

APPLICATION OF FACTOR ANALYSIS FOR THE EVALUATION AND DETERMINATION OF CRITICAL FACTORS RESPONSIBLE FOR URBAN POVERTY IN EKITI STATE, NIGERIA.

BY

**AYENI, Gabriel Olusegun (Ph.D),
Ekiti State Community and Social Development Agency,
Plot 20, Bank Road, Besides GT Bank,
Ado-Ekiti, Nigeria.
e-mail: Segunike@yahoo.com**

AND

**Prof. ADEBAYO, Williams Oluwole,
Department of Geography and Planning Science,
Faculty of the Social Sciences,
Ekiti State University,
Ado- Ekiti, Nigeria.
e-mail: oluwadabayowilli@yahoo.com**

ABSTRACT.

This study focuses on determining and evaluating critical factors contributing to urban poverty in Ekiti State, Nigeria. The data used for the study were collected through the administration of 850 copies of a well structured questionnaire. The Stratified Random Sampling technique was used in the administration of the questionnaire and the analysis was subjected to Factor Analysis. The study reveals that the following factors contributed in various proportions to urban poverty in Ekiti State, Nigeria: Income (14.65%); Housing characteristics (8.98%); Commerce and Communication (5.73%); Educational facilities (4.98%); Roads and drainages (4.08%); Water facilities (3.35%); Securities services (3.18%) etc. The study concludes that, the government should give out short-term loan to the urban poor to establish small-scale enterprises to enhance their income status while low cost housing units should be provided. All necessary infrastructural facilities like roads, electricity, education, health and security be made accessible and affordable to the urban poor.

KEYWORDS: Poverty, Vulnerability, Urbanization, Infrastructural facilities.

1.0: Introduction.

There is no general agreeable definition of poverty but it has been one of the fundamental social problems confronting human race since the existence of man on the planet Earth. Poverty encompasses inadequate income and denial of the basic necessities such as education, health services, clean water and sanitation (World Bank, 2007). It can be seen as an unacceptable deprivation in human well-being that can consist of low monetary income and low consumption levels as well as social deprivation such as risk, vulnerability etc (United Nations, 2001). Poverty, being heterogeneous with multi-dimensional links to problems of hunger, illiteracy, diseases, child

and maternal mortality is a fundamental challenge facing Africa as well as the rest of the World in the 21st century (Carley, Jenkins and Smith, 2001).

In recent decades, there has been explosive growth in global urban populations. In developing countries, 40% to 60% of urban dwellers have inadequate sanitation (Tipping *et al*, 2005), and slum-dwellers (urban poor) are the most vulnerable to sanitation-related diseases because they are the most exposed to unmanaged human excreta and waste (Peterson *et al*, 2007). Africa is currently experiencing the highest rate of urbanization, with a four-fold increase in urban dwellers anticipated between 1990 and 2020, to reach 500 million people (Ndahlahwa, 2005). In tandem with this massive shift has come what Tipping, Adom and Tiaijuka, (2005) call "the rapid urbanization of poverty and ill-health" and the growth and densification of slums.

According to the World Bank (2012), one-third of the people in developing countries who live in cities live in squatter settlements. Most inhabitants in World's cities experience urban poverty. Urban poverty is a multi-dimensional phenomenon. The urban poor live with many deprivations. Their daily challenges may include: limited access to employment opportunities and income, inadequate and insecure housing and services, violent and unhealthy environments, little or no social protection mechanisms and limited access to adequate health and education opportunities.

The urban growth is attributed to both natural population growth and rural to urban migration. Urbanization contributes to sustained economic growth which is critical to poverty reduction. The economies of scale and agglomeration in cities attract investors and entrepreneurs which is good for overall economic growth. Cities also provide opportunities for many, particularly the poor who are attracted by greater job prospects, the availability of services, and for some, an escape from constraining social and cultural traditions in rural villages. Yet, city life can also present conditions of overcrowded living, congestion, unemployment, lack of social and community networks, stark inequalities, and crippling social problems such as crime and violence.

In Nigeria, the urbanization process is similar to what obtains in several other developing countries; as the growth and complexity of human settlements and in particular the rate of urbanization has been phenomenal (Ujoh *et al.*, 2010). Considering its 2006 population figure of over 140 million people- the highest in Sub-Saharan Africa (Ajanlekoko, 2001; FRN, 2007; Jiboye, 2011a); available data however shows that the country has been growing at the rate of 5.5% annually from 1980 to 1993, and recently, its growth has increased to the rate of 5.8%, which has resulted in a total urban population of 62.66 million people (or, 43% of the national population). By projection, this proportion is expected to increase to more than 60% by 2025 (UN, 2007). Consequently, Nigeria has one of the highest urban growth rates, having cities ranked among the fastest growing in the world. Not only is the country experiencing one of the fastest rates of urbanization in the world, its experience has been unique in scale, pervasiveness and historical antecedents. This process has resulted in a very dense network of urban centres (Oladunjoye, 2005); thereby constituting a major problem to the urban residents whose quality of life and living conditions have deteriorated considerably (Ajala, 2005; Jiboye, 2009; 2011a). However, it has been established that the degrading condition of the cities' environment in most developing nations affects the socio-economic and national development (Ogunleye, 2005). Therefore, a major developmental challenge facing the nations, particularly those within the developing world, is how to cope with the increasing urbanization and minimize its adverse consequences on the cities' environment as well as overall wellbeing of the people (Jiboye, 2011b).

The amalgams of the poor state of infrastructure informed Ajunmobi, (2004:32), to comment that Ekiti State is lagging behind in social and economic advancement due to many years of total neglect by the past administrations. Even, the urban centres, including the State capital, are not immune from the pangs of poverty as shown by irregular and epileptic supply of water and

electricity. The housing conditions are very deplorable to the extent that most structures lack basic urban services like water, bathrooms, toilets, kitchens and waste disposals (Ayeni and Bankole, 2015). Therefore, this study not only analyzed issues of household income and sanitation but other measures of poverty like socio-economic indices, housing and housing characteristics, basic urban services – water, bathrooms and toilets, kitchen, market, waste disposal, roads and drains, electricity, security and other services.

2.0: The Study Area.

Geographically, Ekiti State is found between Longitudes 4⁰45' to 5⁰ 45' East of the Greenwich Meridian and on Latitudes 7⁰15' to 8⁰ 5' North of the Equator (Adebayo, 1993) . Ekiti State shares boundaries with Kwara State in the north, Kogi State in the north- east, Osun state in the west and Ondo in the south and south- east (Fig. 1). The state is generally an upland area. It is underlain by metamorphic rocks of the basement complex rocks. It is, thus, an undulating surface consisting of old plains with outcrops dome rocks that may either be found in group or in isolation. These groups of rocks are found in Ado, Eyio, Erinmope, Ikere, Efon and Okemesi. All these areas have distinctively hilly terrain, although most parts of the state are dotted with rugged hills. The nature of the terrain has particularly affected the construction of roads cutting across the hills and in some cases try to boycott the obstructions. This is responsible for the meandering of the roads found across most parts of the State. Ekiti state is located in the tropical climate with distinct wet and dry seasons (Adebayo, 1993:11). The State benefits from the double maxima of rainfalls. The rainy season usually commence from April to October while the dry season resume from late October or at times from November to March with temperature ranges between 21°C and 28°C. The southern part of the State is dominated by the tropical rainforest while the guinea savannah forests are found in the northern part of the State.

The state has a total number of 1,628,762 inhabitants in 1991 head counts (National Population Commission,1991) and with a population of 2,398,957 in 2006 (Ekiti State Planning Commission, 2006). In 2011, Ekiti State population was put at 2,837,814 (NPC, 2014). Ado - Ekiti, the state capital and some other Local Government Headquarters (LGHs) have continued to record a progressive influx of migrants since creation. This situation has tremendous demand for more water supply, housing, employment, electricity as well as the need for more roads due to increase in the volumes of vehicular movements. There is therefore the need to provide adequate and up-to-date information on the available infrastructure to plan and cater for the ever growing teeming population of the State by the government and other Donor Agencies.

covariance among a set of observed variables to describe them in terms of a smaller set of un-observable variables. The un-observable variables called factors, describe the underlining relationship among the original variables. Factors analysis requires a set of data points in matrix form with the row and column identifying the matrix (Olorunleke, 2006).

3.1: Test of Sampling Adequacy

The Bartlett's test of sphericity was used in the test for the appropriateness of the sample from the population and the suitability of factor analysis. It tests for the adequacy of the sample as a true representation of the population under study (Alese and Owayemi, 2004).

Table 1: KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy	.585
Bartlett's Test of sphericity. Approx. Chi-square	93764.147
df	5356
Sig.	.000

Source: SPSS Output, 2014.

In the table 1, a chi-square of 93764.147 was significant at the level of .000. This is an indication of the adequacy of the sample. The Kaiser Meyer Olkin (KMO) test is another measure of sample adequacy. A KMO value of 1 represents a perfectly adequate sample while a KMO of 0 represents a perfectly inadequate sample. The KMO value in table 1, is 0.585, which shows that the sample is reasonably adequate.

3.2: Communalities

The communalities are shown in Appendix II. It shows the proportion of the variance explained by the common factors. The communalities are in the range of 0 and 1, with 0 indicating that the common factors (extracted) explained none of the variances in the variables; and 1 indicating that the common factors explained all the variances in the variables. It could also be expressed as a percentage. For instance, the household size was 0.643 which indicated that 64.3% of the variances in household size were accounted for by the common factors while remaining 35.7% was accounted for by unique (unexplained) factors. The initial communalities were always 1.00 before the extraction of factors because at that initial stage, every variable was regarded as a factor with a mean of 0 and standard deviation of 1 (Appendix II).

3.3.: Factor Extraction

Over one hundred variables used in the study were subjected to factor extraction by principal component. The output of the analysis contained the initial component matrix which was subjected to rotation in order to fine tune the loadings on each factor. The initial eigen values, the percentage variance explained, and the rotation sum of squared loadings were presented in Appendix III. There are two forms of rotation viz: orthogonal and oblique rotation. Orthogonal rotation assumes that the factors are uncorrelated, whereas oblique rotation allows for some minor correlations among factors (Abdi, 2003). The rotation methods explored were varimax, promax, equimax and direct oblimin. Varimax method was adopted based on the fact that it produced more meaningful loadings and also because the rotation converged after twenty five iterations. The result of the varimax rotation was used for interpretation. The rotated component matrix was presented in Appendix III.

The number of factors to be retained was specified on the basis of a social science rule which states that only the variable with a loading equal to or greater than 0.4 in absolute terms and percentage of variance greater than 1 should be considered meaningful and extracted for factor analysis. The result was shown in Appendix III.

4.0: Results and Discussion.

A total of fourteen factors were extracted and based on the loading factor of 2% and above obtained as follows:

Factor 1: Income, 14.65% ;Factor 2: Housing characteristics, 8.98%; Factor 3: Commerce and Communication, 5.725%; Factor 4: Educational facilities, 4.98%; Factor 5: Roads and Drainages, 4.08%; Factor 6: Water facilities, 3.35%; Factor 7, Security services, 3.18%; Factor 8: Health facilities, 2.80%; Factor 9: Electricity supply, 2.45% and Factor 10: Waste management system, 2.38%; etc. The twenty five factors contributed a total of 75.986% while the remaining 24.014% was accounted for by extraneous factors, which are unique to the variables and other variables outside the control of the researcher.

From the results of the analyses, it could be deduced that low income contributed about 14.65% to urban poverty. In the study area, about 32% of the respondents in Ado-Ekiti earned less than N10, 000 in a month while in Ikere- Ekiti, 43.9% of the respondents earned less than N10,000 and in Otun- Ekiti, 64.1% of the respondents earned less than N10,000 in a month. The implication of the salary packages is that majority of the people belonged to the low income group, hence, the bulk of the people were poor with a concomitant effects on the standard of living and propensities to save. These categories of people were mostly peasant farmers found across the State. No wonder, low income accounted majorly to urban poor in Ekiti State.

Housing characteristics accounted for 8.98% of factors explaining the occurrence of urban poverty in the State. Most houses in the spatial urban structure of the State lacked the necessary urban services. Toilets, kitchens, bathrooms were detached from the main building and about 48.6% of the buildings had no water supply. Building structures were very old with average age of 40years, hence, some were already dilapidating. This scenario explained the shortage in the supplies of housing units. Many urban poor resulted to constructing 'make- shift' or live in slum conditions. The trading activities were neither encouraging. People (traders) were only engaged in distributive trade and not manufacturing aspects of production. This resulted into low returns! The data on education service did not favour the urban poor. For example, about 38.4% of respondents confirmed that pupils in primary schools travelled an average minimum distance of 1km in Ado Ekiti to access the service while, 40.1% of the respondents in Ikere Ekiti asserted to the same fact and in Otun Ekiti, 42.3% of the respondents corroborated the same statement. The level of educational services provided was termed to be only fair by 78.0% of the respondents in Ado Ekiti, 63.5% of respondents in Ikere Ekiti and 96.8% respondents in Otun Ekiti. The implication of this was that urban poor were paying more in the course of educating their children since they could not afford private institutions that are usually more costly for them.

Most of the urban poor trekked in the course of their daily activities. This fact was corroborated by 26.5%, 19.5% and 48.0% of the respondents in Ado Ekiti, Ikere Ekiti and Otun Ekiti respectively. The houses of most urban poor were not serviced by any road. About 75.2%, 81.1% and 80.8% of the respondents in Ado Ekiti, Ikere Ekiti and Otun Ekiti respectively concluded that houses were not accessible by roads, even, unpaved road. Poverty therefore determines the location and accessibility of urban poor. They preferred location where they would pay low house rent, even, when not accessible by roads.

The main sources of water in the study area were: pipe-borne water, dug-out wells, boreholes, streams/ rivers and rainfall. In Ado Ekiti, 16.1% of the respondents depended on streams/ rivers while in Ikere Ekiti, 25.9% of the respondents relied on streams/ rivers. In Otun Ekiti, it was only about 3.2% of the respondents usually had their water from streams/rivers. The low figure here may be due to the presence of river dam in the local government area. While only 8.5% of the respondents in Ado Ekiti relied on tap water, 8.1% of the respondents in Ikere Ekiti depended on tap water and in Otun Ekiti, it was 59.2%. The urban poor paid more both in terms of distance, time and cost to access potable water because of their financial status.

Most of the urban poor did not have access to security service. About 53.3% of the respondents in Ado Ekiti confirmed that they did not have access to security services, whereas, in Ikere Ekiti, 65.9% of the respondents attested to the same statement and in Otun Ekiti, 72.0% of the respondents were of the same opinion. Such poor communities usually organized themselves into vigilante groups to provide security services to the community. In the study area, the urban poor had less access to health services than their relatively rich counterpart. In Ado Ekiti for example, 48.2% of the respondents had no access to health services while 40.2% of the respondents in Ikere Ekiti suffered the same fate. About 38.9% of the respondents in Otun Ekiti were denied access to health service provision. The outcome of this was that majority of the urban poor patronized traditional medicare practitioners. This approach usually resulted to premature and untimely death.

In the State generally, the supply of electricity had long been in a comatose. Thus, most of the urban poor used firewood and kerosene as sources of power and fuel. For example, in Ado Ekiti, 12.9% of the respondents had no access to electricity supply while, in Ikere Ekiti, 10.8% of the respondents had no access to electricity and in Otun Ekiti, 13.6% of the respondents were in such dire need of access to electricity. Waste management methods had been very poor and usually, it is the poor that bear the brunt of dirty environment and the ill-health condition emanating from this. In this modern era, the following data showed the percentage of the respondents that were defecating in the open: about 39.6%, 37.3% and 57.6% in Ado Ekiti, Ikere Ekiti and Otun Ekiti respectively.

5.0: Conclusion.

This study identified the determinants of urban poverty in Ekiti - State and the proportion of each of the determinants in explaining the occurrence of urban poverty. It was clearly evidenced that low income earning could not allow the urban poor to have access to most of the urban services like housing, electricity, water, health, toilets and good waste management system. Indeed, infrastructural facilities like education, water, roads and drainages, health and electricity supply were unable to meet up with the increase in the ever surging demand of the urban populace. The reason many live in an urban setting devoid of necessary services- slums and squatters, unemployment, crimes and violence. The urban poor therefore become poorer. It is recommended that short-term and medium-term loans should be made available and accessible to the urban poor to finance small enterprises. This would no doubt enhance their income thereby snowballing to a better living condition. Both the Governments, Donor Agencies and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) should empower the urban poor by training them on one skill or the other so that they can earn a better living condition. The scope of social services needed to be expanded and made affordable to the urban poor while low cost housing units should be provided by the government. Urban planners would find these results (poverty determinants and proportions) useful in planning and administering our urban space in Ekiti State.

REFERENCES.

- Abdi, H. (2003). Factor Rotations in factor analysis: In, M. Lewis-Beck, A. Bryman & T. Futing (eds.). *Encyclopaedia for research methods for Social Sciences* (pp.792-795). thousand Oaks (CA): Sage.
- Adebayo, W.O. (1993). *Weather and Climate*: In, Ebisemiju, F. S. (ed.). Ado - Ekiti Region: a geographical Analysis and Master plan, Lagos, Apha Prints.
- Ajala, O.A. (2005). "Environmental Impact of Urbanization: The Challenges to urban governance in Nigeria". In, Fadare, W et al. (Eds.). Proceedings of the conference on Globalization Culture and the Nigerian Built Environment. Vol. II. Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile- Ife, Nigeria.
- Ajanlekoko, J. S. (2001). *Sustainable Housing Development in Nigeria: The financial and infrastructural implication*. International Conference on Spatial Information for Sustainable Development. Nairobi, Kenya.(Online).Available: www.fig.net/pub/proceedings/nairobi/ajanlekoko-CMWSI.pdf. (March 27, 2009).
- Ajumobi, K. (2004). State of Infrastructure in Ekiti State. *The Punch Newspaper*. Vol. 17, No. 19230. June, 22.
- Alese, B. K. & Owoyemi, S.O. (2004). Factor Analytic approach to Internet usage in South Western Nigeria: *Journal of Information Technology Impact*, 4(3), 171-188.
- Ayeni, G.O. & Bankole, B. O. (2015). Poverty Mapping: Potential application in the analysis of poverty in Ekiti- State, Nigeria. *International Journal of innovative Research and Advanced studies (IJIRAS)*. ISSN: 2394-4404, (Online) Vol.2, Issue 6, 2015.
- Carley, M., Jenkins, P. & Smith, H. (2001). *Urban Development & Civil Society: The role of communities in Sustainable Cities*. Earthscan publications Ltd, London and Sterling, VA.
- Ekiti State Planning Commission, (2008). *Ekiti State Database 2008*.
- Federal Republic of Nigeria (FRN) (2007). *Official Gazette on the breakdown of the National and State Provisional Totals 2006 Census*. S.I. No. 23 of 2007, 94 (24), Lagos.
- Independent National Electoral commission (INEC) (2000). *Guide to Polling/ Registration Centres, Ekiti State*, June, 2000.
- Jiboye, A. D. (2011a). Shelter for the Urban Homeless: The Challenge for Sustainable Cities' Development in Nigeria. *The Built & Human Environment Review*. 4 (2), 14-21.
- Jiboye, A.D. (2011b). Achieving Sustainable Housing Development in Nigeir: A critical Challenge to Governance. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*. 1 (9), 121-127.
- National Population Commission (NPC) (1991). *1991 Nigeria Population Census: Analytical Results at the National level*, Abuja.
- Ndahlahwa, F. M. (2005). Impacts of Population Pressure and Poverty Alleviation Strategies on Common Property Resource Availability in Rural Tanzania. *African Journal of Environment Assessment and Management*. Ajeam- Ragee, 10: 26-49.
- Ogunleye, B. (2005). *Environmental Degradation Control for Sustainable Urban Growth in Nigeria*. In, W. Fadare, et al. (Eds). Proceedings of the Conference on Globalization, Culture and the Nigerian Built Environment. Vol. II. Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Nigeria.
- Oladunjoye, A. O. (2005). *Nigeria: Implementation of the Sustainable Cities Programme in Nigeria*. Localizing Agenda 21 Programme. United Nations Programme for Human Settlements. (UN- HABITAT). United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP).

- Havana, Cuba. (Online). Available: www.unhabitat.org/scp-http://www.unhabitat.org/1a21. (September 30, 2010).
- Olorunleke, G.K. (2006). *Managing Customer for brand equity in Carbonated soft drinks market in Nigeria*. A case study of Pepsi. An unpublished Ph.D thesis in marketing, University of Ilorin, Nigeria.
- Oluwadare, S. A. (2006). Performance evaluation and indices of cyber Cafe business. A Factor Analytic Approach. *Journal of Information Communication and Technology*, 7, pp.89-102.
- Paterson, C., Mara, D. and Curtis, T. (2007). Pro-poor Sanitation Technologies. *Geo-forum*. Springer, 10: 260-275.
- Tipping, D. C., Adom, D, and Tiaijuka, A. C. (2005). *UN-Habitat Achieving Healthy Urban Futures in the 21st Century: New Approach to Financing and Governance of Access to Clean Drinking Water and Basic Sanitation as a Global Public Good*. UN- HABITAT.
- Ujoh, F., Kwabe, I.D. and Ifatimehin, O.O. (2010). Understanding Urban Sprawl in the Federal Capital City, Abuja: Towards Sustainable Urbanization in Nigeria. *Journal of Geography and Regional Planning*.3 (5). 106-113.(Online). Available: <http://www.academicjournals.org/JGRP> (July 19, 2011).
- United Nations. (2001). *Report Nigeria (1999-2000). Achieving Growth and Equity*. 2000. United Nation's Development.
- United Nations. (2007). *Commission on Sustainable Development*. Fifth Session Report, 7-25, New York: UN.
- World Bank. (2001). *Poverty in the Midst of Plenty: The Challenge of Growth with Inclusion*. Report No. 14733, Washington D.C.
- World Bank. (2012). *Cities in Transition: A strategic View of Urban and Local Government Issues*. World Bank Infrastructural Group Urban Development, Washington, D.C.: World Bank.

APPENDIX I.

Classification of Communities into Towns, Villages, Hamlets and Farmstead by
Local Government, 2008.

S/N	Local Government	No. of Communities	Towns		Villages		Hamlets		Farmsteads	
			No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1	Ado- Ekiti	66	1	1.52	-	0	3	4.55	62	93.93
2	Efon- Alaaye	131	1	0.76	-	0	2	1.53	128	97.71
3	Ekiti East	34	3	8.82	2	5.88	2	5.88	27	97.41
4	Ekiti South West	34	3	8.82	-	-	-	-	31	91.18
5	Ekiti West	51	5	9.80	2	3.92	1	1.96	43	84.31
6	Emure	82	1	1.21	1	1.21	-	-	80	97.56
7	Gbonyin	76	6	7.89	2	2.63	1	1.31	67	88.16
8	Ido/ Osi	79	7	8.86	4	5.06	2	2.53	66	83.54
9	Ijero	75	9	12.00	4	5.33	1	1.33	61	81.33
10	Ikere	51	1	1.96	1	1.96	4	7.84	45	88.24
11	Ikole	160	3	1.87	14	8.75	18	11.25	125	78.13
12	Ilejemeje	11	1	9.09	5	45.45	-	-	5	45.45
13	Irepodun / Ifelodun	29	3	10.34	3	10.34	5	17.24	18	62.07
14	Ise / Orun	66	1	1.51	2	3.03	3	4.54	60	90.91
15	Moba	24	2	8.33	8	33.33	3	12.50	11	45.83
16	Oye	74	8	10.81	2	2.70	3	2.05	61	82.43
	TOTAL	1,043	55	-	50	-	48	-	890	-

Source: Ekiti State Database, State Planning Commission, 2008.

APPENDIX II.

COMMUNALITIES.	Initial	Extraction
V5a - Age	1	0.763629467
V5b - Gender	1	0.685102491
V6 - Marital Status	1	0.766737448
V7 - Level of Education	1	0.756215885
V8 - Religion	1	0.684533737
V9 - Occupation	1	0.776034286
V10 - Household Size	1	0.642613981
V11 - Average Monthly Income (in Naira)	1	0.78422159
V12 - Is the retail market in the area adequate	1	0.690102492
V13 - Estimated distance of the nearest retail shops to house	1	0.716718831
V14 - Distance to place of work	1	0.719599468
V15 - Mode of Travel	1	0.76321906
V16a - Type of Accomodation Building	1	0.894061434
V16b - No of People Living in the Building	1	0.727058568
V16c - No of Floor	1	0.880704779
V16d - No of Rooms	1	0.793608567
V17 - Nature of Occupancy	1	0.760105058
V18 - if rented, How much is paid as rent monthly(in Naira)	1	0.658703529
V19 - Age of Building (in Years)	1	0.718352435
V20 - Materials used for wall construction	1	0.756807321
V21 - If storey building, materials used for decking	1	0.850500769
V22 - Roofing Materials	1	0.669832684
V23 - Wall Finishing	1	0.627539454
V24 - Condition of Wall	1	0.72293327
V25 - Structural Condition of Building	1	0.771054462
V26 - Is the Building Accessible by Road	1	0.67230294
V27 - Source of Drinking Water	1	0.83889667
V28 - Source of Cooking and Washing water	1	0.869402708
V29 - If Pipe-borne water, how regular is the supply?	1	0.836028419
V30 - Do you pay for pipe borne water?	1	0.754239124
V31 - if yes, how much do you pay per month?	1	0.668461229
V32 - Agency Responsible for Water Supply	1	0.700433355
V33 - Distance of Water Source to the HH	1	0.780173284
V34 - Water Resources Location	1	0.766781682
V35 - Location of Bathroom	1	0.862654874
V36 - Number of Households using a bathroom	1	0.924484013
V37 - Location of Toilets	1	0.872307997
V38 - Number of Households using a toilet	1	0.927727731
V39 - Type of Toilet	1	0.749684953
V40 - Location of Kitchen	1	0.90146237
V41 - Number of Households using a Kitchen	1	0.930128632
V42 - Types of Energy used in Kitchen	1	0.59540823
V43 - Distance of Nearest Market	1	0.772502208
V44 - Range of Goods sold in the market	1	0.720121806
V45 - Description of Market Environment	1	0.786658499

V46 - Are there shopping malls and/or supermarkets around?	1	0.724994478
V47 - Type of Market wanted	1	0.704529422
V49 - What types of goods would you want them to sell	1	0.716589
V50a - Types of Waste generated	1	0.701423801
V50b - Method of waste storage	1	0.635378228
V51 - Methods of Waste Disposal	1	0.680965189
V52 - Frequency of Collection	1	0.739327274
V53 - Condition of Drainage System	1	0.671113034
V54 - Type or Class of Road in Locality	1	0.788554336
V55 - Condition of Road	1	0.717649158
V56 - Is the road provided with drainage?	1	0.822422126
V57 - If yes, kind of drainage available	1	0.727914807
V58 - Do you have difficulty in accessing your house?	1	0.8113596
V59 - If yes, what is responsible for inaccessibility?	1	0.814248506
V60 - Means of Access to your house	1	0.725437291
V61 - Source of Electricity Supply	1	0.640613689
V62 - If PHCN, what is the distance of the Nearest Transformer to the House?	1	0.798908758
V63 - Average Monthly Bill Paid by the Household	1	0.799381057
V64a - Category of Health Facilities	1	0.724545391
V64b - Ownership of Health Facility	1	0.745374314
V65 - Condition of Health Facility	1	0.636822639
V66 - Do you have a Police Post in the Neighbourhood?	1	0.822447674
V67 - If available, State type	1	0.790109023
V68 - Distance of Nearest Police Station to House	1	0.845472275
V69 - Distance of Nearest Fire Station to House	1	0.818285227
V70 - Do you have Postal Agency in your Neighbourhood?	1	0.667820593
V71 - Is there neighbourhood Vigilante in this Area?	1	0.811977898
V72 - How Effective are they?	1	0.827974178
V73 - Who Pays for Security Services?	1	0.844076102
V74 - Type of Communication Gadget owned	1	0.674406246
V75a - Educational Facilities Available	1	0.774549391
V75b - Ownership of Educational Facilities	1	0.654701247
V75c - Distance to HH	1	0.644238708
V76 - Rating of the Level of Service Delivery provided in Locality	1	0.704814872
V77 - Priority Projects in Community	1	0.703957741
V78 - Before Facilities were provided, were the people consulted ?	1	0.925775675
V79 - If yes, At what Satges were they involved?	1	0.927121413
V80a - Type of Religious Centers	1	0.771675214
V80b - Numbers of Religious Centers	1	0.71309901
V81a - Type of Recreational/Cultural Facilities Available	1	0.881144519
V81b - Number of Recreational/Cultural Facilities	1	0.870790246
V82 - Are you a Member of any Voluntary Organization?	1	0.657494297
V83a - Area of Intervention	1	0.712217342
V83b -	1	0.713502642
V84 - How Accessible is Land to Womenfolk for Housing/Property Development	1	0.81459562
V85 - Commonest Gender Related Vices/Crimes	1	0.804524896
V86 - Cultural Heritage Facilities Available in Neighbourhood	1	0.668249626
V87 - Condition of Drainage System	1	0.724760688

V88 - Environmental Condition in Neighbourhood	1	0.620230878
V89 - As there been an incident of Outbreak of Communicable Diseases before?	1	0.864967759
V90 - If yes, What are the likely Cause?	1	0.820019501
V91 - Usual Health Problem caused by Environmental Conditions	1	0.662070957
V92 - What Attracted you to Area?	1	0.640374695
V93 - Would you Relocate from Area if Other Options are Available?	1	0.877091176
V94 - If No, why?	1	0.903025073
V95 - If yes, where else in the town?	1	0.844749575
V96 - Planning Agency Responsible for Development Control	1	0.652571956
V97 - Sources of Noise in Neighbourhood	1	0.758758619
V98 - Observed Effects of Noise on Individuals and Families	1	0.77393564
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.		

APPENDIX III.

Total Variance Explained						
Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	15.23548041	14.6495004	14.6495004	15.23548041	14.6495004	14.6495004
2	9.337435396	8.978303265	23.62780366	9.337435396	8.978303265	23.62780366
3	5.953564515	5.724581265	29.35238493	5.953564515	5.724581265	29.35238493
4	5.18236709	4.983045279	34.33543021	5.18236709	4.983045279	34.33543021
5	4.247202074	4.083848148	38.41927836	4.247202074	4.083848148	38.41927836
6	3.484381415	3.350366745	41.7696451	3.484381415	3.350366745	41.7696451
7	3.310389974	3.183067283	44.95271238	3.310389974	3.183067283	44.95271238
8	2.910712274	2.798761802	47.75147418	2.910712274	2.798761802	47.75147418
9	2.549870181	2.451798251	50.20327244	2.549870181	2.451798251	50.20327244
10	2.478736902	2.383400867	52.5866733	2.478736902	2.383400867	52.5866733
11	2.412097282	2.319324309	54.90599761	2.412097282	2.319324309	54.90599761
12	2.297837449	2.209459086	57.1154567	2.297837449	2.209459086	57.1154567
13	2.067802476	1.988271612	59.10372831	2.067802476	1.988271612	59.10372831
14	1.939926322	1.865313771	60.96904208	1.939926322	1.865313771	60.96904208
15	1.855093505	1.783743755	62.75278584	1.855093505	1.783743755	62.75278584
16	1.72714951	1.660720683	64.41350652	1.72714951	1.660720683	64.41350652
17	1.619953195	1.557647303	65.97115382	1.619953195	1.557647303	65.97115382
18	1.584256549	1.523323605	67.49447743	1.584256549	1.523323605	67.49447743
19	1.532218034	1.473286572	68.967764	1.532218034	1.473286572	68.967764
20	1.391207637	1.337699651	70.30546365	1.391207637	1.337699651	70.30546365
21	1.270559606	1.221691929	71.52715558	1.270559606	1.221691929	71.52715558
22	1.204015646	1.157707352	72.68486293	1.204015646	1.157707352	72.68486293
23	1.170767997	1.125738459	73.81060139	1.170767997	1.125738459	73.81060139
24	1.151717116	1.107420304	74.91802169	1.151717116	1.107420304	74.91802169
25	1.110239518	1.067537998	75.98555969	1.110239518	1.067537998	75.98555969
26	0.992169147	0.954008795	76.93956849			
27	0.978713459	0.941070633	77.88063912			
28	0.957454542	0.920629367	78.80126849			
29	0.939289366	0.903162852	79.70443134			
30	0.904522724	0.869733389	80.57416473			
31	0.878363261	0.844580059	81.41874479			
32	0.839057556	0.806786111	82.2255309			
33	0.817375257	0.785937747	83.01146864			
34	0.789725628	0.759351565	83.77082021			
35	0.761819063	0.73251833	84.50333854			
36	0.727532313	0.699550301	85.20288884			
37	0.692482624	0.665848677	85.86873752			
38	0.666526409	0.640890778	86.5096283			
39	0.629435201	0.605226155	87.11485445			
40	0.579254363	0.556975349	87.6718298			

41	0.574900558	0.552788998	88.2246188		
42	0.568286256	0.546429092	88.77104789		
43	0.532846192	0.512352108	89.2834		
44	0.522462641	0.502367924	89.78576792		
45	0.499446864	0.48023737	90.26600529		
46	0.464729949	0.44685572	90.71286101		
47	0.446924734	0.429735321	91.14259633		
48	0.441157274	0.424189687	91.56678602		
49	0.429482304	0.412963754	91.97974977		
50	0.411812384	0.395973446	92.37572322		
51	0.405473026	0.38987791	92.76560113		
52	0.383261449	0.368520624	93.13412175		
53	0.36517989	0.35113451	93.48525626		
54	0.346961441	0.33361677	93.81887303		
55	0.339023832	0.325984454	94.14485749		
56	0.327240997	0.314654805	94.45951229		
57	0.319574256	0.307282939	94.76679523		
58	0.30723336	0.295416692	95.06221192		
59	0.29569732	0.284324346	95.34653627		
60	0.28521122	0.274241558	95.62077783		
61	0.263567042	0.253429848	95.87420767		
62	0.259326379	0.249352288	96.12355996		
63	0.239194325	0.229994543	96.35355451		
64	0.229943259	0.221099288	96.57465379		
65	0.220475758	0.211995921	96.78664971		
66	0.214754073	0.206494301	96.99314401		
67	0.202307593	0.194526532	97.18767055		
68	0.192684671	0.185273722	97.37294427		
69	0.187037393	0.179843647	97.55278792		
70	0.176748006	0.169950005	97.72273792		
71	0.166532835	0.160127726	97.88286565		
72	0.160697008	0.154516354	98.037382		
73	0.155097952	0.149132646	98.18651465		
74	0.144282094	0.138732782	98.32524743		
75	0.132654508	0.127552411	98.45279984		
76	0.131375655	0.126322745	98.57912259		
77	0.127957353	0.123035916	98.7021585		
78	0.118293704	0.113743946	98.81590245		
79	0.107055582	0.10293806	98.91884051		
80	0.10430173	0.100290125	99.01913063		
81	0.099353782	0.095532482	99.11466312		
82	0.095235268	0.091572373	99.20623549		
83	0.091835039	0.088302922	99.29453841		
84	0.080388885	0.077297005	99.37183541		
85	0.075206497	0.07231394	99.44414935		
86	0.071630315	0.068875303	99.51302466		
87	0.061542827	0.059175796	99.57220045		
88	0.056901097	0.054712593	99.62691305		
89	0.053612091	0.051550088	99.67846313		

90	0.047521966	0.045694198	99.72415733			
91	0.042586931	0.040948972	99.7651063			
92	0.039323046	0.037810621	99.80291693			
93	0.039032132	0.037530896	99.84044782			
94	0.035011159	0.033664576	99.8741124			
95	0.025936379	0.024938826	99.89905122			
96	0.023824978	0.022908633	99.92195986			
97	0.019558888	0.018806623	99.94076648			
98	0.017332712	0.016666069	99.95743255			
99	0.01444024	0.013884846	99.97131739			
100	0.012287176	0.011814593	99.98313199			
101	0.008557175	0.008228053	99.99136004			
102	0.005858356	0.005633035	99.99699308			
103	0.002733126	0.002628006	99.99962108			
104	0.000394075	0.000378919	100			
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.						