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CHAPTER ONE

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Buildings or structures that individuals and their family may live in that meet certain federal regulations. Different housing situations vary for individuals and may depend on age, family, and geographic location (businessdictionary.com, n.d.) It can also be regarded as a system made up of shelter and the supporting basic infrastructure required by man. It is a basic human need in every society and is considered a fundamental right of every individual (Akinwunmi, 2009).

The right to housing is embedded in various international instruments including the United Nations Human Rights Declaration of 1948, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights of 1966, the Istanbul Declaration and Habitat Agenda of 1996 and the Declaration on Cities and other Human Settlements of 2001 (RepublicofKenya, 2004). The right to housing is further embedded in the Constitution of Kenya 2010. Article 43 (1b) of the Constitution provides that every person has the right to accessible and adequate housing, and to reasonable standards of sanitation. Nabutola (Nabutola, May 22-27, 2004) has equated shelter to food, which is a human need, so much so that those who cannot afford it still need it.

Inequality refers to disparities between individuals, groups and nations (Wright, 2008), as inequality increases in any society, the gap between rich and poor widens and the patterns across the income spectrum can be complex. (Anderson & Sim, 2015)

Improved housing conditions save lives, reduce disease, increase quality of life, reduce poverty, mitigate climate change and contribute to achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals for Health (SDG 3) and Sustainable Cities (SDG 11). A fast-changing climate, conflict, inequality,
persistent pockets of poverty and hunger and rapid urbanization are challenging countries’ efforts to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) (UN, 2018).

The world’s urban population will double by 2050 and will require housing solutions. Since over 90% of urban growth is in developing cities, informal settlement and slum dwellers are likely to grow dramatically. In both developed and developing countries improving housing conditions and reducing health risks in the home is thus critically important (WHO, Healthy housing Raising standards, reducing inequalities, 2016)

This assessment of poverty and inequality comes at an important juncture for Kenya. The recent elections and pronouncements of the handshake have underlined the salience of these issues to ordinary Kenyans, and for policy makers. The violence in January-March, 2008 highlighted the importance of addressing poverty and inequality as major goals in their own right, but also for instrumental reasons—since growth is unlikely to be sustained in the presence of severe inequalities which increase the risk of conflict. This underlines the value of appropriate diagnostics about the patterns of poverty and inequality in informing public debates, strategies and actions to overcome exclusion from the benefits of growth and development in Kenya.

1.1 Background of the Study

Since the early times, man has made relentless efforts to obtain housing. The struggle for this basic need has increased progressively as the human race has advanced in numbers and cultural diversity. Housing has economic, social and political roles and is an indicator of development and welfare in a country (Chirchir, 2006). On the economic front, investment in housing contributes towards reducing poverty, generating employment, raising incomes, improving health and
increasing productivity of the labour force. Housing plays a major role in serving as an asset (Alhashimi & Dwyer, 2004)

The megacities in word according to (Köhler, 2012) avoid slums by successful integration and planning. The political will of the mega cities to have better living conditions and hostable cities lies in their political policies and policy implementation. It requires political will to steer the unavoidable streams of people moving from rural areas not only to smaller cities but also to giant megacities, and to take steps to ensure they are appropriately housed. A role that the government in Kenya has largely neglected.

Housing has the potential to reduce or reinforce health inequalities. It exerts a substantial influence on health and wellbeing through several linked routes, including: the affordability of homes; the quality of homes; and the role of the home as a platform for inclusion in community life. Access to adequate housing is enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The United Nations (UN) Habitat Commission (2001) described the key aspects of adequate housing as including: security of tenure, affordability, habitability, and equal and nondiscriminatory access. Poverty levels can be expressed ‘before housing costs’ or ‘after housing costs’. The latter can give a more complete picture, and the differences between the two measures highlights how important housing affordability is to poverty. (Housing and health inequalities, 2016)

The discussion around changing from MDGs to the adoption of SDGs, goes around the unprecedented proliferation of slums and informal settlements, and a chronic lack of adequate housing, which continues to be amongst the major challenges of urbanization (Habitat, n.d.). Slums, informal settlements and inadequate housing remain the visible manifestations of poverty and inequality in cities Kenya not excluded. Inadequate housing complements the measurement of slums, particularly in the developed world, in order not to leave anyone behind.
The issue of women and affordability of houses has been raised by the existing method and data through the Urban Indicators Program (1996-2006), it shows that the affordability is measured as the net monthly expenditure on housing cost that exceed 30% of the total monthly income of any household which is a high number to go by considering the many expenses a household has monthly. Inadequate housing affects women disproportionately and manifests in the form of the number of women-headed households in urban poverty (Habitat, n.d.). There are many other hurdles to women in obtaining decent shelter such as laws and practices that do not support women’s equal rights to land and housing and this largely contributes to housing and inequality.

No society should expect or desire complete equality of income at a given point in time, for a number of reasons. First, most workers receive relatively low earnings in their first few jobs, higher earnings as they reach middle age, and then lower earnings after retirement. Thus, a society with people of varying ages will have a certain amount of income inequality. Second, people’s preferences and desires differ. Some are willing to work long hours to have income for large houses, fast cars and computers, luxury vacations, and the ability to support children and grandchildren. (University, 2013)

The importance of housing stands in contrast to the current housing situation in most cities of developing countries. While a number of countries have responded to their respective housing problems, majority of developing countries still face acute housing deficits. The reasons for poor housing conditions in developing countries is a combination of poor policies and the limited resources available to meet the investment needs of rapid urban population growth. This has given rise to substantial gaps between housing supply and demand in most cities of the developing world leading to high house prices in these countries and increased slum occupation. In the developing countries of Africa, almost every country is experiencing a housing shortage which in most cases
is growing. According to UN-habitat (2011), estimates of housing deficits for the period 2001-2011 indicated that over 60 million new dwellings needed to be constructed to accommodate the rapidly growing number of new urban households in Africa. The condition of housing in these countries is also very poor, with majority of people living in slums and informal settlements. A UN-habitat global audit on slums in 2001 showed that 3 out of 10 inhabitants living in urban areas were slums dwellers. Among the regions of the world, Sub-Saharan Africa has the highest slum growth rate of 4.53% per annum and also the highest proportion of slum dwellers at 61.7% in 2010 (UN-habitat, 2011).

The President of Kenya, Uhuru Kenyatta on Tuesday, December 12 2017 highlighted four pillars of his vision for economic development among the pillars he included 500,000 affordable homes, adding to the already ongoing upgrade of the slums in Kenya (Big four action plan, 2017). In 2004, the GoK launched a large-scale program to improve slums—The Kenya Slum Upgrading Program (KENSUP). The objective of the program is to provide physical, social, economic, organizational and environmental improvements as a means of enhancing the living conditions of slum dwellers. The intention was to construct 150,000 housing units yearly, of which about 60,000 targeted slum dwellers, with the rest redressing inadequate urban and rural housing. The Government planned to provide seed funds of, but the program is to be largely financed by development partners (WorldBank, 2008).

KENSUP’s plan to build new housing units for slum residents has faces difficulties. The multi-storey walk-up apartment buildings with three-room units that are being constructed are relatively expensive and will reach very few of the current slum resident, in Nairobi only 22 percent have access to electricity and 19 percent have access to piped water in the form of an in-house
connection or a yard tap. The housing upgrade has been characterized by small, more crowded, and constructed with worse building materials. (WorldBank, 2008)

Kibera, Nairobi largest, poorest, and most populated slum, KENSUP calls specifically for the temporary relocation of residents to adjacent "decanting sites," allowing the construction of permanent dwellings to proceed in the “Kiberan” villages. As of September 2009, the first decanting site was under construction, and by early 2010 the first families moved. These temporary apartments, however, while providing “Kiberans” with some comfort such as electricity and lower rents, were considered to be problematic due to lack of intermittent supply of piped water and relative great distance from many essential services residents find within Kibera, such as nursing homes, schools, health clinics, pharmacies, water sources and access to transportation, according to reports found on Voice of Kibera

KENSUP, a project by the Kenyan government and UN-Habitat, aimed to improve the livelihoods of people living and working in Kenya’s informal settlements through the provision of security of tenure, housing improvement, income generation, and physical and social planning and implementation of the project.

1.2 Statement of the problem

Over time, Kenya has experienced rapid urbanization which has brought enormous challenges manifested in the acute shortage of quality housing. This results into overcrowding, high house prices, substandard human settlement conditions especially in the slums which are densely populated. It is estimated that about 100,000 new houses are built in Kenya yearly which is far less the market demand of about 500,000 units. A large percentage of this units are either bought or rented by the middle class.
Standard and quality housing is one of the basic human rights that the Constitution of Kenya 2010 in article 43 guarantees Kenyans. It provides for among others the right to clean, decent and affordable housing by the government. As a result of this constitutional responsibility, the government has been initiating projects aimed at addressing housing shortage but above all upgrading the slum housing in Kibera for phase one and two. The cost of housing and quality of housing are important indicators of inequalities that this research is addressing with particular focus on Kibera Slum Upgrading Project as a Case Study. A careful review of the slum upgrading project in Kibera would indicate that major issues on the effectiveness of the initiative determines the pace and rate at which the government is able to address housing inequalities in the country.

1.3 Objectives of the Study
The general objective of the study was to review the effectiveness of slum upgrading initiatives to reduce housing inequalities in Kenya. The research is a case study of Kibera slum in Nairobi.

1.3.1 The specific objectives of the study
The study was to determine the following objectives:

1. To determine the factors leading to housing inequality.
2. Review the slum upgrading policy implementation effectiveness on reducing housing inequalities.
3. To find out how effectively the Kibera Slum upgrading project/s have reduced housing inequalities.

1.4 Research Questions
The study was guided by the following research questions:

1. What factors lead to housing inequality?
2. How has the slum upgrading policy been implemented to reduce housing inequalities?

3. How has the Kibera Slum upgrading project/s reduced housing inequalities?

**1.5 Justification of the study**

The analyses and findings from this research will be of interest to researchers, academicians and policy makers. Researchers are keen to find out why despite the effort by the Kenyan government to reduce inequality, housing in Kenya remains to be a thing for the rich. Researchers can use this study as a reference point. Policy makers can use this study as a guide in designing developing and implementing policies to regulate growth and equality in this sector. The policy makers can also use the findings to improve the housing affordability to Kenyans of all social settings and sustained housing affordability which is necessary towards the realization of Kenya Vision 2030 and the realization of Uhuru’s big four agendas. The main goal of Vision 2030 with regard to housing is to increase production of housing and to achieve better development and access to affordable housing among all the households in Kenya. The findings will also help in providing information necessary to guide general development agenda and the realization of SDGs. The government can use the findings of this study in allocation of the houses instead of using the suggested ruffles tickets to allocate houses to a majority of its citizens as the aim to meet the big four agenda.

**1.6 Scope of the Study**

The study was conducted in Kibera constituency, Nairobi County, Kenya specifically in the Kibera slum and with the ministry of housing and planning Kenya to have a holistic approach to the whole issue. Kibera is one of seventeen constituencies in the county. It is located to the southwest of the City of Nairobi.
1.7 Limitations of the Study

The study required time, patience and determination and some of the challenges encountered during the study included logistics, financials and time management. The researchers’ assumption that during the collection of the questionnaires will be home also presented to be a challenge as there was no indication on when the respondents were likely to be home. To counter the challenge, the researcher made appointments with a number of respondents and collected the questionnaires in time. Several house structures were also inaccessible to the study and the locality was confusing to the non-dwellers. To counter this challenge, the researcher had someone who was familiar with the locality take them round to come up with a conclusive and extensive research.

1.8 Chapter Summary

Chapter one presented the background information on housing agenda and reducing inequality in Kenya. The chapter identified the knowledge gap and explained the significance of the study. The chapter also showed a guideline of the whole thesis.

1.9 Structure of the thesis

Chapter one: presents the background information on assessing the housing agenda to reduce inequality in Kenya. The chapter identified the knowledge gap and explained the significance of the study. It also covered the research questions which were focused on in this study.

Chapter two: covered the literature review based on the three research questions. It provided a theoretical background on an assessment of the housing agenda to reduce inequality in Kenya. This chapter was divided into three sections according to the research questions.
Chapter three: describes the methodology that was used to carry out data analysis and presentation in this the study. The population has also been identified as a sample from Kibera slum. The chapter has also shown the research procedure and data analysis methods used.

Chapter four: covers the research findings. It reports on the findings analyzed from the questionnaires that were sent out to members of different groups. It contains information relating to the three areas of the specific research objectives.

Chapter five: it covers the research summary, conclusions and recommendations. It further covers the future research that emanates from the study.
CHAPTER TWO

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Introduction

This chapter presents a review of literature with particular attention paid to the various variables of this study, that is, the effectiveness of slum upgrade to reduce housing inequalities. It provides in-depth analysis of literature on affordable housing reducing inequality, reducing the housing inequalities and how income levels influence the quality of housing. Through this systematic review a deeper understanding of the variables is achieved. This chapter will review literature from journals, research papers, articles and books written by authors in related field of study. In addition, recent research studies relating to the issues this study addressed are also highlighted. Each subsection derives directly from the research question of the study.

2.1 Factors Leading to Housing Inequality

There is a serious gap between what people earn and how much of their income they must spend on rent. Tight standards for mortgage loans and high home prices have locked many would-be homebuyers out the market (Narasimhan, Fixing Housing Is Key to Addressing Income Inequality, 2015). At the same time, much new rental construction has been focused on luxury apartments. A scarce supply of affordable rental options has resulted in historically low vacancy rates and skyrocketing rents this leaves the question of most of the Kenyans who can barely afford housing out of the question. Meanwhile, wages for most low- and middle-income households are stagnant. Housing supply and affordability plays a large role in creating differences in housing markets and labor markets across urban areas. Housing affordability within an urban area has implications for local labor markets and the local economy (Baranoff, Housing Affordability and Income
Income inequality is among the top challenges for policy makers globally. In a recent survey of 1,767 leaders from academia, business, government and non-profits, The World Economic Forum’s Global Agenda Council found increasing income inequality to be top global concern in 2015.

There are also intergenerational effects of housing on inequality. If affordable housing decreases, wealthy families and lower income families become more segregated. This leads to greater differences in education for the children of poor and rich families. For example, research shows parents can make it more likely for their children to grow up to be high income earning adults through the education and the peers that their children have. Coch (2016) argues that those who have a better-quality schooling are more likely to earn more as adults. Because of this research also indicates wealthy parents have an incentive to cluster into neighborhoods with other wealthy families, to decrease the cost of providing high quality education for their children, and for other social reasons. If there is less affordable housing it makes it easier for this segregation to occur, increasing inequality (Coch, 2016). This thus brings out the question of does the government have the right to provide housing to any of it citizens?

One most commonly cited cause of rising housing income inequality in the developing countries is globalization. Globalization is often understood as the phenomenon of increased international integration, characterized by the movement of people, technology, commodities and ideas across national boundaries (Abeysinghe & Hao, 2014). While many studies have looked at the income distribution effect of globalization, there are variations in the measure used to capture globalization itself. It should be noted that globalization is a complex phenomenon that realizes through many different channels – economic, social and technological, just to name a few. Coupled with the
problem of data availability, existing studies have leveraged on a few more prominent measures of globalization (Abeysinghe & Hao, 2014). Yet with all the effects globalization has brought, equality would be one of them because it presents almost a fair chance to balance the operations and to copy models in this case from the megacities who have almost successfully avoided slums.

The link between income inequality and housing prices is not a well-researched area. A limited number of studies have focused on the impact of rising income inequality on housing prices. (Abeysinghe & Hao, 2014) suggest that reverse impact does not seem to be an area that caught the attention of researchers. When housing wealth cannot be monetized easily, rapid increases in house prices may widen the income gap in a country through income redistribution away from home buyers for owner occupation to property developers, rental property owners and financiers. Although this redistribution effect is largely reflected in non-labour earnings. (Abeysinghe & Hao, 2014). Income and house ownership are directly linked, and a number of slum dwellers hardly have any income to afford the non-subsidized housing from the government.

Kenya hosts some of the most dense unsanitary and insecure slums in the world. Yahya and Nzioki (1993), in their study of informal settlements in Kenya, noted among other things that slums have been growing in most cities in Kenya at a rate faster than the urban population growth. Most of the slums in Kenya are found within the capital city, Nairobi which currently has an estimated population of over 3 million people, 60% of whom are residing in informal slums. Paradoxically, in terms of actual physical space, those living in informal settlements occupy only 5% of the city’s residential land. More than 200 informal settlements in Nairobi are crammed into this tight space accommodating more than half of the city’s residents. Examples of slum settlements in Nairobi include Kibera, Mukuru Kwa Njenga and Mathare valley slum. Kibera is one of the largest slum settlement in Africa, accommodating the largest population density of any slum in Nairobi, where
roughly 2500 people live per hectare or per 10,000 square meters of land, that is, on average one person per every four square meters (Cohre, 2008).

2.2 Slum Upgrading Policy Implementation Effectiveness on Reducing Housing Inequalities

Improved housing conditions can save lives, prevent disease, increase quality of life, reduce poverty, and help mitigate climate change. Housing is becoming increasingly important to health in light of urban growth, ageing populations and climate change (WHO, WHO Housing and Health Guidelines, 2018). Ensuring everyone lives in healthy and safe dwellings has implications for national, regional and local governments who play a major role by setting overall standards and legal context for housing construction and renovation.

Choices of housing types, quality, size and location are shaped by a number of economic, social and demographic factors. These factors affect the features that the house will provide to its occupants (e.g. durability, building materials, accessibility etc.) and whether they can afford the cost of operating and maintaining it. Globally, across low-, middle- and high-income countries, low-income earners are more likely to live in housing that exposes them to health risks. For example, in Cambodia, toilet facilities are only available to 29% of households in the lowest income quintile, compared with 79% of households in the highest income quintile (47, 48). In Guatemala, 89% of the lowest income quintile have dirty floors, compared with 4% of the highest income quintile. This inequality in housing conditions goes beyond whether people are rich or poor. In some countries certain groups, including indigenous people, minority populations, single parent families, disabled people and women, are more likely to live in unsuitable housing (WHO, WHO Housing and Health Guidelines, 2018).

Interventions that create healthy homes can help to break this cycle by improving health and broader social and economic outcomes, yielding important benefits for decades into the future.
These housing-related interventions need to be complemented by policy interventions relating to education, employment, transport, child care, health systems, taxation, wages, benefit levels and job security (WHO, WHO Housing and Health Guidelines, 2018).

People living with disabilities have a hard time assessing the households, in the urban areas, few buildings have put into consideration the plight of people living with disabilities, this gets hard in the slum areas, as the areas lack proper infrastructure and the environment is characterized by mud and impassable roads. The implementation of the houses need to reduce the inequalities by having houses which can be easily assessed by the people living with disabilities thus reducing the inequality.

Housing policy can influence inequality in many ways. Voucher programs that keep people stably housed, for example, can help workers hold down steady jobs, thereby reducing inequality. Zoning laws can either contribute to or reduce economic isolation and segregation, thus increasing or reducing inequality. Tax and transfer programs tied to housing can create work incentives for some people and disincentives for others—ultimately influencing the distribution of income (Acs & Johnson, 2015).

Economic inequality is one of the most significant issues facing cities and entire nations today. But a mounting body of research suggests that housing inequality may well be the biggest contributor to our economic divides (Florida, 2018). Research by Matthew Rognlie found that housing inequality (that is, how much more expensive some houses are than others) is the key factor in rising wealth (ROGNLIE, 2015).

Kenya, like all African countries, focused on poverty alleviation at independence, perhaps due to the level of vulnerability of its populations but also as a result of the trickle down economic
discourses of the time, which assumed that poverty rather than distribution mattered – in other words, that it was only necessary to concentrate on economic growth because, as the country grew richer, this wealth would trickle down to benefit the poorest sections of society. Inequality therefore had a very low profile in political, policy and scholarly discourses. In recent years though, social dimensions such as levels of access to quality housing to all are important in assessing people’s quality of life (KNBS, 2014).

The face of poverty in Kenya is changing and the country is facing a new urban crisis. Nairobi is facing rapid urbanization, yet the divide between rich and poor is growing wider and 60 per cent of residents now live in slums with no or limited access to even the most basic services. Urban poverty is set to be Kenya's defining crisis over the next decade if it is not urgently addressed (OXFAM, 2009).

2.3 Kibera Slum upgrading Project/s Reduced Housing Inequalities

Provision of adequate housing and amenities are major challenges for human development, this is according to Soahil ahmed in his article about disadvantaged housing. Ahmed argues that mostly the low-income urban households in developing countries are not able to adequately provide for their citizens (Ahmad, 2012). This is characterized by the many slums and squatters evident in all developing countries. As the developing continue to grow in the housing sector, the developing are characterized by the developing the proliferation of slums and squatters.

Housing quality refers to the physical condition of a person’s home as well as the quality of the social and physical environment in which the home is located. Aspects of housing quality include air quality, home safety, space per individual, and the presence of mold, asbestos, or lead. Housing quality is affected by factors like a home’s design and age. Poor-quality housing is associated with various negative health outcomes, including chronic disease and injury and poor mental
health. The quality of a home’s neighborhood is shaped in part by how well individual homes are maintained, and widespread residential deterioration in a neighborhood can negatively affect mental health (ODPHP, 2016).

Income is related to housing in three ways: through the gross national product of countries, the income of individuals, and the income inequalities among rich nations and among geographic areas. A central question is the degree to which these associations reflect a causal association. If so, redistribution of income would improve housing in general (Marmot, 2002).

Few realize how many of their neighbors are on the brink of becoming homeless. Financially strapped families face daily challenges: Buy groceries or put gas in the car? Pay the electric bill or buy medicine? Families who can barely afford their rent face disaster if there’s an unexpected hit to their income. This is a major factor in the spike in homelessness in places including tent cities these homes are not in their mind trying to get a home to themselves but to survive the daily struggles which come with running a household (Narasimhan, Fixing Housing Is Key to Addressing Income Inequality, 2015)

Housing supply and affordability plays a large role in creating differences in housing markets and labor markets across urban areas. Housing affordability within an urban area has implications for local labor markets and the local economy. A firm in a given region, for instance, cannot expand without affordably priced homes to house new workers. A robust literature in economics examines the relationship between housing affordability and income inequality, which has become a pressing issue for many of the country’s most popular metropolitan areas (Baranoff, Housing Affordability and Income Inequality: The Impact of Demographic Characteristics on Housing Prices in San Francisco, 2016)
Affordable housing has long been an important planning and design concern in large urban areas and around the peripheries of major cities where population growth has led to an increasing demand for descent housing environments. The issue of affordability has attracted researchers and scholars to explore planning and design determinants, financing mechanisms, cultural and social issues, and construction and building techniques. This interest has been the case for several decades since affordable housing themes have offered a rich research area that involves many paradoxes that keep presenting challenges for planners, architects, and decision makers.

Housing costs are increasing in most cities and incomes are not increasing at the same rate. Governments, on the other hand, are unable to provide sufficient housing stock to bridge the gap between demand and supply due to decreasing housing budgets and the lack of investment. Undoubtedly, the issue of housing affordability is widespread worldwide. Governments have responded to this issue through ways of cost reductions in order to make homes available at a price that a user is able to pay (Ashraf M Salama and Urmi eds Sengputa, 2011). The government uses the salary to identify the people who can afford the houses in Kenya and they mostly focus on the civil servants. But the slum dwellers are not slum dwellers therefore this poses as a challenge to the slum dwellers, the random identification of the slum dwellers thus a feeling of inequality even among themselves.

Abigail McKnight in her article argues that the main problem in reducing inequality will create winners and losers and in terms of tackling inequality the losers include the rich; a group with a strong voice, who have influence and are powerful (McKnight, 2018). A government working on its own interests rather than the interest of the citizens creates a wider gap of inequality. Focusing on the interests of the highly influential group gives them power to block government initiatives that could potentially leave them and their families worse off.
2.4 Theoretical Framework

According to Cedric Pugh, (1986) it was not until the late 1960s that housing attracted much attention from academic social scientists. But since that time the literature has expanded widely and diversified, establishing housing with a specialised status in economics, sociology, politics, and in related subjects. The new literature covers a technical, statistical, theoretical, ideological, and historical range. Housing studies have been derived selectively from diverse bases in conventional theories in economics or sociology, or politics. Others have their origins in less conventional social theory, including neo-Marxist theory which has had a wider intellectual following in the modern democracies since the mid-1970s. A number of thoughts regarding urban housing have been developed during the recent decades, set within the market economy and socialist context (Mitullah, 2003).

2.4.1 The Neo-Liberal Economic Model and Radical Inequality

The private law aspect is a fundamental component of the conception of the rule of law. It stabilizes expectations about the value of goods and services without the cost of state intervention—which has economic value toward achieving a balance between public and private control over institutions and resources—and is thus critical for sustainable development. The ideological importance of the freedom of contract and the right to exchange and acquire property thus became an organizing principle of the capitalist world. However, market fundamentalism has tended to obscure the role of human capital and the importance of the decision-making aspect of human capital in the production and distribution of desired goods and services. The consequence of inequality is that the most important resource in a nation’s economic profile—its human capital—is often underutilized (NAGAN, HAMMER, & AKHMETKALIYEVA, 2017). Thus, in terms of housing and offering solutions which last, the theory will perfectly apply in this study.
2.5 Chapter Summary

This chapter covered the literature review based on the three research questions. It provided a theoretical background the effectiveness of slum upgrades to reduce housing inequality in Kenya. This chapter was divided into three sections according to the research questions: The first section discussed the factors leading to housing inequality in Kenya, the second part discussed the slum upgrading policy implementation effectiveness on reducing housing inequalities and the third part discussed how Kibera slum upgrading project/s reduced housing inequalities.

The following chapter represents the research methodology of this study.
CHAPTER THREE

3.0 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

In this chapter the researcher outlined overall research methodology that was used to meet the objectives of the study. The research design is discussed in this chapter, the population and sample used in the study was analyzed and data collection method used outlined. The chapter further outlines the research procedures applied in the study as well as data analysis and presentation.

3.2 Research Design

A case study research was used for this study. Research design is the conceptual structure within which research is conducted and that it constitutes the blue print for the collection, measurement and analysis of data (Kothari, 2007). A case study involves the study of a unit/person or small group, a situation or a specific case. Kothari (2007) further describes a case study as a form of qualitative analysis that involves a careful and complete observation of a social unit which may be a person, family or institution. The design will be appropriate for this study due to its holistic approach which aims to capture all the details of a particular individual or group as presented in real life situation. This will be necessary in assessing the housing agenda in the Kibera slum upgrade project which has been characterized by politics since its initiation.

3.3 Population and Sampling Design

3.3.1 Population

A population refers to the total collection of elements about which one wishes to make inferences (Cooper & Schindler, 2008). The population is the larger set of observations while the smaller set is called the sample. According to the Lunch bowl network, Kibera has an estimated population of 1.2 million slum dwellers, in an area of 2.5 square Kilometres. 75% of the population of Kibera
are under the age of 18 and 100,000 children living there are orphaned (lunchbowl.org, 2018). The Ministry of Transport, Infrastructure Housing, Urban Development and Public Works has a total of around 500 employees in Nairobi County.

3.3.2 Sampling Design

3.3.2.1 Sampling Frame
Sampling frame is the list of elements from which the sample is actually drawn (Kothari, 2007) or list of ultimate sampling entities, which may be people, households, organizations or other units of analysis of which can be represented by the entire target population or a section of it (Garson, 2012). For this study a total of 80 of the homes in Kibera were targeted, and a total of 10 employees from the ministry Transport, Infrastructure Housing, Urban Development and Public Works in Kenya.

3.3.2.2 Sampling Technique
Sampling is a means of selecting some part of the targeted population to represent the entire population of interest. A sample allows for generalizations about the populations. Census was carried out for this study. Census is where the entire population is targeted to participate in a study (Garson, 2012). This study targeted 80 homes in the slum, and 10 employees from the ministry, random sampling was used on the target population.

3.3.2.3 Sample size

In determining the sample size, the study adopted the formula developed by Fisher et al (1991):

\[ n = \frac{Z^2 \times p \times (1-p)}{d^2} \]
Where:

\( n = \) the desired sample size

\( Z = \) the standard normal deviation, set at 1.96 which corresponds to 95% confidence

\( d = \) Acceptance range of error

\( p = \) factors leading to housing inequality in Kenya will be 11%

\( q = \) has the Kibera Slum upgrading project/s reduced housing inequalities will be 89%

When Population >190,

\[ n = 1.962 \times 0.11 \times 0.89 \times 0.052 \]

=150.437 which was approximately 150 respondents

150 respondents were selected using proportionate random sampling across all selected from the ministry and the Kibera population to participate.

Since the targeted population is above 190, the final sample size (n) was calculated using the following formula:

\[ n = n \div \{1 + (n/N)\} \]

Where:

\( n = \) desired sample size (when target population is greater than 190)

\( nf = \) desired sample size (when target population is less than 190)

\( N = \) the target population
\[ n = 150 \div \{1+ (150/190)\} \]

= 83.822 which is approximately 83 respondents

= 83 respondents were selected using proportionate and simple random method across the targeted respondents

**Table 3.1 Sample Frame**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster/Segment</th>
<th>Target Population</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kibera Population</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry officials</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>190</strong></td>
<td><strong>83</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study used simple sampling technique to identify respondents who to answer the questionnaires sent; this was a chosen means of sampling because it ensured that the researcher was able to identify a random population from a number of employees who work in housing institutions without being biased or pre-selecting a group of respondents.

### 3.4 Data Collection Methods

The data collection method used in this research was structured questionnaire for primary data collection. The choice of questionnaire as tool for data collection was its ability to be able to collect large volumes of information and a large population over s short period of time (Harris & Brown, 2010). The questionnaire will have both open ended and closed ended. The first section of the questionnaire was designed to address the respondents’ demographic information the second
section will address the affordability of the upgraded houses, how they feel the houses are reducing inequality and how their income levels and government policies affected the housing in general.

3.5 Research Procedures

The questionnaire was developed by the researcher based on the research questions. An introductory letter from the University was obtained to facilitate data collection. Authorization was sought from all the respondents.

3.6 Data Analysis Methods

The primary data after collection was coded before analysis. Frequency distributions and percentages were utilized in the descriptive part of this study. The analysis also included a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) to determine the relationship between various variables and thus the researcher was able to draw conclusions. Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) was used as data analysis tool. The research findings were presented using tables, graphs and percentages where necessary.

3.7 Ethical Considerations

A cover letter detailing the research objective and confirming anonymity of the respondent’s identity was attached to the questionnaire. The researcher had informed consent before filling out the questionnaire, objectivity while collecting data and practiced confidentiality.
CHAPTER FOUR

4.0 RESULTS AND FINDINGS

4.1 Introduction

The purpose of this study the effectiveness slum upgrade to reduce housing inequality in Kenya. The chapter is organized in line with the research questions. It shows data presentation and analysis. To simplify the responses, the researcher provided tables and figures to summarize the collective reactions.

4.2 Questionnaire Response Rate

The population comprised of all the 83 representatives of the different villages in Kibera and the ministry officials. The returned were 60 questionnaires which is 72.3%. This was adequate to do analysis because according to Mugenda and Mugenda (2009) a response rate of 50% is adequate for analysis and reporting; a rate of 60% is a good response rate of 70% is excellent. This means that the response rate for this study which was at 72.3% was excellent and therefore enough for data analysis and interpretation.
Table 4.1 Respondent rate (Kibera Residents and the ministry officials)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of questionnaires</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>targeted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of questionnaires</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>72.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>returned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reason for the study not achieving 100% response was because some of the respondents were not in the house when the researcher went collecting the questionnaires.

4.3 Demographic information

4.3.1 Gender of Respondents

The study sought to determine the gender distribution of the respondents. The findings showed that most of the respondents were male at 64% and the female were slightly lower at 36%. The difference is not significant enough to influence the results of the study towards any gender. The findings were as illustrated in the table below
Table 2 Gender of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender of Respondents</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can therefore from table 4.2 that males were the most dominant gender in the effectiveness of the slum upgrade to reduce housing inequality in Kenya.

4.3.2 Age Bracket of the Respondents

Table 3 Percentages of all the Age Gaps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age bracket (in years)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 50 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The respondents were required to input their age brackets, a majority of the respondents were aged between 31-40 representing a percentage of 31.7, following closely respondents were aged between 25-30 years, this represented a percentage of 28.3. 14 of the respondents were which was a percentage of 23.3 were aged between 41-50 years, while those aged between 18-24 gave a percentage of 10. The least was over 50 years and above whose respondents were 4 representing a percentage of 6.7%. This shows that a majority of the respondents are in the middle age gap. Therefore, most of the respondents were mature and had rich experience in housing and inequality in Kenya.

4.3.3 Marital status of the Respondents

Table 4.4 below shows the marital status of the respondents a number of the respondents are married at almost 48.3%.

Table 4 Marital Status of the Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>48.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.4 Level of Education for the Respondents

Table 4.5 below reveals that a majority of the respondents have attended up to secondary school level at 33.3%, primary school education follows in second at a percentage of 25, college education is 21.7% and primary and graduate level are at a distant of 10%. This shows a fair knowledge of housing and equality. There’s is need for capacity building on this.

Table 5 Level Education of the Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of education</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.5 Types of House Structures

Table 4.6 below shows an analysis of the respondents’ type of houses. This shows that a highest number of them live in mud structures at a high percentage of 53.3%. This shows a majority of the slum occupants living in not so good houses and the highest need for equality to improve on the living conditions.
Table 6 Type of House Structures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>House structure</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iron sheets</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wooden</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mud</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4 Descriptive Statistics

4.4.1 Factors Leading to Housing Inequality

One of the objectives of the study was to determine the factors leading to housing inequality in Kenya. The evaluation was by rating the extent of agreement to which the respondents agree with the given statements. It was in a scale of 1-4 where: 1= strongly disagree, 2= disagree, 3= agree and 4 =strongly agree.
Table 7 Factors that Lead to Housing Inequality in Kenya

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. You know what affordable housing is</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. There’s housing inequality in Kenya</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Inequality in housing is not a government issue but a societies issue</td>
<td>44.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. There is need to educate on housing inequality</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Affordable housing is not a realistic issue</td>
<td>55.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Your level of education is considered while the government is allocating houses</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. House allocation is done on a free and fair basis</td>
<td>69.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. There’s resistance from the community to upgrade the housing</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The population in Kibera has increased in the last 3 years</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Do you think housing contributes to equality</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the study it was noted that 48.1% agree that they understand what affordable housing and it affects their life in one way or another, another 48.1% agree that theirs housing inequality in Kenya. 44.2% and 46.2% strongly disagree and disagree that it’s a governments issue and the society is not responsible for reducing the inequality in general. A great number at 55.8% and 21.2% strongly disagree and disagree respectively that that affordable housing is not a realistic issue, this is because housing is a basic need and a majority understand the need to have a realistic home for themselves. Though the governments manifesto on the allocation of the housing in the
slums does not mention anything about education as a measure while allocating houses, the Kibera residents feel at 55.8% and 29.9 percent strongly agree and agree respectively that the government considers the level of education while allocating houses to the residents, on a related note the residents strongly disagree that the house allocation is done in a free and fair manner, they feel like there is influence especially when they are dealing with house allocation. An 80% number of the respondents which is a combination of those who strongly agree and agree that the population in Kibera has increased over the last three years. This goes against the government’s plan to reduce the number of slum dwellers by 2010.

This study has deduced that housing inequality in Kenya is a challenge, identifying different factors that contribute to housing inequality like, government policies and procedures, a growth in the population which continues to grow at a very high rate especially at the slums. Housing is one the major wants of human beings and the residents in Kibera strongly agree at a 69.2 percentage and 19.2 %. Housing is a basic need to reduce equality all over the world and it is therefore one of the sectors where the government can use to efficiently increase the level the level of inequality as they grow the economy and development occurs effectively.

4.4.2 Slum Upgrading Policy Implementation Effectiveness on Reducing Housing Inequalities

This study sought slum upgrading policy implementation effectiveness on reducing housing inequalities. This was done by using a scale of 1-4 where: 1= strongly disagree, 2= disagree, 3= agree and 4 =strongly agree. The table below shows the percentages which was analyzed from the respondents’ answers. Table 4.7 below shows in percentages the way the Kibera residents felt depending on the questions asked by the researcher in the questionnaire.
### Table 8 Slum Upgrading Policy Implementation Effectiveness on Reducing Housing Inequalities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The number of people in a house affect the allocation of houses</td>
<td>40.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Your tribe affects house allocation is being done</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Your age is considered while the government is allocating houses</td>
<td>40.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Your marital status helps in getting a house allocation</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The people are to blame for the slagging of the government in house allocations</td>
<td>53.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Your level of education is considered while the government is allocating houses</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. People living with disabilities are given a priority during house allocation</td>
<td>88.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The house structure you live in is considered during allocation</td>
<td>55.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Modern housing is a basic need</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents at 46.2% disagree that the number of people who are living in a certain house are not considered when the government is allocating houses. This is a large number of the respondents. More than 50% of the respondents feel that one’s tribe affect the allocation of the houses and this has contributed to certain tribes living in the area fell like they are not equals to all the other tribes. One’s age is not considered during house allocations. This can be shown by a 40.4 percentage who strongly disagree with the researcher’s suggestion that their age is considered
while the government does house allocation. Phase two of the house allocation is underway. The house allocation is done off plan. The researcher therefore asked the respondents whether they are to blame because of the delayed house allocation a 53.9% strongly disagreed with this question. The respondents did not at all agree with the researchers question with both strongly agree and agree garnering a zero vote.

The residents felt that the government considered the education level while allocating houses. The majority felt that the more learned you are the more the possibility of getting a house at the allocation level, with the less educated in the society feeling a little bit underprivileged. This was shown by the respondents’ response by a 57.7%.

In the slum there are different types of house structures that is iron sheets, wooden, mud and brick structures. The residents felt that the government does not the type of house they live in with a 55.8% strongly disagreeing with this statement. It important therefore to note that the residents felt like the people living in the weakest structures should be considered by the government while house allocations are being done.

At 59.9% the respondents agree that housing is a basic need. The study therefore concluded that there are very many factors that can be done and should be considered while focusing on ways to reduce housing inequalities in Kenya. There are many ideas from the respondents on the many ways housing inequality can be improved. The respondents felt that inclusivity would be a big factor in solving the inequalities.

4.4.3 Kibera Slum Upgrading Project/s Reduced Housing Inequalities

The table below shows that the respondents reaction on Kibera slum upgrading projects and how they have reduced inequality a very big percentage. The questions asked by the researcher were to
help in finding out on how Kibera slum upgrading project has reduced housing inequalities. The percentages indicated that the government can do more in aiding the citizens to understand more of its policies. It was important to find out the mechanisms in place from the government to help in ensuring equality especially during house allocation and during the whole process of slum upgrade.

During the study it was found out that the respondents did not know the government policies on housing at 69.2%, this meant that the government can always get away with it because they will not be put to task and accountable. The government always considered the employment status of the respondents, this is especially a disadvantage to the because a number of the respondents were casual laborer and therefore this means that they will not be allocated houses.

The general feeling is that the respondents need to learn more on the government policies the respondents agreed at 53.8% which is more than half of the respondents. At 50% the respondents felt the need to do more to improve their living housing conditions, they understood that the blame does not lie with the government alone but also with them as this was a joint effort.
Table 9 Kibera Slum Upgrading Project/s Reduced Housing Inequalities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. You understand the government policies on Housing and inequality</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Your employment status is considered by the government while allocating houses</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. You will do more to improve your living conditions</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. You need to do learn on the government policies</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The government can do more to reduce inequalities</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Corruption is not a factor in house allocation</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The second phase of house allocation has been carried out successfully</td>
<td>94.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. People living with disabilities are given a priority during house allocation</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The second phase has been launched by the government</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. You are happy with the government policies to reduce inequality</td>
<td>65.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5 Inferential Statistics

This section presents a discussion of the results of the inferential statistics. The researcher used correlation analysis to measure the strength between the independent variables that is the
relationship between income, cost, government policies, and house inequalities. Regression analysis established the relative significance of each of the variables on reducing housing inequalities in Kenya.

4.5.1 Correlation Analysis

The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (or Pearson correlation coefficient for short) is a measure of the strength of a linear association between two variables and is denoted by r. The Pearson correlation coefficient, r, can take a range of values from +1 to -1. A value of 0 indicates that there is no association between the two variables.

A value greater than 0.000 indicates a positive association, that is, as the value of one variable increases so does the value of the other variable. A value less than 0.000 indicates a negative association, that is, as the value of one variable increases the value of the other variable decreases.

4.5.2 Correlation Coefficient

The table below shows the correlation coefficient matrix of the predictor variables
### Table 10 Housing Inequalities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors leading to House inequality</th>
<th>Ways to reduce house inequality</th>
<th>Government policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factors leading to House inequality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slum upgrading policy been implemented to reduce housing inequalities</td>
<td>0.46322 (p=.044)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kibera Slum Upgrading Project/s Reduced Housing Inequalities</td>
<td>0.8163 (p=.021)</td>
<td>0.7682 (p=.011)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.10 above shows that all the predictor variables were shown to have a positive association between them at a significant level of 0.05 and hence included in the analysis. There was a strong positive relationship between factors leading to inequality and government policies (correlation coefficient 0.81630); government policies and reducing house inequality (correlation coefficient 0.7612.)
4.6 Regression Analysis

Analysis in table 4.11 shows that the coefficient determination (the percentage variation in the dependent variable being explained by the changes in the independent variables) R2 equals 0.843 that is factors leading to housing inequality, reducing inequality and government policies explains 84.3% of observed housing inequalities. The P-value of 0.000 less than (0.05) implies that the regression model is significant at the 95% significance level.

Table 11 Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.918(a)</td>
<td>.843</td>
<td>.805</td>
<td>.51038</td>
<td>.854 1.242 4 59 .000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6.1 Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

The researcher sought to compare means using analysis of variance
Table 12 Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>.652</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>7.560</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>15.35</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18.64</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Predictors: (constant) factors in inequality, reducing housing inequality, government policies

Dependent Variable: assessment of the housing agenda

ANOVA findings (p-value of 0.00) in the table above shows that there is correlation between the predictors’ variables and the response variable.
CHAPTER FIVE

5.0 SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

The purpose of this study was the effectiveness of slum upgrades to reduce housing inequality in Kenya. This chapter presents the summary of the findings from chapter four, and also gives conclusions and recommendations of the study based on the objectives of the study.

5.2 Summary of the Findings

This study was guided by the following research questions: What factors lead to housing inequality?; How has the slum upgrading policy been implemented to reduce housing inequalities?; How has the Kibera Slum upgrading project/s reduced housing inequalities?

A case study research design was used for this study. The design was appropriate for this study due to its holistic approach which aims to capture all the details of a particular individual or group as presented in real life situations. The study population was limited to Kibera slum. The study population comprised of a total of 60 members who represented different villages of the slum. They were from different house structures, different income levels, and different number of families and from different tribes to capture the whole feel of the study area in full. A census of the entire population was carried. Frequency distributions and percentages were utilized in the descriptive part of this study. The analysis also included analysis of variance (ANOVA) and an analysis to determine the relationship between various variables and thus draw conclusions. The findings were presented using tables and percentages.
5.2.1 Affordable Housing and Reducing inequality

The study was the effectiveness of slum upgrades to reduce housing inequality. The overall evaluation that applies to the organization by rating the extent of agreement to which the respondents agree to the given statements. From the study it was noted that affordable housing will help lessen the inequalities maybe promoted by the government policies and there would be an acquired balance if the government continued to introduce affordable housing especially to the slum dwellers. This was indicated by the high percentages showed by the calculations from the respondents’ responses. The respondents strongly agreed that there’s housing inequality in Kenya, the government is responsible for addressing the housing inequalities, that affording housing is a realistic issue, that allocation of housing is not done on a free and fair basis, the community is willing to cooperate with the government to upgrade the houses, the population in the slums continue to increase and that yes housing contributes to equality. This is deducted from the respondents’ responses which would either strongly agree or agree with the responses by over 50%

5.2.2 Slum Upgrading Policy Implementation Effectiveness on Reducing Housing Inequalities

The research also sought to determine slum upgrading policy implementation effectiveness on reducing housing inequalities. From the analysis of the findings it was noted that the respondents agreed that the tribe one comes from affects the house allocation procedure, the marital status is considered while the government is allocating houses, the government considers your level of education while allocating houses and that housing is a basic need. The respondents also disagreed with the statements that the number of people in a house a considered while doing the upgrade of the houses, the government considers you age in house allocation that the citizens or the people are to blame for the slagging of the government while allocating the off plan phase two and that
the housing structure is considered while the government is allocating houses. The percentages as characterized helped the researcher in coming up with conclusions as the percentages indicated uniformity from the respondents.

5.2.3 Kibera Slum Upgrading Project/s Reduced Housing Inequalities

The research also sought to find out how can Kibera slum upgrading project/s reduced housing inequalities. This section was also characterized by sections of questions to help answer the question. Most of the residents did not understand the government policies yet the ministry officials understood the policies clearly. Despite the fact that a majority of the residents did not have formal employment, the government was still considering their employment before generally allocating houses to them. The residents however agreed that they had a role to play in order to improve their housing conditions and not live the responsibility sorely to the government. There was a general feel that to ease the situation the respondents need to learn more of the government policies in order to have an idea on how it operates the house allocations, the government also need to do more to reduce the housing inequalities. They disagreed with corruption not being a factor while the government was allocating houses to the Kibera houses. While the second phase of the Kibera upgrading project is yet to start according to the respondents. One of the major issues that has marred Kenya is the issue of people living with disabilities where the government is supposed to consider them first in a number of projects, but it was clear from the respondents that the government did not fairly consider them while allocating houses. There was a balance in the feel of the government launching the second phase on the Kibera slum upgrading project. The respondents were not with the government policies put in place to reduce inequalities.
5.3 Discussions

The findings established that there are many factors that lead to housing inequality in Kenya. Access to housing of sufficient space and quality has been a central element in social stratification in Kenya. There has been a general feel of increased slums despite the government’s efforts to radically reduce the slums. The population continues to increase dramatically with no policies on how to counter the general growth of the slums. The sources of housing inequality Kenya and especially in the slum of Kibera need to be addressed. When a market reform process had been underway in the national economy for nearly fifteen years. From the study there was a feel of the respondents that inequality is far from being a topic of discussion as the housing allocation favors people with political position and connections, who can comfortably afford house and just a fraction if the target market gets the subsidized houses from the government. Those of higher socio-economic background, and those whose work units have greater organizational authority have a higher possibility to get the houses compared to the other slum dwellers. From the respondents, there are reasons to believe that in some respects inequalities rooted in socialism are strengthened by institutional changes.

A report from the UN on housing collaborates the findings from the study on turning the page on MDGs to SDGs, the unprecedented proliferation of slums and informal settlements, and a chronic lack of adequate housing, continues to be amongst the major challenges of urbanization (Habitat, n.d.). Slums, informal settlements and inadequate housing remain the visible manifestations of poverty and inequality in cities. Inadequate housing complements the measurement of slums, particularly in the developed world, in order not to leave anyone behind.

The study is in agreement that the houses even though subsidized are not properly allocated to the targeted market because of other factors the feel that the Kenyan house and home ownership should
be completely left to just a few is evident in all. Gichuge (2001) in his study argued that housing development situation has been skewed in favor of high income earners and that even the government development plans do not consider and put in place the low-income earners and have skipped that area which should be part of their responsibility. The government needs to do more in the slum. From the launch of the project in 2003, there has been a nagging problem. The residents who had been allocated the hoses in the first place have moved from the Promised Land back to Kibera, increasing the population even more than it should be. They blame this on the fact Nairobi’s middle class swooped in, searching for affordable housing in a city with skyrocketing rents. Many secured apartments in the new buildings through the informal systems of bribery that dictates a great deal of life in Kenya, this means that the official handover never happened even before we can discuss the phase two of the project.

The study showed that there are ways and factors which the community which is the most affected can come up with and help the government in informing policy. Inclusive development to reduce inequality has to go hand in hand with all the sectors involved. In the development agenda if the development agency wants the sector to take up a project then it is important for the development agency to include the ideas and the suggestions of all the partners. In this case the development agency is the government, it should consider inputting what the citizens of Kibera consider to be a way to reduce the inequality. This way they would own up to the Project because they would feel like they are part and parcel of the development agenda. For example, a number of those who got the phase one allocations to the apartments through the programme saw a business opportunity and rented their flats to middle class tenants at four and five times the subsidized rate. Then they moved back to the slum with extra money in their pocket, meaning the government did not fully accomplish its goal a factor that a majority of the government officials in the study felt could be a
reason why the government is slowing down before it can launch phase two. They have to find a solution for phase one first. The study area also had a lot of resistance because there is a great deal of mistrust of the government and development organizations. A history of failed aid projects and forced evictions have left many residents feeling exploited by outsiders. And to them they feel like the government is following up in the same path as the other aid givers by exploiting them in the name of development. The Kibera was identified for redevelopment since it is one of the largest slums in Africa, with an estimated population of 400,000 people, but the phase two project since its launch in 2016 seem to be taking forever, this is because the government is yet to discuss and finalize on some of the underlying issues with the community.

The informal settlement is composed of Kianda, Soweto, Gatwekera, Kisumu Ndodoga, Lindi, Laini Saba, Silanga, Undugu, Makina and Mashimon villages, with a mixture of many Kenyan tribes, though there are some tribes which seem to have a higher population than the rest, from the study it showed that the interact freely and even though there are many risks involved in such some of the tribes are given a preference when the government is allocating houses. From the study, the respondents felt that if the government embraced the elimination of the villages one by one without favor then it would be easier and faster than where the government picks randomly the people to issue with the houses. The number of people living in a household should also be considered before the government does the house allocations and this will sort a lot of problems because the houses are in one, two and three bedrooms. The study found out that even though the residents would want to do more in order to live the slum sector, the current housing supply in the country is skewed in favour of the middle- and high-income segments of our society, leaving a significant majority of the population to reside in slums and informal settlements a statement which the
government minister James Macharia, the Transport, Infrastructure and Housing Cabinet Secretary echoed when he was launching the project.

The study from the ministry officials found out that the government planned to speed up the project, this is by recognizing that yes there is a need to equalize the housing in this country for a better inclusivity in development, the program further aims at planning for urban growth (in order) to minimize expansion of existing slums equally without the favour of one of the already existing slums but the start was supposed to be first the elimination of the Kibera slum which is one of the biggest slums in the world. It was noted that however the government policies continue not to allow the elimination of the slum free and fairly in the world. This is because a majority of Kenyans are unnecessarily living in slum dwellings, because of limited supply and lack of affordability a factor that the government still has not been able to successfully mitigate the situation. According to Thomson Reuters Foundation Corruption, poor management and lack of public consultation have hurt repeated efforts by the Kenyan government and donors to improve slums, including Kibera, the country’s largest slum.

From the study it was established that there have been so many programmes in Kibera to try and upgrade the slum but a number of the projects have failed and others have stalled. According to (Mwanza, 2016) three projects in Kenya’s slums and recommended future projects consult with affected communities in order to improve the chances of success. But it was also clear from the study that there was need for the government to consult in order to ensure a robust understanding of the local context, including its risk dynamics, and enable transparency and accountability.

The study found out that there are many other factors that have lead to inequality in general in times of housing inequalities. The areas mostly affected by housing inequalities and are under governments’ interest to create subsidized houses are characterized by flood and conflicts. In
aiming to reduce poverty however there are other factors which should be addressed to aim to reduce poverty which is a main contributor to inequality. Employment, reducing environmental hazards, delivering improved-quality housing and ensure better water and sanitation service provision, are some of the factors the government policies and the government can consider having long lasting solutions.

5.4 Conclusion

5.4.1 Factors Leading to Housing Inequality in Kenya

The study concluded that there are many factors leading housing inequality in Kenya, the majority of the targeted for the subsided housing do not have steady incomes and after the relocation of a number of them to the slum area they went back sighting different reasons as to why they were no longer able to stay in the allocated houses this is a factor leading to housing inequality, they feel like the houses were imposed on them. Government lack of consultation in development has led to many unfinished projects especially in the area of study. The study found out that some people prefer still living in the slums even after the upgrade siting scarcity mentality and ownership to their culture. Lack of capacity building is also a major factor that needs to be addressed before the upgrade of the slums takes off. Lack of sustainability ways has also led to them going back to the same place they were trying to be upgraded from. Maybe going the extra mile to be a partnered project between the government and the residents would reduce the back and forth and there would be ownership. Involving the youth like when the National Youth Service had launched the projects in the area is a nice way to keep them engaged and to ensure there is an income. Age of the residents, unfair allocations of the houses, considering the people living with disabilities, lack of
employment, are some of the factors if considered would lead to all-inclusive development leading to housing equality and thus economic development for the country in general.

5.4.2 Slum Upgrading Policy Implementation Effectiveness on Reducing Housing Inequalities

The study found out that the context, including risk dynamics and also transparent means of working between the development agencies, government and the community would ensure accountability and project ownership. Coming up with better ways to go about the projects like securing community buy-in through strong trust building components will help strengthen the social contract between those implementing the intervention and the beneficiaries. Form the start of any project the implementing agency should ensure an all-inclusive way, meaning form the community is involved in the process from as early as the survey and proposal as the solutions to the underlying problems lies with the people. A community styled and community led ensures accountability which is a key component for the effectiveness of the relocation and housing project to ensure equality.

5.4.3 Kibera Slum Upgrading Project/s Reduced Housing Inequalities

The study found out that the government policies in Kenya are not operational. The consideration of people living with disabilities, the transparency in housing allocation and limited buy-ins are not practiced by the ministry officials in the ground, proper mechanisms from the government to fight corruption and ensure equity are just in paper as the project has been characterized by unending corruption cases to an extend of stalling the whole project in general. The research found out that the gaps in the government policies leads the structure owners opposition to KENSUP via lawsuits that have led to delay in the implementation of a number of housing projects and undermined relations between the government and project beneficiaries, which a loss for both the
government and the beneficiaries. The study further found out that the projects need to be particularly sensitive to the political context as the area is a political zone and this has affected the housing development agenda.

**5.5 Recommendations**

This paper was an of the housing agenda in Kenya in order to reduce inequality, the findings show that slum upgrading in order to reduce housing inequality is a way to go to start the whole process. There are many slums in Kenya and with a growing population then the slums continue to grow day by day and without proper mitigation ways the slum will continue to be a menace for Kenya which is a developing country. The findings show that slum-upgrading interventions have the potential to reduce inequality in the urban environments. This can be done if the process is possible if the government includes processes that build the social contract, such as meaningful consultation of residents and social accountability mechanisms which might include but not be limited to channels to air and resolve grievances for the community as there are many issues already from the phase one project and the communities are not ok sharing their grievances for fear of victimization. The study concludes that there is need to build bridging social capital between ethnic groups this will erase the question of tribe while allocating houses and the ethnic divide will slowly be eliminated. There is need for the projects to be of multi-sectorial by design in order to have a higher potential impact and effectiveness. This approach will promote a positive perception of the project, building trust between community and government and thus increasing the possibility of the projects success which the government plans to launch. Corruption allegations can be a thing of the past if the government policies are made clear through capacity trainings in the area. This will lead to reduced failings and temporarily discontinued projects which is a characteristic of all
the subsidized housing projects which will eventually lead to inclusive development. The government should consider including other developing agencies and different development interventions which are integrated, multi-sector and consultative in approach as this will have stronger potential to increase resilience in multi-risk environments compared to single sector projects.

There needs to be a way to come up with projects that do not disrupt the way of life of the beneficiaries and this can be ensured by working with the local agencies and SACCOs which operate locally and have an immense knowledge of what the locals are all about. Slum upgrading is a good way to ensure housing inequalities in Kenya. By upgrading the slums Kenya will be on a good road map to ensuring they achieve the Sustainable Development Goals.

5.5.1 Recommendations for Further Studies

The study suggests that future research could be conducted on challenges of low cost housing in Kenya in line with reducing inequalities in Kenya. The researcher also recommends that more research is done on ways the government can increase its collaboration with the beneficiaries and other development agencies to help reduce housing inequalities in Kenya.
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APPENDIX 1:

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL OF DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS

Edith Mutui

United States International University-Africa

P. O. Box 14634 - 00800,

Nairobi, Kenya, East Africa.

Dear Respondent,

REF: REQUEST TO PARTICIPATE IN DATA COLLECTION

I am a student at United States International University-Africa (USIU-A) Pursuing a Master of Arts in International Relations. To complete my studies, I am conducting a research project titled “The Effectiveness of Slum Upgrades To Reduce Housing Inequality: A Case Study Of Kibera” in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the award of the masters. The questionnaire enclosed seeks to obtain information to help answer the research questions. I request you complete the questionnaire and return it to the self-addressed envelope at your earliest convenience. It will only take a few minutes of your time to answer the questions and you might find it an interesting experience. Your answers will be treated as strictly confidential and purely for academic purpose.

Thankyou in advance for your time and effort.

Yours Sincerely,

Edith Mutui
APPENDIX 2:

QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire is meant to collect information on an assessment of the Housing Agenda to Reduce Inequality: a case study of Kibera Slum Upgrading Project. Kindly answer the questions by writing a brief statement or ticking the boxes provided as will be applicable. The information provided will be treated as strictly confidential and your name will not be mentioned in the research. This research is for academic purposes only.

SECTION A:

Bio-Data

1. Gender: Female [ ] Male [ ]

2. Indicate your age bracket

   a) 18-24 [ ]

   b) 25-30 [ ]
3. Marital status

   a) Single
   b) Married
   c) Widowed

4. What is your highest level of education

   a) Primary school
   b) Secondary school
   c) College level
   d) Under graduate level
   e) Graduate level
Section B:

Affordable housing and reducing inequality.

Please tick the extent to which you agree with the following statements by using a scale of 1-4 where: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree and 4 = strongly agree. Your choice of answer describes your opinion of the statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors that lead to housing inequality in Kenya</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. You know what affordable housing is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. There’s housing inequality in Kenya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Inequality is not a government issue but a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>societies issue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. There is need to educate on housing inequality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Affordable housing is not a realistic issue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Your level of education is considered while</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the government is allocating houses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. House allocation is done on a free and fair basis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. There’s resistance from the community to upgrade the housing

9. The population in Kibera has increased in the last 3 years

10. Do you think housing contributes to equality

11. What type of house do you live in
   
   a) Matope structure
   
   b) Brick structure
   
   c) Mabati structure
   
   d) Wooden structure

12. What is the number of people living in your house?
   
   ………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   
   ………………………………………………………………………………………………………
Section C:

Ways to reduce housing inequalities in Kenya

Please tick the extent to which you agree with the following statements by using a scale of 1-4 where: 1= strongly disagree, 2= disagree, 3= agree and 4 =strongly agree. Your choice of answer describes your opinion of the statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slum Upgrading Policy Implementation Effectiveness on Reducing Housing Inequalities</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The number of people in a house affect the allocation of houses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Does your tribe affect while getting the allocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Your age is considered while the government is allocating houses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Your marital status helps in getting a house allocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. The slum dwellers are to blame for the slagging of the government in house allocations

6. Your level of education is considered while the government is allocating houses

7. House allocation is done on a free and fair basis

8. The house structure you live in is considered during allocation

9. Do you think housing contributes to equality

10. What other factors not mentioned above, may contribute to housing inequalities?

………………………………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………………………………
Section D:

Government allocation of subsidized houses to different slum dwellers and their income in Kenya

Please tick the extent to which you agree with the following statements by using a scale of 1-4 where: 1= strongly disagree, 2= disagree, 3= agree and 4 = strongly agree. Your choice of answer describes your opinion of the statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kibera Slum Upgrading Project/s Reduced Housing Inequalities</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Income is considered when allocating houses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The government is serious about equality while allocating houses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The next phase of house allocation will be fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Phase one of Kibera upgrading affects the government allocation of houses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>The locals are consulted when the government is carrying out allocations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>The new agenda from President Uhuru will successfully eliminate the Kibera slum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Government policies are considered while allocating houses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>You don’t think it’s the work of the government to allocate houses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Your income affects government allocation to houses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>The government is doing enough to reduce housing inequality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. In your own words, do you think the allocation of houses from the government depend on any of the above factors? 

.........................................................................................................................................................

.........................................................................................................................................................