12.31.2023 JOURNAL OF

Env. Management & Construction Res. (JEMCR) Vol. 2 No. 2

NEIGHBOURHOOD ATTRIBUTES AND END-USERS' PERCEPTION WITHIN RESIDENTIAL DENSITY OF LAGOS, NIGERIA

ESV. WALE ADERIBIGBE

6 Ashabi Cole Street, Off Lateef Jakande Road, SBD, Alausa, Ikeja, Lagos, Lagos State, Nigeria.

Abstract

Neighbourhood mirrors the development, characters, planning and allocation of an environment, the type and quality of people's life living within it, their taste, economic entity, their social interaction, convenience and comfort. The aim of this study is to examine the perception of the users about the status of their neighbourhood with a view to improving neighbourhood development The research is an empirical analysis of tenants perception of the three identified residential neighbourhood of Ikeja: high; Ikorodu; medium; and Epe: low densities within Lagos metropolis. Data for the study were collected from administration of questionnaire designed with attitudinal 5 point liker scaling of strongly agree to strongly disagree measuring users perception of attributes that contributes to each of the neighbourhood status.. The structured questionnaire were giving to specific residential users living within each of the neighbourhood. The data were analyzed using weighted mean scores and

Introduction

The type and quality of life of the people living within a vicinity, reflecting their taste, socio cultural diversity and economic entity, are reflections of any typical neighbourhood. Certain neighbourhood characteristics void of preventable health hazards and diseases are sought for, complimenting the consciousness of a decent housing unit. Such neighbourhood characters include the availability of clean air, access to potable drinking water, adequate shelter, security, good transport interlinks and other basic services and facilities (Smersh, Smith and Schwartz, 2003; Sangodoyin and Coker, 2005; Aluko, 2006; & Coker, et.al., 2007).

E-ISSN 3026-8982 P-ISSN 3027-2904

Cronbach's Alpha Co-efficient for Internal Consistency to test for the reliability of estimates for examining these users' perception with the aid of Computer Aided Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) Version 16. The result of the analysis revealed that in high density zone; accessibility to place of worship, presence of market, good road network, good management of flood control, availability of medical facilities, presence of shops, availability of children's schools, security, presence of police station and the availability of portable water were the most attributes perceived by the users to have enhance the density's status. Whereas in medium density zone the perceived attributes include, presence of good road network, market, police station, medical facilities, accessibility to place of worship, good management of waste disposal system, presence of shopping centre(s), portable water, security from crime related activities, peaceful and quiet neighbourhood and availability of children's schools; while good management of waste disposal system, accessibility to place of worship, presence of good road network, neighbourhood secured from crime related activities, presence of shopping centre(s), medical facility, availability of portable water and police station, and accessibility to market, regularity of electricity supply and presence of recreation centre were users' perceived attributes of the low density residential zone. In addition, proximity and accessibility take important positions in the perception of residents as reflected in their responses to questions of accessibility and closeness. The study recommended that the perception and general views of end-users should be incorporated in the operational housing and neighbourhood development policies from the conception to the development of housing, and urban renewal programs to achieve demand-supply driven environment as well as enhancing a balanced value achievements by all stakeholders

KEYWORDS: Neighbourhood Attributes. Perception, End Users, Residential Density Lagos Nigeria.

The Appraisal Institute (1991) cited in Nuhu (2008), equally identified the neighbourhood characters to include age of neighbourhood, rate of construction and vacancy, market activity levels, absorption rate, turnover rate, volume of sales, motivation of buyers and sellers, property use before and after sale, presence of desired amenities, maintenance standards, economic profile, and age of occupants. The neighbourhood attributes or

characters are the surroundings, with other provisions. Building structures discriminately spring up in insanitary neighbourhoods with poor basic amenities. This may lead to increase in the rate of crime and other insecurities. The problem of neighbourhood choice therefore emanates from the need to satisfy housing aspirations which may not be easy to come by. Nwaka, (2005) noted that the vast majority of households live in overcrowded conditions within defective physical dwellings, sometimes located in neighbourhoods which do not provide adequate defences against diseases and other health hazards. The unhealthy situation of the neighbourhood resulting from overcrowding and lack of adequate infrastructural facilities, may therefore pose threat to the healthy and peaceful living of the common people.

Similarly, lack of basic features such as access roads, schools, refuse disposal systems, transportation systems, proximity to places of employment, safety, management, and spaces for economic activities such as shopping centres in the neighbourhoods often affect the perception of property users and residential preference (Sanni and Akinyemi, 2009). Equally, the presence of pollutants, such as noise emanating from nearness to market, mechanic workshop or Motor Park; areas prone to natural disasters such as flooding; nearness to high power voltage wire installations in an environment, crime prone areas and the likes, pose great threat to neighbourhood choice and also affect quality of life (of residents), level of socio-economic development and environmental health (Omole, et al., 2013).

The perception of property users about the status of their neighbourhood is another threat to owners' property objective. The motive of property owners or developers may only be for profit maximization, while end-users make preferences to neighbourhoods and residential properties based on satisfactions derivable. For instance, the results of the analysis by Ukoha and Beamish (1996) on Abuja housing revealed that the single-item measure of satisfaction with neighbourhood facilities was largely predicted by the general cleanliness of the neighbourhood and closeness to work. This suggests that residents' satisfaction with neighbourhood facilities was mainly determined by their feelings about their neighbourhood as being clean and safe with pleasant neighbours, providing opportunities for shopping, and being accessible to work. Thus, neighbourhoods and the location of housing in the community have social and physical characteristics that affect users' satisfaction (Ukoha and Beamish, 1996).

Other problems or concerns within the cities as a result of unchecked rapid population growth and increase in demand for housing in Nigeria include urban

management problems, unemployment, inadequate infrastructural provision and life uncertainty, (Osiki, 1999; Nwaka, 2005; & Omole, et al, 2013). This has made the neighbourhood quality an obvious difficult one. The judicious manner of human perception about neighbourhood features is therefore determined by a network of complex social, economic and cultural interactions and the dynamism of societal growth (Osiki, 1999). This may be evident in the choice of residential neighbourhood location in which some residents or people in search of shelter are subjected to, due to high rate of demand and scarcity of housing supply caused by unguided increase in population within a society. Hence this paper is structure into five parts as introduction, literature review, research methodology, findings and discussion, recommendations and conclusion.

Literature Review

Urbanization and Neighbourhood Development

It is universally observed that urbanization is evolving at different speeds in different continents. Abudullahi (2003) gave a 50% assessment increase in the proportion of city dwellers in Africa and Asia by the year 2025 as against 35% in 1975 and a little more than 37% in 2002. . Urban areas account for only two percent of the earth's land surface but over half of the world's population now resides in cities (United Nations, 2001). Nigeria's urban population has been growing at an alarming rate. This population settled in diverse neighbourhood of their choice due to factors that are economic, social and physical. Defining neighbourhood has been noted to be difficult in the phase of changing environment orchestrated by urbanisation. Initially, neighbourhood was defined as a segment or series of segments of a community or city with an impression of unity in similar property uses, social/ income classes, structural appearances, economic, religious, racial or ethnic status of most of the residents

However rapid urbanization has changed most community or urban landscape of most Nigerian cities (Amao and Ilesanmi, 2013), this has therefore given rise to diverse neighbourhood development yet with some community of interest shared by its occupants. For instance, Jiboye (2005) enunciates that the conventional land use planning approach adopted by most major cities including Lagos, Lagos, Kaduna, Port Harcourt, Onitsha, Enugu and some in other parts of Niger Delta region in Nigeria, has generated diverse urban challenges.

Taking Lagos urban centre into consideration, Fourchard, (2003) observed that the inner city area which is the oldest part of the city, has the lowest quality

residence and the highest population density in the city. The increasing migration of people tends to concentrate in big cities. Developed cities or cities with seemly developmental potentials attract the larger populace. Gomez and Salvador (2006) as cited in Gbadegesin and Aluko (2016), observed that in the 21st century the number of people living in cities will progressively increase. The increasing rate of urban immigration as brought about an alluring traffic congestion, high crime rate, insecurity of lives and properties, deforestation, desertification, ocean drive, flooding, sewage and other pollution problems. This has necessitated an unending quest for a serene neighbourhood with adequate amenities, good access routes, water, electricity, proximity to necessities and other basic needs. However, with the increasing population, neighbourhood preservation and quality need to be sustained thereby preventing any chaos. As urban phenomenon is continuously increasing, extending the boundaries of the city or metropolitan areas, the features of each of the neighbourhood that make up the increase should be well catered for by all the actors in the city policy. High population density in urban areas has resulted in a large-scale modification of the neighbourhood. As a city grows, the increasing concentration of population and economic activities demands more lands to be developed for public infrastructure (e.g. roads, water facilities, and utilities), housing, and industrial, institutional and commercial uses.

Attributes of Neighbourhood Development

Apart from neighbourhood being segments in community or city, its attributes revealed its distinctiveness. Neighbourhood was noted by Harrison and Bloom as an area with superlatively identifiable and recognizable characters with either natural or artificial boundaries. The pattern of the urban growth can influence the neighbourhood as well. Certain neighbourhood may exhibit newness, growth, decay and renewal. Harvey (1996) stated that some are static in character while most are dynamic at various rates of speed. This different state make them to gain public recognition and favour especially from potential residents Neighbourhood attributes are many and varied. It ranges from being physical or environmental, social, economic, to governmental or institutional. It. includes parking availability, size of the catchment area and transit accessibility, similarly, coffee and bakery sites, parks, grocery stores, schools, restaurants and gas stations.

Most residential properties are located in neighbourhoods with overcrowded conditions which do not provide adequate defences against disease and other health hazards (Nwaka, 2005). Coker, Awokola, Olomolaiye, and Booth, (2007) opined that residential properties located in the more recently-developed areas of the city (low-density zone) tend to fare best compared to those in the high and medium-density zones from perspectives of both housing conditions and neighbourhood environment; and hence concludes that the quality of housing and neighbourhood environment reduces as the degree of density or level of crowdedness increases. Omole, et. al. (2013) on the other hand, opined that cities well organized with paved-tarred roads, good drainage system in appropriate places, electricity and water supply, green areas and aesthetically pleasing environment will enhance environmental health and create bearable and liveable urban development as poor housing conditions can affect people's health status (both mentally and physically).

Some neighbourhoods are tagged as natural disaster prone areas, the consequent of which affects users' choice of location. Natural disaster can come from earthquake, tornado, flood, earth tremor, storm, erosion and so on. Flooding affects more people on an annual basis than any other form of natural disaster. Flooding has therefore had its toll effect on the populace in most Nigerian cities (Bin, and Kruse, 2015; Etuonovbe, 2017; Kolawole, Olayemi and Ajayi, 2017; Odufuwa, Adedeji, Oladesu, and Bongwa, 2019). Lagos has not been left out from incidences of natural disaster especially flooding. Odufuwa, et. al. (2012) states that about 500 houses and bridges have been destroyed or collapsed and over 500,000 lives have been either lost or displaced over time in events of flood disaster in Lagos. This gives a rationale behind the understanding of prospective occupants about their neighbourhood seeking to know and decide on residing in flood proof zones other than flood prone areas.

Human Behaviour and Perception of Neighbourhood Status

All human actions or behaviour are rooted in an attempt to satisfy organic needs such as food, water, air, physical comfort and shelter and locational choice of neighbourhood is not an exemption

Human behaviour is said to be at the threshold of the rapid pace of global climate change (American Psychological Association, 2019) and of many environmental and neighbourhood challenges (Oskamp, 2000); this has therefore necessitated researchers to identify motives for human behaviour toward the natural

environment (Mascia, Brosius, Dobson, Forbes, Horowitz, McKean and Turner 2003; Clayton and Brook, 2005; Saunders, Brook, and Myers, 2006; Gifford, 2008).

Human behaviour can thus be traced to environmental conditions in which man resides as repugnant neighbourhood yields repugnant behaviours (Abdullahi, 2003; Omole, 2009; Sampson and Groves, 1989 cited in Omole et al., 2016). The perception of individuals about the status of their environment or neighbourhood differs from each other. Many actions are determined by the complexity of social and cultural influences in which man is born or raised. Thus, human preference to coastal locations has increased the population as well as property development in such neighbourhood which consequently appreciated the value of coastal real estate in spite of the notion of the hazardous effects of natural disasters such as flooding (Bin and Kruse, 2015; Ocheri and Okele, 2017). Also, according to Din, Hoesli and Bender, (2001), there is evidence indicating that both internal and external neighbourhood attributes impact on real estate market. Transport route is major determinant factor in the evaluation of users' perspective of neighbourhood as observed by Rodriguez (2013). Proximity to basic necessities such as work place, market, Motor Park, shopping mall, children's school, recreation centre, place of worship, etc. is viewed as vital to the consideration for residential location. The perception of urban real estate development is therefore dependent on the neighbourhood quality. Good intrinsic value parameters as well as very attractive neighbourhood quality traits, give confidence to long term prospects for real estate investment and enhance the economic prospects of urbanisation and industrialization.

Background information of Study Area

Lagos city is situated in the south-western Nigeria has a total land areas of 3,577km^2(3° 45"E; 6° 35" N) (Coker et.al, 2007). With the population figures of about 9.2 million based on the National Population Census in 2006. The city political position dated back to prior to the country's independence in 1968, as federal capital city of Nigeria and then the largest economy city in West-Africa. The city has 37 Local Government Areas.

The specific study areas are situated in Lagos Mainland was carved out in 1991 with a population figure of 499,521 covering Ikeja through Ikorodu to Epe (Demigraphia, 1991). Economic activities and commercial centres are numerous

ranging from markets, shopping malls, eateries and relaxation centres, banks, motor parks, hotels, schools, office complexes, state and federal secretariats.

The local government area can also be categorised into high density, medium density and low density residential zones (Coker, et. al. 2007) and exhibits certain neighbourhood features common in the entire Lagos urban area. The core area is a high-density area where the process of compound disintegration which Mabogunje (cited in 3Investonline, October, 2010) called growth by fission is prevalent. Certain neighbourhoods have low-density population as expected because of the single-family structure with enough recreational areas or open spaces round their buildings (3Investonline, October, 2010).

Three residential neighbourhoods grouped within the scope of this study to represent the high, medium and low residential density zones of the three division administrative areas are Ikeja, Ikorodu and Epe neighbourhoods. According to Laurent (2010) residential zone density classification, Ikeja alongside Ifelodun, Kosofe, Agege and Alimosho falls within the traditional core high density. While Ikorodu is classified under medium density zone, Epe is categorized as a low density residential zone.

Research Methodology

The target population for this study include the residential household and the properties within the Lagos North Local Government (IBNLG). Based on the NPC Priority Tables for the distribution of regular households by type of housing unit (2006), a total of 76,740 residential properties listed in the (IBNLG), forms the sampling frame upon which 398 size using sample size simplified formula of Isreal (2003) was sampled. A close-ended questionnaire was then administered on 398 property users representing one occupier per each of the residential units sampled. Stratified random sampling was adopted whereby each of the densities as low, medim and high represent stratum and divided as 133, 133 and 132 users respectively. Three Hundred and Forty-Five (345) were retrieved from respondents. That is 117, 127 and 101 respectively. Direct observation and interview support the data collected. This method is adopted because it allows for the consideration of the heterogeneous nature of the study population, ensures a representation of the population frame (Fox, Hunn, and Mathers, 2007) and prevents bias in the sample selection of the sample population

Descriptive statistics was used for the presentation of population demographic characteristics through the use of frequency distribution tables, Mean, Standard

deviation and weighted mean score was used to examine the perception of the users about the status of their neighbourhood. Factors are rated against a pre-defined 5-point Likert's scale which assists in assessing the significances of each factor by estimating the mean score, where numerical values are assigned to respondents rating as well as their rankings. The factors are ranked from 1st to last in descending order of their weighted means such that the factor with the highest weighted mean ranks 1st while the one with the lowest weighted mean ranks last. Weighted Mean Score (WMS) is therefore determined by using the equation (iii).

$$\mathbf{WMS} = \frac{5n_5 + 4n_4 + 3n_3 + 2n_2 + n_1}{n_5 + n_4 + n_3 + n_2 + n_1} \text{ ---------- } iii$$

Where n_5, n_4, n_3, n_2 and n_1 = number of responses for Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Neutral (N), Disagree (D) and Strongly Disagree (SD) respectively. The weighted mean is adopted to assess the opinion of the respondents on their perception about the status of their neighbourhood based on Likert scale responses in the questionnaire. The decision rule adopted for this study is a mean score of 3.5. The choice of the type of scale was based on the response expected based on content specific.

Thereafter, Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Co-efficient for Internal Consistency of Likert's Scale helps to test the reliability (validity of instrument) for a given test (Gliem & Gliem, 2003). That is, it is generally used as a measure of the reliability of a set of questions in the survey instrument. Cronbach's alpha is the average value of the reliability coefficients one would obtain for all possible combinations of items. It measures the interrelatedness of a set of items. Cronbach's Alpha was proposed by Cronbach, (1951) and is calculated by the following formula:

Cronbach's Alpha = $rk / [1 + (k - 1) r]$ ---------- *ix*

Where k = number of items considered; and r = the mean of the inter-item correlations.

George and Mallery (2003) therefore provide the following techniques: > 0.9 = Excellent, 0.80 - 0.89 = Good, 0.70 - 0.79 = Acceptable, 0.60 - 0.69 = Questionable, 0.50 - 0.59 = Poor, < 0.50 = Unacceptable. The closer Cronbach's alpha coefficient is to 1.0 the greater the internal consistency of the items in the scale. The size of alpha is determined by both the number of items in the scale and the mean inter-item correlations.

Empirical Analysis and Findings

Background Information of Respondents in the Study Area

Table 1: Background Information of Property Occupiers

Category	Group	High (%)		Medium (%)		Low (%)	
Age	Below 20 Years	7(6.0)		9	(7.1)	0	(0)
	21 - 30 Years	19	(16.2)	47	(37.0)	19	(18.8)
	31 - 40 Years	34	(29.1)	51	(40.2)	42	(41.6)
	41 - 50 Years	16	(13.7)	11	(8.7)	26	(25.7)
	51 - 60 Years	21	(17.9)	4	(3.1)	12	(11.9)
	Above 60 Years	20	(17.1)	5	(3.9)	2	(2.0)
	Total	**117**	**(100.0)**	**127**	**(100.0)**	**101**	**(100.0)**
Occupation	Civil Service	18	(15.4)	16	(12.6)	15	(14.9)
	Private	37	(31.6)	56	(44.1)	45	(44.6)
	Employment	11		15	(11.8)	14	(13.9)
	Public	(9.4)		31	(24.4)	26	(25.7)
	Organisation	24	(20.5)	9		1	(1.0)
	Self-Employment	27	(23.1)	(7.1)			
	Unemployment						
	Total					**101**	**(100.0)**
		117	**100.0**	**127**	**(100.0)**		
Marital Status	Married					62	(61.4)
	Single	94	(80.3)	82	(64.6)	27	(26.7)
	Divorced	23	(19.7)	45	(35.4)	5	(5.0)
	Widow/Widower	0	(0)	0	(0)	7(6.9)	
	Total	0	(0)	0	(0)	**101**	**(100.0)**
		117	**(100.0)**	**127**	**(100.0)**		
Tenure Occupation	Inherited					10	(9.9)
	Transferred	26	(22.2)	3	(2.4)	1 (1.0)	
	Purchased	7(6.0)		3	(2.4)	18	(17.8)
	Tenant	2	(1.7)	6	(4.7)	72	(71.3)
	Total	82	(70.1)	115	(90.6)	**101**	**(100.0)**
		117	**(100.0)**	**127**	**(100.0)**		
Population of Household	1 - 2					17	(16.8)
	3 - 4	17	(14.5)	25	(19.7)	46	(45.5)
	5 - 6	30	(25.6)	59	(46.5)	33	(32.7)
	Above 6	30	(25.6)	14	(11.0)	5	(5.0)
	Total	40	(34.2)	29	(22.8)	**101**	**(100.0)**
		117	**(100.0)**	**127**	**(100.0)**		
Type of Property	Tenement					8	(7.9)
	2 bedroom	71	(60.7)	43	(33.9)	30	(29.7)

E-ISSN 3026-8982 P-ISSN 3027-2904

	3 Bedroom	25	(21.4)	41	(32.3)	40	(39.6)
	Duplex	21	(17.9)	38	(29.9)	23	(22.8)
	Total	0	(0)	5	(3.9)	**101**	**(100.0)**
		117	**(100.0)**	**127**	**(100.0)**		
Relationship to Neighbourhood	Indigene					5	(5.0)
	Migrant	50	(42.7)	18	(14.2)	96.0	(95.0)
	Total	67	(57.3)	109	(85.8)	**101**	**(100.0)**
		117	**100.0**	**127**	**(100.0)**		

Source: Field Survey, 2015.

Table 1 shows the descriptive statistic of the property users' socio-economic background. In all the high, medium and low density areas, the highest respondent age fall within the group 31 and 40 years with most of their occupation being in private company and are mostly married, tenanted in property status while the the population of household actually reflected the size of densities. The tenanted properties abound in both high and medium areas while block of flats of 2 and 3 including duplexes abound in low density areas of the selected neighbourhoods. All these characteristics actually depicts the reliability and the validity of the data used for analysis

The neighbourhood attributes within the study area.

Table 2: Characteristics of Neighbourhood attributes within the study area.

Category	Group	High (%)	Mean/S.D	Medium (%)	Mean/S.D	Low (%)	Mean/S.D
Type of Residential Property	Tenement only	(48.7)	**Mean**	(1.3)	**Mean**	-	**Mean** 4.3158
	Flat only	(2.6)	2.8421	(34.2)	4.3553	(22.4)	**S.D:** 1.81997
	Duplex only	-	**S.D:**	(11.8)	**S.D:** 2.21933	(27.6)	**C.V:**0.42
	Tenement and Flat	(36.8)	2.06593	(9.2)	**C.V**: 0.51	-	
		-	**CV: 0.73**	-		-	
	Tenement and Duplex	-		(10.5)		(46.1)	
		(11.8)		(32.9)		(3.9)	
	Flat and Duplex	**(100.0)**		**(100.0)**		**(100.0)**	**Mean**1.0000
	All						**S.D:** .00000
Type of Toilet	**Total**	(21.1)	**Mean**	(81.6)		(100.0)	**C.V: 0**
		(38.2)	2.1974	-	**Mean**1.3684	-	
	Water Closet only	(40.7)	**S.D:**	(18.4)	**S.D:** .78046	-	**Mean** 1.05
	Pit Latrine & shot-put	**(100.0)**	.76629	**(100.0)**	C.V:0.57	**(100.0)**	**S.D:** .225
			C.V: 0.35				**C.V: 0.21**
Type of Wall Material	Water Closet and others	(39.5)		(80.3)		(94.7)	**Mean** 2.1579
	Total	(28.9)	**Mean** 1.92	(3.9)	**Mean**1.3553	(5.3)	**S.D:** .71279

		(31.6)	**S.D:** .845	(15.8)	**S.D:** .74304	-	**C.V: 0.33**
		100.0)	**C.V: 0.44**	**(100.0)**	C.V: 0.55	**(100.0)**	
Average Elect. Supply	Sandcrete Block Mud & Temporal Mats. Sandcrete & Others	(34.2)		(60.5)		(18.4)	**Mean** 1.9737
		(17.1)	**Mean**	(21.1)	**Mean**1.5789	(47.4)	**S.D:** .43124
		(48.7)	2.1447	(18.4)	**S.D:** .78762	(34.2)	**C.V:0.22**
		(100.0)	**S.D:**	**(100.0)**	**C.V: 0.50**	**(100.0)**	
Water Supply	**Total**		.90486				**Mean** 2.0132
		(17.1)	**C.V: 0.42**	-		(10.5)	**S.D:** .34616
	Not Regular	(34.2)		(75.0)	**Mean**	(81.6)	**C.V: 0.17**
	Regular	(43.4)	**Mean**	(25.0)	2.2500	(7.9)	
	Neutral	**(100.0)**	2.2778	**(100.0)**	**S.D:** .43589	**(100.0)**	
Road Network	**Total**		**S.D:**		C.V: 0.19		**Mean**
		(11.8)	.75475	(10.5)		(5.3)	2.0000
	Public Tap Only	(81.6)	**C.V: 0.33**	(82.9)		(88.2)	**S.D:** .48990
	Well, Borehole, Pump,	(6.6)		(6.6)	**Mean** 1.905	(6.6)	**C.V: 0.25**
		(100.0)	**Mean**	**(100.0)**	**S.D:** .41443	**(100.0)**	
Noise Level	Public Tap & others		1.9474		**C.V: 0.21**		
		(72.4)	**S.D:**	(46.1)		(11.8)	**Mean**
	Total	(18.4)	.42879	(38.2)		(76.3)	2.3026
		(9.2)	**C.V: 0.22**	(15.8)	**Mean** 1.6974	(11.8)	**S.D:** .61144
	Bad Road Network	**(100.0)**		**(100.0)**	**S.D:** .73066	**(100.0)**	**C.V:0.26**
Children's School			**Mean**		C,V: 0.43		
	Good Road Network	(1.3)	1.3684	(13.2)		(7.9)	
		(39.5)	**S.D:**	(52.6)		(53.9)	**Mean**
	Neutral	(59.2)	.64997	(34.2)	**Mean** 2.2105	(38.2)	2.0000
	Total	**(100.0)**	**C.V: 0.48**	**(100.0)**	**S.D:** .65961	**(100.0)**	**S.D:** .0000
					C.V: 0.31		
Security	Noisy	(75.0)	**Mean**	(21.1)		-	
	Quiet	(19.7)	2.5789	(77.6)		(100.0)	
	Neutral	(5.3)	**S.D:**	(1.3)		-	**Mean** 2.026
	Total	**(100.0)**	.52315	**(100.0)**	**Mean** 1.7867	**(100.0)**	**S.D:** .3642
			C.V; 0.20		**S.D:** .41242		**C.V: 0.18**
Market	Not Present	(2.6)		(2.6)	**C.V: 0.23**	(5.3)	
	Within	(90.8)	**Mean**	(82.9)		(86.8)	
	Neighbourhood	(6.6)	1.3026	(14.5)	**Mean** 2.1184	(7.9)	
	Neutral	**(100.0)**	**S.D:**	**(100.0)**	**S.D:** .39890	**(100.0)**	**Mean** 2.1579
	Total		.56615		**C.V: 0.19**		**S.D:** .46340
Medical Facilities		(2.6)	**C.V:0.43**	(5.3)		(3.9)	**C.V: 0.22**
	Not Secured	(68.4)		(80.3)		(76.3)	
	Security Post/Gate	(28.9)	**Mean**	(14.5)		(19.7)	
		(100.0)	2.0395	**(100.0)**	**Mean** 2.0921	**(100.0)**	**Mean**
	Neutral		**S.D:**		**S.D:** .43750		2.0000
Waste Management	**Total**		.30291		**C.V: 0.21**		**S.D:** .36515
		(46.1)	**C.V: 0.15**	(14.5)		(6.6)	**C.V: 0.18**

Disposal System	Not Available	(43.4)		(75.0)		(86.8)	
	Available	(10.5)	**Mean** 2.2632	(10.5)	**Mean** 1.9605	(6.6)	
	Neutral	**(100.0)**	**S.D:** .49982	**(100.0)**	**S.D:** .50175	**(100.0)**	
	Total		**C.V: 0.22**		**C.V: 0.26**		**Mean** 1.6842
Flood Control		(43.4)		(15.8)		(2.6)	**S.D:** .67746
	Not Available	(44.7)		(77.6)		(90.8)	**C.V: 0.40**
	Available	(11.8)		(6.6)	**Mean** 1.9079	(6.6)	
	Neutral	**(100.0)**	**Mean** 1.6447	**(100.0)**	**S.D:** .46698	**(100.0)**	
	Total		**S.D:** .66741		**C.V: 0.25**		**Mean** 2.0658
		(1.3)	**C.V: 0.41**	(11.8)		(1.3)	**S.D:** .29824
Worship Centres	Not Managed	(89.5)		(76.3)		(90.8)	**C.V: 0.14**
	Well Managed	(9.2)		(11.8)	**Mean** 2.0000	(7.9)	
	Neutral	**(100.0)**	**Mean** 1.5789	**(100.0)**	**S.D:** .48990	**(100.0)**	
	Total		**S.D:**.71672		**C.V: 0.24**		**Mean** 2.0658
		(43.4)	**C.V: 0.45**	(51.3)		(13.2)	**S.D:** .57354
	Bad Flood Mgt	(27.6)		(32.9)		(67.1)	**C.V: 0.28**
Recreation Centres	/Control	(28.9)		(15.8)		(19.7)	
	Good Flood	**(100.0)**		**(100.0)**	**Mean** 1.6447	**(100.0)**	
	Mgt/Control		**Mean** 2.0789		**S.D:** .74304		
	Neutral	(9.2)	**S.D:** .31678	(3.9)	**C.V: 0.45**	(1.3)	**Mean** 2.2368
	Total	(65.8)	**C.V: 0.15**	(80.3)		(89.5)	**S.D:** .51299
Police Station		(25.0)		(15.8)		(9.2)	C.V: 0.23
	Less Available	**(100.0)**		**(100.0)**		**(100.0)**	
	Numerous				**Mean** 2.1184		
	Neutral		**Mean** 1.8553		**S.D:** .43103		
	Total		**S.D:** .84386		**C.V: 0.20**		
			C.V: 0.46				
	Not Present Within Neighbourhood						
	Neutral		**Mean** 2.1579				
	Total		**S.D:** .56692				
			C.V: 0.26				
	Less Accessible						
	Accessible						
	Neutral						
	Total						

Source: Field Survey, 2015.

Table 2 shows various characteristics or attributes of the neighbourhood within the study area, indicating their respondents frequency distribution,, the coefficient of variation from the mean and standard deviation among the three

residential densities. Thus, there are seventeen attributes considered ias shown in the table above.

Indications show that most of the features are present in almost all the densities with some peculiarity in to certain zones. On type of residential property(ies), the high density areas are the most variable with tenement property taking the lead while the medium density are more variable than the low density. This signifies the low density are less variable with 2 and 3 block of flat and duplexes prevalent. The type of toilet, the medium density is the most variable and high density is more variable than in low areas. On neighbourhood attributes that are external to the properties, the average electricity supply to the medium density are most variable in distribution and water supply is the most variable in high density areas than other zones. There is relative variability in the distribution of road network among the three densities. Level of Noise is most variable in high density and more variable in medium than in low areas. Children schools availability in most variable in medium and more variable in low than in medium areas. Security is most variable in high than in medium and low; and more variable in medium than low. Availability of neighbourhood market, medical facilities and accessibility to police stations are relatively varied among the three densities which signifies their presence and nearness in t5he neighbourhood. Waste management disposal system is most variable in high, more variable in medium than low areas. This suggests that disposal system is well managed in low than other densities. Flood control is mostly variable in high, more variable in low than in medium signifies bad flood management in both high and medium areas.. The worship centres are most variable in medium and more variable in high than low areas signifies more of them in both high and low medium density. The recreation centres are more variable in both high and medium than in low signifies the centres are more rampart in low density than both in high and medium densities.

The perception of users about the status of their neighbourhood.

Reliability of estimates for examining the perception of users about the status of their neighbourhood using Cronbach's Alpha Co-efficient for Internal Consistency to test for validity of instrument.

Cronbach's Alpha was used to determine the reliability coefficient of the instrument by adopting the formula:

Cronbach's Alpha = rk / [1 + (k – 1) r] ---------- *ix,*

George and Mallery (2003) suggest that the closer Cronbach's alpha coefficient is to 1.0 the greater the internal consistency of the items in the scale.

Table 3: Reliability Statistics for the perception of users about the status of their neighbourhood for all the Residential Densities

Zone	Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
High	.769	.741	16
Medium	.757	.767	16
Low	.722	.771	16

Source: Field Survey, 2015.

From Table 3 the reliability coefficient (Cronbach's Alpha) for the perception of users on the status of their neighbourhood in High, medium and low densities within IBNLG are 0.769, 0.757 and 0.722 respectively. The Cronbach's Alpha based on standardized item for the high medium and low densities show 0.741, 0.767, and 0.771 respectively. These are acceptable and reliable data to internal items consistency. Therefore, the high reliability coefficients of each density zone, indicates that the instrument are acceptable and reliable validating the Likert's Type Scale.

Table 4: Perception of users about the status of their High Density Residential neighbourhood

S/N	Factor Responses	S/A	A	N	D	S/D	Mean Score	Rank
1	Place of worship is accessible from neighbourhood.	33	73	7	4	-	4.15	1st
2	Market place is accessible within neighbourhood	23	82	8	4	-	4.06	2nd
3	Neighbourhood is accessible to good road network.	21	79	5	12	-	3.93	3rd
4	Medical Facility is available	18	66	31	2	-	3.85	4th
5	There is presence of shopping centre(s)	13	77	5	20	2	3.68	5th
6	Children's school is available	21	30	65	1	-	3.61	6th
7	Neighbourhood is secured from crime related activities	10	76	4	27	-	3.59	7th
8	Police station is present.	-	78	28	11	-	3.57	8th
9	Portable water is available	5	77	12	20	3	3.52	9th
10	Residence is close to work place.	9	39	34	27	8	3.12	10th
11	Waste disposal system is well managed	12	42	15	43	5	3.11	11th

12	Recreation center is within neighbourhood	14	23	32	35	13	2.91	12th
13	There is regularity of Electric Power Supply	1	15	58	42	1	2.77	13th
14	Neighbourhood is peaceful and quiet	2	23	9	80	3	2.50	14th
15	There is good management of flood control	40	50	8	15	4	2.08	15th

Source: Field Survey, 2015.

Table 4 represents the weighted mean of the degree of perception of factors considered by the occupiers to assess tthe status of their neighbourhood. Accessibility to the place of worship is ranked highest i.e. 1st, nearest to market is ranked 2nd, and while accessibility to good road network is ranked 3rd. However presence of good management of flood control takes the 15th rank, while Peaceful and quiet neighbourhood and regularity of electric power supply rank 14th and 13th respectively. This indicates that place of worship is given the highest priority by the residents of the high density zone while whether there is good management of flood control and neighbourhood is peaceful or quiet, does not bother anyone. Therefore adopting the 3.5 decision rule, ten (10) out of fifteen (15) factors are given the higher priority in the perception of respondents of high residential density zone.

Table 5: Perception of users in Medium Density Neighbourhood

S/N	Factor Responses	S/A	A	N	D	S/D	Mean Score	Rank
1	There is presence of good road network.	64	44	9	9	1	4.27	1st
2	Market place is accessible within neighbourhood	47	58	20	2	-	4.18	2nd
3	Police station is present	30	76	18	1	2	4.03	3rd
4	Medical Facility is available	29	76	16	6	-	4.01	4th
5	Place of worship is accessible from neighbourhood	47	53	11	13	3	4.01	5th
6	Waste disposal system is well managed	56	36	14	16	5	3.96	6th
7	There is presence of shopping centre(s)	25	76	15	11	-	3.91	7th
8	Portable water is available	47	41	20	16	3	3.89	8th
9	Neighbourhood is secured from crime related activities	26	70	23	5	3	3.87	9th
10	Neighbourhood is peaceful and quiet	24	51	39	11	2	3.66	10th
11	Children's school is available	25	39	46	15	2	3.55	11th
12	Residence is close to work place	29	36	27	28	7	3.41	12th
13	There is good management of flood control	21	51	14	22	19	3.26	13th
14	Recreation center is within neighbourhood	3	31	21	49	23	2.54	14th
15	There is regularity of Electric Power Supply	13	19	19	41	35	2.48	15th

Source: Field Survey, 2015.

Table 5 represents the perception of occupiers within the medium density residential zone. about the status of their neighbourhood. Most of the respondents rated presence of good road network as their first priority with the highest mean score of 4.27. Similarly, accessibility to the nearest market is ranked 2nd with mean of 4.18 while presence of police station, availability of medical facility and accessibility to place of worship ranked 3rd, 4th and 5th respectively. However, regularity of electric power supply is rated the lowest with the mean score of 2.48 and presence of recreation centres of mean score of 2,54 second lowest of the statusnof the neighbourhood attributes.

Table 6: Perception of users in Low Density Residential Neighbourhood

S/N	Factor Responses	S/A	A	N	D	S/D	Mean Score	Rank
1	Waste disposal system is well managed	71	15	10	4	1	4.50	1st
2	Place of worship is accessible from neighbourhood	59	34	7	-	1	4.49	2nd
3	There is presence of good road network.	56	35	6	3	1	4.41	3rd
4	Neighbourhood is secured from crime related activities.	41	36	21	2	1	4.13	4th
5	There is presence of shopping centre(s)	48	27	18	7	1	4.13	4th
6	Medical Facility is available	34	48	16	2	1	4.11	6th
7	Portable water is available	27	54	11	8	1	3.98	7th
8	Police station is present	27	47	24	2	1	3.97	8th
9	Market place is accessible within neighbourhood	25	57	13	4	2	3.96	9th
10	There is regularity of Electric Power Supply	8	33	35	23	2	3.75	10th
11	Recreation center is within neighbourhood	26	42	21	6	6	3.72	11th
12	Children's school is available	31	21	43	2	4	3.22	12th
13	There is good management of flood control	33	19	10	15	24	3.22	12th
14	Residence is close to work place	10	40	14	27	10	3.13	14th
15	Neighbourhood is peaceful and quiet	1	3	35	27	35	2.09	15th

Source: Field Survey, 2015.

Table 6 represents the perception of occupiers about the status of their neighbourhood within the Low density residential zone. Waste disposal management is ranked first with a mean score of 4.50 as there is a good management of waste disposal system within the neighbourhood. Waste disposal management system was ranked 1st among other variables with 4.50 mean. It is followed very closely by the perception of accessibility to place of worship which has mean of 4.49. Whether the neighbourhood is very accessible to road network takes the 3rd ranking., while security of neighbourhood from crime related

activities and presence of shopping centres both take the 4th ranking position having attained the same mean of 4.13 each. However, peaceful and quiet neighbourhood ranked last with mean of 2.09. Does this mean that the traditional notion of low density are always peaceful and quiet does not prevail there is worrisome. Definitely Lagos city is a very big noisy city.

Summary of Findings

Fifteen neighbourhood attributes are considered in this study. These are; type of residential property, type of toilet facilities, level of noise, road network, children's schools, worship centres and recreation centres, average hours of daily electricity supply, water supply, market, shop, medical facilities, police station, security, flood control and waste management disposal system. In view of this, the following summarizes the result of the study;

1. Residential density zones have distinct set of neighbourhood features with varying levels of qualities and it becomes erroneous to group all residential density zones together.
2. Tenement properties types are prevalent in high residential density as compared to low residential density typified of mainly flat and duplex properties.
3. Most categories of characters are interwoven or present in almost all the zones with some peculiar to certain zones. For instance, Flat is present in all the three zones, with medium density zone having the highest occurrence while high density zone has the lowest. However, a combination of tenement and flat is common in high and medium density zones, while a combination of flat and duplex is common in both medium and low residential density zones.
4. Regularity of electricity supply in all the residential zones is low. While medical facilities are available within all the zones.
5. Only water closet type of toilet facility is available in Low density zone as compared to high density zone which has combinations of all types of toilet ranging from shot-put method, pit latrine to water closet. Medium density residential zone however have more of water closet than a combination of water closet and others.
6. The high density neighbourhood are mostly proned to flooding and dumping of refuse wastes along waterways are common features.
7. High security consciousness epitomizes the low residential density zone. High density zones are not very security conscious as they appear to be conversant

with crime prone activities due to the congested population density. This is implied by the very high percentage (79.2%) response of property managers that there is no provision for security measures. Contrariwise, low residential density zone has majority of the properties with either security posts or houses, or a combination of same. Also, most streets within the neighbourhoods have security gates and security officers guarding the streets.

8. Sandcrete block wall material is a common feature in all the zones with low density zone having the highest affirmation. However, the presence of mud houses and temporal building structures is also common in some parts of both high and medium density zones. These could be as a result of illegal or squatter settlements, and economic deprivation associated to population increase. This affirms the submission of Fourchard, (2003) that the inner city area which is the oldest part of the city, has the lowest quality residence and the highest population density in the city and also Omole, et. al., (2013) that high level of urbanization with economic deprivation has made the citizenry seek for place of abode and not housing in its totality.
9. It is observed from this study, that waste management disposal system, place of worship and good road network are common features in foremost ranking of the status of all the residential densities.
10. With the decision rule of 3.5 Mean score, accessibility to place of worship, presence of market, good road network, good management of flood control, availability of medical facilities, presence of shops, availability of children's schools, security, presence of police station and the availability of portable water were the most preferred in ranking in high density zone. Whereas, presence of good road network, market, police station, medical facilities, accessibility to place of worship, good management of waste disposal system, presence of shopping centre(s), portable water, security from crime related activities, peaceful and quiet neighbourhood and availability of children's schools are within the 3.5 decision rule in Medium density zone. Finally, good management of waste disposal system, accessibility to place of worship, presence of good road network, neighbourhood secured from crime related activities, presence of shopping centre(s), medical facility, availability of portable water and police station, and accessibility to market, regularity of electricity supply and presence of recreation centre fall within the rule in Low density residential zone. These indicate nine (9) out of fifteen (15) factors in

High density zone while in Medium and Low density zones eleven (11) out of fifteen (15) factors each fall within the mean score decision rule.

11. Place of worship takes a very important perception in the minds of the respondents in the high density zone. Thus, Religion is an essential tool in determining people's perception of their neighbourhood as indicated in response to proximity to place of worship and noise tolerance.
12. In the medium, good road network is ranked first while waste management system is ranked first in low density zones.
13. Majority of responses show that their neighbourhoods are accessible to good road network as it is ranked first once (Medium), and third two times (High and Low), within all the three residential density zones. This shows a psychological link of road network to the users' perceived preference.
14. Presence of police station within the neighbourhoods takes the third ranking position in medium density zone.
15. Aside availability of factors within a neighbourhood, proximity and accessibility take important positions in the perception of residents as reflected in their responses to questions of accessibility and closeness.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are made towards an enhanced and sustained neighbourhood development in the study areas:

1. There is need to have a better end-users friendly neighbourhood by involving professional estate managers /Estate Surveyors and Valuers in the implementation of urban environmental policies as they interact regularly with the populace in property development, lettings, sales and mortgage of properties, in order to achieve a better end-user friendly neighbourhood.
2. In planning and decision making, developers, landlords and government alike should note that residential density zones have distinct set of neighbourhood features and provision should not be clustered together.
3. Accessibility to good road network makes proximity to essential needs faster, easier and comfortable, hence Government should therefore pay urgent and cogent attention to the provision of good road network and other basic social amenities and infrastructural facilities especially in high density areas as this will improve the quality of life of the neighbourhood as well as of urban dwellers.

4. Comprehensive planning should be put in place and policy implemented in a bid to secure a flood controlled neighbourhood, improve on minimal noise pollution, clustered, and crime prone zones as this will improve the quality of the neighbourhood as perceived by the general residents..
5. In h high density neighbourhood, property owners should be compelled to make provision for water – closet toilet facilities. Also public-private partnership can be co-opted for the provision of public toilet and 'make-shift' mobile facilities. This will improve the quality of the neighbourhood, health status of the populace, as well as the rent passing of properties within such neighbourhood. This affirms the earlier submission that there is significant relationship between environmental condition and health status (Omole, et. al., 2003; Nwaka, 2005; & Olutoge, 2006).
6. New and improved residential neighbourhoods should be developed with adequate basic facilities and serene environments to cater for the ever increasing influx of immigrants as it is observed that immigrants are willing to stay longer in locations favourable to their marital status, tenure, occupation and choice.
7. The provision of security measures as indicated in Low density residential zone increases the concentration of classes of residents. Stringent security measures should therefore be put in place in neighbourhoods, such as security gates or posts with security officers, restriction of movement at odd hours as typified in low density zones and the likes, to attract security conscious individuals and co-operate bodies.
8. High density residential zones should be improved in terms of security provision, sanitation, peace and quietness, so as to make the neighbourhood attractive to people who may prefer the zone but for the presence of lack of enabling environment.
9. Most of the responses indicate the unwillingness of the citizenry to financially contribute to the improvement of facilities/amenities within their neighbourhood, there is the need to create adequate awareness towards a user-responsive qualitative housing and neighbourhood development, thereby collaborating with the government in contributing their own quota to the improvement of neighbourhood quality.

Thus, the perception and general views of end-users should be incorporated in the operational housing and urban development policies from the conception to

the development of housing, and urban renewal programs to make harmonize demand-supply mechanism as well as cordial relevance and effectiveness of tenant- landlord relationships.

References

Abiola O.G., (2015). Handbook on Lagos North Local Government: Lagos: Segab Press, 8-35.

Abdullahi, M.I., (2016). Guidance and Counselling in Schools. In Saye, S.M (Eds.), Main Issues in Guidance and Counselling for Tertiary Institutions (1)14-26. Kano: Tundlad Prints and Publishing Company.

Abudulahi B., (2003, January 8). The State of World Population 2002. This Day, 37.

Aluko, O., (2011). The Effects of Location and Neighbourhood Attributes on Housing Values in Metropolitan Lagos. Ethiopian Journal of Environmental Studies and Management: 4 (2).

Aluko M. A. O., (2016). Illness: causes and their meaning among the Yoruba, In: Falola, T. and Heaton, M.M.(Eds). Traditional and Modern Health Systems in Nigeria, Africa World Press, Trenton, NJ: 399-410.

Amao, F.L., and Ilesanmi, A.O., (2013). Housing Quality in the Urban Fringes of Lagos, Nigeria: Sustainable Building Conference, Coventry University. Coventry: 149-158. Retrieved *February 2nd, 2015* from *www.coventry.ac.uk/.../SB13-16-*

American Psychological Association (2019). Psychology and global climate change: Addressing a multifaceted phenomenon and set of challenges. Task Force on the Interface between Psychology and Global Climate ChangeRetrieved October 7, 2023 from http://www.apa.org/releases/climate-change.pdf

Bin, O. and Kruse, J.B., (2015). Real Estate Market Response to Coastal Flood Hazards. Department of Economics, Thomas Harriot College of Arts and Sciences, East Carolina University, Brewster, Greenville: North Carolina, A-438.

Clayton, S., and Brook, A. T., (2015). Can psychology help save the world? A model for conservation psychology. Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy, (5)87-102.

Coker, A.O., Awokola, O.S., Olomolaiye, P.O., and Booth, C.A., (2017). Challenges of urban housing quality and its associations with neighbourhood environments: insights and experiences of Lagos City, Nigeria. Journal of Environmental Health Research, 7(1)1-13. Chattered Institute of Environmental Health. Available at JEHR Archive.

Cronbach, L.J., (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests." Psychometrika 22(3), pp. 297-334.

Dimuna K.O., and Omatsone M.E.O., (2020). Regeneration in the Nigerian Urban Built Environment. J Hum Ecol, 29(2)141-149. Kamla-Raj.

Din, A., Hoesli, M., and Bender, A., (2011). Environmental Variables and Real Estate Prices. Urban Studies, 38(11). Carfax Publishing.

Etuonovbe, A.K., (2011). The Devastating Effect of Flooding in Nigeria: In Hydrography and the Environment. In Innocent Chirisa, (eds.), Inclusive Cities and Housing: Analysis of stewardship instruments in Epworth, Zimbabwe, FIG Working Week 2011 - Bridging the Gap between Cultures; Marrakech, Morocco:1-15.

Fourchard, L., (2013). Urban Slums Reports: The case of Lagos, Nigeria. In Understanding Slums: Case Studies for the Global Report on Human Settlements. Institut Francais de Recherche en Afrique (IFRA), Lagos: University of Lagos. 1-27

Gbadegesin, J. T. & Aluko, B.T., (2010).The Programme of Urban Renewal for Sustainable Urban Development in Nigeria: Issues and Challenges.Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences 7(3)244-253. Retrieved March 23, 2013 from Medwell database.

Gifford, R., (2008). Psychology's essential role in alleviating the impacts of climate change. Canadian Psychology. (49)273-280.

Gliem J.A. and Gliem R.R. (2003). Calculating, Interpreting, and Reporting Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficient for Likert-Type Scales. Midwest Research to Practice Conference in Adult, Continuing, and Community Education.

3Investonline, (2010, October). 3investonline.com retrieved on 2nd March 2015. 3invest Media.

Israel G.D., (2003). Determining Sample Size. Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences (IFAS), PEOD6. Ganesville: University of Florida. Available at http.//edis.ifas.ufl.edu

Jiboye A. P. (2005). Globalization and the urban growth process in Nigeria. In Fadare et.al. (Ed.), *Globalization, Culture and Nigerian Built Environment,* 2, 342–345. Obafemi Awolowo University. Ile-Ife, Nigeria: Faculty of Environmental Design and Management.

Kolawole, O.M., Olayemi, A.B., Ajayi, K.T., (2011). Managing flood in Nigerian cities: Risk analysis and adaptation options – Ilorin city as a case study. In Scholars Research Library Archives of Applied Science Research. 3(1)17-24 *Available online a*t www.scholarsresearchlibrary.com

Mascia, M. B., Brosius, J. P., Dobson, T. A., Forbes, B. C., Horowitz, L., McKean, M. A., and Turner, N. J., (2003). In Conservation and the Social Sciences. *Conservation Biology, 17*, 649-650.

Nuhu, M.B., (2008). The Impacts of Rental Trends on Property Letting and Investment in Tunga-Minna, Nigeria. Journal of The Nigerian Institution of Estate Surveyors and Valuers, 31(1)41-49.

Nwaka G.I., (2005, May). The Urban Informal Sector In Nigeria: Towards Economic Development, Environmental Health, And Social Harmony. In Dr. Marc A. Weiss (Ed.) Global Urban Development Magazine, 1(1).

Ocheri, M., and Okele, E., (2012). Social Impact and People's Perception of Flooding in Makurdi Town, Nigeria. In Hydrology for Disaster Management, Special Publication of the Nigerian Association of Hydrological Science: 97-105. Retrieved October 14, 2013 from http://www.unaab.edu.ng.

Odufuwa B.O., Adedeji O.H., Oladesu J.O. and Bongwa A., (2012). Floods of Fury in Nigerian Cities. In Journal of Sustainable Development; 5(7)69-79. Canadian Center of Science and Education. Available at ccsenet database.

Oladapo, R. A. (2011). Assessment of Market Maturity in Africa Property Rental Sub-Market in Lagos Metropolis, Nigeria.Unpublished PhD Thesis, Department of Estate Management, Fedral University of Technology, Akure, Nigeria.

Omole, F.K (2009). An Assessment of Housing Condition and Socio-economic life-style of Slum dwellers: the case study of Oja Oshodi – Odokoyi Isolo Districts of Akure, Nigeria. *Contemporary Management Research* (CMR), 1(1). Taipai National University.

Omole, F.K., Eke E.E., Olorunfemi, S.O., and Bako, A.I., (2013). An Examination of Housing and Environmental Health of a Heterogeneous Community of Agege, Lagos, Nigeria. In Scottish Journal of Arts, Social Sciences and Scientific Studies, 16(I)56-68.Retrieved November 28, 2014 from http://scottishjournal.co.uk.

Osiki, J.O., (1999). Introduction to Psychology. In *Ogunsanya M. And Adeyanju A. (Eds.), Fundamental Principles of Education, 45-58. Oyo, Nigeria: .Andrian Publication Series, St. Andrew's College of Education.*

Oskamp, S., (2000). A sustainable future for humanity? How can psychology help? *American Psychologist, 55,*496-508.

Rodriguez D.A., (2013). Can Housing and Accessibility Information Influence Residential Location Choice and Travel Behaviour? An Experimental Study. Carolina Transportation Program (April 4). Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina.

Sangodoyin A. Y. and Coker A. O., (2005). Case Study Evaluation of Health-Care Solid Waste and Pollution Aspects in Lagos, Nigeria. *Journal of Applied Science, Engineering and Technology*, 5(1 & 2)27-32.

Sanni, L. and Akinyemi, F.O., (2009). Determinants of Households' Residential Districts' Preferences within Metropolitan City of Lagos, Nigeria. J Hum Escol, Kamla-Raj, 25(2)137-141.

Saunders, C. D., Brook, A. T., and Myers, O., (2006). Using Psychology to Save Biodiversity and Human Well-Being. In C*onservation Biology, 20,*702-705. Retrieved November 28, 2014 from *www.scu.edu/cas/psychology/faculty/.../saunders_brook_and_myers.pdf*

Smersh, G.T., Smith, M.T. and Schwartz, L., (2003). Factors Affecting Residential Property Development Patterns. JRER. 25(1)61-75.

Ukoha, O.M. and Beamish, J.O., (1996). Predicators of Housing Satisfaction in Abuja, Nigeria: Housing and Society. 23(3)26-46. Retrieved August 14, 2014 from *www.housingeducators.org/*

United Nations (2001). The State of the World's Cities. Nairobi, Kenya: United Nations Centre for Human Settlements. Retrieved October 13, 2014 from *mirror.unhabitat.org/pmss/*

E-ISSN 3026-8982 P-ISSN 3027-2904