NEWTON (Journals of School of Engineering, Federal Polytechnic, Offa) **2**(2) (2026) 329 – 336
journal homepage: www.fpoonline.edu.ng/newton/uploads.pdf
(e-Version)
2659-0433
Research Article

SOCIOECONOMIC IMPLICATIONS OF LEISURE PARTICIPATION OF HIGHER INSTITUTIONS WORKERS ON REAL ESTATE INVESTMENT AND URBAN PLANNING IN OFFA, KWARA STATE

*Abdullateef A. T., Adewale, Y. Y., Otunola, A. O., Olaniyi, K. J.

ABSTRACT

Institutional workers are characterized by structured employment systems, defined working hours, and professional hierarchies which may influence their participation in leisure activities. The study adopted descriptive survey research design to examine the socioeconomic characteristics of academic staff of three different institutions in Offa, Kwara State on leisure participation and inferred the implications for real estate investment and planning. The study adopted multistage sampling technique comprising purposive, stratified and simple random. The instrument of data collection was structured questionnaire on 5-point Likert scale. The reliability of the instrument was tested using a pilot survey of Thirty (30) staff with an index of 0.9 using Cochran method. A total of 274 questionnaires were administered on participants using simple random sampling technique and results analyzed using frequency tables and relative importance index. The result revealed (54.20%) participation and (45.80%) non-participation in leisure activities and participants prefer leisure facilities in close proximity to their abode. It was recommended among others that institutional authority, and government, should provide adequate incentives for workers to participate in leisure activities. The findings demonstrate that leisure participation is defined by socioeconomic characteristics of the workers in Offa. The study contributes to urban economics and real estate literature by providing empirical evidence from a semi-urban African settlement and offers policy-relevant insights for real estate investment and sustainable urban development in Nigeria.

Keywords: socioeconomics, leisure participation, leisure facilities, real estate, urban planning

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Leisure participation is an essential component of human urban life and plays a significant role in promoting physical, psychological, and social well-being (Phan and Vinh, 2016; Tempesta, 2015; UNO, 1998 and Potvin *et al.*) cited in Ratcliffe, Hong, and Hilton, (2019). It is generally refers to as the time individuals spend on activities outside their formal work and obligatory responsibilities (Roberts, 2013; Veal, 2017). Leisure represents discretionary time that individuals use for relaxation, recreation, and personal development Kelly (2012), Bakare, (2013), Opic and Duranovica, (2014), Jose and Hassen, cited in Thangavhuelelo (2013). In modern societies, leisure has become an important aspect of lifestyle and consumption behavior, particularly among urban workers.

The relationship between leisure behavior and built environment has attracted attention in urban and real estate studies. Real estate investors and developers recognize that the lifestyle preferences and leisure patterns of urban residents influence the demand for different types of properties and amenities. For example, residential estates that provide access to recreational facilities such as parks, gyms, and leisure centers often command higher market value and attract higher income households (Crompton, 2001). Leisure facilities such as parks, recreational centers, shopping malls, sport complexes, and entertainment hubs form an important part of urban land use (Crompton, Nicholls, 2020). These facilities contribute to the attractiveness of residential neighborhood and commercial districts, thereby influencing property demand and real estate value. Modern urban economies increasingly emphasize lifestyle amenities and leisure infrastructure as key drivers of urban growth and property investment (Florida, 2002).

Institutional workers, such as employees in universities, government ministries, hospitals, and other organizations, represent a significant segment of the urban population whose socioeconomic status and lifestyle choices influence local property markets. These workers most often experience structured work schedules and occupational pressures. As a result, their leisure patterns are influenced by various socioeconomic factors including income level, educational attainment, occupational status, household size and work schedule. These socioeconomic characteristics shape the type, frequency, and location of leisure activities individuals participate in (Reeder & Brown, 2005; Akmal, Zainol, Mansor, & Ghazali, 2012; Beenackers, Kanphius, Giskies, Brigs, Kunst, & Vanlenthe (2012); Natusion, & Zahrah 2014).

Despite the growing importance of leisure related development in urban real estate markets, limited attention has been paid to how the socioeconomic characteristics of institutional workers shape their leisure patterns and how these patterns influence real estate investment opportunities. Thus, examining these relationships can provide valuable insights into the demand for recreational facilities, mixed–use developments, and lifestyle oriented real estate projects

Therefore, this study seeks to examine the socioeconomic determinants of leisure patterns among institutional workers in Offa Kwara state and their implication for real estate investment and urban planning, with the aim of providing empirical evidence for urban livability in leisure participation.

1.2 Statement of the Research Problem

In many urban areas, institutional workers form a major part of the workforce and contribute significantly to local economic

Corresponding author.
E-mail address: abdullateeftaslim@yahoo.com
Present address: Department of Estate Management and Valuation, Federal Polytechnic, Offa, Kwara State, Nigeria.
Received 12 September 2025; Received in revised form 14 January 2026; Accepted 31 March 2026; Published eVersion 30 April 2026.
2659-0433/ © 2026 A Publication of NEWTON (Journals of School of Engineering, Federal Polytechnic, Offa). All rights reserved

activities. However, their work schedules, income levels, and family responsibilities hardly allow them to allocate time to recreate. Their pattern of leisure participation varies widely depending on their socioeconomic characteristics, which in turn affects the demand for recreational spaces and facilities (Veal, 2017).

Unlike advanced countries, real estate developments in developing countries are often designed without adequate understanding of the leisure preferences and socioeconomic conditions of potential users. This is the case of Offa where some recreational facilities remain underutilized while others fail to meet the workers and residents need. This situation suggests that there vacuum between the provision of leisure infrastructure and the actual leisure patterns of urban workers Jenkins and Young (2008),

There is therefore, limited empirical research examining how these socioeconomic factors interferes with leisure behavior of residents and government workers and how such behavior can inform real estate investment decisions.

Based on the foregoing there is need to investigate the socioeconomic determinant of leisure patterns among institutional workers in Offa and explore how these patterns relate to the development of recreational facilities and real estate investment opportunities. This study aims to fill this gap by examining the relationship between workers socioeconomic characteristics, their leisure activities, and the implications for real estate development.

The following research questions are proposed

1. What are the socioeconomic characteristics of institutional workers in Offa Kwara State?
2. How socioeconomic characteristics do determine leisure participation in the study area?
3. What are the implications of leisure participation for real estate investment in the study area?

This study, seeks to examine the socioeconomic determinants of leisure patterns among institutional workers and their implications for real estate investment, the study aim will be achieved through the following objectives.

1. To examine the socioeconomic characteristics of institutional workers in Offa Kwara State
2. To examine how socioeconomic characteristics determines leisure participation in the study area
3. To examine the implications of leisure participation for real estate investment in the study area

Findings from this research, if implemented will have several implications for several stakeholders. Real estate investors and developers will gain insight into the leisure preferences and lifestyle needs of institutional workers, which can guide the design of residential estates and commercial developments that incorporate recreational facilities. Urban planners and policy makers will also benefit from the findings by understanding the importance of leisure infrastructure in improving the quality of life of urban workers. Furthermore, the study will contribute to academic knowledge by expanding research on the relationship between leisure behavior, socioeconomic characteristics and real estate investment. It will also serve as a useful reference for future studies on leisure patterns, urban developments, and recreational planning.

2.0 Literature Review

2.1 Concept of Leisure

Leisure is non-work activities that are freely chosen. It is seen as recreational or discretionary free time spent out of work, before or after compulsory activities like working, schooling, doing housework and other day to day normal activities (Bakare, 2013). Expressed at the most prosaic level, leisure studies is the analysis of voluntary behavior, choice, freedom and voluntarism are the basic components in the narration of leisure (Roberts 2013; Rojek, 2005 and Eroğlu *et al*., 2017).

2.2 Concept of leisure participation

Leisure participation refers to the involvement of individuals in recreational, social, or cultural activities during their free time Iso-Ahola (1980) defines leisure participation as the active engagement of individuals in activities that provide intrinsic satisfaction and psychological rewards. According to Driver, Brown, and Peterson (1991) leisure participation plays an important role in improving individuals' physical health, emotional well-being and social integration. It has also been shown that regular involvement in leisure activities can reduce stress, improve productivity, and enhance life satisfaction Caldwell, 2005).

2.3 Socioeconomic characteristics

Socioeconomic characteristics refer to the social and economic attributes that influence individuals' lifestyles and opportunities. These characteristics commonly include income, education, occupation, and social status. Beenackers, Kanphius, Giskies, Brigs, Kunst, and Vanlenthe (2012) noted that socioeconomic status plays a significant role in shaping individuals' access to leisure resources and opportunities. Workers or staffs with higher socioeconomic status tend to have greater access to recreational facilities, leisure equipment, and leisure time. Institutional workers often differ in terms of income level, educational attainment, professional rank, work schedules and job responsibilities. These differences influence on how individuals allocate their time and resources for leisure. For example, Veal (2017) argues that workers with higher income and professional status are more likely to participate in organized leisure activities such as sports clubs, tourism, and cultural events. Conversely, workers with low-income levels may rely more on informal or low-cost leisure activities.

2.4 Socioeconomic determinants of leisure participation

Socioeconomic determinants are the social and economic factors that influence individuals' ability and willingness to participate in leisure activities. Several socioeconomic variables have been identified in the literature as important determinants of leisure participation. Individuals with higher income levels are more likely to participate in leisure activities because they have greater financial resources to support such activities (Searle and Jackson 1985; Araujo, Werneck, Silva, and de-Jesus 2022; Cerin and Leslie, 2008). In the same vein, income influences not only the frequency of leisure participation but

also the type of leisure activities individuals engages in, expensive activities such as travel, golf, and fitness programs are often associated with higher income groups (Godbey and Mowen 2010; Etuk and Ukpe, 2025).

Education influences leisure participation by shaping individuals' awareness, attitudes, and preferences toward recreational activities. Cutler and LIeras-Muney (2010) argue that educated individuals are more likely to engage in healthy and productive leisure activities because they have greater knowledge about the benefits of active lifestyles. Higher education attainment also increases individuals' exposure to diverse leisure opportunities such as cultural events, intellectual hobbies, and recreational sports.

Occupation is another key determinant of leisure participation. The nature of one's job often determines the amount of leisure time available and the level of physical or mental energy remaining after work. Beenackers, Kanphius, Giskies, Brigs, Kunst, and Vanlenthe (2012) and Roberts (2013) notes that occupations involving long working hours or high levels of stress can reduce leisure participation among workers. On the other hand, jobs with flexible schedules may allow individuals to allocate more time for recreational activities. Institutional workers in administrative or managerial positions may have different leisure patterns compared to those in lower-level positions due to differences in income and work schedules.

Age also influences leisure participation. Younger individuals' tend to participate more in physical active leisure activities such as sports and outdoor recreation, while older individuals may prefer less physical demanding activities such as social gatherings or cultural events. Henderson and Bialeschki, (2005) note that leisure preferences and participation patterns change throughout the life course due to differences in physical ability, social roles, and responsibilities.

Gender differences have also been observed in leisure participation. Cultural expectations and social roles often influence how men and women spend their leisure time. Studies show that men generally participate more in sports and outdoor activities, while women may engage more in social and family oriented leisure activities (Shaw, 1994).
However, changing social norms and increasing gender equality in employment are gradually altering these patterns.

2.5 Implications of leisure participation for real estate and urban planning

It is widely acknowledged that leisure participation and recreational amenities have significant implication on real estate investment. Studies by Crompton, Nicholls, Browning, and other urban researchers demonstrate that leisure infrastructure such as parks, green spaces, and recreational facilities enhances neighbourhood attractiveness; increases property values and stimulates real estate development.

Crompton (2001) argues that leisure facilities such as parks and open spaces have a positive effect on nearby property value because people are willing to pay more to live close to leisure environments. According to Crompton residential properties located near parks and recreational centers often experience significant price premiums. The phenomenon is explained through the principle of proximate which suggests that the economic benefits of leisure amenities become capitalized into nearby property values.

Crompton and Nicholls found that houses located close to parks often enjoy an 8-10% increase in property value due to the recreational and environmental benefits associated with these amenities (Crompton, Nicholls, 2020). Grunewald *et al.* (2024) and Teo *et al.* (2023) emphasize that green infrastructure, recreational landscapes, and leisure environments contribute to higher property prices and improved neighbourhood attractiveness.

Nicholls notes that leisure infrastructure plays a key role in shaping housing markets because it improves neighbourhood livability and lifestyles appeal. According to Nicholls, recreational amenities such as parks, trails, and sport facilities enhance the attractiveness of residential areas, which encourages higher demand for housing and stimulates property development. As a result, urban planners and real estate developers increasingly incorporate recreational infrastructure into residential planning to enhance property value and attract residents. Therefore, leisure infrastructure can serve as a powerful catalyst for real estate investment and property market growth.

2.6 Theoretical Framework

This study is anchored on Veblen's theory of leisure class. Thorstein Veblen (1899) proposed that leisure activities are influenced by social status and economic resources. According to the theory, individuals in higher social classes engage in leisure activities that reflect their wealth and social prestige.
Veblen argued that leisure can serve as a form of social display, where individuals' demonstrate their economic status through participation `in certain recreational activities. In the context of institutional workers, individuals with higher socioeconomic status may have greater access to leisure opportunities and may engage in more diverse recreational activities compared to those with lower socioeconomic status

2.7 Empirical Evidence

The study of Babalola and Alayode (2012) on pattern of leisure among academic and non-academic staff in Ondo state tertiary institutions revealed that various social groups do participate in leisure activities but in different leisure activities.

Brown and Reeder, (2005) assessed the socioeconomic condition of the rural people in relation to recreation and tourism infrastructure and how it contribute to rural wellbeing. The outcome showed that recreation and tourism basically increases the local employment, wages, level and income, reduces poverty, and improves education and health and psychological well being

Lawanson, Foley, Assah, Mogo, Mapa-Tassou, and Ogunro (2021) put forward that physical activities are complex and occur in context, shaped by individual and individual and being shaped by local political, socio-economic and built environment.

Crompton and Nicholls emphasize that the value of residential properties often increase as proximity to recreational amenities improves. Their studies reviewing dozens of empirical analyses

show that housing prices generally rise as distance to parks and open space decreases. Their findings indicate that larger parks and well–maintained lifestyle spaces tend to generate stronger property value premiums and influence housing demand over a wider geographical area

Browning, Grunewald and Teo's recent studies examine urban green spaces and highlight their economic significance for real estate markets. Their research indicates that access to green spaces not only improves environmental quality but also increases the desirability of residential locations, thereby encouraging real estate investment and urban development

3.0 Research Methodology

The study adopted descriptive survey research design to examine the socioeconomic characteristics of academic staff of three different institutions in Kwara State (Federal Polytechnic Offa, Lens Polytechnic and College of Health Technology Offa) on leisure participation and inferred the implications for real estate investment and planning. The study adopted multistage sampling technique comprising purposive, stratified, simple random. The instrument of data collection was structured questionnaire on 5 point Likert scale. The questions were divided into four sections: socioeconomic, types of leisure facilities and frequency of leisure participation. The reliability of the instrument was tested via a pilot survey of 30 staff with reliability index of 0.9 using Cochran method. A total of 274 questionnaires were administered on participants using simple random sampling technique. The questionnaire responses were analyzed using (SPSS) software and result presented in frequency tables.

4.0 Results

4.1 Socioeconomic Characteristics of Staff

Table 4.1.1: ***Age of the respondents***

Age	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
25-34	63	24.0	24.0
35-44	86	32.8	56.9
45- 54	68	26.0	82.8
55- 64	45	17.2	100.0
Total	262	100.0	

Source: Authors survey 2025

Table 4.1.1 shows the age distribution of respondents. Respondents between ages 25-34 represent (24.0%), respondents between 35-44 (32.8%), respondents between ages 45-54 represent 26% while respondent between ages 55-64 represent 17.2%. This implies that respondents between ages 35-44 represent the largest respondents captured in the study.

Table 4.1.2: ***Gender of the respondents***

Gender	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Male	184	70.2	70.2
Female	78	29.8	100.0
Total	262	100.0	

Source: Authors survey 2025

Table 4.1.2 shows the gender distribution of respondents. 184 respondents represent 70.2% are male while 78 respondents representing 29.8% are female. This implies that there is preponderance of male among the respondents.

Table 4.1.3 below shows the marital status of the respondents, the result shows that 51 (19.5%) of the respondents are single, 190 (72.5%) are married, 12 (4.60%) are separated and 9 (3.40%) of the respondents are divorced. This implies that most of the respondents are married.

Table 4.1.3: ***Marital status of the respondents***

Marital Status	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Single	51	19.5	19.5
Married	190	72.5	92.0
Separated	12	4.6	96.6
Divorced	9	3.4	100.0
Total	262	100.0	

Source: Authors survey 2025

Table 4.1.4**:** ***Educational Status of the respondents***

Educational Status	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
PhD	68	26.0	26.0
MSc/MA	98	37.4	63.4
HND/BSc/BA/BTech	87	33.2	96.6
WASC/GCE/Trade/ND	9	3.4	100.0
Total	262	100.0	

Source: Authors survey 2025

Table 4.1.4 shows the *Educational Status* of the respondents, the result shows that 68 (26.0%) of the respondents are PhD degree holder, 98 (37.4%) are Master degree holder, 87 (33.2%) are first degree holder and 9 (3.4%) of the respondents hold secondary school and allied certificates. This implies that majority of the respondents are educated.

Table 4.1.5: ***Designation of the respondents***

Cadre	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Chief Lecturer/ equivalent	51	19.5	19.5
Principal lecturer/equivalent	60	22.9	42.4
Senior Lecturer1/Equivalent	47	17.9	60.3
Lecturer II	32	12.2	72.5
Lecturer III	40	15.3	87.8
Asst. Lecturer	32	12.2	100.0
Total	262	100.0	

Source: Author Survey 2025

Table 4.1.5 shows the designation of the respondents, the result shows that 510 (19.5%) of the respondents are Chief Lecturer, 60(22.9%) are Principal lecturer/equivalent, 47 (17.9%) are Senior Lecturer1/Equivalent and 32(12.2%) of the respondents Lecturer II, 40(15.3%) are lecturer III and Asst. Lecturers are 32(12.2). This implies that most of the respondents hold different position in the institution.

Table 4.1.6 Leisure ***Participation by respondents***

Leisure *Participation*	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	142	54.20	54.20
No	120	45.80	100.0
Total	262	100.0	

Source: Authors Survey 2025

Table 4.1.6 shows the frequency of the participation in leisure activities by the respondents, the result shows that 142(54.20%) participate in leisure activities, 120 respondents (45.80%) of the respondents despise leisure activities. This implies that respondents' participation in leisure activities is average.

Table 4.1.7 Types of *Leisure Facilities*

Types of Leisure Facilities	Frequency	Rank
Sports Arcades, Community centers	3.80	1
Social Clubs, Restaurants, Hotels and resorts	3.72	2
Lawn Tennis Courts	3.59	3
Fitness Centers, Gyms, Wellness Centers	3.47	4
Football Fields, Open Parks	3.17	5
Gardens, Libraries, Cinemas, Theaters	3.13	6
Swimming Pools, Beaches	3.10	7
SPAs, Saunas	2.60	8
Golf Courses, Trails, Bowling Alleys	2.55	9
Tourists Centers, Arts Galleries & Museums	2.50	10

Source: Authors survey 2025

Table 4.1.7 show different types of leisure facilities and their ranking in terms of utilization by respondents, Sports Arcades, Community centers rank high while Tourists Centers, Arts Galleries & Museums rank low in leisure activities participation.

Table 4.1.8**: *Income Level* affects leisure participation**

Income Level	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Above 500,000.00	82	31.3	31.3
Above 450,000.00	66	25.2	56.5
Above 350,000.00	65	24.8	81.3
Above 270,000.00	23	8.8	90.1
Above 180,000.00	26	9.9	100.0
Total	262	100.0	

Source: Authors Survey 2025

Table 4.18 shows the income level of the respondents, the result shows that 82 staffs (31.3%) of the respondents earns above 500, 000, 66 (25.2%) earns above 450,000 per month, 65(24.8%) of the respondents earn above 350; while 23 (8.8%) and 26 (9.9%) of the respondents earns above 270,000 and above 180,000 respectively. This implies that majority of the respondents earn wages above 350,000.00

4.2.0 S*ocioeconomic factors affecting leisure participation*

Table 4.2.1: Income Level affects leisure participation

Income Level			
	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	27	10.3	10.3
Disagree	54	20.6	30.9
Undecided	16	6.1	37.0
Agree	78	29.8	66.8
Strongly Agree	87	33.2	100.0
Total	262	100.0	

Source: Authors survey 2025

Table 4.2.1 shows the level of agreement of income with leisure participation, 27 respondents (10.3%) strongly disagree with the fact that income level determines leisure participation while 87(33.2%) strongly agree that income level determines leisure participation. In overall, majority of the respondents affirm that income determine participation in leisure activities.

Table 4.2.2: Age influence leisure participation

Age			
	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	52	19.8	19.8
Disagree	51	19.5	39.3
Undecided	19	7.3	46.6
Agree	67	25.6	72.1
Strongly Agree	73	27.9	100.0
Total	262	100.0	

Source: Authors survey 2025

Table 4.2.2 shows the level of agreement of age with leisure participation, 52 respondents (19.8%) strongly disagree with the fact that income level determines leisure participation while 73(27.9%) strongly agree that age determines leisure participation. In overall, majority of the respondent affirm that age determine participation in leisure activities.

Table 4.2.3 below shows the level of agreement of educational status with leisure participation, 79 respondents (30.2%) strongly disagree that level of education determines leisure participation while 48(18.3%) strongly agree that educational status influence leisure participation. In overall, majority of the respondents confirm that level of education does not influence leisure participation.

Table 4.2.3: Education Level influence leisure participation

Education Level			
	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	79	30.2	30.2
Disagree	76	29.0	59.2
Undecided	24	9.2	68.3
Agree	35	13.4	81.7
Strongly Agree	48	18.3	100.0
Total	262	100.0	

Source: Authors survey 2025

Table 4.2.4: Marital Status affects leisure participation

Marital Status			
	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	84	32.1	32.1
Disagree	24	9.2	41.2
Undecided	55	21.0	62.2
Agree	33	12.6	74.8
Strongly Agree	66	25.2	100.0
Total	262	100.0	

Source: Authors Survey2025

Table 4.2.4 shows the level of agreement of marital status with leisure participation, 84 respondents (32.1%) strongly disagree with the fact that marital status influence leisure participation while 66(25.2%) strongly agree that marital status influence leisure participation. In overall, majority of the respondents averagely admit that marital status affect leisure participation.

Table 4.2.5: Ethnicity influence leisure participation

Ethnicity			
	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	89	34.0	34.0
Disagree	54	20.6	54.6
Undecided	54	20.6	75.2
Agree	38	14.5	89.7
Strongly Agree	27	10.3	100.0
Total	262	100.0	

Source: Authors survey 2025

Table 4.2.5 shows that ethnicity does not influence leisure participation as 89 respondents (34.0%) strongly disagree with the fact that ethnicity determines leisure participation while 27(10.3%) strongly agree that ethnicity influences leisure participation.

Table 4.2.6: Work Schedule of Respondents influence leisure participation

Work Schedule			
	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	44	16.8	16.8
Disagree	34	13.0	29.8
Undecided	59	22.5	52.3
Agree	50	19.1	71.4
Strongly Agree	75	28.6	100.0
Total		100.0	

Source: Authors survey 2025

Table 4.2.6 shows the level of agreement of work schedule/structure with leisure participation, 44 respondents (16.8 %) strongly disagree that work structure or schedule influence leisure participation while 75(28.6%) participants strongly agree that schedule/structure determines leisure participation. In overall, work schedule negatively affect participation in leisure activities.

Table 4.2.7: Lack of awareness of leisure facilities affects leisure participation

Lack of awareness of leisure facilities			
	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	20	7.6	7.6
Disagree	30	11.5	19.1
Undecided	41	15.6	34.7
Agree	75	28.6	63.4
Strongly Agree	96	36.6	100.0
Total	262	100.0	

Source: Authors survey 2025
Table 4.2.7 shows the level of agreement of lack of leisure facilities awareness with leisure participation, 20 respondents (7.6%) strongly disagree that lack of leisure facilities awareness affect leisure participation while 96(36.6%) strongly agree that lack of leisure facilities awareness determines leisure participation. In overall, lack of leisure facilities awareness impact leisure participation negatively.

Table 4.2.8 below shows the level of agreement of family responsibilities with leisure participation, 43 respondents (16.4%) strongly disagree that family responsibilities could affect leisure participation while 71(27.1%) strongly agree that family responsibilities could leisure participation. In overall, family responsibilities positively influence leisure participation.

Table 4.2.8: Family Responsibilities affect leisure participation

Family Responsibilities			
	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	43	16.4	16.4
Disagree	51	19.5	35.9
Undecided	36	13.7	49.6
Agree	61	23.3	72.9
Strongly Agree	71	27.1	100.0
Total	262	100.0	

Source: Authors survey 2025

Table 4.2.9: Leisure facilities impact Real Estate Investment and Urban Planning

Real estate investment and urban planning			
	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	22	8.4	8.4
Disagree	54	20.6	29.0
Undecided	55	21.0	50.0
Agree	71	27.1	77.1
Strongly Agree	60	22.9	100.0
Total	262	100.0	

Source: Authors survey 2025
Table 4.2.9 shows the level of agreement of respondents on leisure facilities influences on real estate investment and urban planning, 22 respondents (8.4%) strongly disagree that leisure facilities could impact on real estate investment and urban planning while 60(22.9%) strongly agree that leisure facilities could impact on real estate investment and urban planning. In overall, leisure facilities impact positively on real estate investment and urban planning.

Discussion of Findings

The results show that average numbers of participants (institutional workers) engage in leisure with (54.20%) against (45.80%). Types of leisure facilities varies from one location to another but socioeconomic disparity form the major factors inhibiting participation in leisure activities as factor such as income, age, schedule of work family responsibilities, and lack of awareness of leisure facilities exhibit major influence in leisure participation while **level of education**, marital status, show moderate effect, ethnicity exhibit the least influence in leisure activities participation.

According to the study, there is disparity in income level. Few respondents earn wages above 350,000 while majority earn below 350,000. This wide margin between the wages of the respondents indicates the type of leisure facilities visit though they averagely have affinity form leisure participation. Perhaps with income average, more participants will develop passion for leisure time.

As one grow old, sickness may manifest that require moderate leisure activities, as thus, choices may be limited. Schedule of work and family responsibilities combine together to dissuade participants from engaging in leisure time activities, and lack of awareness of leisure facilities or the types of leisure facilities available may influence non-participation in leisure activities.
Evidence has also shown that participants prefer leisure facilities in close proximity to their abode. Invariably those with higher wages would prefer to invest in property close to the leisure facilities which has been established to command higher rent and sales value.
For those with low income, their choice of residence investment would be within the low investment leisure facilities where rental and sales value is within their means. This show that leisure facilities impact positively on real estate investment and urban planning however, the investment would be within the respective income level.

The study is in line with the outcome of Beenackers et al. (2012) and Veal (2017)
The relationship between leisure behavior and built environment has attracted attention in urban and real estate studies. Real estate investors and developers recognize that the

lifestyle preferences and leisure patterns of urban residents influence the demand for different types of properties and amenities.

Leisure facilities such as parks, stadiums, cinemas, sport complexes, and entertainment hubs not only command higher market value but attract higher income households and form an important part of urban land use. These facilities contribute to the attractiveness of residential neighbourhood and commercial districts, thereby influencing property demand and real estate value.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The study has examined the socioeconomic characteristics of the institutional workers in the three institutions in Offa and inference revealed that although the participants are keen to participating in leisure activities, their socioeconomic characteristics is a barrier to participation. Nevertheless, leisure facilities proximity and spatial distribution affect both planning and value of investment. Improvement in leisure facilities provision within the urbane corridors is very germane to real estate investment and planning.

The urgent attention of the institutional authorities, government, and urban planner and real estate investors is hereby drawn to provide adequate incentives for workers participation in leisure activities. At the same time, large proportion of land for leisure facilities development should be provided to attract both buyer, developer so as to boost urban livability and economic sustainability.

References

Akmal, F., Zainol, F.A., Mansor, M., Ghazali, Z. (2012). Recreational Program and Its Association with Job Satisfaction. Asian Social Science, 8(13), 172-180

Ajzen, I. (1991). Benefits of leisure: a social psychological perspective in Driver, B. L., Brown, P. J., and Peterson, G. L. (Eds), Benefits of leisure (1991). Venture press. pp 411-417 in Driver, B. L., Brown, P. J., and Peterson, G. L. (Eds), Benefits of leisure (1991). Venture Press pp 411-417

Araujo, R., Werneck, A., Silva, D.R., de-Jesus, G. M. (2022) Socio-demographic inequalities in the trend of different types of leisure time physical activity among Brazilian adults between 2006 and 2009,. International journal for equity in health, 21(1)

Babalola, A.J., Alayode, A. M. (2012). Pattern of Leisure Activity Involvement of Academic and Non-Academic Staff in Tertiary Institutions in Ondo State, Nigeria
American Journal of Human Ecology 1(1), 28–32

Babbie, E. (2010) the practice of social research. Wadsworth publishing

Bakare, (2013), Leisure patterns among Nigerian university lecturers: the potential for leisure education in industries IOSR Journal of sports and physical education 1(2) PP 01-08

Beenackers, M., Kanphius, C., Giskies, K., Brigs, J., Kunst, A., Vanlenthe, F. (2012) Socioeconomic Inequalities In Occupational and Leisure Time Physical Activities. International Journal of Behaviour Nutrition and Physical Activity…..

Boateng, K. A. (2013) Satisfaction with recreational sport facilities and services in Malaysia: demographic influences. Annals of leisure research, 12(1) 22-46

Browning, Grunewald and Teo's recent **(greening schoolyards and urban property values: a systematic review.**

Bryman, A. (2012). Social research methods. Oxford University Press.

Fourie, J., Slabbert, E., & Saayman, M. (2011). The leisure and sport participation patterns of high school learners in Potchefstroom. African Journal for Research in Sport, Physical Education and Recreation, 33(1), pp 65-80.

Caldwell, l. l.2005). Leisure and health: why is leisure therapeutic? British journal of guidance and counseling, 33, 7-26

Castillo-Castillo, A., Walker, R., Keeler, B., Lonsdorf, H. R. (2025) Race and income moderates the effects of parks on housing prices in a segregated city. Journal of landscape and urban planning 259 ()

Cerin, E., Leslie, E. (2008). How socioeconomic status contributes to participation in Leisure time physical activity. Journal of social science and medicine, 66(12), pp 2596-2609

Creswell, J. (2014). Research design: qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches. Sage Publications.

Crompton, J. (2001). Impact of Parks on property values: a review of empirical evidence. Journal of leisure research

Crompton, J. L, Nicholls, S. (2020) Impact on property values of distance to parks and open spaces: An update of US studies in the new millennium, Journal of leisure research 51(2), PP127-146

Crompton, J. L. (2001). The Impact of parks on property values: a review of empirical evidence. Journal of Leisure Research, 33(1), 1-31

Cutler, D. M., LIeras-Muney (2010). Understanding differences in health behaviors by education. Journal of health economics, 29(1), pp 1-28

Driver, B. L., Brown, P. J., Peterson, G. L. (Eds), Benefits of leisure (1991). Venture press pp 411-417

Etuk, S. J., Ukpe, I. (2025). (2025).Consumer economic determinants of leisure behavior: empirical evidence from non-career woman in Obio-Akpor LGA in River state, Nigeria, GPH- international journal of social science and humanities research

Florida, R. (2022). The rise of the creative class: Basic books. A member of the persus books group. New York

Grunewald, W., Sonnerblick, R., Kinkel-Ram, S. S., Stanley, T.B., Clancy, O.M., Smith, A. R. (2024) longitudinal relationships between anti-fat attitudes and muscle dysmorphia symptoms. Body image 51

Henderson, K. A., Bialeschki, M. D. (2005) leisure and active lifestyles: research reflection. Leisure sciences; An interdisciplinary journal 27(5) pp355-365

Iso-Ahola, S. E. (1982. Toward a social psychological theory of tourism motivation: A rejoinder. Annals of tourism research 9(2), 256-262

Javed, A., Naheem, M.A., Waheed, A., & Vohra, I.A. (2015).Visitors' perception of outdoor recreational facilities in Murree City, Pakistan GMSARN international journal (9) 125-136

Jenkins, J. M., Young, T.(2008). Urban Development and the Leisure Dilemma: A case study of leisure and recreation in urban residential estates in the Lower Hunter, New South Wale. Annals of Leisure Research 11:1-2, 77-100

Lawanson, T., Foley, L., Assah, F., Mogo, E., Mapa-Tassou, C., Ogunro, T. (2021) The urban environment and leisure physical activity during the Covid -19 pandemic: a review from Lagos. Cities and health 5(s1), s204-s207

Marciel, M. G., Ortuzar, A. M., De Oliveeira, J. C. M., Gutierrez, L. A. A., Assis, K. L., Reis, R. F., Mola, D. W., Uvinha, R. R. (2024). Leisure styles in adults: changes throughout the covid-19 pandemic. Journal of social science 13(12), 702.

Mokaya, S. O., & Gitari, J. W. (2012). Effects of workplace recreation on employee performance: The case of Kenya Utalii College. International journal of humanities and social science. 2 (3), 176 -183

Mouratid, P. (2019). Built environment and leisure satisfaction: the role of commute time, social interaction, and active travel journal of transport geography vol 80

Nash (1960) and Geoffrey

Natusion, A. D., Zahrah, W. (2014) Community Perception On Public Open Space And Quality Of Life In Medan, Indonesia. International Conference On Quality Of Life , The Pacific SuTera Hotel, Sutera Harbor, Kota Kinbalum, Sabah, Malaysia Elsevier

Nicholls, S. (2019) Impact of parks views on property values: Leisure, Sciences 14(8),

Opica, S., Duranovica, M. (2014). Leisure time of young due to socio-demographic Characteristics. Procedia. Elsevier Ltd. Social and Behavioural Sciences 159, Pp 546-551

Oyeyemi, A L, Araujo, R. H. O., Hassan, A. U., Ofori, E., Stecher, C., Werneck, A. O. Secular trend and socio-demographic disparities in physical activities among adults in eleven African countries: WHO STEPS 2003-2020.international journal of behavoiural nutrition phy Acts

Phan, T., Vinh, N. Q. (2016). Relationship between Leisure Motivation and Job Satisfaction: A Comparison of State-Owned Enterprises, Private Owned Enterprises and Joint Venture Enterprises. Proceedings of the Annual Vietnam Academic Research Conference on Global Business, Economics, Finance & Social Sciences (AP16Vietnam Conference). Hanoi-Vietnam 7-9 August www.globalbizresearch.org

Ratcliffe, K., Hong, I., and Hilton, C. (2019) Leisure participation patterns for school age youth with autism spectrum disorders: findings from the 2016 national survey of children's health j autism dev disord.

Reeder, R. J., & Brown, D. M. (2005). Recreation, Tourism, and Rural Well-Being: A Report from the Economic Research Service. Economic Research Report (7), 1-29

Roberts, K. (2013). Leisure in contemporary society. 2nd edition CABI Publishing

Roberts, K. (2013). Leisure and tourism: Cultural paradigms. Leisure studies, 32(1),109-114

Saunders, M., Lewis, P., Thornhill, A. (2016). Research methods for business students. 9TH edition. Pearson education

Searle, M. S., Jackson, E. L. (1985). Recreational non-participation and barriers to participation: concepts and models. Canadian studies, Society and Leisure 8(2), pp 693-707

Searle, M. S., Jackson, E. L. (1985). Socioeconomic variations in perceived barriers to recreation participation among would-be participants. Leisure sciences, 7(2), pp 227-249

Scott, D. and Willits, F.K. (1998). Adolescent and adult leisure patterns: a reassessment. Journal of Leisure Research, 30(3), pp. 319-330 National Recreation and Park Association

Shaw, S.M. (1994).Gender, leisure, and constraint: towards a framework for the analysis of womens leisure. Journal of leisure research, 26(1), 8-22

Tempesta, T. (2015). Benefits and costs of urban parks: A review. 127-143.Firenze University Press

Thangavhuelelo, T. M. (2013). The relationship between leisure time physical activity and psychological wellbeing in executive employees of selected African countries. A master project dissertation submitted in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree magister Scientia in Biokinetics at the Potchefstroom campus of the Nort-West University

Peng, W., Bai, X., Wu, C., Zhang, H., Li, X., Lu, J. (2024). Socio-demographic factors, Leisure-Time Physical Activity and Mortality. American journal of preventive medicine, 66(4), PP 569-608

Veal, A. J. (2017) leisure, sport and tourism: politics, policy and planning 4th Edition, CABI Publishing

Veblen, T. (1989) the theory of leisure class: An economic study of institutions New York

Vischer, J.C. (2007) The concept of workplace performance and its value to managers. University of California, Berkeley 49(2) winter 20062