

Perception of health-impacts of environmental noise in an ambient noise Context in Owerri -Urban, Imo State, Nigeria

¹E.A. Ubuoh*, ²S.M.O. Akhionbare, ³O.A. Onifade, ⁴S.I Ogbuji

^{1&3}Department of Environmental Management Technology, Federal College of Land Resources Technology, Owerri

²Department of Environmental Technology, Federal University of Technology, Owerri

⁴Department of Project Management Technology, University of Technology, Owerri

*Corresponding author: Dr. Ubuoh, Department of Environmental Management Technology, Federal College of Land Resources Technology, Owerri Email: attahubuoh@gmail.com.

Abstract

This paper reports the results of the investigation, of health impacts of environmental noise context in Owerri-urban, due to incessant complaints of urban dwellers of noise pollution and their effects on the health. This was measured by the use of 210 questionnaires on urban dwellers along the major routes in which 30 questionnaires were randomly administered between sampled routes designated NP1- NP7. The observed results indicates, that the automobile has 32.3%, the church has 3.3%, the construction work has 19.5%, the market has 5.7%, industrial activities 9.0%, hawking 10%, and school 6.6%, with the automobile recording the highest response as the main source of environmental noise pollution and the church having the least response. For the perceived health problems caused by environmental noise, the results further show that Cardiovascular and Physiological effects constituted 20.5%, Hearing Impairment did 25.2%, Sleeplessness did 21.9%, mental health did 11.4%, annoyance did 6.6% and human performance did 14.2%, with hearing impairment ranking the highest and the lowest being annoyance. Environmental noise was at the peak between the hours of eight- 11 A.M constituting 49.1%. The hours between three-seven pm constitutes 39.5%, while <10pm has 11.4% indicating the noise pollution is less in the evening time of the day where people are indoor for rest. These call for best management practice like enforcement of pollution law, maintenance of vehicles and creation of awareness on health implications of environmental noise.

Keywords: Health-impacts, Environmental Noise, Ambient Noise.

Introduction

Noise can be defined as an unwanted or undesired sound whereas, environmental noise is any unwanted or harmful outdoor sound created by human activities, which are detrimental to the quality of life of individuals (Babisch, 1999). According to Encyclopedia Britannica, in acoustic, noise is defined as any undesired sound. In chambers, 21st Century Dictionary, the definition of noise has undergone a change. Noise pollution stands carved out as phrase separately from noise. The two are defined as follows: under Noise + and sound, is a harsh disagreeable sound, or such a sound; din pollution – an excessive or annoying degree of noise in a particular area (Fidel *et al.*, 1995; Hajah, 2004). Community noise (also called environmental noise, residential noise or domestic noise) is defined as a noise emitted from all the sources except noise at the industrial workplace. Main sources of community noise include road, rail

and air traffic, industries, construction and public work, and the neighborhood (Birgitta *et al.*, 1999). Noise pollution is by now recognized worldwide as a major problem for the quality of life in any urban area (Bradley, 1986). In the most developed countries, standards for air pollution and noise exposures are an important part of environmental policy to improve the local environmental quality (Carter, and Hunyor, 1991). Often these standards are based on expert judgments and do not take peoples' preferences into account. Numerous noise surveys treating the problem of noise pollution in many cities throughout the world have been conducted (Persson and Björkman, 1988; Rao, 1998; Sandberg, 1999).

In some surveys, the noise impact was treated as a stress indicator, and in consequence, the role of noise as a risk factor for human health was discussed. Noise effect includes various impacts on mental and physical health and

disturbance of daily activities which may affect sleep, conversation, lead to perception of annoyance, cause of hearing loss, instigate cardiovascular problems as well as affecting human judgment and performance (Passchier-Vermeer, 1993; Babisch, 1999). The perception of sounds in day-to-day life is of major importance for human well-being in urban areas. The paper focus on the effects of human activities as the sources of noise generation and the environmental implications of the perceived noise in Owerri Urban.

Materials and methods

Study area

Owerri Municipal of Imo State is within rainforest zone of Nigeria that lies between longitude $7^{\circ}00'$ and $7^{\circ}05'$ E and latitude $5^{\circ}27'$ and $5^{\circ}31'$. The area covers the total landmass of 24.88 km. It has mean annual rainfall of 213.2 mm, and mean annual temperature ranging between $26 - 28^{\circ}\text{C}$, with humidity that varies between 50.5-70.5 %. Owerri Municipal Council is characterized by influx of people and high volume of vehicular flows in and out of the area due to its nodal function it plays. It has a big central market called Ekeonunwa within the centre with petty trading like hawkers, and shops selling musical equipments, records and grounding machines and churches and a mosque. The population of Owerri Municipal is 165,470 people.

Method of Data Collection by Questionnaire

A structured questionnaire was used on respondents in order to know peoples' perception about noise pollution in the area, and 210 designed questionnaires were randomly administered on respondents along the six selected roads. A set of

30 questionnaires each were sampled on the seven routes (Douglas Road, Okigwe Road, Port Harcourt Road, Orlu Road, Onishia Road, Wethra Road, and Orji Road). And for temporal variation of environmental noise pollution, vehicular flow were monitored based on time grouping as 8 -11am, 3 - 7pm and <10 pm. Personal observations on the type of activities performed in the locations and relevant information were sourced.

Results and Discussion

Sources of Environmental Noise Pollution

Results of sources of environmental noise pollution is shown in Table. 1, and activities such as music stores, automobile, churches, construction works, market squares, industrial activities, hawking and schools were considered in appraisal as appears below:




Fig.1. Sources of environmental noise pollution in Owerri urban.

Table 1: Distribution of respondents according to sources of noise in the selected roads in Owerri urban

Sources	Douglas Road	Okigwe Road	PH Road	Orlu Road	Onishia Road	Wethra Road	Orji Road	Mean	%
	NP 1	NP2	NP3	NP4	NP5	NP6	NP 7		
Music Store	6	5	-	3	1	7	6	4	13.3
Automobile	7	8	10	8	15	9	11	9.7	32.3
Church	1	2	1	1	-	-	2	1	3.3
Construction	2	3	12	10	5	1	8	5.9	19.5
Market	6	2	-	1	2	1	-	1.7	5.7
Industrial	1	3	2	-	7	5	1	2.7	9.0
Hawking	5	2	-	6	-	6	2	3	10
School	2	5	5	1	-	1	-	2	6.6
TOTAL	30	30	30	30	30	30	30		100

From Table 1, the results of the sources of noise pollution indicates that music stores records the mean value of 4 that constitutes 13.3 % of the respondents, automobile has the mean value of 9.7 (32.3%), church 1(3.3%), construction work 5.9 (19.5%), market 1.7 (5.7%), industrial activities 2.7 (9.0), hawking 3 (10%), and school 2 (6.6%) (Fig.1). The overall result shows that church has the lowest percentage response as the source of noise pollution, while automobile records the highest response as the main source of environmental noise pollution in urban areas. The result is consistent with the finding of Spence (Job, 1990), who reported that in the city, the main sources of traffic noise are the motors and exhaust system of autos, smaller trucks, buses, and motorcycles. The noise from the construction of highways, city streets, and buildings is a major contributor to the urban scene. Construction noise sources which ranks the second include pneumatic hammers, air compressors, bulldozers, loaders, dump trucks (and their back-up signals), and pavement breakers are issues in Owerri due to what is called “rescued agenda” of the Government which, is also consistent with the finding of Spence (Job, 1990).

Perceived health problems of environmental noise pollution

Noise health effects are shown in Table. 2, and noise can damage physiological and psychological health, cause annoyance and aggression, hypertension, high stress levels, tinnitus, hearing loss, sleep disturbances, and other harmful effects: stress and hypertension are the leading causes to health problems and tinnitus can lead to

forgetfulness, severe depression and at times panic attacks, chronic exposure to noise may cause noise induced hearing loss and cause of annoyance (ISO. Acoustics, 1997).

Cardiovascular and physiological effects

It has been postulated that noise acts as an environmental stressor (Berglund and Lindvall, 1995; Passchier-Vermeer, 1993). Acute noise exposures activate the autonomic and hormonal systems, leading to temporary changes such as increased blood pressure, increased heart rate and vasoconstriction. After prolonged exposure, susceptible individuals in the general population may develop permanent effects, such as hypertension and ischaemic heart disease associated with exposures to high sound pressure levels (Berglund and Lindvall, 1995; Chakrabarty and Santra , 1997; Passchier-Vermeer , 1993). The result in Table. 2 shows that the sampled population with the mean value of 6.14 (20.5%) agreed that noise pollution is responsible for Cardiovascular and Physiological problems, which ranks second to the highest value.

Hearing impairment

Hearing handicap is the disadvantage imposed by hearing impairment sufficient to affect one’s personal efficiency in the activities of daily living. It is usually expressed in terms of understanding conventional speech in common levels of background noise (ISO. Acoustics, 1997; Passchier-Vermeer, 1993). The result shows that the sampled population ascertained that noise

Table 2: Distribution of respondents according to the perceived problems of noise pollution.

Problems	Sampled locations							Mean	%
	NP 1	NP2	NP3	NP4	NP5	NP6	NP 7		
Cardiovascular and Physiological effects	4	6	8	8	6	5	6	6.14	20.5
Hearing Impairment	11	12	5	6	5	10	4	7.57	25.2
Sleeplessness	8	5	6	8	3	6	10	6.56	21.9
Mental Health	3	2	2	3	7	3	4	3.42	11.4
Annoyance	1	2	1	1	3	4	2	2	6.6
Human performance	3	3	8	4	6	2	4	4.27	14.2
TOTAL	30	30	30	30	30	30	30		100

population is responsible for hearing impairment with the mean value of 7.57 (25.2%). The result is




Fig.2. Health impacts of environmental noise pollution in Owerri urban




Fig.3. Temporal variation of environmental noise generation in Owerri Urban

consistent with the findings of (HCN, 1994; Passchier-Vermeer, 1993; Zaidi, 1998, 1999) WHO observed that hearing impairment in young adults and children 12 years and above has been assessed by LAeq on a 24 h time basis, for a variety of environmental and leisure-time exposure patterns due to environmental pollution.

Sleep disturbance

Uninterrupted sleep is known to be a prerequisite for good physiological and mental functioning of healthy persons (Babisch *et al.*, 1999; Bradley, 1978; Hobson, 1989) sleep disturbance, on the

other hand, is considered to be a major environmental noise effect. Field studies have examined the effects of road traffic and railway noise (Chakrabarty and Santra, 1997; Griffiths, 1983; Griefahn *et al.*, 1996; Griefahn *et al.*, 1998). The primary sleep disturbance effects are: difficulty in falling asleep (increased sleep latency time); awakenings; and alterations of sleep stages or depth, especially a reduction in the proportion of REM-sleep (REM = rapid eye movement) Hobson, 1989). The result indicates that sleeplessness due to noise records the mean value of 6.56 (21.9%). The secondary effects include the reduced perceived sleep quality; the increased fatigue; the depressed mood or well-being; and decreased performance Carter *et al.*, 1994b; Öhrström, 1988; Passchier-Vermeer, 1993; Pearsons, 1998).

Mental Health effects

Mental health is defined as the absence of identifiable psychiatric disorders according to current norms (Faiz *et al.*, 1990). Studies on the adverse effects of environmental noise on mental health cover a variety of symptoms, including anxiety; emotional stress; nervous complaints; nausea; headaches; instability; argumentativeness; sexual impotency; changes in mood; increase in social conflicts, as well as general psychiatric disorders such as neurosis, psychosis and hysteria (Berglund and Lindvall, 1995). However, the studies have been criticized because of problems in selecting variables and in the response bias (Bradley, 1978; Halpern, 1995). The result indicated that the mean value of 3.42 (11.4%) agreed to mental effect of noise pollution in urban area.

The Effects of noise on annoyance

Noise annoyance is a global phenomenon, the physiological features like breathing amplitude, blood pressure, heart-beat rate, pulse rate, blood cholesterol are affected (Environmental Noise

Pollution and its Control, 1992). A definition of annoyance is “a feeling of displeasure associated with any agent or condition, known or believed by an individual or group to adversely affect them” (Koelega, 1987; Lindvall and Radford, 1973). However, apart from “annoyance”, people may feel a variety of negative emotions when exposed to community noise, and may report anger, disappointment, dissatisfaction, withdrawal, helplessness, depression, anxiety, distraction, agitation, or exhaustion (Job, 1990). A number of studies have shown that equal levels of traffic and industrial noises result in different magnitudes of annoyance Griffiths, 1983; Hall, 1981; Miedema, 1993). Data from 42 surveys showed that at the group level about 70% of the variance in annoyance is explained by noise exposure characteristics, whereas at the individual level it is typically about 20% (Job, 1990). The result indicates that sampled population with the mean of 2 (6.6%) agreed that noise pollution is the cause of annoyance in urban area which is the second to the least factors. Conversely, for road traffic noise, the introduction of noise protection barriers in residential areas resulted in smaller reductions in annoyance than expected for a stationary situation (Fidell *et al.*, 1991; Miedema, 1998).

The effects of noise on performance

It has been documented in both laboratory subjects and in workers exposed to occupational noise, that noise adversely affects cognitive task performance Cohen, 1980; Evans and Lepore, 1993; Evans *et al.*, 1998; Haines *et al.*, 1998). Some of the effects are related to loss in auditory comprehension and language acquisition, but others are not (Fidell *et al.*, 1995; Evans, 1998). Experimental noise exposure consistently produces negative after-effects on performance (Hygge and Jones, 1998). The result shows that sampled population with the mean value of 4.27 (14.2%) agreed that noise pollution affect performance in urban area (Fig. 2).

Table 3: Distribution of respondents according to temporal variation of noise generation in the selected roads

Time	Sampled Locations							Mean	%
	NP1	NP2	NP3	NP4	NP5	NP6	NP7		
8-11am	15	18	13	14	14	15	14	14.7	49.1
3-7pm	12	11	14	13	9	12	12	11.8	39.5
<10pm	3	1	3	3	7	3	4	3.4	11.4
Total	30	30	30	30	30	30	30		100

From Table 3, the results shows that environmental noise is at the peak between the hours of 8- 11 am reflecting the mean value as 14.7 (49.1%), the periods the workers, students, pupils and business/market men and women moved to the point of action during the day, hence influx of vehicles that generate noise. The hours between 3-7 pm are the periods that people left their duty posts to their homes for stay which constitutes the mean value of 11.8 (39.5%), while <10pm has mean value of 3.4 (11.4%), indicating noise pollution is less in the evening time of the day where people are indoor for rest (Fig. 3).

Summary and Conclusion

In developing countries, occupational noise and urban, environmental noise are increasing risk factors for hearing impairment. Exposure to excessive noise is also of concern because it is associated with distressing conditions such as tinnitus (Sandberg, 1999). In this study, the health impact of environmental noise has been established based on the administration of questionnaires. It is observed that the church has the lowest percentage response as source of noise pollution, while the automobile records the highest response as the main source of environmental noise pollution in the urban areas, and this has led to the greater number of peoples suffering from hearing impairment in the area. From the temporal variation of environmental noise, its peak was discovered between the hours of 8- 11am and the lowest during the hour of < 10 pm. This variation was found to be influenced by vehicular flow and the movement of people in and out of their destinations. It is now concluded that exposure to excessive noise is the major avoidable cause of

hearing impairment and this is caused by high volume of vehicular flow that leads to blowing of horn by heavy duty trucks, passenger's cars, and tricycles. Based on the results, recommended noise management measures,

Legal measures

Enforcement of regulations to maintain Low Noise Minimum requirements for acoustical in urban area by approved Government Agencies.

If governments implement only weak noise policies and regulations, they will not be able to prevent a continuous increase in noise pollution and associated adverse health effects. Failure to enforce strong regulations is ineffective in combating noise as well.

Engineering measures

Vehicles that apply the road must be maintained and checked by vehicle inspection office (VIO) for compliance.

Education and public Awareness

Noise abatement policies can only be established if basic knowledge and background material is available, and the people and authorities are aware that noise is an environmental hazard that needs to be controlled. Limits on the noise emission of vehicles have been introduced in many countries (Stansfeld *et al.*, 1996). Such limits, together with the relevant measuring methods, should also be introduced in other regions of the world.

References

1. Babisch, W Ising, H Gallacher, JE Sweetnam, PMPC (1999) Traffic noise and cardiovascular risk: The Caerphilly and Speedwell studies, third phase 10-year follow up. *Archives of Environmental Health*. 54: 210-216.
2. Berglund B & Lindvall T (1995) Community Noise. Document prepared for the World Health Organization. *Archives of the Center for Sensory Research*, 2(1), 195.
3. Birgitta, B Thomas, L & Dietrich HS (1999) Guidelines for community noise: WHO document on the *Guidelines for Community Noise* is the outcome of the WHO-expert task force meeting held in London, United Kingdom.
4. Bradley JS (1978) Predictors of Adverse Human Responses to Traffic Noise. *Proceedings of the ASTM Symposium on Community Noise, Kansas City*. Pp.108-123.
5. Bradley JS (1986) Predictors of Speech Intelligibility in Rooms. *J. Acoustical Society of America*. 80, 837-845.
6. Carter, NL & Hunyor SN (1991) A field study of traffic noise and cardiac arrhythmia during sleep. In: Technical Papers: 4th Western Pacific Regional Acoustics Conference. pp. 165-172.
7. Carter, NL Ingham, P Tran, K Huynor SA (1994) A field study of the effects of traffic noise on heart rate and cardiac arrhythmia during sleep. *J. Sound and Vibration*. 169, 221-227.
8. Chakrabarty, D Santra SM (1997) A Status of road traffic noise in Calcutta metropolis, India. *J. Acoustical Society of America*. 101, 943-949.
9. Cohen S (1980). After effects of stress on human performance and social behavior: A review of research and theory. *Psychological Bulletin*. 88, 82-108.
10. Environmental Noise Pollution and its Control, *Proceedings of Specialist Course, Institution of Engineers*, Roorkee, India. 1992.
11. Evans GW & Lepore A (1993) Non-auditory effects of noise on children: A critical review. *Children's Environments*. 10, 31-51.
12. Evans GW (1998) Motivational consequences of exposure to noise. In N.L. Carter and R.F.S. Job (eds.) *Noise as a Public Health Problem (Noise Effects '98)*. 1, 311-320.
13. Evans, GW Bullinger, M Zygge H (1998) Chronic noise exposure and physiological response: A prospective study of children living under environmental stress. *Psychological Science*. 9, 75- 77.
14. Faiz, A Sinha, K, Wals, M & Valma A (1990) Automotive air pollution: *Issues and options for developing countries*. WPS 492, World Bank, Washington, USA.
15. Fidell, S Barber, DS Schultz TJ (1991) Updating a dosage-effect relationship for the prevalence of annoyance due to general transportation noise. *J. Acoustical Society of America* 89, 221-233.
16. Fidell, S Zearsons, K Zabachnick, T Howe, R Silvati, L Barber, DS (1995) Field study of noise- induced sleep disturbance. *J. Acoustical Society of America*. 98, 1025-1033.
17. Griefahn, B Deppe, C Mehnert, P Moog, R Moehler, U Schuemer R (1998) What nighttimes are adequate to prevent noise effects on sleep? In N.L. Carter and R.F.S.

- Job (eds.) Noise as a Public Health Problem (Noise Effects '98). Vol. 2, pp. 445-450.
18. Griefahn, B Mehnert, P Moehler, P Schuemer-Kohrs, A Schuemer R (1996) Design of a field study on the effects of railway noise and road traffic noise. In F.A. Hill and R. Lawrence (eds.) Inter Noise 96. Noise Control – The Next 25 Years, Book 4, pp. 2183-88.
19. Griffiths ID (1983) Review of Community Response to Noise. In G. Rossi, (ed.), Noise as a Public Health Problem. 2, 1031-1047.
20. Haines, M Stansfeld, SA Job, RFS Berglund B (1998) Chronic aircraft noise exposure and child cognitive performance and stress. In N.L. Carter and R.F.S. Job (eds.) Noise as a Public Health Problem (Noise Effects '98). 1,329-336.
21. Hajah RI (2004). Guidelines for Environmental Noise Limits and Control, Noise Labeling and Emission Limits of Outdoor Sources and Vibration Limits and Control. Department of Environment Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment.
22. Hall, FL Birnie, SE Taylor, SM Palmer JE (1981). Direct Comparison of Community Response to Road Traffic Noise and to Aircraft Noise. *J.Acoustical Society of America* 70, 1690-1698.
23. Halpern D (1995) *Mental Health and the Built Environment. More than Bricks and Mortar?* Taylor and Francis Ltd, London, UK.
24. HCN (1994) Noise and Health. Publication No. 1994/15E, Health Council of the Netherlands, The Hague, Netherlands, 1994.
25. Hobson JA (1989) Sleep. Scientific American Library, W.H. Freeman and Co, New York, NY, USA.
26. Hygge S Jones, DM Smith, AP (1998) Recent developments in noise and performance. In N.L. Carter and R.F.S. Job (eds.) Noise as a Public Health Problem (Noise Effects '98). 1, 321-28.
27. ISO (1999) Acoustics–Determination of occupational noise exposure and estimation of noise- induced hearing impairment. International Standard ISO 1999, International Organization for Standardization, Geneva, Switzerland.
28. Job RFS (1990) Psychological factors of community reaction to noise. In M. Vallet (ed.) Noise as a Public Health Problem. 1, 48-59.
29. Koelega HS (1987) (ed.) Environmental Annoyance: Characterization, Measurement, and Control. Elsevier, Amsterdam, Netherlands.
30. Lindvall T & Radford E (1973) Measurement of annoyance due to exposure to environmental factors. *Environmental Res.* 96, 1-36.
31. Miedema HME & Vos H (1998) Exposure response functions for transportation noise. *J. Acoustical Society of America.* 104, 3432-3445.
32. Miedema HME (1993) Response Functions for Environmental Noise. In M. Vallet (ed.) Noise as a Public Health Problem, 3, 428-433.
33. Öhrström E (1988) Research on noise and sleep since Present state. In M. Vallet (ed.), Noise as a Public Health Problem, 3, 331-338.
34. Passchier-Vermeer W (1993) *Noise and Health*. The Hague: Health Council of the Netherlands. Publication No A93/02E, review prepared by TNO Institute of Preventive Health Care, Leiden.
35. Pearsons K (1998) Awakening and motility effects of aircraft noise. In N.L. Carter and R.F.S. Job (eds.) Noise as a Public Health Problem (Noise Effects '98). 2, 427-32.
36. Persson K & Björkman M (1988) Annoyance due to Low Frequency Noise and the Use of the dBA Scale. *J. Sound and Vibration.* 127, 491-497.
37. Rao PA (1998) Noise Pollution and Control, Encyclopedia of Environmental Pollution and Control, Vol 2, *Environmedia Publications*, India, 1998.
38. Sandberg U (1999) Abatement of traffic, vehicle and tire/road noise – the global perspective. In: J. Cuschieri, S. Glegg, Yan Yong (eds.) *Internoise 99 – The 1999 International Congress on Noise Control Engineering*, Fort Lauderdale, Florida, USA, 37-42.
39. Stansfeld, S Gallacher, J Babisch, W Shipley S (1996). Road traffic noise and psychiatric disorder: prospective findings from the Caerphilly Study. *British Medical Journal.* 313, 266-267.
40. Zaidi SH (1998) Current status and future trends of deafness and hearing impairment in the tropics. *Pakistan Journal of Otolaryngology.* 14, 38-45.
41. Zaidi SH (1999) An epidemiological study of hearing impairment in the Himalayan territories of Pakistan. *Hearing International Newsletter.* 8, 1-4.