Kaduna State University Environmental Science Journal (KESJ)
Website: *https://kesj.org.ng* ***ISSN:*** *2734-2751*
© Faculty of Environmental Science, Kaduna State University

Volume 5, Issue 2, December 2025
DOI: https://doi.org/10.66884/kesj.2025.n9tbd567

UNDERLYING FACTORS OF HOUSING CHOICE AMONG ACADEMIC STAFF OF MOSHOOD ABIOLA POLYTECHNIC, OGUN STATE, NIGERIA

Ayodele A. IBUOYE
Department of Estate Management, Kaduna State University

Corresponding Author Email: ayodele.ibuoye@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Purpose: *The study examined prominent determinants of housing choice of academic staff of tertiary institution in Nigeria. This was done with a view to providing information on critical factors that could influence the housing choice of the academic staff when thinking of their dwelling place.*

Methodology*: The study administered 92 questionnaires to the academic staff of Moshood Abiola Polytechnic (MAPOLY), Abeokuta, Ogun State, Nigeria, out of which 53(57.21%) were retrieved and analysed. The study deployed statistical tools such as frequency distribution, mean score, chi-square and Kruskal Wallis test to analysis the data.*

Findings: *The result of the analysis showed that, critical underlying factors include security of workers' family, proximity to place of interest, institution housing scheme (corporative) and income level. The least significant factors were government policy and land/rental prices around the campus.*

Research limitations/Implications: *The limitation includes the use of educational facilities for academic staff and factors underlined their housing choice.*

Practical implication*: The result ascertained that no significant difference in the opinions of the academic staff on majority of the underlying factors. Conclusively, security of a worker's family welfare plays out to be the paramount determinant, therefore the study suggests that, educational institution whether public or private especially at tertiary level should take into consideration not only the security of the environment where the educational facilities will be located but also the welfare of the employees' family especially for institutions that lack staff housing quarters*

Keywords: Housing, Choice, factors, Academic Staff, Tertiary Institution

[1]Email: kesj@kasu.edu.ng

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Housing remains a vital commodity for human sustenance. Its complex nature as a products and dynamic structure as a process have made issues surrounding its mode of decision making with respect

to provisions, physical development, finance and management a trending tropical debates in the public domain. Ademiluyi (2010) defines housing as a dwelling unit that provides refuge, comfort, security and dignity place for occupiers. Sikiru, Abdulrazaq and Luqman (2013) added that the welfare and socio-economic effects characterised with housing sector cannot be undermined in the society. As a basic commodity, Wu, Zang and Dong (2013) explained that, on one hand, housing represent a highest single investment to the investors/developers while on the other hand, it represents the highest single annual expenditure of home rentals. The authors concluded that, the choice of housing is an indication of the socioeconomic status which tend to be vary across individuals or groups

Michelson (1975) conceptualised that individual's ability to choose is not a static event that take place once in lifetimes but a dynamic, subjective and product of emerging circumstances to reflect the current social, economic, political and technology events. This implies that, decision of people about where to leave is continuous and a reflection of dynamism in the socioeconomic strength of the accommodation seekers per time. This assertion was in consonant with the findings of Clark and Deurloo, (2006) and Denton, (2007). The authors argued that the choices of dwelling place vary across individuals, groups, corporate organisations and government. Lahey, Jones, Leishman and Watkins, (2004) added that housing choice is unique and dynamic in nature owing to the socioeconomic elements inherent in its mode of selection; such as age, income, marital status, tenure, migration, population distribution and status. With the understanding of the peculiarities characterised with the mode of housing choice across different groups of socioeconomic status, this study was set out to probe the critical factors among academic staff of Nigeria polytechnics. The study attempted to address two main questions: what are those critical factors? and whether there is a significant difference in the mode of housing choices among different status of the academic staff when thinking of accommodation choices.

However, the findings of this study are pertinent for three major reasons. Firstly, it adds to the growing body of knowledge by providing empirical information on the peculiarities of housing choice and its determinants among tertiary institutions' academic staff. Secondly, it could serve as a guide to investors/developers thinking of investing in rental housing for targeted market like academic staff of tertiary institution; and lastly, the findings could serve as a veritable input in policy formation or reform especially the one that gives academic staff welfare an utmost attention.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

A good number of literatures abound on housing choice and its determinants generally. The upsurge increases in the attention given to housing decision making debates in more recent times by the practitioners/professionals, academics and policy makers is attributable to the sensitivity of housing related issues to wellness of the citizens and the peculiarities characterised with the sector. For instance, Li (2011) conducted research on housing choice among the middle class of Shanghai residents in Hong Kong, China. The author discovered that more preferences were placed on influencing factors such as transport network, infrastructure and housing features among others. Similarly, Wu *et. al.* (2013) surveyed Beijing households' opinions in determining the factors responsible for their choice of residential location in housing market. The study showed the evidence of significance differences in their socioeconomic characteristics when making accommodation choices in the housing market.

In Germany, Shawal and Fredous (2014) investigated the determinants of residential location choice among the garments' workers of Mirpur Companies in Dhaka city. The authors reported the prominence of house rent, facilities, income, family preference and distance form workplace as major determinant factors. In same view, Olanrewaju and Woon (2017) surveyed the opinions of 468

households on critical factors with respect affordability issues on mode of hosing choice in Malaysia. The authors noted the strong influence financial, building, income, accessibility, market and location Malaysia housing market.

In Nigeria, Opaluwa and Aribigbola (2015) sampled 610 households in Lokoja, Kogi state to explore the factors affecting choice of residential housing and deployed multiple logistic regression to capture the effects. The authors found the significant effect of household size, income level accessibility to educational, healthcare and transpotport facilities and distance to working place. Ubani, Alaci and Udoo (2017) examined the interdependence between residents' socioeconomic characteristics status and housing choice influencing factors using the residential neighbourhood of Port-Harcourt as the case study. The authors classified the determinants into pull and push factors and found that purchase/built home, crime/insecurity, income, rental price and facilities were significant factors.

From the parlance of housing choice among the staff of Nigerian tertiary institutions, recent studies including Yusuf (2012); Nnametu, Alaka and Okoronko (2016) and Akinsanya and Adewusi (2017); Yisa and Nuhu (2019) have channelled scholar efforts to revealing the peculiarities of housing choice in the education sector. For instance, Nnametu, Alaka and Okoronko (2016) examined the impact of staff housing on the productivity of academic staff performance in Nigerian Institution. The authors identified lack of accommodation for academic staff, non-affordability of housing rent around campus, insecurity of workers salary, proximity to activity center of household interest and reason linked to safety and convenience. Akinsanya and Adewusi (2017) probed demand-supply market analysis of staff housing quarters of Obafemi Awolowo University Ile-Ife, Nigeria. In another dimension, Ndukwe, Nnaji and Nwuzor (2015) assessed the impact of Nigerian housing policies on university staff service delivery in Ebonyi state. Yisa and Nuhu (2019) evaluated staff quarters of polytechnic in Bida, Niger state but on post-occupancy issue

Other local studies on housing choice in Nigerian tertiary institutions focused on factors influencing students' accommodation choice of housing types. For instant, Kolawole and Abidoye (2016) use Federal University of Technology, Akura, Yusuf (2012) surveyed students of Lagos State University. While Olatuji (2014) looked into students housing quality in Ladoke Akintola University of Tecknology, Ogbomosho, Osun State. Thus, a number of studies exist on factor influencing choices in housing market but little of such literatures available on similar issues that borders on academic staff housing choice in Nigeria tertiary institutions especially the one that reflect the peculiarities of those institutions located in Ogun state, Nigeria.

3.0 METHODOLOGY 3.1 The Study Area

The study was carried out Ogun state, Nigeria in 2019. The study investigated the academic staff of one of the state polytechnics i.e. Moshood Abiola Polytechnic (MAPOLY) formally Ogun state polytechnic. The tertiary learning facilities is situated in the capital city (Abeokuta) in the Southwest region of the country. The polytechnic has five (5) schools such as school of Business and Management studies (SBMS); Communication and Information Technology (SCIT); Environmental studies (SENVS), Engineering studies (SENG) and Science and Technology (SETS). The institution operates off-campus accommodation system. Though the polytechnic has education supporting facilities such as sporting, market, event hall etc. however, no accommodation facilities were provided for both the staff and the students. Hence, due to the situation of housing provision of the institution's staff, an investigative attempt to peculiar modalities of academic staff of the polytechnic becomes pertinent.
The choice of using the tertiary learning institution as the case study could be alluded to the fact that, MAPOLY is the oldest state polytechnic; established about 40yrs ago (1980) and the institution as

attained an enviable position among its contemporaries in the state. Apart from the fact that the polytechnics was located in the capital city (Abeokuta) of the state, the institution has substantially contributed to the physical growth and socioeconomic development especially in the area of human capacity development, employment opportunities and positive image of the state in general.

3.2 Method

The study is quantitative in nature and adopted primary data survey. Self-administered questionnaire exercise was carried out to obtained data from academic staff of the tertiary learning institution. Inquiries into number of academic staff at the registrar office of the institution revealed that, there are 153 academic staff. The study sampled 92 members which accounts for 65% of the academic staff using simple random techniques in order to give the academic staff equal chance of been represented. The study deployed descriptive statistics such as simple frequency distribution, cross-tabulation analysis and relative significant index (RSI) to analyses the data

4.0 RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Table 4.1 presents the analysis of rate of response of the questionnaire survey exercise. The study administered 92(100%) questionnaires on academic staff of the institution, pot of which 53(57.21%) were properly filled and analysed. The study attributes averagely response rate non-regularity/availability academic staff on campus due lingering upgrading issues embattling with by the polytechnic staff. However, those that committed to filling of the questionnaire showed high level of interest and objectivity in the submission of the views with respect to the subject matter of the study.

Table 4.1: Analysis of Response Rate

Questionnaire Administered	Questionnaire Retrieved	Percentage (%)
92	53	57.21

Authors' filed survey: 2019

In Table 4.2, the study examined the socio-demographic profile of the sampled academic staff i.e. the gender, the age and the marital status; the result of summary of the descriptive statistics was presented. The analysis on the gender distribution of the academic staff showed the dominance of male representation (73.58%) compared to their female counterpart (26.42%). The substantial higher representation of male academic staff in the survey exercise tends to signal the gender imbalance in polytechnic staffing as a result of undue preferences the male gender enjoy over female when staffing.

An examination of age bracket of the academic staff revealed that, the categories of the respondents whose age ranged from 36-45yrs, 26-53yrs and 46-55yrs accounted for 39.63, 24.53 and 20.74 in that other. The academic staff within the age bracket 56-65yrs represents 11.32% while the least represented age group were respondents with age 25yrs and less and age above 65yrs having 1.88% representation each. The dominating age in the sample on are age between 30.5 – 50.5yrs (on average) and accounted for 78.29% of the sample. The higher representation of the average age group could be linked to the fact that, the academic staff in this category of age bracket fall within the labour force age in the country.

The result of analyses on the marital status of the academic staff showed that substantial higher percentage of them indicated that they have married (77.36%). Those that have yet to marry among the academic staff accounted for 13.21, no response was gotten for divorced academic staff member while 9.43% expressed the loss of the marital partners (widow/widower). From outcome of the summary

descriptive analysis of the socio-demographic profile of the sampled academic staff, it can be deduced that significant number of the respondents have matured, have their family and accountable to views on the subject matter of the study

Table 4.2: Summary of Descriptive Analysis of Socio-demographical profile of Sampled Academic Staff of the Polytechnic

Profile	Parameters	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	39	73.58
	Female	14	26.42
	Total	**53**	**100.00**
Age	≤25	1	1.88
	26-35	13	24.53 39.62
	36-45	21	20.74
	46-55	11	
	56-65	6	11.32
	>65	1	1.88
	Total	**53**	**100.00**
Marital Status	Single	7	13.21
	Married	41	77.36
	Divorced	-	-
	Widow/Widower	5	9.43
	Total		

Authors filed survey: 2019

In Table 4.2, the study examined the distribution of profile of the academic staff in the polytechnic. The profile information includes school, academic status, educational background and relevant (lecturing) work experiences in the institution. The result of the analysis on the number of academic staff that responded at school level showed that, the school of Business and Management Studies has the higher representative with 18 academic staff representing 33.96% of total sample. Next is the school of Environmental Studies with 13(24.53%) representatives. Respondents from other schools such as Information Technology, Engineering and Sciences accounted for 9(16.97%); 7(13.21) and 5(9.43%) respectively of the sampling population.

For lectureship cadre that participated in the survey, 45.27% of the response were gotten for academic staff with status of Lecturer (I, II & III); 20.75% were Senior Lecturer, those in the category of Assistant Lecturer accounted for 22.64% while the Principal Lecturer and the Technologies represented 5.66% each, while no response was obtained from the chief lecturer during the survey exercise; due to their non-availability. On average, 71.68% of the sample had attained lecturer cadre and above (senior and principal)

Analysis on the highest educational qualification of the academic staff showed that 58.50% of them had Master of Science (M.Sc.) degree, 24.53% had gotten Doctor of Philosophy (Ph. D) academic staff with first Bachelor of Science (B. Sc.) degree holder represented 16.97% while no response was obtained for academic staff with Higher National Diploma (HND) degree. For analysis involving relevant working experience, those academic staff the had been working for more than 10years accounted for 54.72%; the category of academic state with working experience between 6-10yrs

represents 41.51%; the least represented group were those of 1-5yrs years of working experience and accounted for 3.77%. Respondents with working experience less than a year were not sampled as indicated by the result of the analysis

The variation in the sample distribution can be linked to many reasons. The highest representation of academic staff in SBMS could be as a result of higher population of staff in the department; the participants from cadre LI to Principal lecturer due to their dominant presence in the school, while majority of them having M. Sc. and Ph. D degrees is linked to the new education policy specification for minimum requirement for teaching in the tertiary institution of learning. On average, above 80% of top–rated participants i.e. 88.66% of LIII to Senior lecturer in cadre category, 83.03% of respondent with M. Sc to Ph. D in education qualification category and 92.23% of respondents with working experience from 6years and above. This is an indication of the good quality of data obtained and the objective of responses that were analysed.

Table 4.3: Summary of Descriptive Analysis of Profile of Sampled Academic Staff as an Employee in the Polytechnic

Profile	Parameters	Frequency	Percentage (%)
School	Environmental Studies	13	24.53 9.43
	Science	5	13.21
	Engineering	7	33.96
	Business and Mgt.	18	
	Information Technology	9	16.97
	Total	**53**	**100.00**
Current Academic Cadre	Chief	-	-
	Principal	3	5.66
	Senior	11	20.75
	Lect. I/II/III	24	45.27
	Assistant Lect.	12	22.64
	Technologist	3	5.66
	Total	**53**	**100.00**
Highest Educational Qualification	HND	-	-
	BSc	9	16.97 58.50
	M.Sc./M. Phil	31	24.53
	Ph.D	13	
	Total	**53**	**100.00**
Relevant Work Experience	> 1	-	-
	1-5yrs	2	3.77
	6-10yrs	22	41.51
	>10yrs	29	**54.72**
	Total	**53**	**100.00**

In Table 4.4, The study investigated into the prominent underlying factors that could influence the choice of dwelling places among the academic staff of the polytechnic. From the literature especially the local studies; the study identified eight (8) factors. The respondents were asked to indicate the level of influence of those factors on 5-point Likert scale from the highest weight (5-Very high influence) to the lowest (1-Very Low influence). Based on the mean score analysis, the study discovered the strong prominent factors as indicated by MS value to include security *of workers family* (3.698) and *Proximity to place of interest (3.585)* occupying 1st and 2nd position respectively on the rank table. *Institution initiated housing scheme* and *Income* status with mean score 3.528 each were ranked 3rd on the table. However, at the bottom of the ranking table, the study noted the relatively less influencing power of some factors such as government *policy* and *rental prices around the Campus.* As indicated in their mean score indexes, *government police* scored 2.981 and ranked 7th position, while *rental prices around the campus* score 2.830 and ranked 2.830.

The results of the analysis in Table 4.4 can be attributed to different reasons. The strong prominence of *security of workers family* and *proximity to place of interest* factors in the study area could implies that the security of family of the academic staff occupies the topmost priority when they are making decision on where to live. A brief discussion with some academic staff revealed that, some of them raised concern on cultist activities and student rioting as some of the major reasons while the live a little bit far from the campus premises. Another major factor they consider is closeness and ease commuting to places of interest such as school, market, religion centre, health and transport facilities etc. Also, apart from working place, household will want to consider the level of accessibility to other place that may interest family as individual or group.

Institution housing scheme such as cooperative organised among the academic staff also plays a major role in determine choice of dwelling place. Some of the key activities of the corporative especially on their housing scheme to acquire large expanse of land on behalf of their members at cheaper amount and distribute it to members as reasonable prices; this may contribute to decision making in choice of where to live. Income level i.e. the higher the income level led to higher financial strength and more choice to make among alternatives in the housing market.

However, the weak influential power of government policy in deterring where the employees reside in the study area could be attributable to non-interference of government in making decision about where to leave. Some of the roles of government are to regulate and provide enabling environment for citizens, but limited to decision making on where people live, that may be one of the reasons why government policy has little influence on academic staff when making housing choice. Also, the respondents expressed that, rental prices of accommodation around the polytechnic site played no substantial role in their housing choice. The academic staff especially home renter may be preferred to considered at security challenges of the polytechnic neighbourhood to given detail attention to trend in housing price when making choice.

Table 4.4: Underlying Factors of Housing Choice of Academic Staff of MAPOLY

Factors	Level of Influence					TWF	MS	Rank	
	VL	L	M	H	VH				
Security of workers - family	12	39	100	45	196	3.698	1		
Proximity to activities center/household place of interest	6	6	21	112	45	190	3.585	2	

Institution Initiated Housing Scheme	1	8	48	120	10	187	3.528	3
Income	3	14	36	84	50	187	3.528	3
Relatives/Peer Group	2	18	66	64	20	170	3.208	5
Lack of School Quarters	5	30	18	52	55	160	3.019	6
Government Policy	6	16	69	52	15	158	2.981	7
Rental prices around the Campus	9	26	45	40	30	150	2.830	8

Note: Very Low (VL), Low (L), Moderate (M), High (H), Very High (VH), Total Weighted Frequency (TWF), Mean Score (MS)

The study probed further to know whether there is a significant difference in the opinions of the academic staff in different categories on the ranked underlying factors. The categorical information that was examined include; socio-demographic profile: *gender, age and marital status* and the employment profile: *cadre, education qualification and years of work experience*. To ascertain the level of significant differences, the study deployed Kruscal Wallis test and the results were presented in Table 4.5a and 4.5b. The result on socio-demographic analysis (see Table 4.5a) showed noted a significant difference in the view of the academic staff on some factors. For instance, in the categories of gender and marital status, there is a significant difference in the opinions on factor such as *relative/peer group* ($p<.05$) in both cases, while in the age category, there is a significant difference in the views of different age brackets on *proximity to place of interest* ($p<.05$) as one of the influencing factors. However, the academic staff share same views on another factor as indicated by *asymp. significant value (p>.05)* which implies no significant difference.

Similarly in Table 4.5b, except for the case of views on *rental prices around the campus* factor where the academic staff in years of work experience category shared a significant different opinions ($p<.05$), however, the differences in the submissions of the respondent in all the categories i.e. cadre, highest education qualification and work experience on the identified underlying factors were ascertained to be non-significant ($p>.05$). This result suggests the strong level of agreement and similarity on the critical factors the majority of academic staff considered when thing of where to live.

Table 4.5a: Kruscal Wallis Test of Underlying Factors*Socio-Demographic Profile of Academic Staff in the Polytechnic

Factor	Gender		Age		Marital Status		Chi-Square	KWT (A.Sig)
	Chi-Square	KWT (A.Sig)	Chi-Square	KWT (A.Sig)	Chi-Square	KWT (A.Sig)		
Security of workers family	3.014	.241	1.457	.582	5.002	.191		
Proximity to place of interest	5.001	.143	11.285	.024*	5.192	.183		
Institution Housing Scheme	5.427	.108	2.174	.337	4.356	.238		
Income	3.903	.211	2.538	.281	5.263	.172		
Relatives/Peer Group	8.434	.034*	3.612	.235	9.130	.027*		
Absence of School Quarters	6.226	.109	3.447	.239	5.323	.152		
Government Policy	4.384	.201	2.947	.346	4.658	.251		

Rental prices around the Campus	7.943	.0621	2.099	.397	4.189	.219

Kruscal Wallis Test (KWT); Asymp. Significance level @ 5% (*)

Table 4.5b: Kruscal Wallis Test of Underlying Factors*Employment Profile of Academic Staff in the Polytechnic

Factor	Lecturing Cadre		HEQ		RWExp.	
	Chi-Square	KWT (A.Sig) e	Chi-Square	KWT (A.Sig) e	Chi-Square	KWT (A.Sig)
Security of workers family	5.111	.118	4.661	.163	1.342	.699
Proximity to place of interest	5.315	.105	3.582	.228	4.645	.214
Institution Housing Scheme	5.030	.117	3.278	.263	2.116	.375
Income	5.488	.147	2.911	.297	3.698	.282
Relatives/Peer Group	3.974	.229	3.720	.261	1.857	.576
Absence of School Quarters	3.614	.236	3.821	.277	1.932	.604
Government Policy	4.533	.174	4.915	.214	2.574	.266
Rental prices around the Campus	5.892	.138	2.224	.403	10.475	.021

Kruscal Wallis Test (KWT); Asymp. Significance level @ 5% (*)

5.0 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The examined the underlying factors that could influence the choice of housing place among academic staff of Nigeria tertiary learning institution. The primary objective of the study is to identify the prominent influencing factors; using MAPOLY academic staff as a case study. The study used primary data and the information was obtained questionnaire survey. The study deployed statistical tools such as mean score, chi-square and Kruscal Wallis test and found strong prominence of security of workers' family; proximity to place of interest, institution-initiated housing scheme and income as influencing factors. The also ascertained least influential power of the government policy and the land/rental prices around the campus in the study area. Conclusively, security of a worker's family welfare plays out to be the paramount determinant, therefore the study suggests that, educational institution whether public or private especially at tertiary level should take into consideration not only the security of the environment where the educational facilities will be located but also the welfare of the employees' family especially for institutions that lack staff housing quarters.

REFERENCE

Ademiluyi, I. A. (2010). Public housing delivery strategies in Nigeria: A historical perceptive of policy and programme. *Journal of Sustainable Development I Africa 12(6) 153-161*

Akinsanya, G. M. and Adewusi, A. O. (2017).Staff housing needs of Nigerian university. A case study of Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife. *International Journal of Geography and Environmental Management 3(1) 38-52*

Clark, V. A. W. and Deurloo, C. M. A. (2006). Aging in place and housing over-consumption. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, 21(3), 315-335.

Colom M. C. and Cruz Molés, M. (2008). Comparative analysis of the social, demographic and economic factors that influenced housing choices in Spain in 1990 and 2000.*Urban Studies*, 45(4) 917-941.

Denton, N. (2007) The geography of opportunity: Race and housing choice in Metropolitan America, *Contemporary Sociology*, 36(2), 135-136.

Jones, C., Leishman, C. and Watkins, C. (2004). Intra-Urban migration and housing submarkets: Theory and evidence. *Housing Studies*, 19(2) 269- 283.

Kolawole, A. and Abidoye, B. R. (2016). Assessment of factors influencing students' choice of residence in tertiary institutions. *Sains Humanika 8(2) 39-47.*

Lahey, E. K., Newman, L. M. and Kim, D. (2006). Housing choices and mortgage financing options for seniors. *Journal of Real Estate Portfolio Management, 12(2) 103-119.*

Li, L. (2011). Housing choice in an affluent Shanghai: Decision process of middle class Shanghai residents. *Modern Economy, (2) 9-17*

Michelson, M. W. (1975). Environmental Choice, Human Behaviour and Residential Satisfaction. *Book published by* Centre for Urban and Community Studies, University of Toronto, Toronto.

Ndukwe, C., Nnaji, I. L. and Nwuzor, C. I. (2015). Impact of Nigerian housing policies on university staff service delivery in Ebonyi State. *Journal of Social Development 417(3868) 1-17*

Nnametu, N. J., Alaka, N. I. and Okoronkwo, C. (2016). Staff housing: Panacea to academic productivity (Nigerian Institutions). *ERES Housing Markets and Economics Proceedings, 114*

Opaluwa, A. I and Aribigbola, A. (2015). Factors affecting the choice of residential housing in Lokoja, Kogi State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Innovative Science, Engineering and Technology, 2(10) 850-859*

Olanrewaju, A. and Woon, C. T. (2017). An exploration of determinants of affordable housing choice. *International Journal of Housing Markets and Analysis* https://doi.org/10.1108/

Olatunji, S. A. (2014). A study of students' Housing quality in Ladoke Akintola University of Technology (Lautech), Ogbomoso, Nigeria. *Journal of Environment and Earth Science 4(18) 13-18*

Owusu, T. Y. (1999). Residential patterns and housing choices of Ghanaian immigrants in Toronto, Canada. *Housing Studies*, 14(1) 77-98.

Shawal, S. and Ferdous, J. (2014). Study on the factors influencing residential location choice of the garments workers of Mirpur, Dhaka City. *International Journal of Chemical and Process Engineering Research* 1(6) 73-86

Sikiru, J. B., Abdulrazaq, I. U. and Luqman, A. S. (2013). An economic analysis of determinants of house rents in the university environment. *European Scientific Journal 9(19) 99-111*

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) 01-11

Wu, W, Zang, W. and Dong G. (2013). Determinants of residential location choice in a traditional housing market: evidence based on micro survey from Beijing. *Habitat International 39(2013) 16-24*

Yisa, G. G. and Nuhu, B. M. (2019). Post-occupancy evaluation of the staff quarters of Federal Polytechnic Bida, Niger, State. *Journal of Environmental Design and Construction Management 19(4) 113-122*

Yusuf, K. A. (2012). An appraisal of research in Nigerian's University sector.*Journal of Research in Education Development 10(12) 132-330*