VOL. 03 NO. 4,
FEBRUARY, 2024
E-ISSN 3026-9210
P-ISSN 3026-815X



African Scholar Publications & Research International
www.africanscholarpub.com

Journal of Built Env. & Geological Research (JBEGR)

An Analysis of Factors Influencing Households Residential Location Preferences in Abuja, Nigeria

Eyinla Opeyemi Lucky
Auchi Polytechnic, Auchi, Edo State.
rallyberry@gmail.com

Abstract

Households made some basic decision and sacrifice in location choice, which reflect in the reason for residing in their resident. This study examines how some factors are relatively considered in residential choice by different households which reflect in their decision to settle in different location of Abuja. The study was conducted by making use of four different clustered dictricts within the two study areas Lugbe, Wuse, Kubwa and Garki (high dense residential area of Abuja), using 480 structured questionnaires which highlight those factors that have been grouped for the household to choose, each zone is 120 questionnaires. These were ranked using linkert scale and analyses using spearman rank order correlation analysis method. A total of 478 questionnaires were returned, only in Lugbe was 118 returned. The study revealed that those reasons that are peculiar to different households in different neighbourhoods which form the reasons why they reside in such location. The results shows that socioeconomic factors such as income of households has high influence on the decision of households in all the districts, while proximity to working palce also has high influence on all the districts. But family influence, also proximity to information technology were just moderately scored in all the districts. When comparing the calculated value (Rho) with the critical value 0.382, it reveals there is no significant relationship in the factors influencing household preference between Lugbe and Wuse (0.024); Lugbe and Garki (0.284); Wuse and Kubwa (0.123); Kubwa and Garki (0.07). Also, there is significant relationship in the factors influencing households'

preference between Lugbe and Kubwa (0.628); Wuse and Garki (0.640), even though a positive relationship exist between all the districts. The study conclude that socioeconomic factors is crucial in every location decision of households as it relate it with other factors. It is will be useful for urban planner, policy makers and real estate investors on the tenants' desire and reasons for those locations, which should enhance the pattern of development.

Keywords: Residential, Choice, Household, Preferences, Location

Introduction

Location has form basis of interest in demand of dweller in choosing residential properties not only in the study area but everywhere, where space is attachable for human habitation and this has triggered value differences to those environment (Oladapo et al, 2019). Many plan to reside in places that bring both internal comfort and external comfort to their households (Gobi et al, 2019; Oladapo et al, 2019). Therefore family influence, play a major role in residential site location decisions, with different interest and some basic needs which are put into consideration. A husband may want to live close to work, while his wife wants to reasonable close to commercial and social centres. Both want to live in a "good" and prestigious neighbourhood and yet, secure housing at what they consider a reasonable price. They want indoor living space plus outdoor play areas for their children and easy access to schools and parks (Ubani 2015). They may want to live near particular friends or relatives or be near public transportation facilities. They may desire a spot away from the city and close to nature and perhaps a site where they can build their dream house. These objectives are seldom filled by any one location. Some goals must be emphasized at the expense of others in the decision-making process and final decisions are often hard to explain. Though some argue that, these factors don't operate in isolation as Burgress & Skeltys (1992) stated that it is difficult to pick these factors in isolation from each other in taking decisions for many reasons. It is believe that when gaining possession of house or home, they gain a whole package of goods; physical features, accessibility and also neighbourhood characteristics and amenities.

On this note, the relatively lasting influence in which some factors have on residential preferences decision makes an understanding of those factors vital for the formation and effective management of residential demand (Guo & Bhat 2006).

Aim and Objectives

The aim of the study is to analyze the factors influencing residential location preference of households in Abuja, Nigeria with a view to suggesting effective planning proposal towards enhancing urban livability and real estate development decision.

To achieve this aim, there are set objectives;

1. identify those factors influencing the households residential decisions
2. Score the various variables that could influence the households' preference of location of residential property in the study areas.
3. Correlating the neighbourhoods to one another to verify whether their decision relate to one another and whether there is a positive significant in the relationship.

Literature Review

Housing preference is regarded as the continuous decisions of the households about where to reside, based on the existing facilities, bundle of services, social benefits and housing goods. It is worthy of note that individual taste can change as a result of several factors such as growth in size of the family, income change etc. that is why the life cycle model posits that as individuals move through the various stages of life, their housing needs change, prompting moves to more suitable housing (Freeman, 1998). This therefore indicates that people that are younger and single individuals are most likely to move and preference for housing is going to definitely differ or change more rapidly among individuals having these features.

There are different factors which influences location of household in a given environment; this can be family influences, social influence or factor, security, accessibility, amenities and facilities e.t.c (Barlowe, 1978). Kelly & Lamb (2003) revealed some factors to include distance to work place, school or shopping, physical condition of the environment including density, pollution, and neighbourhood conditions, the quality and accessibility to community facility, financial values of neighbourhood as well as social aspect, such as social, economic or ethnic

characteristics. Research has shown several factors influencing the decision of households regarding residing in different location of their choices.

Therefore, household tends to consider all these factors before deciding where and which place to live. Some people tend to live in an environment as a result of commercial activities common in the place, which enhance their businesses or activities. Therefore, an environment of such nature tends to command higher rent than some other places.

Average household tend to live in an environment where there is low cost of living, example, where household can have a maximum saving without spending much on may be food, rent, transportation, e.t.c. this environment involves mostly where one can see the average income earner. Most people prefer to live in areas that boast a pleasant climate, low living costs, and opportunities for the satisfaction of their wants and desire which preferential in nature. In deciding where they and their households will live, individuals often are torn between the counter pull of their wants as consumers and their wants as producers. As consumers, they "seek to settle where living is secure, cheap and agreeable of which the available facilities are not compromised. As producers, they seek to locate where earnings will be large and assured and the working conditions pleasant". It is particularly true that people tends to live in areas which are accessible to their place of work, market, school, religious centers and health facilities of which therefore results to complementarities of the various land uses available.

Even though it is not possible to achieve all the factors in the decision, but the residential preference of households generally involves trade-offs among several factors which give the household the highest possible satisfaction.

It is worthy of note that as housing costs affecting decision of location, there are multiple factors influencing household's residential location decisions (Blijie, 2004; Curtis & Montgomery, 2006; Kim, 2010). It is worthy to note the categorization of this factors into socioeconomic attributes, physical attributes, amenities attributes and neighbourhood factors.

Socio Economic Factors/ Income and Price Variables

Several researches that studied these factors found out that cost and size of dwelling unit, and proximity to activity centers were the most influential. Choice was also found to be dependent on household demographics such as household size, life cycle and

income. Research studies have also attempted to determine resident's decision for central city and suburban locations.

Location decision affecting residential in Abuja development can be influence by economic consideration in much the same way as those involving commercial and industrial establishments. The typical householder wants convenience as well as space and a pleasing environment. He prefers to live near his place employment, near market service centers, and at the same time minimize his housing costs. Income is highly important as it is needed in offsetting the cost of housing. Therefore, it is a huge determinant in housing location. Income of household is put into consideration, in renting or buying residential property, as location price/ cost are not the same in several places which is as a result of several factors in real estate value.

Glent et al (1980) analyzed consumers' tradeoffs in the process of making decision and the selection from among alternatives residential locations in North America. The study concluded that even when transportation is crucial is also not as socioeconomics and demographic factors in determining where people choose to live. That is why William et al (2004) shows that a quite number of residential location decision are tends to enjoy socioeconomic benefit/ status of the location.

It is worthy of note the study conducted in Istanbul city by Dokmeci et al (1996), in which reveals that even though some households are low income earners but they desired to move to location to be closer to their relatives. This further express that staying close to their kin help them to get support when they have difficulties.

Socio cultural factors

Social characteristics is a huge influencing factors which reveal family tie, cultural and tradition practices of households. Many studies in the past regarding housing research have shown that social stratification and homogeneity is vital to residential location choices (Sirgy et al 2005). Social connection reveals how many households relate to their bloodlines, cultutral group and colleague. Many people tends to stay in places where they fill sense of belonging, or where their relations/ kin mostly resides. It has been revealed that social connection and prestige is an important determinant of household residential location. Winstanley et al (2002) revealed familiarity and social connections influences residential location decision. Many don't want to leave a familiar environment to which they are used to and became attached.

While also in United State, Gou & Bhat (2006), revealed that households tend to stay in an area with a high rate of other similar household structure or size.

Neighbourhood Character/ Infrastructure and Housing Quality Factor

The facilities to be enjoyed within environment trigger decisions of households in residing within the neighbourhood. Some households reside in a place as a results of the indoor quality of the house regardless of the others factors. The house quality ranges from availability of space, size, and finishes in term of fittings and fixtures etc. Neighbourhood design has significant influence on the residential location. Meyer & Gearing (2001) shows a survey result which reveal that people above 45years prefer a centrally located neighbourhoods which is walkable and denser in population.

Recreational site within neighbourhood is a factor in which Colwell et al (2002) revealed a connection between recreation site and preference of household for residential. They revealed a positive relationship in which the stronger the taste for recreation the more likely a person is to stay close to recreation sites.

Conceptual Framework and Theory

Housing preference theory reveal that a household residential location decision is a function of physical features (dwelling type, house price and size of dwelling unit), socioeconomic and demographic (household income, household size and workplace location), accessibility attributes (travel time and cost to work), neighbourhood attributes (infrastructures & community facilities), environmental attributes (air quality and size of natural areas) and sociocultural attributes (racial diversity and closeness to kinsmen) (Oladapo et al, 2019; Kim et al, 2005a; Zondag & Pieters, 2005; Opaluwa & Aribigbola, 2015). Kim et al, (2005b); Zondag & Pieters (2005); Curtis & Montgomery (2006) stated that household's decisions is view in 2 major phases; which are residential mobility stage and the housing choice stage. This made Curtis & Montgomery (2005), review it that a household's decision to move or stay in a current home by tenants is affected by a range of push factors (example housing price and insecurity) and pull factors (example proximity to working place, access to quality schools). Therefore when a decision to relocate is done, it definitely leads to the housing choice stage which involves considering of series of factors of dwelling and location attributes.

Lekan & Felicia (2009), carried out a study on the determinants of household residential district preferences in Ibadan metropolis. Their method was basically clustered the study area into three neighbourhood (high, medium and low), in which Mapo area was regarded as high density, while Mokola and Bodija estate area were regarded as medium and low density respectively. And the analysis was done on estimation and reveal that ethnicity and socioeconomic factors are crucial factor affecting household residential preference in high density while in medium density it is environmental quality which is 86% and in low density it is being influence more by hypothesis security of land. Their result further supported by hypothesis which reveal that each category of residential density area of a city, has different unique set of determinants of households' residential location preferences unique to it.

In the thesis of Ubani (2015), regarding factors influencing residential location decision in Port Harcourt, Nigeria. The study, area was clustered into 3 different density (high, medium and low) covering some environment within the study area. And it also adopt some factors in obtains information for the study which was 38 push factors & 33pull factors and later group under some main characters. It make use of Linkert scale and it analysis was carried out using spearman rank order correlation and analysis of variance. It reveals that there is a relationship between factors that influence residential location preference and socioeconomic status of households in the study area. Also level of education attained and the push & pull factors in the study area. As well as income and factors influencing residential location decision. But no significant relationship between household size and factors influencing residential location choice. It is recommended that to reduce household mobility/ change of location, neighbourhood factors should be enhanced to meet up with modern day's infrastructure and services. Ubani et al (2017), indicated a variety of push and pull factors in explaining housing decisions of households in Port Harcourt Metropolis, Nigeria. The study discovered that a highly ranked push factors which include ownership of a home in a new location, high levels of insecurity and crime rate. And the high ranked pull factors include the new destination's security, households' income.

Opaluwa & Aribigbola (2015) carried out a study on factors affecting the choice of residential housing in Lokoja, Kogi State, Nigeria. The study made use of data obtained from 610 households. Also involve multinomial logistic regression analysis was used in which the result reveal that the preference of flats were determined by cost

housing, age, distance to medical facilities, and distance to place of work. It is also similar to preference to duplex. Though the study failed to show the sample frame from each cluster neighbourhood and the sample size designated to each.

Oladapo et al (2019), did an investigation on factors influencing tenants' choice of location of residence in Bosso Local Municipality, Minna, Nigeria. The study tried to establish the roles played by a variety of housing attributes through an analytical survey. It obtained data from 277 structured questionnaire which were answered by the household heads, mostly tenants in the study area. The study made use of factor analysis to reduce the variety of housing variable to a small set of influential components. It was shown that the most important components of residential location choice is dwelling attributes which is being refer to as physical attributes, in which involves factors like numbers of toilets to numbers of bedrooms. This component also follow by accessibility attributes e.g proximity to working place, schools etc. the study therefore of opinion that landowners should respond to the preference of tenants in term of dwelling attributes by building adequate and require number of toilets/ bathrooms to the number of bedrooms.

In one study conducted in Netherlands about residential location choice, by Zondag & Pieters (2005), which use multinomial logic model to analyze various household types. The study revealed that the role of accessibility in residential location choice about different household types is significant but relatively less when compared to socioeconomic and demographic variables, neighbourhood amenities. This method also was adopted by Kim et al (2005), when carrying out similar study in Oxfordshire in the UK. The method adopt preference approach which models the intention to relocate by tradeoffs between accessibility, neighbourhood, household characteristics and physical attributes. It is therefore concluded that households prefer a residential location with a combination of few commuting time, little transport costs, quality schools and lower costs of house.

Jun & Morrow-Jones (2011), analyze homeowner's choice of denser neighbourhood in Columbus, Ohio. It used regression analysis. In the study, each of the variables employed in the model, it was provided specific role; in which neighbourhood characteristics ranked the lowest with a limited role while accessibility factors and household characteristics play moderate and vital roles respectively. In following this trend of ranking characteristics, the multinomial logit model used by Sanit et al (2013), which reveal that socioeconomic characteristics, especially household income and

workeplace location take a significant role in analyzing the location choice of households to live near a rail transit system in Bangkok, Thailand.

Also in Ghana, Acheampong & Anokye (2013), investigated the theory surrounding residential location choice. The study reveal that family tie, proximity to workplace relatively low housing cost/ rentals are the most important reveal factors for residential location choice in 2 urban settlements of Kumasi. It further shows that sociocultural, dwelling and accessibility consideration are significantly more vital than the housing and neighbourhood attributes.

Methodology

The study will be carried out using both primary and secondary data. The primary data is obtained from the use of structured questionnaires to different clustered neighbourhoods in the two study areas. The study area is clustered to 4 different zones which are Lugbe axis, Wuse district, Kubwa district and Garki district. The residents around these zones were chosen 120 households in which questionnaires were given each to represent each zone. These was based on the fact that the neighbourhoods or district represent different character of household population (high, medium and low density). The total questionnaires therefore sum up to 480 which represent the sample size for the study. The questionnaires were all returned except in Lugbe which record 118, this indicate a total of 478 returned questionnaires, which was analysed using descriptive frequency and as well using 5.0 linkert scale which further adopt spear man rank order correlation.

Summary of the Study

The vary factors influencing households location preferences differs across diverse environment but similarity exist in some related locations. But in all of this, there is a unique pattern in Africa context about this related study. That is, some revelation about the importance of sociocultural attributes in the residential location preference of households when compare to similar studies across Europe and America. It is therefore, observe the reason could be the attachment of households in Africa settings to their cultural affinity (Oladapo et al, 2019).

The summary from the above studies indicate that, the factors that affect households' residential choice varies from one location to another and various households types.

Table 4.1 showing size of the households within the Districts

Size of Household	Frequency			
	Lugbe	Wuse	Kubwa	Garki
1	12	25	13	15
2	25	35	25	12
3	34	38	26	34
4	36	7	20	23
5	10	13	29	26
6	1	2	7	10
Total	118	120	120	120

Survey field 2022

Table 4.2 showing response to renewal of rent after expiration in the Districts

Willingness to renew existing rent	Frequency			
	Lugbe	Wuse	Kubwa	Garki
Yes	89	114	110	102
No	29	6	10	18
Total	118	120	120	120

Field survey 2022

Table 4.1 and 4.2 above indicate the households' distributions and whether they are ready to renew their tenancy within the location. The study reveal high concentration of households' class between 2 to 4 across the study areas. Meanwhile more than 75% of the respondent want to renew their stay within the resident area which indicate a strong reason or derivation for residing within the location of choice.

Table 4.3 Response of households to Factors Influencing location preferences (L= Lugbe, W=Wuse, K =Kubwa, G = Garki)

Factors	Very high (4)				High (3)				Moderate (2)				Low(1)			
	L	W	K	G	L	W	K	G	L	W	K	G	L	W	K	G
Socioeconomic factors	42	10	34	18	33	18	37	32	39	47	32	38	4	45	17	32
Low rent																
Household Income	44	30	49	42	35	38	39	38	30	29	21	19	9	23	11	21

Low cost of living	35	12	38	23	42	15	34	31	25	36	31	33	16	57	17	33
Employment opportunities	12	32	14	33	15	21	20	38	26	35	40	27	65	32	46	22
Sociocultural Factors **Family influence**	9	12	16	17	5	18	25	23	77	40	43	33	22	50	36	47
Living close to relations	10	30	12	21	6	29	23	38	74	41	45	45	28	20	40	16
Infrastructure availability and accessibility **Facilities and amenities**	33	35	23	36	26	37	44	38	28	38	34	31	31	10	19	15
Proximity to school	35	36	55	23	32	31	41	32	34	27	16	37	17	26	8	28
Proximity to information technology	7	11	12	14	12	20	18	35	45	36	31	42	54	62	59	29
Proximity to banking facilities	8	49	45	18	16	43	38	47	52	17	25	33	42	11	12	22
Proximity to place of worship	16	12	27	23	19	23	41	28	47	15	35	41	36	70	17	28
Proximity to filling station	7	24	1	13	9	31	9	29	36	35	49	46	66	30	61	29
Proximity to working place	35	49	20	50	38	46	48	57	24	12	42	11	21	13	10	2
Proximity to market	20	39	26	17	18	32	47	36	43	31	38	38	37	18	9	29
Security and safety **Calmness and orderliness**	16	32	18	42	19	35	45	48	48	29	33	17	35	24	24	13
No or low crime rate	18	50	22	46	33	38	35	38	35	21	45	27	32	11	18	9
Housing Quality Factors	19	48	35	39	31	36	48	39	36	21	25	24	32	15	12	18

Beauty of the building																
Management skills	9	24	23	21	16	36	34	38	67	30	23	36	26	30	40	25
Aesthetics features	14	23	27	39	18	32	45	25	47	36	36	34	39	29	12	23
Neighborhood Characters	10	47	32	42	13	43	33	38	37	18	24	21	58	12	31	19
Urban services																
Cooperation with in neighbourhood	13	21	46	36	16	36	41	34	46	38	23	36	43	25	10	14
Absence of urban pollution	12	73	18	35	13	23	34	31	42	15	37	24	51	9	31	30

Source: Field survey, 2022

Table 4.3 above represent data obtain from the field using linkert scale of 4point, where the respondent choose from very high reason to low (i.e Very High= 4, High = 3, Moderate= 2 and Low = 1). In which L represent Lugbe district, W represent Wuse district, K represent Kubwa district while G represent Garki district.

Table 4.4 derivation from the table 4.3 above

Factors	**Very high (4)**				**High (3)**				**Moderate (2)**				**Low(1)**			
	L	**W**	**K**	**G**	**L**	**W**	**K**	**G**	**L**	**W**	**K**	**G**	**L**	**W**	**K**	**G**
Socioeconomic factors	168	40	136	72	99	54	111	96	78	94	64	76	4	45	17	32
Low rent																
Household Income	176	120	196	168	105	114	117	114	60	58	42	38	9	23	11	21
Low cost of living	140	48	152	92	126	45	102	93	50	72	62	66	16	57	17	33
Employment opportunities	48	128	56	132	45	63	60	114	78	105	120	81	65	32	46	22
Sociocultural Factors	36	48	64	68	15	54	75	69	154	80	86	66	22	50	36	47
Family influence																
Living close to relations	40	120	48	84	18	87	69	114	148	82	90	90	28	20	40	16

Infrastructure availability and accessibility	132	140	92	144	78	111	132	114	56	76	68	62	31	10	19	15
Facilities and amenities																
Proximity to school	140	144	220	92	96	93	123	96	68	54	32	74	17	26	8	28
Proximity to information technology	28	44	48	56	36	60	54	105	90	72	62	84	54	62	59	29
Proximity to banking facilities	32	196	180	72	48	129	114	141	104	34	50	66	42	11	12	22
Proximity to place of worship	64	48	108	92	57	69	123	84	94	30	70	82	36	70	17	28
Proximity to filling station	28	96	4	52	27	93	27	87	72	70	98	92	66	30	61	29
Proximity to working place	140	196	80	200	114	138	144	171	48	24	84	22	21	13	10	2
Proximity to market	80	156	104	68	54	96	141	108	86	62	76	76	37	18	9	29
Security and safety	64	128	72	168	57	105	135	144	96	58	66	34	35	24	24	13
Calmness and orderliness																
No or low crime rate	72	200	88	184	99	114	105	114	70	42	90	54	32	11	18	9
Housing Quality Factors	76	192	140	156	93	108	144	117	72	42	50	48	32	15	12	18
Beauty of the building																
Management skills	36	96	92	84	48	108	102	114	134	60	46	72	26	30	40	25
Aesthetics features	56	92	108	156	54	96	135	75	94	72	72	68	39	29	12	23
Neighborhood Characters	40	188	128	168	39	129	99	114	74	36	48	42	58	12	31	19
Urban services																
Cooperation with in neighbourhood	52	84	184	144	48	108	123	102	92	76	46	72	43	25	10	14
Absence of urban pollution	48	292	72	140	39	69	102	93	84	30	74	42	51	9	31	30

Source: Field survey 2023

Table 4.5 Showing the derivation from table 4.4

FACTORS	LUGBE			WUSE			KUBWA			GARKI		
Socioeconomic factors **Low rent**	349	2..96	High	233	1.94	Moderate	328	2.73	High	276	2.3	Moderate
Household Income	350	2.97	High	315	2.63	High	366	3.05	High	341	2.84	High
Low cost of living	332	2.81	High	222	1.85	Moderate	333	2.78	High	284	2.37	Moderate
Employment opportunities	236	2.0	Moderate	328	2.73	High	282	2.35	Moderate	349	2.91	High
Sociocultural Factors **Family influence**	227	1.92	Moderate	232	1.93	Moderate	261	2.18	Moderate	250	2.08	Moderate
Living close to relations	234	1.98	Moderate	309	2.58	High	247	2.06	Moderate	304	2.53	High
Infrastructure availability and accessibility **Facilities and amenities**	297	2.52	High	337	2.81	High	311	2.59	High	335	2.79	High
Proximity to school	321	2.72	High	317	2.64	High	383	3.19	High	290	2.42	Moderate
Proximity to information technology	208	1.76	Moderate	238	1.98	Moderate	223	1.86	Moderate	274	2.28	Moderate
Proximity to banking facilities	226	1.92	Moderate	370	3.08	High	356	2.97	High	301	2.51	High
Proximity to place of worship	251	2.12	Moderate	217	1.81	Moderate	318	2.65	High	286	2.38	Moderate
Proximity to filling station	193	1.64	Moderate	289	2.41	Moderate	190	1.58	Moderate	260	2.17	Moderate
Proximity to working place	323	2.73	High	371	3.09	High	318	2.65	High	395	3.29	High
Proximity to market	257	2.18	Moderate	332	2.77	High	330	2.75	High	281	2.34	Moderate
Security and safety	252	2.14	Moderate	315	2.63	High	297	2.48	Moderate	359	2.99	High

Calmness and orderliness												
No or low crime rate	273	2.31	Moderate	367	3.06	High	301	2.51	High	361	3.01	High
Housing Quality Factors	273	2.31	Moderate	357	2.98	High	346	2.88	High	339	2.83	High
Beauty of the building												
Management skills	224	1.90	Moderate	294	2.45	Moderate	280	2.33	Moderate	295	2.46	Moderate
Aesthetics features	243	2.05	Moderate	289	2.41	Moderate	327	2.73	Moderate	322	2.68	High
Neighborhood Characters	211	1.79	Moderate	365	3.04	High	306	2.55	High	343	2.86	High
Urban services												
Cooperation with in neighbourhood	235	1.99	Moderate	293	2.44	Moderate	363	3.03	High	332	2.77	High
Absence of urban pollution	222	1.88	Moderate	400	3.33	High	279	2.33	High	305	2.54	High

Source: Field Survey, 2023

The table 4.5 above shows that socioeconomic factors are recorded high within the reasons for residing in Lugbe and Kubwa by the majority of the households, but employment opportunities within these factors is moderate among all the districts is except Garki where it is score high. Also sociocultural factors especially family influence is scored moderate in all the district, but living close to relations is scored high in Wuse and Garki respectively. This reveal that generally sociocultural factors are not really a high influence on residing in those districts. Furthermore, infrastructural and accessibilities factors reveal high within the district in which all the districts uniformly agreed high influence of facilities amenities and proximity to working place as a great influence while proximity to school is scored high only in Garki scored moderate, but proximity to filling stations is seen to be moderate across all the districts. But housing quality factors are not really scored high within the districts as management skills and aesthetic features are not seen as highly important which score moderate. Neighbourhood characters is lastly seen as important factors, where absence of urban pollution is scored high in all except in Lugbe.

Table 4.6 obtained from table 4.5

Lugbe x_1	Wuse x_2	Kubwa x_3	Garki x_4	R_1	R_2	R_3	R_4
2..96	1.94	2.73	2.3	2	19	8.5	19
2.97	2.63	3.05	2.84	1	11.5	2	6
2.81	1.85	2.78	2.37	3	21	6	17
2.0	2.73	2.35	2.91	13	9	16	4
1.92	1.93	2.18	2.08	16.5	20	19	22
1.98	2.58	2.06	2.53	15	13	20	11
2.52	2.81	2.59	2.79	6	7	12	8
2.72	2.64	3.19	2.42	5	10	1	15
1.76	1.98	1.86	2.28	21	18	21	20
1.92	3.08	2.97	2.51	16.5	3	4	13
2.12	1.81	2.65	2.38	11	22	10.5	16
1.64	2.41	1.58	2.17	22	16.5	22	21
2.73	3.09	2.65	3.29	4	2	10.5	1
2.18	2.77	2.75	2.34	9	8	7	18
2.14	2.63	2.48	2.99	10	11.5	15	3
2.31	3.06	2.51	3.01	7.5	4	14	2
2.31	2.98	2.88	2.83	7.5	6	5	7
1.90	2.45	2.33	2.46	18	14.5	17.5	14
2.05	2.41	2.73	2.68	12	16.5	8.5	10
1.79	3.04	2.55	2.86	20	5	13	5
1.99	2.44	3.03	2.77	14	14.5	3	9
1.88	3.33	2.33	2.54	19	1	17.5	12

Checking whether there is relationship existing between the decisions taken by each neighbourhoods in Abuja for the study.

Also whether there is significant in the existing relationship between them.

Decision Rule:

H_A: there is positive relationship between the decisions taken by the neighbourhoods towards factors influencing location preferences of households in Abuja.

Ho: there is no relationship between the decisions of the neighbourhoods towards the factors influencing location preferences of households in Abuja.

Also;

HA: there is significant in the relationship existing in the decisions of the neighbourhoods in the study area.

Ho: there is no significant in the relationship existing between the decisions of the neighbourhoods in the study area.

This can be achieved using the table in the above presentation, that is, the linkert scale table derived;

Table 4.7 derived from the above table 4.6

D_1	D_2	D_3	D_4	D_5	D_6	D^2_1	D^2_2	D^2_3	D^2_4	D^2_5	D^2_6
-17	-6.5	-17	11.5	0	-11.5	289	42.25	289	132.25	0	132.25
-10.5	-1	5	9.5	5.5	-4	110.3	1	25	90.25	30.25	16
-18	-3	-14	15	4	-11	324	9	196	225	16	121
4	-3	9	-7	5	12	16	9	81	49	25	144
-3.5	-2.5	-5.5	1	-2	-3	12.25	6.25	30.25	1	4	9
2	-5	4	-7	2	9	4	25	16	49	4	81
-1	-6	-2	-5	1	4	1	36	4	25	1	16
-5	4	-10	9	-5	-14	25	16	100	81	25	196
3	0	1	-3	-2	1	9	0	1	9	4	1
13.5	14.5	3.5	-1	-10	-9	182.25	210.25	12.25	1	100	81
-11	0.5	-5	11.5	6	-5.5	121	0.25	25	132.25	36	30.25
5.5	0	1	-5.5	-4.5	1	30.25	0	1	30.25	20.25	1
2	-6.4	3	-8.5	1	9.5	4	40.96	9	72.25	1	90.25
1	2	-9	1	-10	-11	1	4	81	1	100	121
-1.5	-5	7	-3.5	8.5	12	2.25	25	49	12.25	72.25	144
3.5	-6.5	5.5	-10	2	12	12.25	42.25	30.25	100	4	144
1.5	2.5	0.5	1	-1	-2	2.25	6.25	0.25	1	1	4
3.5	0.5	4	-3	0.5	13.5	12.25	0.25	16	9	0.25	182.25
-4.5	3.5	2	8	6.5	-1.5	20.25	12.25	4	64	42.25	2.25
15	7	15	-8	0	8	225	49	225	64	0	64
-0.5	11	5	11.5	5.5	-6	0.25	121	25	132.25	30.25	36
18	1.5	7	-16.5	-11	5.5	324	2.25	49	272.25	121	30.25

Table 4.8 Testing whether there is relationship existing between factors influencing location preferences of household within the districts.

Relationship between districts	Spearman rank order correlations Rho (p) = 1- $\frac{6\sum D^2}{N(N^2-1)}$	Degree of freedom (df)=N-1	Level of significant	Critical value
Lugbe and Wuse	0.024	20	0.05	0.382
Lugbe and Kubwa	0.628	20	0.05	0.382
Lugbe and Garki	0.284	20	0.05	0.382
Wuse and Kubwa	0.123	20	0.05	0.382
Wuse and Garki	0.640	20	0.05	0.382
Kubwa and Garki	0.07	20	0.05	0.382

The table 4.8 above shows the hypothesis testing for relationships between the different districts of study. It reveals that the correlation is not significant in the relationship factors influencing household preference between Lugbe and Wuse; Lugbe and Garki; Wuse and Kubwa; Kubwa and Garki. The critical value is greater than the calculated value (Rho) which indicate no significant relationship, although there is a positive relationship between factors influencing location preferences of households between the districts. Furthermore, between Lugbe and Kubwa; Wuse and Garki, the correlation is significant as the critical value is less than the calculated value (Rho), also there is a positive relationship between factors influencing location preferences of households between the districts.

Conclusion

It's been exposed that several factors influence the decision of households about residing in a given location. This factors can be relatives and trade off, that is, some location benefit might not have it all, but they project some better factors which can overshadow the deficiency of other factors. For examples, in the study area, there are many who resided in Lugbe to enjoy relative low rent but couldn't enjoy access to banking services (few banks types are available) in which they travel far to the nearest district for banking. The study reveal a relative positive relationship between this factors influencing households within different districts.

Research Significant

Housing as an important aspect of human life with several social and economic benefit and derivative function of comfort. It is very important to take a deep look at those factors which influence our relative decision in taking shelter around several neighbourhoods. This will help the urban policy makers in development process to facilitate a reasonable related functions, also enhance the decision of the developer in giving the tenants the enjoyable facilities and qualities that will retain their occupations. As well develop a reasonable determinant for rental value assessment.

REFERENCES

Acheampong, R.A. & Anokye, P.A. (2013). Understanding Households' Residential Location Choice in Kumasi's Peri-urban Settlements and the Implications for Sustainable Urban Growth. *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences, 3*(9), 60-70.

Barlowe. R (1986) *Land Resources Economics*, 4th Edition, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, Nj

Blijie, H.P. (2004). *Residential Location Choice: The Influence of Migration and Commuting Distance*. Available at: https://www.cvs-congres.nl

Burgess, R., and Skeltys, N. (1992) Findings from the Housing and Location Choice Survey: an overview', eds. *Housing and Urban Development Division and Department of Health Housing and Community Services. Australian Government Publishing Service*

Colwell, P.F., Dehring, C.A., and Turnbull, G.K. (2002)"Recreation Demand and Residential Location" *Journal of Urban Economics,* 51, 418–28.

Curtis, C. & Montgomery, M. (2006). *Housing Mobility and Location Choice: A Review of the Literature.* Working Paper, Curtin University of Technology, Australia. Available at: http://urbanet.curtin.ed.au/

Dokmeci V., Berkoz , L., Levent H., Yurekli H. and Cagdas G. (1996)" Residential Preferences in Istanbul" *Habitat International*,20 (2) 241-251.

Freeman, L. (1998),"Interpreting the Dynamics of Public Housing: Cultural and Rational Choice Explanations". *Housing Policy Debate*. 9(2), 323-345.

Glen, W., Moshe, B.A., and Steven, L.,(1980) "Tradeoffs In Residential Location Decisions:Transportation Versus Other Factors" *Transportation Policy and Decision-Making,* 1 (1)1-14.

Guo, J. Y., and Bhat, C. R. (2006)" Operationalizing the Concept of Neighborhood: Application to Residential Location Choice Analysis" *Journal of Transport Geography*, 15(1), 31-45.

Jun, H. & Morrow-Jones, H.A. (2011). Residential Density and Location Decisions: The Factors affecting Homeowners' Choice of Denser Neighbourhoods. *Housing and Society*, *38*(2), 117-142.

Kim, J.H., Pagliara, F. & Preston, J. (2005a). The Intention to Move and Residential Location Choice Behavior. *Urban Studies, 42*(9) 1621-1636.

Kim, M. (2010). *Residential Location Decisions: Heterogeneity and the Trade-off between Location and Housing Quality.* Doctoral Dissertation, Ohio State University.

Kim, T., Horner, M.W. & Marans, R.W. (2005b). Life Cycle and Environmental Factors in Selecting Residential and Job Locations. *Housing Studies, 20*(3), 457-473

Kelly, J. B., and Lamb, M. E. (2003)"Developmental issues in relocation cases involving young children: When, whether and how" *Journal of Family Psychology,* 17, 193–205

Lekan, S., and Felicia, O.A. (2009)"Determinants of Households' Residential Districts' Preferences within Metropolitan City of Ibadan, Nigeria" *Journal of Human Ecology* 25(2): 137-141.

Myers, D., and Gearin, E. (2001) "Current Preferences and Future Demand for Denser Residential Environments" *Housing Policy Debate*12 (4): 633-59.

Oladapo, R.A., Ojo, B., Ayoola, A.B. & Kemiki, O.A. (2019). Factors Influencing Tenants' Choice of Location of Residence in Bosso Local Municipality, Minna, Nigeria. *Journal of African Real Estate Research*, *4*(1) 23-41. DOI:10.15641/jarer.v4i1.662.

Opaluwa, A.I. & Aribigbola, A. (2015). Factors affecting the Choice of Residential Housing in Lokoja, Kogi State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Innovative Science, Engineering & Technology, 2*(10), 850-859

Sanit, P., Nakamura, F., Tanaka, S. & Wang, R. (2013). Residential Location Choice Analysis along the Urban Railway Corridor in Bangkok, Thailand. *Paper presented at the 13th World Conference on Transport Research,* Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

Sirgy, M.J., Grzeskowiak, S., and Su, C. (2005) "Explaining housing preference and choice: The role of self-congruity and functional congruity" *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment,* 20, 329–47

Ubani, P., Alaci, D.S.A. & Udoo, V. (2017). Determinants of Residential Neighbourhood Choice in a Nigerian Metropolis. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science, 22*(7), 1-11.

Winstanley, A., Thorns, D., and Perkins, H.C. (2002) "Moving House, Creating Home: Exploring Residential Mobility" *Housing Studies,* 17(6) 813–32.

William, A.V., Marinus, C.D., and Frans M.D. (2004) Choosing Neighborhood: Residential Mobility and Neighborhood Careers Amsterdam publishers California, Los Angeles.

Zondag, B. & Pieters, M. (2005). Influence of Accessibility on Residential Location Choice. *Paper for Presentation at the 84th Annual Meeting of the Transportation Research Board.* Washington