Paradigm Academic Press
Innovation in Science and Technology
ISSN 2788-7030
SEP. 2026 VOL.5, NO.3

Common Problems and Improvements in Wi-Fi Access Point Placement in Multi-Room Homes

OTI Šilėnas[1]

[1] Klaipėda State University of Applied Sciences, Klaipėda, Lithuania

Correspondence: OTI Šilėnas, Klaipėda State University of Applied Sciences, Klaipėda, Lithuania.

doi:10.63593/IST.2788-7030.2026.09.004

Abstract

Wi-Fi coverage in multi-room homes can be uneven when access point placement does not match room layout and household use. Common problems include locations chosen for installation convenience, obstruction by walls and furniture, and additional units that provide little useful coverage or have weak backhaul connections. Placement can be improved by selecting open locations near priority rooms, considering signal paths, and using additional access points where one unit cannot serve separate areas adequately. Wired access points and wireless mesh nodes require different placement decisions because their backhaul connections differ. Performance checks at normal device locations can guide adjustments and reveal whether an improvement in one room creates difficulties elsewhere. Cable routes, power availability, housing arrangements, and cost shape the final choice. Effective placement aims to provide dependable service for everyday activities in frequently used rooms.

Keywords: Wi-Fi coverage, access point placement, multi-room homes, wireless mesh, backhaul

1. Introduction

Wi-Fi supports many daily activities at home, including video calls, online learning, streaming, and communication. These activities take place in different rooms, yet connection quality can vary within the same home. A device may work well in the living room but lose its connection in a bedroom or study. This uneven coverage becomes a practical problem when residents cannot use the network reliably in the places where they need it. The location of the access point affects how wireless signals reach each room. In many homes, the access point is built into the broadband router, so its position is decided when the internet service is installed. It may remain beside the incoming cable, near a power socket, or inside a cabinet. Such locations are convenient for installation but may leave frequently used rooms far from the access point or separated from it by several walls. Placement then becomes a mismatch between where the equipment is installed and where the connection is needed. A useful placement decision must consider the paths between the access point and connected devices. Distance matters, but room layout and obstacles also shape these paths. A nearby room behind a substantial wall may be harder to serve than a more distant room reached through an open doorway. Household use adds another consideration. A study used for daily video calls may need more reliable service than a room used only occasionally. The aim is to provide dependable connections in the spaces that support everyday activities. Improving access point placement begins with the layout and use of the home. Room arrangement, physical obstacles, and connection needs help determine suitable locations. Cables, power sockets, and furniture limit the available choices. A workable placement should account for these conditions and provide reliable service in frequently used rooms.

2. Factors Affecting Access Point Placement

Room layout shapes the area that an access point needs to serve. In a compact home, several rooms may be close to a shared living space. In a long home, bedrooms may extend along a corridor, leaving the rooms at the far end

distant from the access point. A central location offers a useful starting point because it can reduce the distance to different rooms. Yet the centre of the floor plan may contain walls, storage spaces, or other barriers. Placement needs to account for the route between the access point and the places where devices are used, rather than distance alone.

Walls and building materials affect these routes. Wireless signals lose strength when they pass through barriers, and the amount of loss depends on the material, thickness, and structure. A light partition and a reinforced concrete wall can have different effects on coverage. Large metal objects can also reflect signals and restrict their passage. Cisco's deployment guidance identifies walls as physical obstacles that can limit coverage around an access point. A room close to the equipment may still receive a weak signal if a substantial barrier lies between them. For placement decisions, this means that reducing the number of obstacles can be more useful than moving the access point a little closer to the room.

Frequency bands also influence the area that can be served. The 2.4 GHz band generally provides longer range, while 5 GHz and 6 GHz offer more capacity for faster connections under suitable conditions. These differences matter when deciding which rooms an access point should cover. A device may maintain a usable 2.4 GHz connection in a distant room while receiving a weaker connection on a higher band. If that room is regularly used for activities requiring greater capacity, relying on the reach of 2.4 GHz may leave its needs unmet. The placement decision should bring the access point closer to that area or consider whether another access point is needed.

The pattern of household use gives these physical factors a practical purpose. A study used for video meetings needs a stable connection during working hours. A television area may need enough capacity for streaming, while an occasionally used room may have modest demands. Choosing a location only to spread coverage evenly can overlook these differences. Frequently used rooms should guide the choice, especially where walls make it difficult for one access point to serve every space well. A suitable position balances the paths to several important rooms and avoids improving one area at the expense of another that is used just as often.

3. Common Problems in Multi-Room Homes

3.1 Placement Driven by Installation Convenience

The position of an access point is often decided by the location of the broadband entry point. When the incoming cable ends near the entrance or in a corner of the living room, the router may be installed there and remain in that position. An available power socket or a short network cable can further restrict the choice. These conditions make installation straightforward, but they give little attention to the rooms that the network must serve. Bedrooms and studies at the opposite end of the home may be separated from the access point by both distance and several internal walls.

Consider a home with a living room near the entrance and two bedrooms along a corridor. If the access point sits beside the entrance, devices in the living room may receive a dependable connection. A laptop in the bedroom at the far end must communicate across a longer and more obstructed path. Moving the access point toward the corridor could shorten that path while retaining useful coverage in the living room. The difficulty is that the original installation may provide no cable or socket at the more suitable position. A choice made during installation then continues to shape network use long after the equipment has been connected.

This arrangement can force residents to adapt their activities to the network. Someone may leave the study to attend a video meeting in the living room, or move a laptop closer to the router to transfer a file. The home has a room intended for work, yet the connection does not support work reliably in that room. The placement problem is more than an uneven signal indicator. It reduces the usefulness of particular spaces and can cause conflicts when several residents need the better-connected area.

Replacing the router may leave this problem unresolved. A replacement can offer benefits, but it still has to communicate through the same layout if it occupies the original position. When the main difficulty is a substantial barrier or a distant group of rooms, equipment replacement alone does not address the arrangement that creates the weak area. Examining alternative positions helps establish whether the existing equipment can serve the home more effectively before another purchase is considered.

Installation convenience also encourages residents to keep the modem, router, and wireless access point together. These functions may be combined in one device, but they do not always need to share one location. A separate access point connected by Ethernet can serve another part of the home while the modem remains beside the incoming line. This distinction creates more placement options. Without it, residents may treat the broadband entry point as the only possible location for wireless service.

3.2 Placement Behind Obstacles or Inside Enclosed Spaces

Access points are sometimes hidden inside cabinets or placed behind televisions to keep equipment and cables

out of sight. These positions introduce nearby obstacles before signals reach other rooms. Walls already restrict signal paths in a multi-room home; enclosing the access point adds another barrier close to the source. Cisco's deployment guidance identifies walls and the surrounding installation conditions as factors that affect coverage. A concealed position can leave the equipment poorly placed even when it is close to the centre of the home.

The effect depends on the surroundings. An open shelf differs from a closed cabinet, and a small object beside an access point differs from a large object directly between it and a frequently used room. The useful question is whether the surroundings obstruct the paths that matter. A cabinet beside the study may appear convenient, but the study could still lie behind both the cabinet enclosure and an internal wall. Moving the equipment onto an open surface may remove one of these barriers without changing its distance from the room very much.

Distance alone can also give a misleading impression of coverage. In a hypothetical layout, a bedroom immediately beside the living room may be separated from the access point by a substantial wall. A more distant room may face an open corridor leading toward the equipment. The closer room is not automatically easier to serve. This difference matters when residents choose a location by looking only at the floor plan. The number and type of barriers along the path can make a position that looks central less useful than a position slightly away from the centre.

Several obstacles can occur along the same path. An access point behind a television may also face a cabinet, a wall, and furniture in the destination room. Attention to only the final wall overlooks the restrictions near the equipment itself. Removing a nearby obstruction offers a practical starting point because it may improve paths toward several rooms at once. Moving the access point directly into one weak room, by comparison, may help that room while leaving the wider placement problem unresolved.

Low placement creates similar difficulties when furniture surrounds the equipment. An access point on the floor beside a sofa or under a desk may have few clear paths toward connected devices. Raising it onto an open shelf can remove some of these obstructions. Height should be considered together with openness, however. A high position inside a closed cabinet can remain poorly suited to coverage. The purpose of changing height is to improve the surrounding paths, rather than to reach the highest available point.

3.3 Poor Placement of Additional Access Points

Adding another access point can address a coverage gap, but its position must serve a clear purpose. A unit placed close to the existing access point may cover much of the same area while contributing little to a distant bedroom or study. Some overlap helps devices maintain access while moving between areas. Concentrating several units in the living room, however, leaves the distant rooms dependent on much the same paths as before. The additional unit should extend service toward an area that the existing arrangement struggles to reach.

Wireless mesh nodes require attention to two connections. One runs between the user's device and the nearby node. The other carries traffic from that node toward the main network, either directly or through another node. A useful location must support both. Placing a node inside a weakly covered bedroom can shorten the connection to a laptop in that room, but the node may still have difficulty reaching the rest of the network.

This explains why a strong local signal does not always produce a dependable connection. A phone near the bedroom node may display a strong signal because the two devices are close together. That indicator does not describe the quality of the node's connection back to the network. Traffic still needs to pass through that connection before reaching the internet. If the node is separated from the main unit by substantial barriers, improving the short local link leaves the more difficult link unresolved.

The edge of the weak area is often a more useful starting point than its most poorly connected location. For example, a node near the entrance to a bedroom corridor may retain a better connection to the main unit while extending service toward the bedrooms. Moving it farther into the corridor brings it closer to users but may weaken its backhaul connection. Moving it too close to the main unit preserves backhaul quality but may contribute little to the distant rooms. Placement involves balancing these two needs.

An access point connected by Ethernet has greater freedom because its backhaul does not depend on receiving a wireless signal from the main unit. It can be positioned near a distant group of rooms, subject to cable access and power availability. Applying the same placement rule to wired access points and wireless mesh nodes overlooks this difference. A location suitable for a wired unit may be unsuitable for a wireless node, even when both provide good local coverage. The connection method must be considered before deciding where the additional equipment should go.

4. Practical Improvements in Placement

4.1 Select an Open Location Near Priority Rooms

A useful starting point is to identify the rooms where reliable Wi-Fi matters most. These may include a study used for video calls, a living room used for streaming, and bedrooms used for online learning. The position of

the access point should reflect where these activities take place. Its distance from the devices matters, but the walls and furniture along each path also need attention. A location that brings the equipment closer to several priority rooms while removing nearby obstructions offers a reasonable starting point for improvement.

Different layouts call for different choices. In a compact home, the living room may connect directly to several bedrooms. An open position near these connections can provide shorter paths to multiple rooms. In a long home, an access point at the entrance may leave the rooms at the far end poorly served. Moving it toward the middle of the occupied area can reduce this imbalance. Where rooms form two groups separated by substantial walls, a single central position may still provide weak service to both groups. Such a layout may benefit more from separate access points serving each area.

The centre of the home should be treated as a candidate location rather than a fixed rule. It may contain a bathroom, storage space, or structural wall that makes installation difficult or obstructs the signal paths. A position slightly away from the centre may offer a clearer route through a corridor or doorway. The practical comparison is between the paths available from each position. A small increase in distance can be acceptable when it avoids a substantial obstacle.

Priority rooms also help resolve competing placement choices. Suppose a study is used for daily video meetings, while a distant spare bedroom is rarely occupied. Moving the access point toward the study may be reasonable if the living room and main bedrooms retain usable service. The aim is to match coverage to actual demand. Giving equal attention to every corner of the floor plan can divert effort from the spaces where unstable connections cause the greatest difficulty.

The immediate surroundings should remain open. A suitable shelf can keep the equipment clear of low furniture, while an appropriate mounting position can prevent objects from being placed around it. Mounting should follow the device's intended orientation because antenna design affects the distribution of coverage. Cisco's deployment guidance links placement and mounting orientation to the area served by an access point. The useful change is to remove obstructions and position the equipment as intended, rather than simply install it as high as possible.

A candidate location should also be sustainable in daily use. An access point placed on a busy dining table may be moved whenever the space is needed. Equipment on an overcrowded shelf may gradually become surrounded by books and other objects. A stable location with room for cables and access to power reduces the chance that a useful arrangement will be changed for convenience. Placement works best when it fits the household's use of the space as well as its connection needs.

4.2 Use Additional Access Points Where Layout Requires Them

Repositioning a single access point may be enough when the main problem is a corner location or a nearby obstruction. It becomes less effective when the home contains a long corridor, separate groups of rooms, or substantial internal barriers. Moving the unit toward one weak area may create another weak area elsewhere. An additional access point can then divide the coverage task, allowing each unit to serve a smaller and more accessible part of the home.

The remaining gap should guide the location of the additional unit. If the main access point already serves the living room and nearby bedroom adequately, another unit should focus on the distant study or bedroom group. Placing it close to the main unit may preserve an easy connection between the units but add little useful coverage. Placing it near the rooms that need service gives it a defined purpose. The appropriate distance between units depends on the layout and obstacles, so equal spacing on a floor plan is not a reliable placement rule.

The choice between repositioning, a wired access point, and a wireless mesh node depends on the available connections. Repositioning uses the existing equipment and is suitable when a better shared location is available. A wired access point is useful when a distant area needs service and an Ethernet route can reach it. A wireless mesh node can extend coverage where installing that cable is difficult, but its position remains dependent on the quality of the wireless backhaul. These differences should shape the installation choice before the equipment is placed.

Ethernet backhaul allows an access point to be positioned according to the rooms it serves. An existing network socket near a distant bedroom group can provide a convenient connection. If new cabling is possible, the route should reach a useful access point location rather than stop at the easiest corner of the room. Otherwise, the installation can reproduce the same convenience-driven problem found at the main router. Power availability and the intended mounting position should be considered alongside the cable route.

A wireless mesh node must balance local coverage with its connection to the rest of the network. A position between the main unit and the weak area is a useful starting point, but "between" does not necessarily mean

halfway by distance. A thick wall near the midpoint may make another location more suitable. Moving the node toward an open passage can improve its backhaul while allowing it to serve rooms farther along the corridor. The paths on both sides of the node matter more than a neat arrangement of evenly spaced units.

For example, consider a main unit in the living room and a study at the far end of a hallway. A mesh node inside the study may provide a strong connection to the laptop but receive a weak connection from the living room. Moving the node toward the hallway entrance may improve backhaul, although the local connection to the study becomes longer. If neither position supports both links adequately, a wired access point near the study may offer a more workable arrangement. The example shows why adding a node and choosing its location are separate decisions.

Additional equipment should be assessed by the gap it closes. A unit that improves service in the target rooms and retains a dependable backhaul has a clear role. A unit that mainly strengthens an already well-served area may need to be moved. Adding further units before checking this arrangement can make it harder to identify which location is useful. A gradual approach allows the household to establish whether each addition solves the problem that justified it.

4.3 Check Performance and Adjust Placement

Placement should be checked at the positions where devices are normally used. A phone beside the access point reveals little about a laptop on a desk behind two walls. Useful locations include the usual work desk, the sofa where streaming takes place, and the part of a bedroom where online lessons are attended. Doors and furniture should be arranged as they normally are. This makes the checks relevant to the conditions that the network needs to support.

Signal strength helps identify weak areas, but everyday performance provides a fuller basis for adjustment. A video call may pause repeatedly, a file transfer may stop, or a device may disconnect while moving between rooms. These problems affect use directly. A speed reading can add information, but a single result may reflect temporary traffic or changing internet conditions. Several checks, combined with normal activities, provide a clearer picture of whether a location is dependable.

Comparisons should keep the main conditions reasonably consistent. The same device can be used in the same rooms before and after moving the access point. Where possible, the checks should use the same frequency band and similar household traffic. Comparing a laptop on 5 GHz before the move with a phone on 2.4 GHz afterwards makes the effect of placement difficult to judge. Keeping these conditions similar helps connect the observed change to the new location.

The pattern of poor performance can guide the next adjustment. If the connection works well near the access point but repeatedly weakens in one distant room, distance and obstacles deserve attention. Moving the unit toward that room or removing a nearby obstruction can be tested. If all rooms perform poorly, including those beside the access point, moving the equipment is less likely to explain or solve the whole problem. The internet connection, network load, and device conditions may also need examination. This distinction prevents repeated relocation when the difficulty lies elsewhere.

A placement change can also shift the weak area rather than remove it. Moving the access point into a study may improve video calls there while making streaming unreliable in the living room. The next step is to compare an intermediate location, preferably one with clearer paths toward both rooms. If the layout offers no position that serves both adequately, the checks provide a practical reason to consider another access point. They help distinguish a poor location from a coverage task that is too difficult for one unit.

Mesh arrangements need checks of both local coverage and backhaul. When a device works well near the main unit but performs poorly beside an additional node, the node's connection to the network deserves attention. Moving it closer to the main unit or toward a clearer path can test whether backhaul is the limiting part of the arrangement. The target room should then be checked again because improving backhaul may increase the distance between the node and its users. A useful position must support the complete route.

Adjustments are easier to assess when one change is made at a time. Moving the access point, adding a node, and changing network settings together can improve performance without revealing which action helped. A brief record of the position and the rooms checked is enough to compare alternatives. This also makes it easier to return to a previous arrangement if a new location performs worse.

The final check should include a period of normal household use. A connection that works well while the home is quiet may behave differently when several residents are online. Placement should support the activities that commonly occur together, such as a video meeting in the study and streaming in the living room. Later changes to room use or furniture provide a reason to repeat these checks. A new home office or a large cabinet near the access point can alter the needs or paths that guided the original choice.

5. Constraints and Trade-Offs in Home Installation

The available placement choices often depend on the existing connections in the home. The broadband entry point may be near the entrance, while a more suitable access point location has no nearby network socket. Moving a router may require a longer cable, and installing a separate access point may require both power and Ethernet. Cable routes become difficult when they cross doorways or pass between rooms. A technically suitable position may involve more installation work than the household can reasonably undertake. An open shelf closer to the priority rooms can offer a useful improvement even when the preferred location is unavailable.

These restrictions differ between rented and owner-occupied homes. Residents in rented homes may have limited permission to drill holes, install wall sockets, or run permanent cables. Their furniture arrangements may also change when they move, reducing the value of an installation designed for one property. Reversible changes, such as repositioning equipment on an existing shelf or using an available network socket, are easier to accommodate. Owners may have more freedom to install cabling, particularly during renovation. In either setting, the cable should reach a location that serves the intended rooms. Ending it at the easiest installation point can reproduce the original placement problem.

Furniture and appearance affect whether a placement remains usable. Residents may prefer to keep equipment out of sight, especially in a living room or bedroom. An access point in an exposed position can occupy space needed for other activities, while visible cables may be difficult to arrange neatly. A dedicated open shelf or suitable mounting position can reduce these conflicts. The arrangement also needs enough space to prevent objects from accumulating around the equipment. If residents regularly move the access point into a cabinet to clear a surface, the original improvement is unlikely to last.

The needs of several residents can make the choice more difficult. One person may use a bedroom for online study while another attends video meetings in a separate room. Moving the access point toward either person may weaken service for the other. Priority should reflect the reliability required by each activity, how often it occurs, and whether another connection option is available. A fixed desktop computer may be served by Ethernet, while phones and tablets still need wireless coverage. Providing a wired connection to one demanding device can create more freedom to place the access point for the remaining users.

Cost should be linked to the problem that remains. Moving an existing access point is a reasonable response when a corner location or nearby obstacle causes poor coverage. An additional access point has a clearer purpose when a separate group of rooms remains weak after repositioning. If only one workstation needs improvement, a direct Ethernet connection may meet that need without extending wireless coverage throughout the area. The least expensive purchase is not always the least expensive workable arrangement. A wireless node that cannot maintain a dependable backhaul may require further equipment or later cabling.

Installation effort also needs to be considered over the period that the home will be used. A new Ethernet route may require more work at the start but allow an access point to remain near a distant study. A wireless arrangement may be quicker to install but offer fewer suitable positions. For residents expecting to move soon, the simpler arrangement may be more practical. For a household using the same study every day over several years, permanent cabling may justify the additional effort. These choices depend on the duration and importance of the need.

A workable decision can proceed through the options that the home actually permits. The existing access point can be moved to an open location and checked in the priority rooms. If a distinct weak area remains, the household can examine whether a wired access point or a wireless node can serve it. Where installation restrictions prevent either option, a wired connection to a fixed device may address the most pressing need. The arrangement should be judged during normal shared use, so that an improvement in one room does not conceal a new difficulty elsewhere.

6. Conclusion

Wi-Fi access point placement in multi-room homes should reflect the routes between the equipment and the rooms where connections are needed. Installation beside the broadband entry point, concealment behind furniture, and poor positioning of additional units can leave important spaces weakly served. These problems persist when equipment is replaced or added without reconsidering its location.

Improvement begins with choosing an open position that provides suitable paths toward frequently used rooms. Where one access point cannot serve separate areas adequately, additional units need locations that support both local coverage and their connection back to the network. Wired access points offer greater freedom of placement, while wireless mesh nodes must remain within dependable reach of the rest of the system. Checks at normal device locations help establish whether an adjustment improves household use or merely moves the weak area elsewhere.

The final arrangement must also fit the home's available cable routes, power sockets, furniture, and installation limits. Reliable service in priority rooms is a more useful goal than equal signal strength everywhere. Linking placement decisions to these needs gives each relocation or additional access point a clear purpose.

References

Cisco. (2019, August 12). *Cisco Catalyst 9115 and 9117 series access points deployment guide*. https://www.cisco.com/c/en/us/products/collateral/wireless/catalyst-9100ax-access-points/deployment-guide-c07-741977.html.

Cisco. (2023, July 13). *Cisco Catalyst 9130 series access point deployment guide*. https://www.cisco.com/c/en/us/products/collateral/wireless/catalyst-9100ax-access-points/deployment-guide-c07-743490.html.

Intel. (n.d.). *2.4 GHz vs. 5 GHz vs. 6 GHz: What's the difference?* https://www.intel.com/content/www/us/en/products/docs/wireless/2-4-vs-5ghz.html.

International Telecommunication Union. (2025). *Propagation data and prediction methods for the planning of indoor radiocommunication systems and radio local area networks in the frequency range from 300 MHz to 450 GHz* (Recommendation ITU-R P.1238-13). https://www.itu.int/rec/R-REC-P.1238-13-202509-I/en.

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).