Assessment of Residential Building conditions and Property Management Strategies in Minna, Nigeria

Rukaiyat Adeola Ogunbajo
B.Tech, M.Tech, ANIVS, RSV
Department of Estate Management and Valuation
Federal University of Technology, Minna-Nigeria
e-mail: rukky.adeola@futminna.edu.ng

ABSTRACT
This study assessed the conditions of leasehold dwelling units and property management strategies in Minna, Nigeria. It sampled 328 dwelling units spread across selected neighbourhoods. Questionnaire were administered and used to solicit relevant data for the study. Simple percentages, total weighted scores, weighted mean, contingency table, chi square distribution, and phi coefficient were used to analyse collated data at various levels of the research. Findings revealed poor conditions of 55.2% of leasehold dwelling units. A computed chi square value (X^2 = 48.965) indicated no statistical significant difference in the overall condition of dwelling units across the sampled neighbourhoods. Findings also showed that only 31% of dwelling units are managed by professional estate surveyors, periodic general renovations by property managers were not carried out in any of the sampled units, while 41% of respondents linked the management and maintenance of ancillary facilities in their neighbourhoods to community efforts and contributions. It further revealed that 51% of respondents were not satisfied with the management of their dwelling units, while 84% of residents were not satisfied with the management of ancillary facilities in their neighbourhoods. A chi square value (X^2 = 14.965) and phi coefficient (φ = 0.209) revealed a weak, but positive and statistically significant relationship between building conditions and management type in the study area. The study emphasized the significance of effective and efficient management practices as key players in ensuring that residential buildings remain in good and decorative states or repair.

Key words: Building condition, Ancillary facilities, Management, Estate surveyor

INTRODUCTION
Buildings are generally known to occupy a reasonable proportion of available urban space. A significant number of these buildings in urban areas are for residential purposes as they provide dwellings for human habitation. According to Ansah (2012), residential property development is one of the most important subsectors of the real estate industry, and it is often described as an essential and important aspect of the socio-economic development of nations. Apart from its economic and physical significance, residential buildings also have social implications which affect the quality of lives and dignity of the occupants (Jinadu, 2007). Over the years, many Nigerian cities have witnessed a tremendous increase in the rate of urbanization, thus, resulting in an increased need for residential accommodation. In response to this, individuals and corporate bodies have embarked on residential property developments in a bid to address the increasing need for residential accommodation. As observed by Olujimi and Bello (2009), the increasing demand for residential property in urban centres would continue to attract the investment interests of real estate developers. In Nigeria and other developing countries, the capital intensive nature of residential property development makes it unaffordable for a considerable proportion of urban dwellers, hence, the need for this category of people to resort to renting residential apartments. However, every dwelling unit intended for use as human habitation is expected to comply with minimum standards of fitness for human habitation in accordance with applicable laws. In Nigeria, the Public Health Laws of Nigeria (1959) as cited in Abiodun and Segun (2005) clearly stipulates conditions expected of a dwelling place in Nigeria. Section 6 of the law explains nuisance conditions, the presence of which renders housing units unsanitary and unsafe. It stipulates that houses should not be damp, ill-ventilated, littered with refuse, or lack essential sanitary facilities. Dwelling units should be accessible by road, have good drainage systems, adequate facilities for waste management, regular and safe sources of water supply, among others.

Aside the provision of dwelling units, the management and maintenance of these units is a subject of discussion in many academic and professional circles. It has been argued that appropriate management principles are necessary to make dwelling units worthwhile for human habitation. According to Lawal (2002), if satisfactory housing services are to be provided, commensurate with the important role it plays in the lives of the people inhabiting these houses, management and maintenance should be given a top priority. Property Management basically entails the provision and control of a residential property with its related community facilities to ensure its proper care, its maximum use and enjoyment, its optimum benefit to the landlord, tenant and other residents in the neighborhood (Lawal, 2002). Its major objective is to secure maximum economic returns from available resources having regard to the present and future social exigencies (Emoh, 2004). According to Kuye (2008), management of dwelling units is essential in order to prolong the useful life of the house by controlling the incidence of obsolescence, ensure that the house remains in good physical condition, ensure the functionality of the building, help sustain the periodic income realizable from the house, and enhances the social life of the end users through better accommodation, infrastructure and healthy environment.

In recent times, studies on many Nigerian cities, as well as empirical evidence has shown a general poor state of residential settlements, particularly in low income and high density neighbourhoods for example Coker, *et al*, (2007); Ilesanmi,(2012); Ogunleye, (2013); and Owoeye & Ogundiran (2014), among others. In a bid to emphasize the significance or otherwise of property management to building conditions and residents' well-being, this research theoretically and empirically examines the condition of physical building components of leasehold residential buildings, the quality of services provided in these dwelling units, and the condition of basic ancillary facilities in ten (10) selected low/middle income neighbourhoods in Minna. The study provides an indepth analysis of the factors which are significant in explaining these conditions, focusing primarily on the management strategies adopted. It also examines the relationship between management type and the condition of dwelling units. This study employed a reasonable sample and different analysis approaches, the objective of which is to provide evidence on the extent to which professional management strategies contribute in determining the condition of leasehold residential buildings or otherwise.

An Overview of Residential Dwelling conditions in Nigeria

The relevance of shelter to man has been extensively dealt with in literature and cannot be over emphasized. The 1999 Constitution of Nigeria recognises housing as a fundamental human right, thus it is imperative that all Nigerians have access to decent accommodation. However, existing literature shows an apparent variation in residential building conditions across different geographical areas, for instance: A study by Abiodun and Segun (2005) assessed the status of housing in Ile-Ife, south western Nigeria. The study aimed at assessing the compliance of housing units to minimum standards of fitness as stipulated in existing regulations. 324 housing units were assessed and findings showed that most of the housing units did not meet the basic requirements expected of living premises, thus unfit for habitation based on public health standards. Indices of fitness employed in the study are: approved building plan, adequate accessibility, adequate spacing, damp-free indoor environment, adequate sewage disposal, adequate solid waste disposal facility, adequate water supplies and availability of mosquito nets, adequate drainage systems, and regular sanitary inspection by Environmental Health Officers.

Coker, *et al*, (2007) carried out a survey of housing quality and neighbourhood environments in Ibadan, Nigeria. The research primarily aimed at evaluating housing in the study area, thus, the city was divided into high, medium and low density zones. A total of 172 dwellings were

surveyed and penalty scoring was used to assess the conditions of housing and quality of the environment in each zone. Results showed that approximately half of all the dwellings surveyed in the three zones had sub-standard housing conditions and were categorised as unfit for human habitation. Also, only one of the low density areas had good neighbourhood environment, while none of the high and medium density areas had good environmental conditions. Findings further showed that houses in the high density areas had the worst housing and environmental characteristics, followed by houses in the medium density area. Houses were classified into: good, acceptable, borderline, substandard and unfit based on scores obtained from a survey of means of sewage disposal, toilet facilities, water supply, electricity supply, ventilation, safety and degree of occupancy.Jiboye (2011) evaluated public housing performance in Lagos state using tenants' rating of residential quality in order to provide a rationale for residential quality improvement. 1,022 households drawn from four (4) public housing estates were sampled and residential quality was determined using variables which were rated and ranked based on their calculated weight values. The study showed the level of adequacy of variables such as water adequacy, floor quality, access to neighbourhood facilities, privacy, ventilation, sewage disposal system, conditions of windows and ceilings, and adequate lighting among others in terms of quality and availability. Ilesanmi (2012) also examined the housing and neighbourhood quality of public housing in Lagos. The research sampled 225 housing units comprising 5 low-income and 3 middle income estates, and data were analysed using penalty scoring. Indicators used to measure housing quality include: external visual quality, structural quality of buildings, and quality of housing services, neighbourhood roads, landscaping, environmental layout and location. Findings revealed that 34% of the sampled housing units were of poor quality, dilapidated, and showed visible signs of two or more major defects; while 65% and 30% in low and middle income estates respectively presented poor neighbourhood quality.

Jiboye (2012) carried out a post-occupancy evaluation of residential satisfaction in Oniru Estate, Lagos. Among other objectives, the study sought to assess the physical characteristics of housing units and the environment. Performance criteria used in assessing housing units include: accessibility, functionality, spatial adequacy and efficiency, aesthetics, security and privacy; while factors considered in assessing the condition of the environment include: external visual quality, quality of maintenance, structural quality, quality of services, quality of estate roads, quality of landscape and open spaces, environmental layout and location. The study presented the cumulative scores on the rating of housing physical characteristics based on the above criteria which showed that 58.1% of housing was in good state, while 30.3% and 11.6% were in fair and bad states respectively. Ogunleye (2013) examined the physical conditions of low-income settlements in the core areas of Akure. 14 residential neighbourhoods were sampled and collected data were analysed using simple frequency and percentage distribution. Findings showed that majority of the housing units lack basic infrastructure and as much as 53.3% of them were described as unsatisfactory by modern standards. Adeleye *et al* (2014) examined the perception of housing quality by residents and non- residents of Ibara housing estate, Abeokuta. Weighted mean scores were used to analyse collected data. The study established that the condition of building elements such as roofs, walls, floors windows, doors, toilets/bathrooms, lighting and ceiling, were perceived by the residents to be of good condition, they were also fairly satisfied with facilities and services in the estate.

Anofojie *et al* (2014) examined the quality of housing in five (5) public housing estates in Amuwo odofin local government area of Lagos State. A total of 77 housing units were sampled. Building elements considered in analysing the quality of housing units include: roofs, walls, floors, doors, windows, toilets, bathrooms, staircases, lighting, ceiling, painting and ventilation. Similarly, basic infrastructure considered were: public transportation,

recreational facilities, power supply, security, car park, refuse management, roads, drainages, water supply, health care facilities, schools, public toilets, markets and shopping centres. A five (5) point likert scaling was adopted for the analysis which described the overall condition of building elements in the sampled estates as fair, while the overall condition of infrastructure was described as bad. Owoeye and Ogundiran (2014) assessed housing and environmental quality of Moniya community in Ibadan. 185 residents were sampled, and findings revealed that Moniya is a typical slum community with inadequate basic services, substandard housing and derelict structures, acute congestion and unhealthy living conditions. Materials used for wall and roof construction, as well as the physical condition of housing units were the determinants of housing condition, while indices used in assessing environmental quality were: sources of water supply, toilet and bathroom facilities, source of electricity, condition of drainages, method of waste disposal, condition of access roads, health and educational facilities.

Ogunbajo (2013) assessed housing management and maintenance in two federal housing estates in Abuja. Among other objectives, the study sought to examine the conditions of housing and neighbourhood facilities in the estates, and also assess management strategies and maintenance approaches adopted. A total of 735 housing units were sampled, and collected data were analysed with frequency counters, simple percentages and weighed mean. Results showed varying physical conditions of housing units in the sampled estates. While some were intact and in good of state of repairs indicating serious maintenance commitment, others were bad and unattractive showing general neglect or non-challance to maintenance. It is evident from above that the conditions of residential dwellings in many Nigerian cities are in deplorable conditions.

RESEARCH METHOD

The research population for this study comprised leasehold residential dwelling units (ie, residential buildings occupied by tenants) in ten (10) selected areas in Minna Metropolis where rapid residential property developments have been observed in recent times. The Abuja Electricity Distribution Company put the total number of housing units in these areas as at the time of this research at 31,126. This was adopted due to the absence of up to date records on the number of residential dwelling units in these areas by the National Population Commission and the Niger State Bureau of Statistics, and also because a very significant proportion of dwelling units in these areas are connected to the National grid. Based on this, it was estimated that 40% of the total dwelling units in the study area are leasehold properties (occupied by tenants). This is in line with Malpezzi (1993) which estimated that roughly 40% of the world's population lives in rental housing, Ivy and Ernest (2010) which described 43% of Ghanian residents are tenants, and the American Community Survey micro data (2014), which documented that 35% of the United States residents occupy rented houses. The study population was therefore put at 12,450 dwelling units. A sample size of 373 dwelling units was arrived at using the sample size calculator (2015) by Mocorr Research Solutions online. This was distributed proportionately among the selected neighbourhoods based on the number of dwelling units in each neighbourhood. In order to ensure a fair selection of the sample from the population, a multi-stage sampling was adopted. First, the entire population was divided into a number of strata. This is similar to the classification of Coker, *et al* (2007); Olujimi and Bello (2009); Adebayo (2012); Famuyiwa and Otegbulu (2012); and Ogunleye (2013), while the next stage involved the random selection of samples from each stratum. Questionnaire were designed and administered on household heads, or any available adult member of the household to solicit information on the condition of building components, availability and condition of basic ancillary facilities, management responsibility, service charge administration and management, frequency of repairs, and other general management

issues. A total of 328 questionnaires were duely completed and retrieved, representing a response rate of 88%. Inspections were also conducted round the whole area, observations were made and findings noted.

The conditions of physical building components of dwelling units, services provided within each unit, and the basic ancillary facilities in each of the sampled neighbourhoods were assessed on a three point likert type scale. Frequency counters and simple percentages were used in this research to describe these conditions. These simply involved collating frequencies of the conditions of all variables measured and computing percentages therefrom. The condition of each dwelling unit was thereafter measured using total weighted scores of all the variables measured. In achieving this, numerical values were assigned to respondents' rating of the condition of each of the variables measured in ascending order, with 1 representing the worst conditions and 3 representing the best conditions. Cut –off marks were thereafter derived and used to ascertain the condition of each dwelling unit. In arriving at the cut-off marks, the summation of weighed scores was computed based on the assumption that all variables were in their best conditions on one hand (51), and at their worst conditions on the other hand (18). These two values were thereafter divided into two (2) class intervals, and further indexed into two quality grades indicating good condition and poor conditions respectively. Where the summation of weighted scoresfor a dwelling unit was between 35 and 51, such unit was said to be in good condition, while a total weighted score of between 18 and 34 signified an overall poor condition of such dwelling unit.

Weighted mean scores for each of the measured variables were further computed for each neighbourhood. The summation of weighted mean scores of all the eighteen (18) variables measured was used to denote the overall condition of dwelling units in each neighbourhood. Since the sampled areas have similar neighbourhood characteristics, the contingency table was used to test the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference in the condition of dwelling units across the neighbourhoods. Weighted mean scores for all the variables measured were computed from frequencies collated in each of the sampled areas, and built into the contingency table for analysis.

The property management strategies adopted in the study area was also examined and presented using frequency distribution. The chi square statistic (X^2) and Phi coefficient (*f*) was used to test for a significant relationship between management type and the condition of dwelling units. Comprehensive details and respondents assessment of all management related issues are presented in form of tables. All data analysis was conducted using Analyse-it® v4.5 statistical software for Microsoft Excel and SPSS v21.The sampled neighbourhoods are coded as N_1- N_{10} for ease of data presentation and analysis. They are: Barkin-saleh (N_1), Maikunkele (N_2), Chanchaga (N_3), Kpakungu (N_4), Maitumbi (N_5), Gbaganu (N_6), Nyikangbe (N_7), Sauka-kahuta (N_8), Tudun-fulani (N_9), and Fadikpe (N_{10}).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

Physical Building Components

Responses on the condition of physical building components of residential buildings in the sampled neighbourhoods were collated and percentages computed therefrom. Physical building components measured include internal and external walls, floors, ceiling, roof, doors and windows. One striking observation based on percentage computations from collated data is that as much as 50% of walls in neighbourhoods N_1, N_2, N_3 and N_4 were damp, while over 50% of internal and external walls in neighbourhoods N_6, N_7 and N_{10} were good. Computations from collated data further revealed that 46% of dwelling units in N_4have leaking ceilings, while over 60% of dwelling units in N_2, N_3, N_5, N_6, N_7 and N_{10} have good ceilings. None of the dwelling units have their roofs blown off, while the condition of doors

and windows varies across the neighbourhoods. Some were in good conditions, while others were in fair and bad conditions.

Services provided within dwelling units

Certain services are provided within the dwelling units, and the conditions of these services were also examined. These include the condition of toilet and bathroom facilities, kitchen, sources of water supply, regularity of electricity supply, and the availability of wall fence around housing units. Frequencies of respondents' rating for the condition of each of these services were collated and percentages computed therefrom. Findings showed that only 7%, 14%, 16% and 22% of dwelling units in N_2, N_4, N_9, and N_{10} respectively have good toilets and bathrooms, while as much as 45%, 66%and 32% of dwelling units in N_1, N_4, and N_9 respectively have bad toilets and bathrooms. It was recorded that water in the study area is commonly sourced from three (3) sources, viz: supply from the public mains, bore holes and hand dug wells. Findings revealed that water supply from the public mains is totally unavailable in some areas, thus, residents have to source alternative sources of water supply. A significant proportion of residents' source water from hand dug wells within the neighbourhoods. Electricity supply is also very epileptic in the study area. Based on findings, as much as nine (9) out of the ten (10) areas sampled received electricity supply from the public mains for less than twelve (12) hours per day. Also, findings revealed that 84%, 77%, 57%, and 65% of dwelling units in N_4, N_5, N_6, and N_8 respectively do not have wall fences, while 63% and 61% of dwelling units in N_9 and N_{10} have wall fences.

Basic Ancillary facilities in the sampled Neighbourhoods

It is widely accepted that certain ancillary facilities enhances the liveability and comfort of urban dwellers in residential areas. Some of these basic ancillary facilities perceived to have direct impacts on residential buildings were examined. They include access roads, drainage facilities, mode of refuse disposal, general sanitary condition, landscaping & general aesthetics, as well as the level of security. The conditions of these facilities within the immediate vicinity of the sampled dwelling units in the study area were also assessed on a three point likert type scale. Similar to assessments in previous sections, frequencies for the condition of each of these facilities were collated and percentages computed therefrom.

Findings revealed that a significant percentage of access roads to residential dwellings in the study area are untarred. However, while some of these untarred access roads are motorable, quite a number of them are not motorable. Precisely, none of the dwelling units in N_6, N_7, N_9 and N_{10} have tarred access roads, while only 6%, 5%, and 17% of dwelling units in N_1, N_4, and N_5 respectively have tarred access roads. Records further showed that quite a number of dwelling units in the sampled areas lack functional drainage systems to convey waste water and runoff, with as much as 60%, 67%, 70%, 55% and 50% in N_1, N_2, N_4, N_6 and N_{10} respectively. For dwelling units with drainage systems, a considerable number of them are blocked while some are good. A significant proportion of residents dispose refuse in designated refuse dump sites, and in available open spaces (which are burnt in some cases), while less than 25% of residents in six (6) out of the ten (10) sampled areas dispose their refuse in dustbins which are further cleared by waste disposal authorities at intervals. The general sanitary condition of the study area was rated as clean, fair, and dirty (as the case may be) based on findings from physical inspection of the area as at the time of this study. However, these in most cases were best described as fair and dirty, while very few were clean. An assessment of the landscaping and general aesthetics of the areas revealed that the condition of landscaping and general aesthetics within the immediate vicinity of 100% of dwelling units in three (3) of the sampled areas were bad, and same applies to 85%, 90%, 81% and 94% of dwelling units in N_5, N_6, N_7 and N_{10} respectively. Finally, residents' perception of the level of security in their various neighbourhoods was also recorded. Over 50% of residents in seven (7) out of the ten (10) sampled areas described their various

neighbourhoods as secured. Frequency distribution tables for findings in section 4.1 – 4.3 are not presented due to their voluminous nature but can be found in the appendix.

Overall Condition of Leasehold Residential Dwellings

In a bid to establish the overall condition of leasehold residential dwellings in the study area, the condition of each dwelling unit was determined by comparing the summation of weighted scores of all the eighteen (18) variables measured in each unit with the derived cut-off marks. The total number of dwelling units in good and poor conditions was derived and is presented in table 1. The table shows that only 44.8% of residential buildings occupied by tenants in the study area are of good condition, while 55.2% of such dwellings are in poor condition.

Table 1: Overall condition of dwelling units

Condition of Building	Freq.	Percentage
Good Condition	147	44.80%
Poor Condition	181	55.20%
Total	328	100%

Going a step further, weighted mean scores were computed for each variable on neighbourhood basis. The summation of weighted mean scores of all the eighteen (18) variables measured was used to denote the overall condition of dwelling units in each of the sampled areas. This is shown in table 2. A careful look at the last row of table 2 reveals slight variations in the total weighted mean scores across the neighbourhoods. The scores are highest in neighbourhoods N_3 and N_{10} (35.21) indicating a slightly better overall conditions of leasehold residential buildings. This is followed closely by N_7 (34.84), N_6 and N_8 (34.12), N_5 (34.02), N_2 (33.74) and N_9 (33.17). Neighbourhoods N_1 and N_4 have the least total weighted scores (31.10 and 28.63 respectively) thus indicating overall worse conditions compared to other neighbourhoods.

Table 2: Weighted mean scores for all variables measured.

Variables measured	**Neighbourhoods**									
	N_1	**N_2**	**N_3**	**N_4**	**N_5**	**N_6**	**N_7**	**N_8**	**N_9**	**N_{10}**
Internal and External walls	1.800	2.111	2.242	1.821	2.264	2.595	2.465	2.235	2.158	2.333
Floor	2.150	2.815	2.697	2.446	2.925	2.881	2.907	2.529	2.368	2.444
Ceiling	2.150	2.592	2.636	2.036	2.528	2.571	2.628	2.176	2.263	2.667
Roof	2.450	2.741	2.636	2.286	2.679	2.476	2.535	2.471	2.434	2.556
Doors	2.050	1.926	2.182	1.661	1.962	1.929	2.116	1.824	2.105	2.333
Windows	1.900	2.111	2.091	1.893	2.151	2.190	2.279	2.294	2.263	2.222
Toilet	1.850	1.778	2.030	1.482	2.208	2.024	2.140	2.118	1.842	2.111
Bathroom	1.850	1.778	2.030	1.482	2.208	2.024	2.140	2.118	1.842	2.111
Kitchen	2.000	2.074	2.151	1.571	2.019	2.048	2.023	2.118	2.053	2.167
Water supply	1.800	1.556	1.697	1.839	1.585	1.500	1.419	1.412	1.579	1.994
Electricity supply	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.302	1.235	1.368	1.000
Wall fence	1.400	1.481	1.485	1.161	1.226	1.429	1.465	1.353	1.631	1.611
Access road	1.650	1.926	2.000	1.500	1.680	1.738	1.651	2.059	1.684	1.444
Drainage facilities	1.550	1.593	1.848	1.339	1.698	1.571	1.977	1.941	1.947	1.611
Mode of refuse disposal	1.400	1.556	1.879	1.375	1.453	1.548	1.488	1.882	1.737	1.994
General sanitary condition	1.500	1.852	1.515	1.304	1.679	1.786	1.698	1.588	1.316	1.889
Landscapping & general aesthetics	1.000	1.222	1.455	1.000	1.170	1.095	1.233	1.294	1.000	1.056
Security	1.600	1.630	1.636	1.429	1.585	1.714	1.372	1.471	1.579	1.667
Total Weighted Mean Scores	**31.10**	**33.74**	**35.21**	**28.63**	**34.02**	**34.12**	**34.84**	**34.12**	**33.17**	**35.21**

The study further explored if there is a significant difference in the overall condition of dwelling units across neighbourhoods. The contingency table was used to test the null hypothesis that overall building conditions are the same across the sampled neighbourhoods, thus, average weighted scores of all the variables measured across the selected neighbourhoods were built into the contingency table, and chi square (X^2)computed therefrom. Upon computation, $X^2 = 48.965$. With a confidence level of 95% and a critical $X^2 = 124.342$, the null hypothesis (H_o) is accepted since the critical $X^2(124.342)$ exceeds the calculated $X^2(48.965)$. This implies that there is no statistically significant difference in the overall condition of leasehold residential dwellings across the sampled neighbourhoods. As such, this study conveniently describes leasehold dwellings in the sampled areas as having similar conditions.

Property Management Strategies Investigated

Certain management strategies are employed by property managers in a bid to ensure that managed properties remain in good and decorative state of repairs. Prominent strategies employed in the study area for the management of residential buildings were assessed by residents and are presented in table 3.

Findings revealed that varied categories of individuals are involved in the management of dwelling units in the study area. They are estate surveyors and valuers, lawyers, agents, care takers, and landlords. This study however classified them into two broad categories, viz: Professional estate surveyors and non-Professional estate surveyors. Records in table 3 show that 31% of the sampled dwellings are managed by professional estate surveyors, while 69% of them are managed by non-professional estate surveyors. These non-professionals comprise lawyers, agents, care takers and landlords. Research findings as documented in table 3 also show that periodic inspections are carried out in only 33% of the dwelling units while such inspections are not carried out in 67% of the units. Ideally, periodic inspections should be carried out by property managers in order to identify faults in the property and also ensure that observed faults are taken care off so as to reduce obsolescence. The table further depicts that repair works are carried out twice a year by property managers in only 1% of the dwelling units, while yearly repair works by property managers is undertaken in 8% of the sampled dwellings. For 53% of the residential units, repair works are carried out by the management authorities when major faults are reported, while repair works are never carried out by management authorities in 38% of the dwellings. For dwelling units in the last category, repair works are solely carried out by the occupants of these units.

Table 3: Frequency distribution for management strategies employed in the study area.

Management Strategies	Frequency	Percentage (%)
N = 328		
Responsibility for management of dwelling units		
Professional Estate Surveyor	103	31%
Non-professional estate surveyor	225	69%
Periodic inspections of dwelling units		
Yes	108	33%
No	220	67%
Frequency of repairs by property managers		
Monthly	0	0%
Quarterly	0	0%
Half yearly	3	1%
Yearly	28	8%

When major faults are reported	173	53%
Never	124	38%
General renovation of dwelling unit by property managers		
Quarterly	0	0%
Half yearly	0	0%
Yearly	0	0%
Never	328	100%
Payment of service charge		
Yes	159	48%
No	169	52%
Insurance of dwelling unit		
Yes	0	0%
No	0	0%
No idea	328	100%
Responsibility for management and maintenance of ancillary facilities		
Government agencies	26	8%
Community efforts/ Contributions	134	41%
Individuals	15	4%
No body	108	33%
No idea	45	14%

All the residents also affirmed that throughout the period of their tenancy terms, general renovation of their dwelling units have never been carried out by the property managers. Findings further revealed that 48% of residents pay service charge, while 52% do not pay. All the residents had no idea as to whether their dwelling units have been insured or not.

Other findings from the study as documented in table 3 reveals that community efforts are employed by 42% of residents for the management and maintenance of ancillary facilities. In this case, residents are directly involved in digging and clearing gutters, filling potholes with sand bags, burning refuse, making monetary contributions to fix major electrical faults, build culverts, etc. On the contrary, 33% of residents affirmed that nobody manage these facilities in their immediate neighbourhoods. They are left unattended to, thus the reason for the poor and dilapidated conditions of ancillary facilities in the affected neighbourhoods. 14% of the residents had no idea of who manages and maintains ancillary facilities in their neighbourhoods, while 4% of residents reported that certain maintenance works are sometimes undertaken by well to do individuals in the neighbourhood. For 8% of residents, government agencies carry out maintenance of ancillary facilities in their neighbourhoods. Respondents in the first three (3) categories adopted the above mentioned alternatives as a result of negligence on the part of the government agencies responsible for the maintenance of ancillary facilities.

Residents also expressed varied levels of satisfaction with the management of their dwelling units as well as ancillary facilities in their neighbourhoods. These are presented in table 4. As shown in the table, 14% of residents were very satisfied with the management of their dwelling units, 35% were satisfied, while 51% were not satisfied. Similarly, while 16% of residents were satisfied with the management of ancillary facilities in their respective neighbourhoods, 84% of residents were not satisfied with the management of these facilities.

Table 4. Residents' level of satisfaction with management

Level of satisfaction	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Management of dwelling unit		
Very satisfied	48	14%
Satisfied	114	35%
Not satisfied	166	51%
Management of ancillary facilities		
Very satisfied	0	0%
Satisfied	51	16%
Not satisfied	277	84%

The Relationship between Residential Building Condition and Management Type

This research also sought to establish if residential buildings under the management of professional estate surveyors have better conditions compared to those managed by non-professional estate surveyors. Having determined the condition of each dwelling unit and collated data on their respective management types, these two variables (building condition and management type) were cross tabulated as shown in table 5 for further analysis.

Table 5: Cross tabulation for Building conditions and Management types

		Building condition		Row Total
		Poor condition	Good condition	
Management type	Professional estate surveyor	41	62	103
	Non- professional estate surveyor	140	85	225
ColumnTotal		181	147	328

Figures in table 5 were subjected to statistical test using the chi square statistic (X^2) and the phi coefficient (*f*). While the chi square statistic tests for a significant relationship between the variables, the phi coefficient (*f*) is a well-known statistical tool that reveals information about the strength of the existing relationship. The resulting coefficient ranges from -1 to +1. Results of the chi square test are presented in table 6.

As indicated in table 6, the chi square value (X^2) at 1 degree of freedom is 14.356, and has a corresponding p value of 0.000. The p value is less than the alpha level ($\alpha = 0.05$), thus, signifies that a relationship exists between the management type employed in the study area and the condition of residential buildings.

Table 6: Chi square test for the relationship between building condition and management type

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	14.356[a]	1	.000		
Continuity Correction[b]	13.464	1	.000		
Likelihood Ratio	14.363	1	.000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.000	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	14.312	1	.000		
N of Valid Cases	328				

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 46.16.
b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Computation of the phi coefficient (*f*) helped to reveal the strength of the relationship between building condition and management type. A computed phi coefficient (0.209) with a corresponding p value (0.000) indicates a significant relationship between building conditions and management type. The strength of the existing relationship can however be described as weak because the phi coefficient is low (0.209). Analysis indicates that there is weak, positive and statistically significant relationship between building conditions and

management type in the study area. It therefore implies that good building conditions are associated with property management by professional estate surveyors, while poor building conditions are associated with non-professional management.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The significance of professional property management to building condition and residents' satisfaction has been emphasized. This study carefully examined the conditions of dwelling units in selected neighbourhoods in the study area by assessing the conditions of eighteen (18) variables for each of the dwelling units. Computed total weighted mean scores showed slight variations in these conditions across the neighbourhoods, which were proven to be statistically insignificant. This is attributed to similar management strategies employed in the management of leasehold residential units across neighbourhoods in the study area. Generally, the management of dwelling units and basic ancillary facilities in the study area can best be described as poor, since a significant proportion of the residents are not satisfied with these services. This study further attributes rapid obsolescence and the general poor outlook of residential areas to ineffective and inefficient management, as well as poor attitude to maintenance. With the extensive damage these have done to residential areas, a shift and a reorientation of management emphases has become necessary. Also, due to the capital intensive nature of residential property development, it is important that appropriate measures are taken to ensure that the invested capital is profitably recouped. Such measures include proper management and maintenance, thus, resulting in improved capital and / or rental values.

REFERENCES

Abiodun, P. B. and Segun, A. O. (2005). An Assessment of Housing Status in a Typical Nigerian Town. *Journal of Applied Sciences* 5, 437-440. Doi: 10.3923/jas.2005.437.440.

Adeleye, O. A., Azeez, T.O. and Yusuff, I.O. (2014). Perception of Housing Quality by Residents and Non-Residents of Ibara Housing Estate, Abeokuta, Ogun State, Nigeria. *American Journal of Human Ecology*. 3(3), 35-42.

Anofojie, A.E., Adeleye, O.A. and Kadiri, M.A. (2014). Housing Quality Assessment in selected Public Residential Estates in Amuwo-odofin LGA, Lagos, Nigeria. *International Journal of Research in Earth and Environmental Sciences*, 2(6), 7-16.

Ansah, A.O. (2012). Examination of the Determinants of Housing Values in Urban Ghana and Implications for Policy Makers. Paper presented at the African Real Estate Society Conference in Accra, Ghana from 24th -27th October 2012.

Coker, A.O., Awokola, O. S., Olomolaiye, P. O., and Booth, C. A. (2007). Challenges of Urban Housing Quality and its associations with Neighbourhood Environments: Insights and Experiences of Ibadan City, Nigeria. *Journal of Environmental Health* Research, 7(1), Available at www.cieh.org/jehr/jehr3.aspx?id=11490.

Emoh, F.I. (2004). *Real Property Investment and Management.* Akwa: Christon International Co. Ltd.

Ilesanmi, A.O. (2012). Housing, Neighbourhood quality and Quality of life in Public Housing in Lagos, Nigeria. *International Journal of Housing Science,* 36(4), 231-240.

Jiboye, A.D. (2011). Evaluating Public Housing Performance: Providing a basis for Residential Quality Improvement in Nigeria. *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research*, 9 (2), 225-232.

Jiboye, A.D. (2012). Post-Occupancy evaluation of Residential Satisfaction in Lagos, Nigeria: Feedback for Residential Improvement. *Frontiers of Architectural Research* (2012) 1, 236-243.

Jinadu, A. M. (2007). *Understanding the basis of Housing.* Revised edition, Jos: University Press. 205 pp

Kuye, O. G. (2008). *Estate Office Practice*. Lagos: Climax Communications Limited, 705pp.

Lawal, M. I. (2002). *Principles and Practice of Housing Management*. Ile-Ife: Ilco Books.

Ogunbajo, R.A. (2013). An Assessment of Housing Maintenance and Management in Federal Housing Estates in Abuja. *Journal of Nigerian Institution of Estate Surveyors and Valuers.* 38 (1), 65-76.

Ogunleye, B.M. (2013). Analysis of the Socio-economic Characteristics and Housing Conditions in the Core Neighbourhood of Akure. *Journal of Geography and Regional Planning*, 6 (6), 229-236.

Olujimi, J.A.B. and Bello, M.O. (2009). Effects of Infrastructural Facilities on the Rental Values of Residential Property. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 5 (4), 332-341.

Owoeye, J.O. and Ogundiran A.O. (2014). A Study on Housing and Environmental Quality of Moniya Community in Ibadan, Nigeria. *Journal of Environment and Earth Sciences*, 4(13), 51-60.