Occupants housing satisfaction: does age really matter?
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Scholars from diverse disciplines have established how objective and subjective housing attributes influence occupants’ housing satisfaction. The aim of this study is to determine the effect of age grouping on overall housing satisfaction with respect to private housing development in Abuja, Nigeria. Samples of 112 structured questionnaires were systematically administered to the occupants of Prince and Princess Housing Estate. Sixty-six were subsequently retrieved for analysis representing 74% response rate. Descriptive statistics and one-way analysis of variance was conducted, and the result indicates that there was a statistically significant difference for total housing satisfaction between age groups. A Tukey’s post hoc test revealed that housing satisfaction was statistically significantly higher in the 61 and above age group in the sample. The result implies that there is a need to incorporate specific demographic changes such as in age groups in residential housing development and policy plan especially in developing countries. The study also contributes to further our understanding on the relationship between resident’s socio-demographic characteristics and housing satisfaction. This paper represents first housing satisfaction studies that examines age factor to determine level of variation in housing satisfaction between various age groups in private housing development in the Nigerian context.
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Introduction

Housing is recognized as basic necessity in line with other infrastructure such as good roads, access to health services, adequate water, electricity and schools among others (Clement & Kayode, 2012). Housing satisfaction promotes national economic development as indicator of person’s standard of living and place in the society (Jiboye, 2009). Housing is an indispensable ingredient in the productive life course of an individual, family, community and the nation. Housing is provided through public as well as private sector initiatives including self-help in most countries of the world. While public housing is government delivered infrastructure, private housing consists of private developers, cooperative societies and individual (including self help) or a group of individuals (Salleh, 2008).

Housing provided through whatever means is expected to meet certain minimum requirements, which is perceived through expression of happiness and satisfaction of the occupants. The challenging task before the various housing stakeholders is how to
identify factors determining housing satisfaction and the necessary approach in housing development planning (Jiboye, 2009), and such factors are numerous with a complex relationship (Teck-Hong, 2012). Identifying housing satisfaction parameters is equally complicated because satisfaction levels vary from person to person based on their individual expectations, needs and affordability (Amerigo & Aragonest, 1997; Brown, 1995).

Housing satisfaction models as advanced by many researchers have found a series of factors as significant determinants of overall housing satisfaction, these include physical characteristics, demography and socio-economic characteristics among others (Jiboye, 2009; Liu, 1999; Lu, 1999; Ogu, 2002; Salleh, 2008; Teck-Hong, 2012; Ukoha & Beamish, 1997). Previous studies have shown relationships between demographic factors and occupants’ housing satisfaction. These relationships can be positive (see e.g. Lu, 1999). The study of Mohit, Ibrahim, and Rashid (2010) reveals negative influence of age on housing satisfaction. However, findings of these studies may not be applicable in all contexts. Equally such findings have not covered various age groups (the young, the middle-aged, the old, etc. vis-à-vis their needs, aspiration and requirements). This plays a vital role in shaping housing satisfaction of an individual. Thus, the need to establish age groups’ components on housing satisfaction level in Nigeria cannot be over-emphasized. This study aims to examine the influence of age on housing satisfaction. The objectives are:

1. To determine the how various age groups responds to housing aspirations in private housing estate, and
2. To determine whether age really matters in housing satisfaction level.

Rosenberg and Everitt (2001) opined that housing and built environment is the second most important requirement for aged people being next to health and finances. Interestingly, not much attention is given to the aspect of ageing, such as planning and housing satisfaction factors (Sivam & Karuppannan, 2007). Studies on housing satisfaction of various age groups can serve as means for providing basis of successful ageing society or specific needs of various age groups in a given society. Moreover, understanding housing satisfaction requires examination of people and their environment (James, 2008), which may be better established through peer group housing aspirations.

Nigeria has been making concerted efforts towards attaining her housing needs through various housing policies and programmes, using various delivery strategies ranging from direct construction to the provision of enabling environment. This is particularly true in the federal capital territory Abuja, which for the last decade has experienced a series of private sector-driven mass housing estate developments especially within the phase 2, 3 and 4 development plan of the capital city (Waziri, Yusof, & Salleh, 2013). The need to determine how occupants of private housing estates respond to their housing environment, particularly age components of the demographic status may provide an answer as to whether age actually matters in housing development planning. Mohit et al. (2010) argue that the degree of housing satisfaction of different age groups may differ from one another.

This study furthers our understanding on the relationship between household age group and overall housing satisfaction, and thus extends what Lu (1999), James (2008), Amole (2009) and Mohit et al. (2010) have discovered on the influence of age on housing satisfaction. The result will also serve as a guide to enhance residential development
and policy planning not only in Nigeria, but other developing countries with similar housing situations.

**Literature review**

**Concept of housing satisfaction**

Housing satisfaction relates to how a consumer of housing product reacts to the overall components of such product in response to their expectations. This is equally the degree to which the inhabitants feel that their housing is helping them to achieve their goals (Jiboye, 2012). It also refers to individual’s evaluation of their housing environment, subjects to their needs, expectations and achievements (Hui & Yu, 2009). It is a subjective variable which depends on many physical and social parameters. The concept of housing satisfaction was developed based on the premise that the gap between the anticipated and desired housing by the occupants and the exact neighbourhood conditions is determined (Mohit et al., 2010). Residential decisions by the household are made based on their needs and aspirations; absence of complaints indicates housing satisfaction at equilibrium point of needs and aspirations, and would likely result in expression of housing dissatisfaction, thus reflecting the degree by which individual housing needs are fulfilled (Salleh, 2008).

In addition, changing housing requirement, aspiration as occupants move through their life course posits household out of concurrence with their housing situations (Lu, 1999), indicating possible variation in terms of housing aspiration as a result of demographic changes. In their theory of housing adjustment, Morris and Winter (cited in Ukoha & Beamish, 1997) offer predictors of housing satisfaction in which they contend that this occurs when the housing situation is not consistent with the cultural, family and community housing norms; any shortfall on the housing situation may push the household to make some form of adjustment or adaptations to make housing consistent with their norms. The incongruity between the actual housing situation and housing norms results in housing deficits, which give rise to residential dissatisfaction. Once their (occupants’) dissatisfaction with the current housing surpasses a certain level, they are likely to consider some form of housing adjustment (Hui & Yu, 2009; Salleh, 2008).

The concept of housing satisfaction is generally linked with the quality of life as indicated in various satisfaction researches (Ibem & Amole, 2012). This is particularly true when housing is acquired with the expectations that it meets the household specific and diverse needs (Ibem & Amole, 2012). Housing satisfaction is a concept that can be influenced by both objective and subjective measures of housing attributes, which includes physical, social/psychological (attitudes towards their residential environment, management attributes and the demographic characteristics of the residents (Amole, 2009).

**Measurement of housing satisfaction**

Measuring housing satisfaction can either be subjective which is influenced by household demographic characteristics such as age and age groupings; or objective as determined by the overall housing components. Amole (2009) contends that subjective measures are concerned with psychological aspects and measure perception, emotions, attitude and aspirations. These psychological human aspects can be determined by age
and other social factors. The objective measures of housing satisfaction relate to physical characteristics, facilities, services and environment (Mohit et al., 2010). Though there seems to be no universally accepted measurement scale of housing or residential satisfaction, various researchers have attempted to provide a basis for measuring housing satisfaction (see e.g. Adriaanse, 2007; Amole, 2009; Hui & Zheng, 2010; Najib, Yusof, & Zainul Abidin, 2011) among others. In the context of this research, housing satisfaction is measured based on four main components of housing satisfaction in relation to age groupings. These four physical attributes are; structural components, dwelling features, neighbourhood facilities and management services. Oh (2000) considers residential satisfaction components to include quality of dwelling unit, quality of close environment and quality of urban site. Previous studies have considered dwelling unit features (Salleh, 2008; Ukoha & Beamish, 1997).

Structural components

Structural components refer to building envelopes, which are contingent to the stability of the physical structure. This includes the roof, ceilings, walls, doors and windows, floor and the general finishing. Structural components of a building can be a basis for satisfaction or dissatisfaction for its inherent life cycle costing components. Research conducted on public housing in Enugu and Owerri, south-east Nigeria reveals poor construction and not in accordance with structural as well as neighbourhood guide lines (Moughalu, 1991; Nwachukwu, 1989), which has made the resident to be dissatisfied. Public housing in Benin city, Nigeria, was found to have leaking roofs and cracks walls, demonstrating poor construction services provided by contractors (Moughalu, 1991). Residents of public housing in Abuja, as reported by Ukoha and Beamish (1997), were dissatisfied with their buildings and structural features.

Dwelling unit features

Dwelling unit features are the space and sizes provision and arrangements for living room, bedrooms, kitchen, etc. Building features such as the number of bedrooms, size and location of kitchen are found to be strongly related to housing satisfaction (Salleh, 2008). Most of the residents of public housing in Maiduguri, north-east Nigeria are found to have few bedrooms, which is a source of occupants’ dissatisfaction (Ozo, 1990). In contrast, Ogu (2002) discovers that occupants of housing estate in Benin City, south–south Nigeria indicate positive residential satisfaction with their dwelling features. The differences in housing satisfaction on dwelling features between Maiduguri and Benin might be associated with demographic and cultural settings in these areas.

Neighbourhood features

Neighbourhood and housing environment represent total available facilities and services, which can be a great source of satisfaction or dissatisfaction. This is associated with both physical and social characteristics of the surroundings. Previous researches have established how neighbourhood factors influence housing satisfaction (see e.g. Awotona, 1987; Clement & Kayode, 2012; Salleh, 2008; Ukoha & Beamish, 1997). The findings of Salleh (2008) reveals the most significant neighbourhood factors contributing to low housing satisfaction in private low-cost housing are related to neighbourhood facilities.
and surrounding areas, including poor public transportation, lack of children’s playground, multipurpose hall, parking areas, and safety and facilities for the disabled.

**Management services**

Sam Udo-Akagha (1992) defines management as “the executive function of planning, organizing, coordinating, directing, controlling and supervising any industrial or business project or activity with responsibility for result”. Management services as provided by the developers are important elements that contribute to overall housing satisfaction. These are rules and regulations, maintenance, management staff and policies, participations and rents (Paris & Kangari, 2006). Previous studies suggest that good housing management increases the relative satisfaction of occupants in public housing. However, overall satisfaction towards management activities depends on the comprehensive planning and coordination of activities within the residential estate, and the managerial skills, experiences and the extent of policy compliance as set in the overall interest of the residents and the comfort, habitability of the residential environment. Public housing occupants have expressed dissatisfaction with the managerial services (Liu, 1999; Ukoha & Beamish, 1997).

**Age as demographic factor**

Previous studies have shown a positive relationship between demographic factors and housing satisfaction. These studies include (Amole, 2009; James, 2008). Moreover, contends that household requirements are dependent upon their personal characteristics which include demographic, social and economic factors. The demographic factors affecting housing satisfaction are: age, family size, gender and education level among others. In their studies of residential satisfaction with public core housing in Abeokuta, Nigeria, Ibem and Amole (2012) found that educational background, employment sector, age and sex have a significant contribution towards residential satisfaction. Similarly, as humans progress through their life course, changes in aspirations including housing occur, hence age and age groupings contribute to overall housing satisfaction at different stages. Galster (1987) found older residents to have lower level of aspirations, but higher level of tolerance towards any shortcomings regarding their residence. Mohit et al. (2010) in their assessment of residential satisfaction in newly designed public low-cost housing in Kuala Lumpur discovered negative influence of age on residents’ satisfaction.

However, little is known about the scenario within different age groups, and how this influences occupants’ housing satisfaction. In most studies, demographic factors are combined to provide aggregate effect on the overall housing satisfaction. Similarly, as an important life cycle component, age group factors may perhaps matter in housing satisfaction. In this study, such trends as age and/or age groupings are measured in relation to the overall housing satisfaction components to establish the differences and the level of significance. Despite the fact that age plays a significant role in shaping individual’s housing satisfaction, there is little literature establishing the effect of age on housing satisfaction. James (2008) investigates how the levels and determinants of housing satisfaction among elderly tenants in apartment housing differ from other age groups, adopting “locus of control” approach. He further opined that the impact of different housing on one’s locus of control is age dependent. The ability for one to have control over his/her is significantly high at a young age. The study was conducted in the western contexts
and cannot be generalized to the context of developing country like Nigeria with diverse culture, norms and tradition. Following James (2008), this research measures overall housing satisfaction based on the interaction of age groupings with objective housing satisfaction attributes as identified above. Figure 1 below depicts a direct relationship between age and overall housing satisfaction on an independent–dependent relationship. The general hypothesis is that each age group has a direct influence to housing satisfaction. But there is insufficient information on the influence of different age groups on the occupants’ housing satisfaction.

Methodology

The study instrument was adapted from the previous housing satisfaction research and modified to suit the specific context in line with the aim and objectives of the study. Construct as well as language validation was done by three experts in urban planning and one in psychometrics. The instrument contains six sections (A–F); section A and B centred around questions involving demographic and socio-economic characteristics of the respondents, while sections C, D, E and F are structured to measure housing satisfaction level of the household. This is based on five-point Likert scale ranging from “1” Very dissatisfied; “2” Dissatisfied; “3” Moderately satisfied; “4” Satisfied; “5” Very satisfied.

According to Sekaran (2000), population sizes greater than 30 and less than 500 are classified as appropriate for most research. Samples of 112 structured questionnaires were administered to elicit information from the respondents. This is based on total population of 1,120 housing units representing 10% of the household resident in Prince and Princes Housing Estate, Abuja, Nigeria. The distributions effected through systematic random sampling were every unit of the sample has equal opportunity of being selected. Similarly, 66 of the questionnaires were retrieved for analysis, yielding a 74% response rate.

A reliability test was conducted and a Cronbach’s $\alpha$ value of the total satisfaction level with private housing development of .783 was obtained as shown in Table 1. Cronbach’s $\alpha$ ranges from 0 to 1.00, with values close to 1.00, indicating high consistency; it is, however, desirable to have a reliability coefficient of .70 or higher (Wells & Wollack, 2003). This indicated that the data were acceptable and all items were retained for subsequent analysis. Descriptive statistics as well as one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to provide the mean satisfaction level between respondents the age groups.

| Cronbach’s $\alpha$ | No. of items |
|---------------------|--------------|
| .783                | 5            |

Figure 1. Conceptual framework.

Table 1. Reliability.
Presentation of findings

Respondent’s demographic and socioeconomic profile

The result of the analysis of the respondent’s socio-demographic characteristics indicates that in the housing estate 40.9% are between the ages of 31–40 while those above 61 years constitute about 6.1%. Males have the highest number from among the respondents with about 83.3% as against their female counterpart in the range of 16.7%. About 39% of the respondents are public servants, 28.8% are staff of various organize private sectors, 27% are into different types of business within the informal sector, while 4.5% are retired civil servants. The housing estate is made up of between two bedrooms, semi-detached bungalow and five-bedroom duplex. Two bedrooms have the highest occupants based on the response rate with a record of 36.4% occupation and a 12% for the five bedrooms’ house. Housing tenure comprises owner occupiers and renters with a response level of 39% and 60.6%, respectively. About 18 of the respondents have stayed in the estate for about three years, while only 4 (6.1%) have been in the estate for over six years. Hausa’s and Igbo’s seem to have the highest number of population based on the response rate of 31.8% each, Yoruba’s 24% and only 3% of the respondents are foreign nationals. Thirty-seven per cent have monthly income between N101,000–N200,000 (USD 631–1250). About 47% of the respondent’s residents have education of at least of degree level.

Descriptive analysis for housing satisfaction

Descriptive analysis for housing satisfaction in Prince and Princes Housing Estate, shown in Table 2 below explain the mean total housing satisfaction between the various age groups. Higher mean housing satisfaction is expressed in the age group of 51–60 years, while 61 and above age groups recorded a very low satisfaction. On the other hand, the young household in the age groups of 20–30 years have low housing satisfaction than the middle-aged groups (30–40) and higher in 41–50 age group.

The effect of age groups on housing satisfaction

One way ANOVA was used to test the research hypothesis. To confirm the basic assumptions of homogeneity of variance, Levine’s test generated shows significant value of .007 (greater than .05 – significance). This implies that differences in housing satisfaction between the various age groups were found to be statistically significant ($F (4, 61) = 3.912, p = .007$). The multiple comparisons (Table 3) show the mean difference of total housing satisfaction between the age groups.

The result from the multiple comparison tables signifies a variation in housing satisfaction level between the various age groups. The question is whether such variation is statistically significant. The difference between and within age group 20–30 years and (31–40; 41–50; 51–60; 61 and above) is statistically not significant as shown. The difference is found to be statistically significant for and within age group 31–40 and (61 and above) with .19 significance. The result further reveals that there is a statistically significant difference in housing satisfaction level between age group 61 and above and 41–50 (.11), 51–60 (.006).
Table 2. Descriptive analysis.

| Total housing satisfaction scale | N  | Mean   | Std. deviation | Std. error | Lower bound | Upper bound | Minimum | Maximum |
|---------------------------------|----|--------|----------------|------------|-------------|-------------|---------|---------|
| 20–30                           | 14 | 121.5000 | 17.24373       | 4.60858    | 111.5438    | 131.4562    | 81.00   | 148.00  |
| 31–40                           | 27 | 128.3704 | 16.54399       | 3.18389    | 121.8258    | 134.9150    | 100.00  | 157.00  |
| 41–50                           | 13 | 132.5385 | 18.59039       | 5.15605    | 121.3044    | 143.7725    | 84.00   | 157.00  |
| 51–60                           | 8  | 137.1250 | 26.86707       | 9.49894    | 114.6636    | 159.5864    | 111.00  | 195.00  |
| 61 and Above                    | 4  | 97.2500  | 8.53913        | 4.26956    | 83.6623     | 110.8377    | 86.00   | 106.00  |
| Total                           | 66 | 126.9091 | 19.85852       | 2.44441    | 122.0273    | 131.7909    | 81.00   | 195.00  |
Table 3. Multiple comparisons.

| Dependent variable                      | (I) Age | (J) Age | Mean difference (I−J) | Std. error | Sig.  | 95% Confidence interval |
|----------------------------------------|---------|---------|-----------------------|------------|-------|-------------------------|
|                                        | 20−30   | 31−40   | −6.87037              | 6.02287    | .784  | −23.8009                |
|                                        |         |         |                       |            |       | 10.0602                 |
|                                        | 41−50   | 31−40   | −11.03846             | 7.04374    | .524  | −30.8387                |
|                                        |         |         |                       |            |       | 8.7618                  |
|                                        | 51−60   | 31−40   | −15.62500             | 8.10512    | .314  | −38.4088                |
|                                        |         |         |                       |            |       | 7.1588                  |
|                                        | 61 and Above | 31−40 | 24.25000             | 10.36810   | .147  | −4.8952                |
|                                        |         |         |                       |            |       | 53.3952                 |
|                                        | 20−30   | 41−50   | 6.87037               | 6.02287    | .784  | −10.0602                |
|                                        |         |         |                       |            |       | 23.8009                 |
|                                        | 41−50   | 41−50   | −4.16809              | 6.17353    | .961  | −21.5222                |
|                                        |         |         |                       |            |       | 13.1860                 |
|                                        | 51−60   | 41−50   | −8.75463              | 7.36147    | .757  | −29.4480                |
|                                        |         |         |                       |            |       | 11.9388                 |
|                                        | 61 and Above | 41−50 | 31.12037 *             | 9.79774    | .019  | 5.7855                 |
|                                        |         |         |                       |            |       | 58.6623                 |
|                                        | 20−30   | 51−50   | −4.16809              | 6.17353    | .961  | −13.1860                |
|                                        |         |         |                       |            |       | 21.5222                 |
|                                        | 41−50   | 51−50   | −8.75463              | 7.36147    | .757  | −29.4480                |
|                                        |         |         |                       |            |       | 11.9388                 |
|                                        | 51−60   | 51−50   | −4.58654              | 8.21770    | .981  | −27.6868                |
|                                        |         |         |                       |            |       | 18.5138                 |
|                                        | 61 and Above | 51−50 | 35.28846 *             | 10.45634   | .011  | 5.8952                 |
|                                        |         |         |                       |            |       | 64.6817                 |
|                                        | 20−30   | 61 and Above | 15.62500             | 8.10512    | .314  | −7.1588                |
|                                        |         |         |                       |            |       | 38.4088                 |
|                                        | 41−50   | 61 and Above | 4.58654              | 8.21770    | .981  | −18.5138                |
|                                        |         |         |                       |            |       | 27.6868                 |
|                                        | 51−60   | 61 and Above | 39.87500 *             | 11.19883   | .006  | 8.3946                |
|                                        |         |         |                       |            |       | 71.3554                 |
|                                        | 61 and Above | 61 and Above | 24.25000             | 10.36810   | .147  | −53.3952                |
|                                        |         |         |                       |            |       | 4.8952                  |
|                                        | 31−40   | 61 and Above | −31.12037 *            | 9.79774    | .019  | −58.6623                |
|                                        |         |         |                       |            |       | −3.5785                 |
|                                        | 41−50   | 61 and Above | −35.28846 *            | 10.45634   | .011  | −64.6817                |
|                                        |         |         |                       |            |       | −5.8952                 |
|                                        | 51−60   | 61 and Above | −39.87500 *            | 11.19883   | .006  | −71.3554                |
|                                        |         |         |                       |            |       | −8.3946                 |

*The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.
Discussion
This research was motivated by the possible influence of age and age groupings on the overall housing satisfaction level in a particular housing setting. While previous research treats age to interpret demographic profile of respondents, this study has examined how age variance affects housing aspirations. Household occupants express their overall housing satisfaction based on objective measures of housing satisfaction (structural components, dwelling units’ features, neighbourhood facilities and management services provided by the developers), in line with previous studies (see, e.g. Ibem & Amole, 2012; Jiboye, 2009; Salleh, 2008), as well as subjective measures such as aspirations (the influence of age). Amole (2009) observes that subjective measurement appears to be more relevant housing satisfaction research, thus focusing on age components.

Descriptive analysis indicates that middle-aged groups (31–40 years) constitute the highest number with more than 40% occupancy. Results of analysis for these groups suggest a statistically significant difference in housing satisfaction level with the older age group of 61 years and above. These findings suggest that the gap between what is aspired and received is age dependent.

In general, occupant’s overall housing satisfaction is found to be moderate. The result shows that age group level of satisfaction is significantly higher at the group 50 to 60 years. This may explain why, for instance, Sivam & Karuppannan (2007) in their study of factors influencing aged person’s residential satisfaction opined that, if the old household is dissatisfied with their housing, they will be more confined to their residences and this will increase chances of high depression, isolation and increased mobility problems and equally contends that, ageing in place refers to growing old at home, community and environment that one is familiar with. The level of housing satisfaction at a relatively older age of 61 and above group was generally lower as against the preceding age groups. This is because the aspiration changes over time. This may be as a result of strong family ties associated with most Nigerian culture with preference to relocating close to relatives and associates upon attaining the retirement age of 60 years. Other explanations could be that most housing design in the capital city is of a modern concept, which makes it difficult for the older folk to cope with their specific housing aspiration for a traditional housing environment. The result indicates further that housing satisfaction levels vary from person to person based on individual expectations and needs, which are age determinant. This concurs with (Amerigo & Aragonest, 1997; Brown, 1995).

The findings, perhaps, provide better insight on the effect of age groups in housing satisfaction levels, as this tends to increase with the changing age group. It indicates that age factors actually matter in determining the housing satisfaction as observed in different housing satisfaction level. The study affirms the findings of James (2008) that the variation in household housing satisfaction is equally age dependent. Ibem and Amole (2012) have equally found age to predict housing satisfaction in public core housing estate in south-west Nigeria. This has further confirmed that household housing satisfaction relates to changes in age components.

This implies that demographic components of changing age over a life course analysis be part of a proposed housing development. Therefore, for future housing policy, it is recommended that housing development policies planning should provide adequate parameters within which age groupings of the intended end users are integrated for effective housing satisfaction, well-being and improved mental stability over time. The nature of housing requires for the older age groups particularly upon retirement to reflect on the traditional setting of conventional Nigerian societies in an integrative manner. For the
federal capital city design, to cater mostly for those in employment, certain housing swap policy may be looked into for those anticipating to move. This is particularly relevant when housing provision is made on owner occupation basis. Taking cognizance of all the housing satisfaction variables including age would stem the path of residential relocation process and promote sustained neighbourhood arrangement, hence, maintaining conducive urban spatial planning. It is similarly recommended that further studies with large population samples should be conducted to substantiate precisely on the specific needs of various age groups as well as the influence of family ties in residential satisfaction.

Conclusion

In this study, four dimensions of housing satisfaction (structural components, dwelling unit features, neighbourhood facility and management services) were investigated in relation to the occupants various age groupings. This is based on a sample in private housing development in Nigeria, which is the present trend of housing provision (Aliyu, Kasim, & Matin, 2011; Awodele, 2008). Ikejiofor (1997) reports that substantial number of urban housing in the developing countries will continue to be provided by the private sector in twenty-first century.

The studies have shown the influence of age in determining housing satisfaction level in private housing development. The young generation, the middle-aged and the old respond differently with varying housing needs and aspiration, specific to age situations. Housing satisfaction is influenced by age, and the level of effect varies from one age group to the other, signifying the need for integration of various age group components. In the Nigerian context, the satisfaction level at old age may have been as a result of the statutory retirement age requirement of 60 years, and most people prefer to rejoin with their extended family members upon retirement and/or relocate to a neighbourhood with similar housing norms, values to their traditional community. The likelihood of expressing low satisfaction at an advanced age may be as a result of the psychological mind set in relocating to their most preferred housing environment. Moreover, while general housing satisfaction in prince and princes’ housing estate is moderate, there is variation between and within age groups.

The study implies that, while efforts are increasingly geared towards private sector housing development, it has the capacity to provide satisfactory living environment if factors influencing housing satisfaction are thoroughly integrated into the planning and policy stages. The characteristic of target beneficiaries of any housing scheme both short and long term should be adequately addressed in relation to overall life span of the housing. This would stimulate residential mobility associated with the changing demography, particularly the age of the household.
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