International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Invention 12(10): 8747-8756, 2025
DOI: 10.18535/ijsshi/v12i10.01
ISSN: 2349-2031
https://valleyinternational.net/index.php/theijsshi

Analysis of Socio-Economic Factors Influencing the Implementation of The Affordable Housing Programme In Mombasa County, Kenya

Sheikh Sayyid Awadh[1], Dr. Wicliffe Anyango[2], Dr. Simon Chege[3]

[1,2,3]Zetech University

Abstract:

This study examined the impact of socio-economic factors on the successful implementation of the Affordable Housing Programme in Mombasa County, Kenya. The scope of the study was vested in the Buxton Point Affordable Housing Programme, where the researcher was interested in examining the former residents of Buxton Point who were relocated to pave the way for the redevelopment of the estate into affordable housing units. From a target population of 520 former households displaced during redevelopment, a sample of 226 respondents was selected to investigate the impact of income, access to financing, employment status, education, and household size on housing outcomes. Structured questionnaires were used to gather data, which was then analysed using descriptive statistics, correlation, and multiple regression. The results show that household income and access to financing are the best indicators of being able to buy a home, which shows how crucial financial capacity and credit availability are. Employment status and education have moderate positive effects, while larger household sizes make things less affordable. Correlation results indicate strong positive associations between income ($r = 0.65$, $p < 0.05$) and employment status ($r = 0.58$, $p < 0.05$) with housing outcomes. This strong positive correlation is contrasted by a negative relationship between affordable housing programs and household size ($r = -0.42$, $p < 0.05$). The regression model accounted for approximately 58% of the variance in housing outcomes (Adjusted $R^2 = 0.578$), with ANOVA results confirming statistical significance between the variables tested. The study concludes that socio-economic factors are central to the success of the Affordable Housing Programme, with income and financing access as the most critical enablers. Policy implications recommended by the study include designing income-sensitive mortgage products, expanding cooperative and microfinance lending, job creation, and skills development to enhance financial capacity. Additionally, aligning housing unit typologies with household size and strengthening financial literacy are essential to increase affordability and eventual uptake of the affordable housing units. By addressing these multi-dimensional barriers, housing policy can move closer to achieving equitable and sustainable affordable housing access.

Keywords: **Affordable Housing Program, Public Interest Economic Regulation Theory, Residual Income Theory, Housing Finance, Urban Development, Institutional Capacity, Housing Deficit, and Stakeholder Engagement.**

1.0 Introduction and Background

Rapid urbanisation in Kenya, particularly in Mombasa County, has dramatically increased demand for affordable housing while exposing deeply entrenched socio-economic barriers that undermine housing initiatives such as the Buxton Point Affordable Housing Project. With an annual urban growth rate of approximately 4.4%, Kenya adds more than 500,000 new urban dwellers yearly, many of whom settle in informal areas due to unaffordable formal housing (World Bank, 2017; Giti, 2025). The implications for Mombasa, the country's second-largest city and a critical coastal hub, are acute: the rising population exerts pressure on limited land, drives up construction costs, and worsens the already significant housing deficit.

Despite ambitious commitments under the Big Four Agenda and the Affordable Housing Act of 2024, delivery remains far short of demand. The Kenya National Bureau of Statistics (KNBS, 2024) reports that only 3,357 affordable units were completed in 2023, compared to 1,390 in 2022, a positive increase but still far below the government's annual target of 200,000 units. Consequently, the supply-demand gap persists, reinforcing inequality in access to adequate housing. This underscores that policy frameworks and institutional arrangements, while important, are insufficient without tackling the socio-economic realities that constrain affordability.

Key barriers are linked to household-level socio-economic dynamics. Rising construction costs, driven by inflation and reliance on imported building materials, significantly inflate unit prices. For example, the Duca et. Al., (2021) noted a 14% rise in steel reinforcement bar prices and a similar increase in cement prices during 2023. These increases raise overall construction costs, undermining affordability and discouraging private-sector participation. At the household level, low and unstable incomes, coupled with the dominance of informal employment in Mombasa's port, logistics, and tourism-driven economy, limit eligibility for mortgage products. Without payslips, collateral, or formal credit histories, many residents are locked out of formal financing (Mukolwe, Badurdeen, & Khamis, 2024). In parallel, larger household sizes exacerbate affordability pressures, as families require bigger units at higher costs, while relatively low education levels reduce earning potential and financial literacy.

Building on this, the current study specifically focuses on the population of 520 former Buxton Point tenants who had expressed interest in purchasing the redeveloped units. The majority of these households, however, were unable to acquire the units due to financial and socio-economic constraints. The study aims to discern the socio-economic factors such as income, employment,

household size, education, and access to financing that inhibited their participation in the Affordable Housing Programme. This focus on the ground level gives us real-world proof of the problems that make it hard to carry out housing programs in Mombasa County.

The gap between what policymakers want to happen and what actually happens in Mombasa is a sign of a bigger problem that coastal African cities are facing. Ogunjobi (2023) demonstrate that in Lagos, Nigeria, despite ongoing housing initiatives aimed at providing affordable units, high construction costs, land speculation, and low household incomes have hindered their execution. As a result, informal settlements are growing all the time, and most low-income people live in them. In the same way, Maina et. Al., (2024) shows how poor financing options and poor coordination between agencies make government-led housing programs less effective in Dar es Salaam. Again, informal jobs and big families make it hard to get formal housing.

Comparative insights from Accra reveal similar affordability challenges. The Center for Housing Finance Africa (2024) review revealed that a limited percentage of households were eligible for mortgages, while the majority of residents depended on savings or informal cooperatives. Innovations like savings and loans associations are starting to show up, but high land costs and insecurity of tenure in coastal urban areas make it hard to scale them up. Cape Town provides a further instructive example: according to the report by Cape Town Central City Improvement District (2024) and a Financial Times (2025) report, rising demand from internal migration and global capital inflows has driven housing prices sharply upward, excluding many low- and middle-income households. Even with significant public investment in social housing, socio-economic inequalities perpetuate exclusion and settlement in under-serviced peripheries.

These comparative cases reveal that coastal location, urban desirability, and socio-economic structures combine to intensify affordability challenges. While contexts differ, common constraints emerge: low and unstable incomes, informal labour dominance, rising construction and land costs, and inadequate financing instruments. These dynamics are particularly pronounced for Mombasa given its coastal geography, reliance on tourism and port-related employment, and land scarcity. The city's challenges thus resonate with but are not identical to those of other coastal African towns, necessitating localised empirical analysis.

This study, therefore, narrows its focus to a single objective: to evaluate the influence of socio-economic factors on the effectiveness of the Affordable Housing Program (AHP) in Mombasa County. Concentrating on socio-economic determinants allows a deeper understanding of how household income, employment status, household composition, education, and financing access intersect to shape affordable housing outcomes. It also positions the analysis within two theoretical frameworks: the Residual Income Theory, which stresses affordability as the residual capacity of households to sustain living standards after paying for housing (Grevenbrock et. Al., 2024), and the Public Interest Economic Regulation Theory (PIERT), which emphasizes the role of government intervention in correcting market failures and ensuring public welfare (Bankovsky, 2024). These theories provide a robust foundation for examining how socio-economic realities interact with policy frameworks in shaping housing delivery.

The contribution of this study lies in addressing three gaps in current scholarship. First, most existing research is either nationally focused or centred on Nairobi, with limited empirical work on Mombasa's coastal context (Mwendwa, 2022). Second, many studies isolate socioeconomic variables rather than examine their combined effects. This study integrates multiple socio-economic factors into a unified framework to capture their interrelationships. Third, there is limited empirical evidence from residents directly affected by housing programs such as Buxton Point. This study draws on household-level data from 226 respondents out of the 520 former tenants of Buxton Point, offering a direct window into the everyday socio-economic challenges that stood in the way of acquiring the redeveloped affordable units. By drawing on household-level data from 226 former residents, the study provides ground-level evidence that complements policy and institutional analyses.

The guiding research question is: Do socio-economic factors significantly influence the implementation of the Affordable Housing Program in Mombasa County?

From this, the study tests the following hypotheses:

H_0: Socio-economic factors do not significantly impact the successful implementation of the AHP.

H_1: Socio-economic factors significantly impact the successful implementation of the AHP.

In addressing this question, the study contributes context-specific insights to Kenya's urban development discourse, aligning with global goals such as SDG 11 (Sustainable Cities and Communities). This study juxtaposes Mombasa's challenges within the broader African Coastal landscape. The study offers actionable lessons for financiers, developers, and policymakers. In addition to focusing on the socio-economic realities, the research underscores that affordable housing policies must go beyond the affordable housing numerical delivery targets; instead, policymakers should address the financial sustenance, equitable employment for all, and demographic challenges that shape household access.

2.0 Literature Review

This research is based on the Residual Income Theory (RIT) and the Public Interest Economic Regulation Theory (PIERT).

The Residual Income Theory, developed by Edwards and Bell (1961) and later refined by Ohlson (1995), makes the simple but powerful point that housing affordability cannot be judged only by how much of a household's income goes into rent or mortgage payments (Shinn & Khadduri, 2020). Instead, the real measure lies in what is left over after covering food, education, healthcare, transport, and other daily essentials. If very little remains, then even "affordable" housing can place a household under severe

financial stress. Recent contributions by Grevenbrock et. Al., (2024) echo this, showing that residual income provides a truer picture of affordability struggles, especially for low-income families who often live one tough choice away from hardship deciding whether to pay for housing or to meet other basic needs.

This perspective is particularly relevant in Mombasa, where high living costs, unstable incomes, and large household sizes mean that many families find themselves in precisely this position. They may desire to own a unit under the Affordable Housing Programme, but after meeting essential needs, they simply lack the disposable income to make such a commitment. This is where the PIERT comes in. The theory highlights the role of government and regulatory institutions in intervening when open market structures alone cannot address such structural barriers. Particularly for Mombasa, Galster and Lee (2021) reported that this means that we have to accept that without targeted interventions through financing support, subsidies, or policy changes to lower the cost of construction and credit, the vision of affordable housing risks leaving behind those who need it most. In the context of Mombasa, PIERT underscores the importance of aligning institutional frameworks with household realities to expand housing access, particularly for populations excluded from formal housing markets, as captured in this study's focus on former Buxton Point residents.

Globally, housing affordability is a pressing urban challenge. The United Nations (2022) estimates that over one billion people live in inadequate housing, highlighting the magnitude of unmet need. In advanced economies, affordability challenges stem primarily from rising housing costs relative to stagnant wages. For example, the United States of America has over 37 million households spending over 30% of their income on housing expenses (Desmond, 2022). However, as Residual Income Theory suggests, such ratios underestimate hardship, since many households lack sufficient disposable income to cover essentials after housing payments (Grevenbrock et al., 2024). Lessons from these global contexts inform the analysis for Mombasa, indicating that affordability cannot be measured solely through simple income-to-housing ratios but must consider residual income available for basic needs.

Socio-economic factors consistently influence housing outcomes across contexts. Employment is pivotal, with formal jobs linked to stable income and mortgage access, whereas informal or precarious work restricts households from formal housing markets (Jang-Trettien, 2022). Household size is also significant; larger families face higher housing costs and risk overcrowding when income growth lags behind household needs. Education complements these dynamics, as higher attainment increases access to stable employment, enhances financial literacy, and improves engagement with mortgage and credit systems (Cuéllar, 2025). These global perspectives speak directly to the realities in Mombasa. The Residual Income Theory helps make sense of the everyday struggles households face where meeting basic needs often leaves little room for housing costs. At the same time, PIERT reminds us that without deliberate regulatory support, many families will remain locked out of housing opportunities because of structural barriers that the market alone cannot fix.

In Sub-Saharan Africa, affordability constraints are intensified by rapid urbanisation, low wages, and limited access to finance. Fewer than 15% of urban households can afford the cheapest formally constructed home (CAHF, 2023). Informality dominates employment structures, excluding most households from mortgage markets. In Nigeria, high construction costs and rising land prices have forced millions into informal settlements (Ogundipe, Adebayo, & Lawal, 2024). Similarly, over 70% of residents in Dar es Salaam occupy informal housing due to low incomes and lack of financing options (Kombe, 2024). These regional patterns underscore that even modest housing expenditures can overwhelm household budgets, leaving insufficient residual income for other essential needs, confirming the relevance of Residual Income Theory for coastal Kenyan cities like Mombasa.

African experiences also illustrate the relevance of PIERT. Ethiopia's Integrated Housing Development Programme (IHDP) delivered over 400,000 condominium units in Addis Ababa through cooperative savings and government subsidies (CAHF, 2023), demonstrating how coordinated state action can widen access. South Africa's Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP) has delivered more than three million subsidised units since 1994, expanding ownership among the poorest households (CAHF, 2023). Ghana's PPP-based initiatives show that policy alignment can reduce costs by up to 25% (Adabre & Chan, 2020). These lessons highlight explicitly for Mombasa that institutional frameworks, subsidies, and PPPs can mitigate socio-economic constraints, offering transferable strategies for local policymakers and developers to consider.

Across these regional and global contexts, income remains the most binding constraint, while informal employment excludes households from conventional financing. Household size and education levels further condition affordability, shaping household capacity to transition into formal housing markets. These comparative patterns indicate that Mombasa is likely to face amplified constraints due to weaker state capacity, high informality, and limited financing instruments. The literature supports the need for integrated strategies combining household-level support with systemic reforms, reflecting the dual perspective advanced by Residual Income Theory and PIERT.

In Kenya, affordable housing is a flagship agenda under the Big Four Plan, yet the deficit exceeds 250,000 units annually (CAHF, 2024). Only 11% of households qualify for mortgages, reflecting widespread income constraints and restrictive lending practices (Kieti, Mugo, & Kariuki, 2022). Mortgage rates of 12-14% further limit accessibility, more so for households in low- and middle-income brackets (Central Bank of Kenya, 2024). Over 80% of the labour force is in informal employment, leaving most households unable to meet documentation requirements for formal financing (Mukolwe et. Al., 2024).

In Nairobi, micro-mortgages and savings cooperatives have begun expanding financing options, though challenges of scale and tenure insecurity persist (Kieti et. Al., 2022). In contrast, Mombasa's coastal-specific socio-economic realities intensify affordability

constraints. Household incomes are particularly low, with most families earning below Ksh. 40,000 per month, well below mortgage eligibility thresholds (Mukolwe et al., 2024). Employment is concentrated in tourism, port services, and small-scale trading, sectors characterised by informality and volatility. Household size is also a key determinant, with 42% of families supporting more than three dependents, creating a demand for larger units, which are often underprovided. Education levels remain modest, with most households reporting secondary schooling and limited tertiary attainment, constraining both earning potential and financial literacy. Financing access is exceptionally limited, as cooperative housing schemes and micro-mortgage products are scarce compared to Nairobi. Moreover, land scarcity and reliance on imported materials elevate construction costs, pushing unit prices far beyond the reach and affordability of low- and middle-income families (Institute of Quantity Surveyors of Kenya, 2023). These dynamics confirm that, for Mombasa, affordability challenges are simultaneously household- and system-driven, validating the application of Residual Income Theory and PIERT and justifying the study's focus on former Buxton Point residents.

Despite growing scholarship, three gaps persist. Most Kenyan studies are either national or Nairobi-centric, hence overlooking the unique socio-economic dynamics of coastal counties. Previous research studies often isolated the factors influencing the success of affordable housing projects, such as income, employment, household size, and financing, rather than examining their combined effects. Lastly, resident perspectives were rarely incorporated, despite their importance in revealing ground-level affordability realities. This study fills these gaps by drawing directly from the experiences of 226 former Buxton Point residents, using their household-level data to show how different socio-economic factors come together to shape access to affordable housing in Mombasa. By analysing the socio-economic factors through the lens of the Residual Income Theory (RIT) and Public Interest Economic Regulation Theory (PIERT), the study looked at the issue from two sides: the day-to-day household affordability challenges faced by households in Mombasa County (RIT), and the wider institutional interventions needed to deal with structural barriers in the affordable housing segment (PIERT).

3.0 Methodology

This study was centered on data collected from the Buxton Point Affordable Housing Project in Mombasa County, Kenya. This project is a redevelopment project jointly undertaken by Gulfcap Real Estate Ltd. (GCRE) and the Mombasa County Government to restructure the former Buxton Estate into a modern, affordable housing community. This project was one of the flagship projects commissioned under Kenya's Big Four Agenda, one of them being the Affordable Housing Programme (Mwangi, 2021; Mwita, 2023). Phase one of the project, which is the focus of this study, is complete and fully occupied. Hence, this research is based on the former tenants of the Buxton Estate who were relocated to pave way for the new Buxton Point Affordable Housing Estate. In total, the study focused on 520 households that were relocated during the Buxton redevelopment process. From this population of 520 former residents who occupied the estate prior to its redevelopment, the study analysed their experiences to understand the socio-economic factors that facilitated or constrained their ability to acquire the newly redeveloped units within Buxton Point.

The analysis focused exclusively on socio-economic factors as the independent variables influencing affordable housing outcomes. These included household income (categorised into income bands), employment status (formal, informal, self-employed, or unemployed), household size (number of dependents), education level (primary, secondary, tertiary), and access to housing finance (mortgage eligibility, loan access, and rental expenditure). The dependent variable, affordable housing implementation, was measured through indicators of affordability, financing accessibility, and housing outcomes among respondents.

Data were analysed using descriptive statistics to summarise socio-economic characteristics and inferential methods to test hypothesised relationships. Pearson correlation analysis was employed to assess associations between individual socio-economic factors and housing outcomes, while multiple regression analysis was used to determine their combined influence. Chieng and Mustafa (2024) state that this methodological approach provides objective evidence of how independent variables (socio-economic factors) impact the dependent variable (The implementation of affordable housing in Mombasa).

The econometric model adopted for the study was specified as follows:

$$Y_i = \alpha + \beta_1 INC_i + \beta_2 EMP_i + \beta_3 HSIZE_i + \beta_4 EDU_i + \beta_5 FIN_i + \gamma' Z_i + \mu_i$$

Where:

Y_i = successful implementation of the Affordable Housing Programme for household *i*.

α = constant

β_1 = coefficient measuring the effect of household income (INC_i)

β_2 = coefficient measuring the effect of employment status (EMP_i)

β_3 = coefficient measuring the effect of household size ($HSIZE_i$)

β_4 = coefficient measuring the effect of education level (EDU_i)

β_5 = coefficient measuring the effect of access to housing finance (FIN_i)

γ = coefficients for the vector of control variables (Z_i) such as age, gender, number of income earners, and tenure.

μ_i = error term.

While the population of 520 former Buxton tenants and the sample of 226 respondents, along with the selected socio-economic variables, provide a focused understanding of the factors affecting affordable housing in Mombasa County, this representation may not fully capture the broader national picture of how socio-economic factors influence the implementation of affordable housing

programs across Kenya. Additionally, reliance on self-reported data introduces the potential for reporting bias. Some respondents may consciously or unconsciously give socially desirable answers (These are answers the respondents think the researcher would like to hear), which could corrupt the true relationship between socio-economic factors and housing outcomes. The cross-sectional characteristic of the study further limits its capacity to capture temporal dynamics, such as changes in household income, employment, or family size, over time. To critique this scope, Creswell and Creswell (2018) note that cross-sectional studies, while valuable for exploring relationships at a single point in time, are limited in their ability to reflect longitudinal trends, which can restrict generalizability.

Several measures were put in place to address these limitations and ensure the study was reliable and valid. The researcher conducted a pilot study to identify any shortcomings in the research study questionnaire prior to rolling it out to the research respondents. Key housing sector experts from the State Department of Housing and Urban Development also reviewed this research tool (Questionnaire) to confirm content and construct validity, and they made sure that the questions posed accurately reflected the study variables and theoretical framework. Research method reliability was tested using the Cronbach's Alpha. This test showed a strong coefficient of 0.87. Evidence shows that such a string coefficient score indicates that the independent variable is measured consistently across the research tool being utilised.

Stratified random sampling was used to ensure the study meaningfully captured respondent diversity. This approach allowed the sample to reflect differing realities across income levels, household size, employment status, educational attainment and access to housing finance, thereby improving the representativeness and generalisability of the findings and ensuring that voices from diverse socio-economic groups were included. The research was guided by ethical research principles in every stage of the research process. Consent was sought from all respondents, whereby they were clearly briefed on the purpose and scope of the study, to which they all assented. Data confidentiality was assured, and personal identifiers were carefully anonymised during data handling. These steps safeguarded the rights of participants while also strengthening the integrity and credibility of the study's evidence base (Creswell & Creswell, 2018).

The study applied descriptive and inferential analytical tools to generate credible insights. Descriptive statistics were used to highlight key characteristics of the respondents, Pearson's correlation measured the strength and direction of associations between variables, and multiple regression assessed the independent influence of socio-economic factors on affordable housing outcomes. This combination of techniques allowed for triangulation, resulting in richer, more reliable, and well-rounded findings.

The study, however, is not without limitations. Its focus on Mombasa County means the findings may not fully represent conditions in other regions. In addition, reliance on self-reported data introduces the possibility of response bias, while the cross-sectional design captures realities at only a single point in time. Even so, the careful use of sampling, strong ethical safeguards, and a blended methodological approach provide a solid basis for the study's conclusions and lend weight to the trustworthiness of its findings. What emerges is a clear, balanced understanding of the socio-economic factors shaping the implementation of affordable housing in Mombasa County. These insights remain useful for policymakers, practitioners, and scholars alike.

4.0 Results

Out of the 226 questionnaires distributed to respondents, only 196 were completed and returned, this being a response rate of 97%. Thirteen questionnaires were not returned, while 17 were excluded due to incomplete information. This high response rate exceeds the 70% threshold considered ideal for descriptive studies (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003), ensuring sufficient data analysis validity.

Table 1: Questionnaire Response Rate

Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Distributed	226	100%
Returned (usable)	196	87%
Incomplete	17	8%
Not returned	13	5%

The analysis revealed distinct variations in income distribution within households. Fourteen percent (14%) of families reported relying on a single income earner, which increased vulnerability to financial instability in the event of job loss or income disruption. Fifty-seven percent (57%) of families had two income earners, reflecting shared financial responsibility, while 29% reported three or more income earners, suggesting comparatively stronger financial stability. Despite multiple income streams, most families faced affordability challenges, given rising living costs and limited access to mortgage financing.

Table 2: Showing the Number of Income Earners (Breadwinners) per Household

Number of Income Earners	Frequency	Percentage (%)
One earner	27	14%
Two earners	112	57%
Three or more earners	57	29%
Total	**196**	**100%**

The data further showed that 42% of families supported more than three dependents, while 38% supported exactly three. Eleven percent (11%) supported one dependent, and nine percent (9%) supported two. Larger household sizes placed greater financial strain on families, reducing their ability to access affordable housing. Even families with fewer dependents operated under tight economic constraints, underscoring the significance of household size in shaping housing affordability.

To better understand housing needs, respondents were asked about the ideal number of bedrooms for a family of five (two parents and three children). Four categories were considered: one-bedroom, two-bedroom, three-bedroom, and more than three bedrooms. The results indicated a strong preference for three-bedroom units, with a mean of 2.93, and both the median and mode were at three bedrooms. The low variance (0.737) suggested that responses clustered closely around this option. This highlights a clear demand for three-bedroom units among families of average size; a preference developers should consider when designing affordable housing.

Descriptive findings indicated that most households earned below Ksh 40,000 per month, well below mortgage eligibility requirements. Employment was predominantly informal, limiting access to formal credit due to a lack of documentation. Education levels were mainly secondary, restricting both earning potential and financial literacy. These socio-economic realities emerged as key barriers to housing access.

The statistical results were derived as follows;

Table 3: Regression Model

Predictor Variable	β (Unstandardized)	Std. Error	Std. β	t-value	p-value	95% Confidence Interval
(Constant)	**1.215**	**0.21**	**-**	**5.79**	**0**	**0.801 - 1.629**
Household Income	**0.245**	**0.052**	**0.421**	**4.71**	**0**	**0.143 - 0.347**
Financing Access	**0.198**	**0.061**	**0.316**	**3.25**	**0.002**	**0.078 - 0.318**
Employment Status	**0.112**	**0.049**	**0.186**	**2.29**	**0.024**	**0.015 - 0.209**
Household Size	**-0.095**	**0.037**	**-0.172**	**-2.57**	**0.011**	**-0.168 – -0.022**
Education Level	**0.084**	**0.036**	**0.151**	**2.33**	**0.021**	**0.013 - 0.155**

Table 4: ANOVA Results

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F-value	p-value
Regression	28.752	5	5.75	35.83	0
Residual	19.168	190	0.101		
Total	47.92	195			

The correlation results confirmed strong associations between socio-economic factors and housing outcomes. Household income showed the strongest positive correlation with affordability ($r = 0.65$, $p < 0.05$), followed by employment status ($r = 0.58$, $p < 0.05$). Household size had a significant negative correlation ($r = -0.42$, $p < 0.05$), while education exhibited a moderate positive correlation ($r = 0.36$, $p < 0.05$). These findings validate the expectation that socio-economic factors substantially shape access to housing.

The regression model further examined the combined effect of these variables, explaining approximately 57.8% of the variation in affordable housing outcomes (Adjusted $R^2 = 0.578$). The model was statistically significant, as confirmed by the ANOVA results ($F(5,190) = 35.83$, $p < 0.001$), indicating that the socio-economic predictors collectively and reliably influence housing access.

Analysis of individual predictors revealed that household income ($\beta = 0.245$, $p < 0.001$) and access to financing ($\beta = 0.198$, $p = 0.002$) were the strongest determinants of affordability, highlighting the critical role of financial capacity and credit availability. Employment status ($\beta = 0.112$, $p = 0.024$) and education level ($\beta = 0.084$, $p = 0.021$) exerted moderate positive effects, suggesting that formal employment and higher education enhance access. In contrast, household size had a significant negative influence ($\beta = -0.095$, $p = 0.011$), indicating that larger families faced greater difficulty in acquiring redeveloped units.

Overall, these results suggest that interventions aimed at boosting household incomes and expanding affordable financing mechanisms would yield the most substantial improvements in housing access. Complementary measures such as formalizing employment prospects, expanding access to education, and giving targeted financial assistance to larger households would help Mombasa's affordable housing efforts play out more successfully. These interventions would not only remove structural barriers to participation. However, they would also create a more conducive climate in which families of various sizes and backgrounds could fully benefit from the program.

Summary

The results prove that socioeconomic factors affect Mombasa County's implementation of affordable housing. The most significant factors were income levels and financial accessibility, indicating that credit availability and financial capacity ultimately decide who gets a home and who doesn't. The redeveloped units were more affordable for households with stable and higher incomes. In contrast, many others were prevented from doing so, despite their willingness, due to restricted access to mortgages and other forms of financing. Education and work status also had a big influence: those with formal jobs and more education could better meet their housing-related financial commitments. Larger households, on the other hand, had greater financial constraints, putting a strain on their capacity to keep up with expenditures and highlighting the special issues of families with several dependents. These findings are consistent with the Residual Income Theory, which states that households may only allocate resources to housing after addressing their most fundamental requirements. In reality, this implies that households with little to no discretionary income after meeting basic needs are essentially barred from attending even "affordable" initiatives.

The findings also align with the Public Interest Economic Regulation Theory, which highlights the role of institutions and the government in intervening when markets fail, especially when it comes to removing obstacles like unequal access to formal employment, low and unstable incomes, and limited financing options. When combined, the data shows that Mombasa County's socioeconomic realities remain the primary determinants of home affordability. This highlights the significance of comprehensive policy and financial solutions in addition to supporting the study's main idea. The greatest impact on expanding access would come from initiatives to increase household incomes, establish avenues for low-cost credit, and support larger families.

Assuring that affordable housing initiatives fulfill their promise of inclusion and equality, complementary strategies like increasing formal employment, funding education, and raising financial literacy also empower households in more sustainable ways. In conclusion, the study shows that overcoming numerous obstacles at once is necessary to make affordable housing in Mombasa viable. The ability of households to obtain and maintain suitable housing is influenced by sociodemographic and financial issues. Therefore, better coordination between financial institutions, developers, and politicians is essential to success. Together, these actors advance economic stability, increase financial accessibility, and provide tailored assistance to households with greater needs, enhancing the efficacy and inclusivity of affordable housing programs and guaranteeing that no group is left behind.

4.1 Discussion

Research results indicated that income level had the greatest influence towards the successful implementation of the affordable housing program in Mombasa County, Kenya. This result supports the work of Kieti et al. (2022), who reported that only about 11% of Kenyans qualify for mortgage financing, leaving most households unable to access formal housing markets. Employment status also played a significant role, as many respondents relied on informal or precarious jobs that offered them limited or no access to credit facilities to enable them to secure affordable housing units. Echoing Hassan et. Al. (2021) observation that larger households in Nairobi tend to experience higher housing pressures; this study also found that family size has an impact on a household's ability to secure affordable housing. Although less pronounced, education still mattered, reinforcing Badawy's (2019) argument that it enhances job prospects and financial literacy, both of which shape housing outcomes.

Correlation analysis backed up these observations. Household income showed the strongest positive link with affordability ($r = 0.65$, $p < 0.05$), followed by employment status ($r = 0.58$, $p < 0.05$). Education maintained a moderate positive relationship ($r = 0.36$, $p < 0.05$), while household size revealed a clear negative effect ($r = -0.42$, $p < 0.05$). Taken together, these results strongly validate the

idea that socio-economic factors are not just background variables, but the main drivers shaping access to affordable housing in Mombasa County.

The regression model provided additional empirical depth, showing that socio-economic variables jointly explained approximately 57.8% of the variation in housing outcomes (Adjusted $R^2 = 0.578$). ANOVA results confirmed that the model was statistically significant ($F(5,190) = 35.83$, $p < 0.001$), indicating that the predictors collectively and reliably influence housing access. Individually, household income ($\beta = 0.245$, $p < 0.001$) and access to financing ($\beta = 0.198$, $p = 0.002$) were the strongest determinants, emphasising the critical role of financial capacity and credit availability. Employment status ($\beta = 0.112$, $p = 0.024$) and education level ($\beta = 0.084$, $p = 0.021$) exerted moderate positive effects. At the same time, household size had a significant negative effect ($\beta = -0.095$, $p = 0.011$), illustrating that larger households face greater challenges in acquiring redeveloped units. These findings extend previous research by quantifying the combined influence of income, employment, household size, education, and financing access within a single empirical framework specific to Mombasa County.

The study also challenges assumptions that dual-income households are necessarily financially secure. Even families with multiple earners face affordability constraints due to high living costs and limited financing options. This highlights that income levels alone are insufficient; access to affordable financing mechanisms is equally critical. Moreover, the preference for three-bedroom units identified in the descriptive analysis suggests that housing design should be aligned with the socio-economic and family structures prevalent in Mombasa.

The results carry several implications for housing policy and practice, particularly within the Kenyan and broader African context:

- **Financing Innovation** - Policymakers and financial institutions should expand income-sensitive products, including micro-mortgages and cooperative-based housing loans, to reach households excluded from conventional mortgage markets.
- **Employment and Income Growth** - Formal job creation and wage stabilisation are essential to improving mortgage eligibility, reducing reliance on informal employment, and enhancing household financial security.
- **Family-Oriented Housing Design** - Developers should prioritise three-bedroom units to align supply with the socio-economic profiles and preferences of average families in Mombasa.
- **Targeted Subsidies** - Subsidised interest rates, reduced land costs, and construction incentives are necessary to make housing more affordable for low- and middle-income households.
- **Capacity Building in Financial Literacy** - Education programs that strengthen knowledge of credit, savings schemes, and cooperative financing can improve household readiness for homeownership.

In sum, the study confirms that socio-economic realities, particularly low incomes, limited access to financing, insecure employment, and larger household sizes, are decisive barriers to affordable housing in Mombasa County. By integrating correlation, regression, and ANOVA analyses, the findings provide robust quantitative evidence supporting these conclusions. Situating these results within both theoretical and empirical debates, the study contributes context-specific evidence that extends existing literature and underscores the urgency of policy, financial, and developmental innovations. Addressing these socio-economic constraints is essential for ensuring that affordable housing programs in Kenya, and similar African urban contexts, achieve their intended impact.

5.0 Conclusion and Recommendations

This study aimed to investigate the impact of socioeconomic determinants on the execution of Kenya's Affordable Housing Programme, utilizing the Buxton Point reconstruction project in Mombasa County as a case study. The research population consisted of 520 families relocated during the reconstruction process. A representative sample of 226 respondents was selected for data collection from this population. The research focused on five major variables: family income, access to finance, work status, education, and household size, and examined how these influenced housing outcomes for impacted families.

The study placed particular focus on the 520 former tenants of Buxton Point who initially expressed interest in purchasing units within the redeveloped estate. In reality, however, most were unable to do so. This provided an important opportunity to pinpoint the exact socio-economic barriers that limited households from transitioning from rental arrangements to ownership. The findings make it clear that, irrespective of government intentions or programmatic goals, underlying socio-economic conditions remain decisive in shaping both the cost and accessibility of regenerated housing.

By anchoring the analysis in the lived experiences of this community, the study contributes context-specific insights into the wider challenges confronting Kenya's Affordable Housing Programme. The results stress the need for targeted interventions that consider household size, educational background, employment stability, and financial capacity. In doing so, the research deepens understanding of how socio-economic realities restrict access to housing, while also highlighting the institutional reforms needed to bring affordable housing initiatives in line with the practical needs of urban households in Mombasa County and beyond.

Overall, the evidence underscores that socio-economic realities are central not peripheral to determining housing outcomes in Mombasa County. Among the factors assessed, household income and access to finance stood out as the strongest predictors, showing that financial resources and the availability of affordable credit directly shape households' chances of moving from tenancy to ownership of redeveloped units. Employment status and educational attainment were also influential, though their effects were less pronounced compared to income and financing. Formal work improved household stability and eligibility for financing, but greater levels of education appeared to boost both earning potential and financial literacy, increasing access to affordable housing

choices.

Conversely, household size has a detrimental impact on affordability. Families with several dependents faced increased financial obligations, which reduced disposable incomes and limited their ability to take up refurbished apartments, even when desire was shown. This study underscores the idea that socio-demographic factors combine with financial reality to exacerbate exclusion from affordable housing.

The statistical evidence strengthens these findings. Correlation analysis showed that household income had the largest positive relationship with housing outcomes ($r = 0.65$, $p < 0.05$), followed by job status ($r = 0.58$, $p < 0.05$). Education showed a moderate but significant association ($r = 0.36$, $p < 0.05$), indicating its position as an enabler rather than a major driver. Household size had a negative connection ($r = -0.42$, $p < 0.05$), indicating the impact of greater family sizes on affordability. Taken together, our findings illustrate the multifaceted character of socioeconomic variables and indicate that financial and demographic restrictions jointly determine the limits of housing access in Mombasa's affordable housing market.

The regression model explains 58% of the variation in housing outcomes (Adjusted $R^2 = 0.578$), and ANOVA results confirm the model's statistical significance ($F(5,190) = 35.83$, $p < 0.001$), indicating that these socio-economic factors collectively account for a significant proportion of differences in housing affordability. These data demonstrate that socioeconomic considerations significantly impact executing the Affordable Housing Programme in Mombasa County. Even households with multiple income workers sometimes struggle to purchase housing owing to high living costs and restricted financing options. Respondents' preference for three-bedroom flats emphasizes matching housing availability to household size and socioeconomic profile to boost uptake and satisfaction rates.

This study shows that socioeconomic factors like household income, financial accessibility, employment status, education, and household size significantly affect the availability of affordable housing in Mombasa County. Families with larger family structures, insecure incomes, or limited financial resources continue to be disproportionately confined, underscoring the necessity of tackling these obstacles head-on. In addition to individual solutions, cross-sectoral policy, financial, and developmental measures are required to address them.

Based on these findings, various recommendations are made to improve the effectiveness of the Affordable Housing Program. Finally, this study shows that socioeconomic determinants such household income, access to financing, employment status, education, and household size all have a substantial influence on affordable housing outcomes in Mombasa County. Households with little financial resources, unpredictable wages, or larger family sizes remain disproportionately constrained, stressing the importance of tackling these challenges front on. Addressing them requires more than just individual answers; it requires cross-sectoral policy, budgetary, and developmental initiatives.

While transparent housing allocation procedures can guarantee equity and accountability in housing allocation and distribution, policy and financial subsidy initiatives also play an important role in facilitating affordable housing affordability. These policies and financial interventions include reduced mortgage rates, development incentives, and cheaper land costs. Together, these solutions demonstrate the need for a comprehensive system of socioeconomic support. The Affordable Housing Program can only achieve its long-term objective of supporting Kenya's sustainable urban growth and its immediate goals of equitable access by adopting such a comprehensive approach.

References

1. Adabre, M. A., & Chan, A. P. (2020). Towards a sustainability assessment model for affordable housing projects: The perspective of professionals in Ghana. Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management, 27(9), 2523-2551.
2. Badawy, A. (2019). Factors affecting housing affordability in Kenya: A case study of Mombasa County (Thesis, Strathmore University). Retrieved from http://suplus.strathmore.edu/handle/11071/6662
3. Bankovsky, A. (2024). Public Interest Economic Regulation Theory and housing markets. *Journal of Housing Economics*.
4. Bankovsky, M. (2024, February). What should families want? From Hazel Kyrk to Margaret Reid and beyond. In Research in the History of Economic Thought and Methodology: Including a Symposium on Hazel Kyrk's: A Theory of Consumption 100 Years after Publication (pp. 95-116). Emerald Publishing Limited.
5. CAHF. (2023). *State of the housing sector in Sub-Saharan Africa*. Centre for Affordable Housing Finance in Africa. https://housingfinanceafrica.org
6. Cape Town Central City Improvement District. (2024). *State of Cape Town Central City Report 2024*. https://www.capetownccid.org/sites/default/files/2025-09
7. Central Bank of Kenya. (2024). *Annual report 2024*. https://www.centralbank.go.ke
8. Centre for Affordable Housing in Africa. (2024). Kenya. In *Africa Housing Finance Yearbook 2024* (p. 111-114).
9. Chieng, K. F., & Mustapa, F. D. (2024). Research Methodology for Cost Modelling Development on Smart Living Features Implementation in Malaysian Housing. In Insights on Resiliency and Urban Development (pp. 221-244). IGI Global.
10. Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2023). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.

11. Cuéllar, L. I. P. (2025). Promoting global financial inclusion through integrated financial and technological literacy improvements. A panel data analysis. *Revista de Métodos Cuantitativos para la Economía y la Empresa*, 1-23. https://www.upo.es/revistas/index.php/RevMetCuant/article/view/9441/10087
12. Desmond, M. (2022). *Poverty, by America*. Crown Publishing Group.
13. Duca, J. V., Muellbauer, J., & Murphy, A. (2021). What drives house price cycles? International experience and policy issues. Journal of Economic Literature, 59(3), 773-864.
14. Financial Times. (2025). *Global house prices: Raising the roof.* https://www.ft.com/house-prices
15. Galster, G., & Lee, K. O. (2021). Housing affordability: A framing, synthesis of research and policy, and future directions. International Journal of Urban Sciences, 25(sup1), 7-58.
16. Giti, D. M. (2025). Public–private partnerships for the development of low-cost housing to meet Kenya Vision 2030 and related goals. *Journal of Public Policy and Administration, 9*(1), 31–38. Science Publishing Group. https://doi.org/10.11648/j.jppa.20250901.14
17. Grevenbrock, N., Ludwig, A., & Siassi, M. (2024). Homeownership rates, housing policies, and co-residence decisions. *Macroeconomic Dynamics*. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1365100524000123
18. Hassan, M. M., Ahmad, N., & Hashim, A. H. (2021). Factors influencing housing purchase decisions. International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 11(7), 429-443.
19. Institute of Quantity Surveyors of Kenya. (2023). *The 2025/2026 Construction Costs Handbook*. https://iqskenya.org/2023/07/12/the-2023-2024-construction-costs-handbook-retailing-at-ksh-3000-is-available-in-hard-copy-at-the-secretariat-mpesa-paybill-no-933450-account-no-chb/
20. Jang-Trettien, C. (2022). House of cards: informal housing markets and precarious pathways to homeownership in Baltimore. *Social problems*, *69*(4), 928-951. https://doi.org/10.1093/socpro/spab004
21. Kenya National Bureau of Statistics. (2024). *Economic Survey 2024: Providing, Managing, and Promoting Quality Statistics*. Kenya National Bureau of Statistics. https://www.knbs.or.ke/wp-content/uploads/2024/05/2024-Economic-Survey.pdf
22. Kieti, D., Mugo, M., & Kariuki, S. (2022). Mortgage affordability and access in Kenya: A case study of Nairobi. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment, 37*(2), 345-367.
23. Kieti, R. M.; Rukwaro, Robert W.; Olima, Washington H.A., (2022, June 1). Kenya's push for affordable housing is creating opportunities despite barriers. Retrieved from The Conversation: https://theconversation.com/kenyas-push-for-affordable-housing-iscreating-opportunities-despite-barriers-183553
24. Kombe, W. J. (2024). Dar es Salaam: City report. *African Cities Research Consortium*. https://www.african-cities.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/12/ACRC_Working-Paper-23_December-2024.pdf
25. Maina, M., Weldeghebrael, E. H., Frediani, A. A., & Uduku, O. (2024). Housing: domain report. https://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4916123
26. Mortgage Refinancing as a Tool for Affordable Housing Financing: The Promise of the Kenya Mortgage Refinancing Company (KMRC). (2014). Aleri Consulting. https://rak.co.ke/mortgage-refinancing-as-a-tool-for-affordable-housing-financing-thepromise-of-the-kenya-mortgage-refinancing-company-kmrc
27. Mukolwe, I., Badurdeen, F., & Khamis, M. (2024). Informal employment and housing finance in Kenya. *African Journal of Economic Policy, 30*(1), 45-61.
28. Mwangi, W. (2021, May 3). *At last, the Sh6bn Buxton affordable housing project takes off.* Nation. Retrieved from https://nation.africa/kenya/counties/mombasa/at-last-sh6bn-buxton-affordable-housing-project-takes-off-3385580
29. Mwendwa, J. (2022). Housing demand and supply dynamics in Mombasa: A case study. *Journal of Urban Planning and Development, 148*(4), 04022034.
30. Mwita, M. (2023, September 14). *Homeowners to occupy Sh6bn Buxton affordable housing units.* The Star. Retrieved from https://www.the-star.co.ke/business/kenya/2023-09-14-homeowners-to-occupy-sh6bn-buxton-affordable-housing-units/
31. Ogundipe, O. A., Adebayo, A. A., & Lawal, A. A. (2024). Housing affordability and informal settlements in Nigeria. *Urban Studies, 61*(1), 123-139.
32. Ogunjobi, H. (2023). *Housing deficiencies in Lagos State Nigeria: the need for an affordable approach towards strategic delivery* (Doctoral dissertation, Anglia Ruskin Research Online (ARRO)).
33. Shinn, M., & Khadduri, J. (2020). Employment, income, and housing affordability. *Housing Policy Debate, 30*(2), 289-306. https://doi.org/10.1080/10511482.2019.1682639
34. United Nations. (2022). *The United Nations world urbanization prospects: The 2022 revision*. https://population.un.org/wup
35. World Bank. (2017, April). *Kenya needs 2 million more low-income homes: Building them would boost its economic growth*. https://www.worldbank.org/en/country/kenya/publication/kenya-needs-2-million-more-low-income-homes-building-them-would-boost-its-economic-growth