Datasets on factors influencing the urban environmental quality of intra-urban motor parks across density areas of Lagos metropolis
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A B S T R A C T

This survey data examined the factors influencing commuters’ perception of environmental quality in the selected intra-urban motor parks of Ibeju Lekki, Ifako Ijaiye and Ikeja local government areas, Lagos State, Nigeria. A survey of 376 commuters was carried out. The purposive sampling technique was used for the survey while the sampling procedure evolved from the identification of the study area to the administration of questionnaire with commuters in the motor parks. Data were analyzed using descriptive (likert scale outputs) and inferential statistical techniques (factor analysis for data reduction and categorization). The datasets can be considered in the transport and environmental policies of Lagos State and Nigeria with a view to engendering a conducive environment in the intra-urban motor parks of Lagos State, Nigeria.

© 2018 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Inc. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).
Specification Table

| Subject area                     | Environmental Science          |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| More specific subject area       | Transportation Management      |
| Type of data                     | Tables                         |
| How data was acquired            | Field Survey through questionnaire |
| Data format                      | Raw and analyzed               |
| Experimental factors             | Simple percentages and commuter perception index (CPI) were used as analytical tool of the generated data. Factor analysis was used in determining the factors influencing environmental quality in intra-motor parks. Likert scale also ranked factors using the Sum of weighted values (SWV). |
| Experimental features            | The key method used in data collection - structured questionnaire designed in Likert scale, the questionnaire was designed in such a way that it helped to collate basic information from the respondents. A population size of seventy five thousand, thirty two (75,032) was selected, and a total sample size of 376 respondents was used in data generation, with questionnaire distributed to commuters. Variables pertaining to the above listed targets were identified and incorporated into questionnaires as the primary source of data. The data was collated and analyzed using mean item score ranking, percentages, descriptive statistics and inferential statistics. |
| Data source location             | Ibeju Lekki, Ikeja and Ifako-Ijaiye Local Government Areas, Lagos State, Nigeria |
| Data accessibility               | All collected data are in this data article |

Value of the data

- The data can be used for evolving transportation and environmental policy for Lagos State, Nigeria.
- The data could be used in location and infrastructure planning of motor parks for Lagos State, Nigeria.
- The survey can be adopted for other high density cities in Nigeria such as Abuja, Kano, Kaduna, Ibadan, Enugu, Calabar, Warri, Benin City, Port-Harcourt and so on.
- The data could be used as basis of comparison of environmental quality of intra-urban motor parks across other density areas of Lagos metropolis and Nigeria at large.
- The questionnaire for this survey can be adopted and adapted in other subject areas.
- The data can be used by the physical planning authority (government) and private developers as a framework in addressing the subject of environmental quality in the location, design and planning of other urban motor parks and similar infrastructures taking into consideration the Commuter’s perception.

1. Data

The data describes collated responses solicited from commuters on their take on the factors influencing commuters’ perception of environmental quality in the selected intra-urban motor parks of Ibeju Lekki, Ifako Ijaiye and Ikeja local government areas, Lagos State, Nigeria. A total of 400 questionnaires was distributed and 376 (94%) were retrieved for analysis. Non response were excluded from the analysis. Data collected through the research instrument was analyzed and provided study information. Previous studies on the subject can be seen in [1–10]. The following methods of analysis were employed: Descriptive statistics (univariate analysis) using mean, frequency, percentages and proportions. The five point likert scale was also used. The various responses were analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS Version 21).
1.1. Socio-demographic characteristics of commuters

The socio-economic characteristics of the commuters explore the socio-demographic differences in the factors influencing commuters’ perception of environmental quality. These include: gender (Table 1), age (Table 2), education status (Table 3), employment status (Table 4), monthly income (Table 5), marital status (Table 6) and household size (Table 7).

Table 1
Gender of respondents. Source: Field Survey, 2017.

| Gender | Ibeju-Lekki | Ifako | Ikeja | Total |
|--------|-------------|-------|-------|-------|
|        | Freq | %   | Freq | %   | Freq | %   | Freq | %   |
| Male   | 22   | 62.9 | 107  | 58.2 | 92   | 58.6 | 221  | 58.8 |
| Female | 13   | 37.1 | 77   | 41.8 | 65   | 41.4 | 155  | 41.2 |
| Total  | 35   | 100.0| 184  | 100.0| 157  | 100.0| 376  | 100  |

Table 2
Age of respondents. Source: Field Survey, 2017.

| Age of respondent | Ibeju-Lekki | Ifako | Ikeja | Total |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|-------|-------|
|                    | Freq | %   | Freq | %   | Freq | %   | Freq | %   |
| Below 18 Years    | 2    | 5.7 | 21   | 11.4 | 10   | 6.4 | 33   | 8.7 |
| 18–40 Years       | 19   | 54.3| 113  | 61.4 | 97   | 61.8| 229  | 60.9|
| 40–60 Years       | 11   | 31.4| 40   | 21.7 | 44   | 28.0| 95   | 25.3|
| Above 60 Years    | 3    | 8.6 | 10   | 5.4  | 6    | 3.8 | 19   | 5.1 |
| Total             | 35   | 100.0| 184  | 100.0| 157  | 100.0| 376  | 100  |

Table 3
Education status of respondents. Source: Field Survey, 2017.

| Education status of respondent | Ibeju-Lekki | Ifako | Ikeja | Total |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-------|-------|-------|
|                                | Freq | %   | Freq | %   | Freq | %   | Freq | %   |
| No formal education            | –    | –   | 15   | 8.2  | 23   | 14.6| 38   | 10.1 |
| Primary education              | 2    | 5.7 | 9    | 4.9  | 14   | 8.9 | 25   | 6.7 |
| Secondary education            | 16   | 45.7| 45   | 24.5 | 41   | 26.1| 102  | 27.1 |
| Tertiary (first degree)        | 17   | 48.6| 83   | 45.1 | 62   | 39.5| 162  | 43.1 |
| Post graduate                  | –    | –   | 32   | 17.4 | 17   | 10.8| 49   | 13.0 |
| Total                          | 35   | 100.0| 184  | 100.0| 157  | 100.0| 376  | 100  |

Table 4
Employment status of respondents. Source: Field Survey, 2017.

| Employment status of respondent | Ibeju-Lekki | Ifako | Ikeja | Total |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-------|-------|-------|
|                                | Freq | %   | Freq | %   | Freq | %   | Freq | %   |
| Yes                            | 25   | 71.4| 113  | 61.4 | 110  | 70.0| 248  | 66   |
| No                             | 10   | 28.6| 71   | 38.5 | 47   | 29.9| 128  | 34   |
| Total                          | 35   | 100.0| 184  | 100.0| 157  | 100.0| 376  | 100  |
In summary, data revealed that young adults (18–40 years), literates (graduates of tertiary institutions), employed, underpaid and married persons, were most affected by the environmental quality of the intra-urban motor parks across the three density areas in Lagos metropolis.

### Table 5
Monthly income of respondents. Source: Field Survey, 2017.

| Monthly income of respondents | Ibeju-Lekki | Ifako | Ikeja | Total |
|------------------------------|------------|------|-------|-------|
| Freq | %     | Freq | %     | Freq | %     | Freq | %     |
| Below N18,000                | 9         |      | 46    |      | 44    |      | 99    |      |
| N18,000–N36,000              | 11        | 31.4 | 72    | 39.1 | 58    | 36.9 | 141   | 37.5 |
| N36,000–N54,000              | 5         | 14.3 | 26    | 14.1 | 10    | 6.4  | 41    | 10.9 |
| N54,000–N72,000              | 7         | 20.0 | 13    | 7.1  | 18    | 11.5 | 38    | 10.1 |
| N72,000–N90,000              | 3         | 8.6  | 17    | 9.2  | 16    | 10.2 | 36    | 9.6  |
| Above N90,000                | –         | –    | 10    | 5.4  | 11    | 7.0  | 21    | 5.6  |
| Total                        | 35        | 100.0| 184   | 100.0| 157   | 100.0| 376   | 100.0|

### Table 6
Marital status of respondents. Source: Field Survey, 2017.

| Marital status of respondent | Ibeju-Lekki | Ifako | Ikeja | Total |
|------------------------------|------------|------|-------|-------|
| Freq | %     | Freq | %     | Freq | %     | Freq | %     |
| Single                      | 12         | 34.3 | 103   | 56.0 | 63    | 40.1 | 178   | 47.3 |
| Married                     | 18         | 51.4 | 59    | 32.1 | 78    | 49.7 | 155   | 41.2 |
| Divorced                    | 1          | 2.9  | 10    | 5.4  | 6     | 3.8  | 17    | 4.5  |
| Widowed                     | 1          | 2.9  | 7     | 3.8  | 4     | 2.5  | 12    | 3.2  |
| Separated                   | 3          | 8.6  | 5     | 2.7  | 6     | 3.8  | 14    | 3.8  |
| Total                       | 35         | 100.0| 184   | 100.0| 157   | 100.0| 376   | 100.0|

### Table 7
Household size of respondents. Source: Field Survey, 2017.

| Household size of respondent | Ibeju-Lekki | Ifako | Ikeja | Total |
|------------------------------|------------|------|-------|-------|
| Freq | %     | Freq | %     | Freq | %     | Freq | %     |
| 1 Person                     | 5          | 14.3 | 8     | 4.3  | 4     | 2.5  | 17    | 4.5  |
| 2 Persons                    | 4          | 11.4 | 20    | 10.9 | 8     | 5.1  | 32    | 8.5  |
| 3 Persons                    | 5          | 14.3 | 24    | 13.0 | 24    | 15.3 | 53    | 14.1 |
| 4 Persons                    | 7          | 20.0 | 49    | 26.6 | 40    | 25.5 | 96    | 25.5 |
| 5 Persons                    | 11         | 31.4 | 37    | 20.1 | 30    | 19.1 | 78    | 20.7 |
| 6 Persons                    | 1          | 2.9  | 30    | 16.3 | 26    | 16.6 | 57    | 15.2 |
| 7 Persons                    | 1          | 2.9  | 11    | 6.0  | 14    | 8.9  | 26    | 6.9  |
| 8 Persons                    | 1          | 2.9  | 3     | 1.6  | 6     | 3.8  | 10    | 2.7  |
| 9 Persons                    | –          | –    | 2     | 1.1  | 1     | .6   | 3     | 0.8  |
| 10 Persons                   | –          | –    | 8     | 4.3  | 3     | 1.9  | 11    | 2.9  |
| 11 Persons                   | –          | –    | –     | –    | 1     | 0.6  | 1     | 0.3  |
| Total                        | 35         | 100.0| 184   | 100.0| 157   | 100.0| 376   | 100.0|
Table 8
Factors influencing environmental quality.

| S/N | Factors                                      | Opinion | SWV | CPI |
|-----|----------------------------------------------|---------|-----|-----|
|     |                                              | 1       | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   |       |
| 1   | Distance to work                             | 23      | 79  | 150 | 88  | 100 | 1483  | 3.94 |
| 2   | Availability of Market                       | 9       | 55  | 120 | 160 | 33  | 1282  | 3.41 |
| 3   | Lighting                                     | 14      | 49  | 145 | 134 | 34  | 1253  | 3.33 |
| 4   | Accessibility to road network                | 12      | 70  | 141 | 105 | 48  | 1235  | 3.28 |
| 5   | Accessibility to Transport                   | 15      | 83  | 128 | 100 | 50  | 1215  | 3.23 |
| 6   | Public water supply                          | 21      | 69  | 121 | 137 | 28  | 1210  | 3.21 |
| 7   | Toilet Condition                             | 29      | 67  | 122 | 129 | 29  | 1190  | 3.16 |
| 8   | Building Condition                           | 22      | 51  | 197 | 63  | 43  | 1182  | 3.14 |
| 9   | Security of Passengers                       | 16      | 86  | 147 | 86  | 41  | 1178  | 3.13 |
| 10  | State of the toilet facilities              | 27      | 74  | 106 | 117 | 42  | 1171  | 3.11 |
| 11  | Accessibility to economic opportunity       | 19      | 99  | 109 | 125 | 24  | 1164  | 3.09 |
| 12  | Cost of Living                               | 19      | 69  | 161 | 113 | 14  | 1162  | 3.09 |
| 13  | Drainages                                    | 50      | 66  | 97  | 127 | 36  | 1161  | 3.09 |
| 14  | Building Density                             | 8       | 77  | 205 | 53  | 33  | 1154  | 3.06 |
| 15  | Cost of Food                                 | 21      | 65  | 171 | 108 | 11  | 1151  | 3.06 |
| 16  | Cost of Rent                                 | 31      | 63  | 161 | 102 | 19  | 1143  | 3.04 |
| 17  | Information Boards                           | 42      | 81  | 115 | 102 | 36  | 1137  | 3.02 |
| 18  | Security of Cars                             | 20      | 109 | 124 | 90  | 33  | 1125  | 3.02 |
| 19  | Borehole                                     | 43      | 84  | 116 | 94  | 39  | 1130  | 3.0  |
| 20  | Traffic Density                              | 16      | 111 | 128 | 98  | 23  | 1129  | 3.0  |
| 21  | Road Condition                               | 32      | 85  | 136 | 104 | 19  | 1121  | 2.98 |
| 22  | Litterbins                                   | 42      | 97  | 102 | 100 | 35  | 1117  | 2.97 |
| 23  | Car Park                                     | 25      | 98  | 141 | 93  | 19  | 1111  | 2.95 |
| 24  | Nearness to health facility                  | 25      | 104 | 140 | 77  | 30  | 1111  | 2.95 |
| 25  | Availability of Shops                       | 11      | 41  | 148 | 155 | 21  | 1107  | 2.94 |
| 26  | Aesthetics                                   | 35      | 88  | 143 | 88  | 22  | 1102  | 2.93 |
| 27  | Signages                                     | 34      | 95  | 139 | 91  | 17  | 1090  | 2.89 |
| 28  | Cleanliness                                  | 58      | 74  | 126 | 96  | 22  | 1078  | 2.86 |
| 29  | Shelter                                      | 58      | 74  | 126 | 96  | 22  | 1078  | 2.86 |
| 30  | Footpath/Pedestrian walkway                  | 27      | 117 | 135 | 89  | 8   | 1062  | 2.82 |
| 31  | Picnic Benches                               | 60      | 107 | 121 | 68  | 30  | 1059  | 2.82 |
| 32  | Landscaping                                  | 42      | 101 | 135 | 80  | 18  | 1059  | 2.82 |
| 33  | Physically Challenged                        | 28      | 138 | 137 | 55  | 18  | 1025  | 2.76 |
| 34  | Accessibility                                | 34      | 95  | 139 | 91  | 17  | 1090  | 2.89 |
| 35  | Privacy                                      | 45      | 117 | 116 | 80  | 18  | 1037  | 2.75 |
| 36  | Social Interaction among neighbors           | 48      | 101 | 145 | 72  | 10  | 1023  | 2.72 |
| 37  | Sitting Platform                             | 61      | 85  | 111 | 93  | 16  | 1016  | 2.70 |
| 38  | Nearness to Secondary School                 | 32      | 116 | 138 | 62  | 28  | 1004  | 2.67 |
| 39  | Open Spaces                                  | 31      | 114 | 137 | 80  | 14  | 990   | 2.63 |
| 40  | Air Pollution                                | 83      | 99  | 86  | 92  | 16  | 987   | 2.60 |
| 41  | Presence of Hazard                           | 67      | 120 | 112 | 55  | 22  | 973   | 2.59 |
| 42  | Odor                                         | 97      | 88  | 81  | 95  | 15  | 971   | 2.58 |
| 43  | Dust and Silt                                | 85      | 98  | 102 | 71  | 20  | 971   | 2.58 |
| 44  | Well Water                                   | 63      | 130 | 105 | 59  | 19  | 969   | 2.57 |
| 45  | Privacy Level                                | 81      | 112 | 98  | 59  | 26  | 965   | 2.57 |
| 46  | Nearness to Primary School                   | 44      | 118 | 137 | 57  | 20  | 962   | 2.55 |
| 47  | Noise Level                                  | 97      | 103 | 74  | 79  | 23  | 956   | 2.54 |
| 48  | Water Fountain                               | 83      | 135 | 94  | 46  | 18  | 955   | 2.53 |
| 49  | Flora                                        | 82      | 124 | 96  | 62  | 12  | 926   | 2.46 |
| 50  | Children Play Facility                       | 83      | 123 | 97  | 55  | 17  | 870   | 2.31 |

Strongly disagree (1), Disagree (2), Moderately agree (3), Agree (4), Strongly disagree (5).
2. Experimental design, materials and methods

A survey of intra-urban motor parks of Ibeju Lekki, Ifako Ijaiye and Ikeja local government areas, Lagos State, Nigeria. The target population was chosen because the area is densely populated and often experience heavy vehicular movements. Secondly, they contain several motor parks that link to the other parts of the state. Studies [11–30] have used similar statistical methodologies in analyzing their survey data. Simple percentages and commuter perception index (CPI) were used as analytical tool of the generated data.

| Table 9 | KMO and Bartlett’s Tests of factors influencing environmental quality. |
|---------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy. | 0.913 |
| Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity: | Approx. Chi-Square | 9062.745 |
| | Degree of freedom | 528 |
| | Significant level | 0.000 |

| Table 10 | Communalties of factors influencing environmental quality. |
|---------|-------------------------------------------------------------|
| Variables | Initial | Extraction |
| Distance to work | 1.000 | 0.598 |
| Accessibility to transport | 1.000 | 0.742 |
| Accessibility to road network | 1.000 | 0.791 |
| Traffic density | 1.000 | 0.625 |
| Privacy | 1.000 | 0.612 |
| Accessibility to economic opportunity | 1.000 | 0.628 |
| Availability of shops | 1.000 | 0.655 |
| Public water supply | 1.000 | 0.720 |
| Litter bins | 1.000 | 0.728 |
| Information boards | 1.000 | 0.867 |
| Children’s play facility | 1.000 | 0.738 |
| Nearness to primary school | 1.000 | 0.786 |
| Nearness to secondary school | 1.000 | 0.861 |
| Nearness to health facility | 1.000 | 0.742 |
| Social interaction among neighbours | 1.000 | 0.592 |
| Cost of food | 1.000 | 0.816 |
| Cost of living | 1.000 | 0.782 |
| Cost of rent | 1.000 | 0.823 |
| Aesthetics | 1.000 | 0.696 |
| Picnic benches | 1.000 | 0.734 |
| Seating platform | 1.000 | 0.712 |
| Drainages | 1.000 | 0.707 |
| Availability of market | 1.000 | 0.614 |
| Lighting | 1.000 | 0.585 |
| Presence of hazard | 1.000 | 0.657 |
| Security of cars | 1.000 | 0.723 |
| Security of passengers | 1.000 | 0.599 |
| State of the toilet facilities | 1.000 | 0.659 |
| Air pollution level | 1.000 | 0.794 |
| Dust and silt | 1.000 | 0.837 |
| Odour | 1.000 | 0.887 |
| Noise level | 1.000 | 0.827 |
| Privacy level | 1.000 | 0.696 |

Extraction method: principal component analysis.
Section A of the questionnaire was used to extract data on the socio-demographic characteristics of the commuters (respondents). Section B of the questionnaire had questions on "factors influencing environmental quality." The data were extracted using a 5-Likert type scale, where 1 is for "Strongly disagree"; 2 is for "Disagree"; 3 represents "Moderately agree"; 4 is for "Agree"; and 5 represents "Strongly disagree. The questionnaire can be assessed as Supplementary Data 1 while the raw data for the three local Government area considered can be assessed as Supplementary Data 2.

Factor analysis was used in determining the factors influencing environmental quality in intra-motor parks. Likert scale also ranked factors using the sum of weighted values (SWV). The factors influencing environmental quality as summarized using the CPI and SWV as shown in Table 8. It can be seen that the factors were arranged in decreasing order of the commuter perception index. Some statistical test was carried out to test the reliability of the data for factor analysis. The results are presented in Table 9. It can be seen that the KMO value is 0.913 with Bartlett’s test significance of 0.000. This indicates that the data is suitable for factor analysis. The tests further indicate that the correlation matrix is not an identity matrix. Further indices such as Cronbach’s Alpha can be included. Communalities of variables were obtained as presented in Table 10. The principal component analysis was used to collapse 33 variables. The variable with the lowest communality was lighting (58.5%) while the highest communality was odor (88.7%). Total variance explained using the principal component analysis as extraction method was shown in Table 11. It can be seen that all factors that are
Table 12
Rotated component matrix of factors influencing commuters’ perception of environmental quality.

| Component                  | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6   | 7   |
|----------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Odour                      | 0.911 |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Dust and silt              | 0.893 |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Noise level                | 0.886 |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Air pollution level        | 0.865 |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Presence of hazard         | 0.682 |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Privacy level              | 0.637 | 0.330 |     |     |     |     |     |
| Accessibility to road      | 0.802 |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| network                    |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Accessibility to transport | 0.786 |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Traffic density            | 0.699 |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Distance to work           | 0.598 | 0.388 |     |     |     |     |     |
| Security of cars           | 0.548 |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Accessibility to economic  | 0.521 | 0.360 |       |     |     |   0.364 |     |
| opportunity                |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Privacy                    | 0.502 | 0.393 |     |     |     |     |     |
| Security of passengers     | 0.468 |     |     |     | 0.362 | 0.425 |     |
| Children’s play facility   |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Picnic benches             |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Seating platform           | 0.359 | 0.622 |     |     |     |     |     |
| Information boards         | 0.391 | 0.554 |     |     |     |     |     |
| Aesthetics                 | 0.325 | 0.532 | 0.467 |     |     |     |     |
| Litter bins                | 0.430 | 0.483 |     |     |     |     | 0.440 |
| Cost of food               |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Cost of rent               |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Cost of living             |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Nearness to secondary      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| school                     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Nearness to primary        |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| school                     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Nearness to health facility| 0.384 | 0.306 | 0.301 | 0.407 |     |     |     |
| Social interaction among   |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| neighbours                 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Lighting                   |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| State of the toilet facilities |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Availability of market     | 0.361 | 0.431 | 0.519 |     |     |     |     |
| Drainages                  |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Availability of shops      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Public water supply        |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |

Extraction method: principal component analysis.
Rotation method: Varimax with Kaiser normalization.
Rotation converged in 7 iterations.

Table 13
Component transformation matrix of factors influencing commuters’ perception of environmental quality.

| Component | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6   | 7   |
|-----------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 1         | 0.415 | 0.528 | 0.434 | 0.300 | 0.298 | 0.335 | 0.264 |
| 2         | −0.787 | 0.052 | −0.051 | 0.434 | 0.390 | 0.094 | 0.162 |
| 3         | 0.392 | −0.463 | −0.114 | 0.642 | 0.195 | −0.407 | 0.064 |
| 4         | 0.157 | −0.032 | −0.262 | −0.414 | 0.834 | −0.023 | −0.193 |
| 5         | 0.162 | −0.193 | −0.570 | 0.167 | −0.105 | 0.756 | 0.038 |
| 6         | 0.039 | 0.609 | −0.407 | 0.296 | −0.102 | −0.211 | −0.565 |
| 7         | 0.053 | 0.308 | −0.486 | −0.149 | −0.063 | −0.312 | 0.737 |

Extraction method: principal component analysis.
Rotation method: Varimax with Kaiser normalization.
with Eigenvalues above 1 were extracted and represented under the column extraction sums of square loadings. The results revealed 7 unconfirmed factors and also suggested that there was a cumulative total of 71.61% with variances of 3.09% and 5.94% at and after extraction; which was confirmed after rotational extraction. The rotated component matrix of factors influencing commuters’ perception of environmental quality was presented in Table 12. The result revealed the structure of variables that were studied and used in the reduction into four factors. These factors are physical, economic and recreational and educational factors. The component transformation matrix of factors influencing commuters’ perception of environmental quality was presented in Table 13. As with the others, principal component analysis was used as the extraction method and varimax with Kaiser Normalization was used as the rotation method.
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