HOUSING CHOICE DETERMINANT IN IBADAN METROPOLIS

Oshikoya, Taiwo Peter[1] and Ifediora, Christian Osita[2]
Department of Estate Management, Ajayi Crowther University Oyo, Oyo State Nigeria.

ABSTRACT*: Housing in every society of the world is considered a top priority among the life component, as it provides shelter, safety, and comfort among others. The preference/choice for housing has continue to differs from one individual or household to another as each is influenced by distinct factors. The study examined various choice factors associated with housing choice in Ibadan metropolis with the aim of highlighting the factors in the study area. The research adopted both descriptive and analytic techniques. Through the use of questionnaire survey as a case study approach, reliable data and information were gathered. This provided strategic overview of the various factors that influences housing choice in Ibadan. It was discovered that key factors that influence housing choice in the study area includes socio-economic factors and the easy of commuting within the city metropolis. The study recommended that the identified factors should be well noted when making choice.*
KEY WORDS*; housing, housing choice, household, socio-economics.*

INTRODUCTION

Housing is considered one of the most important components of life as it provides shelter, safety, security, comfort and dignity. It is a means of fulfilling one's economic needs, functioning from the commercial stance. Housing can also indicate the standard of living of any society i.e. a status symbol (Henilane, 2016; Ademiluyi, 2010). Housing as a form of shelter has attracted the attention of scholars in both the public and private space of both developed and developing economies (Nubi, 2015). UN (2014) established that there is a connection between housing and the health of any nation at both the micro and macro level. Additionally, World Bank (2016) observed that the urbanization trends across Africa have created a deficit of at least 51 million units of housing. Similar to which, Nigeria as the most populous country with an urbanization rate of 4.8 percent has an exponential increase in demand for urban housing thus, creating a deficit of around 17 million units as at the year 2013. To this end, there is a need to produce at least 700,000 housing units in different market segments on an annual basis to keep up with increasing demand. Meanwhile, the current level of housing production is below 100,000.

There have been various attempts to meet up with the housing deficit in the urban center of both developed and developing countries (Akinbogun, 2015). This has led to efforts by the government through social housing and private investors through capital investment in developing residential properties. These efforts have led to increased access to residential property. Since the government alone cannot fully meet up the existing housing deficit, private investors are presented with ample opportunity to invest and recoup their capital at profit levels (Oladokun, 2011). In developing housing, private investors seek to mitigate the risk of void associated with not developing to the taste and preference of the end-users, so as to capture the highest return on capital development with minimum risk. To this end, investors need to take

33

cognizance of the investment climate through the understanding of the factors influencing tenant preference and choice in the market with a view to maximizing investment returns. Furthermore, the choice of housing is said to be affected by a number interconnected factors (Boumeester, 2011). These factors guide the choice of housing by end-users and are known as tenant considerations. Fleury-Bahi *et al*. (2008) established that a household's decision to choose a particular housing is strongly linked to the quest for satisfaction in terms of quality of the space. In addition to which, Ubani, Alaci and Udoo (2017) maintained that the choice and decision for housing varies from one individual to the other. This is because they consider that having shelter improve their quality of life, access to opportunities and possibilities of future business expansion. Thus, there is a need to understand the concept behind these choices and preference factors so as to help both investors and tenant alike make productive choices that leads to viable housing investment that suits their preferences in the housing market respectively. Housing choice is not a static but dynamic phenomenon as it involves the continuous selection of suitable houses based on the preferences of stakeholders.

The identification of the factors influencing housing preferences is a necessity as it provides a yardstick for measuring good housing policy on a general and specific basis as it relates to decisions about space utilization and optimization on fresh locations. Sound housing decisions can only be made if we can identify housing preferences in a reliable way (Floor and Kempen, 1997). To this end, this study seeks to examine this study therefore seeks to identify the various factors that stimulate the choice of housing in Ibadan metropolis with the view of investigating and analyzing the factors towards generating viable developmental options that will enhance housing policies in Nigeria.

LITERATURE

Housing has an essential role in economic development of each country, accounting for 10–20 % of total economic activity in the country, as well as being to be the biggest fixed asset of households (European Commission, 2005). The concept "housing" has a similar concept – "house" which was described by Melnikas (1998) as a specific and relatively limited physical, biological and socially closed place where people and groups of people can live their bio-social life. This is achieved through the receipt of services, performance of house chores and other biosocial activity.

Housing is a necessity characterized by a huge capital outlay, the choice to buy or rent a house will strategically revolve round individual financial preference. Living in satisfactory housing conditions is one of the most important aspects of people's lives. It involves places where many people especially the older ones spend a large part of their time (Vera-Toscano and Ateca-Amestoy, 2008).

 Household's decision to choose a particular residential district could be influenced by a number of factors among others. Thus, the need to understand the concept behind these choices and preference factors will help both individual and investors in the housing market to make a viable housing investment decision. Housing choice and preferences factor determinant has generated many controversies in various fields of endeavor as both choice and preference are considered to be lifetime phenomenon (Opaluwa and Aribigbola, 2015).

According to Boumeester (2011) preference can be explored by studying the choices made by the people, given an assumption that choice is a typical reflection of a person's preferences. As after haven made a choice between equally-attractive alternatives, an individual's liking for the chosen option apparently increases (Egazn *et al*.). This implies that household's housing choice reflects their personal preferences but also can be a function of the housing market conditions where these choices are made. In a situation that what is available in the market does not exactly match their criteria so well people have to adjust to what is available, as the actual choice will probably not reflect the exact preference. Preference ratings guide residential choice based on the personal and financial considerations which often precludes selection of the preferred location (Preston, 1982).

Housing preference is the combination of all the desired features of the dwelling as well as the location (the living environment) (Boumeester, 2011). These various features are each given a separate value by the household when they are looking for somewhere to live. For example, a family with children is more likely to prefer a single-family dwelling with a backyard than a single person would. Meanwhile, a household with a high income is more likely to prefer buying a dwelling than a household with a low income. Traditionally, housing preferences focuses on the choice between renting and owning, prices households want to pay, size, type and location of the dwelling households.

Consequently, Housing choice is said to be affected by a number or combination factors which are very much interconnected to each other. Choices will be influenced by constraints which include lack of alternatives on the housing market or a lack of access to certain parts of the stock such as the social rented sector. A household's decision to choose a particular residential district could be due to socioeconomic, cultural, administrative or purely psychological factors (Olatubara, 1997). Urban residential location models indicate that the determinants of households' choice of residence include income of the household, family size, population density, rent and transport cost (Alonso, 1964; Mirth, 1969).

Socio-economic factors is simply the combination of social and economic factors that forms part of general lifestyle component which plays a crucial role in shaping our housing choice and decision making, these factors include income level, education level, marital status, official status, employment status and years living in Ibadan among others (Akinyode, Khan and Ahmad 2015). Mehdi et al. (2009) opines that family socio-economic status describes family's position such as rank, class, status or economic position in a society; it also determines their dwelling choice and preference. This implies that persons with very low incomes usually do not live in large or luxury apartment such as detached houses, mansion, or high-rise buildings while families with children usually prefer a single family dwelling with larger space i.e more rooms. This is based upon the concepts of allocating scarce and limited resources to various activities that are related with the progress, protection and conservation (Mehdi et al., 2009).

Huange and Clark 2001 suggest demographic factors as another important factor to be considered in the analysis of housing choice, as this affects tenure choice through changing socio-economic status. Wu (2010) opines that people in their young ages are likely to have a verse preference for housing. This is the reason that most of them are in their transition period where they experience tough stages of life such as detachment from parent and job hunting and

marriage, just as in the case where single get married and couple turned into family. Therefore, those who are young tend to be location conscious in their housing choice, and that they are also feels restricted by the available housing option which is the housing stock (Vliet, 1998).

Mobility is another vital factor that has been considered to affect the choice of housing in terms of the timing of activities, traffic congestion and choice to destination (Movement from proposed of desired house to work place, place of worship, social networks and school) (Geier; Holz-Rau; Krafft, 2000). However, households without a car might choose their housing location considering the availability of public transport and supply of infrastructure on a small-scale level than households with a car – which are able to choose their housing location within a broader range, more also general environmental special orientation (Scheiner and Kasper, 2003). Other socio-demographic factors that affect choice of housing includes, quietness, peacefulness, level of organization of the environment, the lifestyle of the individual, and security level. Schneider and Spellerberg (1999), stated that the lifestyles still differ significantly between urban and rural environments.

Availability of certain internal infrastructure in the home such as water, tiles and general house finishing, more also the neighborhood and the housing location, the segregated designs of daily life are a challenge (Klee 2001). While some need shopping malls, sports facilities, and an entertainment district close to home, for others, internet access and delivery services are suitable. Most recently, these phenomena have been discussed in connection with lifestyles and choice of housing location (Scheiner and Kasper 2003). Fiadzo et al. (2001), indicators which include the distance to nearest hospital, distance schools and higher institutions of learning, distance to nearest market are used to estimate housing quality. Nazyddah (2011), indicates that housing satisfaction can also influences housing preference and choice which could be measured in terms of availability of physical and social components including open space, play area, parking, prayer and multi-purpose halls, perimeter roads, pedestrian walkways, public phone and local shops as public facilities components, while noise, crime, accidents and community relations as social environment components.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study was a descriptive research that sought to assess housing choice determinant in Ibadan metropolis. Data for this research work was gathered from two major sources, that is, primary and secondary. Primary data was collected through questionnaires administration on the respondent. Secondary data includes data collected from journals, textbooks, conference papers, academic thesis, publications of various institutions and organizations, materials from internet and other reliable data and information which provide strategic overview of the various factors influencing housing choice and preference in the study area.

Residential areas of the city of Ibadan were classified and divided into three distinct density zones – low, medium and high. Therefore, multistage sampling was employed for this study. The first stage will involve the stratification of the study area into residential densities. Three residential densities have been identified to be low, medium and high density areas (Daramola, 2014). This is supported by Afon (2005) where the study indicated that the use of urban residential zones is reliable in collecting primary data.

Firstly, this is because residential neighborhood in an urban area has a likelihood of exhibiting more permanent geographical attributes with respect to locations, housing types and structures, amongst others. Secondly, these permanent geographical attributes basically illustrate the socioeconomic and cultural attributes of the residents. Lastly, there is likelihood of having residents that have homogenous social and economic characteristics. On the basis of the foregoing, this study focused on low and medium density residential neighborhoods. Author's reconnaissance survey revealed that fifteen prominent residential neighborhoods fall within these two categories which include: Kolapo-Ishola Estate, Basorun, Agodi GRA, Alalubosa, Samonda, Iyaganku, Old Bodija, New Bodija, Jericho, Onireke, Idi-Ishin Oluyole, Elebu, Alao-Akala Estate and Akobo Estate. Where the low density areas comprise of eight (8) areas (Onireke, Idi Shin, Alalubosa, Samonda, Agodi GRA, Iyaganku, Kolapo-Ishola estate and Jericho) whilst the medium density areas include seven (7) identified areas which includes Oluyole Estate, Basorun, Akobo Estate, Alao-Akala Estate, Elebu, Old Bodija and new Bodija. A total of 90 questionnaires were distributed to three selected neighborhoods of different residential densities, from which 56 were retrieved representing approximately 62% of the respondent.

RESULT, FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1.0

Background of Respondent	Frequency	Percent	
Gender			
Male	31	44.6	
Female	25	55.4	
Total	**56**	**100**	
Age	**Frequency**		**Percent**
18-25	12	21.4	
26-35	18	32.1	
36-50	3	5.4	
51-65	18	32.1	
66 and above	5	8.9	
Total	**56**	**100**	
Occupation	**Frequency**	**Percent**	
Student	8	14.3	
Private Employed	14	25.0	
Government Employed	8	14.3	
Self Employed	21	37.5	
Unemployed	5	8.9	
Total	**56**	**100**	

Source: Author's field survey, 2021

The analysis above as shown in table 1.0 shows that the gender of the respondents has 31 to be male while female was 25. This implies that most of the respondents are male with 55.4% and 44.6% female, this difference could be as a result of housing decision making ability of male compare to female in the study area, this is in line with study by (Aluko and Amidu, 2006).

The age group of the respondents also shown in Tables 1.0 reveals that about 32.1% falls in-between the age bracket 18 to 25 years while 21.4% of the respondents were between the age range of 26 to 35 years. Meanwhile, 5.4% are between the ages of 36 to 50 years while 51 to 66 took 32.1 % of the respondent age range, the last age range which is 66 years and above has just 5 respondents which is approximately 8.9%. The above age analysis reveals that the age composition of the participants in the study area falls in between that active age groups of the society. This is in line with studies by (2010).

From the above analysis as shown in table 1.0, it was also discovered that about 14.3% of the respondents are student whilst 25.0% of the respondent are privately employed; about 14.3% of the respondents are government employed. 37.5% of the respondents are self-employed, while the unemployed is about 8.9%. The analyses above reveals that majority of the respondents are self-employed in terms of running their own businesses on an entrepreneurial, contractual or consultancy basis. This group of people might have more tendencies to make housing choice based on the access afforded by their business support.

Table 2.0: Other Socio-economic factors of Respondent

Income Level	Frequency	Percent	
18,000 and below	9	16.1	
19.000-50,000	20	35.7	
51,000-100,000	16	28.6	
100,000 and above	11	19.6	
Total	**56**	**100**	
Marital Status	**Frequency**		**Percent**
Single	16	28.6	
Married	28	50	
Divorce	1	1.8	
Widower	11	19.6	
Total	**56**	**100**	

Source: Author's field survey, 2021

The income level of the respondents from the above table 2.0 shows that about 16.1% of the respondent income level falls below 18,000 which is the assumed minimum wage benchmark in the country (Nwude, 2013). 35.7% of the respondents also whose income level falls between 19,000 - 50,000, whereas a total of 28.6 % of the respondents' income are within the range of 51,000 - 100,000. The last category of respondents based on income level is composed of about 19.6% ranging from 100,000 and above which is assumed to be relatively higher compare to others on the table. This outlines that majority of the respondents are within the average income groups. Thus, confirming the studies by Boumeester, (2004) which highlighted that income is a key factor among the socio-economic factors in housing choice determinant, thus this will reflect in the types of accommodation and housing location.

From the above analysis as shown in Table 2.0, it shows the marital status of the respondents. 28.6% of them are singles, a total of 50% of the respondent are married and also just about 1.8% which is of a little significant is divorce while 19.6 % are widower. This aspect of

household socio-economic characteristics is of much significant in housing choice in respect to space demand. The larger the family the larger the space demand. The combination of the two analyses will give prediction of household housing preference in most economy of the developing nations as Nigeria.

Table 3.0 Summary of Findings on The Importance of The Following Factors on Housing Choice
Factors

Socio-economic	Mean	Rank
Security / Crime Rate	3.8036	1
Monthly income	3.5357	2
Change in Social Status	3.4286	3
Serenity	3.4107	4
Change in Marital status	3.3571	5
Religion and Tribal	3.0893	6
Family Size	3.0714	7
Frequent Rent review	2.7143	8
Distance and Location	**Mean**	**Rank**
Pollution / Neatness	3.4643	1
Closeness to Work	3.3750	2
Worship Center	3.2143	3
Market & Spar	3.1429	4
Health facility	3.1429	4
Popularity	3.0893	5
Bus-stop/ public transport	2.9643	6
Traffic Situation	2.9107	7
Banks and other financial institutions	2.9107	7
Schools and Training Centres	2.8393	8
Social Clubs and Recreation Centres	2.5179	9
Police Station/Emergency Services	2.3929	10
Utilities / Infrastructure		
Electricity	3.2143	1
Mobile Network (GSM)	3.0714	2
Good Road Network	2.9107	3
Water Supply	2.7679	4
Waste Collection	2.4286	5
Borehole	2.3393	6

From the above analysis as shown in Table 3.0, it shows how various identified factors influences choice of housing based on their individual ranking, considering the socio-economic

factors, it was discovered that security / crime rate is the most influencing factor among other that influences respondents choice of housing in the study area while monthly income is rank second in the other of preference this mean that respondent will always make housing choices including location choice, building types and finishing base on their financial capacity, while consider safety is considered as their priority.

Frequency of rent review and their family size is considered less significant on the choice priority list of the respondent, the implication goes thus, either estate surveyors or other real estate agent do not carry out rent review as at when due or rent increase after review may be less significant.

From table 3.0 above under the distance and location factors pollution/neatness is considered respondents' priority in housing choice, implication is that respondents are conscious of their health which could be as a result of their epidemic knowledge and awareness or social status, respondent also prefer housing choice that will provide easy access to their place of work especially the in the low and medium density area of Ibadan metropolis. Proximity to worship centres and market are also considered important to respondent especially the high density zone area of Ibadan metropolis. Closeness to social club is considered less important by the respondent, this could be due to the fact that most of this respondent don not belong to any social clubs or probably not fashionable to their religion and cultural believes.

According to the Table 3.0 above it is important to examine the public utilities and infrastructure as an important factors in housing choice. Respondents will prefer a housing location with a regular supply of electricity among other factors; another important factor is the availability of mobile network which was rank second on the priority list of the respondents. Most respondent will prefer a location that will enable them communicate with families and their business associate as communication reduces stress. Respondents do not consider borehole and waste collection as issues in making housing choice.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study examined the various determinants of housing choice in Ibadan metropolis; the study was able to successfully confirm some of the key housing preference of respondents in some of the residential neighborhoods. The study also indicated factors that constrain the housing choice especially as it relates to the income status. For instance, majority of the respondent prefer to stay very close to their work or business. Others prefer to be closer to the market and schools. These findings indicate that policymakers and planners need a better understand and active respond to local needs because of its future consequences. Urban planners and politicians should efficiently deploy educational properties among all of the study area's neighborhoods to satisfy housing preferences and choice. Most respondent in low density residential neighborhoods are more of the high income so therefore will prefer a decent accommodation with good finishing and better public infrastructure owning to their status and financial capability. The middle and low income group are more concerned about proximity and quick access to their respective place of work in other not to incur extra transportation or transaction cost. Most young people do not have common housing choice preference. Finally,

the study also indicates that housing characteristics and quality of the housing features contribute significantly to the individual choice of Housing.

It therefore recommended that that policymakers and other relevant agencies in housing delivery should familiarize themselves in the findings of this study thus there is need for a better understanding and active respond to local needs because of its future consequences. Also, urban planners and politicians should efficiently deploy educational properties among all of the study area's neighborhoods to satisfy housing preferences and choice.

References

Ademiluyi, I. A. (2010). Public housing delivery strategies in Nigeria: A historical perspective of policies and programmes. *Journal of sustainable development in Africa*, *12*(6), 153-161.

Akinyode, B. F., & Khan, T. H. Consumers' Housing Attributes in the Context of their Socio-Economic Background in Ibadan Urban Centres.

Boumeester, H. J. F. M., Coolen, H. C. C. H., Dol, C. P., Goetgeluk, R. W., Jansen, S. J. T., Mariën, A. A. A., & Molin, E. (2008). *Module Consumentengedrag WoON 2006* (Hoofdrapport). Delft: Onderzoeksinstituut OTB.

Farsi, M. (2010). Risk aversion and willingness to pay for energy efficient systems in rental apartments. *Energy Policy*, *38*(6), 3078-3088.

Fiadzo, E. D., Houston, J. E., Estimating housing quality for poverty and development policy analysis: CWIQ in Ghana. *Social Indicators Research*, *53*(2), 137-162.& Godwin, D. D. (2001).

Henilane, I. (2016). Housing concept and analysis of housing classification. *Baltic Journal of Real Estate Economics and Construction Management*, *4*(1), 168-179.

Mohit, M. A., & Nazyddah, N. (2011). Social housing programme of Selangor Zakat Board of Malaysia and housing satisfaction. *Journal of Housing and the Built environment*, *26*(2), 143-164.

Nwude, E. C. (2013). The politics of minimum wage in Nigeria: the unresolved issues. *Asian Journal of empirical research*, *3*(4), 477-492.

Popoola, A., Tawose, O., Abatan, S., Adeleye, B., Jiyah, F., & Majolagbe, N. (2015). Housing Conditions And Health of Residents in Ibadan North Local Government Area, Ibadan, Oyo State, Nigeria. *Journal of Environmental Sciences and Resource Management*, *7*(2), 59- 80.

Scheiner, J., & Kasper, B. (2003). Lifestyles, choice of housing location and daily mobility: the lifestyle approach in the context of spatial mobility and planning. *International Social Science Journal*, *55*(176), 319-332.

Sanni, L., & Akinyemi, F. O. (2009). Determinants of households' residential districts' preferences within metropolitan city of Ibadan, Nigeria. *Journal of Human Ecology*, *25*(2), 137-141.

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

Wu, F. (2010). Housing environment preference of young consumers in Guangzhou, China: Using the analytic hierarchy process. *Property Management*, *28*(3), 174-192.