

**RESIDENTS' QUALITY OF LIFE IN SEME BORDER SETTLEMENTS, NIGERIA**

---

**OLUWADARE, DEBORAH BUNMI**

**RESIDENTS' QUALITY OF LIFE IN SEME BORDER SETTLEMENTS, NIGERIA**

**BY**

**OLUWADARE, DEBORAH BUNMI B.Sc. (Hons) Ife**

**EDMP11/12/R/0082**

**A RESEARCH THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE  
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AND REGIONAL PLANNING,  
FACULTY OF ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN AND MANAGEMENT,  
OBAFEMI AWOLOWO UNIVERSITY, ILE-IFE, NIGERIA.**

**IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF  
MASTER OF SCIENCE DEGREE IN URBAN AND REGIONAL PLANNING**

**JUNE 2015**

**AUTHORIZATION TO COPY**

**OBAFEMI AWOLOWO UNIVERSITY, ILE-IFE**

**HEZEKIAH OLUWASANMI LIBRARY**

**POSTGRADUATE THESIS**

**AUTHOR: OLUWADARE Deborah Bunmi**

**Title: RESIDENTS' QUALITY OF LIFE IN SEME BORDER SETTLEMENTS,  
NIGERIA.**

**Degree: M.Sc. (Urban and Regional Planning)**

**Year: 2015**

I, OLUWADARE Deborah Bunmi hereby authorized the Hezekiah Oluwasanmi Library to copy my thesis, in whole or in part in response to request from individual researcher and organization for the purpose of private study or research.

Signature: -----

Date: -----

**CERTIFICATION**

This is to certify that this study was carried out by OLUWADARE Deborah Bunmi of the Department of Urban and Regional Planning under the supervision of Dr. AFON A.O.

-----

Dr. A.O. AFON

Supervisor

-----

Date

-----

Dr. S.A. ADEYINKA

Acting Head of Department

-----

Date

**DEDICATION**

This thesis is dedicated to God who is my rock, pillar and the one who owns the final say over my life. For without Him, I would have become nothing in life.

-----  
OLUWADARE Deborah Bunmi

-----  
Date

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I give glory to God Almighty for His faithfulness and love for seeing me through this phase of my life's journey. You are worthy of my praise. I would also like to express my gratitude to those who provided me with guidance, encouragement, support and motivation through this research project. I would first like to thank my supervisor, Dr. Afon A.O. for his constant support, encouragement, careful revisions and constructive feedback. To my Head of Department, Dr. Adeyinka S.A., thank you for the guidance and encouragement throughout this process. I acknowledge the role played by all my lecturers and other members of staff in the department. To my Colleague, friend, and brother Mr. Ojo, A.O. I say a big thank you.

This accomplishment would not have been possible without the love and support from my family. I am deeply indebted to my parents Pastor Jeremiah Olorunfemi Oluwadare and late Mrs. Felicia Temitayo Oluwadare for the morals, financial support, encouragement and tolerance they gave me right from my childhood. Also to my siblings' bro Segun, Peter and Opeyemi, I say thank you for your moral support in the course of my academic pursuit.

Special thanks also to Mr and Mrs Patrick Ogunjobi and all members of CACSA Ife District, Ile-Ife for your moral support and timely encouragement. I should not forget the contribution of my friends, seniors, course mates and roommates who in one way or the other assisted me in the course of this study. I am also grateful to Pastor & Mrs. Olanlege and at the same time Mr. Semako for the assistance rendered during the data collection in Seme border. You have made this research a great success. All your support for me have been so priceless.

I thank my fiance: Dr. Ojo Opeyemi for the love, care and encouragement he gave during the course of my study. I want to say a big thanks to you.

**Deborah Bunmi OLUWADARE**

**JUNE 2015**

## TABLE OF CONTENT

Title page	i
Authorization	ii
Certification	iii
Dedication	iv
Acknowledgement	v
Table of content	vi
List of Tables	ix
List of Figures	xi
List of Plates	xii
Abstract	xiii
<b>CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Background to the Study	1
1.2 Problem Statement	5
1.3 Aim and Objectives	8
1.4 Justification of the Study	9
1.5 Scope of the Study	10
1.6 An overview of the study area	10
<b>CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW/THEORETICAL AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK</b>	<b>21</b>
2.1 Preamble	21
2.2 Literature Review	21
2.3 Theoretical Framework	38
2.4 Conceptual Framework	42

<b>CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>48</b>
3.1 Introduction	48
3.2 Primary Data	48
3.3 Sample Frame	48
3.4 Sampling Procedure	48
3.5 Secondary Data	51
3.6 Data Analysis	51
<b>CHAPTER FOUR: RESIDENTS' SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS IN SEME BORDER SETTLEMENTS</b>	<b>55</b>
4.1 Introduction	55
4.2 Gender Distribution of Residents in Seme Border Settlements	55
4.3 Age of Residents	56
4.4 Income Status of Respondents	58
4.5 Marital Status of Residents	60
4.6 Education Status of Residents	61
4.7 Years Spent in Pursuit of Education	63
4.8 Occupational Status of Residents	65
4.9 Household Size of Respondents	66
4.10 Respondent's Length of Stay	68
4.11 Residents' Ethnic Group and Religious Affiliations	70
<b>CHAPTER FIVE: ANALYSIS OF INFRASTRUCTURE AVAILABILITY IN SEME BORDER SETTLEMENTS</b>	<b>73</b>
5.1 Introduction	73
5.2 Distribution of Infrastructure in Seme Border	73



5.3	Conditions of Infrastructure in Seme Border	78
<b>CHAPTER SIX: RESIDENTS' QUALITY OF LIFE IN SEME BORDER</b>		
<b>SETTLEMENTS</b>		<b>86</b>
6.1	Introduction	86
6.2	Quality of life Indicators in Seme Border	86
6.3	Importance Attached to and the Satisfaction Derived from QoL Indicators in Seme Border Settlements by Respondents	101
6.4	Comparative Analysis of Residents' Importance of and Satisfaction on Quality of Life Indicators	115
<b>CHAPTER SEVEN: DETERMINANTS OF RESIDENTS QUALITY OF</b>		
<b>LIFE IN SEME BORDER</b>		<b>119</b>
7.1	The Factor Analysis	119
7.2	Correlation Matrix and Communalities of Selected Variables	120
7.3	Variance Explained of Residents' Quality of Life Determinants'	123
7.4	Extracted Determinants of Residents' Quality of Life in Seme Border	125
<b>CHAPTER EIGHT: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS</b>		
<b>AND CONCLUSION</b>		<b>130</b>
8.1	Summary of Findings	130
8.2	Physical Planning Problems Identified	134
8.3	Recommendations	136
8.4	Areas for Further Research	139
8.5	Conclusion	140

References	141
Appendix I	153
Appendix II	164

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1	Survey of indicators recommended by different countries	28
Table 2.2	Elements of quality of life by Schwartz (1994)	29
Table 2.3	Elements of quality of life classified by Mukherjee (1989)	29
Table 2.4	Core domains and indicators of quality of life	30
Table 2.5	Core quality of life indicator characteristics	31
Table 2.6	Typology of Border region development	36
Table 2.7	Quality of life: core domains and indicators	43
Table 3.1	Sampling frame distributed into categories of settlements	49
Table 3.2	Stratification of villages to categories for questionnaire administration	50
Table 4.1	Gender of Respondents in the border settlements	56
Table 4.2	Descriptive statistics of age of Residents in Seme border.	58
Table 4.3	Descriptive statistics of Residents' income in Seme border	59
Table 4.4	Marital status of Residents in the border settlements	61
Table 4.5	Number of years spent in pursuit of formal education by residents	64
Table 4.6	ANOVA of years spent in pursuit of formal education in the study area	64
Table 4.7	Patterns of Respondents occupation	65
Table 4.8:	Analysis of Variance of respondents' household size	67
Table 4.9:	Descriptive Statistics for the residents' Length of Stay in the Study Area	69
Table 4.9a:	Length of Stay of Respondents in their current residence	69
Table 4.9b	Descriptive Statistics for the residents' Length of Stay	69
Table 4.9c	Variation in length of residence in the study area	70
Table 4.10:	Ethnic Background of Residents in the Study Area	71
Table 4.11	Summary of ANOVA and Chi-Square of the socio-economic attribute of residents in the study area.	72

Table 5.2	Available facilities in Seme Border settlements	74
Table 5.2a	Available facilities in the Huts of Seme border	75
Table 5.2b	Available facilities in the Hamlet of Seme border settlements	76
Table 5.2c	Available Facilities in the Villages of Seme Border	77
Table 5.3	Respondents' view of the conditions of the available facilities in Study area	79
Table 5.3a	Respondents' view of the conditions of the available facilities in the Hut	80
Table 5.3b	Respondents' view of the condition of available facilities in the Hamlet	81
Table 5.3c	Respondents' view of the condition of the available facilities in Villages	82
Table 6.1	Respondents housing condition in the study Area	87
Table 6.2	Household services	89
Table 6.3	Electricity supply	91
Table 6.4	Means of gaining access to buildings	91
Table 6.5	Residents feeling of connection with surrounding countries	92
Table 6.6	Visitation of Residents to bordering country	93
Table 6.7	Respondents attendance at Neighbourhood Association meetings	93
Table 6.8	Impact of cultural diversity on Respondents	94
Table 6.9	Determinants of healthcare facility' usage	94
Table 6.10	Overall health of Respondents ' in Seme border settlements	95
Table 6.11	Residents' perception of the general condition of the environment	96
Table 6.12	Why residents do not have sense of pride in their neighbourhood	97
Table 6.13	Determinants of residents' pride in their neighbourhood	97
Table 6.14	Chi-Square test for Residents ' reasons for sense of pride in their	

	Community	98
Table 6.15	Respondents' modes of travelling within Border settlement	98
Table 6.16	Respondents ' frequency of using public transport in the study area	99
Table 6.17	Governance quality in the view of Respondents	99
Table 6.18	Respondents' Feelings about their household income	100
Table 6.19	Respondents' description of their overall economic situation in the Study area	100
Table 6.20	Importance attached to quality of life indicators by Respondents in the study area	103
Table 6.21	Residents expressed satisfaction on quality of life indicators in Seme border	104
Table 6.22	Importance attached to quality of life indicators by Respondents in hut	106
Table 6.23	Residents Satisfaction Index on quality of life indicators in the hut	107
Table 6.24	Importance attached to quality of life indicators by Respondents in Hamlet	109
Table 6.25	Residents Satisfaction Index on quality of life indicators in the hamlet	110
Table 6.26	Importance attached to quality of life Indicators by Respondents in villages	112
Table 6.27	Residents expressed satisfaction for the villages of Seme border	113
Table 6.28	Respondents rating on the overall quality of life	114
Table 6.29	Quality of life index in Seme border	114
Table 6.30	Residents satisfaction with overall quality of life	115
Table 6.31	Indicators group based on deviation about the mean of QLII and RSI in	

	the Study area	116
Table 7.1	Correlation matrix of selected variables used in factor analysis	121
Table 7.2	Communalities of Respondents' responses	123
Table 7.3	Total Variance Explained of Respondents' determinant of quality of life	124
Table 7.4:	Rotated Component Matrix <sup>a</sup> of Respondents' Responses	126

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1:	Map of Nigeria Showing Lagos State	11
Figure 1.2:	Map of Nigeria, Lagos State and Badagry	19
Figure 1.3	Badagry in the context of Lagos state	20
Figure 1.4:	Street map of Seme showing the selected settlements under study	
Figure 2.1	Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs.	41
Figure 2.2	Determinants of Residents Quality of life	45
Figure 4.1	Age Distribution of residents in the border settlements	57
Figure 4.2	Spatial Distribution of Respondents Income	60
Figure 4.3	Education Statuses of Residents'	62
Figure 4.4	Household Size of Respondents in the Study Area	67
Figure 4.5	Respondents' Length of Stay in the Study Area	68
Figure 4.6	Religious Affiliation of Residents in the Study Area	71
Figure 7.1	Factor Influencing Respondents' Quality of Life in Seme Border	129

**LIST OF PLATES**

Plate 5.1	Physical condition of a typical Private Nursery & Primary School and Government Primary School in Seme border	83
Plate 5.2	Typical Waste dumped on road side and waste stored and expecting collection by Local Government Wast and Sanitation Department	84
Plate 5.3	Poor Condition of access roads in the study area	84
Plate 5.4	Fair Condition of Health Facilities in the Study Area	84
Plate 5.5	A road side Market in Seme Border	85
Plate 6.1	Toilet and bathroom located outside the building in the study area	90
Plate 6.2	Typical uncovered manually dug well and a non-functional borehole in the study area.	90



## ABSTRACT

The study examined the socio-economic characteristics of residents in selected settlements of Seme border; identified and examined the available social, economic and environmental infrastructure; examined the determinants of residents' QoL and examined the residents' perceived Quality of Life (QoL) in the study area. This is with a view to suggesting policy measures to enhance residents' QoL in the border region.

Data for the study were obtained from both primary and secondary sources. Primary data were obtained from residents in the existing 21 settlements stratified into huts, hamlets and villages in the study area. One of every two settlements (50%) was randomly selected without replacement, giving a total of 11 settlements. There were 228, 1131 and 284 buildings in the selected huts, hamlets and villages respectively. Questionnaire were administered on household heads in every fifth (5th) building (20%) using systematic random sampling. Out of the 1643 buildings, 329 were sampled. Data collected included the residents' socio-economic attributes, views on the availability and condition of infrastructure, QoL indicators and the determinants of QoL. Secondary data obtained included population figures and maps of the study area from Badagry Local Government. Data obtained were analyzed using frequency, ANOVA, Chi-square, and Factor analysis.

Findings revealed that 83.6% of the respondents were between the age bracket of 31 and 60 year. The mean age of residents was 44 years. The average monthly income of the residents in the study area was ₦22, 700.00k. There is a significant difference in the average monthly income of the residents in the hut, hamlet and villages with ₦25, 300.00k, ₦24, 600.00k and ₦12, 700.00k respectively ( $F= 2.733$  and  $p=0.66$ ). It was established that 64.4% of the residents' engaged in informal activities. Findings further revealed that all the respondents (100%) had

access to communication facilities such as mobile phone and radio while most of the settlements had no access to government supplied electricity. The average condition of all facilities measured on 7-point Likert scale in the study area was slightly bad (2.93). The facility in the poorest condition was electricity supply with an index of very bad (1.07). Generally, the three most important QoL indicators to residents were the health of residents', access to local government waste disposal facilities and availability of electricity supply each with an index of 7.00. The satisfaction derived from the services related to the above indicators were with indices of 3.31, 1.00 and 2.98 respectively. The level of importance attached to QoL indicators directly varied with increase in settlement's size as the indices for the hut, hamlet and villages were 5.51, 5.64 and 5.66 respectively. The overall residents' perceived QoL for the study area was slightly poor (index = 3.15). Six determinants of QoL identified, jointly explained a variance of 68.7%. Three of these factors (infrastructure and governance, social connectedness and safety) explained variance of 22.2%, 14.8% and 13.6% respectively.

The study concluded that residents' level of satisfaction were very low with the indicators rated to be of very high in importance to their quality of life such as quality and reliability of government services, electricity availability among others. More so, the availability and quality of infrastructure that can positively impact on the residents' QoL were very poor.

## CHAPTER ONE

### INTRODUCTION

#### 1.1 Background to the Study

Over the years, research attention have been extended to the study of boundaries, borders, borderlands and the border impacted population in both developed and developing countries (Bonchuk, 2012; Johnson, 2010; Asiwaju, 2006; Ajomo, 1989). Border is defined as the physical line or wall separating two nations. It is a line that indicates a boundary. Border towns according to Newman (2006) are towns or cities close to the boundary between two countries, state or regions. Boundaries are markers in existing between states and separate places in political, socio-cultural, and economic terms (Timothy, 2000). According to Max Weber cited by Johnson (2010), boundaries are essential, since they describe the territory that is between two areas and are also created because multiple power contest a finite global space in the aspect of power seeking, exclusive control or sovereignty. While border demarcates a state's territory, it also describes identities, belonging, and political affiliation (Weber, 2012).

Border regions all over the world possess the same characteristics and problems. This is as a result of the special circumstances surrounding their evolution (Sewanu, 2010). Some of these characteristics are the artificial neglect of the border communities, security issues, terrorism, crime, uncontrolled migration, fragmentation of coherent culture, smuggling and illicit trade route (Asiwaju,1993). These characteristics are shared by all borders whether in America, Asia, Africa, Australia or Europe. From 1945, European border regions began to change from fragmentation and neglect to integration. African border regions have on the other hand, retained the earlier characteristics despite the changes taking place in Europe since 1945(Ajomo, 1989). Why the border towns in Europe are merging and forming conurbations, African border towns

are decreasing in population and forming frontier march-land (Sewanu, 2010). In other words, what has characterized African border towns is neglect especially in the provision of infrastructural, communication facilities and industries. It is the absence of this that has affected the residents' quality of life and the population growth along the border region and makes them all villages or rural area till date (Kishor and Johnson, 2005).

Growing concern over Quality of Life (QoL) of city dwellers has become more explicit (Omar, 2009; Mata, 2002; O'Boyle, 1997; Liu, 1975). Policy makers and researchers increasingly engaged in understanding social, economic problems, going beyond economic criteria and other objective measurements of QoL (Dunning, Williams and Abonyi, 2008). This issue on quality of life varies across time and culture (Diener and Suh, 1997; Sugiyama, Thompson and Alves, 2009). It is referred to as the general well-being of an individual (Meule, Fath, Real, Sütterlin, Vögele and Kübler, 2013). The World Health Organisation (2007) defines QoL as the individual's perception of their position in life in terms of culture and value system in which they live and also in relation to their goals, expectation, standards, and concern. In the definition of Foo (2000), QoL is also explained as individual overall satisfaction with life. From these definitions, QoL can be described as a broad ranging concept that is affected by a person's physical health, psychological state, level of independence and their relationships to salient features of the environment. It focuses on all facets of life which includes cultural, social, environmental, physical, health and the local value systems among others.

QoL has been an evolving concept overtime for addressing issues such as health, environment, liveability, housing, urban psychology and many other social and physical aspects that influence human lives directly and indirectly. The concept has also significantly become more relevant in terms of measuring progress toward achieving improved wellbeing and

therefore, helping to fulfil sustainability goals and objectives. It also helps in contextualizing relevant policies and strategies by local and regional governments in seeking a foster sustainable regional development in more holistic and inter-disciplinary ways (Costanza, 2008).

In measuring quality of life, two approaches are traditionally conceptualized; these are objective and subjective indicators. Occasionally, both approaches are also being used. The predominant approach, often labelled the “objective” or “social indicators” approach, tends to measure quality of life in terms of aggregate measures of social condition factors external to the individual. Such research largely uses measures that reflect general social circumstances present in a given time or place, such as levels of economic activity, employment, public health, or crime, to predict quality of life among individuals in society. Such factors are viewed as objective because their importance as contributors to quality of life is based in the normative ideals of society, meaning that most members of society would agree on the desirability or undesirability of a given indicator. On the other hand, subjective indicators focus on the individual’s judgment of their condition in life and are designed to gauge the opinion of the individual about their QOL. Questions comprising such measures typically ask respondents to rate their overall satisfaction with life compared with some standard. A major strength of the subjective approach is that it facilitates examination of both overall quality of life and the various domains that comprise it, such as housing, neighbourhood, health, social connectedness, environment, work and the family among others (Liu, 1975; Milbrath, 1979; Wish, 1986; Foo, 2000; Andre and Bitondo, 2001; Tsou and Liu 2001; Gabriel and Bowling, 2004; UNDP, 2004; Venhooven, 2004; Schacman, Liu and Wang, 2005, Noll, 2005; Heuck and Schulz, 2012).

Previous research has demonstrated that housing is an important domain that contributes to the overall quality of life (Das, 2008; Oswarld et al., 2003; Zebardast, 2009). It has been demonstrated that increasing housing satisfaction is accompanied by a significant increase in

For more information, please contact [ir-help@oauife.edu.ng](mailto:ir-help@oauife.edu.ng)

OBAFEMI AWOLowo UNIVERSITY