www.ees.uni.opole.pl
ISSN paper version 1642-2597
ISSN electronic version 2081-8319
Economic and Environmental Studies
Vol. 17, No. 4 (44/2017), 757-775, December 2017

Assessment of Residents' Neighbourhood Confidence in an African Traditional City: The Abeokuta Experience

Oluwaseun OLOWOPOROKU, Adetayo SALAMI and Olamide AKINTIFONBO

Department of Urban and Regional Planning, Obafemi Awolowo University Ile-Ife Nigeria

Abstract: This study examined the socio-economic attributes of respondents, their level of satisfaction with available infrastructure and services and intra-urban variation in residents level of neighbourhood confidence in Abeokuta Nigeria. The stratified residential zones are the older residential areas, newer residential areas and the Government Reserved Areas (GRA). A total of 123 residents were selected for survey using systematically sampling technique. The study revealed that residents' socio-economic attributes such as income and educational status varied significantly with different residential areas. Findings revealed that there is low level of satisfaction with available facilities and services as they rated 2.9, 2.9 and 3.4 in the older, newer and GRA residential areas. Similarly, the mean neighbourhood confidence indices for the older residential area, newer residential area and GRA were 3.3, 2.9 and 3.7 respectively. The most important factor that increased residents' confidence in the newer residential area and GRA was conducive physical environment for child raising with indices 3.6 and 4.2 respectively, while the most important factor that increased residents' confidence in the older residential area was social cohesion. It recommended government provision of environmental amenities across the residential areas as well as encouragement of home ownership through the provision of housing schemes at low prices and interest rate.

Keywords: neighbourhood, confidence, residential area, GRA, facilities, services, Abeokuta

JEL codes: O1, O18

https://doi.org/10.25167/ees.2017.44.8

Correspondence Address: O. A. Olowoporoku, Department of Urban and Regional Planning, Obafemi Awolowo University Ile-Ife Nigeria. Phone +234 8063874056. E-mail: oluwaseunayodele6@gmail.com

1. Introduction

Globally, neighbourhoods have become the habitat for the teeming population (Islam, 2007; Sam, Rayram and Bilgel, 2012). Neighbourhood environment in urban areas are vital to the survival of man. According to European Union (2001) a neighbourhood is defined as a physical space which a complex interplay exist between different activities and actions forms the living conditions for people residing there. In another parlance, a neighbourhood is defined as an area having several thousand residents covering an area that people can walk across (Freiler, 2004; Kingsely, 1999; Ross, 2000). Neighbourhoods create the physical and social environment for interaction among residents which help shape notions about community and individual perception of their wider social space (Swatt, Varano and Uchida, 2012). Neighbourhood invariably shape the future of cities (Temkim and Rohe, 1996).

Confidence is the ability to trust or believe in something. Therefore neighbourhood confidence can be defined as the feeling of trust for a community resulting from expectations. Jano (und) defined neighbourhood confidence as a long term and optimistic view that the future of the neighbourhood will either remain stable and positive or show a sign of marked improvement, ability of residents to remain (socially and economically) and to defend the fabrics of place of residence. Neighbourhood confidence breeds attachment between the person and the environment as a whole (Bonaiuto et al, 2003). Therefore neighbourhood confidence is not only embedded in attachment but also residents expected security in a neighbourhood.

As opined by Hollister et al (1978) and Bonaiuto (2004), neighbourhood confidence stresses residents' opinion about the future of their neighbourhood, perception of change in the neighbourhood, neighbourhood satisfaction and factors influencing their choice of stay and attachment in the neighbourhood. Thus neighbourhood attachment is the relationship between the person and the environment, and tends to influence peoples' affective bonds with their residential environment as a whole (Banaituto et al, 2003). Consequently, satisfaction with neighbourhood is an imperative factor of neighbourhood quality which invariably indicates residents' quality of life and ultimately determines their confidence (Galster, 2001; Sedaghatnia et al, 2013).

Neighbourhoods' shaping of the future of cities does not follow the same trajectory time (Temkin and Rohe, 1996; Salami, 2014). This explains that if people are no longer interested in their neighbourhood, the social structure deteriorates very rapidly, the area loses its stability, and becomes confronted with change which leads to neighbourhood decay. At the point of decay,

people may no longer be interested in the neighbourhood thus forcing them to move. Confidence in the future of the neighbourhood is a key psychological prerequisite for neighbourhood revitalization (Perkins and Brown, 2003). High confidence in neighbourhood leads to residential stability, home maintenance and improved property security (Galster and Hesser, 1982; Varady, 1986; Salami, 2014). On the other hand low level of confidence leads to disinvestment by landlords, breeding of absentee house owners, decrease in housing prices, decrease in tax base, reduction in funding of social programs, and poor maintenance of facilities (Salami, 2014).

The importance of neighbourhood is very fundamental to the base of life. People spend majority of their lives in the neighbourhood and this influences their economic and social life (Sedaghatnia et al, 2013). As established by Healey (1998), neighbourhoods provide a useful scale for studying social relations of everyday life worlds as they combine both social and spatial dimensions. It is a place of social, physical and economic activity that affects the quality and influences city sustainability in many ways. Neighbourhood information is being recognized as vital for planning and operating most city wide services as well as essentials for developing effective strategies for improving individual communities. Therefore understanding residents' expectations of a neighbourhood is necessary for successful city planning and specific designs of urban spaces for a more sustainable development. As city planners and policy makers design new neighbourhoods and revalorize existing ones, it is important to pay increased attention to particular factors that most affect neighbourhood confidence.

Several studies have been carried out by different authors in the evaluation of urban neighbourhoods. For instance Holister et al, (1978) and Sam et al, (2012) examined neighbourhood attachment and established that neighbourhood attachment are determined by contextual, functional and human features in the environment. These studies examined neighbourhood confidence using single indicator (satisfaction). Other studies such as Livingston, Bailey and Kearn (2010) and Permentier, Bolt and Ham (2007) focused on people's place of attachment and its influence on their reputation, while Andersen (2008) examined the basis for residents wanting to leave deprived neighbourhood. These studies tend to concentrate only on notorious and deprived neighbourhoods. These past studies did not extensively examine neighbourhood confidence across different socio-economic status. Also, the indicator they used for measuring neighbourhood confidence was neighbourhood satisfaction with cost of living. This study will examine different indicators such as satisfaction with available facilities, neighbourhood attributes that determine

level of residents' confidence in their neighbourhood. The intent of this study is therefore to establish the variation in neighbourhood confidence across neighbourhoods of different socio-economic status in Abeokuta Nigeria. Also, the study discussed the socio-economic attributes of the residents in the study area. This type of study is imperative as it will elucidate factors that influence residents' level of confidence in their residential areas.

2. The Study Area

The study area is Abeokuta the capital of Ogun State. It is located in the South Western part of Nigeria. The city is located within latitude 7^0 $7'$ N to 7^0 $11'$ N and longitude 3^0 $11'$E to 3^0 $22'$E. Abeokuta is a historic Yoruba city formed by the Egbas in 1830. The city has become cosmopolitan as a result of its elevation to the status of a state capital in 1976. As of 2006, the total population of the city was 451, 607. This city is mainly covered by two Local Government Areas (LGAs) – Abeokuta South and Abeokuta North. As common to most typical traditional African cities, three homogeneous residential zones are identified in Abeokuta. These are the older/indigenous areas, the newer/modern residential areas and the government reservation areas (GRA). The level of development in the residential zones varies with the different historical period's common in African countries: pre-colonial, colonial and post-colonial.

Each of these zones is observed to be internally homogeneous in terms of physical characteristics, socio-economic status and availability of environmental amenities. The indigenous areas, modern residential areas and the government reservation areas (GRA) are respectively associated with high, medium and low residential areas respectively. Pre-colonial development in any African city with long historical origin is attributed to the indigenous area of the city which is predominantly occupied by indigenes. Residential buildings in this zone are closely built together and connected to one another with foot paths in a serpentine manner. The houses are mainly of traditional courtyard system and Brazilian type (popularly called face-me-I-face-you in Nigeria). The zone is usually devoid of adequate environmental amenities. The modern residential zone features house types such as flats and face-me-I-face-you which are mostly characterized with road accessibility and better provision of environmental amenities. The presence of heterogeneity of residents is introduced in this zone as well as improved socio-economic characteristics. The Government Reserved Area is characterized with well layout plans. The ethnic composition is also

heterogeneous and the residents mostly engage in white collar job. The building types comprised mainly flats and duplexes with small private open spaces. Also, the zone is of better provision environmental amenities compared with the other two zones.

3. Methodology

For the purpose of this study, Abeokuta South Local Government, the largest LGA in the city was selected. This LGA comprised the three identified residential zones. The city comprised fifteen (15) political wards. Five political wards were randomly selected which represented 33.3% of the identified wards. The selected wards consist of 15 older residential neighbourhoods, 16 newer residential neighbourhoods and one GRA. Systematic sampling technique was used in the selection of 33.3% of the neighbourhoods in each sub area. Thus, three neighbourhoods were selected in the older residential area, four in the newer residential area and one in the GRA. In the selected areas, every 10th residential building was sampled sequel to enumeration of buildings based on street numbering system and the counting of building where buildings were not numbered, especially in the traditional residential areas. In each selected building, the focus was on any adult from age 18 years and above. The benchmark of 18years is premised on the age as appoint of legal transition into adulthood. The benchmark has been used in previous Nigerian studies such as Daramola and Olowoporoku (2016) and Olowoporoku (2017). Thus, a total of 123 residents were selected from the 123 selected buildings on which questionnaires were administered.

Thus, the sample comprised 39 respondents in the older residential area, 69 respondents in the newer residential area and 15 in the GRA. Data collected through the questionnaire survey were socio-economic attributes of the residents, assessment of facilities and service, and those pertaining to factors that attract residents to a neighbourhood. Analysis of the data was done using cross tabulation and Chi-Square test.

Mean index was used to analyse level of satisfaction with facilities, physical attribute of neighbourhood and residents confidence in neighbourhood. The views of the residents on satisfaction with facilities and services were expressed using a five-point Likert scale. The analysis of the responses evolved Residents' Satisfaction Indexes (RSIs) and mean Residents' Satisfaction Indexes ($\overline{RSI}$). To obtain a RSI, a weighted value of 5,4,3,2 and 1 were respectively attached to rate each response (Very Satisfied (VS) =5, Satisfied (S) =4, Fairly Satisfied (FS) =3, Dissatisfied (DS)

=2 and Very Satisfied (VD) =1) on any facility or service. The SWV for each item was obtained through the sum of the product of number of responses of each item and the respective weighted value attached to each rating. This is expressed mathematically as:

$$\text{SWV} = \sum_{I=1}^{5} X_i Y_i$$

Where:

SWV = summation of weight value,

X_i = number of respondents to rating i;

Y_i = the weight assigned a value (i = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5).

The RSI for each item on the scale was arrived at by dividing the Summation of Weighted Value (SWV) by the total number of respondents in each residential area, mathematically expressed as:

$$\text{RSI} = \frac{\text{SWV} = \sum_{I=1}^{5} X_i Y_i}{N}$$

The $\overline{\text{RSI}}$ later was computed by summing residents' satisfaction and dividing by the number of the identified facilities and services (n = 14), mathematically expressed as:

$$\overline{\text{RSI}} = \frac{\text{RSI}}{n}$$

Residents' satisfaction with available facilities and services with the actual value of the $\overline{\text{RSI}}$ indicated a moderate level of satisfaction by residents. Values with positive deviations indicated high level of satisfaction, while those with negative deviations indicated low level of satisfaction with available facilities and services. The Mean Index (MD) indicates the deviation from the mean.

The views of the residents on neighbourhood attributes were expressed using a five-point Likert scale of Very Good (VG), Good (G), Fair (F), Poor (P) and Very Poor (VP). The views were measured through an index called Perceived Attribute Index (PAI). The procedure for arriving at this index is similar to the one used to measure resident satisfaction. The mean indexes were denoted by $\overline{\text{PAI}}$. Residents expressed their views on perceived level of confidence using a five-point Likert scale of Very High (VH), High (H), Fair (F), Low (L) and Very Low (VL). The views were measured through an index called Residents' Confidence Index (RCI). The procedure for arriving at this index is similar to the one used to measure resident satisfaction. The mean indexes were denoted by $\overline{\text{RCI}}$.

4. Research Findings

This section discusses the profiles of the respondents, the available environmental facilities based on residential characteristics, factors that attract people to neighbourhoods, neighbourhood attribute and residents perceived confidence in the study area.

4.1 Profiles of the Respondents

The profiles of the respondents discussed are gender, educational attainment, length of stay, income status, household size, type of building and tenure of building all these in relation to their places of residence. As established by Galster and Hesser (1981) and Lu (1999), socio-economic attributes are main features that affect neighbourhood quality. On gender, findings revealed that 50.4% of the respondents were female while 49.6% were male. Further findings into the gender distribution of residents across the residential areas revealed that 76.9%, 33.3% and 60.0% of the respondents in the older, newer and GRA were females, while the proportion of males were 23.1%, 66.7% and 40.0% in the same residential area respectively.

Educational attainment is expected to play an important role as people with higher educational attainment are high in status, conscious and often seek residential locations that satisfy their prestigious dwellings and neighbourhood (Gbakeji and Rilwani, 2009). Findings revealed that 97.6% of the respondents had one form of formal education. It was established that 12.3%, 24.4% and 60.9% of the respondents had primary, secondary and tertiary education respectively. However, educational statuses lower than tertiary education decreases from the GRA to the older residential areas, while the proportion of respondents with tertiary education increases from older residential areas to the GRA. The variation in education status of respondents in the three residential areas was significant through the Chi-square test computed ($\chi^2 = 46.52$, $p \leq 0.000$).

Investigations were made into the household size of respondents. A household was defined as a person or group of people with shared cooking and living arrangements. Thus, household size was measured by the number of people living together with common eating arrangement. Based on this, the household size of the residents was categorized into three.

Table 1. Profile of Respondents

Attribute	Residential Area			
	Older	Newer	GRA	Total
	Frequency (%)	Frequency (%)	Frequency (%)	Frequency (%)
Gender				
Male	30 (76.9%)	23 (33.3%)	9 (60.0%)	62 (50.4%)
Female	9 (23.1%)	46 (66.7%)	6 (40.0%)	61 (49.6%)
Total	**39 (100.0%)**	**69 (100.0%)**	**15 (100.0%)**	**123 (100.0%)**
Educational Status				
No Formal Education	2 (5.1%)	1 (1.4%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (2.4%)
Primary	11 (28.2%)	4 (5.8%)	0 (0.0%)	15 (12.3%)
Secondary	18 (46.1%)	11 (15.9%)	1 (6.7%)	30 (24.4%)
Tertiary	8 (20.5%)	53 (76.8%)	14 (93.3%)	75 (60.9%)
Total	**39 (100.0%)**	**69 (100.0%)**	**15 (100.0%)**	**123 (100.0%)**
Household Size				
1 – 5	20 (51.2%)	30 (43.4%)	9 (60.0%)	59 (47.9%)
6 – 10	1 (2.6%0	5 (7.2%)	1 (6.7%)	7 (5.7%)
Above 10	1 (2.6%)	1 (1.4%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (1.6%)
No Response	17 (43.6%)	33 (47.8%)	5 (33.3%)	55 (44.7%)
Total	**39 (100.0%)**	**69 (100.0%)**	**15 (100.0%)**	**123 (100.0%)**
Type of Building				
Face me I face You	31 (79.5%)	33 (47.8%)	0 (0.0%)	64 (52.0%)
Flat	4 (10.3%0	32 (46.4%)	13 (86.7%)	49 (39.9%)
Traditional Courtyard	4 (10.2%)	4 (5.8%)	0 (0.0%)	8 (6.5%)
Duplex	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0%)	2 (13.3%)	2 (1.6%)
Total	**39 (100.0%)**	**69 (100.0%)**	**15 (100.0%)**	**123 (100.0%)**
House Ownership				
Rented	23 (59.0%)	49 (67.2%)	4 (26.7%)	76 (61.8%)
Owner-Occupied	5 (12.8%)	18 (26.1%)	11 (73.3%)	34 (27.6%)
Inherited	11 (28.2%)	2 (2.9%)	0 (0.0%)	13 (10.6%)
Total	**39 (100.0%)**	**69 (100.0%)**	**15 (100.0%)**	**123 (100.0%)**

Source: Source: Authors' Field Survey, 2017.

The household sizes of one to five members were categorized as small, those with six to ten members as medium while those with more than ten members was categorized as large (Daramola and Olowoporoku, 2016). Findings revealed that majority (47.9%) of the respondents had small household size, 5.7% had medium household size, while 1.6% of the respondents had large household size. However, 44.7% of the respondents' did not declare their household size.

The common types of residential buildings in Abeokuta were also examined. Flat housing were the most predominant type of houses in GRA as it constituted 86.7% of type of houses in this zone. In the newer residential zone, face me I face you and flats were the most common housing

type and constituted 47.8% and 46.4% respectively of the houses surveyed, while in the older residential area, face me I face you was the dominant type of housing as it constituted 74.5%, while flat houses constituted 10.3% of houses in the residential area. Impliedly, flat houses are associated with elite class while face me I face you houses are associated to people of low status. Findings were also made into home ownership in the study area. As established by Holister et al (1978) and Fainstein and Hirst (1996) neighbourhoods of highest confidence are those with high level of owner occupancy while those with lowest level of confidence are those with low rate of occupancy. Findings revealed that 61.8% of the respondents live in rented apartments, 27.7% in owner occupied houses, while 10.6% live in inherited buildings. However, the GRA contained majorly (73.3%) house owners.

Income plays a significant role in neighbourhood attachment. Gbekaji and Rilwani (2009) opined that the higher the income of the resident, the higher the rate of owner occupancy. Consequently, home owners tend to be less inclined to move out of their neighbourhoods. Findings revealed that the mean income of residents in the older, newer and GRA were ₦ 27,060, ₦ 88,844 and ₦ 105,000 respectively. Further findings revealed that the mean income increases from the older residential area to the GRA. This confirmed the earlier findings that majority of the residents in the GRA live in owner occupied houses. Impliedly, residents in the GRA may be less inclined to move out of their neighbourhood. On length of residence of respondents in the study area, the mean length of residence in the older, newer and GRA residential areas were approximately 21 years, 7 years and 11 years respectively.

4.2 Factors that Attracted Residents to the Neighbourhoods

Information on factors that attracted residents to their neighbourhood is presented in Table 2. This is necessary because different reasons may influence resident's desire to stay in a neighbourhood. The study established that on the aggregate, the most prominent factor that attracted people to the neighbourhoods in the city was nearness to work which accounted for 15.0%, while the least factor (4.3%) was proximity to individual's community. Across the residential areas, the most prominent factors that attracted people to the GRA were quietness of the neighbourhood which constituted 21.5% of the responses and good housing which accounted for 20.0% of the responses. In the newer residential area the most prominent factors that attracted people to this area were nearness to work and quietness of the neighbourhood as both accounted for18.1% and 13.3% of the responses. In

the older residential areas, residents claimed that the most prominent factors that attracted them to the neighbourhoods were nearness to work (13.4%) and place of birth (13.4%).

Table 2. Factors that Attracted People to the Neighbourhoods

Residential Area				
Factors	**Old**	**New**	**GRA**	**Total**
	Frequency (%)	Frequency (%)	Frequency (%)	Frequency (%)
Nearness to work	15 (13.4%)	34 (18.1%)	6 (9.2%)	55 (15.0%)
Quietness of the Neighbourhood	6 (5.4%)	25 (13.3%)	14 (21.5%)	45 (12.3%)
Security	9 (8.0%)	23 (12.2%)	13 (20.0%)	45 (12.3%)
Good Housing	8 (7.1%)	23 (12.2%)	12 (18.5%)	43 (11.7%)
Proximity to Relatives	12 (10.7%)	21 (11.2%)	8 (12.3%)	41 (11.2%)
High Community Cohesion	11 (9.8%0	13 (6.9%)	7 (10.8%)	31 (8.4%)
Better Schools for Children	8 (7.1%)	18 (19.6%)	2 (3.1%)	28 (7.6%)
Low Rent	9 (8.0%)	12 (6.3%)	1 (1.5%)	22 (6.0%)
Place of Birth	15 (13.4%)	5 (2.6%)	0 (0.0%)	20 (5.4%)
Proximity to my Community	11 (9.9%)	4 (2.1%)	2 (3.1%)	16 (4.3%)
Low value of Property	7 (6.3%)	9 (4.8%)	0 (0.0%)	16 (4.4%)
Total	***111 (100.0%)**	***187 (100.0%)**	***65 (100.0%)**	***363 (100.0%)**

*These were more than the number of questionnaires administered because resident selected more than one option as any factors could attract people to a neighbourhood.

Source: Authors' Field Survey, 2017.

4.3 Services and Facilities Available in the Neighbourhoods

Sequels to the findings on factors that attracted residents to the neighbourhoods, is findings on facilities and services that are available in the different neighbourhoods in the study area (Table 3). On the overall, the five most available facilities in the study area were game house, primary school, secondary school, waste collection services and maternity homes accounting for 19.8%, 14.7%, 10.7%, 10.2% and 9.5% respectively. However, in the older residential neighbourhood, facilities and services rated most available by residents in this area were fire station, primary school, game house and pipe borne water which respectively constituted 14.5%, 12.5%, 12.5% and 12.5%. The most available facilities and services in the newer residential areas were game house, primary school and waste collection were 15.3%, 15.3% and 14.6% respectively while primary school, secondary school, specialist hospital, police station and waste collection services were the most available in the GRA and they all rated 20.0% respectively. However, out of the

fourteen facilities and services one was not available in the older residential area; four were not available in the newer residential area, while nine were not available in the GRA.

Table 3. Facilities and Services Available in the Neighbourhood

Residential Area				
Facilities and Services	**Older**	**Newer**	**GRA**	**Total**
	Frequency (%)	Frequency (%)	Frequency (%)	Frequency (%)
Primary School	39 (12.5%)	69 (15.3%)	15 (20.0%)	123 (14.7%)
Secondary School	20 (6.5%)	55 (12.2%)	15 (20.0%)	90 (10.7%)
Specialist Hospital	0 (0.0%)	7 (1.5%)	15 (20.0%)	22 (2.6%)
Police Station	0 (0.0%)	14 (3.1%)	15 (20.0%0	29 (3.5%)
Waste Collection Services	5 (1.6%)	66 (14.6%)	15 (20.0%)	86 (10.2%0
General Hospital	0 (0.0%)	7 (1.5%)	0 (0.0%)	7 (0.8%)
Health Centre	19 (6.1%)	41 (9.1%)	0 (0.0%)	60 (7.2%)
Maternity Homes	33 (10.6%)	46 (10.2%)	0 (0.0%)	79 (9.5%)
Game House	39 (12.5%)	69 (15.3%)	0 (0.0%)	165 (19.8%)
Clubs	34 (10.9%)	39 (6.9%)	0 (0.0%)	65 (7.8%)
Post Office	20 (6.5%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	20 (2.4%)
Cultural Facility	14 (4.5%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	14 (1.7%)
Fire Station	14 (4.5%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	14 (1.7%)
Pipe Borne Water	39 (12.5%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	39 (4.7%)
Total	**310 (100.0%)**	**450 (100.0%)**	**75 (100.0%)**	**835 (100.0%)**

*These were more than the number of questionnaires administered because resident selected more than one option in terms of facilities and services in their neighbourhood.

Source: Authors' Field Survey, 2017

4.4 Residents' Satisfaction Indices with Facilities and Services in the Area

Succeeding the discussions on availability of facilities and services across the residential area, their satisfaction with the facilities and services available in the neighbourhoods were examined. Contained in Table 4 is residents' satisfaction with facilities and services in the neighbourhood. This is measured in the study by calculating Residents Satisfaction Indices (RSI). The RSI across the three residential zones are measured by mean and mean deviation. Computed $\overline{RSI}$ for the older, newer and GRA residential areas were 2.9, 2.9 and 3.4 respectively. In the older area, residents were more satisfied with educational facilities, health facilities and waste collection services as they weighed 3.9, 3.4 and 3.3 respectively. Residents in the older residential area were least satisfied with cultural facilities and fire station with negative mean deviation of 0.5 each. Of the ten facilities and services examined in this residential area, seven were between dissatisfied and fairly satisfied level of satisfaction while only three facilities in the older residential area had their mean higher than the computed$\overline{RSI}$.

Table 4. Residents Satisfaction Indices on Facilities and Services in the Neighbourhoods

Residents' Satisfaction	Residential Area					
	Older		Newer		GRA	
	$\overline{RSI}$	M.D	$\overline{RSI}$	M.D	$\overline{RSI}$	M.D
Educational	3.9	+1.0	3.6	+0.7	4.0	+0.6
Health	3.4	+0.5	3.3	+0.4	4.0	+0.6
Waste Collection	3.3	+0.4	3.2	+0.3	4.0	+0.6
Recreational	2.9	0.0	2.9	0.0	2.7	-0.4
Shopping Centre	2.9	0.0	3.1	+0.2	3.7	+0.3
Water Supply	2.9	0.0	2.6	-0.3	2.3	-1.1
Police Station	2.8	-0.1	2.8	-0.1	3.5	+0.1
Post Office	2.7	-0.2	2.8	-0.1	1.8	-1.6
Cultural	2.4	-0.5	2.5	-0.4	2.7	-0.4
Fire Station	2.4	-0.5	2.5	-0.4	2.0	-1.4
Mean ($\overline{RSI}$)	**$\overline{RSI}$= 2.9**		**$\overline{RSI}$ = 2.9**		**$\overline{RSI}$= 3.4**	

Source: Authors' Field Survey, 2017.

In the newer residential area, facilities and services that respondents were mostly satisfied with were educational facilities, health facilities and waste collection as they had positive mean deviations of +0.7, +0.4 and +0.3 respectively. The residents were least satisfied with unavailability of fire station and cultural facilities in their neighbourhoods. These factors have a negative mean deviation of -0.4 each. Of the ten facilities and services examined, six were between dissatisfied and fairly satisfied level of satisfaction, while the remaining four facilities had a mean higher than the computed $\overline{RSI}$. In the GRA, residents were mostly satisfied with educational facilities, health facilities and waste collection as they weighed 4.0 each on the satisfaction index. Residents in this zone were least satisfied with unavailability of post office and fire station which had mean scores of 1.8 and 2.0 respectively and negative mean deviations of -1.6 and -1.4 respectively. Of the ten facilities and services examined in the GRA, five were between dissatisfied and fairly satisfied level of satisfaction, while five of these facilities had a positive deviation about the mean.

Findings revealed that the level of satisfaction with facilities and services tend to be highest in the GRA compared with the older and newer residential areas. Residents satisfaction index with facilities and services are very close in the older and newer residential areas. This suggests that

residents' satisfaction was not much influenced by variation in the socio-economic attributes of the respondents in the two residential areas. Consequently, the levels of confidence in these zones are likely to be close.

4.5 Residents' Neighbourhood Perceived Attribute Indices and Residents Confidence Indices in the Study Area

Sequel to the discussion on satisfaction with available facilities and services, neighbourhood perceived attribute and residents neighbourhood confidence is presented in this section. Parkes, Kearns and Artkinson (2002) established that the appearance of a neighbourhood influences satisfaction. Impliedly, the more deteriorated the physical condition of a neighbourhood, the less the neighbourhood confidence. Contained in Table 5 is the Perceived Attribute Indices ($\overline{\text{PAI}}$) measured by calculating Residents Perceived Attribute Indices ($\overline{\text{PAI}}$). The ($\overline{\text{PAI}}$) across the three residential zones are measured by mean and mean deviation. The mean PAI computed for the older, newer and GRA were 3.3, 3.1 and 4.1 respectively. Respondents in the older residential area ranked closeness to place of worship, relations in the community and a good place to raise children as the best attribute in the neighbourhood. These attributes were perceived to be good with mean scores of 4.0, 3.9 and 3.6 respectively. The least ranked physical attribute in this zone was standard of parks and other open spaces with a negative mean and mean score of -1.0 and 2.3 respectively. Findings on neighbourhood perceived attribute from the newer residential area revealed that closeness to place of worship and privacy at home were the best attribute of their neighbourhood. These attributes had a mean score of 3.8 each. The least ranked physical attribute in this zone were standard of parks and other open spaces which had a mean deviation of -0.7 and upkeep of road with a mean deviation of -0.2.

Table 5. Residents' Perceived Attribute Indices in the Neighbourhoods

Residents' Perceived Attribute	Residential Area					
	Older		Newer		GRA	
	$\bar{X}$	M.D	$\bar{X}$	M.D	$\bar{X}$	M.D
Closeness to Place of Worship	4.0	+0.7	3.8	+0.7	4.0	0.0
Relations in the Community	3.9	+0.6	3.6	+0.5	4.6	+0.5
Good Place to Raise Children	3.6	+0.3	3.5	+0.4	4.8	+0.7
Standard of Schools	3.5	+0.2	3.5	+0.4	4.2	+0.1
Standard of Heath Care Services	3.5	+0.2	3.1	0.0	4.0	0.0
Reputation of Neighbourhood	3.5	+0.2	3.5	+0.4	4.7	+0.6
Level of Crowding	3.5	+0.2	3.4	+0.3	3.8	-0.3
Privacy at Home	3.5	+0.2	3.8	+0.7	4.8	+0.7
Cleanliness of Neighbourhood	3.4	+0.1	3.2	+0.1	4.7	+0.6
Upkeep of Road	3.3	0	2.9	-0.2	4.8	+0.7
Public Transport	3.2	-0.1	3.3	+0.2	2.5	-1.6
Appearance of Building	3.2	-0.1	3.6	+0.5	4.4	+0.3
Safety from threat of Crime	3.2	-0.1	3.2	+0.1	4.0	0.0
Condition of Street Facilities	3.0	-0.3	3.0	-0.1	3.7	-0.4
Standard of Parks and other Open Spaces	2.3	-1.0	2.4	-0.7	3.4	-1.2
Mean ($\overline{\mathbf{PAI}}$)	$\overline{\mathbf{PAI}} = \mathbf{3.3}$		$\overline{\mathbf{PAI}} = \mathbf{3.1}$		$\overline{\mathbf{PAI}} = \mathbf{4.1}$	

Source: Authors' Field Survey, 2017

Respondents in the GRA ranked upkeep of road, a good place to raise children and privacy at home as the best attributes of the neighbourhood. These attributes had a mean deviation of +0.7 each, while the least ranked attributes of the neighbourhood were access to public transport and standard of parks and other open spaces as the weighted indexes were 2.5 and 3.4 respectively. The findings indicated that the GRA was more socially and physically attractive compared to the older and newer residential areas. Although the newer residential area is more physically attractive than the older areas, the residents in the older residential area perceived the social attributes of the neighbourhood to be better compared with the residents of the newer residential areas.

Table 6. Residents' Neighbourhood Confidence in the Study Area

Residents' Confidence	Residential Area					
	Older		Newer		GRA	
	$\bar{X}$	M.D	$\bar{X}$	M.D	$\bar{X}$	M.D
Child Raising	3.4	+0.1	3.6	+0.7	4.2	+0.5
Population Changes	3.7	+0.4	3.6	+0.7	4.2	+05
Social Interaction	3.8	+0.5	3.2	+0.3	4.1	+0.4
Security	3.5	+0.2	3.1	+0.2	4.1	+0.4
Incidence of Crime	2.5	0.8	2.8	-0.1	3.9	+0.2
Infrastructure Provision	3.0	-0.3	2.6	-0.3	3.7	0.0
Infrastructure Maintenance	3.6	+0.3	1.8	-0.8	2.0	-1.7
Mean ($\overline{\mathbf{RCI}}$)	$\overline{\mathbf{RCI}} = \mathbf{3.3}$		$\overline{\mathbf{RCI}} = \mathbf{2.9}$		$\overline{\mathbf{RCI}} = \mathbf{3.7}$	

Source: Authors' Field Survey, 2017

Presented in Table 6 is the respondents' neighbourhood confidence across the residential areas. The views were measured through the Residents' Confidence Index (RCI). The computed mean for the older, newer and GRA residential areas were 3.3, 2.9 and 3.7 respectively. In the older residential area, respondents perceived that their level of confidence is most influenced by social interaction with a computed mean of 3.8. In other words, the confidence in the older residential neighbourhood was highest as a result of social interaction between residents. This confirmed the analysis of the perceived neighbourhood attribute where residents ranked the neighbourhood as a good place for social interaction. Respondents in the older zone ranked incidence of crime and infrastructural provision least. These had negative mean deviation scores of -0.8 and -0.3 respectively. This opinion could be attributed to low level of satisfaction with facilities and services in the neighbourhood. Also as earlier established, there were no police stations in the older residential areas.

Findings on confidence level in the newer residential area revealed that residents perceived their level of confidence is mostly influenced by good environment for child raising and positive population changes with weighted mean of 3.6 each. Residents' perceived confidence in the neighbourhood in terms of infrastructural provision to be very low with a mean deviation of 1.8 and a negative deviation of -0.8. In the GRA, respondents perceived their level of confidence in the neighbourhood is most influenced by conduciveness of the neighbourhood to child raising and social interaction between neighbours with index of 4.2 each. This is confirmed in the analysis of the perceived neighbourhood attribute where the residents ranked their neighbourhood as a good

place to raise children. Respondents in this area ranked confidence in the neighbourhood least in terms of incidence of crime with index of 2.0 and a negative deviation of -1.7.

The study established that the prominent factors that influence neighbourhood confidence in the older residential area were social cohesion. Impliedly, the higher the level of social interaction, the higher the level of neighbourhood confidence in the older residential area. The prominent factor that influences neighbourhood confidence in the newer residential areas and GRA was the conducive physical environment for child raising.

5. Conclusion and Recommendation

This study assessed various factors that influence residential mobility across the three residential zones namely, the older residential area, the newer residential area and Government Residential Area in Abeokuta in relation to their socio-economic attributes.

The findings of the study revealed that relationship exists between neighbourhood confidence and place of residence. The study revealed that socio-economic attributes of the respondents such as income and educational status differ across the different residential neighbourhoods and these attributes increased from older residential areas to the GRA. Residents in the GRA had the highest level of satisfaction with available infrastructure and service in the neighbourhood, although, the services in the older and newer residential neighbourhood were more than that in the GRA, the conditions of the facilities available in the GRA were better than the older and newer residential areas.

The study established that dissatisfaction with neighbourhoods of low social status is influenced by low level of infrastructural provision. The study also established that the highest level of confidence exists in the GRA and least in the newer residential area. This is because socio-economic attributes, satisfaction with available facilities and services and physical attributes in the different residential areas varied. Based on these findings, the following are recommended in improving residents' neighbourhood confidence in the study area. The standard of open spaces in the older residential areas is poor as the available spaces are used as refuse dumps. It is important for the government, CBOs, NGOs and other environmentally concerned institutions to provide more waste collection services in this area. Also sanitary inspection in the older residential area will help to improve the physical outlook in the neighbourhoods.

The study established that noise is not a problem in the GRA, however in order to resolve the problems of noise in the older and newer residential areas, zoning principles can be employed to separate different activities especially commercial activities in the study area. The GRA is found in the study to be a place where high income people reside, the study recommend the location of police stations in these area. Also, factor that the residents in the GRA's least liked about the neighbourhood is unavailability of pipe borne water. Thus, the government should provide pipe borne water for the residents in GRA and newer residential areas. Since ownership influences permanence in the neighbourhood, the government should encourage home ownership in the newer residential area through the provision of housing schemes at low prices and interest rate.

Literature

Andersen, H. S. (2008). Why do Residents want to Leave Deprived Neighbourhood? The Importance of Residents' Subjective Evaluations of their Neighbourhood and Its Reputation. *Journal of Housing and Built Environment* 23: 79-101.

Bonaiuto, M.; Fornara, F.; Bonnes, M. (2003). Indexes of Perceived Residential Environmental Quality and Neighbourhood Attachment in Urban Environments: A Confirmation Study on the City of Rome. *Landscape and Urban planning* 65*:* 41-52.

Bonaiuto, M. (2004). Residential Satisfaction and Perceived Urban Quality. Inc. Spielberger (Ed). *Encyclopedia of Advanced Psychology* 3: 67-272.

Daramola, O. P.; Olowoporoku, O. A. (2016). Environmental Sanitation Practices in Osogbo, Nigeria: An Assessment of Residents' Sprucing-Up of Their Living Environment. *Economic and Environmental Studies* 16 (4): 699-716.

Fainstein, G. S.; Hirst, C. (1996). Neighbourhood Organization and Community Planning. The Metropolis Neighbourhood Revitalization Program. In W. D. Keating, N. Kumkolz; P. Star (Eds.). *Revitalizing Urban Neighbourhood*: 111. Lawerence: University Press of Kansas.

Freiler, C. (2004). *Why Strong Neighbourhoods Matter: Implication and Practice*. Neighbourhood Task Force Toronto.

Galster, G. (2001). On the Nature of Neighbourhood. *Urban Studies* 38 (12) 2111-2124.

Galster, G. C.; Hesser, G. W. (1981). Residential Satisfaction: Composition and Contextual Correlate. *Environment and Behaviour* 13(6): 735-758.

Gbakeji, J. O.; Rilwani, M. L. (2009). Residents' Socioeconomic Characteristices and the Residential Mobility Process in an Urban Space. The Example of Warri Metropolis Delta State, Nigeria. *Journal of Human Ecology* 27(1): 45-52.

Healey, P. (1998). Building Institutional Capacity through Collaborative Approaches to Urban. *Environment and Planning* 20: 1531-1546.

Holister, M. B.; Auger, B.; Walter, R. A.; Pattison, T. (1978). *Measuring Neighbourhood.* Available at: http://www.archive.org/details/measuringneighbo00bost. Assessed June 2014.

Islam, S. (2007). *Neighbourhood Charactersitices and Adjacent Ravines on Houses Price*. Edmonton, Alberta, Canada: Department of Anthropology and Economics and Political Science, Grant MacEwan College.

Kingsley, T. G. (1999). *Building and Operating Neighbourhood Indicator System. A Guidebook.* Urban Institute USA.

Livingston, M.; Bailey, N.; Kearn, A. (2008). Neighbourhood Attachment in Deprived Areas: Evidence from the North of England. *Journal of Housing and Built Environment* XXV (4): 409-427.

Lu, M. (1999). Determinants of Residential Satisfaction: Ordered Logit vs. Regression Model. *Growth and Chang* 30: 264–287.

Olowoporoku, O. A. (2017). Residents' Perception of Environment Hazards and Risks in Coastal Towns of Delta State, Nigeria. An M.Sc thesis submitted to the Department of Urban and Regional Planning, Obafemi Awolowo University. Ile-Ife Nigeria.

Parkes, A.; Kearns, A.; Atkinson, R. (2002). What Makes People Dissatisfied with their Neighbourhood.? *Urban Studies* 39 (13): 2413-2438.

Permentier, M.; Bolt, G.; Ham, M. (2007). Behavioural Responses to Neighbourhood Reputation. *Journal of Housing and Built Environment* 22(2): 199–213.

Perkins, B. B.; Brown, G. D. (2003). Place Attachment in Revitalizing Neighbourhood: Individual and Block Level Analysis. *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 23 (3): 259-271.

Ross, C. E. (2000). Walking Exercise and Smoking: Does Neighbourhood Matter? *Social Science and Medicine* 51: 265-274.

Salami, N. A. (2014). Intra-Urban Analysis of Neighbourhood Confidence in Abeokuta, Nigeria. A B.Sc Thesis Submitted to the Department of Urban and Regional Planning, Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile Ife Nigeria.

Sam, N.; Rayram, N.; Bilgel, N. (2012). The Perception of Residents' Environmental Quality and Neighbourhood Attachment in a Metropolitan City: A study on Bursa,Turkey. *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences* 1(1): 22-39.

Sedaghatnia, S.; Ghahramanpouri, A.; Hasanuddin, L.; Sapura, M. (2013). An Evaluation of Residents' Quality of Life through Neighborhood Satisfaction in Malaysia. *Environmental Management and Sustainable Development* 2(1):114-125

Swatt, L. M.; Varano, S. P.; Uchida, C. D. (2012). *Fear of Crime, Incivilities and Collective Efficacy in Four Miami Neighbourhoods.* Justice and Security Strategies, Inc.

Temkim, K.; Rohe, W. (1996). Neighbourhood Change and Urban Policy. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 15 (3): 159-170.

Varady, D. P. (1986). Neighbourhood Confidence: A Critical Factor in Neighbourhood Revitalization. *Environment and Behaviour* 13(4), 480-501.

Ocena zaufania sąsiedzkiego mieszkańców w tradycyjnym afrykańskim mieście: doświadczenia Abeokuty

Streszczenie

W niniejszym artykule zbadano społeczno-ekonomiczne atrybuty respondentów, ich satysfakcję z dostępnej infrastruktury oraz usług, a także wewnątrzmiejskie zróżnicowanie poziomu zaufania sąsiedzkiego wśród mieszkańców w Abeokucie w Nigerii. Do wyodrębnionych stref mieszkaniowych zaliczono: starszy obszar mieszkaniowy, nowszy obszar mieszkaniowy, a także obszar zarezerwowany rządowo (GRA). Wybrano łącznie 123 respondentów na podstawie techniki systematycznego doboru próby. Wyniki badań ukazały, że społeczno-ekonomiczne atrybuty badanych, takie jak dochód i wykształcenie, istotnie się różnią w zależności od obszaru zamieszkania. Poziom satysfakcji z dostępnych udogodnień infrastrukturalnych i usług jest niski i wynosi 2,9, 2,9 i 3,4 odpowiednio dla starszego, nowszego i rządowego obszaru mieszkaniowego. Analogicznie, średnie wskaźniki zaufania sąsiedzkiego dla starszego, nowszego i rządowego obszaru wyniosły odpowiednio 3,3, 2,9 i 3,7. Najważniejszym czynnikiem podnoszącym pewność sąsiedzką w nowszym oraz rządowym obszarze mieszkaniowym było sprzyjające otoczenie fizyczne dla dorastających dzieci ze wskaźnikami odpowiednio 3,6 i 4,2. Natomiast dla starszego obszaru mieszkaniowego czynnikiem takim była spójność społeczna. W artykule zarekomendowano zapewnienie środowiskowych obiektów rekreacyjnych w obszarach mieszkaniowych, jak też zachęcenie właścicieli mieszkań poprzez dostarczenie im po niskich cenach i stopach procentowych projektów domów.

***Słowa kluczowe**:* sąsiedztwo, zaufanie, obszar mieszkaniowy, rządowy obszar mieszkaniowy, infrastruktura, usługi, Abeokuta

Kody JEL: O1, O18

https://doi.org/10.25167/ees.2017.44.8