ASSESSMENT OF THE LEVEL OF URBAN DEPRIVATION IN SELECTED LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREAS WITHIN LAGOS STATE AND OSUN STATE

[1]Ademola Farinmade, [2]Akinola Beatrice

Department of Urban and Regional Planning
University of Lagos

Abstract: **The study assessed the level of urban deprivation in selected local government areas in Lagos state and Osun state. It examined the nature and level of urban deprivation in the selected Local government area; residents' response to urban deprivation; and what is obtainable within the selected local government area to manage multiple deprivation and alleviate poverty. This was with a view to providing information that could enhance living condition in the study area Data were collected in six selected Local Government Areas. These were three LGAs from Lagos state and three LGAs from Osun state. Random sampling was used to select residents to be sampled. Questionnaires was administered randomly to 20 households in each area. The number of respondents from each state are 58 and 54 from Lagos and Osun states respectively. Thus, a total of 112 buildings were sampled. The study revealed Urban deprivation in the study area is manifested through unequal provision of physical and social infrastructure within the various selected LGAs. In Lagos state, majority of the respondents were deprived of constructed bus stops (79.3%), approved motor parks (79.3%), post office (70.7%), public library (87.9%), dispensary (69.0%) and General Hospital (62.1%). In Osun state, majority of the respondents were deprived constructed bus stops (90.7%), approved motor parks (79.6%), post office (74.1%), public library (79.6%), health facilities (61.1%) and modern market (79.6%). Thus, the study has shown that urban deprivation exists in each of the states. It was also revealed that in response to the level of deprivation experienced and poor urban governance, the maintenance of the infrastructure is shared between the government, community associations and individuals. However, urban deprivation still persists. In addition to this, environmental problems such as loss of aesthetic and air pollution were experienced across the selected LGAs. This study therefore concludes that in order to ensure that the environment is liveable, it is important that the quality is improved. This involves the introduction of community empowerment programs and improved level of urban governance.**

Keywords: **Assessment, Urban, Deprivation, Local Government, Lagos State, Osun State**

Background to the Study

All across the globe, cities are motors of growth. They are key contributors to national socio-economic and environmental performance. As a result of urbanization which is progressing as fast as never before in history, growth within cities have outpaced the development of infrastructure and provision of social services. Also, it has overwhelmed municipal authorities in most cities. (Kombe, 1995; United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat, 2001; Kironde, 2006). Urban growth brings possibilities of improved access to jobs, goods and services for poor people in developing countries and beyond as globalization trends connect cities world-wide (Robert, 2012). The process is supported by government in order to bring important advantages such as better and less expensive public services, and better living standards due to the concentration of economic activities (Pearce, Blakely, Witten, and Bartie, 2007). Nevertheless, research has shown that inequality is dangerously on the rise, with some areas benefiting substantially more than others from public investments and economic growth alongside new forms of urban insecurity (UN-HABITAT, 2008; OECD, 2015). Irrespective of the advantages attached to urban growth, there are also problems through which a phenomenon known as urban deprivation sets in.

Urban deprivation is a standard of living below that of the majority in a particular society that involves hardships and lack of access to resources. Places suffering from urban deprivation have visible differences in housing and economic opportunities being the rich living alongside poor people. According to Grenfell 2017, deprivation can also be experienced among the affluent neighbourhoods such that a row of housing may be deprived while another is non-deprived within the same environment. According to Runciman (1966), relative bases for deprivation have expressions other than contrasted absolute standards. He identified as deprived the individual who lacks a resource which he wants and sees with others. This also supports the opinion of Cullingworth (1973) that standards on urban deprivation vary considerably from one part of the contemporary world to another. He further emphasized that one-fifth of inhabitants in some developed nations described as being deprived had objective standards of living which would have been classified as above average in many developing countries of the world. In relation to this, Adefila and Bulus (2014) added that the connotation of urban deprivation is epitomized in the use of such terms as 'advantaged and disadvantaged', 'privileged and less-privileged'. It can therefore be included that urban deprivation brings segregation into the system.

Series of indicators have been developed to measure urban deprivation in literature. A study carried out by the Office for National Statistics, England (2007), developed the term "Index of Multiple Deprivation" which provides a measure of relative deprivation in the various aspects of human lives. Factors such as low-income, unemployment, lack of education, poor health, and crime were identified as the major problems affecting the urban dwellers. In 2018, the United Nations Development Program

(UNDP) prepared the new global Multidimensional poverty index (MPI) in alignment with the sustainable development goals. The MPI looks beyond income to understand how people experience poverty in multiple and simultaneous ways. It identifies how people are being left behind across three key dimensions: health, education and standard of living, comprising 10 indicators. People who experience deprivation in at least one third of these weighted indicators fall into the category of multidimensionally poor. The indicators include; Nutrition, child mortality, years of schooling, school attendance, cooking fuel, sanitation, drinking water, electricity, housing, and assets owned.

The incidence of urban deprivation is not evenly distributed over society as a whole but is specific to sections of the population. The effect is well spelt on the areas rather than individuals who live in those areas such that a situation known as spatial segregation is established in the urban life. This is because the level or the category of deprivation that exists in one residential area differs from what exists in another. The effect of deprived neighbourhoods in urban environment cannot be over-emphasized just as it can be multidimensional. Thus, understanding the differences in the level of deprivation existing within various distinct locations can help to manage multiple deprivation as well as alleviate urban poverty. This study therefore attempts to assess the level of urban deprivation in Lagos state which is a coastal state and Osun state which is a landlocked state within southwest Nigeria

LITERATURE REVIEW
Scholars from different parts of the world have worked on various aspects of urban deprivation over the years (Runciman, 1966; Cullingworth, 1973; Herbert, 1975, Boswell 2020; Grenfell, 2017). Nevertheless, majority of them have disaggregated the issue, focusing on individual aspect or domain of deprivation and its relationship or association with urban deprivation as a whole.

The work of Mare, Mawson and Timmins (2009) analysed the distribution of socio-economic deprivation throughout New Zealand. The study considered socio-economic characteristics such as income, educational attainment, employment, and ethnicity. Differences in the incidence of deprivation for different ethnic groups were emphasized. Findings from the study revealed that ethnic groups with the most population experience urban deprivation at a higher level than ethnic groups with less population. This supports the view that deprivation in one geographical location can differ from another. Nevertheless, the study was country-based and not localized among the residents of a geo-political zone within a country. Their focus did not cover other aspects of deprivation (such as crime, living environment deprivation, barrier to housing and services) that also can be experienced in urban centers.

As stated by Parkes, Kearns and Atkinson (2002), there are good reasons to ask if the residents are satisfied with their neighbourhood. According to skifter (2008) residents' satisfaction is often split up into housing and neighbourhood satisfaction. Parkes, Kearns and Atkinson (2002) found that the factors explaining neighbourhood satisfaction, beside housing satisfaction, are physical conditions of the neighbourhood, friendliness of neighbours, social interaction and safety of the environment. This can also be supported by the claims of Tersteg and Albeda (2015), that physical aspects of the neighbourhood that shape neighbourhood choice and satisfaction includes building density, the location towards the city centre and work, availability and quality of facilities, services and public spaces and traffic safety. The way in which people take these aspects into account depends on personal needs and preferences. These studies have been carried out in cities outside Nigeria on residents' satisfaction and perception of deprived neighbourhoods. This present study will be carried out in Nigeria and explore all the dimensions of urban deprivation as stated in the MPI 2018 to assess residents' perception of their neighborhood.

According to John Boswell, John Denham, Jamie Furlong, Anna Killick, Patricia Ndugga, Beata Rek, Matthew Ryan & Jesse Shipp (2020), they explained place-based politics in United Kingdom and introduced the concept of nested deprivation. They opined that where deprivation is dispersed and then nested within mostly affluent constituencies it does not allow for the political mobilization among communities of interest. It reveals that deprivation brings disconnection within the affluent communities as well as social isolation and atomization. This study, however will consider deprivation across both the affluent and poor neighborhoods.

In 2014, Sarkar, Banerji and Sen carried out a study on the patterns of socio-economic deprivation and its impact on quality of life in West Bengal, India. The study made use of several socio-economic characteristics such as health, education and economic status as indicators of urban deprivation in the study area based on human development index. It was concluded that the high level of socio-economic deprivation in the study area led to degraded quality of life. This was identified in terms of poor housing quality and poor physical infrastructure which may bring about multidimensional vulnerability to different kinds of social, medical, and economic problems. This study, however will consider different domains of urban deprivation and its focus is southwestern cities in Nigeria, which has different culture and economy compared to West Bengal, Indian.

From the foregoing, it is evident that there is dearth of literature on urban deprivation in Nigeria and in particular, relating differences in its level within geo-political zones.

Study Area
The study area includes Lagos state and Osun State, two southwestern states in Nigeria. It is discussed in terms of geographical location, population and residential zones.

Lagos state: Lagos state is located in the southwestern geopolitical zone of Nigeria. The smallest in area of Nigeria's thirty-six (36) states, with a population of over 15 million (Wikipedia, 2014). Lagos State was created on May 27, 1967 by virtue of States Decree No. 14 of 1967 which restructured Nigeria's Federation into 12 States. Prior to this, Lagos Municipality was administered as a Federal Territory by the Federal Government through the Federal Ministry of Lagos Affairs as the regional authority, while the Lagos City Council governed the City of Lagos. Equally, the Metropolitan areas of Ikeja, Agege, Mushin, Ojo, Ikorodu, Epe, and Badagry were then administered by the Western Region Government. The State took off as an administrative entity on April 11, 1968 with Lagos Island serving the dual role of being the State and Federal Capital respectively. However, with the creation of the Federal Capital Territory of Abuja in 1976, Lagos ceased to be the capital of the State, as this was moved to Ikeja. Similarly, with the formal relocation of the seat of the Federal Government to Abuja on 12th December, 1991, Lagos ceased to be Nigeria's political

capital. Nevertheless, Lagos remains the nation's economic and commercial capital. The State is located on the South–Western part of Nigeria, on the narrow plain of the Bight of Benin. Lying approximately on longitude 20 42'E and 32 2'E respectively, and between latitude 60 22'N and 60 2'N, Lagos State is bounded in the North and East by Ogun State of Nigeria, in the West by Republic of Benin, and stretches over 180 kilometers along the Guinea Coast of the Bight of Benin on the Atlantic Ocean. Its territorial extent and political jurisdiction encompass the city of Lagos and the four administrative divisions of Ikeja, Ikorodu, Epe and Badagry collectively referred to as IBILE and covering an area of 358,862 hectares or 3,577 sq. km. which represents 0.4% of Nigeria's territorial land mass of 923,773 sq. km.

Osun State: Osun is the ancestral home of the Yoruba Race whether home or abroad. It is the central and most important location of this morally rich, culturally sound and highly sophisticated race in the world. It represents the spiritual, the physical and the technological. The vision is to be the pathway and the guiding light into the future. This was what the founding fathers and agitators for the creation of a state to be named '' Osun '' had in mind and did everything possible to realise the vision. They weathered opposition and confronted obstacles for the generation past, present and unborn. The State is situated in the tropical rain forest zone. It covers an area of approximately 14,875 sq km and lies between latitude 7° 30′ 0″ N and longitude 4° 30′ 0″ E. Though a landlocked state, it is blessed with presence of many rivers and streams which serves the water needs of the state. It is bounded by Ogun State to the south, Kwara State to the north, Oyo State to the west and Ekiti and Ondo State to the east. The state is within the tropical rain forest with abundance of resources. Minerals resources found in the state include gold, kaolin and others which are being extracted for the benefit of the state and the people.

The state also has many hills in towns like Ikirun, Iragbiji, Ilesha, Ikire and Ile-Ife. These hills were fortresses for the people during the Yoruba wars and the Fulani expansionist period. Presently, they serve as beautiful sceneries and landscape to look upon when visiting or passing through these towns. There are over 200 major towns and several villages in the state.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The primary data was collected through field observation and administration of questionnaire on the residents in the study area. The questionnaire addressed issues like socio-economic status of the residents, residents' response to availability and access to basic needs and factors responsible for urban deprivation in each residential zone. The study population comprises the residents of selected local government areas in Lagos State and Osun State. Multi-stage sampling procedure was adopted for the administration of questionnaires in this study. The Local Government Areas for each state was stratified based on the senatorial districts of the state. This was to help to bring out the variations in the socio-economic status and level of urban governance in each zone in the study areas. According to Lagos State Government official website (accessed September, 2021), Lagos State is made of three federal senatorial districts, namely: Lagos East, Lagos Central and Lagos West. Hence, in each district, one Local Government area was selected randomly. This resulted in selection of three (3) areas in the Local Government areas in Lagos state (table 1). Osun State is also divided into three federal senatorial districts, each, one Local Government area was selected randomly from each of the districts (table1). The sample frame for this study included the residential buildings in the selected six (6) areas. Questionnaires was administered randomly to 20 households in each area. A total of 120 Questionnaires was administered and 112 was retrieved. The data obtained from the questionnaires was analysed with the use of Statistics Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). Descriptive and inferential statistics was used to analyse the data. Descriptive statistics was used in explaining residents' socio-economic attributes, residents' response to availability and access to basic needs in each selected, factors responsible for urban deprivation and level of urban deprivation. Inferential statistics such as Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to compare the means of some quantitative variables on socio-economic characteristics and urban deprivation across the Local Government Ares. Likert scale was used to determine the level of deprivation through proximity, condition, level of satisfaction and severity of environmental problems in the selected LGAs

DATA ANALYSIS

The Nature and Level of Urban Deprivation: Availability of Physical Infrastructure in Lagos State

The result t in Table 2 shows that physical infrastructure such as water and electricity supply were available to a larger number of respondents. Other infrastructures such as constructed bus stops, approved motor parks, public library, constructed drains, waste collection services, tarred road and post office were available to 20.**7**%, 20.7%, 12.1%, 58.6%, 56.9%, 62.1% and 29.3% of the respondents respectively. The same were not available to 79.3%, 79.3%, 87.9%, 41.4%, 43.1%, 37.9%, and 70.7% of the respondents respectively. In the absence of these facilities, the respondents make use of other means such as emptying waste in open spaces and making use of irrelevant bus stop thereby causing traffic jam in hotspots. The analysis in table 3 on the information on the availability of social infrastructure reveals that educational facilities such as public and private primary school, public and private secondary school were available to 84.5% and 89.7%, 68.9% and 77.8% of the respondents respectively, while they were not available to 15.5% and 10.3%, 31.1% and 22.4% of the respondents respectively. Health facilities which include dispensary, maternity centre and general hospital was available to 31.0%, 58.6% and 37.9% of the respondents while it was not available to 69.0%, 41.4% and 62.1% of the respondents respectively. Also, commercial facilities such as traditional market and modern market was available to 58.6% and 37.9% respectively while it was not available to 41.4% and 62.1% respectively. Police post or station which is expected to ensure maximum security in the environment was available to 44.8% of the respondents while it was not available to 55.2% of the respondents. In view of the above, it is thus evident that there was deprivation of social infrastructure such as educational and health facilities. Also, the respondents are deprived of physical infrastructure such as constructed bus stops, approved motor parks, waste collection services and public library.

April 2022 IJSDR | Volume 7 Issue 4

Table 4. presents summary of information on the Infrastructure Proximity Index (IPI) of physical infrastructure in Lagos state. As related by the respondents, it was found that the closest physical infrastructure were water supply (4.62), electricity (4.31) and constructed drains (4.23). Conversely, the infrastructure with the least proximity to the respondents' residence were constructed bus stops (2.63), Approved motor parks (2.62), and public library (2.20). Table 5 presents summary of information on the Infrastructure Proximity Index (IPI) of social infrastructure in Lagos state. As related by the respondents, it was found that the closest physical infrastructure were Private primary school (4.11), Maternity centre (3.86) and Public primary school (3.60). Conversely, the infrastructures with the least proximity to the respondents' residence were Public secondary school (2.67), Private secondary school (2.45), and Police post/station (2.29). From the summary of information in table 6 on the Infrastructure Condition Index (ICI) of physical infrastructure in Lagos state as related by the respondents, it was found that the best physical infrastructures were Water supply (4.39), Post office (3.90) and Electricity (3.72). Conversely, the infrastructures which are in a very bad condition to the respondents' residence were public library (3.13), Approved motor parks (2.58), and Constructed bus stops (2.20). Table 7 presents summary of information on the Infrastructure Condition Index (ICI) of social infrastructure in Lagos state. As related by the respondents, it was found that the best social infrastructures were Private primary school (4.32), Private secondary school (4.31) and Modern market (4.00). Conversely, the infrastructures which are in a very bad condition to the respondents' residence were Public secondary school (3.37), Public primary school (3.31), and Police post/station (2.93).

ANALYSIS OF INFRASTRUCTURES FROM OSUN STATE

This section presents the analysis of both physical and social infrastructures of respondents in Osun State. These are responses on the availability, proximity, and conditions of the infrastructure. As presented in Table 8, physical infrastructure such as water and electricity supply were available to a larger number of respondents from the study area. Other infrastructure such as constructed bus stops, approved motor parks, public library constructed drains, waste collection services, tarred road and post office were available to 9.3%, 20.4%, 20.4%, 64.8%, 66.1%, and 57.4% and 25.9% of the respondents respectively. They were not available to 90.7%, 79.8%, 79.8%, 35.2%, 38.9%, 42.6%, and 74.1% of the respondents respectively. In the absence of these facilities, the respondents make use of other means such as emptying waste in open spaces and making use of irrelevant bus stop thereby causing traffic jam in hotspots. As shown in Table 9, the information on the availability of social infrastructure reveals that educational facilities such as public and private primary school, public and private secondary school were available to 75.9% and 90.7%, 68.5% and 77.8% of the respondents respectively and were not available to 24.1% and 9.3%, 31.5% and 22.2% of the respondents respectively. Health facilities which include dispensary, maternity centre and general hospital were available to 50.0%, 38.9% and 38.9% of the respondents and were not available to 50.0%, 61.1% and 61.1% of the respondents respectively. Also, commercial facilities such as traditional market and modern market were available to 48.1% and 20.4% respectively and were not available to 51.9% and 79.6% respectively. Police post or station which is expected to ensure maximum security in the environment was available to 48.1% of the respondents while it was not available to 51.9% of the respondents. In view of the above, it is thus evident that there was deprivation of social infrastructure such as health facilities. Also, the respondents are deprived of physical infrastructure such as constructed bus stops, approved motor parks, waste collection services and public library.

Table 10 presents summary of information on the Infrastructure Proximity Index (IPI) of physical infrastructure in Osun state. As related by the respondents, it was found that the closest physical infrastructures were Water supply (4.63), Electricity (4.26) and Constructed drains (4.05). Conversely, the infrastructures which are in least proximity to the respondents' residence were Approved motor parks (3.50), Constructed bus stops (3.25) and public library (2.94). Table11 presents summary of information on the Infrastructure Proximity Index (IPI) of physical infrastructure in Osun state. As related by the respondents, it was found that the closest social infrastructures were Private Primary School (3.98), General Hospital (3.96) and Public Secondary School (3.85). Conversely, the infrastructures which are in least proximity to the respondents' residence were Traditional Market (3.34), Modern Market (3.22), and Police Post (2.66). Driveable from Table 12 is the summary of information on the Infrastructure Condition Index (ICI) of physical infrastructure in Osun state. Likert scale was used to rate the condition of each facility available to the respondents. The values attached to each index was 5, 4, 3, 2, 1, representing very good, good, fair, bad, very bad. These values were multiplied by the number of respondents to get the sum weighted value for each facility. The Summation of Weighted Values (SWV) was divided by the number of respondents to achieve the mean which was used to derive the Infrastructure Condition Index (ICI). As related by the respondents, it was found that the best physical infrastructures were Water supply (3.96), Post office (3.88) and public library (3.63). Conversely, the infrastructures which are in a very bad condition to the respondents' residence were Tarred Road (3.24), Constructed Drains (3.02) and Constructed bus stops (2.95).

Table 13 presents summary of information on the Infrastructure Condition Index (ICI) of physical infrastructure in Osun state. As related by the respondents, it was found that the best physical infrastructures were General Hospital (4.20), Private Secondary School (4.07) and Modern Market (4.06). Conversely, the infrastructures which are in a very bad condition to the respondents' residence were Public Secondary School (3.67), Maternity Centre (3.54) and Police post/Station (3.50).

Response to Urban Deprivation

In order to examine the response of the residents to urban deprivation, residents' satisfaction with infrastructure and the maintenance of the infrastructure were considered. It is important to know if their effort in the maintenance of infrastructure is in response to urban deprivation or just to facilities they are not satisfied with. This section therefore discusses residents' satisfaction index and level of maintenance by various bodies. Table 14 presents summary of information on the Infrastructure Satisfaction Index (ISI) of physical infrastructure in Lagos state (LS). As related by the respondents, it was found that the most satisfying

physical infrastructures were Water supply (4.20), Post office (3.61) and Constructed drains (3.45). Conversely, the infrastructures which are less satisfying to the respondents' residence were Constructed bus stops (2.84), Public library (2.64) and Approved motor parks (2.52).

Table 15 presents summary of information on the Infrastructure Satisfaction Index (ISI) of social infrastructure in LS. As related by the respondents, it was found that the most satisfying social infrastructures were General Hospital (4.19), Modern market (3.94) and private secondary school (3.77). Conversely, the infrastructures which are less satisfying to the respondents were Public Primary School (2.90), Police post/Station (2.61), and Dispensary (2.55). Table 16 presents summary of information on the Infrastructure Maintenance Index (IMI) of physical infrastructure in LS. As related by the respondents, it was found that the most maintained physical infrastructures were Water supply (2.35), Waste Collection Services (1.82) and Electricity (1.75). Conversely, the infrastructures which are less maintained infrastructures were Tarred Road (1.25), Approved motor parks (1.22), and Post Office (1.08). Table 17 presents summary of information on the Infrastructure Maintenance Index (IMI) of physical infrastructure in LS. As related by the respondents, it was found that the most maintained social infrastructures were Private primary school (2.86), Private secondary school (2.68) and Modern market (1.97). Conversely, less maintained infrastructures were Police post/station (1.02), General hospital (1.21), and Police post/station (1.21).

Table 18 summarises information on the Infrastructure Satisfaction Index (ISI) of physical infrastructure in Osun state (OS). As related by the respondents, it was found that the most satisfying infrastructures were Water supply (3.94), Public library (3.91) and Post office (3.41). Conversely, the infrastructures which are less satisfying to the respondents' residence were Tarred Road (2.84), Constructed Drains (2.80), and Constructed bus stops (2.70). Table 19 gives the Infrastructure Satisfaction Index (ISI) in OS. As related by the respondents, it was found that the most satisfying infrastructures were General hospital (4.04), Private primary school (3.91) and Public secondary school (3.58). Conversely, the infrastructures which are less satisfying to the respondents' residence were Modern market (3.44), Police post/station (3.18), and Dispensary (3.10). Table 20 presents summary of information on the Infrastructure Maintenance Index (IMI) of physical infrastructure in OS. As related by the respondents, it was found that the most maintained physical infrastructures were Water Supply (2.74), Constructed Drains (2.24) and Waste Collection Services (2.17). Conversely, the infrastructures which are Less maintained were Tarred Road (1.40), Public Library (1.38), and Post Office (1.05). Table 21 presents summary of information on the Infrastructure Maintenance Index (IMI) of physical infrastructure in OS. As related by the respondents, it was found that the most maintained social infrastructures were Private primary school (2.88), Private secondary school (2.84) and Traditional market (1.84). Conversely, the infrastructures which are Less maintained infrastructures were Police post/station (1.02), General hospital (1.02), Public primary school (1.02) and Public secondary school (1.02).

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

This section is based on the data analysed and interpreted on urban deprivation Lagos state (LS) which is a coastal state and Osun state (OS) which is a landlocked state within southwest Nigeria. Based on the availability of infrastructure, water supply and electricity were the most available physical infrastructure in the two states considered. Constructed bus stops, approved motor parks, post office and public library were the least available. Also, among the social infrastructure, educational facilities were the most available to the respondents across all the six LGAs considered. Health facilities were the least available infrastructure in Lagos state while modern commercial facilities were the least available in Osun state. With respect to the average IPI for each category of infrastructure, the physical infrastructure was closer to the respondents than the social infrastructure in both states. For instance, the police post was the farthest to the respondents across both states.

In Lagos state, majority of the available physical infrastructure were in good condition. Those that were least available were in bad condition. It can be deduced that it was as a result of their condition that people did not patronize them. Also, social infrastructure such as privately owned educational facilities were in better condition than the government owned schools. Coupled with police post/station were not in good condition but can be improved upon. However, this is not the case in Osun state. Though available physical infrastructure (water supply and electricity) was in good condition but for the social infrastructure, the major health facility (General Hospital) and modern commercial facilities were in good condition. The educational facilities, other health facilities and police post were fairly in good condition but needs to be improved upon. Thus, it can be deduced that the respondents from Lagos state are deprived of quality education structure and proper security/safety. While those from Osun state are deprived of quality health, quality education and proper security/safety.

In addition, the results from the analysis of the respondents' level of satisfaction with the available infrastructure revealed that, the social infrastructure in both states considered had higher average ISI than physical infrastructure. Also, the findings revealed that all the infrastructure were maintained by three different bodies. These included the government, community associations and individuals. In Lagos state, it was found that the most maintained physical infrastructures were Water supply, Waste Collection Services and Electricity. While for the social infrastructure, Private primary school, Private secondary school and Modern market which are sustained by individuals were the most maintained infrastructure. However, in Osun state, as related by the respondents, it was revealed that physical infrastructure was more maintained than the social infrastructure with the exception of privately owned educational facilities. In comparison to Lagos state, it can be stated that due to the negligence of the government in the role of maintaining infrastructure, the residents/respondents resolved to create their own facilities which are being properly maintained and encourage higher patronage level.

Conclusion and Recommendation

This study has assessed the level of urban deprivation in Lagos state which is a coastal state and Osun state which is a landlocked state within southwest Nigeria. It can therefore be concluded that with respect to each state there is a fair variation in the level of urban deprivation in the study area. The respondents from Lagos state are deprived of quality education structure and proper security/safety. While those from Osun state are deprived of quality health, quality education and proper security/safety. Also, the problem of poor maintenance of infrastructure is evident in both states.

The level of deprivation has been concluded based on information on the availability of infrastructure, the condition and maintenance of infrastructure. In response to this, the residents have sorted to different means to cater for their needs. This includes patronizing privately owned facilities instead of the government owned facilities. Also, some of the facilities are being maintained by the residents, shop owners within the area and community associations.

Recommendations

In order to effectively address the state of urban deprivation in the study area, it is important that measures are taken on how to address the people's vulnerability to a higher level of urban deprivation. Based on this, the following measures are recommended.

Self-governing techniques through collective action can be adopted by the community members in each of the Local Government areas. This involves the people organizing themselves based on appropriate institutional arrangements, mutual agreements and shared understanding. This will help them to plan and execute public goods and services that directly touch the lives of the people in the community. For instance, the provision of proper neighbourhood security can be employed to ensure safety.

The role of the government in the provision of infrastructure cannot be over-emphasized. In view of the above, the government may be helpful in the provision of primary healthcare services which can serve as an annex of the general hospital in the Osun state. This evident in Lagos state to cater for the population in need of healthcare. Also, the infrastructure that were available can be improved upon. The government can also help the community organizations in achieving a better environment.

The residents should participate in the identification of environmental problems and basic amenities in which they were deprived. They can also think of possible solutions through the help of a professional or as a community empowerment programme. This will help to strengthen social cohesion and cooperation within the residential areas. With this, the residents can solve their problems easily without feeling biased when the improvement is on-going.

REFERENCES

Adefila, J. O. and Bulus, J. S. (2014): Spatial inequalities in infrastructural development in plateau state, Nigeria. American international journal**z** of contemporary research, 4 (7), pp. 89-97.

Adegoke, K.A. and Bello, O.S. (2015) Dye Sequestration Using Agricultural Wastes as Absorbent. Water Resources and Industry, 12, pp 8-24

Akinola, S. R. (2007): Coping with Infrastructural Deprivation through Collective Action among   Rural People in Nigeria. Nordic Journal of African Studies 16(1), pp. 30–46.

Alasdair, R. (2011): Deprivation in Sheffield.

Allen, L. (1991): Benefits of leisure services to community satisfaction. In B. Driver, P Brown &   G. Peterson (Eds.), Benefits of leisure (pp. 331-350). State College, PA: Venture Publishing, Inc.

Amérigo, M. A., & Aragones, J. I. (1997). A theoretical and methodological approach to the study of residential satisfaction. Journal of Environmental Psychology, 17(1), 47-57.

Amole, D. (2009). Residential satisfaction in students" housing. Journal of Environmental Psychology, 29(1), 76–85.

Bonaiuto, M., Bonnes, M., & Continisio, M. (2004). Neighborhood evaluation within a multiplace perspective on urban activities. Environment and Behavior, 36(1), 41–69.

Bonaiuto, M., Fornara, F., & Bonnes, M. (2006). Perceived residential environment quality in middle-and low-extension Italian cities. Revue Européenne de Psychologie Appliquée/European Review of Applied Psychology, 56(1), 23–34.

Bratton, M. and Van de Walle, N. (1992): Towards governance in Africa: popular demands and   state responses. In Hyden, G.; Bratton, M., ed., Governance and politics in Africa: Lynne Rienner, Boulder, CO, USA. pp. 26-47.

Cabrera-Barona, P., Murphy, T., Kienberger, S., & Blaschke, T. (2015). A multi-criteria spatial deprivation index to support health inequality analyses. International Journal of Health Geographics, 14(11).

Cabrera-Barona, P., Wei, C. and Hagenlocher, M. (2016): Multiscale evaluation of an urban deprivation index: Implications for quality of life and healthcare accessibility planning. Journal of applied geography. 70 (2016) 1-10. Journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/apgeog

Carr-Hill, R. (2005): An Introduction to the Use of Indexes to Measure Deprivation. The PHO Handbook of Health Inequalities Measurement. Pp. 87-96

Casson, M. and Godley, A. (2000): Cultural factors in economic Growth.

Crampton, P., C. Salmond and F. Sutton (1998) "Research Report No 6: NZDep91 A New Index of Deprivation" Health Services Research Centre, Wellington.

Cullingworth, J. B. (1973): Problems of an urban society: the social content of planning. Allen and Unwin.

Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) (1980): Design Manual: On-site wastewater treatment and disposal systems, report EPA-600/2-78-173.Cincinnati, USA.

Eroglu, S. (2007). Developing an Index of Deprivation Which Integrates Objective and Subjective Dimensions: Extending the Work of Townsend, Mack and Lansley, and Halleröd. Social Indicators Research, 80(3), 493-510.

Francescato, G. (2002). Residential satisfaction research: the case for and against. In Residential environments: Choice, satisfaction, and behaviour (pp. 15-34).

Galster, G. C., & Hesser, G. W. (1981). Residential Satisfaction. Environment and Behavior, 13(6), 735-758.

Galster, G. C. (1987). Identifying the correlates of dwelling satisfaction. Environment and Behavior, 19(5), 539-568.

Harriss, J. (2001): Social Capital Construction and the Consolidation of Civil Society, Development Studies institute, working Paper No. 01 - 16: London School of Economics.

Harvey, P. (2007): Excreta Disposal in emergency, An inter-agency manual. WEDC, Loughborough University, UK. http://wedc.lboto.ac.uk/

Havard, S., Deguen, S., Bodin, J., Louis, K., Laurent, O., & Bard, D. (2008). A small-area index of socioeconomic deprivation to capture health inequalities in France. Social Science & Medicine, 67,2007-2016.

Herbert, D. T. (1975): urban deprivation: Definition, measurement and spatial qualities, Blackwell publishing on behalf of the royal geographical society (with the institute of british geographers), 141. 362-372.

Hur, M. and Murrow-jones, H. (2008): Factors that influence Residents' satisfaction with Neighborhoods. Environment and behavior, vol. 42, pp. 504-519

Jansen, S. (2014). The impact of the have-want discrepancy on residential satisfaction. Journal of Environmental Psychology.

Julio, R. P. (2011): targeting deprivation through qualitative and quantitative indicators, case study of Kisumu, Kenya. A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the award of M.sc. Degree in Geo-information science and earth observation of the university of twente, the Netherlands.

Kironde, L. (2006). Housing the Forgettten Agenda in Dar Es Salaam; . tanzania.

Kombe, W. J. (1995). formal and informal land management in tanzania, the case of dar es salaam. urban studies spring research series 13.

Lagos State Government official website (accessed September, 2021)

Makinde, O. O. (2006). Influences of socio-cultural experiences on residents" satisfaction in Ikorodu low-cost housing estate, Lagos state. Environment, Development and Sustainability, 1-26.

Mare, D. C, Mawson, P. and Timmins, J. (2009): deprivation in new Zealand: regional patterns and changes.

Martínez, J. A. (2005): "Monitoring intra-urban inequalities with GIS-based indicators." International Institute for Geo-Information Science and Earth Observation.

Maslow, A. H. (1943): A Theory of Human Need. Psychological Review, 5, pp. 370-396.

Mayer, S. E. (2001): How did the increase in economic inseperability between 1970 and 1990 affect children's educational attainmen. American Journal of sociology, vol. 107(1), pp. 1-32.

Morris, E. W., & Winter, M. (1975). A theory of family housing adjustment. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 79-88. Morris, E. W., & Winter, M. (1978). Housing, family, and society: John Wiley and Sons.

Msilu, D. D. (2009): Investigating the intra-urban inequalities and environmental injustice on urban deprivation in Dar Es Salaam city – Tanzania: An Msc Thesis submitted to the international institute for geo-information science and earth observation, Enschede, The Netherlands.

Noble, M. Penhale, B. Smith, G. and Wright, G. (1999) Measuring Multiple Deprivation at Local Level, Index of Local Deprivation 1999 Review, University of Oxford.

Nolan, B., and Christopher T. Whelan (1996). Measuring Poverty Using Income and Deprivation Indicators: Alternative Approaches: The Economic and Social Research Institute, Dublin. Journal of European Social Policy. Vol. 6(3), pp. 225-240.

Office for national statistics, England (2007): index of multiple deprivation.

Olokesusi, F. (1987): Water Supply, Possible Constraints on Socio-economic Development in Oyo state of Nigeria.

Onibokun, A. G. and Kumuyi, A. J. (1996): Urban poverty in Nigeria; towards sustainable strategies for its alleviation. Centre for African Settlement Studies and Development, Ibadan, Nigeria. Series 10. pp. 1-2.

Pampalon, R. and Raymond, G. (2000): A Deprivation index for health and welfare planning in Quebec. Chronic Dis Can. Vol. 21(3), pp. 104-113.

Pampalon, P., Hamel, D., Gamache, P., & Raymond, G. (2009). A deprivation index for health planning in Canada. Chronic Diseases in Canada, 29(4), 178-191

Parkes, A., Kearns, A. and Atkinson, R. (2002): What makes people dissatisfied with their neighbourhoods? Urban Studies, vol. 39(13), pp. 2413-2438.

Pearce, J., Blakely, T., Witten, K., and Bartie, P. (2007): Neighborhood deprivation and access to fast-food retailing: a national study. American journal of preventive medicine 32, (5), 375–382.

Permentier, M., Van Ham, M. and Bolt, G. (2007): Determinants of neighbourhood satisfaction. Journal of Housing and the Built Environment.

POSTnote (2002): Access to Sanitation in developing countries, December, no. 190.

Puddifoot, J. (1994): Community identity and sense of belonging in a Northeastern English town. The Journal of Social Psychology, 134, 601-605.

Rakodi, C. (2006): Urban livelihoods, in Clark DA (ed.): The Elgar companion to development studies, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 659-664.

Rakodi, C. and Tony, L. J. (2002): Urban livelihoods. A People Centered Approach to reducing poverty. Great Britain, Stlus Pub. LIC.

Robert, M. (2012). Researching the Urban Dilemma: Canada: International Development Research Centre.

Runciman, W. G. (1966): Relative deprivation and social justice. Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Sabina, A. (2002): Dimensions of human development. World development, vol. 30(2), pp. 181-205

Sarkar, B., Banerji, H., and Sen, J. (2014): Patterns of Socio-economic Deprivation and its impact on Quality of life: case of a less developed region in West Bengal, India. Athens Journal of Health, Vol. 1(4), pp. 271-285

Skifter, A. H. (2008): Why do residents want to leave deprived neighbourhoods? The importance of residents' subjective evaluations of their neighbourhood and its reputation. Journal of housing and the built environment, vol. 23, pp. 79-101.

Smith, K. M. (2011): The relationship between residential satisfaction, sense of community, sense of belonging and sense of place in a western Australian urban planned community. A Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the award of PhD. faculty of computing, health & science, Edith Cowan University.

Speare, A. (1974). Residential satisfaction as an intervening variable in residential mobility. Demography, 11(2), 173–188.

Townsend, P. (1987): Deprivation. Journal of Social Policy. 16 (1): pp. 125-14.

United Nations (2011): Study on infrastructure for economic development and poverty reduction in Africa. Nairobi.

UN-Habitat. (2008). what is good governance? economic and social commission for Asia and the pacific.

UN-Habitat (Ed.) (2008): State of the world's cities 2010/2011, Bridging the Urban Divide. London: Earthscan

UN-Habitat (2018): Annual Progress report

Vera-Toscano, E., & Ateca-Amestoy, V. (2008). The relevance of social interactions on housing satisfaction. Social Indicators Research, 86(2), 257–274.

Waziri, A. G., Yusof, N., & Salleh, A. G. (2013). Residential Satisfaction with Private Housing Estate Development in Abuja-Nigeria. ALAM CIPTA, International Journal of Sustainable Tropical Design Research and Practice, 6(2), 3–12.

World Health Organization (WHO) (2003): Guidelines for drinking water quality. Third edition. Geneva. www.who.int/water_sanitation_health/dwq/guidelines2/en/

World Bank (1992): Governance and Development. World Bank, Washington, DC, USA

Table 1: Selected Local Government areas

LAGOS STATE		
Senatorial Districts	Local Government Areas (LGAs)	Selected LGAs
Lagos West	Agege, Ajeromi/ifelodun, Alimosho, Ifako-ijaye, Amuwo-odofin, Badagry, Ikeja, Mushin, Ojo, Oshodi-isolo	Badagry
Lagos Central	Apapa, Eti-osa, Lagos island Lagos mainland, Surulere	Eti-osa
Lagos East	Ibeju-lekki, Epe, Ikorodu, Kosofe, Somolu	Ibeju-lekki
OSUN STATE		
Senatorial Districts	Local Government Areas (LGAs)	Selected LGAs
West	Ayedaade, Ayedire, Ede north, Ede south, Egbedore, Ejigbo, Irewole, Isokan, Iwo, Ola-Oluwa	Ede North
Central	Boluwaduro, Boripe, IFedayo, Ifelodun, Ila, Irepodun, Odo-otin, Olorunda, Orolu, Osogbo	Osogbo
East	Atakunmosa East, Atakunmosa west, Ife dentral, Ife East, Ife north, Ife south, Ilesa east, Ilesa west, Obokun, Oriade.	Atakunmosa east

Source: Authors Field Survey, 2021

Table 2: Availability of Physical Infrastructure in Lagos State

Physical Infrastructure	Available	Not available	Total
Water supply	55(94.8)	3(5.2)	58 (100.0)
Electricity	57(98.3)	1(1.7)	58 (100.0)
Constructed drains	34(58.6)	24(41.4)	58 (100.0)
Waste collection services	33(56.9)	25(43.1)	58 (100.0)
Tarred road	36(62.1)	22(37.9)	58 (100.0)
Constructed bus stops	12(20.7)	46(79.3)	58 (100.0)
Approved motor parks	12(20.7)	46(79.3)	58 (100.0)
Post office	17(29.3)	41(70.7)	58 (100.0)
Public library	7(12.1)	51(87.9)	58 (100.0)

Table 3:   Availability of Social Infrastructure in Lagos State

Social Infrastructure	Available	Not available	Total
Police post/station	26(44.8)	32(55.2)	58 (100.0)
Dispensary	18(31.0)	40(69.0)	58 (100.0)
Maternity centre	34(58.6)	24(41.4)	58 (100.0)
General hospital	22(37.9)	36(62.1)	58 (100.0)
Public primary school	49(84.5)	9(15.5)	58 (100.0)
Private primary school	52(89.7)	6(10.3)	58 (100.0)
Public secondary school	40(68.9)	18(31.1)	58 (100.0)
Private secondary school	45(77.6)	13(22.4)	58 (100.0)
Traditional market	34(58.6)	24(41.4)	58 (100.0)
Modern market	22(37.9)	36(62.1)	58 (100.0)

Table 4: Proximity to Physical Infrastructure in Lagos State

Physical Infrastructure	Mean	Standard deviation	Rank
Water supply	4.62	0.53	1
Electricity	4.31	0.84	2
Constructed drains	4.23	1.18	3
Waste collection services	3.90	1.41	5
Tarred road	4.14	1.07	4
Constructed bus stops	2.63	1.67	7
Approved motor parks	2.62	1.72	8
Post office	2.73	1.39	6
Public library	2.20	1.12	9

Average IPI is 3.4

Table 5: Proximity to Social Infrastructure in Lagos State

Social Infrastructure	Mean	Standard Deviation	Rank
Police post/station	2.29	0.99	10
Dispensary	3.21	1.26	4
Maternity centre	3.86	0.94	2
General hospital	3.04	1.37	5
Public primary school	3.60	1.09	3
Private primary school	4.11	0.96	1
Public secondary school	2.67	1.20	8
Private secondary school	2.45	1.33	9
Traditional market	2.82	1.24	7
Modern market	3.00	1.71	6

Average IPI is 3.11

Table 6.: Condition of Physical Infrastructure in Lagos State

Physical Infrastructure	Mean	Standard Deviation	Rank
Water supply	4.39	0.88	1
Electricity	3.72	0.83	3
Constructed drains	3.58	1.12	4
Waste collection services	3.49	1.34	5
Tarred road	3.47	1.20	6
Constructed bus stops	2.20	1.13	9
Approved motor parks	2.58	0.78	8
Post office	3.90	1.14	2
Public library	3.13	1.03	7

Average ICI is 3.38

Table 7: Condition of Social Infrastructure in Lagos State

Social Infrastructure	Mean	Standard deviation	Rank
Police post/station	2.93	0.86	10
Dispensary	3.43	0.77	7
Maternity centre	3.70	0.81	6
General hospital	3.93	1.01	4
Public primary school	3.31	1.18	9
Private primary school	4.32	0.61	1
Public secondary school	3.37	1.18	8
Private secondary school	4.31	0.55	2
Traditional market	3.80	0.78	5
Modern market	4.00	0.98	3

Average ICI is 3.71

Table 8: Availability of Physical Infrastructure in Osun State

Physical Infrastructure	Available	Not available	Total
Water supply	53(98.1)	1(1.9)	54 (100.0)
Electricity	53(98.1)	1(1.9)	54 (100.0)
Constructed drains	35(64.8)	19(35.2)	54(100.0)
Waste collection services	33(66.1)	21 (38.9)	54(100.0)
Tarred road	31(57.4)	23(42.6)	54(100.0)
Constructed bus stops	5(9.3)	49(90.7)	54(100.0)
Approved motor parks	11(20.4)	43(79.6)	54(100.0)
Post office	14(25.9)	40(74.1)	54(100.0)
Public library	11(20.4)	43(79.6)	54(100.0)

Table 9:   Availability of Social Infrastructure in Osun State

Social Infrastructure	Available	Not available	Total
Police post/station	26(48.1)	28(51.9)	54 (100.0)
Dispensary	27(50.0)	27(50.0)	54 (100.0)
Maternity centre	21(38.9)	33(61.1)	54 (100.0)
General hospital	21(38.9)	33(61.1)	54 (100.0)
Public primary school	41(75.9)	13(24.1)	54 (100.0)
Private primary school	49(90.7)	5(9.3)	54 (100.0)
Public secondary school	37(68.5)	17(31.5)	54 (100.0)
Private secondary school	41(77.8)	12(22.2)	54 (100.0)
Traditional market	26(48.1)	28(51.9)	54 (100.0)
Modern market	11(20.4)	43(79.6)	54 (100.0)

Table 10: Proximity to Physical Infrastructure in Osun State

Physical Infrastructure	Mean	Standard deviation	Rank
Water supply	4.63	0.62	1
Electricity	4.26	0.73	2
Constructed drains	4.05	1.23	3
Waste collection services	3.61	1.41	6
Tarred road	3.85	1.27	5
Constructed bus stops	3.25	1.48	8
Approved motor parks	3.50	1.50	7
Post office	3.89	1.28	4
Public library	2.94	1.71	9

Average IPI is 3.78

Table 11: Proximity to Social Infrastructure in Osun State

Social Infrastructure	Mean	Standard deviation	Rank
Police post/station	2.66	1.28	10
Dispensary	3.73	1.14	4
Maternity centre	3.59	1.12	7
General hospital	3.96	1.15	2
Public primary school	3.65	0.90	6
Private primary school	3.98	.94	1
Public secondary school	3.85	.91	3
Private secondary school	3.73	.90	4
Traditional market	3.34	1.10	8
Modern market	3.22	1.35	9

Average IPI is 3.57

Table 12: Condition of Physical Infrastructure from Osun

Physical Infrastructure	Mean	Standard deviation	Rank
Water supply	3.96	1.13	1
Electricity	3.57	1.16	4
Constructed drains	3.02	1.19	8
Waste collection services	3.31	1.40	5
Tarred road	3.24	1.10	7
Constructed bus stops	2.95	1.05	9
Approved motor parks	3.29	1.38	6
Post office	3.88	1.15	2
Public library	3.63	1.26	3

Average ICI is 3.43

Table 13: Condition of Social Infrastructure in Osun State

Social Infrastructure	Mean	Standard Deviation	Rank
Police post/station	3.50	0.93	10
Dispensary	3.81	1.11	7
Maternity centre	3.54	1.07	9
General hospital	4.20	0.94	1
Public primary school	3.84	0.80	6
Private primary school	3.98	0.77	4
Public secondary school	3.67	0.94	8
Private secondary school	4.07	0.73	2
Traditional market	3.89	0.85	5
Modern market	4.06	1.06	3

Average ICI is 3.86

Table 14: Satisfaction of Physical Infrastructure in Lagos State

Physical Infrastructure	Mean	Standard deviation	Rank
Water supply	4.20	0.94	1
Electricity	3.40	0.97	4
Constructed drains	3.45	1.23	3
Waste collection services	3.32	1.29	5
Tarred road	3.20	1.44	6
Constructed bus stops	2.84	1.02	7
Approved motor parks	2.52	1.12	9
Post office	3.61	0.86	2
Public library	2.64	1.35	8

Average ISI is 3.24

Table 15.: Satisfaction of Social Infrastructure in Lagos State

Social Infrastructure	Mean	Standard deviation	Rank
Police post/station	2.61	1.11	9
Dispensary	2.55	0.96	10
Maternity centre	3.73	0.83	4
General hospital	4.19	0.87	1
Public primary school	2.90	1.09	8
Private primary school	3.56	1.11	5
Public secondary school	2.94	1.22	7
Private secondary school	3.77	1.03	3
Traditional market	3.55	0.71	6
Modern market	3.94	0.91	2

Table 16: Satisfaction of physical infrastructure in Lagos state.

Supply	2.35	0.90	1
Electricity	1.75	0.85	3
Constructed Drains	1.60	0.86	5
Waste Collection Services	1.82	0.97	2
Tarred Road	1.25	0.63	7
Public Library	1.39	0.78	6
Constructed Bus Stops	1.65	0.88	4
Approved Motor Parks	1.22	0.42	8
Post Office	1.08	0.27	9

Average ISI is 3.38

Table 17: Maintenance of Social Infrastructure in Lagos State

Social Infrastructure	Mean	Standard deviation	Rank
Police post/station	1.00	0.00	9
Dispensary	1.58	0.89	4
General hospital	1.00	0.00	9
Public primary school	1.02	0.14	7
Private primary school	2.86	0.35	1
Public secondary school	1.02	0.14	7
Private secondary school	2.68	0.47	2
Traditional market	1.53	0.51	5
Modern market	1.97	0.78	3

Average IMI is 1.59

Table 18: Satisfaction of Physical Infrastructure in Osun State

Physical Infrastructure	Mean	Standard Deviation	Rank
Water supply	3.94	1.12	1
Electricity	3.26	1.08	5
Constructed drains	2.80	1.05	8
Waste collection services	3.07	1.42	6
Tarred road	2.84	1.43	7
Constructed bus stops	2.70	1.03	9
Approved motor parks	3.31	1.62	4
Post office	3.41	1.70	3
Public library	3.71	1.36	2

Average ISI is 3.23

Table 19: Satisfaction of Social Infrastructure in Osun State

Social Infrastructure	Mean	Standard Deviation	Rank
Police post/station	3.18	1.10	8
Dispensary	3.10	1.25	10
Maternity centre	3.12	1.51	9
General hospital	4.04	1.11	1
Public primary school	3.52	1.13	5
Private primary school	3.91	0.91	2
Public secondary school	3.58	1.14	3
Private secondary school	3.58	1.01	3
Traditional market	3.46	1.35	6
Modern market	3.44	1.63	7

Average ISI is 3.49

Table 20: Maintenance of Physical Infrastructure in Osun State

Physical infrastructure	Mean	Standard deviation	Rank
Water Supply	2.74	0.62	1
Electricity	1.91	0.88	5
Constructed Drains	2.24	0.80	2
Waste Collection Services	2.17	0.88	3
Tarred Road	1.40	0.72	7
Public Library	1.38	0.50	8
Constructed Bus Stops	1.64	0.50	6
Approved Motor Parks	2.00	0.94	4
Post Office	1.05	0.22	9

Average IMI is 1.84

Table 21: Maintenance of Infrastructure Social in Osun State

ocial infrastructure	Mean	Standard deviation	Rank
Police post/station	1.02	0.17	8
Dispensary	1.50	0.72	6
Maternity centre	1.73	0.88	5
General hospital	1.00	0.00	8
Public primary school	1.00	0.00	8
Private primary school	2.88	0.33	1
Public secondary school	1.00	0.00	8
Private secondary school	2.84	0.37	2
Traditional market	1.84	0.73	3
Modern market	1.78	0.55	4

Average IMI is 1.66