

This work is licensed under a
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-
NoDerivs 3.0 Licence.

To view a copy of the licence please see:
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>

HOUSING PREFERENCES AND POLICY
IN KIBERA, NAIROBI

By

Nelle W. Temple

DISCUSSION PAPER NO. 196

INSTITUTE FOR DEVELOPMENT STUDIES
UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI

MARCH, 1974

This paper was originally issued in January 1973 as I.D.S. Working Paper No. 88.

The research reported here was financed by a grant from the Center for International Studies of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, U.S.A. The author has benefitted from the assistance received as a Research Associate of the Nairobi City Council's Urban Study Group. The views expressed in this paper, however, are those of the author and should not be interpreted as reflecting the views of the Nairobi City Council, the Institute for Development Studies, the University of Nairobi or any other institution.

IDS/DE/196

HOUSING PREFERENCES AND POLICY IN KIBERA, NAIROBI

By

Nelle W. Temple

ABSTRACT

This paper reports data on housing and housing preferences gathered in a random sample survey of adults living in Kibera, Nairobi in June-July 1972. First, brief background information on the Kibera settlement is given, together with descriptions of Old Kibera housing and the three recent National Housing Corporation estates which are the first stage in the eventual total redevelopment of the area. Secondly, the sociological characteristics of owner-related and tenant-related adult residents of Old and New Kibera are summarised. Thirdly, their responses to various questions on housing preferences (e.g., willingness to pay higher rent, whether they could afford to buy a house in a new estate, the preferred design, location and facilities of housing, whether they would prefer renting or buying) are analysed in terms of some characteristics that might influence preferences. Fourthly, the impact of redevelopment at Kibera is considered in terms of the number and types of people who are likely to be displaced and the equity of various ways of dealing with resettlement of the Nubian and the poorer tenant population. The principal conclusion is that a large number of low-income people are likely to be more ill-housed after the redevelopment than before, even though many of them would be willing to pay the economic rent of decent low-cost permanent-quality accommodation. Public housing agencies should compensate for the demolition of low-income housing (when it makes way for middle-income housing) by replacing it with units of £500-1,000 either at Kibera or elsewhere in Nairobi, so that the city is not left with a bigger housing shortfall, relative to demand, than before the redevelopment program. The survey results are presented in detail in the tables for the benefit of other researchers and policy-makers.

HOUSING PREFERENCES AND POLICY IN KIBERA, NAIROBI

From a random sample survey of the adult population of Kibera, Nairobi, carried out in June-August 1972, data are available on the housing stock in Kibera, the sociological characteristics of Kibera residents and households, and the housing preferences of the Kibera residents. This paper will summarise these findings and briefly explore their implications for housing policy in Nairobi.

BACKGROUND ON KIBERA

The data reported in this paper come from a random sample of 418 adults¹ living in the area of Kibera bounded by the 1928 City boundary on the north and east, the Nairobi Dam and Mutoini River on the south and the Ngong Road Forest, Jamhuri Park and the Kibera

1. The sample was drawn in the following manner. Maps of all of Kibera, old and new, were drawn from on-the-ground observation and up-to-date aerial photographs in May-June 1972. Each separate residential building (detached structure) on the maps was numbered consecutively. A random number table was used to pick 178 houses from the approximately 1,300 buildings on the maps. Of these buildings, 10 were not inhabited at present, and information was refused in 3. The remaining 165 houses were mapped for sampling of random third adults by listing all adults living in the building and using one of thirty different patterns of selecting random third adults from the list. Interviewers then returned to the building to interview the individuals chosen. Out of 460 individuals selected by this sampling method, 40 were not interviewed (refusals - 16; unavailable-13; language difficulty-1; estimated interviews in 3 houses where information was refused-10). Two interviews were not completed and have been omitted from the analysis. The sample size for analysis is 418, representing a 91% completion rate (allowing only 4 substitutions). Interviews were conducted in 105 buildings in Old Kibera, 28 buildings in Salama, 23 buildings on the Hill, and 9 buildings (houses) in New Kibera Village. Note that the sample is a random sample of Kibera adults (age 16 and over), not a sample of household heads or households. Of the interviews 82% were in Swahili, 14% in English, and 4% in tribal languages (mostly Luo).

In the structures in our sample, the average number of households per building was 3.9 in Old Kibera and 2.0 in New Kibera. Old Kibera houses averaged 7.7 adults per building and 2.0 adults per household. New Kibera houses average 5.3 adults per building and 2.6 adults per household (in New Kibera Village each house was counted separately, while in Salama and the Hill semi-detached houses were counted together as one building rather than as separate houses).

= 2 =

Railway Station on the west. This is an area of approximately 820 acres. This area includes ten 'villages' of housing in temporary materials, totalling some 920 separate buildings. Approximately two-thirds of these buildings have been erected by Nubians who are descendants of Sudanese soldiers who were given Kibera residence permits between 1912 and 1934. The rest have been built since 1956 by 'squatters', mostly Kikuyu and Kamba, who live on the outlying fringes of Kibera near the Nairobi Dam or on the lower slopes of the Mutoini River Valley. The area also includes three housing estates built by the National Housing Corporation (N.H.C.) or the Ministry of Health and Housing since 1963. The first of these estates, called Salama by the local residents, was built and occupied in several phases in 1963-64, 1967-68, and 1969-1970. It consists of about 180 houses, most of which are detached or semi-detached 3-6 room 'Swahili-type' houses with an interior, open courtyard, built on 70' x 50' plots. The second estate, an aided, self-help scheme, has been built in phases between 1970 and 1972. It will be called the 'Hill' in this report because of its location on a prominent hilltop. In June-July 1972 it consisted of 204 houses, with 6 others under construction. The Hill houses are detached or semi-detached 3-5 room houses of more conventional design, with a small back garden rather than a courtyard on plots of approximately 70' x 40'. The third estate, New Kibera Village, built in 1971-72, was only half-completed and one-third-occupied by August 1972, although eventually it will be composed of 216 units. This estate consists of clusters of adjoining courtyard houses of 4-6 rooms on 40' 8" x 40' 8" plots. There are also a few blocks of houses in Salama which belong to the Ministry of Works and are used for employee housing.

In Old Kibera, that is the housing areas in temporary materials, even the Nubian plot-holders do not have title to the land on which their homes are built. The Kenya Government is the owner of the Kibera land. Within the next decade, the Government, through the National Housing Corporation, plans to redevelop the whole of Old Kibera into new housing estates and shopping areas in permanent building materials. Registered Nubian owners of houses erected under the permits of 1912-1934 may receive compensation when their houses are demolished and/or they may receive preference in allocation or terms of purchase for N.H.C. houses in New Kibera. The

compensation is set by the Nairobi Provincial Commissioner and the local administration and may be applied to the deposit on the house. Nubians may be given up to one year to pay the balance of the deposit before they begin regular monthly payments. Kibera Nubians are given preference in allocation of N.H.C. houses in New Kibera before other applications are considered, but they must make the same payments as others with the exception of installment terms for the deposit. It is anticipated that the Government will take responsibility for resettling the non-Nubian squatters elsewhere, perhaps in rural settlement schemes, at the time of redevelopment. The tenants living in Old Kibera, who are a majority of the population, are not likely to receive any official aid in relocating themselves after demolition of their present quarters.

The new estates, depending on the purchase price of the houses, have been offered either on a 20-year purchase basis (Salama, the Hill) financed directly by the National Housing Corporation, or on a 15-year mortgage basis (New Kibera Village) financed by the Housing Finance Company of Kenya. In Salama, the price of the houses has been £470-2,135, with a 10-15% deposit required and normal monthly repayments of shs 62-291. Only 52 houses, all built in 1963-64, cost less than £1,150 and have monthly payments under shs170. On the Hill prices have been £1,150-1,475, with a deposit of about 7% and monthly repayments of shs170-217. In New Kibera Village, prices are £1,850-2,470, with a deposit of about 12.5% and monthly repayments of shs332-443. Current rental prices in these estates are twice to three times the monthly payments, calculated on a per room basis. As can be guessed from these figures, the population of New Kibera is predominantly middle-class Africans.

Although the Kibera population is not strictly representative of the Nairobi African population as a whole, especially because of the strong presence of the Nubians, it is one of the most varied neighbourhoods in Nairobi in tribal compositions, income distribution, housing types and tenancy status. It was therefore appealing as an arena for a small study of housing preference within a diverse population. Also the presence of traditional housing as well as three types of modern housing in the area meant that many people had seen and experienced different materials and layouts and thus were better equipped to state their preferences than if they had not had this first-hand information.

HOUSING STOCK IN KIBERA IN 1972

Housing in Old Kibera must be built in "temporary" materials by law. Since the Government has been planning to redevelop the area since the Carter Land Commission of 1933-34, the local administration has been instructed not to allow erection of permanent buildings, with the exception of the mosque and madrasa (Koran school). Thus 96% of the buildings inhabited by our sample of adults in Old Kibera were built with temporary wall materials: mud and wattle, mud and wattle finished with plaster, mud bricks or timber. One building had walls of concrete blocks, and the other 4% used a combination of the above materials. 90% of the mud or timber buildings had earth floors, 8% had plastered earth floors, and 2% had concrete floors. 95% of buildings in Old Kibera had roofs of pounded debes, scrap metal, or corrugated iron sheets, 5% of grass thatch and 2% of other materials. Thus the typical building in Old Kibera has an earthen floor, a metal roof, walls of mud and wattle construction, and consists of five rooms.

The interviewers were asked to give a general opinion of the condition of the building as compared to the average, structurally sound building of its type. In this evaluation, we found that 9% of our Old Kibera respondents live in good quality buildings, 36% in average quality buildings and 54% in poor quality buildings. From observation of housing in Kibera, I would say that the best quality buildings are usually Nubian family homes which have plastered and painted walls, a carefully laid concrete floor, roofing of new iron sheets and a ceiling. Some of these homes have electricity and a telephone. The nicest of them are quite lovely, with exterior landscaping, and would probably cost about shs15,000-20,000 to build. The owners of these houses often complain about the restriction on building in permanent materials, because they would prefer to build a stone house. Most of the tenant housing is of the typical type described earlier. The poorest quality housing in both materials and construction is found in the squatter areas and is inhabited by the squatters and their tenants.

Public utilities in Old Kibera are minimal. To my knowledge, all homes in Old Kibera rely on pit latrines or other such methods of waste disposal. No home has inside water, though there are about twenty water kiosks supplying the area with city water sold by the debe. The mosque and a few shops, clubs and homes of wealthy individuals in the central area of Old Kibera have had electricity

installed, and there are also a few telephones. In general, people buy water by the debe, store it in big drums in the home, rely on kerosene lanterns for light and pit latrines for waste disposal. The roads are murrum and of poor quality since neither the Government, the City Council, nor the residents accepts responsibility for maintaining them.

The housing in New Kibera is of permanent quality in conformity with the Grade 1 City Council building bylaws. Floors and courtyards are of cement, walls are of concrete blocks, and roofs are of corrugated iron or asbestos sheets or tiles. Each home has internal water points and a water-borne sewerage system. All are supplied with electricity and several have been successful in getting telephones installed. Roads are tarmac and street lights have been provided.

WHO OCCUPIES HOUSING IN KIBERA ?

In this section, we will look first at the characteristics of adult residents of owner households and adult residents of tenant and servant households in Old Kibera and in the new housing estates. Tables I and II summarise the data on the individuals in each of these four categories in terms of their relationship to the household head, marital status, sex, tribe, religion, length of residence in Kibera, household size, number of rooms their household occupies², monthly household income, education, occupation, residence of wife or wives, age and number of areas of Nairobi lived in. Rather than restate all of these data in words, this commentary will note the more general and interesting observations. I have presented most tables in detail in case they are of interest or of use to other researchers.

In 1972, 70% of Kibera adults lived in Old Kibera and 30% in New Kibera housing estates. Of the total adult population of Kibera, one-quarter were owners or plot-holders and their relatives in New and Old Kibera, one-half were tenants and

2. We counted each bedroom, sitting room and kitchen as a separate room in the survey.

their relatives in Old Kibera, and one-quarter were tenants and their relatives in New Kibera. The total adult population of Kibera is in the range of 9,000-10,000, with more than 7,000 adults in Old Kibera and more than 2,000 adults in New Kibera. In the households of our respondents we found an average of .71 children per adult overall, thus implying a total Kibera population of 15,500 to 17,000.

In Old Kibera, there are striking differences among owner-related and tenant-related adults on almost every sociological characteristic. This largely reflects the fact that the owner-related population is roughly 70% Nubian Muslims who are life-long residents of Kibera with their complete families³, and for whom rents are as important a source of income as employment.⁴ Thus, compared to tenants, the owner-related individuals tend to include a smaller proportion of heads of household (52%) because there are more resident adult dependents, a larger proportion of divorced, widowed and separated partners (15%), an equal sex ratio (even slightly biased in favor of females), a large majority who have lived in Kibera longer than nine years, a higher proportion of illiterates with no education (44%), a very low proportion of individuals in wage employment (9%), a high proportion of married men with all of their wives living in Nairobi (80%), a higher mean age (36.2 years) and a lower mean number of areas of Nairobi lived in (1.1 areas). The households that owner-related individuals live in are larger, both in terms of people (an average of 6.6 including children) and rooms (2.3 rooms), less crowded and have a more dispersed income distribution (33% of households have incomes under shs250 a month, 44% between shs250 and shs749 and 16% of shs750 and over).

3. The Nubians are all Kenya citizens, having been born and raised in Kenya, though their grandfathers and great-grandfathers originated in the southern Sudan and were brought to Kenya as soldiers by the British.

4. While only 12% of Old Kibera Nubian adults are in households whose income derives solely from rents, a total of 62% are in households with some rental income and, overall, rents represent an average of 48% of their monthly household income. Thus approximately one-third of the total income of the Old Kibera Nubian community comes from rents.

Tenant-related adults living in Old Kibera are 90% Christians, with Luo, Luhya, Kamba, and Kikuyu tenants comprising 85% of the total. Of the tenant-related individuals, 63% are household heads, men outnumber women by a proportion of 2 to 1. 82% have lived in Kibera eight years or less (that is, they have come since Independence), only 23% are illiterates with no education while 33% have a complete primary education or more, 54% are in wage employment, only 35% of the married men have all of their wives living in Nairobi, their mean age is 31.7 years and they have lived, on the average, in 1.9 areas of Nairobi. The households of tenant-related individuals almost invariably occupy one room, with an average household size of 3.7 people including children. Of their households 67% have monthly incomes in the range of shs250 to shs749 (a stable working = class wage), while 21% have less than shs250 a month, and 7% shs750 or more.

In New Kibera, the same types of differences among owner- and tenant-related adults appear. These differences largely reflect the fact that one-third of New Kibera resident owners are Nubians moved from demolished areas of Old Kibera. Nubians predominate among the less educated, less wealthy, non-employed owners in New Kibera. The owner-related adults include 56% owner-heads-of-household and 11% non-owner-heads-of-household (e.g. a married son living with his wife in a house owned, but not occupied, by his father). Among the owner-related individuals, a high proportion (22%) are widowed, divorced, or separated (mostly Nubian women), and the sex ratio is even. Most have either lived in Kibera over 27 years (30% = Nubians) or under three years (59% non-Nubians allocated houses on the Hill or in New Kibera Village). There are high proportions both of illiterates with no education (30%) and of people with at least some secondary education (59%). A similarly dispersed distribution of employment appears, with 52% not employed, and 44% employed in non-manual jobs. Of married male owners 33% had their wives living in Nairobi. The mean age of the owner-related sample was 35.1 years, and they had lived in an average of 2.3 areas in Nairobi. Households of owner-related individuals living in New Kibera average 5.85 people including children, and occupied 3.5 rooms. Two-thirds had household incomes in the range of shs750-5,000 a month. Only 7% had household incomes under shs250 per month.

Among tenants in New Kibera (including a few servants), 63% are heads of household and 40% are unmarried. The sex ratio is 3:2 in favor of males. Over 90% of tenants are Christians, with the strongest tribal representation being Luos with 40%. My data does not provide any explanation for this over-representation of Luos in the tenant population, since I do not have data on the tribal affiliation of non-resident owners of New Kibera houses nor on the manner in which tenants found their Kibera accommodation. Of the tenants 71% had lived in Kibera less than three years, and another 26% for three to eight years. Only 15% of the tenants have less than a complete primary education, while 45% have a complete secondary education or more. Only 22% are not employed; 58% are in non-manual jobs, mostly clerical or quasi-professional. Of married men 73% had their wives in Nairobi. The average age of tenant-related individuals is 27.8 years, and they have lived in 2.8 areas of Nairobi on the average. Tenants' households average 4.1 people including children and occupy two rooms on the average. Two-thirds have incomes in the shs750-5,000 range, with only 1% earning less than shs250 a month. Note that if the cases where income was not known or was refused are excluded, the proportion of families with incomes in the shs750-5,000 range rises to over three-fourths.

Though I could not perform the analysis because of the limitations of the computer's table-generating program, I suspect that non-Nubian New Kibera owners and non-servant New Kibera tenants are virtually indistinguishable on the sociological characteristics listed here. They represent largely the four principal Kenya tribes, have at least a full primary education and usually more, and are stably employed in non-manual jobs requiring some training, with a monthly household income over shs750.

Table III gives data on rural land ownership of residents of Old and New Kibera and their spouses. In Old Kibera, 59% either own no land or less than one acre; only 11% own 10 acres or more. In New Kibera, 63% own no rural land; 18% own 10 acres or more.

Owners of mud and stone houses in Kibera or Nairobi were asked if they rented out any rooms, and their monthly income from rents. The results are summarised in Table IV. Those owning

mud houses were 17% of the Kibera adult population; those owning stone houses were 6% of the Kibera adult population. Of mud house owners, 25% do not rent out any rooms. The other 74% rent out an average of 4.3 rooms apiece from which they receive an average monthly income of shs143. Of the stone house owners 38% did not rent out any rooms. The 62% who did rent out an average of 3.0 rooms for which they received an average monthly payment of shs363. From owners' questionnaires, we would thus calculate an average room rent of shs33 for mud housing and shs121 for stone housing.

According to information supplied by tenants in Old Kibera (see Table V), they pay an average rent of shs45 a month for the accommodation they occupy. In 98% of the cases, the accommodation is a single room or bedspace for the household. Longer residence in the dwelling is associated with slightly lower rent; 57% of tenants of three years' residence or more pay shs20-39, while 65% of tenants with less than three years' residence pay shs40-59. This finding could be due to the fact that people tend to retain lower-rent accommodation longer, or that market rents go up over time but the increment is not charged to established tenants, or that longer-established tenants tend to be in older, more dilapidated housing, while more recently built housing commands a higher rental. According to a rather rough calculation using midpoints of the income categories, Old Kibera tenants pay an average of 14% of their household income for rent, with 74% paying in the range of 8% to 20%. As will be shown later, 67% of Old Kibera tenants would be willing to pay higher rent for better accommodation.

New Kibera tenants pay an average rent of shs281 a month for their average-size accommodation of two rooms. This gives an average figure of shs140 a room for housing in New Kibera. The relationship shown in Table VI between length of residence and rent paid is principally due to the fact that many of the Salama houses are both older and less expensive, with more expensive houses being built in the last 1-3 years. New Kibera tenants pay an average of 21% of their household income for rent with 79% paying in the range of 10% to 31%. New Kibera tenants 53% would be willing to pay higher rent for better accommodation.

To briefly summarise this discussion, we find that owner-related individuals in Old Kibera are composed largely of two groups: Nubians as described above and Kikuyu-Kamba squatters many of whom are poor, landless, and came to Kibera before Independence. Owner-related individuals in New Kibera are also comprised largely of two groups: Nubians similar to those who are owners in Old Kibera and non-Nubians who are largely well-educated, stably employed in non-manual jobs and have 'middle-class' household incomes of over shs750 per month. Tenants in Old Kibera are a more varied lot, but the majority are Christians of the main Kenya tribes, stably employed in manual or low-level non-manual jobs, with incomes in the range of shs250-750 per month. Tenants in New Kibera are similar to non-Nubian owners in New Kibera: mostly well-educated, and stably employed in non-manual positions with middle-class incomes.

In reporting their reasons for living in Kibera, 92% of the Nubians say it has always been their home. 75% of the non-Nubians came because Kibera was a place they could find accommodation (rental, tenant-purchase, or squatter housing), and of these 31% mentioned the comparative inexpensiveness of Kibera housing.

HOUSING PREFERENCES

The following information about housing preferences was collected from the respondents in the survey:

- a) tenants' willingness to pay higher rent for better accommodation (Table VII);
- b) tenants' preference for renting as opposed to buying or building a house in Nairobi (Table VIII);
- c) Old Kibera residents' desire and ability to move into new housing in Kibera (Table IX);
- d) type of New Kibera housing (i.e. Salama, Hill, New Kibera Village) preferred by each respondent (Table X);
- e) type of layout (i.e. adjoining rooms versus rooms with separate access to the outside) preferred by each respondent (Table XI);

- f) type of private open space (i.e. courtyard or garden) preferred by each respondent (Table XI);
- g) whether the respondent would prefer to be allocated a house in New Kibera or a building plot elsewhere in Nairobi (Table XII);
- h) whether the respondent would build a three-room stone house or a six-room mud house on a hypothetical plot in Nairobi if the cost were the same (Table XIII);
- i) whether the respondent would prefer to live close to town, paying high rent but being able to walk to work, or live far from town, paying low rent but with transportation costs every day (Table XIV);
- j) which facilities and housing qualities the respondent would consider absolutely necessary if moving to new accommodation (Table XV); and
- k) whether the respondent identifies housing as one of the major problems of his life in Kibera (Table XVI).

The data on these preferences is shown in Tables VII to XVI. The more interesting findings are summarised below.

Overall, 62% of Kibera tenants would be willing to pay higher rent for better accommodation. The proportion in Old Kibera is 67% and in New Kibera 54%. Within Old Kibera and each of the new housing estates (with the single exception of those paying shs40-89 a month in Salama), the proportion willing to pay higher rent is perfectly inversely associated with current rent paid--the lower the current rent, the more willing to pay higher rent for better accommodation. In Old Kibera, 8% would be willing to pay higher rent within their current rental category, 31% one category higher, and 28% two or more categories higher. In New Kibera, the analogous proportions are 9%, 28%, and 16%. The question did not specify what "better housing" would be, so for some of these individuals it is likely that only slightly better housing would not be worth the extra expense, while substantially better housing would be.

About two-thirds of lower-income tenants and one-half of middle-income tenants would be willing to devote a higher proportion of their income to housing than they do at present. That they do not is probably a reflection of the fact that sufficiently "better" housing is not available at the price they would be willing to pay. This could be because there is a shortage of housing that could, in fact, be provided at an "economic rent" that they would be willing to pay. Long waiting lists for Nairobi City Council flats and houses rented at "economic" rates testify to the rationing now going on as a result of the shortage. The shortage of housing also drives up rents in the private sector and prices them beyond the means of many who could afford the "economic rent" for the same accommodation. In other cases, it is likely that housing of the quality desired is impossible to build and rent for the amount that the prospective tenant is willing to pay. This is the case for tenants in Old Kibera now paying, say shs40 a month who would be willing to pay up to shs50 a month for several rooms in a permanent structure with water and electricity. Given current land and building costs and bylaw requirements in Nairobi, it is virtually impossible to provide such accommodation without a subsidy.

When tenants are asked whether they would prefer to rent again or to buy or build their own house when they leave their present accommodation, roughly equal percentages choose each alternative. We find a perfect association between income group and proportion preferring renting to buying (the higher the income, the larger the percentage that would prefer to buy or build). Less than 20% of those in the lowest income group would prefer to buy or build, while less than 20% of those in the highest income group would prefer to rent again. Rural land ownership also seems related to the preference expressed since those owning small shambas under ten acres prefer to rent in a proportion of 3:2, whereas those owning no rural land or ten acres or more prefer to buy or build in a proportion of 4:3. This is probably due to the fact that people who must stay in town (because they own no rural land) and people who can afford to stay in town (because they are relatively wealthy-- land holdings being one indication) are more likely to prefer to invest in an urban home for themselves than those who have enough rural land assets to establish a home there, but often not a high enough income to establish an urban home as well. Furthermore, those men with all

of their wives living in the rural area prefer renting to buying in a proportion of about 3:2, while those with their wives in Nairobi prefer buying to renting. Similarly, those people who prefer to live in the rural area prefer renting to buying in a proportion of 3:2, while those who prefer to live in the urban area prefer buying to renting in a proportion of 3:2.

When Old Kibera residents are asked if they would like to move into the new housing in Kibera, 14% say no, 64% would like to but could not afford it on the terms we cited (a deposit of shs2,000 and monthly payments of shs200) and 22% would like to and could afford these terms. Among those who would not like to move to New Kibera, Nubians form 50% though they are only 22% of the population. About a quarter of Nubians, Luos, Luhya and Kambas would like and could afford to move on these terms, along with one-sixth of Kikuyus and "others". However, in each tribal group except Nubians, two-thirds cannot afford these terms, though they would like to live in New Kibera.

Of the Nubians, 43% would like to make the move, but could not afford these terms. The terms cited would roughly correspond to the normal tenant purchase payments on a house costing £1,000 (£1,400), paid over 10(20) years. According to these responses, nearly half of the Nubians cannot be resettled in Kibera new housing unless it is of lower cost or on better terms than those given above.

Of course, with "better terms" even a destitute can afford to purchase middle-class housing in Nairobi because of the housing shortage which raises private market rents to two or three times the "economic" rent of publicly constructed accommodation. By sub-letting all or part of the house at the market rent, anyone can easily finance the purchase of a house which is being sold to him at the "economic price". The principal conditions which would inhibit a poor person from purchasing a middle-class house from the National Housing Corporation would be:

- a) if he is not eligible to be allocated the house under the rule that requires that his household's present income be more than four times the monthly repayments, (b) if he cannot sublet all or part of the house because it is forbidden, or because his family needs all of the house for its own space requirements and cannot find alternate accommodation

5. I am grateful to B. Wasow for pointing this out to me.

at a cheaper price than the difference between the economic and market rent on the house, or (c) if he cannot pay the initial deposit on the house, either from his own resources or by borrowing. By waiving the normal procedures on income requirements and allowing installment payment of the deposit, the N.H.C. has made it possible for poor Nubian families displaced from their demolished homes to occupy new houses even when they had no income. By allocating them the houses, the N.H.C. indirectly gave them an income which was adequate to maintain their families in middle-income housing. The term "middle-class" or "middle-income" thus refers primarily to the income group of people who can afford housing of this cost at its private market rental, not to those who would be able to afford to buy such housing. However, in practice the two groups are often identical (as in the mortgage estate at Kibera) because of income criteria applied to decide eligibility for allocation of houses. Without special terms, housing estates in the cost bracket of New Kibera Village (£1,850-2,470) are out of reach for the large majority of Nubians. If the Government is committed to a policy of resettlement in the Kibera area of the Nubians displaced by redevelopment, it will have to plan on lower-cost housing and/or on great generosity in subsidising acquisition of more expensive housing by those who cannot afford the normal terms. By providing enough extra sub-lettable rooms to each resettled family, the Government can ensure that the family will have enough to pay the tenant-purchase charges. Naturally, the capital cost per family of such resettlement in middle-class housing is extravagantly high. However, without such special arrangements or the construction of units under £1,000, almost half of the Nubians do not expect to be able to purchase housing in the new estates in Kibera.

Two-thirds of the non-Nubian population also cannot afford the hypothetical tenant-purchase terms, and the implication is that they will be seeking rental accommodation elsewhere in Nairobi when Kibera is redeveloped. Therefore at least 5,000 people who are currently paying an average of shs45 a month for rent will be forced to find other accommodation in an already tight housing market when redevelopment is carried out. Only 20% of Old Kibera tenants are willing to pay monthly rents above shs90 or could afford to buy a £1,400 house, so they are the only ones who would be likely to find

accommodation in New Kibera if rentals continue as at present. As is shown in Table IX, income level does not influence the preference for moving to New Kibera, but it is closely associated with the ability to buy a house on the terms we gave.

When asked which type of New Kibera house they preferred, overall 32% of respondents preferred the Hill, 20% New Kibera Village, 18% Salama, 9% any or another choice, 8% none of them and 14% could not say. The Hill houses are most favoured by residents of all types of Kibera housing (including those in the other new estates). This preference is especially strongly expressed by Hill residents, New Kibera Village residents, Luos, unmarried persons, tenants (especially those now occupying fairly spacious accommodations) and people in middle-income households (shs750 a month or more). Except among Nubians and the poorest households, Salama is usually least favoured. Strong support for New Kibera Village is only expressed by its residents (who still slightly favour the Hill), though it is generally preferred to Salama, except by Nubians. The differences in preference among the three types of houses are not strikingly large—each draws the loyalty of one-fifth to one-third of the Kibera sample. However, if one excludes the Nubians' preferences from consideration, the clearly preferred house-type is the Hill (32%), then New Kibera Village (21%), then Salama, (11%). This, I would guess, is the rank-order of preference that would be given by the Nairobi population as a whole.

Further corroboration for the preference for houses of the type that has been built on the Hill comes from Table XI. Respondents were asked whether they preferred a house with an open courtyard inside or a garden outside. They were also asked whether they preferred a house in which all of the rooms have separate doors to the outside or a house in which you must walk through one room to get to the other rooms. When responses to these two questions are combined, the overall responses are as follows: 15% prefer a courtyard and separate access (type 1), 12% prefer a courtyard with connecting rooms (type 2), 14% prefer a garden with separate access (type 3), 23% prefer a garden with connecting rooms (type 4), 37% give other responses. Types 1 and 2 are typical of most of Salama and New Kibera Village housing; type 3 is typical of much of the rental housing in Old Kibera (though only rarely is the semi-private open space a "garden"); type 4 is exemplified by the Hill housing.

Certain house plans are often thought more suitable for some groups than others. Housing with a courtyard is often assumed to be more popular with Muslims. Housing with separate access for rooms is more suitable for partial sub-letting than a house where rooms connect only in the interior, and thus should be more popular with low-income resident owners. In fact, we find that people with household incomes over shs750 a month definitely prefer type 4, as do Christians, tenants, Luos and Kikuyus. Type 1 is most preferred by Nubians, Muslims and people with incomes under shs250 a month. It is interesting that none of the people in New Kibera Village prefer courtyard housing, though they are living in it. Women are comparatively more attracted to courtyard housing than men, perhaps because they appreciate that children are easier to supervise in a courtyard. Overall, rooms with separate access are more popular with Old Kibera residents than connecting rooms, undoubtedly because few of them can afford more than one room. The same holds for the Nubians, many of whom depend on sub-letting rooms for a major portion of their income. In New Kibera connecting rooms are strongly favoured, again probably because more of these households can afford more than one room and they appreciate the convenience and privacy of connecting rooms. My impression from talking to Kibera residents is that most of them strongly prefer detached or semi-detached dwellings to the "cluster" housing of New Kibera Village which, they claim, looks "crowded". Perhaps home-owners also prefer to be able to see and identify "their" home as distinct from surrounding houses. Perhaps after residents of New Kibera Village have been established there for some time, a user-reaction study will show whether this new style of housing will gain in popularity.

When asked whether they would prefer to be allocated a Kibera house or a building plot in Nairobi, Kibera residents overall gave these answers: 50% prefer a Kibera house, 21% prefer a building plot, 10% would take either, 13% would take neither and 6% do not know. In both Old and New Kibera, half would take the Kibera house, though the proportion preferring a plot is higher in New Kibera (one-quarter) than in Old Kibera (one-fifth). More Old Kibera residents would take neither, while more New Kibera residents would take either. Tribal differences are not pronounced, though Nubians definitely have a strong preference for Kibera houses, and Luos

and Luhya have a stronger than average preference for a building plot. We find a Kibera house most popular with those whose household incomes are shs450 a month or more (54% favour it) and least popular with people with incomes under shs250 (37%). A Nairobi plot is most favoured by those with high or low incomes (24%) and least favoured by the group with incomes between shs450 and shs750 a month (13%). One surprising finding for those that argue that there is strong demand and preference for self-construction in temporary materials among certain low income portions of the Nairobi population is that of those who would choose to build a larger house in temporary materials (see next paragraph), fully 50% would choose a Kibera house over a building plot and only 17% would choose a building plot. Of those who would prefer to build a smaller house in permanent materials, 50% would choose the Kibera house, while 23% would choose a building plot in Nairobi.

Strict building bylaws may force some people to build small structures in permanent materials although they would prefer to devote their building resources to more space at the cost of quality in materials and construction techniques. To elicit preferences for space/building cost tradeoffs, we asked respondents which type of house they would prefer to build if they had a building plot in Nairobi and the two types of houses cost the same amount: a three-room stone house or a six-room mud house. Overall, 72% would build the stone house and 28% the mud house. Preference for building a mud house is considerably more pronounced among owners (57%) than tenants (18%), among those with incomes under shs250 a month (53%) than those with higher incomes (4-30%) and among Nubians (63%) than non-Nubians (20%). The proportion preferring to build a mud house decreases as income goes up and the proportion preferring to build in stone increases with income. For each cell in Table XIIIc, the mean number of household members and mean number of rooms occupied by the household was calculated. The results show that people preferring to build in mud have larger households in every income category than those who would build in stone. Those who prefer mud are also occupying more rooms than their income counterparts who prefer stone. The conclusion is that larger households in each income group have a greater propensity to choose roomier accommodations even at the cost of building quality than those with smaller households. Of course, income and tribe are more fundamental determinants of whether an individual would be likely to prefer to build (and live in) a mud structure. Many Nubian family

homes in Old Kibera are excellent structures even though they are built in temporary materials. Many of their mud houses are plastered and painted inside and out, have well-laid cement floors and provide a very pleasant and sanitary living environment. Though the City Council Grade I bylaws deny the possibility of constructing this type of dwelling, it is likely that our respondents know these examples and would be quite happy to live in a well-finished "mud" house rather than crowd into a smaller "permanent" structure that is more expensive to construct.

Another dimension of housing preference is the distance of the home from the place of work as a function of the cost of the accommodation and of transport. We asked our respondents whether they would prefer to live close enough to walk to work but pay high rent, or live far from their work, paying low rent but with transport costs every day. One reason for this question was to test the often-heard assertion that casual labourers and unemployed job-seekers prefer to live in areas such as Mathare Valley which are close to potential jobs rather than in, say, Dagoretti or Kariobangi, which are an expensive bus ride or a very long walk from town and the industrial area. Our findings give no support whatever to this assertion. While overall cost of accommodation plus transport would be taken into account by 18% in choosing the cheapest place, fully 51% of the respondents in our sample who were unemployed, casual labourers, self-employed or unskilled workers would choose to live far from town and pay transport if the rent were cheaper, while 31% would choose to live close to town. Only 45% of the employed respondents (semi-skilled jobs or higher) would choose to live far, versus 35% who would live close and 21% who would choose the cheaper alternative. Analysing responses to this question as a function of household income, we find that living close is only relatively preferred by those with incomes of shs750 per month or more, while those living on shs250-750 a month prefer to live far by a ratio of 2 to 1. This implies that there is potentially large demand for cheap accommodation in peri-urban areas of Nairobi for poorer people and that this should be taken into account in planning Nairobi's future development.

In an attempt to find out which facilities and qualities of housing people require, we asked our respondents which of the following things they would require in a house to which they were moving (that is, they would not move in unless these things were there): an inside water tap, an inside toilet, a shower, electricity, low rent or payments, a good roof, a concrete floor, stone walls. In spite

of wording the question in a way designed to elicit minimum housing requirements, many respondents seemed to give us what they would prefer rather than the minimum they would require. Thus in Old Kibera we find that 48% of the respondents say they would require at least three of the four facilities and all three of the housing qualities, while only 40% would be content with less than three of each at low rent. In New Kibera, 86% require at least three of the facilities and all of the housing qualities, while only 6% would be content with less than three of each. The fact that we find an inverse relationship in Old Kibera between income and the percentage requiring all the components of high quality housing implies that this was treated as a preference question by many of the low-income people now living in mud housing. Thus the data from this question cannot be used to show relative demand for different types of facilities and housing qualities, though it does show that a large number of people who have currently accepted accommodation in temporary quality buildings with few facilities aspire to something better.

We asked each of our respondents to tell us what were the biggest problems he had in his life at Kibera. Overall, 56% of Kibera adults mentioned a housing problem as one of the three most important problems they faced. Table XVI shows the percentages of respondents in various categories who identified housing as a problem. In Old Kibera, 67% of tenant-related adults mention housing as a problem. Of Old Kibera owners, 49% also mention housing or redevelopment as a problem. In New Kibera, 26% of owners and 46% of tenants identify housing as a problem. Residents of the Hill, both owners and tenants, appear most satisfied with their housing with only 18% mentioning a housing complaint.

We further questioned New Kibera residents about the biggest problem they had because of living in the new houses: 35% had had no problems, 28% mentioned the small size of the house or bad relations between co-residents, 15% mentioned problems in the design or construction of the house, 9% said they had difficulties in paying for their accommodation, 8% mentioned problems with the utilities and 5% gave other complaints. Among the specific design and construction complaints were the following:

" The houses are very small, Hill houses have no thoroughfare for cars, materials used are very poor, tiny bathrooms, no privacy in these houses."

" Houses should have ceilings and should be painted; the outside compound should be enlarged."

" Use stone instead of sand blocks; ceiling should also be put in these houses."

" Stop building houses which are crowded together like New Kibera Village."

" They should build houses without shared facilities; houses with private facilities would be better."

" They should build bigger houses with kitchens, bathrooms and toilets inside."

" Build good houses-- four rooms. Use better materials. New Kibera Village is just a prison --no car parks, crowded, price high." Build better quality houses but also those which are very cheap to meet our pay".

" Houses should be plastered, better floor, ceiling, hot water system."

" Make room for car parks. Put lights outside houses."

" Latrine should be Asian type of latrine and not European type like the ones we have at present at Kibera area. They are not suitable to young children. All sewerages connected with latrine and kitchen should be built underground, not like the ones we have which are exposed to children (dangerous for epidemic diseases). A house for one man with his family like myself should have the following;

- a) one large sitting room and three bed rooms with a large kitchen;
- b) water reservoir should be put on top of the house to store extra water for emergency shortage of water which comes abruptly and it is rather common in Nairobi; c) a compound of the building should have a car park enclosed within. The back windows of each room should be made thief-proof by adding strong iron bars to support window glasses or wire mesh whichever is possible. Floors of the rooms should be painted to make the house look smart".

Lastly, when asked what changes they would like to see in housing policy in Kibera, 45% of Kibera adults said that lower cost houses should be constructed, with 52% of tenants giving this as one of their two answers. The next-most-mentioned suggestion, namely the faster construction of new houses, was mentioned by only 14% of the respondents.

Many people in Kibera do not seem to realise that better quality housing costs more to construct than poorer quality housing. They argue that the Government should be building better quality housing which is also cheaper to rent or buy. Agencies like the N.H.C. which build housing are thus caught on the horns of a public relations dilemma: no matter whether they build high quality, expensive housing or low quality, inexpensive housing, they are bound to be criticised.

CURRENT HOUSING POLICY IN LIGHT OF THESE FINDINGS

Our data show that many people of all economic levels aspire to good quality permanent housing with a full complement of facilities. Many tenants would be willing to pay higher rent if they could get better accommodation. In the meantime, a large percentage express dissatisfaction with their current housing arrangements. The difficulty in meeting these aspirations comes in the fact that three-quarters of the Old Kibera tenant population would not be willing to pay rents over shs90 a month, and almost half of the Old Kibera Nubian population could not afford to buy a £1,400 house on the usual terms even though they would like to live in New Kibera.

Thus the new housing built in Kibera, especially the Hill and New Kibera Village, cannot cater for the needs of much of the existing population in Old Kibera. This is not to say that these houses are disliked (except by a portion of the Nubian sample) but simply that they are out of financial reach for much of the population. Of course, they do provide accommodation for middle-income African families, three-quarters of whom find that their new accommodation is better in some way than their previous home. Data on willingness to pay higher rent and desire to buy or build an urban house give support to the argument that there is a shortage in Nairobi of rental and tenant-purchase housing even in relatively high income brackets. Therefore, the housing being built in New Kibera is undoubtedly fulfilling a need. However, just as the policy provides some benefits, it also has costs, and it seems worthwhile to discuss both the costs and benefits of the current redevelopment effort in Kibera in light of the survey findings.

So far the redevelopment of Kibera has resulted in a net gain in housing in the area. Only about 75 Nubian homes have been demolished thus far, even including those on the site of Jamhuri Estate. About

600 three to six-room units have taken their place. This is a result of the deliberate policy of the Government to locate the first estates where they would cause least disruption of the existing population. Though the new estates were strongly opposed by a large part of the Nubian population when they were first initiated, this opposition seems to be fading. In this respect, one would have to praise the way in which gradual redevelopment has convinced many of the Nubians of the benefits (or inevitability) of permanent quality buildings and public utilities. Some of the Nubian population has already been rehoused in New Kibera: most because their previous houses stood on the site of a new estate, but a few because they voluntarily vacated houses in Old Kibera. In addition, New Kibera now provides a home for about 2,000 other adults with more than 1,000 children, most of whom have middle-class incomes, good education, and are stably employed in non-manual jobs. Though most of them are renting now, many are young with good prospects for promotion and aspire to become Nairobi home-owners eventually.

The housing that has been built in New Kibera is of varying design. The Salama houses have proved popular with the Nubians, (for whom they were designed) and less popular with others. The Hill houses appeal to a wide section of the population including a large majority of Hill residents. New Kibera Village does not attract as much support, but this could be because our survey was conducted soon after the first houses were finished and few Kibera residents had been able to see the houses from the inside as well as the outside. Almost half of the Kibera adults think that lower-cost houses than these should be constructed in the future.

On the positive side, the redevelopment of Kibera has and will rationalise the layout of the area and make it possible to provide expensive infrastructure like sewers, water mains and roads. Naturally the Government and the City Council are reluctant to provide expensive services such as these to randomly placed temporary buildings even if some plot-holders might be willing to pay for them. It is much more efficient to demarcate an orderly arrangement of plots that can be serviced relatively cheaply and persuade people to have their homes there. Once plots are sold, the costs of desirable services such as roads and street lighting can be apportioned among plot-owners in the normal fashion, whereas there would be little inducement

for the Government or City Council to undertake such works without hope of compensation by the users. An area served by a trunk sewer can safely accommodate a much larger population than one served by pit latrines, so a greater number of people can be housed at Kibera once the redevelopment is completed. However, because of the steep slopes of the river valleys, some land which presently holds squatter housing cannot be used for moderately-priced permanent housing, so the increase in population will probably be only 25-35%, that is, from about 15,000 to about 20,000 under current plans.

While the redevelopment will result in better housing for some people others will undoubtedly be worse off both financially and in terms of the quality of their housing. The demolition of Old Kibera will displace some 12,000 people, only a fraction of whom are likely to be rehoused in new estates. Even assuming optimistically that houses were built for under £1,400, that all Nubian families who could afford (and wanted) a house got one and that rental rooms were available for as little as shs60 a month (and non-Nubian owners are assumed to have the same ability to pay rent as tenants), then only some 5,150 of these 12,000 could be rehoused in Kibera. If rental rooms were only available for shs90 or more, then the number who could theoretically be accommodated would fall to 2,700. This means that, even under unrealistically favourable assumptions, some 6,850 to 9,300 people from Kibera would have to find other places to live if they wanted to stay in Nairobi. These people, of course, are mostly the poorer people now living at Kibera. These are the people who are now owners but could not afford to buy a new £1,400 house under normal terms and those who could not afford shs60 a month for rent. Unless some steps are taken by public authorities, these people will find that they must accept poorer quality or more crowded accommodation than they have now, probably at a higher rental, wherever they move in Nairobi. This is in addition to the psychological costs of breaking up a well-established community, at least among the Nubians. Most of these people do not prefer to live in poor quality accommodation, but they are forced into it because decent accommodation is less and less available at prices they can pay. Public agencies must take some of the blame for this state of affairs in that they have not devoted much of their housing finance to providing decent low-cost rental and tenant-purchase housing in the £500-1,000 range, which is what the stably employed manual and low-level non-manual worker would like. Instead, they have mostly built more expensive middle and

upper-class housing, which is more likely to be provided by the private sector anyway. In some cases, as at Kibera, these building programs will entail the destruction of as many low-income housing units as construction of higher-income units. This is not necessarily to say that Kibera should be reserved exclusively for low-income housing, but only that all of the funds invested in these housing estates should not leave the city with a bigger housing shortage than before. Since it is unlikely that there is a bigger shortfall of units renting for shs284 a month than for shs45 a month, this is precisely the effect of the present policy.

Thus, I would recommend as a matter of policy that redevelopment not be allowed to diminish the number of low-cost housing units, particularly those in the critically short range of shs20-59 rental a month. Otherwise, it seems clear that a redevelopment policy such as the one at Kibera is benefitting the few who can afford expensive housing at the expense of the many who cannot afford it and will be forced to pay higher rents for the poor quality, relatively inexpensive housing that is still available. Low-income housing should not be demolished to make way for middle-income housing without an attempt to rebuild low-income housing, at least to the previous level.

In the case of the Kibera redevelopment, there are at least three options available if this recommendation is to be implemented. First, the demolition of low-cost units in Old Kibera could be compensated by building low-cost housing areas (houses of £500-1,000) among the New Kibera estates. These could be houses constructed by the N.H.C. or serviced plots where the owners would be required to build to a good standard, consistent with the goal of low cost. If the cost were low, houses built by the N.H.C. would probably serve the need better in Kibera, as we have seen in the survey that the people who would prefer a building plot to a Kibera house tend to be the wealthier and poorer members of the community. The poorer ones might have trouble organising and financing construction to a standard consistent with the bylaws, while the wealthier ones would probably not be content with a plot surrounded by buildings of lower quality than their own. Secondly, the N.H.C. could solicit the cooperation of the Nairobi City Council and ask them to make up this shortfall of low-income housing for 6,000-9,000 people. Thirdly, the N.H.C. could ask the Government for another parcel of land in Nairobi on which they could build lower-cost housing for at least 6,000-9,000 people, or the N.H.C.

could loan money to the Nairobi City Council with the stipulation that it be used to build low-cost housing. If technical knowledge about low-cost building is a constraint, perhaps some housing funds should be used for research on techniques and materials for low-cost housing construction. If the real constraint is preoccupation with high quality buildings as symbols of the success of development in independent Kenya, one can only say that it is unfortunate that the self-image of the bureaucracy should take precedence over the goal of improving living conditions for the common man who would like clean, private accommodation in Nairobi for a modest price.

It can plausibly be argued that some form of redevelopment of Kibera is perfectly justified in terms of economic rationality and town-planning principles. For some years, the Nubian landlords have been enjoying windfall income from the rental value of the land they occupy, without having to pay rates or even land rent on "their" plots. It seems inevitable that eventually the Government would ask for the land to be put to higher value or more intensive use, and thus deprive the Nubians of this windfall. Legally speaking, the Nubians are not being deprived of a birthright but of the gift of free accommodation and rental income which they have enjoyed for about fifty years. However, fifty years of de facto ownership is bound to instill some sense of belonging, and so the Nubians deserve some sympathy when they claim they are being treated unfairly. As redevelopment proceeds in the future, more Nubian families will be displaced. Among them will be a higher proportion of poorer people who cannot afford new housing over £1,000 unless they are given huge subsidies. Many of them fear utter destitution and homelessness if no provision is made for them since they have no tribal reserve and their relatives in New Kibera are likely to be crowded already in their new accommodations because of the necessity of renting several rooms to meet the purchase payments. For these poor people in particular, some provision should be made, and they should be informed in advance so that they can organise what resources they have for the eventual relocation. Three types of solutions are possible. First, provision can be made in the plans for Kibera for an area of very low-cost housing and or serviced plots on which low-cost houses could be built as described above.

This would have the advantage of preserving Kibera as a community for the Nubians, who have no other reserve, and of perpetuating the tradition by which the welfare of the poorer Nubians is looked after by their wealthier relatives and Nubian neighbours. If the poor Nubians were resettled away from the day-to-day charity of their fellow-tribesmen, many of them would be utterly destitute. My guess is that these very poor Nubians, most of whom are elderly or disabled people or divorced women, constitute no more than 10% of the Nubian population. If the National Housing Corporation were prepared to commit itself to a low-cost housing solution for them in Kibera, it is possible that funds might be forthcoming from wealthy individuals, the tribal associations or the Kibera Muslim community to enable them to pay for the accommodation. Secondly, very low-cost housing or serviced plots could be provided for them elsewhere in Nairobi. Because of the disruption of the charity network this seems a less preferable solution. Thirdly, they might be allocated some rural land, preferably in the Nairobi peri-urban area, and resettled in a way similar to what is envisioned for the poor non-Nubian squatters. If only the very poor Nubians were resettled in this way, it would probably be unsuccessful as most are unable to farm well due to disabilities or age. However, if this option were presented to all Kibera Nubians, a certain percentage of the better-off Nubians would probably prefer rural land to a Kibera house, and they could provide the nucleus of a settlement that could feed and support the destitute Nubians. These three alternatives are not mutually exclusive, and some combination that gives individuals a real choice among options would probably create greater satisfaction as well as easing the task of evacuation and demolition of Old Kibera.

Two last suggestions which follow from the survey findings are that the house design which is significantly more preferred is the detached single-family house, though separate access to some rooms from the outside is desirable in cases where it is likely that partial subletting will occur. Secondly, there is a demand for rental rather than tenant-purchase housing among large sections of the stably employed manual and low-level non-manual working class. This could be provided at "economic rents" under shs90 a room a month directly by public authorities or perhaps, almost as cheaply, on the private market if enough tenant-purchase housing of low cost, suitable for sub-letting is built.

TABLE 1: Old Kibera -- Sociological Characteristics of Adults

Variable	Resident owners and their adult relatives	Tenants and servants and their adult relatives and friends
Sample size % of Old Kibera adults % of Kibera adults	N = 82 27.9% of O.K. adults 19.6% of Kibera adults	N = 212 72.1% of O.K. adults 50.7% of Kibera adults
Relationship to the head of household	Owner heads = 45.1% (37) Non-owner heads = 7.3% (6) Wife of head = 24.4% (20) Child of head = 15.9% (13) Other relative = 7.3% (6)	Tenant heads = 62.7% (133) Wife of head = 25.9% (55) Child of head = 3.3% (7) Other relative = 6.1% (13) Friend of head = 1.9% (4)
Marital status	Unmarried = 25.6% (21) Married permanent = 57.3% (47) Married, temporary liaison = 2.4% (2) Widowed, divorced, separated = 14.6% (12)	Unmarried = 13.2% (28) Married, permanent = 80.7% (171) Married, temporary liaison = 1.9% (4) Widowed, divorced, separated = 4.2% (9)
Sex	Male = 46.3% (38) Female = 53.6% (44)	Male = 67.9% (144) Female = 32.1% (68)
Tribe	Nubian = 70.7% (58) Kikuyu = 23.2% (19) Kamba = 6.1% (5)	Nubian = 3.8% (8) Kikuyu = 16.0% (34) Kamba = 17.5% (37) Luhya = 21.2% (45) Luc = 30.7% (65) Other tribes = 10.8% (23)
Religion	Muslim = 73.2% (60) Protestant = 17.1% (14) R. Catholic = 8.5% (7) No religion = 1.2% (1)	Muslim = 7.5% (16) Protestant = 48.1% (102) R. Catholic = 42.5% (90) No religion = 1.9% (4)
Length of residence in Kibera	3-12 months = 1.2% (1) 1-3 years = 2.4% (2) 3-8 years = 1.2% (1) 9-16 years = 14.6% (12) 17-27 years = 29.3% (24) Over 27 yrs. = 51.2% (42)	Less than 3 months = 9.9% (21) 3-12 months = 13.2% (28) 1-3 years = 27.4% (58) 3-8 years = 29.7% (63) 9-16 years = 10.4% (22) 17-27 years = 7.1% (15) Over 27 years = 2.4% (5)

TABLE 1: CONTD.

Variable	Resident owners and their adult relatives	Tenants and servants and their adult relatives and friends
Household size (people including minors) (rooms)	Av. people per room = 2.85 Av. people per household = 6.6 Av. rooms per household = 2.3	Av. people per room = 3.6 Av. people per household = 3.7 Av. rooms per household = 1.0
Monthly total household income	(N) Less than 250/- = 32.9% (27) 250 - 449/- = 25.6% (21) 450 - 749/- = 18.3% (15) 750 -1449/- = 12.2% (10) 1450 -5000/- = 3.7% (3) DK, refuse = 7.3% (6)	(N) Less than 250/- = 21.2% (45) 250 - 449/- = 42.9% (91) 450 - 749/- = 24.1% (51) 750 -1449/- = 6.1% (13) 1450 -5000/- = 0.5% (1) DK, refuse = 5.2% (11)
Education	None, illiterate = 44.4% (36) Less than complete primary = 30.9% (25) Complete primary = 11.1% (9) Less than complete secondary = 8.6% (7) Complete secondary = 4.9% (4)	None, illiterate = 22.7% (48) Less than complete primary = 44.5% (94) Complete primary = 20.9% (44) Less than complete secondary = 10.0% (21) Complete secondary = 1.9% (4)
Occupation	Retired, housewife = 42.7% (35) Full-time student = 9.8% (8) Unemployed = 24.4% (20) Self-employed = 8.5% (7) Casual laborer = 6.1% (5) Skilled or semi-skilled manual = 3.7% (3) Low-level non-manual = 4.9% (4)	Retired, housewife = 21.2% (45) Full-time student = 3.8% (8) Unemployed = 9.4% (20) Self-employed = 5.7% (12) Casual labourer = 5.7% (12) Unskilled and domestic servant = 11.4% (24) Semi-skilled manual = 15.1% (32) Skilled manual = 2.8% (6) Security guard, police = 12.7% (27) Low-level non-manual = 9.4% (20) Secretary, clerk = 2.4% (5)
Residence of wife or wives (for married men)	Wife in Nairobi = 80.0% (20) Wife in the rural area = 12.0% (3) Wife in other area or mixed = 8.0% (2)	Wife in Nairobi = 34.5% (41) Wife in the rural area = 52.9% (63) Wife in other area or mixed = 12.6% (15)
Mean age of sample	Mean age = 36.2 years N = 81	Mean age = 31.7 years N = 211
Mean number of areas of Nairobi lived in	Mean number of areas = 1.1 areas N = 82	Mean number of areas = 1.9 areas N = 212

TABLE II : New Kibera - Sociological Characteristics of Adults.

Variable	Resident owners and their adult relatives	Tenants and servants and their adult relatives and friends
Sample size % of New Kibera adults % of Kibera adults	N = 27 21.8% of New Kibera adults 6.5% of Kibera adults	78.2% of New Kibera adults 23.2% of Kibera adults
Relationship to the head of household	(N) Owner head = 55.5% (15) Non-owner head = 11.1% (3) Wife of head = 11.1% (3) Child of head = 13.7% (1) Other relative = 14.8% (4) Friend of head = 3.7% (1)	(N) Tenant head = 62.9% (61) Wife of head = 20.6% (20) Child of head = 5.2% (5) Other relative = 6.2% (6) Friend of head = 2.1% (2) Servant of head = 3.1% (3)
Marital status	Unmarried = 18.5% (5) Married, permanent = 55.5% (15) Married, temporary liaison = 3.7% (1) Widowed, divorced, separated = 22.2% (6)	Unmarried = 40.2% (39) Married, permanent = 56.7% (55) Married, temporary liaison = 1.0% (1) Widowed, divorced, separated = 2.1% (2)
Sex	Male = 51.9% (14) Female = 49.1% (13)	Male = 60.8% (59) Female = 39.2% (38)
Tribe	Nubian = 33.3% (9) Kikuyu = 18.5% (5) Kamba = 7.4% (2) Luhya = 11.1% (3) Luo = 14.8% (4) Other tribes = 14.8% (4)	Nubian = 1.0% (1) Kikuyu = 14.4% (14) Kamba = 17.5% (17) Luhya = 12.4% (12) Luo = 40.2% (39) Other tribes = 14.4% (14)
Religion	Muslim = 40.7% (11) Protestant = 29.6% (8) R. Catholic = 25.9% (7) No religion = 3.7% (1)	Muslim = 5.2% (5) Protestant = 71.1% (69) R. Catholic = 21.6% (21) No religion = 2.1% (2)
Length of residence in Kibera	Less than 3 months = 22.2% (6) 3-12 months = 22.2% (6) 1-3 years = 14.8% (4) 3-8 years = 3.7% (1) 9-16 years = 3.7% (1) 17-27 yrs. = 3.7% (1) Over 27 yrs. = 29.6% (8)	Less than 3 months = 9.3% (9) 3 - 12 months = 26.8% (26) 1 - 3 years = 35.1% (34) 3 - 8 years = 25.8% (25) 9 - 16 years = 2.1% (2) Over 27 yrs. = 1.0% (1)
Household size (people including minors). (rooms)	Av. people per room = 1.85 Av. people per household = 5.85 Av. rooms per household = 3.5	Av. people per room = 2.25 Av. people per household = 4.1 Av. room per household = 2.0

TABLE II: CONTD.

Variable	Resident owners and their adult relatives	Tenants and servants and their adult relatives and friends
	(N)	(N)
Monthly total household income	Less than 250/- = 7.4% (2)	Less than 250/- = 1.0% (1)
	250 - 449/- = 7.4% (2)	250 - 449/- = 5.2% (5)
	450 - 749/- = 14.8% (4)	450 - 749/- = 11.3% (11)
	750 - 1449/- = 22.2% (6)	750 - 1449/- = 34.0% (33)
	1450 - 5000/- = 44.4% (12)	1450 - 5000/- = 30.9% (30)
	DK, refuse = 3.7% (1)	DK, refuse = 17.5% (17)
Education	None, illiterate = 29.6% (8)	None, illiterate = 3.1% (3)
	Less than complete primary = 3.7% (1)	Less than complete primary = 11.5% (11)
	Complete primary = 7.4% (2)	Complete primary = 19.8% (19)
	Less than complete secondary = 18.5% (5)	Less than complete secondary = 20.8% (20)
	Complete secondary = 22.2% (6)	Complete secondary = 28.1% (27)
	More than complete secondary = 18.5% (5)	More than complete secondary = 16.7% (16)
Occupation	Retired, housewife = 18.5% (5)	Retired, housewife = 13.5% (13)
	Full-time student = 11.1% (3)	Full-time student = 4.2% (4)
	Unemployed = 22.2% (6)	Unemployed = 4.2% (4)
	Semi-skilled manual = 3.7% (1)	Self-employed = 1.0% (1)
	Low-level non-manual = 7.4% (2)	Unskilled and domestic servant = 6.3% (6)
	Secretary, clerk = 11.1% (3)	Semi-skilled manual = 4.2% (4)
	High-level non-manual = 22.2% (6)	Skilled manual = 8.3% (8)
	Managerial, professional = 3.7% (1)	Low-level non-manual = 8.3% (8)
		Secretary, clerk = 21.9% (21)
		Teacher = 3.1% (3)
		High-level non-manual = 20.8% (20)
	Managerial, professional = 4.2% (4)	
Residence of wife or wives (for married men)	Wife in Nairobi = 88.9% (8)	Wife in Nairobi = 73.3% (22)
	Wife in the rural area = 11.1% (1)	Wife in the rural area = 16.7% (5)
		Wife in other area or mixed = 10.0% (3)
Mean age of sample	Mean age = 35.1 years	Mean age = 27.8 years
	N = 27	N = 96
Mean number of areas of Nairobi lived in	Mean number of areas = 2.3 areas	Mean number of areas = 2.8 areas
	N = 27	N = 97

TABLE III : Do you (or your husband) own a shamba?
How many acres do you have?

Land Owned	ALL% (N)	Village	
		Old Kibera	New Kibera
None	57.0% (235)	54.3% (157)	63.4% (78)
Less than 1 acre	3.2% (13)	4.5% (13)	-
1 - 3 acres	12.6% (52)	15.2% (44)	6.5% (8)
4 - 9 acres	14.3% (59)	15.2% (44)	12.2% (15)
10 acres or more	12.9% (53)	10.7% (31)	17.9% (22)
T O T A L	100.0% (412)	99.9% (289)	100.0% (123)

TABLE IV : (a) Number of rooms let

(b) income from rents from houses owned in Kibera or Nairobi.

(a) Number of rooms let	Type of house			Income from rents per month	Type of Owner	
	In mud house % (N)	In stone house % (N)			Those letting mud houses	Those letting stone houses
None	26.4% (19)	37.5% (9)	Total rooms let in mud houses: 227 rooms	1 - 49/-	N = 10	-
1 room	9.7% (7)	12.5% (3)		50 - 149/-	N = 21	N = 2
2 rooms	16.7% (12)	12.5% (3)	3.2 rooms let per mud house owner	150-249/-	N = 9	N = 3
3 rooms	6.9% (5)	16.7% (4)	4.3 rooms let per renting mud house owner	250-349/-	N = 8	N = 4
4 rooms	13.0% (10)	4.2% (1)		350-549/-	N = 1	N = 2
5 rooms	4.2% (3)	16.7% (4)	Total rooms let in stone houses = 45 rooms	550-749/-	-	N = 2
6 rooms	8.3% (6)	-		750-1000/-	-	N = 1
7 rooms	5.6% (4)	-	1.9 rooms let per stone house owner	Don't know, refuse	N = 2	N = 1
8 rooms	5.6% (4)	-		T O T A L	N = 51	N = 15
10 rooms	1.4% (1)	-	3.0 rooms let per renting stone house owner.			
20 rooms	1.4% (1)	-				
T O T A L	100.1% (72)	100.1% (24)				
As % of Kibera adults.	17.2%	5.7%				

Average of 142/90 income per month per renting owner of mud houses (4.3 rooms).
Average of 362/50 income per month per renting owner of stone houses (3.0 rooms).

TABLE V : Old Kibera tenants only - Monthly rent paid by: a) number of rooms occupied, b) length of residence in building, c) monthly total household income.

Monthly rent paid	ALL % (N)	(a)			(b)		(c)					
		Bedspace only	1 room	2 rooms	3 rooms	Less than 3 years	3-27 years	Less than 250/-	250 - 449/-	450 - 749/-	750 - 1449/-	1450 - 5000/-
under 20/-	.5% (1)	-	.5% (1)	-	-	-	1.7% (1)	2.3% (1)	-	-	-	-
20-39/-	37.4% (79)	100.0% (1)	38.0% (78)	-	-	29.8% (45)	56.7% (34)	50.0% (22)	36.3% (33)	29.4% (15)	23.1% (3)	-
40-59/-	56.9% (120)	-	57.1% (117)	66.7% (2)	50.0% (1)	64.9% (98)	36.7% (22)	40.9% (18)	61.5% (56)	66.7% (34)	46.2% (6)	100.0% (1)
60-89/-	3.3% (7)	-	2.9% (6)	33.3% (1)	-	2.6% (4)	5.0% (3)	4.5% (2)	-	3.9% (2)	23.1% (3)	-
90-129/-	1.4% (3)	-	1.0% (2)	-	50.0% (1)	2.0% (3)	-	2.3% (1)	2.2% (2)	-	-	-
130-199/-	.5% (1)	-	.5% (1)	-	-	.7% (1)	-	-	-	-	7.7% (1)	-
	100.0% (211)	100.0% (1)	100.0% (205)	100.0% (3)	100.0% (2)	100.0% (151)	100.1% (60)	100.0% (44)	100.0% (97)	100.0% (51)	100.0% (13)	100.0% (1)
	Average rent paid= 45/- per month	.5%	97.2%	1.4%	.9%	71.6%	28.4%	22.0%	45.5%	25.5%	6.5%	.5%

TABLE VI : New Kibera tenants only -- Monthly rent paid by a) number of rooms occupied, b) length of residence in building, c) monthly total household income.

Monthly rent paid	ALL % (N)	a) Number of rooms occupied						b) Length of residence in dwelling			c) Monthly total household income				
		1 room	2 rooms	3 rooms	4 rooms	5 rooms	6 rooms	Under 1 year	1 - 3 years	Over 3 yrs.	Less than 250/-	250-449/-	450-749/-	750-1449/-	1450-5000/-
40-59/-	1.0% (1)	-	-	5.9% (1)	-	-	-	-	2.5% (1)	-	-	-	-	2.9% (1)	-
60-89/-	11.9% (12)	20.7% (6)	27.3% (6)	-	-	-	-	6.7% (3)	7.5% (3)	37.5% (6)	-	60.0% (3)	46.2% (6)	8.8% (3)	-
90-129/-	9.9% (10)	20.7% (6)	13.6% (3)	5.9% (1)	-	-	-	4.4% (2)	15.0% (6)	12.5% (2)	50.0% (1)	20.0% (1)	7.7% (1)	8.8% (3)	8.1% (3)
130-199/-	18.8% (19)	37.9% (11)	18.2% (4)	23.5% (4)	-	-	-	17.7% (8)	15.0% (6)	31.3% (5)	-	-	23.1% (3)	32.4% (11)	2.7% (1)
200-349/-	22.8% (23)	13.8% (4)	36.4% (8)	29.4% (5)	7.7% (1)	33.3% (5)	-	24.4% (11)	25.0% (10)	12.5% (2)	-	-	15.4% (2)	26.5% (9)	27.0% (10)
350-500/-	26.7% (27)	6.9% (2)	-	23.5% (4)	92.3% (12)	46.7% (7)	40.0% (2)	37.8% (17)	22.5% (9)	6.3% (1)	50.0% (1)	20.0% (1)	7.7% (1)	17.6% (6)	45.9% (17)
Over 500/-	8.9% (9)	-	4.5% (1)	11.8% (2)	-	20.0% (3)	50.0% (3)	8.9% (4)	12.5% (5)	-	-	-	-	2.9% (1)	16.2% (6)
Average rent paid 281/- per month.	100.0% (101)	100.0% (29)	100.0% (22)	100.0% (17)	100.0% (13)	100.0% (15)	100.0% (5)	99.9% (45)	100.0% (40)	100.1% (16)	100.0% (2)	100.0% (5)	100.1% (13)	99.9% (34)	99.9% (37)
		28.7%	21.8%	16.8%	12.9%	14.9%	5.0%	44.6%	31.6%	15.8%	2.2%	5.5%	14.3%	37.4%	40.7%

TABLE VIII: Tenant only - Rent paid by village and rent willing to pay for a better house.

Monthly rent paid	ALL % (N) (%)	Old Kibera	Salama	H111	New Kibera village
Under 20/-	3% (1) [100%]	5% (1) [100%]	-	-	-
20 - 39/-	25.3% (76) [70%]	37.8% (6) [70%]	-	-	-
40 - 59/-	39.0% (11) [65%]	57.7% (11) [66%]	1.8% (1) [0%]	-	-
60 - 89/-	5.7% (17) [59%]	2.5% (5) [66%]	21.4% (12) [58%]	-	-
90 - 129/-	4.0% (12) [83%]	1.0% (2) [50%]	16.1% (9) [89%]	4.0% (1) [100%]	-
130 - 199/-	6.7% (20) [75%]	.5% (1) [0%]	28.6% (16) [75%]	8.0% (2) [100%]	5.6% (1) [100%]
200 - 349/-	7.3% (22) [68%]	-	17.9% (10) [70%]	20.0% (5) [40%]	38.3% (7) [86%]
350 - 590/-	9.0% (27) [22%]	-	8.9% (5) [40%]	52.0% (13) [15%]	50.0% (9) [22%]
Over 500/-	2.7% (8) [13%]	-	5.4% (3) [33%]	16.0% (4) [0%]	5.6% (1) [0%]

In brackets at the lower right-hand corner of each cell of the table is the percentage of respondents in that cell who would be willing to pay higher rent for a better house.

CONTD....

TABLE VIII: CONTD. Tenant only -- Rent paid by village and rent willing to pay for a better house.

Monthly rent paid	ALL% (N) (%)	Old Kibera	Salama	HI 11	New Kibera Village
TOTAL	100.0% (300) [57%]	100.0% (201) [57%] Av. rent = 44/-	100.1% (56) [66%] Av. rent = 205/-	100.0% (25) [28%] Av. rent = 390/-	100.1% (18) [50%] Av. rent = 362/-

TABLE VIII: Tenants only - "When you leave this house, would you prefer to rent a house again or to buy one?" by a) total monthly household income, b) ownership of shamba by self or spouse, c) residence of wife/wives for married men, d) whether respondent prefers to live in the rural area or in town.

	ALL % (N)	(a) Total monthly household income						(b) Ownership of shamba by self or spouse					(c) Residence of wife			(d) Where prefer to live?		
		Less than 250/-	250-449/-	450-749/-	750-1449/-	1450-5000/-	DK, refuse	None	Less than 1 acre	1 - 3 acres	4 - 9 acres	10 acres or more	All in Nairobi	All in rural area	Other	Rural area	Urban area	Either or depends
To rent	5.7% (139)	67.4% (31)	53.2% (50)	51.6% (32)	30.4% (14)	16.1% (5)	28.0% (7)	38.7% (55)	75.0% (6)	51.0% (25)	53.8% (28)	38.5% (20)	41.3% (26)	58.2% (39)	44.4% (8)	54.8% (92)	33.7% (23)	35.3% (18)
To buy or build	42.8% (130)	19.5% (9)	33.0% (31)	41.9% (26)	65.2% (30)	77.4% (24)	40.0% (10)	47.9% (58)	25.0% (2)	40.8% (20)	34.6% (18)	51.9% (27)	50.8% (32)	37.3% (25)	50.0% (9)	35.7% (60)	50.6% (42)	52.9% (27)
Other, don't know	11.5% (35)	13.0% (6)	13.8% (13)	6.5% (4)	4.3% (2)	6.5% (2)	32.0% (8)	13.4% (19)	-	8.2% (4)	11.5% (6)	9.6% (5)	7.9% (5)	4.5% (3)	5.6% (1)	9.5% (16)	15.7% (13)	11.8% (6)
TOTAL	100.0% (304)	100.0% (46)	100.0% (94)	100.0% (62)	99.9% (46)	100.0% (31)	100.0% (25)	100.0% (142)	100.0% (8)	100.0% (49)	99.9% (52)	100.0% (52)	100.0% (63)	100.0% (67)	100.0% (18)	100.0% (168)	100.0% (83)	100.0% (51)

TABLE IX : Old Kibera only - "Would you like to move into the new houses in Kibera? (YES) would you be able to afford to buy a new house if you had to pay a deposit of two thousand shillings and two hundred shillings a month as the payment to the National Housing Corporation?" by a) tribe, b) monthly total household income, c) tenancy status.

Do you want a house in New Kibera?	ALL % (N)	(a) Tribe							(b) Monthly total household income					(c) Tenancy status	
		Mubian	Kikuyu	Luo	Luhya	Kamba	Other tribes	Less than 250/-	250-449/-	450-749/-	750-1449/-	1450-5000/-	Owner-related	Tenant related	
Don't want	14.2% (40)	31.7% (20)	13.7% (7)	6.3% (4)	4.9% (2)	12.2% (5)	9.1% (2)	17.1% (12)	12.3% (13)	11.1% (7)	18.2% (4)	25.0% (1)	23.1% (18)	10.9% (22)	
Would like but can not afford	64.1% (180)	42.9% (27)	70.6% (36)	71.4% (45)	70.7% (29)	65.9% (27)	72.7% (16)	75.7% (53)	63.2% (67)	57.1% (36)	50.0% (11)	25.0% (1)	52.6% (41)	68.5% (139)	
Would like and can afford	2.7% (61)	25.4% (16)	15.7% (8)	22.2% (14)	24.4% (10)	22.0% (9)	18.2% (4)	7.1% (5)	24.5% (23)	31.7% (20)	31.8% (7)	50.0% (2)	24.4% (19)	20.7% (42)	
T O T A L	100.0% (281)	100.0% (63)	100.0% (51)	99.9% (63)	100.0% (41)	100.1% (41)	100.0% (22)	99.9% (70)	100.0% (106)	99.9% (63)	100.0% (22)	100.0% (4)	100.1% (78)	100.0% (203)	

TABLE X : Which type of new house in Kibera do you prefer: the ones in Salama near Karanja Road, the ones on the Hill, or the recently completed ones in New Kibera Village? by a) village of residence, b) tribe, c) religion, d) marital status, e) tenancy status, f) total monthly household income.

Prefer:	ALL % (N)	(a) Village of residence					(b) Tribe							
		Old Kibera	Salama	Hill	New Kibera Village	Mubian	Kikuyu	Luo	Luhya	Kamba	Other tribes			
Salama	18.2% (76)	22.1% (65)	14.3% (10)	3.0% (1)	-	32.9% (25)	12.5% (9)	19.4% (21)	8.3% (5)	14.8% (9)	17.1% (7)			
Hill	31.6% (132)	25.2% (74)	37.1% (26)	69.7% (23)	42.9% (9)	27.6% (21)	30.6% (22)	38.0% (41)	25.0% (15)	29.5% (18)	36.6% (15)			
New Kibera Village	19.6% (82)	17.0% (50)	28.6% (20)	12.1% (4)	38.1% (8)	10.5% (8)	20.8% (15)	25.9% (28)	23.3% (14)	14.8% (9)	19.5% (8)			
Any or other	8.6% (36)	10.5% (31)	7.1% (5)	-	3.9% (3)	13.9% (10)	4.6% (5)	18.3% (11)	3.3% (2)	12.2% (5)				
None	7.7% (32)	9.9% (29)	2.9% (2)	3.0% (1)	17.1% (13)	6.9% (5)	.9% (1)	8.3% (5)	13.1% (8)	-				
Don't know, can't say	14.4% (60)	15.3% (45)	10.0% (7)	12.1% (4)	7.9% (6)	15.3% (11)	11.1% (12)	16.7% (10)	24.6% (15)	14.6% (6)				
TOTAL	100.1% (418)	100.0% (294)	100.0% (70)	99.9% (33)	100.0% (21)	99.9% (76)	100.0% (72)	99.9% (108)	99.9% (60)	100.1% (61)	100.0% (41)			

TABLE X: "Which type of new house in Kibera do you prefer: the ones in Salama near Karanja Road, the ones on the hill, or the recently completed ones in New Kibera COMTD. Village?" by a) village of residence, b) tribe, c) religion, d) marital status, e) tenancy status, f) total monthly household income.

Prefer:	(c) Religion				(d) Marital status				(e) Tenancy status		(f) Total monthly household income						
	Muslim	Protestant	Roman Catholic	No religion	Unmarried	Married	Widowed divorced separated	Owner related	Tenant related	Less than 250/-	250-449/-	450-749/-	750-1449/-	1450-5000/-	DK, refuse		
Salama	27.2% (25)	13.5% (26)	16.8% (21)	50.0% (4)	12.9% (12)	18.2% (54)	34.5% (10)	22.0% (24)	16.8% (52)	21.3% (16)	21.0% (25)	18.5% (15)	22.6% (14)	4.3% (2)	11.4% (4)		
Hill	27.2% (25)	35.2% (88)	30.4% (38)	12.5% (1)	37.6% (35)	31.1% (92)	17.2% (5)	24.8% (27)	34.0% (105)	16.0% (12)	29.4% (35)	27.2% (22)	41.9% (26)	56.5% (26)	31.4% (11)		
New Kibera village	16.3% (15)	20.2% (39)	22.4% (28)	-	20.4% (19)	19.6% (58)	17.2% (5)	23.9% (26)	18.1% (56)	20.0% (15)	15.1% (18)	25.9% (21)	21.0% (13)	23.9% (11)	11.4% (4)		
Any or other	6.5% (6)	8.8% (17)	9.6% (12)	12.5% (1)	5.4% (5)	9.8% (29)	6.9% (2)	6.4% (7)	9.4% (29)	8.0% (6)	13.4% (16)	12.3% (10)	1.6% (1)	2.2% (1)	5.7% (2)		
None	13.0% (12)	6.7% (13)	4.8% (6)	12.5% (1)	8.6% (8)	6.8% (20)	13.8% (4)	11.9% (13)	6.1% (19)	13.3% (10)	6.7% (8)	7.4% (6)	6.5% (4)	4.3% (2)	5.7% (2)		
Don't know, can't say	9.8% (9)	15.5% (30)	16.0% (20)	12.5% (1)	15.1% (14)	14.5% (43)	10.3% (3)	11.0% (12)	15.5% (48)	21.3% (16)	14.3% (17)	8.6% (7)	6.5% (4)	8.7% (4)	34.3% (12)		
TOTAL	100.0% (92)	99.9% (193)	100.0% (125)	100.0% (8)	100.0% (93)	100.0% (296)	99.9% (29)	100.0% (109)	99.9% (309)	99.9% (75)	99.9% (119)	99.9% (81)	100.1% (62)	99.9% (46)	99.9% (35)		

In brackets are the mean number of rooms inhabited by these households

TABLE XI: "Which do you like better: a house with an open courtyard inside it (like the houses in Salama), or a house with a garden outside (like the ones on the hill)? Which do you like better: a house in which all of the rooms have separate doors to the outside or a house in which you must walk through one room to get to the other rooms?" by a) village of residence, b) sex, c) tribe, d) religion, e) tenancy status, f) total monthly household income.

Prefer:	ALL %(N)	a) Village of residence					b) Sex		c) Tribe					
		Old Kibera	Salama	Hill	New Kibera Village	Male	Female	Nubian	Kikuyu	Luo	Luhya	Kamba	Other tribes	
														(N)
Courtyard, rooms with separate access	14.6% (61)	16.0% (47)	17.1% (12)	6.1% (2)	-	14.9% (38)	14.1% (23)	30.3% (23)	9.7% (7)	13.0% (14)	10.0% (6)	9.8% (6)	12.2% (5)	
Courtyard, connecting rooms	12.4% (52)	11.9% (35)	21.4% (15)	6.1% (2)	-	10.2% (26)	16.0% (26)	6.6% (5)	6.9% (5)	18.5% (20)	15.0% (9)	14.8% (9)	9.9% (4)	
Garden, rooms with separate access	13.6% (57)	14.6% (43)	11.4% (8)	9.1% (3)	14.3% (3)	15.3% (39)	11.0% (18)	18.4% (14)	13.9% (10)	9.3% (10)	13.3% (8)	13.1% (8)	17.1% (7)	
Garden, connecting rooms	22.5% (94)	13.6% (40)	24.3% (17)	66.7% (22)	71.4% (15)	24.7% (63)	19.0% (31)	7.9% (6)	25.0% (18)	36.1% (39)	15.0% (9)	16.4% (10)	29.3% (12)	
Other responses	36.8% (154)	43.9% (129)	25.7% (18)	12.1% (4)	14.3% (3)	34.9% (89)	39.9% (65)	36.8% (28)	44.4% (32)	23.1% (25)	46.7% (28)	45.9% (28)	31.7% (13)	
T O A L	99.9% (418)	100.0% (294)	99.9% (70)	100.1% (33)	100.0% (21)	100.0% (255)	100.0% (163)	100.0% (76)	99.9% (72)	100.0% (108)	100.0% (60)	100.0% (61)	100.1% (41)	

TABLE XI: CONTD. Which do you like better: a house with an open courtyard inside it (like the houses in Salama), or a house with a garden outside (like the ones on the hill)? Which do you like better: a house in which all of the rooms have separate doors to the outside or a house in which you must walk through one room to get to the other rooms? by a) village of residence, b) sex, c) tribe, d) religion, e) tenancy status, f) total monthly household income.

Prefer:	(d) Religion				(e) Tenancy status		(f) Total monthly household income					
	Muslim	Protestant	Roman Catholic	No Religion	Owner-related	Tenant-related	Less than 250/-	250-449/-	450-749/-	750-1449/-	1450-5000/-	DK, refuse
Courtyard, rooms with separate access	28.3% (26)	7.8% (15)	14.4% (18)	25.0% (2)	22.0% (24)	12.0% (37)	18.7% (14)	14.3% (17)	16.0% (13)	21.0% (13)	2.2% (1)	8.6% (3)
Courtyard, connecting rooms.	7.6% (7)	15.5% (30)	10.4% (13)	25.0% (2)	7.3% (8)	14.2% (44)	8.0% (6)	11.8% (14)	14.8% (12)	17.7% (11)	8.7% (4)	14.3% (5)
Garden, rooms with separate access	19.6% (18)	11.9% (23)	12.8% (16)	-	16.5% (18)	12.6% (30)	14.7% (11)	16.0% (19)	8.6% (7)	11.3% (7)	13.0% (6)	20.0% (7)
Garden, connecting rooms.	8.7% (8)	29.0% (56)	24.0% (30)	-	18.3% (20)	23.9% (74)	6.7% (5)	18.5% (22)	17.3% (14)	32.3% (20)	54.3% (25)	22.9% (8)
Other responses	35.9% (33)	35.8% (69)	38.4% (48)	50.0% (4)	35.8% (39)	37.2% (115)	52.0% (39)	39.5% (47)	43.2% (35)	17.7% (11)	21.7% (10)	34.3% (12)
T O T A L	100.1% (92)	100.0% (193)	100.0% (125)	100.0% (8)	99.9% (109)	99.9% (309)	100.1% (75)	100.1% (119)	99.9% (81)	100.0% (62)	99.9% (46)	100.1% (35)

TABLE XII: If you had your choice, would you prefer to be allocated a tenant-purchase house in Kibera or a building plot somewhere else in Nairobi? by a) village of residence, b) tribe, c) total monthly household income, d) whether would choose to build a stone house or a mud house.

Would prefer:	ALL % (N)	a) Village of residence					(b) Tribe							
		Old Kibera	Salama	Hill	New Kibera Village	Nubian	Kikuyu	Luo	Luhya	Kamba	Other tribes			
Kibera house	49.8% (208)	49.3% (145)	52.9% (37)	45.5% (15)	52.4% (11)	48.4% (52)	50.0% (36)	41.7% (45)	50.0% (30)	44.3% (27)	43.9% (18)			
Nairobi plot	21.3% (89)	19.4% (57)	20.0% (14)	30.3% (10)	38.1% (8)	17.1% (13)	15.3% (11)	25.0% (27)	25.0% (15)	18.0% (11)	29.3% (12)			
Either	10.3% (43)	8.8% (26)	11.4% (8)	21.2% (7)	9.5% (2)	1.3% (1)	15.3% (11)	12.0% (13)	10.0% (6)	9.8% (6)	14.6% (6)			
Neither	13.2% (55)	16.0% (47)	10.0% (7)	3.0% (1)	5.3% (4)	12.5% (9)	16.7% (18)	8.3% (5)	23.0% (14)	12.2% (5)				
Depends, don't know	5.5% (23)	6.5% (19)	5.7% (4)	-	7.9% (6)	6.9% (5)	4.6% (5)	6.7% (4)	4.9% (3)	-				
TOTAL	100.2% (418)	100.0% (294)	100.0% (70)	100.0% (33)	100.0% (21)	100.0% (76)	100.0% (72)	100.0% (108)	100.0% (60)	100.0% (61)	100.0% (41)			

CONTD.

TABLE XII: "If you had your choice, would you prefer to be allocated a tenant-purchase house in Kibera or a building plot somewhere else in Nairobi?" by a) village
 CONTD. of residence, b) tribe, c) total monthly household income, d) whether would choose to build a stone house or a mud house.

	(c) Total monthly household income						(d) Would choose to build:	
	Less than 250/-	250-449/-	450-749/-	750-1449/-	1450-5000/-	DK, refuse	3-room stone house	6-room mud house
Would prefer:								
Kibera house	37.0% (27)	46.5% (53)	56.3% (45)	55.7% (34)	52.2% (24)	44.1% (15)	49.8% (148)	50.0% (57)
Nairobi plot	26.0% (19)	21.1% (24)	12.5% (10)	23.0% (14)	26.1% (12)	29.4% (10)	22.9% (68)	16.7% (19)
Either	5.5% (4)	11.4% (13)	12.5% (10)	8.2% (5)	17.4% (8)	8.8% (3)	12.1% (36)	6.1% (7)
Neither	20.5% (15)	16.7% (19)	12.5% (10)	11.5% (7)	4.3% (2)	5.9% (2)	12.5% (37)	15.8% (18)
Depends, don't know	11.0% (8)	4.4% (5)	6.3% (5)	1.6% (1)	-	11.8% (4)	2.7% (8)	11.4% (13)
TOTAL	100.0% (73)	100.1% (114)	100.1% (80)	100.0% (61)	100.0% (46)	100.0% (34)	100.0% (297)	100.0% (114)

TABLE XIII: "Pretend you are going to build a house in Nairobi on your own plot, and you find out that there are two types of houses that you could build for the same amount of money. Which one of these houses would you choose to build: a modern stone house of three rooms, or a mud and wattle house of six rooms?" by a) village of residence, b) tenancy status, c) total monthly household income, d) tribe.

Would build:	ALL %(N)	a) Village of residence				b) Tenancy status		c) Monthly total household income						d) Tribe						
		Old Kibera	Salama	HI 11	New Kibera Village	Owner- related	Tenant related	Less than 250/-	250- 449/-	450- 749/-	750/- 1449/-	1450- 5000/-	DK, refuse	Mubian	Kikuyu	Luo	Luhya	Kamba	Other tribes	Non- Mubian tribes
3-room stone house	72.3% (297)	63.5% (183)	88.4% (61)	97.0% (32)	100.0% (21)	43.3% (45)	82.1% (252)	47.3% (35)	69.8% (81)	75.0% (60)	80.6% (50)	95.1% (44)	81.8% (27)	37.0% (27)	69.6% (48)	88.0% (95)	80.0% (48)	77.0% (47)	80.0% (32)	79.9% (270)
6-room mud house	27.7% (114)	36.5% (105)	11.6% (8)	3.0% (1)	-	56.7% (59)	17.9% (55)	52.7% (39)	30.2% (36)	25.0% (20)	19.4% (12)	4.5% (2)	18.2% (6)	63.0% (46)	30.4% (21)	12.0% (13)	20.0% (12)	23.0% (14)	20.0% (8)	20.1% (68)
TOTAL	100.0% (411)	100.0% (288)	100.0% (69)	100.0% (33)	100.0% (21)	100.0% (104)	100.0% (307)	100.0% (74)	100.0% (116)	100.0% (80)	100.0% (62)	100.0% (46)	100.0% (33)	100.0% (73)	100.0% (69)	100.0% (108)	100.0% (60)	100.0% (61)	100.0% (40)	100.0% (338)

The first number in brackets is the mean number of household members in the respondents' households; the second is the mean number of rooms occupied by the household.

TABLE XIV: "Would you prefer to live close enough to walk to your job but pay high rent, or live far from your job in a place with low rents and pay for the bus or other transport every day?" by a) occupation, b) monthly total household income.

Would prefer to:	ALL (11)	a) Occupation				(b) Monthly total household income					
		Unemployed, casual labor self- employed, unskilled manual labor	All other occupations (employment)	Retired, housewives, students	Less than 250/-	250- 449/-	450- 749/-	750- 1449/-	1450- 5000/-	DK, refuse	
Live close, pay high rent	35.6% (140)	30.9% (29)	34.6% (65)	42.2% (46)	33.3% (22)	27.8% (32)	28.9% (22)	45.9% (28)	47.7% (21)	48.4% (15)	
Live far, pay low rent	45.5% (179)	51.1% (48)	44.7% (84)	42.2% (46)	33.3% (22)	60.9% (70)	59.2% (45)	37.7% (23)	22.7% (10)	29.0% (9)	
Live wherever cheapest	18.8% (74)	18.1% (17)	20.7% (39)	15.6% (17)	33.3% (22)	11.3% (13)	11.8% (9)	16.4% (10)	29.5% (13)	22.6% (7)	
TOTAL	99.9% (393)	100.1% (94)	100.0% (188)	100.0% (109)	99.9% (66)	100.0% (115)	99.9% (76)	100.0% (61)	99.9% (44)	100.0% (31)	

TABLE XV: If you and your family were looking for another place to live, which of the following things would be absolutely necessary for you in a house; that is, you would not agree to live there unless these things were there: a) inside water tap, b) an inside choo (toilet), c) shower, d) electricity, e) low rent or payments, f) good roof, g) concrete floor, h) stone walls^g by village of residence and income.

Would require:	ALL % (N)	Old Kibera	New Kibera	Old Kibera only: Total monthly household income						New Kibera only: Total monthly household income				
				Less than 250/-	250-449/-	450-749/-	750-1449/-	1450-5000/-	Less than 250/-	250-449/-	450-749/-	750-1449/-	1450-5000/-	
Loss than 3 of both qualities and facilities	30.4% (116)	39.7% (110)	5.7% (6)	33.3% (24)	40.2% (45)	40.9% (27)	56.5% (13)	25.0% (1)	-	42.9% (3)	7.1% (1)	5.1% (2)	-	
3 modern facilities, less than 3 qualities	5.8% (22)	5.1% (14)	7.6% (8)	5.6% (4)	2.7% (3)	7.6% (5)	4.3% (1)	25.0% (1)	-	-	14.3% (2)	10.3% (4)	4.8% (2)	
3 qualities, less than 3 modern facilities	5.5% (21)	7.2% (20)	1.0% (1)	8.3% (6)	8.9% (10)	6.1% (4)	-	-	14.3% (1)	-	-	-	-	
3 facilities and 3 qualities	58.4% (223)	48.0% (133)	85.7% (90)	52.8% (38)	48.2% (54)	45.5% (30)	39.1% (9)	50.0% (2)	100.0% (3)	42.9% (3)	78.6% (11)	84.6% (33)	99.2% (40)	
T O T A L	100.1% (382)	100.0% (277)	100.0% (105)	100.0% (72)	100.0% (112)	100.1% (66)	99.9% (23)	100.0% (4)	100.0% (3)	100.1% (7)	100.0% (14)	100.0% (39)	100.0% (42)	