



---

# **The Choice of Neighbourhood Environments among the Local Community Setting in Ondo State, Nigeria**

**Oloruntoba Kayode <sup>a\*</sup>, Familola Isaac <sup>b</sup> and Oni Olusola Feyisara <sup>b</sup>**

<sup>a</sup> *Department of Architecture Federal Polytechnic, Ile Oluji, Ondo State, Nigeria.*

<sup>b</sup> *Rufus Giwa Polytechnic, Owo, Ondo State, Nigeria.*

## **Authors' contributions**

*This work was carried out in collaboration among all authors. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.*

## **Article Information**

DOI: 10.9734/AJGR/2022/v5i2133

## **Open Peer Review History:**

This journal follows the Advanced Open Peer Review policy. Identity of the Reviewers, Editor(s) and additional Reviewers, peer review comments, different versions of the manuscript, comments of the editors, etc are available here: <https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/90166>

**Original Research Article**

**Received 07 June 2022**  
**Accepted 11 August 2022**  
**Published 17 August 2022**

---

## **ABSTRACT**

Human social and community satisfaction has become vital among the local residents. This study examines the factor of neighbourhood choice and preference in a local community in the Ondo State, Nigeria. The study implored local residents' perception via 150 structured questionnaires. The findings showed that local residents' choice of environment hinged on the factor of safety, socio-economic and resident's culture. Thus, the choice of the local community might not be the same with the urban residents.

*Keywords: Community; satisfaction; neighbourhood; environment; culture; Nigeria.*

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

The local resident's lifestyles and inhabitability comfort cannot be assessed without clear knowledge of their community environment. It has been opined that the human physical environment influences their satisfaction level [1]. However, the neighbourhood choice factors

remain very significant in predicting the inhabitant lifestyles [2,3,4].

Roux [5] suggested that for a clear understanding of choice of human environment, physical and social factors should be considered. The aforementioned was considered as basic to determine the choice of an environment. The

---

\*Corresponding author: E-mail: [oloruntobakayode@gmail.com](mailto:oloruntobakayode@gmail.com);

author considers the environmental social factor to include the environment composition as providing the needed security or safety. Thus, it is the level of safety enjoyed within an environment that facilitates the inhabitant's cohesiveness and affinity to the community. The social community cohesiveness has significant influence of social norm [1]. Social norm encompasses the assessment of individual on inappropriate and appropriate attitudes, belief, behaviours and values.

The physical environment comprises the tangible elements and features of an environment. It has potential influence on the social environment. The neighbourhood physical environment design and connectivity has influenced the social relationship that occurs within a community. Accessibility is crucial to human basic needs that encompass the environmental beautification, social facilities and activities form vital tools of predicting the choice of environment [6]. The study conducted by Ball et al., [6] on residents' preference to associate in a desirable environment was found to be related with the basic social amenities' proximity to such area, and the availability of pedestrian to aid the eco-sustainability.

Therefore, human beings do prefer to associate with the natural environment that provides needed social facility and aesthetically appealing [7]. Aesthetic pleasant neighbourhood arena can be associated with the human choice of environment [8]. However, various research works have been conducted to assess the necessary factors responsible for human environment [9,10,11,12]. The factor of connectivity and human networking within a community was particularly considered vital in the choice of neighbourhood environment [9,13]. When inhabitants have easy access to their daily activities and needs, they derived satisfactory feeling in the environment. Public spaces and green environment were recorded as part of the contributing factor of choice of human environment [5]. This study geared to assess factors responsible for local community resident choice of environment [14-17].

The independent variables applied were symbolized as follow:

- i. Security and safety - A
- ii. Social factor - B
- iii. Aesthetic - C
- iv. Accessibility - D

- v. Cultural factor - E,

while the choice of neighbourhood environment symbolized as "CNE". Thus, the following hypotheses were raised:

Hi: Security & safety of inhabitants positively influence their choice of neighbourhood environment

Hii: Social needs of inhabitants positively influence their choice of neighbourhood environment.

Hiii: Aesthetic look of the neighbourhood positively influence their choice of environment

Hiv:- Accessibility of inhabitants to their daily activities positively influence their choice of environment

Hv:- Cultural factor of inhabitants positively influence their choice of neighbourhood environment.

## 2. METHODOLOGY

This study considered a typical local community "ISUADA" in the Owo Local Government Area of Ondo State, Nigeria. A total of 150 questionnaires was administered among the residents of the community to assess their perception on the choice of the environment. The choice of environment was assessed via five variables; security/safety, social factor, aesthetic, accessibility, and cultural factors.

The administered questionnaires were analysed with SPSS.

## 3. DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Statistical test and the EFA were conducted to check reliability of the variables. The Cronbach's Alpha of 0.70 was set as a benchmark range from approximately (0.600 – 0.900) as suggested by George et al., (2007).

KMO value was generated to ascertain the variable number of adequacy. The correlation coefficient derived to check the validity of the variable in the model.

Having high value of KMO suggests the variable number adequacy, about 32%.

Adjustable R-Square value of the variance in the dependable variable could be predicted from the dependent's variables (Table 1).

**Table 1. Regression significant R<sup>2</sup> and AR<sup>2</sup>**

Model	R	R-Square	Adjusted R-square	Std. Error of Estimate	Sig.
1 Regression	0.60 -	0.334 -	0.312 -	0.600 -	0.01

**Table 2. Coefficient of correlations**

Variable	Me-an	Std. Dev.	Cranbach's Alpha	Coefficient of correlations				
				A	B	C	D	E
Choice of Environ-ment	3.42	0.840	0.752	0.04	0.03	0.21	0.04	0.01
A	2.51	1.016	0.784	-	-	-	-	-
B	2.71	0.914	0.814	0.42**	-	-	-	-
C	2.72	1.482	0.741	0.81**	0.61**	-	-	-
D	2.60	1.014	0.784	0.782**	0.54**	0.50**	-	-
E	2.52	0.942	0.821	0.801**	0.51**	0.42**	0.53**	-

*Predictor (constant) A, B, C, D and E dependable variable: Choice of neighbourhood environment CNE*

#### 4. SUMMARY OF RESULTS

**Table 3. Results and hypothesis**

Hypothesis	Hypothesized	Sig.	Result
A	Security and safety	0.04	Supported
B	Social factor	0.03	Supported
C	Aesthetics	0.21	Not supported
D	Accessibility	0.04	Supported
E	Cultural factor	0.01	Supported

#### 5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The study recommended high correlation between the independent variables. The correlation ranged from 0.42 to 0.81 as shown in Table 2. The high significant level reflects that the constructs were capable to explain the neighbourhood choice of environment as supplemented by the high Alpha value. However, security and inhabitant safety was exhibiting good significant level of 0.04 along with the accessibility factor having the same significance level of 0.04. The social factor of the respondents in the area exhibited high significance level of 0.03 while cultural factor associated with the inhabitants exhibited significant level of 0.01 having the highest significance value. The aesthetic factor of the inhabitant in the study area exhibited significance level of 0.21 having the weakest value of significance. Considering the aforementioned, it is obvious that the factor of neighbourhood environment can be accessed via the projected variables. Hence, the study established that the choice of neighbourhood environment is highly associated with the culture

of the inhabitants. This finding can be linked with the high interest of the local community in the culture and norms as reflected in the traditions. As such, the inhabitants in local community attached strong affinity to their cultural supporting environmental factors. The social factor equally considered vital in selecting the local inhabitant choice of neighbourhood environment. This factor cannot be separated from the high influence of culture that associated in their social life and activities. The social activities among the local dwellers rally around their immediate neighbourhood environment. Therefore, the environmental elements and features in their neighbourhood should be considered in making their choice of environment. Thus, security and safety along with the accessibility were both relevance in determining the choice of local dwellers in the study area in respect to their environment. This implies that local inhabitants do prefer to reside in an environmental secured and reasonable accessible to their daily engagements as a factor in the choice of neighbourhood environment. Aesthetic does not shown to have positive influence on the local

inhabitant choice of their neighbourhood environment in the study area. This can be associated to the fact that the local dwellers attached little or no tangible importance to the beautification of their environment unlike it is applicable in the urban centres where beauty and aesthetic features are celebrated. This study shows that the choice of neighbourhood environment among the local dwellers hinged on the inhabitants' factors of culture, social, security/safety and accessibility. This study had some shortcomings such as consideration of limited respondents as it considers only single local community. Hence, we suggest that further research should be encouraged to encompass several local community settings for wider scope and result.

## CONSENT

As per international standard or university standard, Participants' written consent has been collected and preserved by the author(s).

## COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

## REFERENCES

1. Coleman J. Foundation of Social Theory, Cambridge M.A.: Belknap; 1990.
2. Ester C, et al. BMJ Open. 2015;2016; 6:e010384. DOI: 10.1136/bmjopen-2015- 010384
3. Seth GB, et al. The Efficiency of U.S. Public Space Utilization during the COVID-19 Pandemic Risk Analysis. 2021;0(0). DOI: 10.1111/risa.13800
4. Van Hoof J, Marston HR, Kazak JK, Buffel T. Ten questions concerning age-friendly cities and communities and the built environment. Building and Environment. 2021 Jul 15;199:107922.
5. Roux AVDC. Residential Environments and Cardiovascular Risk. Journal of Urban health. Bulletin of the New York Academic of Medicine. 2003;80:569–189.
6. Humpel N, Owen N, Leslie E. Environmental Factors Associated with Adults Participation in Physical Activity. A Review. Am. J. Prev. Med. 2002;22:1793–1812.
7. Oloruntoba K. Impact of Public Space on Knowledge Saring in Cyberjaya, Malaysia. Published Ph. D Thesis Submitted to to Universiti Teknologi, Malaysia; 2013.
8. Carmona M, Magalhaes C, Hammond L. Public Space: The Management Dimension. First published 2008 by Routledge, 2 park square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon Ox14 4RN, Simultaneously published in the USA and Canada by Routledge 270 Madison Avenue, New York USA. 2008; 10016. ISBN 0-203-92722-2.
9. Zhang M. The Role of Land Use in Travel Mode Choice: Evidence from Boston and Hong Kong. J. Am. Plann. Assoc. 2004;70 (3):344–360.
10. Ewing R, Cervero R. Travel and the Built Environment Synthesis. Transport Res. Rec. 2001;1780:87–114.
11. Freedman B, Gordon P, Peers J. Effects of Non-Traditional Neighbourhood Design on Travel Characteristics. Transport. Res. Rec. 1994;1466:63–70.
12. Lei L, Lin Z. From traditional and socialist work-unit communities to commercial housing: the association between neighborhood types and adult health in urban China. Chinese Sociological Review. 2021 May 27;53(3):254-84.
13. Andrew K Kiplagat, Julius K Koech, Job K Ng'etich, Mercy J Lagat, Judith A Khazenzi, Kenneth O Odhiambo. Urban green space characteristics, visitation patterns and influence of visitors' socio-economic attributes on visitation in Kisumu City and Eldoret Municipality, Kenya. Trees, Forests and People. 2022;7: 100175.
14. Carmona M, Health T, Tiedell. Public Space – Urban Spaces: The Dimensions of Urban Design Architecture Press, N.Y. Oxford OX28DP. 2003;3:96–102. ISBN 0 7506.
15. Frank LD, Pivo G. Impacts of Mixed Use and Density on the Utilization of Three Modes of Travel: Single Occupant Vehicle, Transit and Walking. Transport. Res. Rec. 1994;1466:44.
16. Pale RR, Pratt M, Blair SNC. Physical Activity and Public Health: A Recommendation from the Centres for

- Diseases Controls and Prevention and the American College of Sports Medicine. JAMA. 1995;273:402 – 407.
17. Schuster JM. Two Urban Festival: La Merce and First Night; Planning Practice and Research. 1995;10(2):173–87.

---

© 2022 Kayode et al.; This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

*Peer-review history:*

*The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:*  
<https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/90166>