



## Community Satisfaction for People with Physical Disabilities in Mubi: The Impact of Home Modification

Okoye K. C.\*

Department of Architecture, Modibbo Adama University (MAU), Yola, Nigeria

Corresponding Author: visitkasie@gmail.com

### ABSTRACT

This study examined the relationship between home modification and community satisfaction for people with physical disability that effect mobility in Mubi, North Eastern Nigeria. A total of 50 people with physical disabilities that effect mobility, comprising of 25 adults in Mubi North and 25 adults in Mubi South local government areas of Adamawa state were randomly selected. Home modifications relating to; entrance to the buildings, access to goods and services, usability of rest rooms, were implemented for people in Mubi North, while people in Mubi South waited for their turn. Vreugdenhil & Rigby General Community Satisfaction Scale (GCSS) was used as the measurement tool and administered one on one to the respondents before the execution of home modifications and after three months of the modifications. Responses to each item in the GCSS are provided on a 5 point Likert scale ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”. Findings from the study indicates that community satisfaction was significantly enhanced for the participants in Mubi North after home modification with mean score 4.111 ( $p=0.001$ ), as compared to the waiting participants in Mubi south with score 1.780 ( $P=0.126$ ). Overall Satisfaction with modification outcomes has a significant positive correlations at  $p<0.01$  level with the variables of home modification. The study recommends that home modification should be recognized as a key element for residential satisfaction that enhances safety, accessibility, and comfort, allowing individuals, especially those with disabilities, to live independently and satisfied within their own homes and communities.

**Keywords:** Home Modification, Community Satisfaction, Residential Satisfaction, Physical Disability

### INTRODUCTION

Disability is part of human experience, arising from the interaction between health conditions such as spinal cord injury, environmental barriers such as inaccessible building and a range of personal and other factors (WHO, 2023). It is estimated that 1.3 billion people, about 16% of the global population experience one form of disability or another. “Persons with disabilities include those who have long-term physical, mental, intellectual or sensory impairments which in interaction with various barriers may hinder their full and effective participation in society on an equal basis with others” (WHO 2003). The UN Convention on

the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) obligates member states to ensure persons with disabilities can live independently and participate fully in society, by guaranteeing accessibility in housing, transportation, information, and communication by identifying and removing barriers (UNCRPD, 2006).

Studies has shown that while accessible housing for new builds is important for creating new inclusive environments, the majority of people will continue to live in existing buildings, necessitating modifications to meet accessibility standards (Mayordomo-Martínez & García-Mateos, 2024; Okoye, 2017; Okoye, 2022). The ability to modify a home is a key



element in ensuring housing satisfaction and that housing can contribute to comfortable, safe and independent living in the community (WHO, 2023).

### **Residential Satisfaction**

Residential satisfaction is individuals' perceptions and feelings that the community meets personal needs and expectations, and a measure of contentment and connectedness with housing and surrounding environment (Tang, et al 2024; Smith, 2011). It is a multi-dimensional construct encompassing residents' feelings about their living environment, which is shaped by both the social aspects, such as community acceptance and relationships with neighbors, and the physical aspects, like the quality and maintenance of housing, the availability of amenities, and the broader neighborhood environment (Grillo et al., 2010; James et al., 2009). Residential satisfaction approaches therefore encompass a holistic perspective, considering various factors that contribute to how residents feel about their living environment, including their perceptions of: social amenities, public services and infrastructure, housing and physical environment, employment and other opportunities, accountability, accessibility and effective representation (Li, et al 2024). Throughout the literature, satisfaction has been equated with well-being, and quality of life ((Dhanabhakym & Sarath, 2023; Allen, 1991).

### **Well-being and Quality of life**

An individual's well-being is fundamentally dependent on the quality of their relationships and their community (Prilleltensky, 2005). According to Prilleltensky, (2005) there are three levels to well-being: individual, relational and community levels. Individual well-being is a multidimensional state of thriving, encompassing freedom from threats, strong physical and mental health, and access to resources to meet daily needs, alongside social,

emotional, environmental, financial, and cultural dimensions (Beauchemin et al 2025). Relational well-being is the experience of having positive, supportive, and nurturing relationships, as well as the capacity to actively participate in social, community, and political life, leading to individual and community flourishing (Prilleltensky, 2005; Ruggeri et al, 2020). Community well-being also encompasses acquisition of basic resources such as education, housing and employment and broader social, economic, environmental, and cultural factors, as well as the collective happiness and living conditions identified by the individuals within the community (Kapur, 2021; Prilleltensky, 2005). The community context significantly influences well-being, as negative conditions within a community that undermine an individual's sense of control, mastery, and self-esteem can increase vulnerability to depression, helplessness, and hopelessness (Hammig, 2024). The values of the individual, relational, and community well-being are fundamentally interconnected, with each value being distinct yet reliant on the others for its meaning and existence (Roversi, 2022; Prilleltensky, 2005).

Quality of life is closely associated with life satisfaction, with higher levels of satisfaction correlating with better overall quality of life and well-being (Bramston et al., 2002). There are three general approaches to quality of life (Allen, 1991). First, the subjective (individual) well-being, which focuses on personal satisfaction and happiness (Allen, 1991). "This approach pays little attention to external forces or the environment as influencing one's quality of life" (Allen, 1991, p.333). The second, the objective (environmental/community) considers external factors like living conditions and safety unlike the individualist approach (Allen, 1991). However, "this approach ignores individual freedom and replaces individualism with the greater good of the community and



society” (Allen, 1991, p. 333).

The third approach combines the subjective (individual) and objective (environmental/community). These are often considered together, as environmental conditions can influence a person's subjective feelings, creating an integrated view of their wellbeing (Dobson & Redman, 2025). Quality of life therefore involves evaluating an individual's or population's overall well-being, encompassing both objective conditions and subjective experiences (World Health Organization, 2012). These life experiences are influenced by satisfaction in different domains, including personal, neighbourhood, and community (Liu, 2024; Bramston et al., 2002). Each of these domains is shaped by various attributes.

Although satisfaction is equated with well-being and quality of life in general (Allen, 1991), satisfaction is based on the fact that it measures the difference between expectations and what is received and is evaluated based on the degree to which actual experiences align with desired or expected outcomes (Grzeskowiak, et al, 2006; Lu, 1999; Vittersø, 2025). Satisfaction has been viewed in various ways and in many fields such as Architecture, Planning, Sociology, Psychology and Geography; however, regardless of the discipline, the fundamental concept of achieving a desired state of fulfillment is a common thread (Bramston et al., 2002; Lu, 1999). Despite the various concepts, they share similar core ideas: they measure community conditions (Grzeskowiak et al., 2006; Vittersø, 2025; Lu, 1999), and conclude that personal satisfaction as a combination of an absence or low complaints and a strong resemblance or high degree of congruence between a person's current situation and their desired situation. However, incongruence between actual and desired situation leads to dissatisfaction (Grzeskowiak et al., 2006;

Vittersø, 2025; Triana, 2025).

### **Factors Impacting on Community Satisfaction**

Residential satisfaction is a multifaceted concept influenced by the interplay of physical, social and personal factors. These elements are not independent but rather interwoven, creating a unique perception of the residential environment and ultimately shaping the resident's overall contentment with their home and community (Tang, 2024; Chen, 2023). Social factors includes sense of belonging, high-quality community life, strong social networks, and mutual respect (Amerigo & Aragones, 1997; Gamo & Park, 2022). Physical factors includes a well-designed community layout, lower crime rates, convenient access to essential services and amenities, and the overall quality of housing within the neighborhood (James et al., 2009; Kato, 2024; Wang et al. 2023;). Personal factors refers to age, gender, tenure (owner vs. renter), and length of residence (Filkins et al., 2000; Lu, 1999; Weifang et al., 2025).

The social environment encompasses the cultural setting, relationships, and interactions individual experience, shaping their behavior, attitudes, and development (Lee, 2023; Sirgy & Cornwell, 2002). Research shows that residents who feel a strong sense of belonging to a community also exhibit a stronger identification with that community (Belanche et al., 2021) leading to a greater satisfaction with social relationships and the physical environment, ultimately increasing overall residential satisfaction (Akinyode et al., 2024). The feeling of belonging directly strengthens a person's attachment to a community (Pardede & Kovač, 2023), and a strong level of attachment to one's community generally leads to greater residential satisfaction. (Aiello et al., 2010; Nzimande & Morris-Kolawole, 2024). Strong community social networks increases



satisfaction by providing crucial support and interaction, which can compensate the negative effects of adverse environmental conditions (Aiello et al., 2010; Grillo et al., 2010; Birnbaum, 2021). Generally, the more positive relationship, social ties and support networks one has in a community, the higher their level of residential satisfaction (Tang et al., 2024; Allen, 1991). However, this is contingent on the social ties and support networks being non-maladaptive. A supportive, trusting, and friendly community significantly increases resident satisfaction (Filkins et al., 2000; Li et al., 2025).

A positive social environment goes beyond just having social connections with family and friends; it also includes active community involvement (Amerigo & Aragones, 1997; Grillo et al., 2010). Belonging to a voluntary association generally strengthens community ties by fostering social connections, trust, and civic engagement (Liu, 2024). Being involved in one's community leads to positive perceptions of the neighborhood, which in turn fosters greater residential satisfaction (Amerigo & Aragones, 1997; Kirby, 2025;). A person's sense of community safety significantly influences their social interaction and involvement. Feeling safe in one's community fosters greater openness to social interaction, participation in community events, and the formation of support networks, while a lack of perceived safety can lead to increased fear, isolation, and a reluctance to engage with neighbors and local activities (James et al., 2009; Wang & Liu, 2025).

Fear of crime and feelings of personal safety are predictors of residential satisfaction. (James et al., 2009; Wang & Liu, 2025). Residents who feel their community is unsafe are indeed less satisfied, and this dissatisfaction can contribute to high residential mobility out of the community (Grillo et al., 2010; Dragičević, et al., 2022; James et al., 2009). Satisfaction with

community services like emergency, business, and non-profit services is directly related to overall community satisfaction. When people are satisfied with the quality and availability of these services, it positively influences their broader satisfaction with the community (Allen, 1991; Grzeskowiak et al., 2003; Syahrinullah, 2025). Satisfaction with community services is influenced by community satisfaction (Filkins et al. 2000; Xie et al., 2022).

Community layout and design are strongly linked to residents' attachment and satisfaction. Well-designed communities incorporate elements like public gathering spaces, accessible transportation, and opportunities for healthy living, building aesthetic pleasantness and minimal high density housing, foster social connection, leading to increased attachment and community satisfaction among residents (Alwah et al., 2023; Braubach, 2007). In turn, excessive noise from overcrowding in high-density housing can reduce community attachment and residential satisfaction, contributing to stress, frustration, and potential negative health and social outcomes (Braubach, 2007; James et al., 2009; Alwah et al., 2023). The more an individual is attached to a community, the higher the level of satisfaction.

Economic factors like job security, the presence of employment opportunities, and future financial security are strong determinants of overall community satisfaction. Communities thrive when members feel secure and have prospects for financial well-being, influencing broader contentment and stability within the area (Ariffin et al., 2025). This has the advantage of reduced residential mobility, increased attachment to the community and strong overall community satisfaction (Ariffin et al., 2025).

A strong attachment to one's residential





environment is a key personal factor that significantly contributes to higher residential satisfaction. Economic investments like homeownership, temporal investments like a long length of residence in a community can foster strong emotional attachments to a community (Aiello et al., 2010; James et al., 2009; Kao & Sapp 2020). Homeowners tend to be more financially stable, leading to lower residential mobility out of the neighbourhood and increased attachment to their communities. Attachment to the community increases social involvement and relationships which in turn leads to greater residential satisfaction. (Kao & Sapp 2020; James et al., 2009). Research indicates a strong positive correlation between the duration of residence in a community and the level of attachment and involvement, primarily driven by the development of extensive social networks and increased community engagement over time, resulting in strong residential satisfaction (Kao & Sapp 2020). While new arrivals often focus on immediate needs like housing and employment, long-term residents may shift their focus to broader community issues such as infrastructure, schools, public spaces and community improvement (Gamo & Park, 2024). Long-term residents, particularly those involved in community associations, often experience higher residential satisfaction due to feeling secure, having their needs met, and developing a strong sense of belonging. These residents engage in improving the community, which directly contributes to their fulfillment and fosters a deeper connection to their neighborhood (Gamo & Park, 2024).

The number of people known in the community increases residential satisfaction. Having close friends nearby and knowing them within the community is associated with increased residential satisfaction. (Filkins et al., 2000; Latreille et al., 2024; Grzeskowiak et al., 2003). This is because local friendships foster strong

community sentiments and more engagement in the community (Grillo et al., 2010; Latreille et al., 2024; Grzeskowiak et al., 2003). The more friends known in the community also provides more sources of social support, which is crucial for coping with difficulties and improving overall well-being (Chen et al 2023). Marital status is a significant personal characteristic that influences residential satisfaction. Studies indicate that single persons, and especially single-parent households, tend to report lower levels of satisfaction and overall quality of life compared to married couples with children (Lu, 1999; Mridha, 2020). Children tends to bind their families to the community through schooling, relationships and extra curricular activities, this attachment increases residential satisfaction (Lu, 1999; Mridha, 2020).

Age is consistently shown to have a significant relationship with residential satisfaction, with most research indicating that older adults tend to have higher residential satisfaction than younger individuals, often due to factors like homeownership and the increased importance of local services and social connections as people age (Amián et al., 2021; Allen, 1991; Filkins et al., 2000; Lu, 1999; Mridha, 2020). Studies have shown that females report higher levels of residential satisfaction than males (Aiello et al., 2010; Mridha, 2020; Filkins et al., 2000). This difference is linked to women developing more affective ties and stronger emotional bonds to their communities and living environment more than men and therefore, experience more residential satisfaction (Aiello et al., 2010; Mridha, 2020). The aim of this study is to assess the effect of home modification on community satisfaction for people with physical disabilities that affect mobility in Mubi Nigeria.

### Research Questions

The research questions were:



- i. Is there a difference in community satisfaction for people with physical disabilities that affect mobility after receiving home modification? And, if so,
- ii. What factors determine the overall community satisfaction for people with physical disabilities that affect mobility after home modification?
- iii. How can community satisfaction of people with physical disabilities that affect mobility be improved at home?

### MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study sample was recruited from the monitoring and evaluation team of a none governmental organization (NGO) providing home modification for people with physical disabilities due to the insurgency in Mubi, North Eastern Nigeria. A total of 50 people with physical disabilities that affect mobility comprising of 25 adults in Mubi North and 25 adults in Mubi South local government areas of Adamawa state were randomly selected. Home modifications relating to; entrance to the buildings, access to goods and services, usability of rest rooms, were implemented for people in Mubi North, while people in Mubi South waited for their turn. The General Community Satisfaction Scale (GCSS) (Vreugdenhil & Rigby, 1987) was used to measure community satisfaction. The GCSS consists of 27 items using an answer format of a 5 point Likert Scale, ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”, with a high score indicating satisfaction. The GCSS has a concurrent validity of .78 and .85 (Vreugdenhil & Rigby, 1987) and included items that were relevant to a global or general evaluation of the

physical and social environment of communities and is recognised as a measure that is replicable across different communities and cultural contexts and therefore, regarded as a valid and reliable instrument.

The overall community satisfaction was analyzed based on a mean score of 3.00 on a five point scale as positive indication of satisfaction, and values below 3.00 indicating dissatisfaction. If the mean response is below 1.50, this indicates that the respondents are “strongly disagree”; between 1.50 and 2.49, this indicates that the respondents are “disagree”; Between 2.50 and 3.49, this indicates that the respondents are “neutral”; Between 3.50 and 4.49, this indicates that the respondents are “agree”; above or equal to 4.50, this indicates that the respondents are “strongly agree”. The questionnaire was administered one on one to the respondents before the execution of home modifications and three months after the modifications. Analysis of the data was done using descriptive statistics, correlation (Spearman’s rho) analysis of variables, paired T test and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) in SPSS version 21.

### RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Community Satisfaction was significantly enhanced in Mubi North after home modification with mean score of 4.111 ( $p=0.001$ ) and a standard deviation of 1.020, as compared to Mubi South where residents were still expecting home modifications, with mean score of 1.780 ( $P=0.126$ ) and standard deviation of 1.699. Details are shown in Table 1.

**Table 1:** Comparison of Mean, SD and p-value of General Community Satisfaction Scale (GCSS) Instrument.

SN	Variables of GCSS	Mubi South group n= 25			Mubi North group n =25		
		Mean	SD	Remark	Mean	SD	Remark
1.	This suburb is a wonderful place in which to live.	1.83	0.689	D	3.67	1.050	A

2	This suburb is a good place for children to grow up in.	2.01	1.026	D	3.48	0.823	N
3	This suburb is a boring place.	1.43	1.159	SD	3.56	0.658	A
4	They should knock the whole place down and redesign	1.05	1.178	SD	4.53	0.169	SA
5	This suburb is a beautiful place to live.	1.07	0.858	SD	3.57	1.179	S
6	There is a feeling of pride in this community.	2.32	1.326	D	4.54	1.048	SA
7	This suburb is one of Nigeria's most attractive places.	4.28	1.517	S	4.53	1.065	SA
8	The environment in this suburb is depressing.	1.14	1.029	SD	3.64	1.156	A
9	The quality of life in this suburb is low.	1.16	1.149	SD	3.54	0.743	A
10	People don't care much about this suburb.	1.00	0.797	SD	3.67	1.635	A
11	This suburb has a lot of good things going for it.	1.10	1.645	SD	3.42	0.957	N
12	This suburb is a comfortable, relaxing place to live.	2.28	0.767	D	3.28	1.447	N
13	This suburb is a disgrace to Northeastern Nigeria.	1.77	0.618	D	3.61	1.169	A
14	This suburb is a terrible place for children.	1.53	1.074	SD	3.42	0.725	N
15	There just isn't enough privacy in this area.	1.95	1.157	D	3.50	0.956	A
16	Life is really dreary in this suburb.	1.95	1.199	D	4.47	0.176	A
17	This suburb is a very clean place.	1.01	0.755	SD	3.51	1.171	A
18	It's ridiculous to think people really like to live here	2.36	1.219	D	4.48	1.053	A
19	This area has a good feeling about it.	4.22	1.310	S	4.47	1.051	A
20	This area is an interesting place to live.	1.08	1.070	SD	3.58	1.133	A
21	This suburb is a good place for families.	1.11	1.166	SD	3.48	0.645	N
22	Living in this suburb is unpleasant.	1.47	0.899	SD	3.61	1.633	A
23	People should be proud to say they live in this suburb.	1.89	1.440	D	3.46	0.759	N
24	It is dangerous to live in this suburb.	1.22	0.652	SD	3.22	1.559	D
25	In general, I am satisfied with living in this suburb.	1.56	0.891	D	3.70	1.633	A
26	This suburb is a pleasant place to walk.	1.98	1.643	D	3.45	0.750	N
27	I am satisfied with the quality of housing in this suburb.	2.31	0.850	D	3.31	1.641	N
Total		1.780	1.699	D	4.111	1.020	S
F-Value		58.505			28.001		
P-Value		0.126			<0.001		
					*		

### Factors determining the overall community satisfaction after Home Modification

An analysis of items of community satisfaction that have very strong correlation coefficients ( $\rho > 0.750$ ) with home modifications shows that all 27 variables, has positive correlation with the home modifications, however the impact of modifications on "They should knock the whole place down and redesign", ( $\rho = 0.798$ ) and "In general, I am satisfied with living in this suburb." ( $\rho = 0.779$ ), significantly impacted on overall community satisfaction for people with disability that affect mobility after home modification. This shows that the overall community satisfaction levels are determine by enhancing satisfaction on those variables. This will ensure strong community satisfaction for people with

physical disabilities that affect mobility in Mubi particularly and Nigeria in general.

### CONCLUSION

Community Satisfaction was significantly enhanced in Mubi North after home modification with mean score of 4.111 ( $p = 0.001$ ) and a standard deviation of 1.020, as compared to Mubi South where residents are still expecting home modifications, with mean score of 1.780 ( $P = 0.126$ ) and standard deviation of 1.699. The study recommends that home modification should be recognized as a key element for residential satisfaction that enhances safety, accessibility, and comfort, allowing individuals, especially those with disabilities, to live independently and satisfied within their own homes and communities.



## REFERENCES

- Aiello, A., Ardone, R., & Scopelliti, M. (2010). Neighbourhood planning improvement: Physical attributes, cognitive and affective evaluation and activities in two neighbourhoods in Rome. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 33(3), 264-275.
- Alwah, A.A.Q., Al-Attar, A. & Wei, T. (2023) Relationship between the perceived characteristics of the built environment and social sustainability: Sana'a City, Yemen use case... *J Hous and the Built Environ* 38, 2581–2638 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10901-023-10054>
- Amerigo, M., & Aragonés, J. (1997). A theoretical and methodological approach to the study of residential satisfaction. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 17(1), 47-57.
- Allen, L. (1991). Benefits of leisure services to community satisfaction. In B. Driver, P Brown & G. Peterson (Eds.), *Benefits of leisure* (pp. 331-350). State College, PA: Venture Publishing, Inc.
- Ariffin, M. F., Mat, Z., Aris, A. (2025). A Comprehensive Review on Determinants of Employees' Job Satisfaction. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science (IJRISS)*, 9(06), 4150-4163. <https://doi.org/https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.906000314>
- Akinyode, B. F., Adeoye, D. O. and Jelili Kolade Olawale, J. K. (2024) Assessing Residential Satisfaction Among The Residents In Ogbomoso Urban Centre, Nigeria, *Journal of Architecture and Civil Engineering Volume 9 ~ Issue 9 (2024)* pp: 82-95
- Beauchemin, J., Lonborg, D., O'Donnell, T. (2025) Global Wellness Perspectives: A Qualitative Study from Rural and Urban Mozambique. *Glob Soc Welf.* <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40609-025-00398-2>
- Belanche, D., Casaló, L. V., Rubio, M. A. (2021) Local place identity: A comparison between residents of rural and urban communities, *Journal of Rural Studies*, Volume 82, 242-252,
- Birnbaum, L., Wilhelm, C. Chilla, T., Kröner, S. (2021) Place attachment and digitalisation in rural regions, *Journal of Rural Studies*, Volume 87, 2021, Pages 189-198,
- Bramston, P., Pretty, G., & Chipuer, H. (2002). Unravelling subjective quality of life: An investigation of individual and community determinants. *Social Indicators Research*, 59(3), 261-274.
- Chen, C., Bian, F. & Zhu, Y. (2023) The relationship between social support and academic engagement among university students: the chain mediating effects of life satisfaction and academic motivation. *BMC Public Health* 23, 2368 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-023-17301-3>
- Chen, T., Luh, D., Hu, L., & Shan, Q. (2023). Exploring Factors Affecting Residential Satisfaction in Old Neighborhoods and Sustainable Design Strategies Based on Post-Occupancy Evaluation. *Sustainability*, 15(21), 15213. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su152115213>
- Dhanabhakya, M. & Sarath M. (2023). Psychological Wellbeing: A systematic Literature Review *International Journal of Advanced Research in Science Communication and Technology* DOI:10.48175/IJARSCT-8345
- Dobson, J., & Redman, J. (2025). Environmental wellbeing: a concept and principles for research, policy and action. *Local Environment*, 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13549839.2025.2506587>
- Dragičević, V., Kopic, M., Matić, D. G., & Grujić, A. (2022). Urban Planning





- Impact on Mobility and Residential Satisfaction of Older People in Novi Sad. *Sustainability*, 14(5), 2689. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14052689>
- Filkins, R., Allen, J., & Cordes, S. (2000). Predicting community satisfaction among rural residents: An integrative model. *Rural Sociology*, 65(1), 72-86.
- Gamo, B.R. & Park, D. (2022) Community capacity influencing community participation: Evidence from Ethiopia, *World Development Perspectives*, Volume 27,
- Gamo, B.R. & Park, D. (2024) Sense of community affects community satisfaction: Mediating role of community participation, *Journal of Community Psychology*, Volume 52 (1)258-275
- Grillo, M., Teixeira, M., & Wilson, D. (2010). Residential satisfaction and civic engagement: Understanding the causes of community participation. *Social Indicators Research*, 97(3), 451-466.
- Grzeskowiak, S., Sirgy, M., Lee, D., & Clairborne, C. (2006). Housing well-being: Developing and validating a measure. *Social Indicators Research*, 79(3), 503- 541.
- Hammig, O. (2024) Overindebtedness, unemployment, and poor mental health – and the role of sense of control: a population-based *Front. Public Health*,| <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2024.1324402>
- James, R., III, Carswell, A., & Sweaney, A. (2009). Sources of discontent: Residential satisfaction of tenants from an internet ratings site. *Environment and Behavior*, 41(1), 43-59.
- Kao, Y. & Sapp, S. G. (2020) Is social capital as a determinant of community attachment? *Sociological Spectrum* 40(1):1-15  
DOI:10.1080/02732173.2020.1748149
- Kapur, R. (2021) Recognizing the Meaning and Significance of Community Well-being Department of Adult Education and Continuing Extension Faculty of Social Sciences University of Delhi
- Kirby, N., Stasiak, D. & Schneidemesser, D. (2025) Community resilience through bottom-up participation: when civil society drives urban transformation processes, *Community Development Journal*, Volume 60, Issue 3, Pages 528–547, <https://doi.org/10.1093/cdj/bsae031>
- Latreille, J., Houle, J., Coulombe, S. (2024) The influence of the residential environment on well-being and personal projects: Perspectives of young people living in public housing, *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, Volume 98,
- Lee, M. H. (2023) Exploring the Sociology of Culture: Unveiling the Dynamics of Meaning, Identity, and Society *International Research Journal of Arts and Social Sciences Volume 11*, Issue 4
- Li, Y., Wang, Z., & Zhu, Y. (2024). How Does Government Intervention Affect Community Residents' Satisfaction with Public Services—Evidence from CSS (2021) in China. *Sustainability*, 16(17), 7326. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16177326>
- Li, Z., Jin, Y., & Yang, M. (2025). How Social Trust Affects Young Adults' Mental Health: Chain Mediation Effects of Social Sustainability in Communities. *Sustainability*, 17(3), 844. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su17030844>
- Liu, H.K. (2024) Exploring Relationships Between Nonprofit Participation and Political Participation in Asian Context. *Voluntas* 35, 1–22 (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-022-00538-8>
- Lu, M. (1999). Determinants of residential satisfaction: Ordered logit vs. regression models. *Growth and Change*, 30(2), 264-277.
- Mayordomo-Martínez, D., & García-Mateos,



- G. (2024). Evaluating Accessibility Solutions in Collective Residential Buildings: Field Research in Southeast Spain. *Buildings*, 14(6), 1621. <https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings14061621>
- Mridha M. (2020) The effect of age, gender and marital status on residential satisfaction *Local Environment* 25(3):1-19 DOI:10.1080/13549839.2020.1801615
- Nzimande, N. P., & Morris-Kolawole, F. (2024). Does Size Really Matter for the Place Attachment of High-Rise and Low-Rise Housing Estates? A Budapest Case Study. *Sustainability*, 16(3), 1195. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16031195>
- Okoye, K. C. (2017). Design Strategy for the Needs of People with Physical Challenges in Public Housing Estates in Yola, Nigeria. Unpublished *PhD. Thesis*, Abia State University Uturu, Nigeria.
- Okoye, K. C. (2022). Effect of Home Modification on Quality of Life of People with Physical Disabilities in Mubi. *FUW Trends in Science & Technology Journal*, Vol. 7 No. 1 pp. 820 – 825
- Pardede, S., & Kovač, V. B. (2023). Distinguishing the Need to Belong and Sense of Belongingness: The Relation between Need to Belong and Personal Appraisals under Two Different Belongingness-Conditions. *European journal of investigation in health, psychology and education*, 13(2), 331–344. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ejihpe13020025>
- Prilleltensky, I. (2005). Promoting well-being: Time for a paradigm shift in health and human services. *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health*, 33(66), 53-60.
- Roversi, T. (2022). From Individuality to Personhood in Dewey's Later Works. In: Miras Boronat, N.S., Bella, M. (eds) *Women in Pragmatism: Past, Present and Future. Women in the History of Philosophy and Sciences*, vol 14. Springer, Cham. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-00921-1\\_11](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-00921-1_11)
- Ruggeri, K., Garcia-Garzon, E., Maguire, Á. (2020) Well-being is more than happiness and life satisfaction: a multidimensional analysis of 21 countries. *Health Qual Life Outcomes* 18, 192 . <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12955-020-01423-y>
- Smith, K. M. (2011). *The relationship between residential satisfaction, sense of community, sense of belonging and sense of place in a Western Australian urban planned community. PhD Thesis*, Edith Cowen University.
- Syahrinullah (2025) The Effect of Service Quality on Community Satisfaction at The Bonde Village Office, Majene Regency *International Journal of Arts and Social Science Volume 8 Issue 6*, Page 165 [www.ijassjournal.com](http://www.ijassjournal.com)
- Tang, Q., Wei, Z., & Huang, S. (2024). Residential Satisfaction of Subsidized Housing Estates in Post-Reform China: Roles of the Built and Social Environments. *Land*, 13(7), 899. <https://doi.org/10.3390/land13070899>
- Triana, M., Garcia, M. F., Richard, O., Yücel, I., Ahmed, R. (2025) Status incongruence effects under conditions of task interdependence: Too close for comfort, *Journal of Business Research*, Volume 189.
- United Nations (2006) Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities
- Vittersø, J. (2025). Life Satisfaction. In: *Humanistic Wellbeing*. Springer, Cham. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-69292-5\\_4](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-69292-5_4)
- Vreugdenhil, A., & Rigby, K. (1987). Assessing generalized community satisfaction. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 127(4), 367-374.



- Wang, F., Liu, M. (2025) Exploring the influence of perceived safety in residential underground car parks on residents' satisfaction and well-being. *Sci Rep* 15, 19248. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-025-04468-5>
- Wang, W., Gao, Y., Pitts, A., & Dong, L. (2023). A Bibliometric Analysis of Neighborhood Sense of Community. *Sustainability*, 15(5), 4183. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15054183>
- Weifang. S., Majie, D., Na, Z. (2025) The mediating effect of community identity and the moderating effect of social comparison in the relationship between residential mobility and sense of meaning in life. *Front. Psychol.*, Volume16 | <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1501060>
- World Health Organization (2012) Quality of Life: Measuring Quality of Life.
- World Health Organisation (2023) *Global report on health equity for persons with disabilities*
- Xie, Q., Xie, X., & Guo, S. (2022). The Factors Influencing Public Satisfaction with Community Services for COVID-19: Evidence from a Highly Educated Community in Beijing. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(18), 11363. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph191811363>