

Perceived Risk and Insecurity of Road Transport Operations in Ado-Odo/Ota Local Government Area, Ogun State Nigeria

Olufemi Ezekiel Jayeola; Margaret Emem Ogunbiyi; and Adeleke Oluwaseun Akinyele

Department of Management Technology, Bells University of Technology, Ota, Nigeria.

E-mail: afolabiseyo@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

This study aimed at examining the perceived risk and road transport insecurity in Ado-Odo/Ota Local Government Area (LGA) of Ogun State, Nigeria. Multiple regression analysis and chi-square test were adopted to determine the influence of road transport insecurity on socio-economic factors.

The findings revealed that, there is a strong correlation between the income earned by the operators and robbery, accident, and kidnapping as $R = 0.978$ and the three components together explain 95.6% of the variations in the (INC) while about 4.4% observed relationships are not explainable by the selected predictor. There is no significant difference in the perception of operators of road transport insecurity on road transport operations as chi-square statistics (X^2) value is 20.7 which is not significant as chi-square tabulated at 28 degree of freedom and 5% significant level is 41.3.

The study therefore recommended that transport planners and managers, government at all tiers, stakeholders, policy makers in connection to road transport should ensure adequate rehabilitation of dilapidated existing roads and enlightenment of the public on the scourge of road transport insecurity to curb the reoccurrence of the menace in operations on our roads.

(Keywords: robbery, insecurity, accidents, kidnapping, Ado-Odo/Ota, Nigeria)

INTRODUCTION

Transportation moves people and goods from one place to another using a variety of vehicles across different infrastructure systems. It does this using not only current and sophisticated technology (such as vehicles, various energy sources, and

infrastructure), but also people's time and effort; producing not only the desired outputs of passenger trips and freight shipments, but also adverse outcomes in form of risk such as air pollution, noise, congestion, crashes, injuries, and fatalities which in turn reflect insecurity issue. Transportation is the lifeline of any nation, connecting people, goods and services, supporting the economy and facilitating the delivery of public safety response services but if not well planned, managed and maintained, it could result into huge security anomalies (Oyesiku, 2002).

Security can be defined as the effort to protect assets physical, human, or intellectual capital from criminal interference, removal, or destruction, whether by terrorists or domestic criminals, or incidental to technological failures or even natural hazards events. Transportation, security involves both the items being transported and the machinery used to transport the items, and the owners of each have differing priorities for security. The owner of the goods wants them protected at any cost for safe delivery to the destination. The owner of the transportation assets wants to protect their rolling stock, rails, bridges and tunnels, ships, road infrastructures, and ports in order to stay in business, even at the cost of losing the cargo.

When the "cargo" is human beings, the transporter is responsible for the transportation assets' performance for a successful delivery to the intended destination, but there is a societal debate about who is responsible for the security of the individual passenger on the asset which road modes is dominating (Kinney, 2018).

Adesanya (2004), believed that road transportation is a form of land transport which involves the movement of people and goods by motor cars, trucks, buses, motorcycles, and bicycles. It is the most popular means of

transport. In Nigeria, there are different types of roads, and they are classified according to their quality. The quality is determined by the width, type of surface, number of lanes, facilities available, etc. These are the high-quality trunk 'A' roads, some dual carriage, owned and maintained by the federal government, and linking the states and the federal capital. There are also, all season, general tarred, Trunk 'B' roads, owned and maintained by the State governments, linking local governments with State capitals. There is generally un-tarred seasonal 'Trunk 'C' roads owned and maintained by the local governments. These connect the communities with the local government headquarters (Ileoje, 2004).

Ige, (2015) opined that there is a lot of insecurity on Nigerian highways, as robbers often waylay road travelers. In this manner passenger buses travelling from the northern to southern parts are always accompanied by armed escorts in case of any attack along the way. While highway armed robbery is rampant in the southern part of the nation, it has since started to occur in the northern part as well. They cited for example, on 17th September 2004 an armed robbery gang attacked some businessmen along Katsina-Kano Road killing two persons, and they made away with over 25 million Naira.

According to Adewumi, Oluwole, and Olasunkanmi (2015) "oranges and foam balls have been at various ugly times laced with nails and set on roads as traps to deflate the tyres that ran over them. Tyres have been shot on motion as well as direct attack on the drivers and passengers. Many lives have been lost at different times when buses were attacked on the highways". Some board vehicles as passengers and along the way arrest proceedings in the vehicles and rob people of their valuables. Sad to state that some make away with valuables of the people, while some make their ways into the vehicles as "gospellers" who are piously devoted to spread the gospel but under their garments are sophisticated guns and robbery apparatus used to rob innocent passengers. These risk contributing factors and wholesome insecurity challenges on Nigeria roads have been on the increase and thus demand a critical investigation.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Despite the efforts of the three tiers of government in curbing the ever increasing insecurity

challenges in Nigerian road transportation operations, there is a reoccurrence at alarming rate while the systemic approaches put in place hardly see the order of the day due to non-implementation and mismanagement as viewed by the various scholars.

Their observation of the insecurity issues centered on accidents, robberies, factors responsible for, consequences and solutions of this insecurity threats. Adewumi, et al. (2015) in their study of perceived risk and fear of crime in public transport modes in Nigerian transit environment observed from the commuters' perceptions that robbery was the major threat in Nigerian transit environment while victimization was higher at the routes between stop stations and that transit related crime also occur at stop stations, transits towns and paths within urban centers that have higher than normal rates of criminal activity in general. They further revealed that crime consistently does not peak during the day but are concentrated late at night.

Onatere-Ubrurhe (2015) and Omidiji, (2010) believed that insecurity on Nigerian roads has taken different dimension with the use of emerging public transport modes to perpetuate criminal activities. They observed that experience has it that some criminals board vehicles as passengers and along the way rob people of their valuables while some hijack vehicles and drive to nearby bushes to unleash terror on the helpless victims, and in some cases stones, tyre rims and woods are used to stop vehicles. Apart from frequent armed robbery incidents, passengers are sometimes kidnapped during trips.

The country has lost a good number of her productive populations to the incidences of crime on-board public transportation, which most times result to road crashes. Frequent announcements of various types of criminal activities in Nigeria public transport over the years have become a disturbing issue to users, non-users and particularly the policy makers.

This has gone beyond local or national discourse, as international communities keep given warning notifications about the insecurity of Nigerian public transport services. For instance, the Times International of London, (1985) commented on the alarming rate of criminal activities in Nigeria. While, the Travel Warning System of the United States Department of Bureau of Consular Affairs also gives warning statements about the

insecurity of public transport in the country, particularly for the foreigners (Onatere-Ubrurhe, 2015; Usman, 2005).

The country has lost a good number of her productive populations to the incidences of crime on board public transportation, which most times result to road crashes (Raji, 2008). According to the Federal Road Safety Commission (FRSC), road transits crime is on the increase as road travel represents about 85% percent of all passenger journeys in Nigeria. In 2008 for instance, about 4,944 deaths occurred in 9,114 road crashes with 17,390 persons injured as a result of criminal activities.

Although, the industry is certainly striving to encourage potential passengers, crime on the Nigerian highways has recently emerged as a high-profile priority requiring scrutiny. Despite these facts, incidence and the fear of transit crime are two of the more under researched areas in the field of crime prevention in Nigeria. This is the case with respect to both the actual incidence of crime along transit corridors and the commuters' perception of crime associated with transit usage (Loukaitou-Sideris, 2009).

Onatere-Ubrurhe (2015), proposed strategic action plan for monitoring road transport security in Nigeria among which includes increase in the presence of well-equipped security personnel along highways, introduce undercover security officers to apprehend offenders/robbers operating onboard vehicles, increase natural surveillance through design (design measures should be introduced in areas where incidents concentrated), install Closed-Circuit Television (CCTV) cameras in motor parks/bus stations and vehicles, install passenger alarms, emergency phones and intercoms at motor parks/bus stations and on vehicles, reduce overcrowding in motor parks/bus stations and separation of waiting passengers from other members of the public (e.g., installing shelters or barriers).

METHODOLOGY, RESULTS, AND DISCUSSION

Test of Hypotheses One

H₀₁: There is no significant influence of road transport insecurity on socio-economic demographic in Ado-Odo/Ota.

The insecurity parameters which are examined along with socio-economic characteristics of income, occupation and age are robbery/theft, traffic accidents and kidnapping. The multiple regression analysis result for **INCOME (INC)** of the operators from the Table 1 indicated that the p-value of F-test is statistically significant.

The p-value associated with the F value is very small (.004) and when compared with our alpha level of 0.05 we can conclude that the independent variables robbery, accident and kidnapping reliably affect and predict the dependent variable income. The table also displays the multiple correlation coefficients, R , its square, R^2 , and an adjusted version of this coefficient as summary measures of model fit.

The multiple correlation coefficient $R = 0.978$ indicates that there is a strong correlation between the income earned by the operators and the predicted by the regression model components. In terms of variability in income accounted for by the fitted model, this amounts to a proportion of $R^2 = 0.956$, or 95.6% while R^2 will increase when further terms are added to the model even if these do not explain variability in the income.

The use of this adjusted measure leads to a revised estimate that 95.6% of the **(INC)** of the operators can be explained by the three explanatory contributing components. In other words, the three components together explain 95.6% of the variations in the **(INC)** while about 4.4% observed relationships are not explainable by the selected predictor. Also, the output shown in Table 1 also provides estimates of the regression coefficients, standard errors of the estimates and t -tests that a coefficient.

The estimated regression coefficients are given under the heading "Unstandardized Coefficients Beta"; these give, for each of the explanatory variables, the predicted change in the dependent variable when the explanatory variable is increased by one unit when other conditional variables in the model remaining constant.

Table 1: Model Summary, ANOVA and Coefficients of Income of Operators.

Model Summary						
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate		
1	0.978 ^a	0.956	0.923	0.99198		
ANOVA ^a						
Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig	
Regression	86.064	3	28.688	29.153	0.004 ^b	
Residual	3.936	4	0.984			
Total	90	7				
Coefficients ^a						
Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
(Constant)	16.089	3.863		4.165	0.014	
Robbery/Theft (ROB)	0.027	0.074	0.038	0.361	0.736	
Accident (ACC)	0.650	0.072	0.983	9.051	0.001	
Kidnapping(KID)	- 0.008	0.089	- 0.009	- 0.087	0.935	

a. Dependent Variable: (INC) Income earned by operators

b. Predictors: (Constant), (ROB), (ACC), (KID)

Source: Author's Field Report (2021)

That is, there can be an effect in income earned by the operators (**INC**) when there is an increase of ten units in robbery case (**ROB**) from 0.027 to 0.27 and also an effect in income realized for every additional score recorded on accident occurrence (**ACC**) scale (or by 6.5 for an effect of 10 units **ACC** scale) provided that all other predictors are the same and an effect of 0.08 in income generated (**INC**) score for every one unit of kidnapping (**KID**) assuming that all other variables in the model are held constant.

$$\text{MODEL (INC)} = 16.089 + 0.027(\text{ROB}) + 0.65(\text{ACC}) - 0.008(\text{KID})$$

The “ANOVA” in table 1 provides an *F*-test for the null hypothesis that none of the explanatory variables affected the (**INC**) of the operators. Here we can clearly reject this null hypothesis $\{F(3, 4) = 29.153, p < 0.001\}$, and so conclude that at least one of (**ROB**), (**ACC**) and (**KID**) is affecting the (**INC**) of the operators. In this regard we reject null hypothesis and accept alternative hypothesis meaning that there is significant influence of road transport insecurity on income as a measure of socio-economic characteristics in the study area. Conclusively, this model implies that only accident

β_2 ACC (0.650) in Ado-Odo/Ota is significant in affecting income generated with t-value of 9.051 at 0.001 significant level, meaning that there are some other factors which affect income generation (**INC**) analysis of the operators than robbery, accident and kidnapping which could be for a further study.

For Occupation; the multiple regression analysis result for **OCCUPATION (OCC)** of road transport operation from the Table 2 indicated that the p – value of F-test is not statistically significant. The p-value associated with the F value is 0.086 and when compared with our alpha level of 0.05 we can conclude that the independent variables robbery, accident and kidnapping do not affect and predict the occupation.

The multiple correlation coefficient $R = 0.882$ indicates that there is a correlation between the occupation (driving) and the predicted by the regression model components. In terms of variability in occupation accounted for by the fitted model, this amounts to a proportion of $R^2 = 0.778$, or 77.8%.

Table 2: Model Summary, ANOVA and Coefficients of Occupation.

Model Summary					
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	
1	0.882 ^a	0.778	0.611	2.72875	
ANOVA ^a					
Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig
Regression	104.091	3	34.697	4.663	0.086 ^b
Residual	29.784	4	7.446		
Total	133.875	7			
Coefficients ^a					
Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	26.241	19.980		1.313	0.259
Robbery/Theft (ROB)	0.846	0.551	0.857	1.535	0.200
Accident (ACC)	0.866	0.376	0.778	2.302	0.083
Kidnapping(KID)	- 1.423	1.312	- 0.690	- 1.084	0.339

a. Dependent Variable: (OCC) Occupation as an operator

b. Predictors: (Constant), (ROB), (ACC), (KID)

Source: Author's Field Report (2021)

The table further established that 77.8% of the (OCC) as operators can be explained by the three explanatory components. In other words, the three components together affect and explain 77.8% of the variations in the (OCC) while about 22.2% are not explainable by the insecurity parameters.

Table 2 also shows that, the occupation as an operator (OCC) can be affected when there is an increase of ten units in robbery case (ROB) from 0.847 to 8.47 and equally an effect in occupation for every additional score recorded on accident (ACC) scale (or by 8.66 for an effect of 10 units ACC scale) and an effect of 14.23 on occupation (OCC) score for every one unit of kidnapping (KID) assuming that all other variables in the model are held constant as reflected in the regression equation model.

$$\text{MODEL (OCC)} = 26.241 + 0.846(\text{ROB}) + 0.866(\text{ACC}) - 1.423(\text{KID})$$

The similar table provides an *F*-test for the null hypothesis that none of the explanatory variables affected the (OCC) as operators being socio-economic variable. Therefore, null hypothesis can be accepted {*F* (3,4) = 4.660, *p* > 0.05}, and so we can conclude that none of (ROB), (ACC) and

(KID) affects the (OCC) as operators. In this respect null hypothesis will be accepted and alternative rejected hypothesis meaning that there is no significant influence of road transport insecurity on occupation as operator as a measure of socio-economic characteristics in Ado-Odo/Ota local government. The model implies that there are some other factors which affect occupation as operator (OCC) rather than robbery, accident, and kidnapping.

For Age; the multiple regression analysis result for AGE (AGE) of road transport operators from the table 3 indicated that the *p*-value of *F*-test is not statistically significant. The *p*-value associated with the *F* value is 0.104 and when compared with the alpha level of 0.05 we can conclude that the independent variables robbery, accident and kidnapping do not have influence on the age of the operators. The multiple correlation coefficient *R* = 0.868 indicates that there is a correlation in the age of operators and the predicted by the regression model components. In terms of variability in occupation accounted for by the fitted model, this amounts to a proportion of *R*² = 0.753, or 75.3%.

Table 3: Model Summary, ANOVA and Coefficients of Age of Operators.

Model Summary					
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	
1	0.868 ^a	0.753	0.568	2.69229	
ANOVA ^a					
Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig
Regression	88.506	3	29.502	4.070	0.104 ^b
Residual	28.994	4	7.248		
Total	117.500	7			
Coefficients ^a					
Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	1.583	15.835		0.100	0.925
Robbery/Theft (ROB)	0.619	0.616	0.477	1.005	0.372
Accident (ACC)	0.280	0.441	0.169	0.635	0.560
Kidnapping(KID)	0.285	0.326	0.418	0.873	0.432

a. Dependent Variable: (AGE) Age of operators

b. Predictors: (Constant), (ROB), (ACC), (KID)

Source: Author's Field Report (2021)

The table shows that 75.3% of the **(AGE)** of operators can be explained by the three explanatory components. In other words, the three components together affect and explain 75.3% of variations in the **(AGE)** while 24.7% are not explainable by the insecurity parameters. The age of the operators **(AGE)** can be affected when there is an increase of ten units in robbery case **(ROB)** from 0.619 to 6.19 will influence the age and for every additional score recorded on accident **(ACC)** scale (or by 2.80 for an effect of 10 units **ACC** scale) and an effect of 2.85 on age **(AGE)** score for every one unit of kidnapping **(KID)** assuming that all other variables in the model are held constant as reflected in the regression equation model.

$$\text{MODEL (AGE)} = 1.583 + 0.619(\text{ROB}) + 0.280(\text{ACC}) + 0.285(\text{KID})$$

The similar Table 3 provides an *F*-test for the null hypothesis that none of the explanatory variables affected the **(AGE)** as operators being socio-economic variable. Therefore, null hypothesis can

be accepted $\{F(3,4) = 4.070, p > 0.05\}$, and so we can conclude that none of **(ROB)**, **(ACC)** and **(KID)** affects the **(AGE)** as operators.

In this respect null hypothesis will be accepted and alternative rejected hypothesis meaning that there is no significant influence of road transport insecurity on age of the operators as a measure of socio-economic characteristics in Ado-Odo/Ota local government. The model implies that there are some other factors which affect occupation as operator **(AGE)** rather than robbery, accident and kidnapping.

Test of Hypotheses Two

Ho₁: There is no significant difference in the perception of operators of road transport insecurity on road transport operations

Table 4: Observed Perception of Operators.

Operators	Excellent	Good	Indifferent	Poor	Very poor	Total
Ado-Odo	12	8	10	9	8	47
Agbara	10	16	7	7	8	48
Igbesa	5	18	5	11	6	45
Iju-Ota	11	13	8	6	12	50
Itele	8	14	7	6	8	43
Koko Ebiye	6	9	7	7	9	38
Owode	15	11	6	11	5	48
Sango Ota	13	12	9	5	11	50
Total	80	101	59	62	67	369

Source: Author's Field Report (2021)

Table 5: Expected Perception of Operators.

Operators	Excellent	Good	Indifferent	Poor	Very poor	Total
Ado-Odo	10.189702	12.864499	7.514905	7.897019	8.533875	47
Agbara	10.406504	13.138211	7.674797	8.065041	8.715447	48
Igbesa	9.7560976	12.317073	7.195122	7.560976	8.170732	45
Iju-Ota	10.840108	13.685637	7.99458	8.401084	9.078591	50
Itele	9.3224932	11.769648	6.875339	7.224932	7.807588	43
Koko Ebiye	8.2384824	10.401084	6.075881	6.384824	6.899729	38
Owode	10.406504	13.138211	7.674797	8.065041	8.715447	48
Sango Ota	10.840108	13.685637	7.99458	8.401084	9.078591	50
Total	80	101	59	62	67	369

Source: Author's Field Report (2021)

Table 6: Chi-square Contingency Table.

Operators	Excellent	Good	Indifferent	Poor	Very poor	
Ado-Odo	0.321617	1.83943	0.821793	0.154054	0.033399	3.1702929
Agbara	0.015879	0.62336	0.0593306	0.140645	0.0587307	0.8979458
Igbesa	2.318598	2.622024	0.6696982	1.564201	0.5767019	7.7512227
Iju-Ota	0.002358	0.03435	3.675E-06	0.686245	0.9400833	1.6630404
Itele	0.18761	0.422653	0.0022603	0.207678	0.0047418	0.8249421
Koko Ebiye	0.608219	0.188734	0.1405552	0.059272	0.6393205	1.6361008
Owode	2.027598	0.347989	0.3654747	1.068065	1.5839173	5.3930433
Sango Ota	0.430358	0.207617	0.1264444	1.37689	0.4066505	2.5479608
Chi-square value						20.714256

Source: Author's Field Report (2021)

However, the value of chi-square at 28 degree of freedom and 5% significant level is 41.3. From the analyses, it can be seen that calculated chi-square statistics ($X^2 = 20.7$) is less than the value of chi-square tabulated obtained at 28 degree of freedom and 5% significant level ($X^2 = 41.3$).

Hence, the hypothesis of the perception of operators of road transport insecurity on road transport operations assumed not to differ across locations is acceptable and this means that: "perception of operators of road transport insecurity on road transport operations do differ

across the locations". The results further confirm the affirmative response of operators across the locations regarding road transport insecurity and road transport operations in the cities/towns in Ado-Odo/Ota local government.

CONCLUSION

Road transport insecurity has been focused of several past scholars and this has been dealt with in relation to health, safety awareness, accident occurrence and so on. This research

study has also contributed into the transport research of road transport insecurity with the focus into its implication on socio-economic characteristics of the operators and their various causes, as well as situation and condition of roads and perception of these road transport insecurity on road transport operations involving operators.

On one hand the empirical findings indicate that there is significant relationship between income/earnings of the operators, occupation as operators and age of operators and the insecurity variables of robbery, traffic accident and kidnapping. While on the other hand, the correlation between road transport insecurity is only significant in income/earnings but not significant in occupation and age. The study further concluded that:

- (i) there is significant influence of road transport insecurity on income as a measure of socio-economic characteristics in the study area and the model implies that only traffic accident is significant in affecting income generation of the operators.
- (ii) there is no significant influence of road transport insecurity on occupation as operator as a measure of socio-economic characteristics as no predictor's robbery, accident, and kidnapping affects the occupation as operators.
- (iii) there is no significant influence of road transport insecurity on age of the operators as a measure of socio-economic characteristics as no predictor's robbery, accident and kidnapping affects the occupation as operators.
- (iv) robbery and traffic accidents have been the most terrifying and demanding road transport insecurity on Ado-Odo/Ota roads which are usually caused by bad road conditions, absence of lightening and law enforcement and security agents on the roads.
- (v) all the three categories of roads examined are in bad condition and situation.
- (vi) the perception of operators of road transport insecurity on road transport operations do differ across the local government.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The examination of the literatures related to road transport insecurity revealed that a lot of work has been conducted on the topic. But little attention has been given to the way and manner these insecurity issues affected socio-economic characteristics of the operators and causes of it. This study is an attempt to contribute theoretically and practically to the road transport insecurity characteristics and problems. This study therefore attempts at providing recommendation which could help solve some of the associated road insecurity problems of operators during their operations. These are as follow:

- (i) Government at all levels should encourage and adhere to the provision of adequate law enforcement and security agents on all road infrastructures in the study area.
- (ii) Rehabilitation of existing dilapidated and construction of new roads within the study area in particular and state in general.
- (iii) Enlightenment of the public on the scourge of road transport insecurity.
- (iv) Intensive efforts should be embarked upon in lightening of the environment and transport infrastructures in order to curb the reoccurrence of the menace on our roads.

REFERENCES

1. Adesanya, A. 2004. "Management and Analysis of Transport Sector Performance and Its Intersectoral Linkages". A paper Presented at a Training Program on Sectoral Policy Management and Analysis: Ibadan, Nigeria. June 21-July 9.
2. Adewunmi, I.B. 2015. "Perceived Risk and Fear of Crime in Public Transport Nodes: The Experience from Nigerian Transit Environment".
3. Ige, O.O. 2015. "Road Accident Situation: A Time Series Analysis". *International Journal of Environmental Issues*. 3(1).
4. Ileoje, N.P. 2004. *A New Geography of Nigeria. (Fifth Edition)*. Longman Nigeria Plc.: Lagos, Nigeria.
5. Kinney, J.B. 2018. "Crime Attractors, Generators, and Detractors: Land Use and Urban Crime Opportunities". *Built Environments*. 34(1): 62-74.

6. Loukaitou-Sideris. 2012. "The Geography of Transit Crime. Documentation and Evaluation of Crime Incidence on and around the Green Line Stations". *Journal of Planning Education and Research*. 22(2): 135-151.
7. Omidiji, A.A. 2010. "Federal Road Safety Corps".
8. Onatere-Ubrurhe, J.O. 2016. "Travel Without Fear: A Proposed Strategic Action Plan for Monitoring Road Transport Security". *Developing Country Studies*. ISSN 2224-607X (Paper) ISSN 2225-0565 (Online). 6(1). 2016.
9. Oyesiku, O.O. 2002. "From Womb to Tomb". 24th Inaugural Lecture at Olabisi Onabanjo University on 27 August 2002. Olabisi Onabanjo University Press: Ago Iwoye, Nigeria.
10. Raji, B.A. 2008. "Movements in Urban Area". A Ph.D. AREA paper presented in the Department of Geography, University of Ibadan: Ibadan, Nigeria.
11. Usman, Y.O. 2005. "FRSC Refocuses on Road Safety Tenets". *Weekly Trust Newspaper*, October 1-7, 2005.

SUGGESTED CITATION

Jayeola, O.E., M.E. Ogunbiyi, and A.O. Akinyele. 2022. "Perceived Risk and Insecurity of Road Transport Operations in Ado-Odo/Ota Local Government Area, Ogun State Nigeria". *Pacific Journal of Science and Technology*. 23(2): 83-91.

