

ISSN: 0189-5958

Website: [www.arabianjbm.com/NGJSD\\_index.php](http://www.arabianjbm.com/NGJSD_index.php)

Publisher: ZARSMI Dubai, UAE and Centre for Social  
Science Research Enugu Nigeria

**IMPACT OF NIGERIAN HOUSING POLICY ON UNIVERSITY STAFF  
SERVICE DELIVERY IN EBONYI STATE: A STUDY OF EBONYI STATE  
UNIVERSITY (EBSU), ABAKALIKI AND FEDERAL UNIVERSITY  
NDUFU ALIKE IKWO (FUNAI)**

**Ndukwe, C. (Mrs) Ph.D**

*Department of Public Administration, Ebonyi State University, Abakaliki*  
[ndukwechinyere@ymail.com](mailto:ndukwechinyere@ymail.com)

**Nnaji, Ifeoma Loretto (Mrs) Ph.D**

*National Open University, Awka Study Centre*  
[datamatrixconsult@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:datamatrixconsult@yahoo.co.uk)

**Nwuzor, Chidi Iroko**

*Department Of Public Administration, Ebonyi State University, Abakaliki.*  
[Nwuzorchidi@yahoo.com](mailto:Nwuzorchidi@yahoo.com)

**Abstract**

*The provision of low-cost housing scheme in Nigerian has been a subject of debate and one that seem to have been either forgotten or has eluded the government. This paper therefore was a bold attempt by the researchers to ascertain the impact of Nigerian Housing Policy on University Staff Service delivery in Ebonyi State using Ebonyi State University, (EBSU) and Federal University Ndufu Alike Ikwo, (FUNAI) as the study areas this study investigated to find out why government's policies on public housing in Nigeria have failed to yield the required dividends. Elite theory of public policy was adopted as the theoretical framework of analysis. The researchers used survey research design to elicit the required data through questionnaire distributed to 356 staff gotten from the total population of 3,350 by the application of Taro Yamane formula. In the course of the investigation, it was discovered that weak housing policies over the years have greatly contributed to failure to provide housing units in our universities. The study also discovered that apart from few coaster buses provided by the Federal Government to convey FUNAI staff to and from capital city (Abakaliki) and Ikwo, there is currently no housing plan for the concerned staff, among other findings. The study concluded that any further delay in the provision of affordable housing in our universities will dash the hope of meeting the target of vision 20:2020 in Nigerian education industry, the implication is that the standard of education will continue to dwindle, the study recommended for urgent national legislation that will make it compulsory for government to provide through public-private partnership, affordable low-cost housing in Nigerian universities and setting up a committee that will work out a master plan to realize the dream of the housing project, among others.*

**Keywords:** Nigeria, Impact, Housing Policy, University Staff, Service Delivery, EBSU, FUNAI.

## **INTRODUCTION**

Apart from man's natural quest for continuous feeding (food), the second most vital human need is shelter. Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary (1998) defined a house as a building for human habitation, especially one that consists of a ground and roof. Historically, the provision of housing has always been of great necessity to man. As a unit of the environment, housing has profound influence on the health, efficiency, social behaviour, productivity, satisfaction and general welfare of the community and it is a reflection of the cultural, social and economic values of a society and one of the best historical evidences of the civilization of a country (Olotuah, 2000).

The Nigerian state is enjoined by section 16(1) (d) of the 1999 constitution under the fundamental objectives and directive principles of state policy to provide suitable and adequate shelter for all citizens. In the words of Peple (2013:1):

Under the Transformation Agenda and Vision 20:2020, the provision of accessible and affordable housing is one of the strategic national imperativeness for guaranteeing the well-being and productivity of the citizenry.

She noted that the Federal Ministry of Lands, Housing and Urban Development, established as a free standing Ministry in April 2010, is the umbrella policy arm of the Federal Government charged with the responsibility of ensuring adequate and sustainable housing delivery and maintenance of a conducive living environment that meets the needs and aspirations of the Nigerian citizens.

However, Peple (2013), observed that prior to this, between 1975 and 2010, most of the functions of the ministry were performed under various other ministries, such as Housing, Works and Environment. Due to this history of institutional instability and many changes of direction over the years, arising from mergers and demergers, the housing and urban development sector had been organized under different administrative and institutional arrangements that had and continues to affect the quality and nature of the nation's public housing delivery.

For Agbola (1998), the provision of adequate housing in any country is very vital as housing is a set of stimulant of the national economy. Housing is a set of durable assets, which accounts for a high proportion of a country's wealth and which households spend a substantial part of their income. This may not be unconnected to the reasons why housing has become a regular feature in economic, social and political debates often with highly charged emotional contents.

Meanwhile, very great variations are to be found in the extent to which different governments take responsibility for housing their populations. In Nigeria for instance, not quite a substantial public funds are invested in the housing programme thus, the post independence development plans have given little emphasis to housing and it is therefore pertinent to highlight that Nigeria's population, especially in large cities, have by and large grown faster than the capacity of the building industry to provide housing which is both of inadequate standard and also not within economic reach of an average worker. Okolie in Ezeani and Elekwa (2001:226-228) has noted with dismay that:

*Nigerian housing problem has not been comprehensively studied, but there is enough information to conclude that the magnitude of the problem is quite serious. The colonial housing policy sought to provide houses at minimum rents to all colonial staff and a few necessary indigenous support staff usually clerks, prison officials, police and army. Therefore, the late 1950s and 1960s saw increased, but still rather limited intervention by government in the provision of housing. Meanwhile, the post colonial political leadership in 1960 continued on what was left by the provision of quarters to civil servants through the regional housing corporation that were established. Till date, Nigerian government has not been seen to have any housing plan for its workforce.*

In Nigeria, apart from the almost dilapidated staff quarters in its first premier universities, no tangible plan has been made or is being made to provide houses for university staff in both federal and state owned. Ebonyi State for instance, currently has two (2) public universities; Ebonyi State University (EBSU), Abakaliki and Federal University Ndufu Alike Ikwo (FUNAI). These universities can neither boast of any tangible staff quarters nor have any tangible plan for any. While the newly created Ebonyi State is still battling to provide some basic social amenities, it seems to be less bordered about providing housing for university staff whom it claims, earn more than other workers in terms of monthly take home.

It is worthy to note that despite what appeared to be an avowed determination of the Nigerian governments to provide affordable houses for workers in their development plans, empirical facts suggested that expenditures on housing normally fell short of the plan target and so, more than fifty years of the nation's independence, the successive housing policies have not yielded any remarkable result. Worst still, the slogan "housing for all by the year 2000" is, more than ever, a far cry and a mirage.

It is against the backdrop of these all-important realities that this study apart from enquiring into why there is a persistent systemic failure in the provision of public staff quarters in our universities and its impacts on service delivery, served as a nugget of solution on the problem of staff housing in EBSU and FUNAI.

### **Problem Statement**

Weak housing policy which leads to ineffective and non operational framework for housing delivery in Nigeria, was the prime problem of this research. In many developing countries including Nigeria, public housing crisis has escalated unabated despite a number of government's acclaimed new policies, programme and strategies being engaged in addressing the problem (Ibem, Anosike & Azuh, 2011).

The burgeoning housing supply deficit in Nigeria which as at 2008 was put at over 15 million housing units (Onwueanyi, 2008) for instance, has been blamed on low productivity in public sector housing. For many people like Bana, 1991 and Mustapha, 2002), the challenge of low productivity in public housing in Nigeria is rooted in mismanagement of funds and politicization of housing programme, but for others including; Ikejiofor, (1999), Akinmoladuh and Oluwoye, (2007), Ademuliyi and Raji, (2008), poor implementation of housing policies as

well as lack of proper co-ordination of activities of public housing agencies were the key challenges of public housing in Nigeria. Low capacity of public housing agencies in delivering their housing mandate is responsible for the failure of past public housing schemes to achieve set target in Nigeria (Bana, 1991, Emerole, 2002).

Irrespective of the school of thought one may want to attribute the problem of public housing delivery to in Nigeria and its component parts, the crux of the matter remains that at present, virtually all work places especially in our universities, have no planned housing scheme for the workers. The lack of consistency and continuity of policies has often been the major hurdle in the implementation of any government programme. Government housing policies till date, have not been people/workers –centred and has been treated with kiddies glove to the detriment of improved quality service delivery. There is therefore a complete government ideological insensitivity and visionless political leadership towards affordable housing for staff in Nigerian universities.

### **Objectives of the Study**

The broad objective of the study was to ascertain how government’s policy on public housing in Nigerian universities has affected quality education. Specifically, the study sought to:

1. Find out why government’s policies on public housing in Nigeria have failed to yield the required dividends.
2. Ascertain the government’s master plan to deliver affordable housing scheme in Nigeria universities especially in EBSU and FUNAI.

### **The Concept of Public Housing: A Discourse**

There are as many interpretations of public housing as there are authors (Odey, 1999, Parson, 2007). For Ibem et al (2011), public housing is described as housing provided, owned or managed independently by government or in collaboration with private sector for the purpose of providing mass housing to citizens and some key top government officials on owner-occupied or rental basis. In spite of the different meanings and connotations of public housing in literature, there is consensus among authors and researchers that the goal of public housing provision in most countries of the world is the provision of subsidized housing to households and individuals who are unable to gain access to decent housing at market prices (Ibem and Amole, 2010). This certainly, will help to improve public health, reduce social injustice and poverty, ensure social order and accommodate population growth hence, reduce financial misappropriation and corruption in public and civil service.

According to Pepple (2013), the goal of the National Housing Policy (NHP) is to ensure that all Nigerians own or have access to decent, safe and sanitary housing in healthy environment with infrastructural services at affordable cost, with secure tenure. This no doubt, has position the housing sector as one of the prime drivers of socio-economic development, including job creation and employment as well as accelerated national transformation.

Many scholars for instance, Omole, 2001, Valencia, 2007, Sengupta and Tipple, 2007, have argued that public housing provision involves policy formulation, institutional development, actual housing provision, allocation and management. This goes to suggest that challenges in public housing provision are related to policy formulation, institutional growth and development as well as actual production and consumption of housing units and services.

In Nigerian universities, for instance, in the College of Agricultural Sciences (CAS) campus of EBSU, the only available staff quarters are dilapidated with almost or complete lack of basic social amenities in them. Besides, they are insignificantly few that many staffs are not even aware of their existence let alone accessing them. Evidences abound that public housing provision in Nigerian universities has not recorded any impressive result in matching housing production to housing needs and demands by staff. These in no small measure, affect efficient and effective service delivery in our nation's universities.

**Performance of Public Housing in Nigeria (1960-2010)**

<b>PERIOD</b>	<b>PROGRAMME TARGET</b>	<b>ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL</b>
<b>First National Development Plan (1962-1968)</b>	- Planned construction of 61,000 housing units.	- Only 500 units less than 1% of the planned units were constructed. The political chaos and the resulting civil war (1966-1970) contributed to the marginal progress recorded during this period.
<b>Second National Development Plan (1971-74)</b>	- Establishment of National Council of Housing (1972) to advise the government on housing matters and Federal Housing Authority (FHA) in 1973 to co-ordinate public housing provisions.  - Plan direct construction of 59,000 low-cost housing units across the federation.	- 7,080 housing units representing 12% of planned houses were actually built.
<b>Third National Development Plan (1975-1980)</b>	- Creation of Federal Ministry of Housing, Urban Development and Environment and conversion of Nigerian Building Society to Federal Mortgage bank of Nigeria (FMBN).  - Promulgation of the Land Use Decree (1978).  - Planned construction of 202,000 low-cost housing units nationwide.	30,000 housing units representing less than 15% of planned houses were actually completed.
<b>4<sup>th</sup> National Development Plan (1981-1985)</b>	- National Housing Program launched for the first time in 1980. Earmarked ₦1.9 billion for the construction of 160,000 housing units for low-income people.  - The second phase of the housing program set out to construct 20,000	A total of 47,234 housing units representing about 23.6% of planned housing units were constructed in the first phase. The second phase was cut short by the military coup of 1983.

	housing units across the country.	
<b>Military Governments (1986-1999)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- National Housing program planned 121,000 houses on Site-and-Services housing program between 1993 and 1995.</li> <li>- 1988 National Housing Policy launched to <i>provide Nigerians access to quality housing and basic infrastructure.</i></li> <li>- 1991 National Housing Policy was launched with the goal of <i>granting all Nigerians access to decent housing by 2000</i> in response to the slogan “Housing for All by the year 2000” of the United Nations.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 5,500 housing units (less than 5%) of planned houses were actually constructed.</li> <li>- Provision of rural infrastructure through the Directorate of Food, Roads and Rural Infrastructure (DFFRI).</li> </ul>
<b>Civilian Governments (1999-2010)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The New National Housing and Urban Development Policy (NHUDP) launched in 2002 with the goal of ensuring that “<i>all Nigerians own or have access to decent housing through private sector-led initiatives</i>”.</li> <li>- Planned construct about 10,271 housing units through the Public-Private Partnership (PPP) housing schemes across the country.</li> <li>- Planned construction of 500 housing units in the Presidential Mandate Housing Scheme in all 36 State capitals and Abuja.</li> <li>- Government planned a pilot project involving the construction of 40,000 housing units per annum nationwide.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 2000 serviced plot through PPP site and service in Ikorodu, Lagos.</li> <li>- 4,440 housing units completed in Abuja, Port Harcourt, Akure and Abeokuta, through PPP.</li> <li>- The Presidential Mandate Housing Scheme did not take off in many states. In Ogun State about 100 housing units representing 20% of the planned units were constructed.</li> <li>- Records of the achievement level of the pilot projects are not available.</li> </ul>

*Source:* Compiled by the authors from various sources. Ali (1996); Omole (2001); Ajanlekoko (2002); Mustapha (2002); Bello and Bello (2006); UN-HABITAT, (2006); Olotuah (2010), Ibem et al (2011).

While it cannot be ruled out from the table that public housing has had some almost significant achievements, the truth remains that such achievements are far from being satisfactory since an average newly employed staff in any government establishment groan of

lack of accommodation, a situation that makes him/her unable to settle properly after many years.

There is a general notion that this development is due to lack of proper monitoring and evaluation of housing policies and programmes in Nigeria (Federal Republic of Nigeria, 1991, Jiboye, 2010 and Kellercher, 2010). This being the case, the reality therefore, is that there is dearth of good information infrastructure that allows for feedback mechanism in public housing delivery in Nigeria and this is probably why there appear to be no adequate and reliable information base for effective housing policy formulation, programme design and implementation strategies in the country, which is inimical to effective and efficient public housing delivery system.

UN-HABITAT (2006) in Ibem et al (2011), had reported that past public housing policies and programmes in Nigeria were aimed at enabling low-income earners gain access to decent housing at affordable costs. To achieve this, no Nigerian is expected to pay more than 20% of his/her monthly income on housing according to the 2002 National Housing and Urban Development Policy (Aribigbola, 2008). But to the contrary, prior studies (Onibokun, 1985; Awotona, 1990; Mba, 1992; Olotuah, and Bobadoye, 2009; and Ibem, 2010) have shown that the targeted population of many past public housing schemes in Nigeria did not benefit from such schemes and this was due to the high cost of housing units provided.

Consequently, several authors have contended that the constraints in accessing housing inputs (land, building materials and finance) as well as the cost of providing infrastructure were partly responsible for the hike in the cost of public housing beyond the reach of an average Nigerian worker (Ikejiofor, 1999; UN-HABITAT, 2006; Aribigbola, 2008). What is deducible from the foregoing submission is that poor management arising from the nature of policy framework of those housing schemes and the use of inappropriate design standards contributed to high cost of public housing in the last few decades in Nigeria.

### **Assessment of Government's Efforts towards Efficient and Effective Housing Delivery in Nigeria**

There is no doubt that over the years, Nigerian government has made different attempts and efforts towards providing affordable housing for its workforce but like everything "Nigerian", policy statements to that effect, have always been dead on arrival. What is however worrisome, regrettable and ironical, is that unquantifiable huge sums of billion dollars have been claimed to have been sunk into government's housing schemes.

Adesoji (2011) assessed the official (government) intervention in housing delivery in Nigeria based on four periods: the colonial, post-independence, second civilian administration, and post second republic periods till date. During the early colonial period according to him, the housing activities and policies of government in Nigeria focused on the provision of quarters for expatriate staff and for salaried indigenous staff in some specialized occupations like railways, police etc. That marked the advent of Government Residential Areas (GRAs) in Nigeria. The basic idea in the GRA policy as he noted, was to provide habitable housing and housing environment for those expatriate administrators comparable to the best of their respective countries. These housing quarters were well planted, with all the possible comforts, services and amenities; including water, closed sewers, electricity and abundance of open space and recreational areas.

In the post-independence period (1960-1979), Adesoji (2011), noted that emphasis was placed on the five-yearly development plans as an instrument for economic growth. In the first two plans he observed, the housing sector was virtually neglected. Further deterioration was witnessed in the housing situation during the civil war period, especially in the war affected areas.

The third plan period (1975-1980) introduced the most comprehensive and active intervention by the government in the housing sector. This was because, the period recognized the housing problems and aimed to increase the supply of housing to a substantial level through government participation, but the second civilian administration period (1980-1983), witnessed a steady increase in the interest and involvement of public sector in shelter delivery, and the importance of shelter sector within the overall economy (Lawanson, 2005, Adesoji, 2011). They noted that most of the strategies and activities during these periods maybe seen to be in conformity with enabling concept, public production of shelter remained their common feature. In the words of Ademiluyi and Raji, 2008:189;

*The period witnessed huge failures, when government allocated ₦1.9 billion for housing construction in all the twenty states of Nigeria, including Abuja. By June 1983, ₦600 million (37.5%) had been spent to complete only 32,000 units, yielding an overall achievement level of just 20 percent.*

They observed that the period coincided approximately with the fourth National Development Plan period as it witnessed the continued increasing deficit on urban housing as well as its continuous deterioration in the rural areas. The beneficiaries of this programme were identified as the low-income earners whose annual income did not exceed ₦8000 (Adesoji, 2011). It is pertinent to mention that this phase of the programme failed to take off in most states, and that the shelter policy came to an abrupt end in December 1983, making way for a fresh look at the shelter sector which has culminated in the National Housing Policy (Okoye, 2009).

The fourth official intervention in public housing according to Adesoji (2011) is the post Second Republic periods till the present date (1984 to date). This is when he noted that much activities in the area of housing was not done at the onset of this period as it has been very much transitional one, in which the Federal Government was preoccupied with the preparation of a new and more relevant National Housing Policy which was finalized and launched in February, 1991. It nevertheless yielded less than proportionate dividend after many years of its implementation and subsequent housing policies have since been implemented.

What cannot be disputed from the foregoing is that Nigerian government at one time or another, has made some efforts and policies to provide mass and affordable houses for its workforce. What is however worrisome is the persistent near complete absence of staff quarters in our nation's universities including EBSU and FUNAI, all in Ebonyi State. This is just but stating the obvious.

In their evaluation of accessibility of low-income earners to decent housing in Nigerian tertiary institutions, Olotuah and Adedeji (2007), lamented that the monthly and annual income of salary earners in tertiary institutions and the maximum loan obtainable in an effort to make them live in decent houses, are far from satisfactory as shown this table.

**Harmonized Tertiary Institutions Salary Structure (HATISS and maximum loan obtainable**

<b>HAT ISS GRA DE</b>	<b>Monthly Income (₦)</b>	<b>Annual Income (₦)</b>	<b>25% of Annual Income used for Mortgage Repayment (₦)</b>	<b>Maximum Loan obtainable at annual interest of 9% &amp; repayable over 25 yrs (₦)</b>
1.	5534	66408	16602	163,806
2.	5615	67380	16845	166,204
3.	5741	68892	17223	169,934
4.	6110	73320	18330	180,856
5.	6799	81588	20397	201,250
6.	8061	96732	21483	215,518
7.	11064	132768	33192	327,495
8.	12229	146748	36687	361,978
9.	13590	163080	40770	402,264
10.	15177	182124	45531	449,240
11.	16432	197184	49296	486,387
12.	17692	212304	53076	523,683
13.	22095	265140	66285	654,012
14.	23854	286248	71562	706,078
15.	25722	308664	77166	761,372

*Source:* Olotuah and Adedeji (2007)

They observed that the percentage (%) of beneficiaries between 2000 and 2005, are pointers to the laxity in government's efforts in providing affordable and decent housing to workers in tertiary institutions as shown in the table below.

**Percentage of Beneficiaries**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Number of contributors</b>	<b>Number of Beneficiaries</b>	<b>Percentage % number of beneficiaries</b>
2000	1,285,157	349	0.027
2001	1,857,279	2,043	0.110
2002	1,863,995	2,286	0.123
2003	1,900,126	2,079	0.109
2004	1,728,22	2,079	0.210
2005			

Source: Olotuah and Adedeji (2007)

The foregoing observations may not be unconnected to Onibokun (1990) earlier submissions that the housing need of every Nigerian worker from 1990 to 2020 is likely to have a multiplier effect as can be seen in the table below.

**Estimated Housing Needs between the periods of 1990-2020**

<b>Income Group</b>	<b>1990</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2020</b>
Low-income	8,413,980	14,372,293	39,989,286
Medium-income	7,770,005	13,273,291	33,573,900
High-income	7,624,230	12,419,068	28,548,633

Source: Onibokun, 1990.

**Theoretical Framework/Explanation**

In order to understand and explain the reason for the continuous neglect of government in providing decent and affordable housing in Nigerian universities, this study adopted a public policy theory known as “Elite Theory”, propounded by Wilfred Pareto and Robert Michaels quoted in Ezeani (2005).

According to them, Elite Theory regards any public policy as the values and preferences of governing elite(s). In other words, public policy, which housing is inclusive, is the product of the elites, reflecting their values and serving their ends, one of which may be a desire to provide for the welfare of the masses. As Henry (1995) quoted in Ezeani (2005:299) succinctly puts it;

*...the elite/mass model contends that a policy making/policy executing elite is able to act in an environment characterized by apathy and information distortion and thereby governs a largely passive mass. Policy flows downward from the elite to the mass. Society is divided according to those who have power and those who do not. Elites share common values that differentiate them from the mass, and prevailing public policies reflect elite values, which may be summed up as: preserve the status quo.*

While Henry’s submissions contain a high degree of objectivity, it has to be pointed out that his believe that the environment which the elites act are usually characterized by environment of largely passive mass, is far from the obvious truth and misleading because some environments like that of the university, are more often, occupied by people of high intellectuals who are mentally, physically and social aware and conscious of their rights but they are always victims of bad leadership where the government has no political will to implement sound and people-oriented policies (housing inclusive). Since they cannot take laws into their own hands in a way of forcing government, they usually resign to fate.

However, the relevant of this theory to this study, is that it has succeeded in exposing where the lack of coherence and practical housing policies over the years come from. This therefore, becomes an avenue to open new vistas on the way forward.

## **Methodology**

**Research Design:** The researchers adopted survey research design where carefully selected Academic and Non-Academic Staff of both EBSU and FUNAI were the respondents to the questionnaire for the study.

**Description of the Areas of the Study:** In the serene atmosphere of the eastern Nigeria, West Africa stands a young citadel, driven by the quest for teaching, learning, research, development and excellence –EBSU. Since 1999 when EBSU was upgraded to a full-fledged multi-disciplinary university, the school became one of the few universities fully committed to development of academic programmes in the areas of law, humanities, sciences and technology. In its multi-annex dimension, EBSU has always aimed at being one of the outstanding state universities unequalled in the country. EBSU is constantly repositioning itself in pursuit of pride of place and greater dynamic vote in pure Research and Development (R&D), both at the undergraduate and postgraduate levels. Its motto is “Development and Excellence”.

The university (EBSU) was founded in 1996 in Abakaliki Nigeria. It is housed in campuses formally belonging to the Enugu State University of Science and Technology (ESUT) and Anambra State University of Science and Technology (ASUTECH). Presently, though government has a grand master plan to relocate the university to the permanent site along Abakaliki-Enugu Express Way, the university has four annexes: Colleges of Agricultural Science (CAS), College of Health Sciences (CHS) Presco, Ishieke Annex and Permanent Site. EBSU has 11 faculties and 70 departments but, the governor of Ebonyi state, Martin Elechi ordered the reduction in the number of faculties from 11 to 8 and 70 to 57 departments. Of all these annexes, only CAS has some few and almost dilapidated staff quarters.

FUNAI on the other hand, is one of the 9 new Federal Universities that were established in 2011 in order to expand access to quality education to all part of Nigeria. Academic activities in the university commenced fully in the first week of November, 2012 with 10 departments/academic areas and 25 undergraduate programmes run in the faculties of humanities, social sciences, science and technology as well as basic medical sciences.

Located at the heart of Ikwo (Ndufu-Alike Ikwo) precisely, in Ikwo Local Government area of Ebonyi State, the university admitted 308 in the 2012/2013 academic session and 494 students in the 2013/2014, and investing in a 5-year (2013-18) campus development project to provide new teaching space, more students’ accommodation, staff offices, sports facilities etc. It is presently engulfed in the precarious problem of lack of staff quarters which affects the standard of service delivery.

**Population of the Study:** The population of the study comprises the academic and non-academic staff of EBSU and FUNAI as at March, 2015.

### **Population Table**

S/N	University	Academic staff	Non-academic staff	Total	Percentage %
1.	EBSU	877	1899	2776	82.87%
2.	FUNAI	188	386	574	17.13%
Grand total				3,350	100%

Source: Field survey, 2015.

**Sample Size and Sampling Techniques**

To determine the sample size of the study, the researchers used Tara Yamane formula of:

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + \frac{N(e)^2}{I}}$$

where; n = Sample Size, N = Total Population  
 I = Constant, e = Error margin = 0.05

$$n = \frac{3,350}{1 + 3350(0.05)^2}$$

$$n = \frac{3,350}{1 + 3350(0.0025)}$$

$$n = \frac{3,350}{1 + 8.4} = \frac{3350}{9.4} = 356$$

Because of the 2 universities covered, the researchers applied Bowles’s proportional allocation formula to determine the actual number of persons that were administered questionnaire in each university. The formular is given as:

$$nh = \frac{Nhn}{N}$$

where; nh = number allocated to each unit  
 Nh = Total population in each unit  
 n = Total sample size  
 N = Overall population of the universities

$$\therefore \text{EBSU} = nh = \frac{2776 \times 356}{3350} = 295$$

$$\text{FUNAI} = nh = \frac{574 \times 356}{3350} = 61$$

The researchers combined simple random and stratified sampling techniques. The simple random sampling ensured that every staff of the universities had equal and independent chance of being selected in the samples studied. Stratified sampling on the other hand ensured that the samples were divided according to the universities (EBSU and FUNAI).

**Method of Data Analysis:** Data collected in the field were carefully analyzed using simple percentage and Chi-square statisticals tool to draw relevant inferences and conclusion.

**Findings/Discussion**

In the course of our investigation, we made the following findings as discussed:

1. **Weak Housing Policies over the Years:** Evidences right from the constitution abound that over the years, Nigerian government has been unable to come up with appropriate and practical legislation or policy that will ensure immediate provision of affordable housing for an average worker particularly in the universities. The constitution did not in anyway mandate the government to provide houses for its workforce as to provide the legal implication for failing to do so. There is complete lack of consistency and

continuity in housing policy formulation and this has resulted to poor implementation strategies over the years.

2. We discovered that the federal government provided few coaster buses to convey FUNAI staff to and fro the capital city (Abakaliki) and the school. No current government plan to provide any housing unit to cushion the effects of transportation. Lectures hardly start as provided for in the school time table and most times, lecturers do not come at all. Unlike FUNAI, no provision has been made by the state government either to provide staff quarters in EBSU or shuttle buses to cushion the effects of moving to and fro the campuses. This affects the quality of academic activities in the university.
3. We also discovered that high interest rates from commercial bank loans and the inability of the Federal Mortgage Bank (FMBN) to provide adequate mortgage facilities have further compounded the problem. This is coupled with high inflation rate. Government is not helping matters as the involvement of the public sector in housing in Nigeria has been more of policy formulation than housing delivery, a situation that will spell doom for our dream of having world class universities. Government has not actually considered affordable housing as priority and the resultant effect has been unending financial corruption by both academic and non-academic staff to make housing ends meet, this is quite unfortunate especially as the time to achieve the vision 20:2020 is around the corner.

### **Conclusion/Recommendations**

The goal of achieving affordable and decent housing in our universities (EBSU & FUNAI) is attainable but the necessary machinery must be put in place and on time too. An average investor will be willing to as quickly as possible work in difficult environments in the short and long run if there is convincing evidence that reforms that will improve the investment climate will be practically implementable. It has to be noted that high quality and well-managed housing in Nigerian universities, is a cornerstone of qualitative and sustainable education and so, the planning (timely) is a contributory factor.

Although government had at various times made provision for staff housing loans in our universities and had also delved into sites-and-service schemes and several others, the housing policies and programmes seem to have achieved nothing. This is however remediable provided there is a renewed commitment, redirection of focus and a demonstration of the right political will on the part of the new governments of President Muhammed Buhari and Governor Dave Umahi of Ebonyi state respectively.

Finally, the study concluded that any further delay in the provision of affordable housing in our universities, will dash the hope of meeting the target of vision 20:2020 in Nigeria education industry and this portends great danger for our all-round development.

In view of the foregoing, the following recommendations should be greeted with a high sense of urgency and a true national spirit:

1. Government should collaborate with the private sector and international aid agencies to provide low-cost housing schemes in our nation's universities. Before then, there should be an immediate National Assembly Legislation making it compulsory for Federal and state governments in Nigeria to provide low-cost housing in all public universities. To ensure that government does not operate on a loss, deductions of housing allowances

should be from the source of the salary account of a prospective university staff. This will reduce the feeling effect on the part of the university staff. Since government through the yearly budget should not be expected to shoulder the responsibility of providing low-cost housing alone, public-private partnership will be a welcome development. Also, the capital market can be a good source of providing long-term funds through the issuance of bonds and other financial instruments to finance infrastructural projects. The implementation of such project(s) should be left in the hands of the university authorities while the government should ensure adequate and transparent monitoring to ensure results.

2. Government should set up a committee that will work out a master-plan to realize sustainability in the housing project. The factors such as workable housing policy formulation and decision making, execution and monitoring including social acceptability and economic feasibility should not be treated with laxity.
3. Since every public policy and programme are known to achieve better results under a peaceful and favourable political atmosphere, concerted efforts by the political leaders at all levels of government, should be made a priority. This will among other things ensure that housing programmes are devoid of unnecessary political interference. Nigerians must be re-orientated on this.

As multi-faceted as the problem of public sector housing can be, the implication is that much time and efforts can still be wasted on policy documents and programme designs if the required political will, astuteness and capacity to make them work are absent.

## **References**

- Ademiluyi, A.I. and Raji, B.A. (2008). Public and Private Developers as Agents in Urban Housing Delivery in Sub-Saharan Africa: The Situation in Lagos State, *Humanities and Social Sciences Journal*, 3(2) (2008), pp. 143-150.
- Ademiluyi, I.A. (2010). Public Housing Delivery in Nigeria: A Historical Perspective of Policies and Programmes. *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa* 12(6) 153-168.
- Adesoji, D.J. (2011). Urbanization Challenges and Housing Delivery in Nigeria. The Need for an Effective Policy Framework for Sustainable Development. *International Review of Social Sciences and Humanities* vol. 2, No. 1 (2011), pp. 176-185.
- Ajanlekoko, K.S. (2001). Appraisal of the National Housing Policy. *Housing Today* 1(6) 13-20.
- Akinmoladun, O.I and Oluwoye, J. (2007). An Assessment of why the Problems of Housing Shortages Persist in Developing Countries: A Case Study of Lagos Metropolis Nigerian *Pakistan Journal of social Sciences* 4(4) 589-598.
- Ali, I. (1996). The National Housing Programme – The Way Forward – Housing Today – the *Journal of the Association of Housing Corporations of Nigeria* 11(2) 16-19.
- Aribigbola, A. (2008). *Conceptual Issues in Housing and Housing Provision in Nigeria*, Akure: FUTA.

- Awotona, A. (1990). *Nigerian Government Participation in Housing: 1970-1980*. *Habitat international* 14(10) 17-40.
- Bana, P.M. (1991). *Housing the Urban Poor in Nigeria the Nigerian Institute of Architects Journal* 6(1) 22-25.
- Bello, M.O, and Bello, V.A. (2006). *Sustainable Investment in Nigeria Housing Sector: What Went Wrong*. Ogun: Covent University.
- Emerole, C.G. (2002). Restructuring Housing Development and Financing in Nigeria: The Role of Partnership and Collaboration Strategies. *Housing Today* 1(5) 26-29.
- Ezeani, E.O. (2005). *Fundamentals of Public Administration*, Enugu: Zik-Chuks Publishers.
- Federal Republic of Nigeria (FRN). *National Housing Policy*, Lagos (1991). Federal Ministry of Works and Housing.
- Henry, N. (1995). *Public Administration and Public Affairs*, New York: Prentice-Hall of India Ltd.
- Ibem, E.O. (2006). An Assessment of the Role of Government Agencies in Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs) in Housing Delivery in Nigeria. *Journal of Construction in Developing Countries* 15(2) 23-48.
- Ibem, E.O. and Amole, O.O. (2010). *Evaluation of Housing Programmes in Nigeria: A Theoretical and Conceptual Approach – the Built and Human Environment Review* 3:88-116.
- Ibem, E.O., Anosike, M.N., Azuh, D.E. (2011). Challenges in Public Housing Provision in the Post Independence Era in Nigeria. *International Journal of Human Sciences* vol. 8 Issue 2, pp. 421-443.
- Ikejiofor, U. (1999). A, 1975-1995. Ha The God that Failed. A Critique of Public Housing in *Nigeribitat International*, 23(2) 177-188.
- Jiboye, A.D. (2010). Correlates of Public Housing in Lagos, Nigeria. *Journal of Geography and Regional planning* 3(2) 017-028.
- Jiboye, A.D. (2010). The Challenges of Sustainable Housing and Urban Development in Nigeria: *Being a Paper Presented at Fourth International Conference on Research and Development, International Research and Development Institute, UNILAG, AKOKA, Nigeria*.
- Kellecher, K. (2010). *Organizational Capacity to Deliver Effective Treatments for Children and Adolescents. Administrative Policy Mental Health* 37:89-94.

- Lawanson, T.O. (2005). *Challenges of Sustainability and Urban Development in Nigeria: Reviewing the Millennium Development Goals*. Nigeria: Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife.
- Mba, H.C. (1992). The Delimmas of the Housing programmes in Nigeria in H.C. Mba, J.U. Ogbazi & K.O. Efobi (eds) *Principles and Practice of Urban and Regional Planning in Nigeria*, Awka: Mekslink Publishers Nigeria.
- Mustapha, I. (2002). Overview of Housing and Urban Development Programme Since Independence. *Housing Today Journal of the Association of Housing Corporation of Nigeria* 1(6) 28-30.
- Okolie, A.M. (2001). A Critical Assessment of Urban Housing Programmes in Nigeria, in Ezeani, E.O. and Elekwa N.N. (2010). *Issues in Urbanization and urban Administration in Nigeria*, Enugu: Jamoe Enterprises (Nigeria).
- Olotauh, A.O. (2010). *Housing Development and Environmental Degeneration in Nigeria. The Built and Human Environment Review* 3:42-48.
- Olotuah, A.O. and Adedeji, Y.M.D. (2007). *An Evaluation of Accessibility of Low-Income Earners to Housing Finance in Nigeria: the Nigerian Housing Perspective/D-Review*.Net.
- Olotuah, A.O. and Bobadoye, S.A. (2009). Sustainable Housing Provision for the Urban Poor: A Review of Public Sector Intervention in Nigeria. *The Built and Human Environment Review*, 2(2009), 51-63.
- Omole, F.K. (2001). *Basic Issues in Housing Development*, Ondo: Efmobless Publishers.
- Onibokun, A.G. (1990). *Public Housing Delivery System in Nigeria: A Critical Review*. Nigerian Institute of Social and Economic Research, NISER, Ibadan, 429-446.
- Onwuemenyi, O. (2008). Nigerian Housing Sector in Punch Tuesday, January 29, 2008. Retrieved April 18, 2008.
- Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary (1998). Special Price Edition: London: Oxford University Press.
- Oxley, M. (1999). *Institutional Structure of Social Housing Finance in the UK: Recent Developments*. *Urban Studies* 36(4) 673-682.
- Pepple, A.I. (2013). *Ministerial Platform Mid-Term Report of President Goodluck Jonathan's Administration*. Abuja: Ministry of Lands, Housing and Urban Development.
- Sengupta, U. and Tipple, A.G. (2007). *The Performance of Public Sector Housing in Kolkata India, in the Post-Reform Milieu*. *Urban Studies* 44(10) 200-2037.

UN-HABITAT (2006). *National Trends in Housing Production Practices*. Vol. 4: Nigeria, United Nations Centre for Human Settlements: Nairobi.

Valencia, M.M. (2007). Poor Politics Poor Housing Policy under the Color Government in Brazil (1990-92) *Environment and Urbanization* 19(2)391-408.