573204](https://doi.org/10.1080/14616718.2011.573204)
15. Jiboye, A. D. (2010). The correlates of public housing satisfaction in Lagos, Nigeria. *Journal of Geography and Regional Planning*, 3(2), 17.
16. Jiboye, A. D. (2014). Significance of house-type as a determinant of residential quality in Osogbo, Southwest Nigeria. *Frontiers of Architectural Research*, 3(1), 20–27. doi: [10.1016/j.foar.2013.11.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foar.2013.11.006)
17. Johnson, C. (2011). *Creating an enabling environment for reducing disaster risk: Recent experience of regulatory frameworks for land, planning and building in low and middle-income countries*. Retrieved from <https://www.preventionweb.net/english/hyogo/gar/2013/en/bgdocs/Johnson,%202011.pdf>
18. Kayode, S. J., Muhammad, M. S., & Bello, M. U. (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](https://doi.org/10.22178/pos.72-6)
19. 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](https://doi.org/10.52403/ijrr.20211051)
20. Khanom, N. A. (2010). Conceptual issues in defining public private partnerships (PPPs). *International Review of Business Research Papers*, 6(2), 150–163.
21. Kim, J. (2017). *Residential satisfaction of long-term public rental housing* (Doctoral dissertation), KDI School.

22. Makinde, O. O. (2013). Housing delivery system, need and demand. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, 16(1), 49–69. doi: [10.1007/s10668-013-9474-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10668-013-9474-9)
23. Martin, R. (2011). The local geographies of the financial crisis: from the housing bubble to economic recession and beyond. *Journal of Economic Geography*, 11(4), 587–618.
24. 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](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.habitatint.2009.04.002)
25. Muhammad, S., Aremu, R., & Akande, S. O. (2018). Comparative Assessment of Residential Satisfaction between Public and Private Housing Estates in Federal Capital City (FCC) Abuja, Nigeria. *International Journal of Geography and Environmental Management*, 4(3), 53–62.
26. Muhammad, Z., & Johar, F. (2018). Coping with Challenges of Public-Private Partnership (PPP) for Housing Delivery in Nigeria. *International Journal of Engineering & Technology*, 7(2.29), 1097. doi: [10.14419/ijet.v7i2.29.14320](https://doi.org/10.14419/ijet.v7i2.29.14320)
27. Muhktar, B. A., (2010). Land accessibility and implications for housing development in Kano Metropolis, Nigeria (Doctoral dissertation), University of Sheffield.
28. 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](https://doi.org/10.22178/pos.69-8)
29. Ogun, T. P. (2010). Infrastructure and Poverty Reduction: Implications for Urban Development in Nigeria. *Urban Forum*, 21(3), 249–266. doi: [10.1007/s12132-010-9091-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s12132-010-9091-8)
30. Oladokun, T. T., & Aluko, B. T. (2012). *Public-private partnership in housing delivery in Lagos State, Nigeria*. Retrieved from <https://ir.oauife.edu.ng/handle/123456789/7714?show=full>
31. Olatunbosun, A. J. (2018). A comparative analysis of residential quality of public and private estates in an urban centre of Lagos, Nigeria: A case study of Iba Estate in Ojo and Unity Estate in Alimosho. *Journal of Geography and Regional Planning*, 11(4), 46–60.
32. Olofa, S., & Nwosu, A. (2015). Investigating the problems associated with Public Private Partnership in the process of housing delivery in Nigeria. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 3(1), 123–130.
33. 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](https://doi.org/10.51583/ijltemas.2021.101201)
34. Saidu, A. I., & Yeom, C. (2020). Success Criteria Evaluation for a Sustainable and Affordable Housing Model: A Case for Improving Household Welfare in Nigeria Cities. *Sustainability*, 12(2), 656. doi: [10.3390/su12020656](https://doi.org/10.3390/su12020656)
35. Srivastava, M., & Rai, A. K. (2013). Investigating the mediating effect of customer satisfaction in the service quality-customer loyalty relationship. *Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction & Complaining Behavior*, 26(3), 95–109.
36. Stone, M. E. (1993). *Shelter Poverty: New Ideas on Housing Affordability*. Temple University Press. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt14bt4bs>
37. Thomsen, J., & Eikemo, T. A. (2010). Aspects of student housing satisfaction: a quantitative study. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, 25(3), 273–293. doi: [10.1007/s10901-010-9188-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10901-010-9188-3)
38. Umoh, N. N. E. (2012). *Exploring the enabling approach to housing through the Abuja mass housing scheme* (Doctoral dissertation), Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
39. 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.