Litter Management in Selected Transport Interchanges in Ibadan North Local Government

Adekiya I.S.[1]

[1] Osun State College of Technology

Received: 8 December 2017 Accepted: 1 January 2018 Published: 15 January 2018

Abstract

This study examined the socio-economic characteristics of the operators in selected transport interchange in Ibadan; determined the quality and composition of litter generated; examined little storage, collection, transportation and disposal practices of litter generated: and identified and examined factors influencing litter management in the study area. These were with a view to providing information for policy response to litter management practices.The data were collected using multi-stage sampling. The first stage was the purposive selection of the four transport interchange. The second stage was the stratification of the transport interchange into different operators such as traders and public transport operators. The third stage involves the selection of 20

Index terms—

1 Litter Management in Selected Transport Interchanges in Ibadan North Local Government

Abstract-This study examined the socio-economic characteristics of the operators in selected transport interchange in Ibadan; determined the quality and composition of litter generated; examined little storage, collection, transportation and disposal practices of litter generated: and identified and examined factors influencing litter management in the study area. These were with a view to providing information for policy response to litter management practices.

The data were collected using multi-stage sampling. The first stage was the purposive selection of the four transport interchange. The second stage was the stratification of the transport interchange into different operators such as traders and public transport operators. The third stage involves the selection of 20% of 177 retail shop outlets and425 umbrella stands. A total of 120 trader sand 80 public transport operators were purposively selected for questionnaire administration. Information elicited from interchange operators were on socio-economic attributes, quantity and composition of litter, litter storage, collection, transportation and disposal and management strategies of litter generated.

The mean ages for the traders and public transport operators were 35and38years respectively. The study established that traders (49.2%) and public transport operators (38.8%) had secondary certificate. The mean income of the traders and the public transport operators were #55,000 and #32,000 monthly respectively. The traders (54.1%) employed between 1 to 3 persons in their retail outlet, while public transport operators (58.5%) stay in the transport interchange for minimum of 10minutes. It was also established that traders (82%)and public transport operators (91.3%) littered the environment. The proportion of litter generated by the operators within the transport interchange are black nylon (86.9%), metal scrap (24.6%). Traders (60%) litter by flinging throwing litter, while public transport operators (47.5%) litter by leaving rubbish behind. The predominant storage facilities used by the traders were sack (63.9%), dust bins (41.8%) and basket (32%). The litters collected were disposed through a government disposal system, which the litter were gathered and incinerated in a place. Traders litter of the following reasons; because they feel paid workers will clean up the litter (65.6%), they feel

the material they drop is not litter (54.9%) and there are no bins around (51.6%). Education of people was selected as a management strategy by the traders (77%), while provisions of more litter bins along the road were selected by public transport operators (95%).

2 Introduction

itter is generally defined as misplaced solid waste. Litter is waste, but not all waste is litter. Litter can be as small as a sweet wrapping or as large as a bag of rubbish or it can mean lots ot items scattered about (litter and law). Likewise "litter" as a verb can as well be regarded as an environmental anti-social behavior (Andrew 2006) and disorder of materials at places that are not needed without the intention of clearing it.

Littering is defined as individuals' intentional or unintentional act of throwing of waste on bare ground in general daily practice (Ojedokun and Balogun, 2013) Littering is untidy and hazardous to the health of humans and animal (Ojedokun 2013). Littering activity can be done at any undesignated place of human activities. Places that are often littered include streets, parks, open space, public ground, public buildings, beaches, public transport vehicles, attraction centres and transport interchanges.

A transport interchanges convergence and a transition point where people are gathered within it. According to Piotr and Piotr (2012), a transport interchange is commonly understood to be the place where transfers between different public transport lines or modes occur. In addition, it may be a place where passengers join or leave the public transport system on foot, by bicycle, motorcycle, or car (Auckland Transport, 2013), thereby certain facilities such as toilets, car parks and sit out, information board exist within it. In this regard, it is a common place (public place) where a lot of different activities take place and which is accessible by different people.

Several human activities take place in a transport interchange. The different activities in a transport interchange include commercial, social and administrative. Diazl, Urella and Ribalaygua (2012) documented that transport interchanges accommodate several commercial activities carried out within them and surroundings. Corresponding to the extent commercial activities that take splace in a transport interchange, is the extent that waste will be generated as "waste is an unavoidable by product of human activities" (Ramachar, Rafi, Umaamahesh and Guptha 2012).

Ibadan is a large city which has several transport interchanges in different sizes which include Ojo, Iwo road, Dugbe, Sango interchange. Researches on litter management at transport interchanges are not popular as how generated waste in these interchanges is not documented. It is on this note that this research work will be embarked upon. This study would examine how the litter generated in transport interchanges stored, transported and disposed in Ibadan city in order to provide sustainable information on litter management practices.

3 II.

4 Justification of the Paper

The significance of prevention of litter should not be undervalued. Litterbugs, (2009) assert that, litter can have impact on the quality of life and crime rate in public places. The social economic and environmental cost of litter should not be ignored, as it contains dangerous materials such as sharp objects like metal scrap, glass remnant, and broken bottles etc. litter create unsafe places that detract the enjoyment of people. A public place like transport interchange should be free from litter because of the various users present.

Government unresponsiveness to littering has made littering a severe environmental problem that defaces and degrades our environment. The presence of litter in a region affects the social, economic and physical sphere in a deleterious manner. Prior to this, it is best handled with an effective litter management strategy with the backing of strict government policy. Hence, this project would be carried out to provide necessary information on litter management in transport interchange in order to elicit response from government. This thereby would help to prevent further degradation of the environment.

5 III.

6 Conceptual Consideration

Orthodoxy littering is when someone drops garbage in places that are not designated for the garbage disposal. Example is dropping a wrapper of biscuit on the ground by the side of the road after eating the biscuit inside the wrapper or similar acts. Littering also occurs in a moving vehicle either by littering the vehicle or throwing garbage out of the window by passengers and drivers or both (drive-by-littering). Coined out of Gellar at al **??**1982) littering is an act of dropping, throwing, flinging materials consciously and unconsciously at places that are not designated for such materials. "Littering can occur in many locations, it can vary in amount, types and rates, and places that are prone tom persistent high level of littering are described as hotsports". (Queensland litter and illegal Dumping Action Plan, 2013). According to Waste Reduction and Recycling (2013), dangerous littering is the depositing of waste at a place that causes, or is likely to cause harm to a person, property or the environment. Littering is sometimes done consciously/intentionally and unconsciously/unintentionally while the volume of litter thrown or deposited from an individual is usually small in size and shape. Unintentional littering describes a situation where one is not trying to litter but such action results in litter. Some examples o f this

form of littering are: throwing garbage into an over flowing garbage can and it falls on to the ground or the wind blows it off the top of the pile, when a materials falls off someone's pocket at the point of inserting it into his or her pocket. Under certain conditions is littering acceptable in the society. It is represented in the Source: adopted from ENCAMS, (2016)

Littering has been found to take placeat transition point i.e. where people move from one place to the other. Transport interchange cannot be left out in this regard. The high rate of littering is as a result of a feeling of sense of non-ownership of the property as the land does not seem to belong to anybody. Nevertheless, litter originates through the activity of people. **??**jedokun and Balogun (2016) submitted that littering problem is an inherent fact of modern living that exists in one way or another in many countries. In Nigeria, urban litter is one of the visible and persistent environmental issues facing the Oyo State Government.

Items are discarded either activity or passively (Sibley and Liu, 2003) in places such as parks, roads, paths, camping grounds, cafes, stores or other public buildings. Items such as cigarettes, bottles and other glass or plastic containers, napkins bags, tissues, take away food packages, snack wrappers, are frequently dropped in these locations, seriously damaging the environment. Some of those items are non-degradable, resulting in negative consequences for the environment and natural areas. Apart from the costs of employing someone to remove the litter, there are additional environmental costs to take into account (B. Torgler, A. Garcia-Valinas and A. Macintyre 2014).

IV. Sampling Procedure, Sample Frame and Sample size Multi stage sampling techniques was used for the collection of data from traders and operators in transport interchanges in Ibadan North local Government Area. There were four major transport interchanges identified in Ibadan North Local Government. These were Agbowo, Sango, Mokola and Agodi. The first stage was the selection of the transport interchanges purposely.

The details about each transport interchanges are represented in Table 1.

The second stage was the stratification of the transport interchange into two different operators. The third stage was the stratification of traders present in the transport interchange into two, Umbrella and shop retail outlet, which were selected through systematic random sampling.

As for the public transport operators, convenient sampling was carried out on them. With 20 questioning per transport interchange. Details of traders in each transport interchange are represented in Tables 1 and 2. Afterwards 20% of the traders present at the interchange were administered with questionnaire.

However locked up shops were excluded from the sample frame. Refer to Table 3 to see the percentage of trading outlets that will be surveyed. The table revealed the proportion of trading platforms in the transport interchanges and their percentages.

Table 1: Details of Transport Interchanges Present in Ibadan North Local Government.

The commercial activities were classified thus: interchanges that has make-shift retail shops (70% built with wood) = A, interchange that has permanent structure for retail activities = B.

The arrangement was classified thus: interchange where vehicle is parked on the road side = A, interchange where vehicle is parked at a designated place off the road = B.

The size would be classified based on the number of vehicle transport available there: mini bus = A, tricycle = B, taxi = C, motorcycle = D, big us = E.

The transport interchanges vary from one another greatly in terms of their available commercial activities, arrangement, and size (variety of vehicle transport available). However, the options were selected based on their availability at the transport interchanges.

7 Data Analysis and Discussion

8 Average Duration of Stay of Public Transport Operators in the Interchange

The duration of minutes spent by public transport operators in the study area is presented in Table below. The minutes were categorized into four groups of 10 minutes and below, 11 to 20, 21 to 30 and 31 minutes and above. Majority (42.5%) of the operators spend 10 minutes and lesser in the interchange. Others that spend 10 to 20 minutes. 21 to 30 minutes and 31 minutes above in the study area are 37.5%, 16.3% and 3.7% repectively. On the average the public transport operators spend 20 minutes in the study area. The average time spent in the study area by the operators is 15 minutes. Furthermore than half of the respondents spends 20 minutes and below in the interchange. This indicates that they spend quite some time in the interchange before leaving for their destination, and several of them engage in activities that might lead to dropping litter in the interchange.

9 Source: Author's Field Survey 2017 b) Respondent's littering Act

The littering act of traders and public transport operators are depicted in table above. As at the time the questionnaire is administered on traders 22.1% said they still littered in the environment while 82% of the traders said they have littered before in one way or the other in the environment in the study area. Also 29.6% of the public transport operator's sand they still littered in the environment while 91.3% of public transport

operators said they have littered in one way or the other in the environment. Findings show that as at the time the questionnaire was administered 59.8% of the traders that have littered in the past no more litter as well as 45% of the public transport operators. The difference in the percentage of respondents that have littered before and people that still litters indicates that majority that have littered in the past have grown to be conscious of it by not littering or the respondents don't feel comfortable to say the truth.

Volume XVIII Issue V Version I Table above presents the relationship of trader's socio-economic characteristics and their littering behavior. Male gender littered more than the female at the time the questionnaire was administered, as 26.7% of males said they litter and 17.7%of females. But when asked if they have ever littered, the male slightly exceed the female, as 85% of males said they have littered before while 79% of females said they have littered before. Findings revealed that 0% of people with no formal education do litter while 10.5% of trader with primary school certificate litters, 21.7% of traders with secondary school certificate litters, 27.6% of people with tertiary degree litters, and 50% of people that did vocational studies litters. While majority (84.2%) of the traders that have primary school education said they have once littered, as well as 83.3% of traders with secondary education, 66.7% of traders with no formal education, 75.9% of traders with tertiary education and 100% with vocational education said they have once littered in one way or the other. Also majority (60%) of traders in age bracket 25 years and below litters as at the time questionnaire was administered. Those within the age brackets 26 to 45 years and 46 years and above that litters are 15.7% and 10.5% respectively. While majority (85%) of the traders within age bracket 25 years and below said they have once littered in one way or the other. Those within the age brackets 26 to 45 years and 46 years and above that have littered are 80.7% and 84.2% respectively.

The difference between the variables whether "you have ever littered" and "do you litter" shows that higher number of male and female traders used to litter in the past than the recent time. It showed that more number of traders with no formal education, primary, secondary, tertiary and vocational education used to litter in the past than recent time. More traders within the age brackets of 25years and below, 26 to 46 years and above used to litter in the past than the recent time.

10 Recommendations

The concerned part of the government on environmentally related matters should indulge in researches like this and several others on litter before making a new policy concerning the cleanliness of the environment.

Environmental related matters on litter should be treated with utmost priority by every government regime, in order to achieve the desired goal of an environmentally clean state.

Environmental related hazards are of great concern to people as it affects the whole populace in an appalling manner it is therefore pertinent to create an integrated model that would combine the right litter strategies towards the right target in order to reduce as level among people.

The litter management strategies should henceforth be made part of the prescriptive and regulatory standards for development in Nigeria for new development and existing development.

The state government should educate the public on the subject matter that is, waste generation, waste disposal and waste management; this can be achieved through publication on social media.

11 XI.

12 Conclusion

The littering attitude of the operators assessed in selected transport interchanges showed that the level of littering can be rated very bad, because of their indulgences in improper measure put in place against littering by the government. The ineffective measure can be traced to the improper survey, assessment of the generation, transportation, storage and disposal of litter.

Despite the people's littering behavior majority of them still want to operate in a clean environment better than where they are. Oyo state government should take note of the people's needs for littering reduction as provided in this research in order to facilitate the vision of keeping Oyo state very clean. [1]

[1]Year 2018 © 2018 Global Journals Litter Management in Selected Transport Interchanges in Ibadan North Local Government

below

Axis of acceptability	Axis of excusability
ACCEPTABLE	EXCUSABLE
If the area is already dirty or run-down	When everyone else is doing it
If the litter will be cleaned up by others	When drunk
If there aren't sufficient bins	When you can't be seen
In the country where it is more noticeable	In front of the children In (receptacle) public
In my own backyard If the area is tidy and presentable	
UNACCEPTABLE	TABOO
	Axis for acceptability/excusability for littering.

Figure 1: Table below :

1

Transport interchange	Commercial activities	Arrangement	Size (transport variety)
Agbowo	A,B	A	A,C,D
Agodi	A,B	A	A,B,C,D,E
Mokola	A,B	A	C,D,E
Sango	A,B	A,B	A,C,D,E
			Source: Author's, 2017

Figure 2: Table 1 :

2

S/N	Location	No of shops	No of locked-up shops	No of opened shops	No.of stands	Umbrella
1	Agodi-Gate Interchange	57	3	54	334	
2.	MokolaInterchnage	17	0	17	54	
3.	Sango Interchange	107	11	96	22	
4	U.I Interchange	10	0	10	15	
	Total	191	14	177	425	
					Source: Author's, 2017	

Figure 3: Table 2 :

3

Litter Management in Selected Transport Interchanges in Ibadan North Local Government

Year 2018
3
Volume XVII
Issue V Version
I
(H)
Global Journa
of Human So
cial Science -

S/N 1	Location Agodi-Gate interchange	No of open shops 54	20% of the open shops 11	No of Umbrella stands 334	20% of the umbrella stands 69
2	Mokola interchange	17	3	54	11
3	Sango interchange	96	19	22	4
4	U.I interchange	10	2	15	3
	Total	177	35	425	87

Source: Author's, 2017

Figure 4: Table 3 :

4

Amount	Frequency	Percentage
#35,000 and below	53	66.3%
#36,000 -#45,000	18	22.5%
#46,000 and above	9	11.3%
Total	80	100

Source: Author's Field Survey 2017

VI.

Figure 5: Table 4 :

5

Average Duration in Minutes	Frequency	Percentage
10 minutes and below	34	42.5%
11 to 20	30	37.5%
21 to 30	13	16.3%
31 minutes and above	3	3.7%
Total	80	100

Source: Author's Field Survey 2017

Figure 6: Table 5 :

6

Do you litter?		Have you ever Litter?	
(Traders) Response			Frequency
Frequency		Percentage	
Percentage			
Yes			100 82%
12 22.1%			
(Public Transport Frequency percentage			Frequency
			percentage
Operator) Response			
Yes		73	91.3%
37	29.6%		

Figure 7: Table 6 :

[Dwyer et al. ()] , W O Dwyer , F C Leeming , M K Cobern , B E Porter , J M Jackson . 1993.

[Design ()] , Urban Design . 2011. (Transport Interchanges)

[Transport Interchange as City Centres ()] , *Transport Interchange as City Centres* 2015.

[Munoz-Cadena et al. ()] *An approach to litter generation and littering practices in a Mexico city neighbourhood, www, mdpi. com/journal/sustainability*, C Munoz-Cadena , P Lina-Manjarrez , I Estrada-Izquierdo , E Ramon-Gallegos . 2012. 33 p. .

[Andrew ()] 'Anti-social behaviour: concerns of minority and marginalized Londoners'. M Andrew . *Internet Journal of Criminology* 2006. 2006.

[Baltes and Hayward ()] 'Application and evaluation of strategies to reduce pollution: behavioural control of littering in a football stadium'. M Baltes , S Hayward . *journal of applied psychology* 1976. p. .

[Ajagbe ()] *Assessment of the Safety of Commercial Motorcycle Operation in Ibadan Municipality*, O Ajagbe . 2015. (Unpublished)

[Afangideh et al. ()] 'Attitude of urban dwellers to waste disposal and management in Calabar'. A I Afangideh , K U Joseph , J E Atu . *European Journal of Sustainable Development* 2012. 1 (1) .

[Miller et al. ()] 'Can the design of trash can influence litter-related behaviour'. M Miller , M Albert , D Bostick , E Geller . *Southeastern Psychological Association* 1976.

[City of Casey Litter Management Strategy ()] *City of Casey Litter Management Strategy*, 2010-2014.

[Clean Up ()] Australia Clean Up . *Rubbish Report. 11. Code of Practice on Litter and Refuse*, 2010. 2006.

[Critical review of behavioural interventions to preserve the environment: research since 1980. Environment and behaviour] *Critical review of behavioural interventions to preserve the environment: research since 1980. Environment and behaviour*, p. .

[Sibley and Liu ()] *differentiating active and passive littering a two-stage process model of littering behaviour in public spaces*, C G Sibley , J H Liu . 2003. (environment and behaviour)

[Fuggle and rabie ()] *Environment management in South Africa*, R Fuggle , M &rabie . 2009. Cape Town: Juta Law Publishers.

[Bickman ()] *Environmental attitudes and actions, journal of social psychology*, L Bickman . 1972. p. .

[Geller et al. ()] *Environmental Preservation: New strategies for behaviour change*, E Geller , R Winnett , P Everett . 1982. New York: Pergamon Press.

[Environmental protection agency ()] *Environmental protection agency*, 1990.

[Environmental protection agency ()] *Environmental protection agency*, 1993.

[Fisher et al. (ed.) ()] *Environmental psychology*, J Fisher , P Bell , A Baum . hold, rinehart and Winston (ed.) 1986. New York.

[Sherrington et al. ()] 'Exploring the indirect cost of litter in Scotland'. C Sherrington , D Hogg , C Darrah , S &hann . *wasteminz.org.nz* 2012. p. .

[Finnie ()] 'Field experiments in itter control'. W Finnie . *journal of environment and behaviour* 1973. p. .

[Paloma et al. ()] 'Identification of self-reported user behaviour, education level, and preferences to reduce littering on beaches-A survey from the SE pacific'. Lucas B Paloma , N Barbara , C Martin , T . *Journal, Ocean and Coastal Management. Pp* 2013. Elsevier. p. .

[Illegal Dumping Presentational Guide ()] *Illegal Dumping Presentational Guide*, 1998. (United States Environmental protection Agency)

[Nguyen and Dinh (2014)] 'Innovating littering prevention model in Hanoi: the reality and lessons from example of San Jose site USA'. T Nguyen , P Dinh . *International Journal on Research in Earth and Environmental Sciences* 2014. February, 2014. (1) .

[Torgler et al. ()] 'Justifiability of Littering: An empirical investigation'. B Torgler , M A Garcia Yalinas , A Macintyre . *Journal of Behavioural and Experimental Economics* 2008.

[Encams ()] *Litter and the tow: A guide for the public, Environmental protection agency*, Encams . 1970. p. 172. (Keep Britain Tidy))

[Love where you live Keep Britain Tidy ()] 'Love where you live'. *Keep Britain Tidy*, 2013.

[Love where you live Keep Britain Tidy ()] 'Love where you live'. *Keep Britain Tidy*, 2014.

[Ramachar et al. ()] 'Municipal solid waste management (Msw) scenario in Kurnool city'. T Ramachar , K Rafi , M Umamahesh , N Guptha . *Global Journal of Researches in Engineering* 2012. 12 (2) .

[David et al. ()] 'municipal solid waste management, its effect and resource potential in a semi-urban city: a case study'. O David , O Oladipupo , N Anthony , I Isaac , O Kolawole . *Journal of South African Business Research* 2014. 2014. (705695) .

[Cierjacksa ()] 'Operational performance indicators for litter management at festivals in semi-natural landscapes'. Behrb Cierjacksa , Kowarika . *Journal -Ecological Indicator* 2012. Elsevier. 13 p. .

[Piotr and Piotr ()] O Piotr , K Piotr . *Quantitative assessment of public transport interchanges*, 2012.

[Ojedokun and Balogun ()] 'Psychosociocultural analysis of attitude towards littering in a Nigerian urban city'. O Ojedokun , S Balogun . *Ethopian Journal of Environmental Studies and Management* 2011. 4 (1) .

[Transport (ed.) ()] *Public transport interchanges design guidelines*, Auckland Transport . Rusell Turnbull (ed.) 2013.

[Queensland's and illegal dumping action plan ()] *Queensland's and illegal dumping action plan*, 2013.

[Kohlenberg and Phillips ()] 'Reinforcement and rate of litter depositing'. R Kohlenberg , T Phillips . *Journal of applied behaviour analysis* 1973. p. .

[Ojedokun and Balogun ()] 'Self-monitoring and responsible environmental behaviour: the mediating role of attitude towards littering'. O Ojedokun , S Balogun . *Journal of Psychology and Behavioural Sciences* 2013. 2 (1) p. .

[Sule ()] *Solid and faecal waste disposal urban development planning framework the Nigeria experience*, R Sule . 2004. Nigeria. (thumbprint IntI Company)

[Edmund and Immaculata ()] 'Street littering in Nigerian towns: towards a framework for sustainable urban cleanlmess'. E N Edmund , O Immaculata . *An International Multi-Disciplinary Journal* 2009. (3) .

[Fourchard ()] *The case of Ibadan, Nigeria, understanding slums: case studies for the global report on human settlements*, L Fourchard . 2003.

[Ajaegbo et al. ()] 'The determinants of littering attitude in urban neighbour hoods of Jos'. E Ajaegbo , S Dashit , A Akume . *JORIND* 2012. (3) p. 10.

[Samson and Albert ()] 'The determinants of littering attitude in urban neighbourhood of'. I Samson , T Albert . *Jos. JORIND* 2012. 10 (3) .

[Dorf ()] *the engineering handbook*, R C Dorf . 2005. Boca Raton: CRC Press.

[Ojedokun ()] 'The role of sociodemographical and psychological factors in taking littering prevention actions'. O Ojedokun . *International Journal of Advances in Psychology* 2013. 2 (4) .

[The view from the street Keep Britain Tidy ()] 'The view from the street'. *Keep Britain Tidy*, 2012.

[Diazl et al. ()] 'Transport interchanges effects on their surroundings in Tunja (Colombia) and Cordoba (Spain): A comparative approach'. S E Diazl , J M Urena , C Ribalaygua . *The Open Geography Journal* 2012. 5 p. .

[Oyeniyi ()] 'Waste management in contemporary Nigeria: The Abuja Example'. B A Oyeniyi . *International Journal of Politics and Good Governance* 2011. 2 (2) .