Research Paper

Housingcondition and Socio-Economic Characteristicofslum Residents In Makoko

Ademola Farinmade[1], Opejin Abdulahi[2], Tolu Akinyemi[3] and Richard Onigboje[4]

[1,2,4] *Department of Urban and Regional Planning, University of Lagos*
[3] *Department of Estate Management, University of Lagos*

Abstract
This study examined the condition of housing in relation to the socioeconomicfeatures of slum dwellers in Makoko area of Lagos metropolis. In achieving the aim of this study, the following objectives; an assessment of socio-economic characteristics of the residents,an assessment of housing qualities in the study area, and an assessment of the environmental and physical conditions in the study area were raised and addressed.A total of184 questionnaires were administered in the study area out of which one hundred and sixty-nine (169) which constitutes 91.8% were duly filled and returned. The questionnaires were well structuredto obtain data on the socio-economic characteristics of the respondents, their housing quality, the environmental condition of the study area, factors contributing to slum development and the implications of slum development in the study area. The findings revealed that income, occupation, household size and education are the primary socio-economic factors that affect housing conditions. In addition, most buildings in the area are in need of renovation and maintenance upon the fact that many of them are 10-19 years with few between 40 years and above. Furthermore, most buildings in the study area are structurally deformed, overcrowded and with the presence of insanitary housing environment. Although the general conditions of buildings occupied by households are considered fair by most of the residents, most buildings in the study area are in need of minor repairs. Thus, the study recommends the need to improve existing housing stocks within poor residential neighborhoods such as the study area as well as the revitalization of the area by the government in collaboration with the members of the community.
Keywords: Housing, condition, socio-economics, quality, slum

I. BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

More than 1.8 billion people worldwide lack adequate housing, and the number of people living in informal settlements has now surpassed 1 billion (Human Right Council. 2020). The Encyclopedia Britannica defines slums as residential areas that are physically and socially deteriorated and in which satisfactory family life is impossible. Bad housing is a major index of slum conditions. By bad housing is meant dwellings that have inadequate light, air, toilet and bathing facilities; that are in bad repair, dump and improperly heated; that do not afford opportunity for family privacy; that are subject to fire hazard and that overcrowd the land, leaving no space for recreational use. One of the most serious problems of urban housing provision in Nigeria is the issue of poor housing quality (Ekpo and Nwokoro, 2012).

Housing is often regarded as one of the basic human needs. It ranks second after food andthereafter clothing. It is a pre-requisite for the survival of man (Onibokun, 1985). Thus, housing as a unit of the environment has profound influence on the health, efficiency, social behavior, satisfaction and general welfare of the community. It reflects the cultural, social and economic values of a society, as it is the best physical and historical evidence of the civilization of a country.

The importance of providing adequate and quality housing in any country cannot be overstated nor disputed in time or space. It is a stimulant to the national economy. However, the re-current nature of housing needs and the unending desire for good housing tends to confirm the wide impression that there is hardly any society that has been able to cope satisfactorily with its housing requirement (Modupe, 1986).

The spread of shanty dwellings, squatter settlements and slums in most of our cities in Nigeria and other less developed nations of the world can be attributed to a chain of factors. Of course, such factors are closely associated with the low level of socio-economic and cultural lifestyles of the inhabitants of those areas. Slums are homes to the poorest of urban population in Africa. The houses inhabited by slumdwellers are mostly decrepit, overcrowded, located in neighborhoods that are prone to flooding and plagued with poor sanitation and shortage of potable water.

Urbanization refers to specific changes in the structure and distribution of urban population as well as in size and character of a settlement. Slumsare easily formed in areas experiencing rapid urbanization without commensurate increase in theprovision and maintenance of housing and infrastructure. Slums have been conceptualized as a group of buildings or an area characterized by overcrowding, deterioration, insanitary conditions, or absence of basic and essential facilities like potable water, drainage system, schools, health facilities, recreational grounds, post office, among others. Slums generate spontaneously and are in some cases, a direct result of the prevalence of poverty experienced by the inhabitants of cities(Bobadoye and Fakere,2013).

Slums, which are regarded as an element of urban decay, also result from congestion in overcrowded cities where poor immigrants seek to settle for just any available accommodation irrespective of quality. The inadequacy in the quality of most urban housing stems mainly from the poor physical state of the buildings. They are often unsafe and insecure and do not provide adequate shelter from the elements of weather. The environment in which the buildings are locatedis squalid in most cases, and this generally leads to slum conditions (Kamruzzaman and Abdul 2016).

Slum living people are very poor and their socio-economic condition does not allow themto live a healthy life. They do not have access to sanitation and so cannot get safe water supply. They have to live in adverse conditions due to poor social, economic and health facilities. Slum areas illustrate high rates of poverty, illiteracy and bad health status. Slum dwellers have low earning as urban areas do not provide them proper jobs. This could be attributed to their lack of formal education facilities. Dwellers of slums engage in informal labor through which they earn very little. Lower socio-economic conditionshaveled them to ailing life. Even though the living condition of slum dwellers are worse than that of rural dwellers. They are more vulnerable to communicable diseases and malnutrition and at the same time exposed to greater risk of accidents at work. Most of the slum dwellers in developing countries are living below poverty line, they do not have good source of income and adequate supply of drinking water is basic human need.

Unhealthy living conditions of slum dwellers are the result of a lack of basic services, with visible, open sewers, lack of pathways, uncontrolled dumping of waste, polluted environments, and unorganized building constructions etc. The existence of the slum is a global phenomenon. Some social scientist said that, slum is the by-product of modern era.

The development of the city is very important, but the provision for the slum's population is needful. There is need to develop the plans and policies for the up gradation of the slum dwellers in terms of infrastructural development and basic amenities. Slums are increasingly faced with negative consequences such as polarization of population in large cities, high density, slums and squatter settlements, acute shortage of housing and basic civic amenities, degradation of environment, traffic congestion, pollution, poverty, unemployment, crime and social unrest (Brijendra, 2016).

In general, slums are the products of failed policies, bad governance, corruption, inappropriate regulation; dysfunctional land markets, unresponsive financial systems and a lack of political will. States parties should recognize for every citizen the right to benefit from social security; including social insurance and should take the necessary measures to achieve the full realization of this right in accordance with their national law.

Slums punctuate almost every city of the world. This has become a universal phenomenon accompanying urban growth. Existing data has showed that slums are continuously on the increase. Thus, the ratio of slums is only expected to increase day by day with chronic problems. The demonstrative effect of improved standard of living prevailing in the urban area has also attracted not only the population from smaller settlements, but also the rural migrants to almost all the major urban centers resulting in the emergence of slums in the heart of the cities.

Urban decay in Nigeria is essentially caused by rapid urbanization and the mismatch in the provision and maintenance of housing and infrastructure. Most of the housing quality related problems in Nigeria results largely from inadequately planned land use and non-secure land tenure, poverty, poor construction and weak development control. Cities, irrespective of their size, provide possibilities of varied occupations and collective services, such as health, education, cultural, technological, commercial or industrial services and thus act as focal points of development opportunities(Bobadoye and Fakere, 2013).

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Available literature was reviewed along subject matter of the research project. This chapter undertakes a review of literature on individual components of the central theme and combinations of such individual components, as basis for developing the researcher's ideas on the general concept of the study.

Housing has a vital role in housing development in every country in the world. The need for housing is not only one of the basic needs, but also represents the living standard of the population. Housing is one of the most important life components giving shelter, safety and warmth, as well as providing a place to rest. According to Abram (1964), "housing is not only a shelter but also part of the fabric of the neighborhood life and of the whole social milieu". It touches upon many facets of economic activity and development. Thus, housing provides social contacts, good image, a sense of belonging and an indicator of social status. Economically, housing represents a major portion of the family budget or that of an establishment, yet in the realm of private and public investment, the built environment represents man's most tangible material asset (Kinyungu, 2004). The 1992 National Housing Policy for Nigeria identified shelter as the most essential human need after food. While adequate housing is crucial for effective performance of man, a considerable proportion of Nigerians live in sub-standard and poor housing as well as deplorable unsanitary residential environments (Onibokun, 1985). To this end, one can deduce that housing is the process of providing a large number of residential buildings on a permanent basis with adequate physical infrastructure and social services in planned, decent, safe and sanitary neighborhoods to meet the basic and social needs of the population and is intended to provide security, comfort and convenience for the users (National Housing Policy, 2004; Osuide, 2004).

The World Health Organization (WHO) describes housing as residential environment which includes the physical structure used for shelter, all necessary services, facilities, equipment's and devices needed or desired for the physical and mental health and social well-being of the family and individuals. The United Nations Ad-Hoc Group of Experts on Housing and Urban Development equally asserted that housing is neither a mere shelter nor household facilities alone. It is an essential need that comprises essential services and facilities, which make up a physical environment that link such individuals and his family to the community in which it evolves. Therefore, environmental amenities like waste disposal, water supply, road access and location services implied by the special links between necessary economic and social infrastructure like education, health and recreation are all parts of the package of services designated as housing (Aribigbola, 2008).

The World Health Organizationstated that a good house should have the following items:
- A good roof to keep out the rain
- Good walls and doors to protect against bad weather and to keep out animals.
- Sunshades all around the house to protect it from direct sunlight in hot weather.
- Wire nettings at windows and doors to keep out insects like house flies and mosquitoes.

In essence, housing quality can be judged from the physical appearance of the buildings, facilities provided, quality of wall used in the building construction, eminence of the roofing materials, condition of other structural components of the house, and the environmental condition of the house. Hence, the inadequacy of housing in terms of quality and quantity results in poor standard of the environment.

The most visible and obvious consequences of urbanization in developing countries, such as Nigeria, is often rapid deterioration of urban housing and living conditions (UNCHS, 2014). Thisis traceable to the fact that urbanization leads to explosive population growth, which is occasioned by a phenomenal leap in the quantitative housing needs of the populace (Akufo, 2006).

The housing needs are not matched by effective demand since the large majority of the populace does not have the wherewithal for adequate housing. The housing situation in Nigeria is characterized by some inadequacies, which are qualitative and quantitative in nature (Oladapo, 2006). Market failure to provide affordable housing has created problems for households living below the poverty level by forcing them to occupy low-quality and overcrowded dwellings located either in decayed areas within the central city or in informal settlements located at the urban fringe (Meng, Hall, & Roberts, 2006).

Thus, for the past few decades, access to adequate housing has remained one of the most unattainable expectations of the majority of urban dwellers in Nigeria (Jiboye, 2010).

Urban Growth in Nigeria

Urbanization is not about the population size, but must satisfy certain conditions likemodernization, physical and economic development, as well as the heterogeneity in occupation (Oyeleye, 2013). The index of urbanization in Nigeria which is the population increase is mainlycaused by rural-urban migration and not by natural increase. Many researchers see rural-urban migration in urbanization process as the genesis of the resultant problems of urbanization in any part of the world (Onokerhoraye, 1995; Wahab et al., 1990; Olotuah, 2006).

Urban growth is the rate of growth of an urban population. Urban growth refers to growth that makes intensive the use of land for the location of buildings and impermeable surfaces to such adegree. Urbanization is mainly caused by urban growth, which could be due to natural populationgrowth, reclassification of urban and rural system and rural-urban migration (Agbola, 2006).

Also, industrialization and modernization which are intertwined with urbanization have led to the diminished functions of the various institutions in Nigerian urban centers. Thus, over 60% of the urban dwellers live in slums characterized with over-crowding, poor sanitary conditions, lack of or inadequate basic facilities and amenities, crimes and poverty among other things. Urbanization therefore influences building collapse, as the demand for more commercial, industrial and residential activities is very high due to the population growth of urban centers (Owoeye&Omole, 2012).

The major challenge of urbanization in Nigerian Urbancentersis environmental problems. Environmental problems in the urban centers have resulted in many health problems in Nigeria, and they also have a negative effect on the overall economy of the country. Improper wastes management has made the societal fabric of many urban centers in Nigeria to be very unsightly. Slums developments in urban centers also deplete the physical environment, increases crimes and violence. The environmental problems in urban centers outweigh the experience in the countryside, as the environmental problems are seen as the results of human activities which are higher in the urban centers (Owoeye&Omole, 2012).

Rapid urbanization has changed the urban landscape of most Nigerian cities. There have been the processes of concentration and congestion in inner cities and the opposite process of dispersal at the urban fringes. The process of growth was stimulated during the colonial period as new towns were planted adjacent to traditional cities to avoid direct contact with the indigenous people based on the policy of indirect rule and residential segregation. Urban growth had led to even higher densities of population and physical developments in the urban fringe.

Urbanization and Housing Quality

As a result of urbanization and lack of economic opportunities in rural areas, many people move to the cities. They move to the cities that are already dealing with issues of overcrowding, infrastructure and high cost of living. This forces them to seek shelter in slums and urban fringe. United Nation Habitat in 2006 found that 90% of slum residents are in the developing countries with struggling economies. In addition, cities were not designed to handle millions of people. This impacts the availability and affordability of housing, forcing millions to live in substandard dwellings with poor housing quality (Amao, 2012). This could be attributed to the cheapsubstandard accommodation there. Substandard housing is the type of housing that does not meet the standards for living by people. These standards are usually set by governments and deal with how safe the dwelling is for people to live.

Indicators for Evaluating Quality of Housing

In essence, quality is a product of subjective judgment which arises from the overall perception which the individual holds towards what is seen as the significant elements at a particular point in time (Anantharajan, 1983 and Olayiwola, 2006). In assessing the quality of housing, qualitative studies have identified some criteria as relevant indicators for quality evaluation in residential development. This includes; -aesthetics, ornamentation, sanitation, drainage, age of building, access to basic housing facilities, burglary, spatial adequacy, noise level within neighbourhoods, sewage and wastedisposal and ease of movement among others, as relevant quality determinants in housing.

However, Hanmer (2000) concluded that qualitative housing involves the provision ofinfrastructural services which could bring about sustainable growth and development throughimproved environmental conditions and improved livelihood. In determining the quality of residential development, Neilson (2004) stipulates five basic criteria which provide that housing must be in compliance with tolerable standard, free from serious disrepair, energy efficient, provided with modern facilities and services, and that it must be healthy, safe and secure. These indicators consist of variables such as; access to basic housing and community facilities, the quality of infrastructural amenities, spatial adequacy and quality of design, fixtures and fittings, building layout and landscaping, noise and pollution control as well as security. There are however indications from these various studies that a single variable may not be sufficient to assess the qualitative nature of residential development; therefore, housing acceptability and qualitative assessment should also take into account type of constructions, materials used, services, spatial arrangement and facilities within dwellings, function and aesthetics, among others (Olu-Sule and Gur, noted in Jiboye, 2004).

Housing Problems in Nigeria

Housing problems abound in Nigeria both in rural areas and urban centers. The problem in the rural areas has to do with qualitative housing while the problem in the urban Centre is quantitative in nature. Housing

problems in the rural areas are connected with qualitative deficiencies like place, degree of goodness and the value of the house.

Wahab (1993) declared that rural housing is incomplete because social services cannot be adequately linked with them. He submitted further that the social services required with housing include electricity, water supply, as well as transportation facilities. All these are deficient in rural housing. On the other hand, urban housing problems include homelessness, slum dwelling, squatting and overcrowding. High rate of urbanization, ever-increasing population of urban dwellers in conjunction with the increasing social expectations of the people are all responsible for housing problems in Nigeria. Ibimilua (2011) identified the problems of urbanization as inadequate housing, unplanned development, improper maintenance of existing structures, aging, absence of social infrastructure, waste management menace, crime, and health hazard. Additionally, the houses in the urban core areas are characterized by inadequate infrastructural facilities, poor ventilation, non-availability of in-built toilet and kitchen, as well as poor refuse disposal system. Other problems that are associated with urban housing are lack of effective planning, development of shanty towns, and availability of dilapidated houses.

Generally, housing in Nigeria is bombarded with problems like poverty, discrimination against the use of indigenous materials, ineffective housing finance, inadequate financial instrument for mobilization of funds, high cost of building materials, shortage of infrastructural facilities, as well as the bureaucracies in land acquisition, processing of certificate of occupancy (C of O), and approval of building plans. Other constraints to housing development, maintenance and delivery are lack of effective planning, ineffective government programs and policies, uncontrolled private sector participation, weak institutional frameworks and poor research and development into housing. In addition to the earlier mentioned problems, Agbola (1998) submitted that housing is inextricably interrelated with broader issues of inflation, income policy, and perplexing range of difficult social and economic trends. All these challenges culminated in the ever-increasing demand that cannot be met by supply. Researchers (Balchin, 1995; Onibokun, 1990; Baer, 1991; Mtafu et al, 2011; Aribigbola, 2006; Kabir, 2004; Charles, 2003) have suggested that housing problems cannot be eradicated. Even the developed countries still have some pockets of homeless people. In Nigeria, the problems of squatting, forced eviction and homelessness are common phenomena in major urban centers like Lagos, Kano, Port Harcourt, Ibadan, Owerri and Kaduna. With a population of over 140 million people and over 35% living in the cities, the housing problem is very cumbersome. In fact, Falade (2007) projected that given an annual population increment of 2.8% and all other factors being equal, more than 62% will be living in urban centres in Nigeria by year 2020. Presently, urban centers are characterized by shortage of housing quantitatively, slum dwelling, squatter settlements, inadequate infrastructural amenities, squalor, overcrowding and generally poor living condition.

At the national level, housing is characterized by abandoned projects, non-implementation of housing policies and neglect of the poor. Mtafu et al, 2011 pointed out that low-income level and affordability are the major challenges. Other problems of housing delivery in Nigeria are connected with the imperfections in policy instruments and its implications. The problems can equally be traced to administrative blockages, in housing delivery.

Public housing provision in Nigeria

In many developing countries, including Nigeria, urban housing crisis is rising despite a number of new policies, programs and strategies being involved in by public and private sectors in addressing this problem. In Nigeria however, from the debut efforts of the Lagos Executive Development Board (LEDB) in 1928 to date, public housing provision in this country has continued to lag behind the demand for housing, as almost 90% of the nation's housing stock is provided by the informal sector (UN-HABITAT, 2006).

As in other developing countries, a number of challenges are influencing the optimum performance of public housing in Nigeria. These challenges which are both related and organizational and have shown manifestations in low productivity and provision of poor quality and expensive housing (Awotona, 1990; Olotuah and Bobadoye, 2009) are increasing by each passing day due to a number of reasons. These include high rates of urbanization and population growth (Akinmoladun and Oluwole, 2007; Olotuah, 2010), absence of proper monitoring and evaluation of public housing policies and programs (Awotona, 1990; Federal Republic of Nigeria, 1991), lack of easy access to land and other housing inputs (Ikejiofor, 1999; UN-HABITAT, 2006) and low capacity of public housing agencies (Bana, 1991; Emerole, 2002). As a result, public housing in Nigeria has acquisition mechanisms to meet increasing housing demand, particularly by low-income earners (Mba, 1992; Olotuah and Bobadoye, 2009).

Since public housing provision is mostly carried out by government agencies, a very good way in addressing multitudes of challenges in public housing provisions in Nigeria is to identify areas of weakness in public housing agencies and subsequently address such weakness for enhanced productivity. Numerous studies have indicated that public housing provision involves policy formulation, institutional development, actual housing provision, allocation and management (Omole, 2001; Valenca, 2007; Sengupta and Tipple, 2007). This

goes to suggest that challenges in public housing provision are related to policy formulation, institutional growth and development as well as actual production and consumption of housing units and services. However, the genuine production of housing units and associated services is one of the key objectives of public housing provision which aims at increasing decent and affordable housing stock within a country, state or locality. Many authors have argued that the challenge of low productivity in public housing in Nigeria is rooted in mismanagement of funds and politicization of housing program (Bana, 1991; Mustapha, 2002) while others are of the opinion that poor implementation of housing policies as well as lack of proper coordination of activities of public housing agencies were the key challenges of public housing in Nigeria (Ikejiofor, 1999; UN-HABITAT, 2006; Akinmoladun and Oluwoye 2007; Ademiluyi and Raji, 2008).Another school of thought believes that low capacity of public housing agencies in delivering their housing mandate is responsible for the failure of past public housing schemes to achieve set targets in Nigeria (Bana, 1991; Emerole, 2002). These views are no doubt very incisive as they attempt to identify the possible reasons why many past public housing schemes failed to achieve targeted number of housing units in the country. They are however, deficient in revealing why this challenge has persisted over the years. Specifically, the reasons why previous public housing programs were politicized and poorly implemented as well as the areas of weakness in organizational capacity in public housing agencies have not been addressed.Findings show that since independence in 1960, governments in Nigeria have demonstrated commitment to addressing the housing problem in several ways. But due to funding, political and organizational challenges public housing agencies have so far provided insufficient number of poor quality and unaffordable housing units in the country.

III.   STUDY AREA

Historical background

Makoko is one of the most urbanized parts of Nigeria. Lagos is the economic hub of Nigeria and houses more than 50% of manufacturing industry outfits. It is the nodal point of all transport modes such as air, water, road and rail. Makoko lies within the south-eastern part of Metropolitan Lagos. It is bounded on the North by Iwaya and University of Lagos, at the West by Ebute-Meta, South by the Third Mainland Bridge and East by the Lagos Lagoon.Makoko community sprang up in the early nineteen centuries. The settlement is surrounded by mass of abundant Akoko trees, wild swamp vegetation and animals. The community is dominated by the Ilajes and Eguns, there are also Yorubas with few Igbos and other ethnic groups. Landownership is vested in two families namely: The Oloto and Olaiye family. The residents of the area are confronted with severe flooding especially during the wet season.

The date of conception for Makoko is debatable, but the majority of literature and articles assert that it was established in the 18[th]Century as a fishing village. Over the many years, thousands of people have made this place their home. Like many other 'slum' areas, the full population of Makoko is unknown because it is formally unrecognized.

Fig 1.1 Map, showing the location of Makoko, Lagos state

Geographical location
Longitude   **3°23"31.085" E,** Latitude **6°30"9.154" N;**

Demography

The Baale (Chief of the village) on land estimates that there are approximately 400,000 people living in Makoko (water and land) and the World Bank estimates that the population on land is just over 85,000. There has never been an official population count on water because the settlement is considered non-existent and illegal. The majority of the residents come from the Egun tribe ofBenin Republic and Badagry, a coastal town in Lagos State that borders the neighboring country,Benin.

The area is self-policed; it is rare to see policemen in the settlement, and during a visit, the community confirmed a low crime rate. The fertility rate is high and a high percentage of residents are illiterate.

Physical Structure and Land use

The houses on water are built from hardwood, supported by wood stilts driven deep into the waterbed. Each house usually houses between six to ten people and a high percentage are rental properties. The waters are five feet deep. Water meanders through the water settlement like streets in between houses. These 'streets' act as a road system, where you can find canoes carrying children to school and people to their places of work. As well as a form of transportation, canoes are used for fishing and act as points of sale; where women sell food, water and household goods. The main economic activities are salt making, sand dredging, sawmills, firewood, and fishing.

IV. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The data for this study were derived from primary and secondary sources. The secondary data comprised of research findings through internet, journals and books. The primary data were obtained through questionnaire administered in Makoko residential area. The questionnaire was designed to collect data on socio-economic characteristics of the respondents, housing quality of the respondents, environmental condition of the study area, factors of slum development and the implications of slum development in the study area. Primary data were collected from one hundred and eighty-four (184) dwellers of Makoko, out of which one hundred and sixty-nine (169; 91.8%) were returned duly filled.

The sample frame was the residential housing units in Makoko and the sample size was 169. Systematic random sampling method was adopted to ensure a fair representation of the population of the study area. Every 5th housing unit was selected starting from the randomly selected first housing unit in the study area. Data obtained from the respondents were tabulated indicating frequencies of responses and their percentage and mean scores, with the aid of the Statistical Package for Social Scientists (SPSS 21.0). Both descriptive and inferential statistics were used for data analysis.

V. DATA ANALYSIS

Table 1: Socio-economic Characteristics of the Residents in the Study Area

Variables	Options	N	%
Highest Educational Qualification	None	26	15.4
	Primary	46	27.2
	Secondary	72	42.6
	Tertiary	25	14.8
	Total	169	100.0
Employment Status	Employed	35	20.7
	Self-employed	97	57.4
	Student	9	5.3
	Unemployed	28	16.6
	Total	169	100.0
Occupation	None	37	21.9
	Civil Servant	43	25.4
	Trading and Commerce	60	35.5
	Industrial Work	24	14.2
	Fishing	2	1.2
	Other	3	1.8
	Total	169	100.0

Monthly Income	Below N10,000	60	35.5
	N10,000 – N30,000	72	42.6
	N30,001 – N50,000	29	17.2
	N50,001 – N70,000	6	3.6
	Above N70,000	2	1.2
	Total	169	100.0

Source: Field Survey 2018
Where N is the number and
Where % represents the percentage

Table 1 shows the socio-economic characteristics of the respondents. The Highest Educational Qualification shows that 15.4% of the respondents did not have any educational qualification, 27.2% of them had primary education, 42.6% of them had secondary education, while the remaining 14.8% of them had tertiary education. This implies that most of the dwellers had at least primary education. The employment status shows that 20.7% of the dwellers were employed, 57.4% of them were self-employed, 5.3% of them were students, while the remaining 16.6% of them were unemployed. This indicates that most of the dwellers are self-employed. The occupation shows that 21.9% of the respondents had no occupation, 25.4% of them were civil servants, 35.5% of them were traders, which is the predominant occupation of the people in the area, 14.2% of them were industrial workers, 1.2% of them were into fishing, while the remaining 1.8% of them were into other occupations. The monthly income shows that a good number of the respondents earned below N10,000, which has a percentage of 35.5%, 42.6% of them earned between N10,000 – N30,000, 17.2% of them earned between N30,001 – N50,000, 3.6% of them earned between N50,001 – N70,000, while the remaining 1.2% of them earned above N70,000. Occupation and income are closely related. The nature of occupation determines their level of income.With this low-income distribution, this implies that most of the people live in the area, because of their low level of income and are unable to afford good quality housing.

Table 2: Housing Qualities of Residents in the Study Area

Variables	Options	N	%
Type of House	Flat	27	16.0
	Bungalow	32	18.9
	A-Wing Apartment	110	65.1
	Total	169	100.0
Number of Dwellers per room	1-3	34	20.1
	4-6	123	72.8
	7-10	6	3.6
	Above 10	6	3.6
	Total	169	100.0
Ownership	Landlord	6	3.6
	Tenant	161	95.3
	Squatter	2	1.2
	Total	169	100.0
Walling	Mud or Mud Block	8	4.7
	Cement Blocks	130	76.9
	Plywood	31	18.3
	Total	169	100.0
Roofing	Zinc	25	14.8
	Corrugated iron sheet	108	63.9
	Asbestos materials	36	21.3
	Total	169	100.0
Structure	Physically Sound	32	18.9
	Need minor repairs	88	52.1
	Need major repairs	23	13.6

		N	%
	Dilapidated and old	26	15.4
	Total	169	100.0
Age of Building	Below 10 years	36	21.3
	10-19 years	93	55.0
	20-29 years	35	20.7
	40 years and above	5	3.0
	Total	169	100.0
Toilet	Pit latrine	68	40.2
	Water closet	68	40.2
	Bucket latrine	4	2.4
	Bush and dunghills	29	17.2
	Total	169	100.0
Bathroom	Indoor-self-contained	46	27.2
	Shared	92	54.4
	Outdoor-open-courtyard	27	16.0
	Not available	4	2.4
	Total	169	100.0
Kitchen	Indoor-self-contained	46	27.2
	Shared	88	52.1
	Outdoor-open-courtyard	29	17.2
	Not available	6	3.6
	Total	169	100.0

Source: Field Survey 2018
Where N is the number and
Where % represents the percentage

Table 2 shows the housing qualities of the respondents. Analysis on the type of house shows that 16.0% of the respondents live in flat apartments, 18.9% of them live in bungalow, while the majority (65.1%) of them live in A-wing apartment, showing that most of the buildings are old and lacking aesthetics. Data on number of dwellers per room shows that 20.1% of the respondents have 1-3 dwellers per room, the majority (72.8%) have 4-6 dwellers per room, 3.6% of them have 7-10 dwellers per room, while the remaining 3.6% of them have above 10 dwellers per room, in this case some are squatters. Analysis on ownership shows that 3.6% of the respondents were landlords, 1.2% were squatters, while the majority (95.3%) were tenants. Analysis on walling shows that 4.7% of the respondents live in houses with mud or mud block walling, 18.3% of them with plywood walling, while most (76.9%) are with cement blocks walling, though some are either plastered inside alone or plastered outside alone. This is linked to poor housing condition in the study area. Data on roofing shows that 14.8% of the respondents' houses have zinc roofs, 21.3% of them have asbestos materials roofs, while the majority (63.9%) have roofs with corrugated iron sheets. Most of the roofing are either leaking or sagging, this state of physical condition identified in the houses shows degradation in housing condition in the area. The structure analysis shows that most (52.1%) of the respondents live in structures that need minor repairs, 18.9% of them are physically sound, 15.4% are dilapidated and old, while the remaining 13.6% need major repairs. The age of the buildings analysis shows that the majority (55.0%) of the respondents live in houses that are 10-19 years old, 21.3% of them are below 10 years old, 20.7% of them are 20-29 years old, while the remaining 3.0% are 40 years and above.The presence of old buildings in the area is an expression of low level of good housing condition due to the deterioration of structural functionality over the years, with poor maintenance aiding this housing problem. The information on toilet shows that 40.2% of the respondents use pit latrine, 17.2% of them use bush and dunghills, while the remaining 2.4% of them use bucket latrines. The analysis of bathroom shows that 27.2% of the respondents have indoor-self-contained bathrooms, the majority (54.4%) have shared bathrooms, 16.0% have outdoor-open-courtyard bathrooms, while the remaining 2.4% of the respondents did not have bathroom. The findings on kitchen shows that 27.2% of the respondents have indoor-self-contained kitchens, the majority (52.1%) of them have shared kitchens, 17.2% of them have outdoor-open-courtyard kitchens, while the remaining 3.6% did not have kitchen.

Table 3. Environmental Conditions in the Study Area

Variables	Options	N	%
Electricity Supply Source	PHCN	122	72.2
	Self-generated plant	4	2.4
	None	43	25.4
	Total	169	100.0
Electricity Supply Availability	Constant/Regular	25	14.8
	Erratic/Irregular	102	60.4
	Not Available	42	24.9
	Total	169	100.0
Water Supply	Pipe bone water	70	41.4
	Underground well water	99	58.6
	Total	169	100.0
Waste Disposal	Free range – road side	18	10.7
	Open space	52	30.8
	Controlled tipping	62	36.7
	Incarcerating/burning	37	21.9
	Total	169	100.0
Road Condition	Tarred	73	43.2
	Un-tarred	96	56.8
	Total	169	100.0

Source: Field Survey 2018
Where N is the number and
Where % represents the percentage

Table 3 shows the Environmental conditions of the respondents. The Electricity Supply Source information shows that most (72.2%) of the respondents got their electricity from PHCN, 2.4% of them use self-generated plants, while the remaining 25.4% of them do not have any. The Electricity Supply Availability shows that 14.8% of the respondents have constant power supply, the majority (60.4%) of them have irregular power supply, while 24.9% of them do not have at all. The findings on water supply shows that 41.4% of the respondents have pipe bone water supply, while the majority (58.6%) of them have underground well water supply. The Waste Disposal analysis shows that 10.7% of the respondents use free range – road side, 30.8% of them use open spaces, 36.7% use controlled tipping, while the remaining 221.9% use incarcerating/burning methods. The findings on road condition shows that 43.2% of the respondents' roads are tarred, while the majority (56.8%) are not tarred.

Table 4. Respondents' Opinion on Environmental Conditions of the Study Area

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Well-ventilated environment	169	2.2722	.93694
Health facilities	169	1.9172	.85510
Good drainage system	166	2.1446	.98636
Recreational Grounds	169	2.0355	.89903

Source: Researchers Field Survey, 2018
Where N is the number and
Where Std. Deviation represents the Standard deviation

Table 4 above shows the mean score of the listed item on environmental condition of the study area where a mean less than 2.5 implies disagreed($\bar{x} < 2.5 \implies disagreed$), while a mean greater than or equal to 2.5 implies agreed ($\bar{x} \geq 2.5 \implies agreed$). These facilities were considered to determine the level of individual satisfaction and comfort derived from their dwellings. The result indicates that all the mean scores of the items are less than 2.5($\bar{x} > 2.5$), it implies that the majority of the respondents disagreed with the items list above.

Hence, the respondents opined that their environment is not well-ventilated; no good health facility; no good drainage system; and no recreational ground. This finding is in agreement with the study conducted by Amao (2012), Oche et al, (2015) and Oladimeji and Mikahi (2017).

Table 5. Respondents' Opinion on the factors that responsible for slum development

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Overpopulation in the urban area	169	3.5858	.51758
Neglect on the part of the government	169	3.1183	.64380
Unplanned development	169	3.2012	.73663
Lack of infrastructural facilities	169	3.1420	.65734
Improper waste disposal	169	3.1361	.68950
Level of poverty among the dwellers	169	3.2426	.65034
Level of illiteracy among the dwellers	169	3.3846	.68139
Rural-urban migration	169	3.7101	.48053
Cultural belief	169	2.6864	.71705
Type and nature of occupation	169	2.9763	.76339
Controls on rents and security of tenant	169	3.1243	.86737

Source: Researchers Field Survey, 2018
Where N is the number and
Where Std. Deviation represents the Standard deviation

Table 5 above shows mean score of the listed item on factors responsible for slum development of the study area where a mean less than 2.5 implies disagreed($\bar{x} < 2.5 \Rightarrow disagreed$), while a mean greater than or equal to 2.5 implies agreed ($\bar{x} \geq 2.5 \Rightarrow agreed$). *The result indicates* that all the mean scores of the items above are greater than 2.5($\bar{x} > 2.5$). This implies that the majority of the respondents agreed with the items as listed. Hence, this table shows that the listed factors above are responsible for slum development in the area.

Table 6. Problems Associated with Slum Development in the Study Area

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Poor sanitation practices in the environment	169	3.1479	.53062
Poor health practices among the dwellers	169	3.2485	.81490
Manifestation of deviant behaviors among the dwellers	169	3.3077	.67259
It serves as hideout for criminals	169	3.3195	.62080
It serves as a breeding and grooming ground for potential criminals	169	3.3432	.64593
It serves as a source of epidemic diseases	169	3.2485	.69677
It breeds political tugs	169	3.2840	.78059

Source: Researchers Field Survey, 2016
Where N is the number and
Where Std. Deviation represents the Standard deviation

Table 6 above shows that all the mean scores of the items above are greater than 2.5($\bar{x} < 2.5$). It implies that the majority of the respondents agreed with the items as listed. Hence, this table shows that the listed factors above are associated with slum development in the area.

VI. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Majority of the respondents in the study area are between the ages of 30-34 years with a percentage of 23.1%. This indicates that the study area is mostly occupied by young people, while ages between 40-44 years with a percentage of 1.2% is low in the area. The area is mostly dominated with Yoruba people with a

percentage of 45%. Also, Majority of the respondents are secondary school graduates and therefore engage in occupation like trading and commerce.Few of them with higher education level are civil servants, and most of the respondents (72 %) earn #10,000-#30,000. This actually means that the residents in the area would be categorized as low-income earners, which actually makes them reside in low standard areas and also struggle for everyday life. General findings revealed that income, occupation, household size and education are the primary socio-economic factors that affect housing conditions. Therefore, the importance of socio-economic characteristics of households plays a vital or key role in assessing housing conditions in a geographical setting or place.

Information on housing types and condition reveals that A - wing apartment type of structure is dominant (65.1%) in the area, while a few occupy bungalow, and the remaining flats. Most buildings in the area are in need of renovation and maintenance upon the fact that many of them are 10-19 years with few between 40 years and above. Most buildings in the study area are structurally deformed, overcrowded and with the presence of insanitary housing environment. The general conditions of buildings occupied by households are considered fair by most of the residents. Most buildings in the study area need minor repairs.

From the given analysis in the area, it can be clearly seen that most of the factors listed are greatly responsible for slum development in the area, in which the government have to play a major and effective role to bring improvement to their standard of living.

VII.   CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Derivable from this study is the fact that the state of buildings and environmental conditions with the likes of waste disposal, drainage system, building structure are below standard in the study area. The findings confirm that the quality of housing in poor residential neighborhoods or slums are among other related factors influenced and determined by the socio- economic factors. This corroborates the observation byBabatunde and Emilia (2017) that there is a positive relationship between residents' socio-economic characteristics and housing conditions in Nigeria. Toyobo et al (2011) is also in agreement with thisinhis study of the socio-economics characteristics of housing quality in Ogbomosho township, Oyo State, Nigeria where the hypothesis tested confirmed a significant difference between the socioeconomic characteristics and housing quality in the study area. Therefore, there is the need to improve existing housing stocks within poor residential neighborhoods. Also, the revitalization of the area by the government in collaboration with the members of the community to make the impact of the government visible and effective in Makoko area is recommended. The revitalization program must entail decisive action of improving the existing infrastructures as well as providing new ones. There should be provision of employment opportunities in the area. This will help in capital formation by which the residents in the area can provide for basic household facilities and proper maintenance of their buildings.

REFERENCES

[1].   Abiodun A. (1999): Housing Finance under National Housing Fund: An appraisal. Paper presented at the General Meeting of the Nigeria Institute of Town Planning.
[2].   Abiodun J.O (1995). The Provision of Housing and Urban Environment Problems in Nigeria;
[3].   Urban and Regional Planning Problems in Nigeria (pp 174-191). Nigeria: University of Ife Press Ltd.
[4].   Abrams C. (1964): Mans struggle for shelter in an Urbanizing world, published by Massachusetts Institute of Technology Cambridge, Massachusetts, and London, England.
[5].   Agbola, T. (1998). The Housing of Nigerians: A Review of Policy Development and, Implementation, Research Report, 14, Development Policy Centre, Ibadan
[6].   Akinmoladun, O.I., Oluwoye, J., (2007). An Assessment of Why the Problems of Housing Shortages Persist in Developing Countries: A case of Study of Lagos Metropolis, Nigeria Pakistan Journal of Social Science 4(4) 589-598).
[7].   Akinola, S. R. (1998), "The Pattern of Housing Quality in Osogbo, Osun State". Ife Journal of Environmental Design and Management, 109-120.
[8].   Amao, F.L (2012) "Urbanization, housing quality and environmental degeneration in Nigeria", Journal of Geography and Planning Sciences, 5(16), 422-429.
[9].   Amerigo, M. and Aragones.J (1997). A Theoretical and Methodological Approach to the Study of Residential Satisfaction. Journal of Environmental Psychology.Vol.17. pp.47 -57.
[10].   Aribigbola, A. (2008). Housing Policy in Formulation in Developing Countries. Evidence of programme Implementation from Akure, Ondo State, Nigeria. Journal of Human Ecology,23(2):125-134.
[11].   Arilesere D. (1997): Housing Finance in Nigeria: A paper presented during NIOB Organized workshop on Affordable Housing. Lagos.
[12].   Awotona, A. (1990). Nigerian Government Participation in Housing: 1970- 1980. Habitat International 14 (10) 17-40.
[13].   Bobadoye, S.A. and Fakere, A.A. (2013). Slum Prevalence in Nigeria: What Role for Architects? World Environment 3(2): 45-51
[14].   Basorun, J.O (2003). Basic Elements of Urban and Regional Planning. Akure, Ondo State, Nigeria: Shalom Publishers.
[15].   Bana, P.M. (1991). Housing the Urban Poor in Nigeria. The Nigerian Institute of Architects Journal 6(1)22-25.
[16].   Brijendra, N. (2016). Socio-Economic Conditions of Slums Dwellers: A Theoretical Study. KAAV International Journal of Arts, Humanities & Social Science 3(3); 5-20
[17].   Campbell, A. et.al (1976). The quality of American life. perceptions, evaluation and satisfaction. Russell Sage foundation. U.S.A.
[18].   Emerole, C.G. (2002). Restructuring Housing Development and Financing in Nigeria: The Role of Partnership and Collaboration Strategies. Housing Today1 (5); 26-29.

[19]. Galester, G. (1985). Evaluating indicators for housing policy: Residential satisfaction VS marginal improvement priorities. Social Indicator Research. Vol.16. pp.415- 448.

[20]. George, C.K. (1999). Basic Principles and Methods of Urban and Regional Planning. Lagos, Nigeria: Libra – Gen Limited.

[21]. Goswami, S and Manna, S 2010: "Social aspects of environment: A study of slums of Raipur city", Man, and Life, January-June Vol-36 1&2, Bidisha, India.

[22]. Jiboye, A (2004). An assessment of the influence of socio-cultural factors on housing quality in Osogbo, Nigeria, unpublished M.Sc. Thesis, Department of Urban and Regional

[23]. Planning, Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Nigeria (2004).

[24]. Kinyungu (2004). Public-private sector partnerships in the servicing of land and provision of housing for low-income Groups in Harare: Experiences and lessons learnt 1990-1996, our common Estate, February 2004.

[25]. Kamruzzaman and Abdul Haim (2016). Soccio-economic Status of Slum Dwellers: An Empirical Study on the Capita City of Bangladesh. American Journal of Business and Society1,(2), 13-18.

[26]. Mabogunje, A.L. (2003) The new mass housing and urban development policy: social and economic impact in Aribigbola, A. (2008). Being text of a public service lecture delivered to the top echelons of the federal civil service. Abuja Nigeria.

[27]. Mohit, M.A. et al (2010). Assessment of residential satisfaction in newly designed public low- cost housing in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia,Habitat International, Vol.34. pp.18 -27.

[28]. Modupe, O. (1986, April). Housing Provision in a Depressed Economy. Paper presented at the then Ondo State Polytechnic Owo, Nigeria.

[29]. Oladimeji, O.O. and Mikahi, O.O. (2017). Housing Condition and Human Health in Beere Area, Ibadan, Nigeria. The Journal of Humanities and Social Studies 5 (7); 133-143

[30]. Olanrewaju, D.O and Akinbamijo, O.B(2002). Environmental Health and Target Audience: A Programmatic Panacea for Poverty Alleviation in Nigerian Cities. African Journal of Environmental Studies, 3(2), 82-89.

[31]. Olanrewaju, D. O., "Town Planning: A Veritable Means for Poverty Reduction"; 38th Inaugural Lecture; Federal University of Technology, Akure, 26th October, 2004.

[32]. Olayiwola, L.M., Adeleye, O. and Ogunsakin, L. (2005): Public Housing Delivery in Nigeria:Problems and challenges in the Conference Proceedings of the XXXIII International Association for Housing Science (IAHS World congress) held in Pretoria, South Africa.

[33]. Olotuah, A.O. and Bobadoye, S.A (2009). Sustainable Housing Provision for the Urban Poor: A Review of Public Sector Intervention in Nigeria. The Built &Human Environment Review. (2)51-63.

[34]. Olotuah, A.O. and Bobadoye, S.A (2009). Sustainable Housing Provision for the Urban Poor: A Review of Public Sector Intervention in Nigeria. The Built &Human Environment Review. (2)51-63.

[35]. Onibokun, A.G and Kumuyi, A.S (1996). Urban Poverty in Nigeria: Towards Sustainable Strategies for its Alleviation. Nigeria: Centre for African SettlementsStudies and Development (CAESDO).

[36]. Onibokun, A.G (1985. Housing in Nigeria: A Book of Reading. Nigeria: Nigeria Institute of Social and Economic Research (NISER).

[37]. Onibokun, P. (1985): Socio-cultural Constraints on Urban Renewal Policies in Emerging Nations: The Ibadan Case in Housing in Nigeria. A book of Readings, NISER, Ibadan.

[38]. Onoekerhoraye, A. G. (1995). Urbanization and Environment in Nigeria: Implication Sustainable Development. Nigeria: The Benin Social Science Series for Africa, University of Benin.

[39]. Osuide SO (2004). Strategies for Affordable Housing Stocks Delivery in Nigeria. 18th Inaugural Lecture of Ambrose Alli University, Floreat System Benin-City pp.2-20.

[40]. Owoeye, J.O. and Omole, F.K(2012). Built Environment Decay and Health Situation of Slum Dwellers in Residential Cores of Akure, Nigeria: American Journal of Human Ecology Vol. 1, No.2, 2012, 33-39 ISSN 2167-9622 Print /ISSN 2167-9630.

[41]. Potter, J. and Cantarro, B. (2006). How does increasing population and diversity affect resident satisfaction? Journal of Environment and Behavior. Vol. 9. No (7). 514 – 545.

[42]. Sengupta, U and Tipple, A.G. (2007). The Performance of Public-sector Housing in Kolkata India, in the Post –reform Milieu. Urban Studies 44(10) 2009-2037.

[43]. Sulyman, A. O. (2000) Introduction to Housing: Basic Concepts and Applications. Nigeria, Olad Publishers.

[44]. Udoma O (2013). Makoko: „Venice of Lagos. "World bank public participation policies and processes in relation to the lives of beneficiaries in slum upgrading projects: case study: Makoko, Lagos, Nigeria".

[45]. UN-HABITAT (2006) National Trends in Housing –Production Practices Volume 4: Nigeria, United Nations Centre for Human Settlements: Nairobi.

[46]. United Nations (1994) Information on Social Development Publicationsand Indicators in the United Nations System. Working Paper No. 7, New York: United Nations Publications.

[47]. United Nations Habitat (2010). "State of the World's cities: Bridging the Urban Divide", United Nations Human Settlements Programme International Conference.

[48]. United Nations Habitat Report (1989). Report of the Commission on Human Settlement on the Work of Its Twelfth Session (Forty – Fourth Session Supplement No 8 (A/44/8)). New York: United Nations General Assembly.

[49]. Valenca, M.M. (2007). Poor politics poor housing. Policy under the Collor government in Brazil Environment and Urbanization 19(2) 391-408.

[50]. Winter, M. (1978). Housing and society. John Wiley and Sons. Toronto, Canada.

[51]. Wahab, B. (2001). Grassroots Participation in Sustainable Urban Development of Slum and Squatter Settlement. Paper presented at the 32nd Annual Conference of the Nigerian Institute of Town Planners, Uyo, Akwa Ibom State.