



GLOBAL JOURNAL OF HUMAN SOCIAL SCIENCE

Volume 12 Issue 6 Version 1.0 March 2012

Type: Double Blind Peer Reviewed International Research Journal

Publisher: Global Journals Inc. (USA)

Online ISSN: 2249-460X & Print ISSN: 0975-587X

Urban Poverty and Residential Environment Degradation in Calabar Area of Cross River State, Nigeria

By Andrew- Essien , Elizabeth E. & Akintoye, Oluyemi A.

University of Calabar, Nigeria

Abstract - In recent times the problem of environmental degradation of urban areas in Nigeria has reached an unprecedented proportion. This phenomenon which is prevalent in both residential and industrial areas is caused by increased population growth, unsustainable use of resources, rapid industrialization, unemployment, income inadequacies as well as inefficient or non-existing waste management strategies. This study examines the contributions of poverty as a reflection of income inadequacies and disparity to the availability of waste disposal facilities and its role in environmental degradation in Calabar urban area. The research objectives are achieved through the identification of the disparity in household income distribution. An assessment of the quality and quantity of waste disposal facilities available to housing units is made using primary and secondary data. The findings reveal a wide pattern of disparity in household income and waste disposal facilities. It is observed that the high density residential areas of Calabar South Local Government are not well served in waste management facilities resulting in environment degradation. The medium and low density residential areas within the municipality are better served resulting in proper waste management. The opinion of residents within the urban area is that government should be solely responsible for waste management.

GJHSS-A Classification : FOR Code: 160810



Strictly as per the compliance and regulations of:



Urban Poverty and Residential Environment Degradation in Calabar Area of Cross River State, Nigeria

Andrew- Essien ^α, Elizabeth E. ^σ & Akintoye, Oluyemi A. ^ρ

Abstract - In recent times the problem of environmental degradation of urban areas in Nigeria has reached an unprecedented proportion. This phenomenon which is prevalent in both residential and industrial areas is caused by increased population growth, unsustainable use of resources, rapid industrialization, unemployment, income inadequacies as well as inefficient or non-existing waste management strategies. This study examines the contributions of poverty as a reflection of income inadequacies and disparity to the availability of waste disposal facilities and its role in environmental degradation in Calabar urban area. The research objectives are achieved through the identification of the disparity in household income distribution. An assessment of the quality and quantity of waste disposal facilities available to housing units is made using primary and secondary data. The findings reveal a wide pattern of disparity in household income and waste disposal facilities. It is observed that the high density residential areas of Calabar South Local Government are not well served in waste management facilities resulting in environment degradation. The medium and low density residential areas within the municipality are better served resulting in proper waste management. The opinion of residents within the urban area is that government should be solely responsible for waste management.

1. INTRODUCTION

Urban areas are characterized by indices of modernization which trigger development and inadvertently propel the functionality of the urban hub or economy as nerve centers for enhanced investment, production, and distribution. This further drives the urban center to hold a stock of manpower supply for capacity development (Bedung et al 2003). All too frequently, urban areas in the Third World strive to meet the demands of modernization in the face of deprivation of basic infrastructural facilities that result in poverty. Poverty has been described as a multi-dimensional situation and process of serious deprivation or lack of resources and materials necessary for living within minimum standards conducive to human dignity and well being. It is a situation whereby the basic necessities of man are either absent or exist in negligible quantities or state. Thus, a country may be classified as being poor, when such basic amenities as good road,

shelter, portable water, medical services, job opportunities and conducive living environment are lacking or inadequate (World Bank 2000, 2001, 2006, NEEDS 2000, and Shamaki 2006).

Various factors account for urban poverty and these include amongst others low income, low educational attainment, lack of skilled manpower development, rapid population increase, (World Bank 2000, Sule 2001). The contributions of urban poverty as a factor in residential environment degradation cannot be over-emphasized given the significance of a healthy environment to the sustainable development of a people. The quality of residential environment is pointed out to be as if not more important than the quality of the environment in which people exist. This is highlighted in contemporary times by high level of unemployment, emergence of shanty towns, problems of waste disposal and population pressure on existing anachronistic facilities. Bradford and Kent (1993) related housing quality and environmental degradation to income and regional economic trends, while Short (1984) assessed out that in comparison to the cities of the developed countries, housing in the developing (and inevitably under-developed) countries is relatively of much poorer quality with the poorest-quality housing facilities found on both sides of the equator covering such countries of Latin and Central America, Africa and Asia.

In Nigeria, the distribution of poverty along the six geo-political zones indicates 72.2% for the North East; 71.2% for the North West, 67.0% in the North - Central, 43.0% in the South -West, 36.1% for the South-South and 26.75 for the South- East (Central Bank of Nigeria Report 2005). Within the South South, Calabar urban area of Cross River State apart from its industrial area is the product of old and newly built-up residential areas. The old houses are mainly dilapidated and located in the traditional area nearer to the king's historical palace and the old sea ports. Other areas with old houses include areas inhabited by the Quas and Efuts ethnic groups. Mbukpa, Edibe-Edibe, Afukang and Anantigha in Calabar South Local Government Area stand out as major areas of residential environment decay. Yet, why do people choose to live here?

The built residential areas in Calabar include the Federal and State Housing estates, and both the University of Calabar and Cross River University of

Author ^{α σ ρ} : Dept of Geography and Environmental Science
University of Calabar, Calabar, Nigeria. E-mail : liessien@yahoo.co

Technology (CRUTECH) Staff housing estates. Other areas include the New Parliamentary extension, Ekorimim, Eight Miles, the Military Barracks and other estates show distinctively that there is noticeable inequality in the spatial distribution of population and housing units with various levels of qualities. This is probably dictated and characterized by different levels of income, social status, and housing qualities. What factors opportune the residents to live here? This research aims at gaining an insight into the contributions of poverty as a reflection of differences and inadequacies in household income to choice of residential location, availability of housing facilities relevant for waste management in the residential environment of Calabar, Cross River State of Nigeria. The findings of this research is of significant importance to government and non government efforts at poverty eradication, urban renewal and sustainable development

II. SHOULD POVERTY DETERMINE HOUSING ENVIRONMENT DEGRADATION?

In recent times the rapid increase in urbanization has reached an unprecedented level as distribution of income regionally and of household quality, have continued to increase, thus becoming a major source of concern to different tiers of government and non government organization (NGOs). The complicity brought about by the rapid rate of rural – urban migration and industrialization in developed and developing countries alike have resulted in the emergence of urban problems with socio-environment and health dimension in cities. The problems of inadequate or non-existing housing amenities, air pollution, noise pollution, increasing crime rate, environment degradation through poor waste management, unemployment and income inadequacies, slums and charity towns emergence have become major nightmares to urban researchers and governments almost every where in the world.

The contributions of poverty as a reflection of income inadequacies resulting from unemployment or under-employment as well as inadequate residential housing facilities, especially for waste management, and residential environment degradation in Nigeria have in the past also attracted much attention in Nigeria. For example, most urban renewal and modification programmes have been concentrated in urban areas where residential housing quality is low for both the low and middle income grouping. These areas are populated by housing units with inadequate domestic and recreation facilities such as domestic waste-water disposal facilities. Where they exist, communal utilization and over-usage ensues. This consequently results in environmental degradation

The situation in Calabar urban area of Cross River State has slightly been less severe when compared to other states in the geo-political regions in Nigeria (Central Bank of Nigeria Report 2005). Eni (1999) and Sule (2001) however point out that there are differences in the quality of existing housing facilities as the level of environmental degradation in different areas of Calabar urban is steadily on the increase. The growing level of industrialization triggered- off by economic growth has herald the influx of new banks and insurance outfits, service providers and government agencies. The resulting consequence translates to direct needs for housing units which often are not be readily available. This will inevitably exert undue pressure on existing residential housing and waste management facilities, thus further reducing environmental quality. In view of the above there is a need to study and identify the contributions of income inadequacies to environmental degradation, availability of waste management facilities and the perception of respondents in the other study area to the existing environmental management processes.

III. POVERTY AND RESIDENTIAL HOUSING DEGRADATION NEXUS IN CALABAR

There exists diverse literature on problems and causes of housing facility inadequacy, the contribution of increasing residential population on housing residential as well as household environment degradation and waste management. (Marris (1965), Abraham (1970) Jones (1972) Akinola, (1978) Sule (1981), Sule (2001) and International Bank for Reconstruction and Development / World Bank, 1990) However, there exists scanty literature relating poverty and environment degradation in Calabar urban area particularly. Housing environment and residential housing facilities in Calabar have been examined by Sule (2001) which show that the quality of the residential environmental is considerably if not much more important than quality of the environment. Mabogunje (1970) and Onakerhoraye (1984) in the assessment of residential environments and policies identified that the dearth of adequate facilities in most urban residential areas are at variance with relevant policies. Studies by Eni (1999) in Calabar confirmed a growing trend in housing environment facilities deterioration particularly with the increasing population. In other to assess the extent to which poverty affects the residential environment, this study selects residential areas based on average household income distribution levels and assesses the available residential housing waste management facilities in each residential area, while identifying the mode of household waste disposal in the study area. Also the study considers the perception of household members in the study area concerning waste management strategies

IV. STUDY METHODS

Calabar, the capital of Cross River State is located in South Eastern Nigeria. The scope of study is Calabar South and Calabar Municipality Local Government Areas (LGAs). The districts considered include Mbukpa, Edibe-Edibe, Big Qua Town, Afukang, State Housing Estate, Federal Housing Estate, University of Calabar Staff quarters, Cross River University of Technology Staff quarters, and Ekpo- Abasi residential areas. The major socio economic activity in Cross River State is largely service provision, especially in a market economy. The recently growing industrial-manufacturing opportunities offer a suitable environment for the establishment of the Calabar Free Trade Zone (CFTZ) and the migration of people to Calabar. Civil service and private institutions provide employment for a considerable proportion of the population. Both primary and secondary data sources were collectively utilized. For the collection of primary data, the entire study area was sub-divided into sampling zones based on existing area nomenclature.

On each street, using existing nominal street numbering system, every third numbered house was selected for sampling. This is done to ensure that sampling is randomly done on both sides of the streets. Where there are more than one distinct household in a house (or compound) with the same number in an area not large enough for the number of samples required not more than two households are selected. The statistical model of analysis employed for this study is the percentages and arithmetic averages. The poverty determinant is examined using the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development income level of 257-370 US Dollars per person in a year. Only household

member of 18 years and above were considered in determining the average household income.

V. RESULTS

Table 1 shows data collected on income distribution pattern of sampled households in the study area. The residential areas considered include Mbukpa, Edibe-Edibe, Ekpo- Abasi, Afukang Orok-Orok, Etta Agbo and Parliamentary area which fell under the poverty line i.e. average household incomes divided among all household members aged 18 years and above was below \$257, which is the minimum (least) for the \$257 – 370 range recommended by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and World Bank (1990). The table also shows that the second group which includes University of Calabar and CRUTEC fall within the middle income group, and slightly above the poverty level. The third group include the respondents interviewed in the Federal, State Housing estates who because their incomes were very slightly higher than the second group were grouped in the high income group. The average incomes of the first group were highly reduced by the high average population of about 6 people in a household. The population of the middle income group was the lowest (about 4 persons), while the high income group had an average of about 4.5 persons.

This considerably influenced the average incomes. In the first group although about 69% of the population was below 18 years the average income was relatively impacted due to low individual incomes. Thus the three income groups were delineated and presented in a tabular form :

Table 1 : Income distribution pattern of selected household members in study area.

N/S	Residential area	N/H	Average annual household salary	Parameters for determining poverty level	Classification (poverty level)	Classification (income group)
1.	Mbukpa Area	50	N14,246	\$257-S370/per/year (N-37,950N51.060)	Below	Low Income
2.	Edibe- Edibe	50	N16,546	„	Below	Low Income
3.	Ekpo Abasi	50	N22,063	„	Below	Low Income
4.	Afokang area	50	N15,356	„	Below	Low Income
5.	Orok- Orok	50	N17,421	„	Below	Low Income
6.	Etta Agbor	50	N38,221	„	Above	Middle Income
7.	Parliamentary area	50	N39,452	„	Above	Middle Income
8.	Unical staff quarter	50	N38,741	„	Above	Middle Income

9.	Crutec staff quarter	50	N37,112	„	Above	Middle Income
10.	Federal Housing Estate	50	N49,652	„	Above	High Income
11.	State Housing	50	N51,251	„	Above	High Income

Given the data above, the need to understand the reason(s) for the choice of residential areas is relevant to this study. Why do some households reside in areas with adequate facilities, while others choose to reside in dilapidated areas of the city? Table 2 shows

primary data on factors responsible for choice of residential areas in Calabar Urban Area. Only 550 Household heads were interviewed and their responses are presented for assessments.

Table 2 : Factors responsible for choice of residential area.

	Reasons for choice of residential area	No. of household heads	Percentages %
1.	Income/Affordability	230	41.81
2.	Availability/ Facility adequacy	94	17.10
3.	Relations/Association/ family compound self owned	53	9.63
4.	Proximity to plasce of work	78	14.18
5.	Company /government provided residence	48	8.73
6.	Nearness to children's school	31	5.63
7.	No consideration	16	2.92
	Total		
	Percentages	550	100

The most indicated factor is "Income/Affordability"(230 household heads or 41.81 percent). The least reason was "No Consideration" (4 households or 0.73 percent). The second highest response of 94 (17.10 percent) was for "Availability" of housing and type(s) of facilities available. The data set thus shows that income largely influences where people live in the study area. This shows that income is most likely to dictate the choice of residential area by a household, although other factors are important. Below poverty

level, affordability may become great restrain limiting household to grossly undesirable sections of the urban area, with least housing facilities. Given the relatively high population and low educational levels of this group, it could result in higher rates of housing environment degradation.

Data in table 3 provides an insight into the pattern of residential housing facility availability in sampled households. It is presented below:

Table 3 : Facilities available in sampled household.

N/S	Name of Residential	Facilities available in household interviewed							
		Toilet			Bathroom			Waste water drainage	
		Modern water system	Latrine (crude/ modified)	None	Modern	Outdoor	None	Available drainage	None
1.	Mbukpa Area	26	65	10	18	78	04	21	79
2.	Edibe- Edibe	11	74	15	10	83	07	10	90
3.	Ekpo Abasi	52	46	02	15	50	00	33	67
4.	Afokang area	59	39	04	55	44	01	30	70
5.	Orok- Orok	65	31	02	60	38	02	27	73
6.	Etta Agbor	67	31	92	77	23	00	46	54
7.	Unical staff quarter	98	00	03	96	04	00	91	09
8.	Crutec staff quarter	97	00	04	92	08	00	88	12
9.	Parliamentary area	63	33	00	75	24	01	72	28
10	Federal Housing	98	02	00	98	02	00	100	00
11	State Housing	100	00	00	100	00	00	100	00
	Percentage	735	321	44	731	354	015	618	582
	Total	66.8	29.2	04	32.2	1.40	1.40	56.2	43.8

It is noticed that, in high income areas, the number of households with modern toilets and bathrooms as well as good networks of water drainage are highest. Areas with low income do not have adequate modern facilities. The number of households with none of the specified facilities was found largely in low income areas. The non -availability or inadequacy of such household waste management facilities will inevitably result in spill-over of such wastes into the

residential environments resulting in environmental degradation.

Table 4 present primary data collected on disposal sites for evacuated household wastes. Household heads, children or other adults responsible for waste management were interviewed. Only 50 households were selected in each residential area, giving a total of 550 households.

Table 4 : Disposal for evacuated household waswaste by household members.

S/N	Sites of Evacuated Household wastes Disposal	Responses (number)	Percentage %
1	Designated waste Disposal sites	205	37.27
2	Uncompleted building sites	054	9.81
3	Intra- Urban Roads	004	0.73
4	Intra-urban Roads (Not in Drainage system)	072	13.10
5	Drainage system along major/ minor streets (Non-Rainfall Periods)	021	3.81
6	Drainage system along major/ minor streets (During Rainfall Periods)	158	28.72
7	Open Fields/ buhes Within City	036	6.55
	Total	550	100

The highest figure of 205 households or 37.27% indicated that their household wastes are usually deposited at "Designated waste disposal sites". The next highest figure of 158 households (or 28.72%) indicates "Drainage systems along major and/or minor streets, (During rainfalls)" as their site of household waste management. The least indication of 4 households or 0.73% was for Inter-urban roads deposition.

Respondents indicate that "Rainfall duration" is the most convenient time or period to evacuate household wastes, as rain- water flow inevitably washes (carries) the waste materials /substances into the gutter and surrounding water bodies such as the river and ultimately into the Ocean. The cost of waste material transportation may have reduced the choice of "Inter-urban roads" (72 households or 13%) as an option. There is a general indication based on the data collected, that these household members about, 96% of which reside in the low income (below poverty level) areas considerably contribute to the deterioration of the urban residential environment.

Table 5 shows data collected on perception of respondents on who should facilitate household waste evacuation. The options provided to respondents

include government agency, private/commercial agency and lastly household members. Notably, distinctions were made between the first two options, since a government may in practice contract a private/commercial waste management agency. In this study, however the commercial waste management agency are those contracted and paid for directly by households.

Table 5 shows that respondents from the three income groups (1063 household or 96.63%) generally indicate that the evacuation of household wastes should be done by government agencies from public tax. A total of 032 households or 2.91% of the total 1100 (100%) households sampled suggested that private/commercial wastes management agencies will perform better, or are most suitable. The least indications (5 households or 0.46%) for "Household members" by respondents, is largely from the low income group. This group observably can not afford such extra household expenditures. (See tables 4 for possible implications of household member dependent waste management (evacuation).These have implications for waste management policy formulation in the state.

Table 5 : Perception of respondents on who should facilitate household waste evacuation.

S/N	Name of Residential area	Government Agency	Private/ Commercial	Household members
1	Mbukpa Area	098	00	02
2	Edibe- Edibe	097	01	02
3	Ekpo Abasi	100	00	00
4	Afokang	99	01	00
5	Orok- Orok	100	00	00
6	Etta Agbor	088	11	01

7	Unical staff quarter	094	05	00
8	Crutec staff quarter	098	02	00
9	Parliamentary area	100	00	00
10	Federal Housing	090	10	00
11	State Housing	098	02	00
	Total	1063	032	005
	Percentage	96.63	2.91	0.46

VI. CONCLUSION

It is observed that there is wide disparity in household incomes of respondents which could be matched aggregately with the areas in which they reside. Income largely influences the choice of residential areas, along with other relatively less considered factors. There is a high level of poverty complicated by high household population in low income areas.

The quality of housing facilities available in low income residential areas is very low and inadequate in quantity, while high income areas have comparatively high levels.

Household wastes evacuated by household members are deposited in numerous forms, including residential and non-residential areas.

The general consensus is that government agencies should be responsible for waste management. This and other observations should be reflected in policy formulation in the state, and other similar places inside and outside Nigeria

VII. RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations preferred to observed problems include the involvement of government and relevant private instructions in the enforcement of the following:

1. Appropriate housing policies and adequate monitoring with practical approaches for implementation.
2. Strict compliance to building regulations and waste facilities provision
3. Appropriate technology and materials suitable for the tropics which are not expensive but readily available and affordable.
4. Development of low-cost housing programs for low income earners with options for owner-occupier.
5. Provision of low-interest house purchasing and self constructed loans to low income persons.
6. The use of rent control, encourage rent debates and provision of allowances in order to improve the purchasing power of low income earners.
7. Better waste management strategies which considers incomes of the beneficiaries should be formulated and concentrated especially in low income areas.

REFERENCES RÉFÉRENCES REFERENCIAS

1. Abraham, C. (1970) Squatter Settlement: Problem and Opportunity. United State Department of Housing and Urban Development. Washington DC: Government Press
2. Anand, S. (1997) 'Aspects of Poverty In Malaysia: A Review of Income and Wealth' In United Nations Centre for Human Settlement and Iteration
3. Akinola, F. (1978) 'Solid Waste Management in Ibadan City' Seminar Paper. Department of Geography, University of Ibadan, Nigeria
4. Bedung, P.R., Diche, G.A., Dachomo, G.D., Dakur D.S., Dink, D.S., and Rangol, E.N. (2003) Introducing Human Geography for High School and Colleges, Jos W. ATS Press
5. Bradford, M. and Kent, A. (1993) Understanding Human Geography: People and their Changing Environment. Oxford: Oxford University Press
6. Central Bank of Nigeria (2005): Poverty Levels of Nigeria's Six Geopolitical Zones
7. Daniel, I. and Hopkinson, M. (1970) Frameworks in Geography. 2nd Edition. London: Oliver and Boyd
8. Eni, D. (1995) 'Slums as an Index of Quality of Life in Nigerian Cities: A Case Study of Calabar' Unpublished PhD Thesis. Department of Geography and Regional Planning, University of Calabar, Calabar, Nigeria
9. Federal Government of Nigeria (2000) NEEDS. The National Planning Commission
10. International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/ the World Bank (1990) 'Poverty: World Development Report 1990. World Development Indicators. Oxford: Oxford University Press
11. Jones, M. (1972) Housing and Poverty in Australia. Melbourne: University Press
12. Lansley, S. (1979) Housing and Public Policy. London: Crom Hetim
13. Mabogunje, A. (1974) 'Cities and Social Order' in Sule (2001) Urban Environmental Pollution Critically: A Synopsis. Benin: BAAJ International
14. Maris, P. (1965) Slum Clearance and Family Life in Lagos. Benin: University Press
15. Ravillion, M., Dah, G. and Van de Walle, D. (1991) 'Quantifying Absolute Poverty in Developing World. UNCHS and ILO (1995)
16. Shamaki, M.A., (2006) The Incidence and Spatial Manifestation of Urban poverty in Sakata Metropolis,

Unpublished M.Sc Dissertation, Sokoto

17. Short, J. (1984) An Introduction to Urban Geography. London: Roteledge
18. Sule, O (1981) 'Environmental Pollution in Urban Center: Waste Disposal in Calabar'. Third World Planning Review. Liverpool: 3 (4)
19. Sule, O. (2001) Urban Environmental Pollution Critically: A Synopsis. Benin: BAAJ International
20. Sule, O. (2003) Fundamentals of Urban Planning: Theory and Practice in Nigeria: Lagos. BAAJ International
21. World Bank Report (2000) Development Issues
22. World Bank Report (2001) Development Issues
23. World Bank Report (2006) Development Issues
24. Urwick, C. and Partners A. (1974) 'Master Plan for Waste Disposal and Drainage in Ibadan'



This page is intentionally left blank