A framework for affordable housing governance for the Nigerian property market
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Abstract

Nigeria is perhaps facing the worst housing deficits in its existence with a homeownership of less than 20% and a housing shortage greater than 30 million. The deficits would lead to a crisis and consequently lead to poor standards of living, unaffordable house prices, high mortgage payments, abandonment, outbreak of diseases, dilapidation, and high maintenance costs. The main research from which this study forms part aims to develop housing governance. This current study aims to identify and the categorize factors accounting for the housing deficits. Based on a cross sectional survey questionnaire the findings lead to the conclusion that the problems in the housing industry can be explained by policies, regulations, legal issues, market, economic and the construction industry.

The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy indicated that the strength of the relationships among variables was moderate. Bartlett’s test of sphericity, which tests the overall significance of all the correlations within the correlation matrix, was significant. The discussions and results have some significant implications to the governments. For now, the government has to play multiple roles of providing housing and that of a market enabler.
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1. Introduction

The relationship between adequate housing and national productivity is very strong and positive. A country with adequate housing also means that such country would spend less on the preventions and controls of diseases, and reduction in crime rate and enhancement in social integration. For the pensioners or retirees, housing is required for...
security reason. Housing is a measure of quality of life. In most of the developing countries, housing is inadequate. There are several indices to measure the affordability of housing. But, two of these indices are mostly applicable. According to one of these, housing is affordable if the rental cost, or mortgage repayment does not exceed 30% of household income for households in the lowest 40% of the income distribution range [1]. For rental purposes, the 30% includes utility bills. In cases of a mortgage, the amount includes the actual consideration, tax, insurance, utilities, and maintenance. Affordable housing is also defined in terms of ‘median multiplier’ [2]. However, based on either of these definitions, housing in all major cities in Nigeria is ‘severely unaffordable’. For instance, cumulatively, annual expenditure for the rental in the cities is N77,762 or 30.7% of the household monthly income [3]. With utility bills, the figure goes up to more than 40% of household income. Due to lack of accuracy on the median income, the mean income is used as proxy here. The mean income is 41,000 for more than 90% of Nigerians or 11,000 for more than 75% of Nigerians [3]. To put this study in context, while literature contains sizeable evidence on apparent causes of housing shortage in Nigeria [i.e. 3, 5, 6.], but due to methodological issues and ‘compartmentalisation effect’, systemic explanations cannot be made on how to reduce the shortage. With these backgrounds in mind, this paper reports part of a study that aims to develop housing governance for the housing industry. This current study addresses itself to identification of the causes of housing shortages in Nigeria.

2. Background

At 2014, the population was 178 million and estimated to increase to 205 million in 2020 and will near 300 million in 2050 [7]. The per capita is US$3,000 with urbanization rate of 3.8% [8]. The real estate accounted for approximately 8% of the GDP each for 2013 [9], 2014 and 2015 [8]. At 2014, the Nigeria property market was valued at US$41 billion [8]. As part of the Gross Capital Formation (GCF), housing constituted 18.99%, 24.48% and 28.07% in 2010, 2011, and 2012 respectively [10]. The housing industry constitutes about 42% of the total value of the real estate. However, housing deficits in Nigeria have remained a tropical issue, despite government interventions through policies, regulations and controls. Prices of houses have increased more than for any other products or services. The price to rent ratio also shows rent is increasingly significantly across the country. Based on World Bank’s estimate cost of building a house in South Africa is USD36,000, USD26,000 in India, but USD50,000 in Nigeria [10]. From 2001 to 2011, house price has increased by 284%, 209% and 161%, in India, Russia and South Africa respectively [11]. In Nigeria, over the same period, house price has increased by 500% [11]. The increase in house prices has outpaced income by a significant margin, leaving mostly in medium and lower-income groups without access to affordable homes. Prices of housing are outstripping inflation. While the monthly rental price for a 4 bedrooms executive house is USD 8,500 in Nigeria (Abuja), in other major Africa cities like Cairo (Egypt), Accra (Ghana) Cape Town (South Africa) and Algiers (Algeria) is USD 3,500; USD 5,000; USD 5,000 and USD 5,000 respectively [12]. Statistical analysis based on data on existing housing stock, population, home production rate, population growth rate from World Bank data, National Bureau of Statistics Nigeria and the National Population Commission Nigeria, revealed that the housing deficit in Nigeria is more than 30 million [13]. The annual supply of housing in Nigeria is approximately a unit per 1000 of the population. 8-10 units per 1000 were recommended for the developing countries. Therefore, it was estimated that, it would take close to 300 years for the housing deficits to close based on existing home production rate. However, in order to close the gap in the next 30 years, the home production rate will have to be 21 times its current rate.

The academic literature suggests that primarily, the reasons for the Nigerian housing deficit include: lack of access to finance, poor capital and budgetary allocation, poor monitoring of mortgage institutions, an inefficient land market, a disproportionate number of speculators, poor infrastructure (i.e. roads, electricity, water, and telecommunication), and tedious and often conflicting legal requirements. The poor performance of the construction sector has a negative impact on the provision of housing. Despite the improvements in the financial and capital markets, less than 1% of Nigerians have mortgage to finance their homes and while the mortgage rate could be up to 30% [8]. The ratio of mortgage to the GDP is one of the lowest in Africa at 0.58%, whereas in South Africa, Namibia, and Morocco is 22.04%, 18.21% and 13.85% respectively [8]. This leaves most Nigerians to self-finance their homes. In fact, more than 90% of existing houses were constructed through unstructured self-help [14]. But the government has not been proactive in the formulations her of policies. For example, between 2007 and 2011, the
expenditure on the housing industry remains very low at around 2% of the total capital expenditure [15]. In 2014, out of the ₦18.5 billion allocated to the Ministry of Lands, Housing and Urban Development, only ₦13.5 billion is allocated for capital expenditure on housing and urban development [8]. If this amount was wholly committed to providing more homes, at ₦7 million per homes, only less than 3000 of two-bedroom bungalows could be provided in urban centres. This excludes the cost of land, transactional cost and other government charges. However, the household income of more than 62% of Nigerians in the cities or 75% of the average national income is less than ₦20,000 [15] but the average rental value is ₦77,760 annually. The interpretation of this statistic is that more than 80% of Nigerians are unable to own a home. Under the National Housing Programme of 1993, homebuyers were expected to deposit 40% of the total building cost. Yet, as of 1995, only 18,500 units of the promised 121,000 units were constructed while house prices had increased by 350% from ₦70,000 to ₦350,000 [16]. The Housing Programme was constrained by the poor conceptualisation and ineffective processes in the acquisition of land. The Federal Housing Authority (FHA) established in 1973 to provide affordable housing to Nigerians, however, it supplied less than 1000 units annually since inception. However, while some of the reasons are known or obvious to most, some are not known or been addressed leading to the fragmented perspectives. It is this fragmentation in proffering ‘solution’ that accounts for the widening gap in the housing shortage and increase in house price. Existing studies are generally descriptive and primary data are collected from a stakeholder or professional in the housing industry. This study begins to fill this void by expanding and perfecting the determinants of housing supply and involving more stakeholders and theories.

3. Outline of research design

The primary data were based on survey questionnaire. The survey was based on convenience sampling method and administered through hand delivery. Convenience sampling is appropriate when respondents are not easily accessible and the population size is not available or accurate. Respondents were asked various questions, but with regards to issues pertaining to affordable housing delivery, respondents were asked based on their current experience of the housing market, to tick the factors that hinder the delivery of affordable housing. The factors were measured on a five continuous scale: 5 denotes extremely often, and 1 denotes not often at all. The ranking of these factors was determined by mode and Average Relative Index (ARI). The factors were selected or modified from various literatures: [3, 5, 6, 17, 18, 19, 20] and the authors’ experiences.

4. Findings and Interpretations

4.1. Respondents’ profiles

Altogether 78 valid survey forms were returned and analysed for this study. The academic backgrounds of the respondents are: estate management (42.3%), architecture (24.4%), quantity surveying (17.9%), engineering (11.5%), laws (2.5%) and 1.3% of the town planning. Also, 43.6%, 37.2%, 14.1%, 3.9% and 1.3% of the respondents are members of The Nigerian Institution of Estate Surveyors and Valuers; The Nigerian Institute of Architects; The Nigerian Society of Engineers; The Nigerian Bar Association and Nigeria Real Estate Developers Association of Nigeria respectively. Respondents with less than five years working experience were 17%; 5 years to less than 10 years were 45%; the remainder 55% has more than 10 years. The interpretations of these statistics are that the surveyed respondents have the required knowledge, skill and expertise to provide valid explain to the nature, characteristics and issue pertaining to the Nigerian housing market.

4.2. Analysis of factors hindering affordable housing delivery

The reliability (R) and validity (V) results testing the general strengths are contained Table 1. Hence data are adequate. With the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure 0.454, and Bartlett’s test of sphericity ($\chi^2 (1596) = 2842.867, p < 0.05$), these factors can be carefully coached towards developing a housing governance framework. However, as observed with the KMO results, there is evidence of multicollinearity. However, for an exploratory study, the results
are acceptable. The lowest factor measured 75% and the highest factors measured 92% (Table 1). The significance (i.e. \( p \)-value) of each of the cost factors \( (H_0: U>U_0) \) show that all the cost factors are significant (Table 2). For each factor, the null hypothesis was the factor was unimportant \( (H_0: U=U_0) \) and the research hypothesis was the factor was important \( (H_1: U>U_0) \). \( U_0 \) is the population mean. A 3.5 critical level was assumed. The small standard errors, suggest that the measurements are reflections of the population parameters. To interpret, all the factors contribute in one way or the other to the problems leading to the housing shortage.

Table 1. Distribution of t-test on determinants of housing supply

| Factor                                                      | V  | R  | Std. Error | Mean | Weightage |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|----|----|------------|------|-----------|
| Lack of construction management skills                      | 0.71| 0.909| .13130     | 0.921|
| Harsh housing regulatory/legal framework                     | 0.771| 0.909| .11015     | 0.897|
| High interest rate on mortgage                              | 0.823| 0.907| .12342     | 0.895|
| Poorly configured vocational training for the construction professional | 0.819| 0.907| .11347     | 0.895|
| Lack of appropriate pricing mechanisms                      | 0.779| 0.908| .11526     | 0.895|
| Sub-standard materials                                       | 0.809| 0.907| .11842     | 0.887|
| Nonconformance to design specifications                     | 0.704| 0.908| .11516     | 0.887|
| Lack of effective implementations of the housing policies   | 0.862| 0.908| .11921     | 0.887|
| Lack of continuity in government policies                   | 0.77| 0.909| .11981     | 0.885|
| Poor consideration of sustainability in housing delivery     | 0.849| 0.909| .10178     | 0.885|
| Substandard quality of housing units                        | 0.796| 0.909| .11681     | 0.882|
| Low household income                                        | 0.773| 0.909| .11574     | 0.877|
| Unqualified workforce                                       | 0.789| 0.909| .11604     | 0.877|
| Lack of access to long term funding for affordable housing  | 0.76| 0.908| .11313     | 0.877|
| Failure or non-implementation of construction standards      | 0.797| 0.907| .11626     | 0.874|
| Inadequate measure of the resettlement of those affected by right of way and similar requirements | 0.802| 0.908| .13314     | 0.869|
| Construction methods                                         | 0.863| 0.908| .10748     | 0.869|
| Inappropriate use of materials and methods                  | 0.679| 0.907| .12056     | 0.867|
| Lack of database for the construction professionals          | 0.703| 0.906| .12207     | 0.864|
| Too much attention high housing priced housing              | 0.794| 0.908| .12606     | 0.864|
| High costs in title and property registration               | 0.797| 0.907| .11208     | 0.864|
| Land acquisition uncertainty                                | 0.751| 0.908| .12342     | 0.859|
| “privitising” the provision of the housing subsector by the government | 0.816| 0.908| .09767     | 0.862|
| Procurement methods                                         | 0.783| 0.907| .12204     | 0.859|
| Importers fixing prices of construction materials and components arbitrary | 0.75| 0.909| .12864     | 0.859|
| The appropriate size and mix of housing development for the community at large | 0.745| 0.907| .10565     | 0.859|
| Short mortgage tenure (usually less than 15 years)          | 0.835| 0.908| .10600     | 0.859|
| Unsustainable home price appreciation                       | 0.80| 0.907| .12185     | 0.856|
| Lack of database for artisans                               | 0.855| 0.906| .12738     | 0.856|
| Too many unregulated agents in purchase of building materials | 0.855| 0.908| .13127     | 0.856|
| Low quality control                                          | 0.739| 0.907| .11604     | 0.854|
Table 1. Distribution of t-test on determinants of housing supply (cont’d)

| Factor | V   | R   | Std. Error | Mean | Weightage |
|--------|-----|-----|------------|------|-----------|
| Excessive down payment | 0.787 | 0.907 | .11392 | 0.854 |
| Late delivery | 0.705 | 0.908 | .11590 | 0.849 |
| Fragmented housing policies | 0.802 | 0.908 | .13120 | 0.849 |
| Lack opportunities for employment in the neighbourhoods | 0.719 | 0.907 | .10966 | 0.849 |
| Increase in population | 0.839 | 0.909 | .12568 | 0.846 |
| Lack of sufficient funding for developers | 0.789 | 0.907 | .11998 | 0.844 |
| Poor maintenance culture | 0.731 | 0.907 | .10600 | 0.841 |
| Low compliance to regulatory and environmental laws | 0.830 | 0.908 | .11557 | 0.841 |
| Land ownership problems | 0.805 | 0.907 | .12708 | 0.836 |
| High rate of urbanisations | 0.827 | 0.908 | .14057 | 0.836 |
| The law on foreclosure | 0.855 | 0.909 | .13299 | 0.836 |
| Cost of importing building materials | 0.809 | 0.909 | .12363 | 0.833 |
| Poor social integration | 0.774 | 0.906 | .14579 | 0.828 |
| Delay issuance of certificate of completion | 0.837 | 0.907 | .13366 | 0.821 |
| Poor financing methods | 0.816 | 0.909 | .12911 | 0.818 |
| Shortages of materials | 0.907 | 0.907 | .13827 | 0.815 |
| Poor infrastructures- [road, water, electricity, telephone, etc.] | 0.769 | 0.909 | .12273 | 0.815 |
| Lack of recreational facilities in the neighbourhoods | 0.824 | 0.908 | .14294 | 0.810 |
| Restrictions on the amount paid in subsidy to low-income households to encourage incentives to work | 0.822 | 0.906 | .14704 | 0.803 |
| Inappropriate standards | 0.750 | 0.906 | .13663 | 0.800 |
| Non-payment of housing loans | 0.800 | 0.909 | .14133 | 0.800 |
| Low awareness on alternative source of funding and procedure for obtaining foreign loans | 0.782 | 0.909 | .14590 | 0.800 |
| Too many speculators | 0.851 | 0.908 | .14799 | 0.795 |
| Cultural issues | 0.796 | 0.906 | .15671 | 0.792 |
| Duplication of roles between state and federal regulatory bodies | 0.878 | 0.907 | .14541 | 0.774 |
| Unlimited documentations | 0.774 | 0.911 | .15598 | 0.749 |

Factor analysis was performed to categorise the factors into similar components. The data were subject to principal component analysis (varimax). The eigenvalue and factor loading were set at 1.0 and 0.4 respectively. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy indicated that the strength of the relationships among variables was moderate (KMO =0.596). Bartlett’s test of sphericity, which tests the overall significance of all the correlations within the correlation matrix, was significant $\chi^2$ (741) = 1392.242, p<0.001), indicating the data were drawn from the same population and that the factors were related. However, some of the factors were removed from the analysis because they produced negative values or falls into more than one group. The factor analysis found 12 underlying components that explained 70% of the total variance. The results will be useful to policy makers towards affordable housing delivery. An analysis of the 12 components suggests that the criteria can be named as: component 1= population; 2=sustainability 3= pricing mechanism; 4=land regulation 5= construction industry; 6=method of procurement; component 7= land ownership; 8=specifications 9= funding; 10=payment; 11=maintenance culture and 12= skilled labour.
Table 2: One-Sample Statistics

| Factor                                      | t    | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | 95% Confidence Interval |
|---------------------------------------------|------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------------|
| Unlimited documentations                    | 1.973| .052            | .30769          | -.0029 - .6183          |
| Too many speculators                       | 3.898| .000            | .57692          | .2822 - .8716           |
| Unsustainable home price appreciation       | 7.680| .000            | .93590          | .6933 - 1.1785          |
| Lack of continuity in government policies   | 9.416| .000            | 1.12821         | .8896 - 1.3668          |
| Shortages of materials                      | 4.821| .000            | .66667          | .3913 - .9420           |
| Land ownership problems                     | 6.457| .000            | .82051          | .5675 - 1.0736          |
| Lack of construction management skills      | 12.010| .000           | 1.57692         | 1.3155 - 1.8384         |
| Sub-standard materials                      | 9.527| .000            | 1.12821         | .8924 - 1.3640          |
| Low quality control                         | 7.844| .000            | .91026          | .6792 - 1.1413          |
| Low household income                        | 9.637| .000            | 1.11538         | .8849 - 1.3459          |
| Unqualified workforce                       | 9.391| .000            | 1.08974         | .8587 - 1.3208          |
| Poorly configured vocational training for the construction professional | 10.281| .000          | 1.16667         | .9407 - 1.3926          |
| Nonconformance to design specifications     | 10.019| .000        | 1.15385         | .9245 - 1.3832          |
| Late delivery                               | 7.743| .000            | .89744          | .6666 - 1.1282          |
| Inappropriate use of materials and methods  | 8.720| .000            | 1.05128         | .8112 - 1.2913          |
| Procurement methods                         | 7.984| .000            | .97436          | .7314 - 1.2174          |
| Lack of database for the construction professionals | 8.192| .000         | 1.00000         | .7569 - 1.2431          |
| Lack of database for artisans               | 7.649| .000            | .97436          | .7207 - 1.2280          |
| Lack of appropriate pricing mechanisms      | 10.567| .000        | 1.21795         | .9884 - 1.4475          |
| Importers fixing prices of construction materials and components arbitrary | 8.073| .000         | 1.03846         | .7823 - 1.2946          |
| Too many unregulated agents in purchase of building materials | 7.716| .000         | 1.01282         | .7514 - 1.2742          |
| Too much attention high housing priced housing | 8.136| .000        | 1.02564         | .7746 - 1.2767          |
| Excessive down payment                      | 7.540| .000            | .85897          | .6321 - 1.0858          |
| Delay issuance of certificate of completion | 5.372| .000            | .71795          | .4518 - .9841           |
| Cost of importing building materials        | 6.326| .000            | .78205          | .5359 - 1.0282          |
| Short mortgage tenure (usually less than 15 years) | 9.555| .000        | 1.01282         | .8017 - 1.2239          |
| “privitising” the provision of the housing subsector by the government | 9.713| .000         | .94872          | .7542 - 1.1432          |
| Fragmented housing policies                 | 7.329| .000            | .96154          | .7003 - 1.2228          |
| Inappropriate standards                     | 5.067| .000            | .69231          | .4202 - .9644           |
| Restrictions on the amount paid in subsidy to low-income households to encourage incentives to work | 4.970| .000         | .73077          | .4380 - 1.0236          |
| Non-payment of housing loans                | 4.354| .000            | .61538          | .3340 - .8968           |
| Factor                                                                 | t      | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | 95% Confidence Interval |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|----------------|----------------|-------------------------|
| Poor financing methods                                              | 5.362  | .000           | .69231         | .4352 – .9494           |
| Poor infrastructures- [road, water, electricity, telephone, etc.]    | 7.208  | .000           | .88462         | .6402 – 1.1290          |
| Increase in population                                              | 7.242  | .000           | .91026         | .6600 – 1.1605          |
| High rate of urbanisations                                          | 6.384  | .000           | .89744         | .6175 – 1.1773          |
| Cultural issues                                                     | 4.336  | .000           | .67949         | .3674 – .9915           |
| Poor social integration                                             | 5.804  | .000           | .84615         | .5559 – 1.1365          |
| Poor consideration of sustainability in housing delivery             | 11.085 | .000           | 1.12821        | .9255 – 1.3309          |
| The appropriate size and mix of housing development for the community at large | 8.737  | .000           | .92308         | .7127 – 1.1335          |
| Lack opportunities for employment in the neighbourhoods              | 7.950  | .000           | .87179         | .6534 – 1.0901          |
| Lack of recreational facilities in the neighbourhoods               | 4.933  | .000           | .70513         | .4205 – .9898           |
| Inadequate measure of the resettlement of those affected by right of way and similar requirements | 8.378  | .000           | 1.11538        | .8503 – 1.3805          |
| Failure or non-implementation of construction standards              | 8.050  | .000           | .93590         | .7044 – 1.1674          |
| Lack of effective implementations of the housing policies           | 10.325 | .000           | 1.23077        | .9934 – 1.4681          |
| Substandard quality of housing units                                | 9.768  | .000           | 1.14103        | .9084 – 1.3736          |
| Harsh housing regulatory/legal framework                             | 11.290 | .000           | 1.24359        | 1.0243 – 1.4629         |
| Lack of access to long term funding for affordable housing           | 9.632  | .000           | 1.08974        | .8645 – 1.3150          |
| The law on foreclosure                                              | 6.556  | .000           | .87179         | .6070 – 1.1366          |
| High costs in title and property registration                       | 8.693  | .000           | .97436         | .7512 – 1.1975          |
| Procurement methods                                                 | 8.588  | .000           | .94872         | .7287 – 1.1687          |
| Construction methods                                                | 8.946  | .000           | .96154         | .7475 – 1.1756          |
| Poor maintenance culture                                            | 9.313  | .000           | .98718         | .7761 – 1.1983          |
| Low compliance to regulatory and environmental laws                 | 6.878  | .000           | .79487         | .5647 – 1.0250          |
| Lack of sufficient funding for developers                           | 7.373  | .000           | .88462         | .6457 – 1.1235          |
| Low awareness on alternative source of funding and procedure for obtaining foreign loans | 5.009  | .000           | .73077         | .4402 – 1.0213          |
| Duplication of roles between state and federal regulatory bodies     | 3.527  | .001           | .51282         | .2233 – .8024           |

The interpretation of the results is complex. In particular, the construction sector related factors are dominants. Though this is contrary to our expectation, but it is not surprising. The plausible interpretation is related to the poor performance of the construction sector. An overview of the performance of the construction was demonstrated earlier in the manuscript. It is also obvious that a major determinant of housing delivery is artificial restrictions due the poor formulations and implementations of government regulations and policies. Mortgage and land allocation policies require examinations. The housing market mechanisms are weak. Government needs to transform the operation of the housing markets. The interventions (e.g. National Housing Fund, Federal mortgage Bank) are not functioning. The mass and social housing programmes require systemic implementations.
5. Concluding comments

This paper has reported a study that identified and categorised the main causes leading to housing shortages. Each of the causes produces significant impacts in the housing shortage. The combination of all the causes created the housing crisis that is widening and if not address together urgently would lead to a more severe crisis. To ensure the continued supply of affordable housing, there is a need for rethinking on the delivery strategy. A new strategy for providing affordable that involves the key stakeholders from the demand and supply sides is needed. ‘Housing governance’ can help matching together the various interest groups in the decision making. At the moment, the government will have to play multiple roles of providing an enabling environment for the housing market and effective and continues housing provision. The housing market is not mature yet, for the government to shift her roles totally to that of enabler only. Government has to stimulate housing development by providing more infrastructures including roads, hospitals, schools, improving water and electricity supply, especially in strategic locations to reduce housing demands in the cities. However, it should be noted, that the main concerns of the study that this study forms part of is to develop a housing governance, therefore, further studies are required to explore the other part of the research. These include the operations of the housing finance market and the requirements of the home owners.
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