

Poverty, Household Strategies and Coping with Urban Life: A Look at the Livelihood Framework in Lagos, Nigeria

Philip O. Sijuwade

School of Urban and Public Affairs, University of Texas, Arlington, Texas, USA

Abstract: The livelihood framework suggests that poverty is not only a product of material deprivation but of a set of interlocking factors, including physical weakness, social isolation, vulnerability and powerlessness. This study aims to explain how the poor cope with the Nigerian urban life through their household strategies in reference to livelihood framework. Data were collected from 400 urban poor living in 3 different neighborhoods in Lagos, Nigeria by using a structured questionnaire. The study reveals that the poor face extreme poverty and vulnerability in terms of their economic and social conditions and cope with these adverse situations having adopted different strategies in their household to survive in the city as they have limited access to the existing economic and social systems.

Key words: Household strategies, urban poverty, livelihood, social capital, social network

INTRODUCTION

The most accepted explanation of poverty is provided by social scientists who attempt to combine both material and non-material dimensions of poverty (Chamber, 1989, 1992; Sen, 1987, 1997). This suggests that poverty is a product not just of material conditions, but also of a set of interlocking factors, including physical weakness, social isolation, vulnerability and powerlessness. The poverty of a household is related to its resource endowments, its organizational capacity to manage and deploy its resources, its labor force position, the available coping mechanisms and external or family contingencies which affect it (Rakodi, 2002). Household strategies are those implicit principles that guide household members when seeking household goods for coping with urban life. This suggests that people can choose and choices make a difference, despite the economic or social constraints they face. By pooling resources, by working in both formal and informal economies, by the self-construction of shelter, by self-provisioning and by the skilful use of social networks, families avoid entrapment in a self-perpetuating culture of poverty (Roberts, 2004). The issue of urban poverty in developing countries attracts research attention in recent times as the major urban centers in these countries face tremendous pressure of population with insufficient infrastructure and social services. In recent decades, the issue of urban poverty in Nigeria has attracted attention from scholars especially social scientists as the major cities of the country face serious challenges of population and poverty. Most of the studies use macro level data to explain the spatial and economic characteristics of the

urban poor. But a few studies focus on the coping mechanisms of the urban poor used in an adverse urban setting. However, attempts have been made in this study to explain the faces of recent urban poverty and the strategies adopted by the poor in their households to cope with urban life.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Data were collected from 3 lower income neighborhoods in the city of Lagos between July 2006 and October 2006. These neighborhoods include Maroko, Mushin and Palmgrove. These neighborhoods were selected as research sites because they represent different forms of adaptations of poor households in the city. Four hundred urban poor were interviewed from 3 neighborhoods based on their employment, income, household structure as well as migration pattern. A structured questionnaire, constructed on various forms of household adaptations such as, economic activities, expenditure and purchasing pattern, shelter and environmental services, using social services, rural-urban ties, social network and community participation, was used for data collection. Mainly descriptive statistics (percentages) were used for data analysis.

The data from the household survey have been supplemented by some qualitative data to demonstrate the coping strategies of the urban poor in Lagos, Nigeria. The study reveals that the urban poor experience miserable economic and social conditions and cope with the adverse urban situations through strategies adopted mainly in their households.

EXPLAINING 'LIVELIHOOD FRAMEWORK'

The increased attention being paid to urban livelihoods follows from a wide recognition that significant portions of urban poor households in developing countries are vulnerable in terms of their sustainable livelihood systems (Rakodi, 2002). A livelihood is generally defined as comprising the capabilities, assets, including both material and social resources and activities required for a means of living. A livelihood is sustainable when it can cope with and recover from stresses and shocks and maintain or enhance its capabilities and assets both now and in the future, while not undermining the natural resource base. A livelihood framework to development draws on a conceptual framework which may be used as a basis for analyzing, understanding and managing the complexity of livelihoods:

The livelihood framework is a tool that helps to define the scope of and provide the analytical basis for livelihoods analysis, by identifying the main factors affecting livelihoods and the relationships between them; to help those concerned with supporting the livelihoods of poor people to understand and manage their complexity; to become a shared point of reference for all concerned with supporting livelihoods, enabling the complementarity of contributions and the trade-offs between outcomes to be assessed; to provide a basis for identifying appropriate objectives and interventions to support livelihoods. At the center of the framework are the assets on which households or individuals draw to build their livelihoods (Rakodi, 2002).

The indicators of Poverty Line analysis based on household consumption do not capture all dimensions of poverty, especially from the viewpoint of poor people themselves. Poverty is not defined solely in terms of low incomes, but uses broader concepts of deprivation and insecurity. And any attempt to place monetary values on these aspects of personal, household and social deprivation involves so many arbitrary assumptions that it is likely to be meaningless. Deprivation occurs when people are unable to reach a certain level of functioning or capability. Chamber (1983, 1989) includes physical weakness, isolation, vulnerability and powerlessness in addition to lack of income and assets. A pyramid starting from income poverty as the most measurable, to access to common pool resources, state-provided commodities, assets, dignity and autonomy is identified.

In livelihood framework, poverty is thus characterised not only by a lack of assets and inability to accumulate a portfolio of them, but also by the lack of choice with respect to alternative coping strategies. The poorest and most vulnerable households are forced to adopt strategies, which enable them to survive but not to improve their welfare. In urban areas, households seek to mobilise resources and opportunities and to combine these into a livelihood strategy which is a mix of labor market involvement, savings, borrowing and investment; productive and reproductive activities; income, labor and asset pooling and social net-working (Rakodi, 2002; Robert, 1998, 2004). Households and individuals adjust the mix according to their own circumstances and the changing context in which they live. Economic activities form the basis of a household strategy, but to them and overlapping with them, may be added migration movements, maintenance of ties with rural areas, urban food production, decisions about access to services such as education and housing and participation in social networks. The 'livelihoods' concept is a realistic recognition of the multiple activities, in which households engage to ensure their survival and improve their well-being, as will be explored further below (Ellis, 1998).

Livelihoods approaches propose that thinking in terms of strengths or assets is vital as an antidote to the view of poor people as 'passive' or 'deprived'. Central to the approach is the need to recognise that those who are poor may not have cash or other savings, but that they do have other material or non-material assets-their health, their labor, their knowledge and skills, their friends and family and the natural resources around them.

Livelihoods' approaches require a realistic understanding of these assets in order to identify what opportunities they may offer, or where constraints may lie. Proponents argue that it is more conceptually appropriate, empirically sound and of more practical use to start with an analysis of strengths as opposed to an analysis of needs. However, it has also been suggested that there is a danger that this emphasis may restrict policy and actions to households that have some assets on which they can build and neglect the poorest and the destitute, who may be effectively assetless (Rakodi, 2002; Mabogunje, 1989; Prayer, 2003).

Social capital is defined as rules, norms, obligations, reciprocity and embedded in social relations, social structures and society's institutional arrangements, which enable its members to achieve their individual and community objectives. Levels of social capital and the ability to call on the social networks involved vary in space and time. They may break down because of repeated shocks like drought, economic crisis or physical insecurity like violence and crime (Moser, 1996; Gugler, 1997).

Social networks are not all supportive of the poor or effective as social capital and are generally thought to be less robust in urban areas because of the mobility and heterogeneity of their populations. Closely linked to social capital is political capital, based on access to the political process and decision-making and best seen as a gatekeeper asset, permitting or preventing the accumulation of other assets. In urban setting, informal cultural networks can serve to transpose ethnocentric or patriarchal rural arrangements that otherwise may have been under threat. The dual potential of social capital is described as follows:

Social capital (or informal networks) built by households over generations in the village may take on a different form in dynamic, multi-cultural urban context where people come and go. This can induce new forms of social organisation at the community and city levels which provide the basis for more effective pooling of resources for lobbying of political leaders, engaging in partnership with civil society, the private sector and local government and for undertaking community development and management initiatives. It can also, however promote an increasing sense of isolation as slum new comers are denied the 'citizenship rights' of older occupants and tenants are excluded from participating in community activities (DFID, 2001).

The livelihood framework now turns to the structures and processes in the macro environment that impact on urban poverty and vulnerability. Livelihood systems and community networks develop in the context of shifting relationships between the state, market and society. These shifts are significant for urban vulnerability as they entail a redistribution of power and responsibility in relation to poverty reduction and development. As Beall and Kanji (1999) noted:

The emphasis by mainstream development agencies on partnership, decentralisation and 'community participation' has increased during the 1990s. decentralisation has involved a shift in the role of central governments from direct providers of services to enablers, creating a regulatory and financial environment in which private enterprises, households and community groups can play an increasing role in meeting their own needs. Responsibilities have shifted to local (public and private) levels. While decentralisation has the potential to provide new

opportunities for previously excluded groups to participate in local planning process, much depends on local power structures and the mobilisation of resources often remains a critical problem.

However, livelihood framework begins 'from the bottom up', drawing largely from literature on sustainable livelihoods. It then considers the structures and process 'from the top down' that enable and constraint urban development. The final component of the framework includes a focus on urban governance as the meeting ground between these 2 constructs.

POVERTY, HOUSEHOLD STRATEGIES AND COPING WITH URBAN LIFE: EVIDENCE LAGOS, NIGERIA

Economic activities: The urban poor are mostly employed in self-managed low paid jobs in the informal urban sectors like street vending and selling (35%), construction work (10%), driving and transport work (20%), factory work (12%) and personal servicing (20%). A small portion (3%) work in government and semi-government organizations. About 35% of the urban poor frequently face underemployment due to lack of employment opportunities, physical illness, staying in their ancestral villages. Significant portions of the urban poor (32%) are harassed physically, mentally and sexually at their work places. About 12% of the urban poor mentioned about unsafe working condition, which sometimes causes injuries and damages to their physical and mental health. The rates of income, wage and productivity are very low among the urban poor. The average monthly income of households is only N4000 (US\$36). But the intra-household income difference (SD. 2453) is quite significant. The condition of female-headed households is comparatively more miserable than male-headed households.

Entering more household members into workforce is the main survival strategy of the urban poor. This is why female participation in the urban work force is considerably higher among the poor than among their rural counterpart. Sometimes the female members use domestic spaces for both production and reproduction through operating income-generating activities with the assistance from other family members. This type of home based research is a manifestation of the urban poor women's involvement in the household production-reproduction sphere in the local space-the setting where poor women live with the members of their households.

Expenditure and purchasing pattern: The urban poor mostly spend their earnings to fulfil their basic needs especially for food and shelter. The average monthly household expenditure is only N3000 (US\$26). There is also a high level of intra household differentials (SD. 1957. 18) in expenditure. The expenditure of single headed households in the city is comparatively lower than other other forms of poor households. More than 60% of the earnings of single headed households are spent in the rural areas where their family members are also living. The expenditure of male-headed households is higher than that of the female-headed households. About 57% of the poor who are living in the low cost housing developed in low-lying land in urban peripheries spend a certain amount of their earning on housing. As most of their earning is used for food and shelters, the poor spend very small portion of their on clothing, medicine, education and incidentals.

The urban poor mainly buy food items like rice, beans, yams and vegetables at a low cost from the open market located near their neighborhoods. They usually buy bad quality stuffs at low costs. Moreover, they cannot afford expensive items like milk, meat and fruit. About 50% of the urban poor buy meat or poultry once or twice a month. It was found that 59 and 71. 8% did not buy milk or fruit in the week they were interviewed either. The urban poor rarely buy new clothes from the market places. Most of them get used clothes from relatives, landlords and employers. They sometimes buy cheap clothes for their family members from second- hand markets. Besides these cheap clothes, they buy used cookeries, furniture and other household goods from second hand markets at low price.

Shelter and environmental services: The urban poor have little access to urban land and they mostly build their houses on vacant private and government land and thereby become squatters in the city. Most of them are living in shanty houses which are constructed from low cost housing materials like tin, bamboo, straw and polythene. These houses become vulnerable during rainy season. Most of the poor urban dwellers are used to living in single roomed housing. In many cases, more than 5 members of the households live in one congested room. Of the single headed households, most live in appalling conditions with 20-30 people living in a single room. Only 15.6% households, with extended families, live in housing with more than one room. The majority of households (54%) have no cooking facilities and they cook outside their only room or open spaces. Another 46% have access to a common oven-where ten to fifteen households share one Kitchen with 4-6 other families.

About 60% of households use firewood and straw for cooking, which are mostly collected by them. They sometime get electricity connections from informal sources and their access to electricity is inadequate and irregular. Most of the poor have no individual access to the city's water supply and they collect water for drinking from a common municipal tap or from hand tube-wells. They usually wait for a long period of time to get water from public municipal taps. More than 65% of households have no access to city sewerage systems and share pit latrines, which are temporary and made by them. This type of latrines pollutes neighborhood environment as well as the whole city environment. Most of the poor (64.4%) living in the city have no access to drainage facilities. Only 17.8% have access to municipal waste disposal facilities and the rest of them dispose in generally marshy land adjacent to their settlements, which also pose serious challenge to the environment of the neighborhood.

Using social services: The urban poor have very limited access to the existing health care facilities. Only 35% use Services from city health centers, most of which are operated by Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO). Less attention from physicians (23%), lack of medicine in the hospitals (18%), high fees and charges (12%) and far to travel (12%) are the major reasons for not using government hospitals by the poor. The majority (59%) get their medicine from pharmacies without the approval of trained physicians. About 30% of the poor take medical advice regarding maternal health from the health centers operated by NGOs. At the period of child delivery only about 5% of the poor seek help from the doctors and nurses and the rest of them seek help mostly from untrained persons, family members and relatives. The poor have low level of education and employment training. More than 60% of the poor have had no formal schooling in their life time. There is at least one school-age child in 50% of the households who is not currently attending school. Despite the high percentage of illiteracy among the urban poor, a very small portion of them attended non-formal education programs (NFEP) managed by NGOs. The poor have low level of employment training and have limited access to such training. Only about 16% of the poor ever attended the skill development training program. Due to poverty, the poor can hardly think about recreation and socializing. They rarely participate in the city's cultural activities despite living in the city over a long period of time.

They typically pass their leisure time by gossiping with family members as well as community members. They have little access to out-door game facilities in the city

and they pass their time by playing few indoor games like ludo and card games. Some of them pass their leisure time only by watching television at their homes or in some communal places. Only 22% of the poor in the city go to parks, zoos and museums for recreation.

Rural-urban ties: The urban poor migrated from different rural areas due to 'push' and 'pull' factors. Lack of jobs, little income in the rural areas, available job services in the city and accompanying the family are major reasons for their migration to the city. But after migration to the city, the poor migrants fail to achieve their expectations and sometimes they consider their previous life better than the present one. But they don't move back to the rural areas due to their present economic reality. Despite living in the city for a long period of time, they do not generally loose their bonds with their villages. Gugler (1997) refers to it as 'life in a dual system'. The urban poor felt better identifying themselves as villagers rather than city dwellers. About 80% of the urban poor maintain a connection with villages, which they visit at least once a year. But the connection with the rural areas is correlated with the period of stay in the city and the pattern of migration. The number of those visiting rural areas is significantly higher among recent and temporary migrants than long-term and permanent migrants. Although, meeting relatives (43.6%) and providing financial help (23%) are the most common reasons for visiting rural areas. 10.2% of the urban poor visit rural areas mainly for observing festivals. Another 15.2% visited rural areas to look after their former homesteads and agricultural lands in their ancestral villages.

Social network: Social networking plays an important role in coping with urban life since it works as 'social capital'. The urban poor maintain both 'blood' networks (15%) and marriage networks (10%) in the city. Besides these kinship networks they have fictive network-based mainly on their areas of origin. This type of network becomes social capital in the context of migration to the city-by providing migration related information and adaptation to city life and by providing initial accommodation and employment information. After migration to the city neighborhood where they live, it becomes important in terms of their social network. About 40% of the urban poor have close relationships with their neighbors. Employment and land lordship also plays important role for social networks for a considerable portion of urban poor (Peil, 1983).

The poor mostly maintain their relationships with relatives, friends and village fellows who are living in the same community. Only about 20% have connections with the people living outside their immediate neighborhoods.

The poor households who are living in the city for a long period of time have wider social network. These long-term households maintain more relationships outside their communities than the households recently migrated to the city. Social network working as a social capital helps to perpetuate reciprocity in their micro-economic life. More than 50% of the urban poor visit and invite each other to social occasions.

The relatives, friends and neighbors help the poor to mitigate their economic and social crisis. More than 53% of the poor provide/receive financial help from their kin and neighbors and another 27% of them provide/receive non-financial support from these relatives and friends.

Community participation: Grouping, factionalism and feuds are characteristics of the urban poor. The poor form committees to resolve existing conflicts in the neighborhood. They rarely rely on help from law enforcement agencies (especially, the police) to mediate in or mitigate their problems. More than 28% of the urban poor are members of different community based political organizations. The rural areas from where the urban poor migrated plays an important role in community-based organization.

Their participation is not limited to their own communities. Most (64.5%) are registered city voters and about 55% cast their votes in the last election, but their level of integration with city politics is determined by their household structure. The single headed households who have mostly migrated to the city recently are not interested in city politics. They are mostly interested in earning money so that they can support their family members. But the majority (68.4%) shared strong nationalist or liberal political ideology and their votes mostly based on their party ideology. A considerable portion of the poor (27.4%) participates in action politics like picketing during strikes, joining public meetings and joining party meetings.

Despite participating in different political activities and maintaining contact with the elected bodies they cannot achieve their expected goals. The leaders use them for their interests and generally ignore their claims. Due to their poverty and vulnerability, they cannot exert strong pressure upon urban government. They consider them vulnerable and powerless in the city; as such they are not interested to attend the protests against the government.

CONCLUSION

Rural-urban migration does not create improved opportunities for a significant portion of city dwellers living in slums as squatters. They invariably live below

the poverty line and have little access to employment in formal sectors. They have failed to secure a sustainable livelihood in the city despite living there for a long period of time. The poor communities are vulnerable in terms of their physical and social capital. They have little access to the city's social and political structure, which also shows their vulnerable situation. Urban government has little initiative to create opportunities for the poor sections of city's population. The poor communities cope with urban life through 'household strategies' such as: putting more family members into the workforce, through petty trading, avoiding many basic goods, which represent luxuries to them, increasing their household size by inducting more relatives, withdrawing their children from education, constructing their own shelter, using kinship as social capital and establishing patron-client relationships with local leaders. There is an intra- households having more than one income earning member, having access to urban or rural land, living in self constructed housing and a renting room to others, having access to city politics for better prospects of wellbeing. However, the livelihood framework explains their situations very well, as it combines both local level issues of the community and macro structures.

REFERENCES

- Beall, A. and R. Kanji, 1999. Households, Livelihoods and urban poverty. Theme study 3. Urban Governance, Partnership and Poverty Series, University of Birmingham, UK.
- Chamber, R., 1983. Rural development: Putting the last first. London; Longman.
- Chamber, R., 1989. Vulnerability, Coping and Policy. IDS Bulletin, 20 (2): 1-7.
- Chamber, R., 1992. Poverty in India: Concepts, Research and Reality. In: Harris, A. and R. Prayer (Eds.). Poverty in India: Research and Policy. Bombay: Oxford University Press.
- DFID, 2001. Meeting the challenge of poverty in urban areas. Final Draft: UK.
- Ellis, F., 1998. Household strategies and rural livelihood diversification. J. Dev. Stud., 35 (1): 1-38.
- Gugler, J., 1997. Life in a Dual System Revisited: Urban-Rural Ties in Enugu, Nigeria 1961-1987. In: Joseph Gugler (Ed.). Cities in Developing World. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mabogunje, A.L., 1989. Urbanization Problems in Africa. In: Shakh, E.L. and R. Obudho (Eds.). Urbanization, National Development and Regional Planning in Africa; New York: Praeger Publishers.
- Moser, C., 1996. Confronting Crisis: A comparative study of household responses to poverty and vulnerability in 4 urban communities. Environmentally Sustainable Development Studies and Monograph Series No. 20. Washington: World Bank.
- Peil, M., 1983. Urban Contacts: A Comparison of Women and Men in West Africa. In: Oppong, C. (Ed.). Female and Male in West Africa. London; Longman.
- Prayer, J., 2003. Poverty and vulnerability in dhakar slums: The Urban Livelihood Study. Hampshire: Ashgate.
- Rakodi, C., 2002. A Livelihood Approach-Conceptual Issues and Definition. In: Rakodi, C. and T. Llyod-Jones (Eds.). Urban Livelihoods: A People Centered Approach to Reducing Poverty. London: Earthscan.
- Roberts, B., 1998. Cities of Peasants: The political economy of urbanization in the 3rd world. Beverly Hills; California.
- Roberts, B., 2004. Informal economy and family strategies. J. Urban Regional Res., 28 (1): 16-23.
- Sen, A., 1987. Poverty and famine: An Essay on Entitlement and Deprivation. London: Clarendon.
1997. Inequality Re-examined. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Sen, A., 2004. Informal economy and family strategies. J. Urban. Region. Res., 28 (1): 6-23.