Residents' Satisfaction with Residential Property Management Services in Abuja, Nigeria

Shien S. Kuma
Department of Estate Management and Valuation, School of Environmental Technolgy,
Federal University of Technology, Minna, Nigeria
kumass@futminna.edu.ng

Abstract
This study evaluates the satisfaction of residents with residential property management services in Kubwa, a residential neighbourhood in Abuja, Nigeria. To achieve this, the study measures the levels of satisfaction of residents with their dwelling units (buildings) and management service delivery. It also analysed the relationship between residential satisfaction and residents' willingness to remain in their current dwellings over a period of time. Data was collected mainly through a structured questionnaire survey distributed to 330 residents with a response rate of 68%. The analysis was made with the use of descriptive statistics, residential satisfaction index and linear regression technique. Findings revealed that residents are moderately satisfied with their overall residential dwellings which include buildings and management service components (63.2%). However, between the two residential components, they were highly satisfied with their buildings (76.2%) but expressed rather very low satisfaction with the quality of management services provided. It was also found that the residents' overall level of satisfaction did not influence significantly their decision to continue to stay in their residential dwellings (R^2=.123). The study recommends adoption of satisfaction evaluation as part of property management routine feedback; will enable the property managers to improve the quality of service delivery.

Keywords: Dwelling unit, Property Management Services, Residents, Satisfaction;

Introduction
A residential property is a product with physical, social and economic values which exert influence on a user's wellbeing and utility optimisation. As a home, a typical residential dwelling unit is expected to satisfy an occupant's physical, physiological and psychological needs or requirements. However, for these expected satisfaction to be met appropriately, Ibem, Opoko, Adeboye and Amole (2013) emphasised that requisite expertise knowledge of professionals as well as established government regulations and standards becomes pertinent.

Satisfaction with a residential dwelling as explained by McCary and Day (1977), is the degree or level of contentment experienced by an occupant with regards to their current residential environment. The level of contentment experienced and expressed by the occupants/users relates significantly to the overall performance of such residential dwelling. According to Abolade, Omirin and Dugeri (2013), a product's performance is the most important factor for satisfaction. This means that the higher the performance of a product, the more satisfaction consumers tend to derive from its consumption. Hence for occupants to attain a level of satisfaction with the use of a residential property, its quality in term of performance must be at its optimum and tended towards meeting their requirements.

Multi-tenanted residential dwellings/ environment sometimes provides for the use of common spaces, facilities and services which in a large number of cases, is inevitable. Where this is the case, two basic requirements become evident; first is the requirement for expertise residential service delivery to enhance the comfortability and satisfaction of occupants (Olanrele & Thontteh, 2014). The second being the requirement for financial resources to continue to deliver such management services (Priemus, 1999; Tawal *et al.*, 2011). For the latter, however, the sources for such type of finance usually come through the determination and collection of service charge which is paid by tenants aside from their prescribed rents. Therefore, to ensure efficiency in property management by experts, efforts towards assessing users' levels of satisfaction at a certain point in time is pertinent. This assessment according to Thontteh and Olanrele (n.d) will provide an understanding of customers' expectation that will help in the identification of gaps in the quality of service delivery. Thus, in filling these gaps, it will also contribute significantly towards the efficient and effective manner in which property management services are provided for the benefit of both the occupants (user) and the landlord (Jeffres & Dobos, 1995; Liias, 1998).

The concept of utility under the theory of consumer behaviour explains utility simply as the ability of a good or service to yield satisfaction to the consumer. It also refers to the amount of satisfaction derived from the consumption or use of a commodity at a particular time which forms the major determinant of consumers demand for such goods/services and their willingness to continue to pay for same (Menger, 2007). However, the practice of residential property management in Nigeria often presents quite the opposite of this utility concept. For instance, Thontteh and Olanrele (n.d) observed that property managers are most time engrossed in the income being generated from buildings much to the disadvantage of its satisfaction to the tenants. Ironically, tenants sometimes do not react effectively to the dissatisfactory manner these services are delivered even when they specifically paid for such. Although, Abolade *et al.* (2013) noted that, sometimes tenants are more satisfied with the buildings meeting their personal needs or requirements than the services provided. In this wise, they will continue to pay for the occupation of such properties that do not provide them with the optimum utility.

Stemming from the above, the study aims at evaluating the levels of tenants' satisfaction with their residential buildings and management services. Also to assess the relationship between satisfaction levels of residential dwelling units and residential management services as well as attempts to ascertain if tenants willingness to stay in their residential dwellings can be influenced significantly by their level of residential satisfaction.

Literature Review

Residential Satisfaction Evaluation: Conceptual Issues

Satisfaction generally can be referred to as that state of mind that explains an individual's fulfilment of a need or desire. It is the intrinsic relationship shared between man and his object of value expressed through sentimental or rational responses or both. Thus in explaining tenant's evaluation of a dwelling unit especially residential, the foremost consideration here is how they respond to their residential environment. Ajzen and Fishbein (1981) provided a trilogy conceptual model in explaining people's general responses to their residential environment. These are; *Affective* responses (which deals with occupant's feelings or emotional state of mind), *Cognitive* responses, referring to an occupant's moral conviction or belief/logic, and *Behavioural* which deals with physical, attitude/character.

Among the early studies that made use of this trilogy conceptual model were those of

Francescato, Weidemann, Anderson and Chenoweth (1974), and Marans and Rogers (cited in Weidemann & Anderson, 1985). They adopted two of the three elements in the model which were the affective and cognitive responses while evaluating residential satisfaction. Francescato *et al.* (1974) idealised satisfaction of a residential unit as a function of different variables which are categorised into *affect*; residents' characteristics such as age, sex, income, previous housing experience etc and *cognitive*; the physical residential environment, management and other occupants. The outcome from their study following this model indicates that information from previous occupants, socio-economic characteristics and relationship with others (attitude) within the residential area will significantly influence the emotional state of mind of an individual hence a positive or negative response.

The third element in the trilogy conceptual model is '*Behaviour*'. This explains the fact that person's behaviour is influenced by satisfaction, perception as well as an assessment of the objective residential environment attributes and the objective attributes of the environment itself (Weidemann & Anderson, 1985)**.** Newman and Duncan (1979) also consider residential satisfaction as a predictor of behaviour, inferring that the more satisfied an individual or persons are with their residential unit, the positive their attitude towards such residential environment and vice versa. Thus this attitude (behaviour) as resulting from residential dissatisfaction according to Jiboye (2012), could lead to an adjustment in form of relocation or intention to relocate. However, Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) contended that behaviour intentions are seen as mediating between one's affective responses and actual behaviour and as such, an occupant/tenant may have negative feelings towards their home probably due to dissatisfaction with certain attributes, they may not have the intention to leave or move out. Intention or willingness to move is also supported by the socio-economic status of residents and not just their level of satisfaction (Hui & Yu, 2009). Sometimes the length of stay, social bonds and other residents attitude influence decision to stay despite low satisfaction with dwelling unit (Galster & Hesser, 1981).

Therefore, to understand the well-being of occupants within their residential environment, a measure of their affective and cognitive responses to either of their dwelling units or management components becomes imperative (Adriaanse, 2007). Amole (2009) and Mohit *et al.* (2010) also opined that for an effective residential satisfaction evaluation, the analysis should be made of the affective response variables which are basically subjective. These includes the physiological and psychological state of an occupant that deals with perception, emotions and aspirations. Also, the cognitive response variables which are the objective environment variables and includes the physical characteristics of the residential environment as well as facilities and services (Theodori, 2001). Quite a substantial number of studies on residential satisfaction in Nigeria has operationalised a combination of two or three elements of the trilogy concept. They either adopt the measure of the entire residential components (Waziri *et al.,* 2013; Jiboye, 2013; Ibem *et al.,* 2013), or a selected components often relating to residential service delivery (Olanrele & Thontteh, 2014). The choice of evaluation of dwelling components and management service were adopted by Ilesanmi (2010) and Tawil *et al.* (2011).

Users' Satisfaction with Residential Building and Management Services

Buildings are one of the key elements or components required in the overall residential satisfaction evaluation. Like any other economic product, residential buildings are designed and constructed to meet the expectations and aspirations of the developer, investor and occupants in various ways (Parker & Matthews, 2001). It has been shown in some studies that the

affective response to building satisfaction is a major predictor of behaviour (Priemus, 1986; Ibem & Amole, 2012). Thus, in the assessment or measurement of users' satisfaction with a particular dwelling unit, a breakdown of the residential building unit into subunits such as the living area (sitting room), bedrooms sizes, kitchen spaces, windows, finishes, toilets/bathrooms becomes necessary. This will provide a statistical evidence on those components that contributes significantly to the overall satisfaction of the dwelling units (see Ukoha & Beamish, 1997; Salleh, 2008). Further, Karstein (2006) and Adriannse (2007) asserted that satisfaction levels of the dwelling unit at a particular point in time can be explained by the characteristics of the households which includes composition, age, sex and income. A household's size may not increase in terms of numbers but as the family grows, some members of the family may require more space for privacy and so on. Hence, number of rooms and their sizes become essential to the overall satisfaction of the dwelling unit. Ibem *et al*. (2013) relate the personal characteristics of users versus those of the physical characteristics of the dwellings in their study. Their findings revealed 3 most important dimension in the variables construct that contribute significantly to the overall residential satisfaction. These were location, aesthetic appearance of buildings and sizes of its components.

Another component aside from building that contributes to the overall residential satisfaction is the management service delivery. Very few literature focusing specifically on the assessment of occupants satisfaction with quality residential management service delivery exist in Nigeria. Olanrele and Thontteh (2014) is one of the few and comprehensive studies in this regard. Others adopt a combination of dwelling units, environmental subsystem and management services. (see Ilesanmi, 2010; Clement & Kayode, 2012; Jiboye, 2013). Most of the items of the management service components evaluated by the aforementioned studies include; security, water supply, waste disposal, cleaning of common areas, general repairs and quality of maintenance work as well as the lighting of common areas. Findings from these studies indicate significantly low satisfaction levels among occupants with residential management service delivery in public and private estates. The study of Ukoha and Beamish (1997) in Abuja revealed that residents expresses higher satisfaction with their residential environment attributes but expressed dissatisfaction with their dwelling units and management services provided. The study of Waziri *et al*. (2013) which uses another residential neighbourhood in Abuja made a similar finding, although Jiboye (2013) found residents to be highly satisfied with their dwelling units and environment attributes but were dissatisfied with the delivery of management services. Liu (1999) in Hong Kong observed a higher dissatisfaction with the level of maintenance and cleanliness of common areas among the measured variables in his study. Elsewhere in Kuala Lumpur, the studies of Mohit, Ibrahim and Rashid (2010) and Tawil *et al*. (2011) also show that occupants were dissatisfied with management services provided. Infact Tawil *et al.* (2011) also found that occupants adjudged the amount paid for services to be quite higher relative to the actual quality of services provided. Evidence from literature thus far has shown a pattern of poor management service delivery to residents as expressed in their levels of dissatisfaction compared to levels of satisfaction mostly with the residential dwelling units and environment attributes.

Methodology

Data sources and collection

A survey of Kubwa, a satellite residential precinct in Abuja was carried out covering Phase I Site I (FHA), Phase II Site I and II. This neighbourhood has a significant number of residential accommodation types ranging from single units (self-contained) one bedroom flats to semi-detached and detached 4-bedroom accommodations. It is also home to a wide

category of income households comparatively. Following the record obtained from Abuja Electricity Distribution Company (AEDC) office, a total estimated residential units of 2,373 in the area was obtained. In determining the appropriate sample size (Ss) that will be statistically significant for the survey, the following formula was used:

$$Ss = [(Z^2 \times P(1-P)] \div C^2$$

Z = Standardised normal value (confidence level) of 95% (1.96), ***P*** is the estimated rate (47%) and ***C*** is the confidence interval (5%). Thus a sample size of approximately 330 residential units was arrived at. Hence a set of 330 questionnaires were distributed to purposively selected residents in the area who were leaseholders and also paying for some management services (service charge). A total of 236 (72%) were retrieved, however, only 207 (88%) of the returned questionnaires were properly filled and valid for analysis. The structured questionnaire used contained three (3) sections, the first section required information on respondents' socio-economic characteristics. The second section measures residents' satisfaction levels with the dwelling unit component and management services, while the third measured respondents' willingness to continue to stay in their residential dwelling units over a given period of time. A 5-point Likert scale with Very Low Satisfaction (1), Low Satisfaction (2), Moderately Satisfied (3), High Satisfaction (4) and Very High Satisfaction (5) was adopted and some of the variables used in the study construct were generated from earlier literature with modifications to align with the research concept (see Ukoha & Beamish, 1997; Ebiaribe & Umeh, 2015). A total of 20 items were generated comprising 10 subunits each of the dwelling unit and management services components respectively. On the measurement of respondents' willingness or intention to stay, a period of 5 years interval effective from the date of the survey was used. The options were; (a) next 5 Years (≤ 5years), (b) 6-10years, (c) 11-15years, and (d) 16years and above and a scale of 1 to 4 was provided for the respondents. These are; 1=Not Willing, 2=Uncertain, 3=Willing and 4=Very Willing.

Reliability analysis of the measured variables

Following the nature of data obtained and scale of measurement used, the reliability of the measured responses from the items was tested using the Cronbach's alpha (α) technique. This provides a reliable estimate that simultaneously considers all possible ways of splitting the test items into the inter-item correlational matrix (Adriaanse, 2007). The test was conducted on the dwelling units and management services components comprising of 10 variables respectively and was performed using the formula (1) below:

$$\alpha = (\sum \lambda_1)^2 / [(\sum \lambda_1)^2 + \sum var\ (\varepsilon_1)] \quad (1)$$

Where $\boldsymbol{\lambda_1}$ is the loading value of each measurement item and $\boldsymbol{var\ (\varepsilon_1)} = 1 - \lambda_1^{\,2}$

The outcome shows that the variables in the dwelling unit construct has an alpha coefficient of **.**678 while **.**776 for the management services component. This is considered an acceptable level of reliability which is above the minimum recommended level of **.**60 for social sciences researches (Sekaran, 2003; Park, Heo & Rim, 2008). The test result suggests that the tenants were more consistent in evaluating their satisfaction with management service delivery than the dwelling units component.

Determination of Satisfaction Index (SI)

Satisfaction index (**S**I) for a particular unit of a residential component say ***a***, is measured as;

$$SIa = [\sum (V_1R_1 + V_2R_2 + V_3R_3 \ \ldots\ldots\ldots + V_nR_n) \div V_h N] \times 100$$

Where SI*a* is the Satisfaction Index for Unit ***a*** of the Residential Component**;**

$V_1 V_2 \ldots\ldots V_n$ indicates the values representing levels of satisfaction scaled while $R_1 R_2 \ldots\ldots R_n$ represents the actual score by respondents on the V_n variable, V_h is the maximum possible score that V^{th} variable could have on the scale used, while ***N*** is the number of respondents under *a*. Further, Residential Satisfaction Index (RSI) which is the sum total of the component satisfaction indices (Mohit *et al.*, 2010), is measured in this study based on Dwelling (*D*) and Management Services (*M*) components. It was determined using the following equation;

$$RSI_{DM} = [\sum(Wf_D + Wf_M) \div \sum(N_D V_D + N_M V_M)V_h] \times 100 \quad (3)$$

Where RSI_{DM} is the residential satisfaction index of tenants with components *D* and *M*, Wf_D and Wf_M are the total weighted frequencies for *D* and *M* components, $N_D N_M$ = are the total number of respondents under the *D* and *M* components, $V_D V_M$ = represents the number of variables being scaled under the *D* and *M* components,

For a better understanding of the analysis on satisfaction levels, a scale is required as a benchmark to aid the interpretation of the outcomes. Bello and Ajayi (2010) provided a justifiable scale as modified from Onibokun (1974) which adopted and used for this study. It provides that the maximum value the RSI can attain is 100% while 25% is the minimum value. Thus the scale is as follows;

1. 0 ≤ 50% = Very Low level of satisfaction
2. 51 – 59% = region of Low satisfaction
3. 60 – 69% = region of satisfaction
4. 70 & above = region of high level satisfaction.

Finally, a regression analysis was conducted to determine the relationship between the level of residential satisfaction and residents willingness to stay. This is also meant to ascertain if residents' satisfaction with their residential environment has a significant influence on their decision to continue to stay.

Results and Discussion

Socio-economic data of respondents

The outcome of the survey shows the predominance of married residents within the modal age range of 45 – 55 years. They are mostly under government employment which accounted for 44.9% and closely followed by those under the employment of the organised private sector with 41.5%. Also, the majority of the respondents earn between ₦2.5 and ₦4.0 million annually (37.7%) and 10.1% earned between ₦6.0 million and above. Despite their income levels, a substantial number of the respondents have a high preference for 2 and 3 bedroom apartments which constituted 39.1% and 38.2% respectively. The least being those occupying 4 bedroom apartments with 14.0%.

Table 2 shows data on respondents' residential satisfaction with their dwelling units and management services in the study area.

Table 1. Socio-economic status of respondents

Items	Category	Freq	%
Age of Respondents (Years)	25 – 35	21	10.1
	36 – 45	56	27.1
	46 – 55	67	32.4
	56 – 65	45	21.7
	66 + years	18	8.7
Marital Status	Married	151	72.9
	Divorced	17	8.2
	Widowed	11	5.3
	Single	28	13.5
Occupational Sectors	Public Servant	93	44.9
	Private employee	86	41.5
	Self-employed	28	13.6
Income Levels (₦'million)	0.5 - 2.0	71	34.3
(Annual)	2.5 - 4.0	78	37.7
	4.5 – 6.0	37	17.9
	6.5 & above	21	10.1
Accommodation Type	One Bedroom	18	8.7
	Two Bedroom	81	39.1
	Three Bedroom	79	38.2
	Four Bedroom & above	29	14.0
	Total	207	

Table 2: Respondents' measure of residential satisfaction

Component	Component Subunit	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	Wfx	Mean
Dwelling Unit (Building)	Interior Wall Finishes	0	14	54	93	46	792	3.826
	Floor Finishing	0	9	76	85	37	771	3.725
	Ceiling Type	0	5	62	11 5	25	781	3.773
	Room Sizes	0	5	65	89	48	801	3.870
	Kitchen Size	0	4	72	93	38	786	3.797
	Sitting room size	0	0	58	10 3	46	816	3.942
	External wall finishing	0	4	75	95	33	778	3.758
	Window types/sizes	0	13	53	11 7	24	809	3.908
	Landscape/walk ways	0	7	75	89	63	775	3.744
	Toilet/Bathrooms	0	6	79	83	39	776	3.749
Management Services	Cleanliness of common areas	34	72	52	36	13	543	2.623
	Fire safety equipment	17	60	72	36	18	599	2.894
	Water provision	36	85	63	37	13	527	2.546
	Security services	40	95	29	33	10	499	2.411
	Generating set	30	94	75	8	0	475	2.295
	Prompt response to defects	29	98	54	30	17	509	2.459
	Waste disposal	34	75	57	30	11	530	2.560
	Quality of maintenance work done	35	87	42	33	10	517	2.498
	Security Lighting	40	79	48	32	8	510	2.464
	Amount paid in relation to service delivery	16	98	93	0	0	491	2.372

1 *= Very Low satisfaction,* ***2*** *= Low Satisfaction,* ***3*** *=Moderately Satisfied,* ***4*** *= High Satisfaction,*
5 *= Very High Satisfaction* ***Wfx*** *= Total Weighted frequency*

A measure of the residents' willingness to stay in their dwelling units over a given period of time as shown in Table 3 below reveals a mean response of 3.609 for those willing to stay within the next 5 years. Those who indicated their desire to stay for up to between 6 years and 10 years followed closely with a mean response of 3.488. However, the responses for 11 – 15 years and 16 years and above diminishes respectively indicating that some of the residents may not be keen to continue to stay in their present dwelling units.

The results from the overall residential satisfaction with both dwelling units and management services RSI_{DM} indicates **.**632 (63.2%) which depicts that residents of the study area are satisfied. The satisfaction level as expressed by the residents is found to be considerably higher with the dwelling units component than the management services provided. This is shown by a satisfaction index RSI_D of **.**762 representing 76.2% for dwelling unit component which is also found to contribute most significantly to the overall residential satisfaction in the study area. However, the residents expressed a low level of satisfaction with the management services as shown by a satisfaction index RSI_M of **.**502 which indicates 50.2% thus contributing least to the overall residential satisfaction in the study area

Table 3: Respondents' willingness to stay in their residential dwellings

	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	Sum	W*fx*	Mean
Next 5 years	4	9	51	143	207	747	3.609
6 - 10 years	6	8	72	121	207	722	3.488
11 - 15 years	6	38	102	61	207	632	3.053
16 + years	33	94	69	11	207	472	2.280

1 *= Not Willing,* ***2*** *= Uncertain,* ***3*** *= Willing,* ***4*** *= Very Willing*

Table 4: Residential Satisfaction Index

Component	Index	Level (%)
RSI_{DM}	**.**632	63.2
RSI_{D}	**.**762	76.2
RSI_{M}	**.**502	50.2

RSI_{DM} = Overall Residential Satisfaction Index (Dwelling & Management Components)
RSI_{D} = Residential Satisfaction Index for Dwelling unit Component,
RSI_{M} = Residential Satisfaction Index for Management Component,

Results of the unit by unit analysis of the satisfaction levels is presented in Tables 5 and 6 below. This shows the satisfaction index of each subunit of the dwelling and management services components respectively and is arranged in a descending order of significance.

The units analysis results of residential satisfaction has shown that, the sitting room (78.84%), window types/sizes (78.16%), bedroom sizes (77.39%), interior wall finishes (76.52%) and kitchen sizes (75.94%) contributes most significantly to the overall satisfaction level of the dwelling units. On the items in the management services provided (see Table 5), the provision of fire services (57.87%), cleanliness of common areas (52.46%), waste disposal (51.21%) and water provision (50.92%) are the items tenants expresses satisfaction levels above 50%.

Table 5: Satisfaction index for subunits of Dwelling component

Dwelling Component	W*fx*	Mean	StDev	RSI	SI*a*
Sitting room size	816	3.942	**.**708	**.**788	78.84

Window Type/sizes	809	3.908	.786	.782	78.16
Bedroom sizes	801	3.870	.793	.774	77.39
Interior Wall finishes	792	3.826	.853	.765	76.52
Kitchen size	786	3.797	.755	.759	75.94
Ceiling type	781	3.773	.684	.755	75.46
Exterior Wall finishes	778	3.758	.737	.752	75.17
Toilet/Bathrooms	776	3.749	.791	.750	74.98
Landscape/walk ways	775	3.744	.780	.749	74.88
Floor finishing	771	3.725	.804	.745	74.49

W*fx* = *Weighted Frequency,* **RSI** = *Residential Satisfaction Index,* **SI*a*** = *Satisfaction Level of a subunits*

Table 6: Satisfaction index for Management Services

Management Services	W*fx*	Mean	StDev	RSI	SI*a*
Fire safety equipment	599	2.894	1.065	.579	57.87
Cleanliness of common areas	543	2.623	1.138	.525	52.46
Waste disposal	530	2.560	1.091	.512	51.21
Water provision	527	2.546	1.156	.509	50.92
Quality of maintenance work done	517	2.498	1.097	.500	49.95
Security Lighting	510	2.464	1.087	.493	49.28
Prompt response to defects	509	2.459	1.013	.492	49.18
Security services	499	2.411	1.115	.482	48.21
Amount paid in relation to service delivery	491	2.372	.625	.474	47.44
Generating Set	475	2.295	.760	.459	45.89

However, they expressed significant low levels of satisfaction with 6 out of the 10 items of management services measured, indicating satisfaction level below 50%. They are mostly not satisfied with the quality of maintenance work being carried, security lighting, promptness of managing firms response to defects reported, security services and alternative power provision. They also consider the amount they are paying currently as service charge quite high in relation to the quality of services being provided. Further, the outcome of the regression analysis shows the R^2 = .123 indicating that only 12.3% of the variation in residents' willingness to continue to stay in their residential dwellings is explained by their levels of satisfaction (RSI_{DM}).

The P-value of .0001 is less than the α = .05 indicating that there is a significant difference between residential satisfaction and willingness to stay. This result also infers that the model has a good predictive ability for the level of residents' willingness to stay hence, a 1% increase in their satisfaction with their residential environment, increases their willingness to stay by 3.2%. The Beta value of .351 indicates that not much influence can be exerted on residents' willingness to stay by their level of residential satisfaction

implying that the relationship is weak significantly

Table 7: Regression of Willingnes to Stay Vs Residential Satisfaction

Model Summary	R = .351	R^2 = .123	Adjusted R^2 = .119	P < .000

		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t-value	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	7.075	1.005		7.042	.000
	RSI_{DM}	.169	.032	.351	5.36	.000

a Dependent Variable: Willingness to Stay

.

Thus, the study findings revealed residents' significant levels of satisfaction with their residential dwelling units (buildings) which includes unit spaces, aesthetics and functional components. It shows an obvious indication that the buildings are meeting their needs and expectations. This finding relates with those of Jiboye (2009) and Ibem *et al.* (2013) respectively. Although the studies of Ukoha and Beamish (1997) and Waziri *et al.* (2013) that uses other residential precincts within Abuja found otherwise. Further, the residents expressed rather very low satisfaction with the delivery of residential management services by the property managers. They are mostly not satisfied with the delay in response to complaints made on repairs, security arrangements and generator services as well as the quality of maintenance work carried out. These findings also aligned with those of Liu (1999), Mohit *et al.* (2010) and Olanrele and Thorntteh (2014) that also found residents to be dissatisfied with management services in their residential dwellings.

Finally, the residents' willingness to remain in their residential dwellings over a period of time is not substantially influenced by their overall residential satisfaction. The results of the regression analysis show a significantly weak relationship explaining only 12.3%. This outcome to a certain extent has confirmed Hui and Yu (2009) position that intention to move or stay is not exclusively dependent on satisfaction but also the socio-economic status of residents. Sometimes due to the huge cost involved in residential property development, people tend to develop their homes on incremental basis hence may be willing to remain in the current residential environment until they have completed theirs.

Conclusion and Recommendation

The study has evaluated residents' satisfaction with their dwelling units and management service components of their residential environment. To achieve this, residential satisfaction indices were determined to measure their levels of satisfaction with the dwelling components as well as determine if the residents' satisfaction has a significant influence on their willingness to remain in their respective dwelling units over a given period of time. The outcome shows that the quality of residential property management service delivery is significantly low whereas, the dwelling units (buildings) have continued to meet residents' needs and expectations hence they expressed high satisfaction. Although despite their level of satisfaction, it does not influence significantly their decision to continue to stay in their current dwelling environment.

Hence, the study recommends here that, as a way forward for property managers to improve their professional task, evaluation of the quality of service delivery should be part of property management routine and results (indices developed) could be used as a basis for future assessment or evaluation.

References

Abolade A. O., Omirin M. M. & Dugeri, T. T. (2013). An Evaluation of User's Satisfaction with Property Management Services in Commercial Properties in Lagos, Nigeria. *ATBU Journal of Environmental Technology*, 6(1) 66-76.

Adriannse, C. C. M. (2007). Measuring Residential Satisfaction: a residential environmental satisfaction scale (RESS). *Journal of Housing and Built Environment.* 2007(22) 287-304. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10901-007-9082-9

Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (1981). Understanding attitudes and predicting social behaviour. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Amole, D. (2009). Residential Satisfaction in Students Housing. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 29, 76-85.

Anderson, J.R. & Weidemann, S. (1985). A conceptual framework for residential satisfaction. In I. Altman & C. W. Werner (Eds). *Home Environments.*(Pp.153-181).New York: Plenum Press.

Bello, V. A. & Ajayi, C. A. (2010). Occupants' Satisfaction and Rent paid for residential properties close to waste dump sites in Nigeria. *Journal of Sustainable Development*, 3(1), 98-103.

Clement, O. I., & Kayode, O. (2012), Public housing provision and user satisfaction in Ondo State, Nigeria. *British Journal of Art and Social Sciences*, 8(1), 103-111.

Ebiaride, E. C. & Umeh, O. L. (2015), Factors influencing users' satisfaction in public and private estates in Lagos, Nigeria. *ATBU Journal of Environmental Technology*, 8(2), 30-41.

Francescato, G., Weidemann, S. & Anderson, J. R. (1989). Evaluating the built Environment from the Users' Point of View: An Attitudinal Model of Residential Satisfaction. In W.F.E. Preiser (Ed). *Building Evaluation*, (pp.181-198) New York: Plenum Press.

Galster, G., & Hesser, G. W. (1981). Residential satisfaction: compositional and contextual correlates. *Environment and Behaviour*, 13, 735–758.

Hui, E. C. M. & Yu, K. H. (2009). Residential mobility and ageing population in Hong Kong, *Habitat International*, 33, 10-14.

Ibem, E. O., & Amole, D. (2012), Residential satisfaction in public core housing in Abeokuta, Ogun State, *Nigeria. Social Indicators Research*. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11205-012-0111-z

Ibem, E. O., Opoko, A. P., Adeboye, A. B., & Amole, D. (2013), Performance evaluation of residential buildings in public housing estates in Ogun State, Nigeria: Users' satisfaction perspective. *Frontiers of Architectural Research* (2013) 2, 178 – 190. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foar.2013.02.001

Ilesanmi, A. O. (2010), Post-occupancy evaluation and residents' satisfaction with public housing in Lagos, Nigeria. *Journal of Building Appraisal*. 6(2), 153-169.http://dx.doi.org/10.1057/jba.2010.20

Jeffres, L. W., & Dobos, J. (1995). Separating Peoples' Satisfaction with Life and Public Perception of the Quality of Life in the Environment. *Social Indicators Research*, 34, 181–211. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF01079196

Jiboye, A. D. (2009), Evaluating tenants' satisfaction with public housing in

Lagos, Nigeria. *Town Planning and Architecture*, 33(4); 239-247

Jiboye, A. D. (2012), Post-occupancy evaluation of residential satisfaction in Lagos, Nigeria: Feedback for residential improvement. *Frontiers of Architectural Research* (2012) 1, 236 – 243. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foar.2012.08.001

Liias, R. (1998). Housing stock: the facilities for future development. *Journal of Facilities*, 16(11), 285-294.

Liu, A.M.M. (1999) Residential satisfaction in housing estates: A Hong Kong perspective. *Automation in Construction*, 8(4): 511 – 524.

McCray, J. W., & Day, S. S. (1977), Housing values, aspirations and satisfaction as indicators of housing needs. *Home Economics*, 5(4), 244-254.

Menger, C. (2007). *Principles of Economics*. Auburn, Alabama: Ludwig von Mises Institute

Mohammed-Tamil, N., Che-Ani, A. I., Zain, M. F. M., Zaharim, A. & Jamil, M. (2009). Owners' satisfaction towards service charge collection of high-rise residential in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. Proceedings of the 4th IASME/WSEAS International conference on energy and environment. EE, 2009. Pp. 328-331.

Mohit, M. A., Ibrahim, M. & Rashid, Y. R. (2010). Assessment of residential satisfaction in newly designed public low-cost housing in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. *Habitat International*, 34(1), 18-37, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.habitatint.2009.04.002

Newman, S. J., & Duncan, G. J. (1979). Residential problems, dissatisfaction, and mobility. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 45, 154–166.

Olanrele, O. O. & Thontteh, E. O. (2014). FM Service Delivery and quality service measurement in public high-rise residential buildings in Nigeria. The use of SERVIQUAL and Satisfaction index. *Journal of Management and Sustainability*, 4(3), 145-156. URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/jms.v4n3p145 Accessed on July 28th, 2016

Parker, C., & Mathew, B. P. (2001). Customer satisfaction: contrasting academic and consumers' interpretations. *Marketing Intelligence and Planning*. 19, 38-46.

Park, Y., Heo, P. & Rim, M. (2008). Measurement of a Customer Satisfaction Index for Improvement of Mobile RFID Services in Korea. *ETRI Journal*, 30 (5), 634-643.

Priemus, H. (1986). Housing as a social adaptation process. A conceptual scheme. *Environment and Behaviour*, 18, 109–131.

Priemus, H. (1999). Social housing management: concerns about effectiveness and efficiency in the Netherlands. *Journal of Housing and Built Environment*. 18(3). 269-279.

Salleh, A. G. (2008): Neighbourhood Factors in Private Low-cost Housing in Malaysia. *Habitat International* 32, 485-493.

Sekaran, U. (2003), *Research Methods for Business*, 4th Ed., John Wiley & Sons, New York, NY.

Tawil, N.M., Che-Ani, A.I., Ramly, A., Daud, M.N., & Abdullah, N.A.G. (2011). Service charge issues in Malaysian high-rise residential management: An analysis using a fuzzy conjoint model. *International Journal of the Physical Sciences*. 6(3), 441-447. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.5897/IJPS10.293

Theodori, G.I., (2001), Examining the effects of community satisfaction and attachment on individual well-being. *Rural Sociology*. 4(66), 618 – 628.

Thontteh, E.O., & Olanrele, O.O. (n.d). Customer-Driven Service Quality Designs and Standards: A catalyst for Effective Property Management. Retrieved on 18/11/2016 from www.unilag.edu.ng/opendoc.php?sno=27350&doctype=doc&docname

Ukoha, O., & Beamish, J.O. (1997). Assessment of resident's satisfaction with public housing in Abuja,

Nigeria. *Habitat International*, 21(4), 445-460. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0197-3975(97)00017-9

Waziri, A.G., Yusuf, N., & Salleh, A.G. (2011), Residential satisfaction with private housing estates development in Abuja. *Alan Cipta*. 6(2), 3-12.

Weidemann, S., & Anderson, J. R. (1985). A conceptual framework for residential satisfaction. In I. Altman & C. H. Werner (Eds.), *Home Environments*. New York: Plenum Press.