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Abstract

African cities especially the national and commercial capitals bring together people from different ethnic (cultural) backgrounds. The resultant mix helps to produce the more cosmopolitan relationships necessary to support a modern nation. Scholars are in agreement however that culture powerfully influences the residential behaviours of the different ethnic groups that make up these urban centres. This paper uses researcher administered questionnaires on six of the most identifiable ethnic enclaves in the city of Lagos to examine the relationship between ethnic (views) and place attachment. It concludes by suggesting that culture plays an important role in urban residential structure.
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1. Introduction

Many African cities especially the national and commercial capitals bring together people of different tribal and cultural backgrounds. This helps to produce the more cosmopolitan relationships necessary to support a modern nation (Hanna and Hanna, 1971). Scholars have argued that the culture (religion, beliefs, customs traditions, languages ceremonies, arts and values) powerfully influence the perspectives and practices of urban cities. In the towns of black Africa, as elsewhere, people tend to reside, associate
and work with their “own kind”. This manifests as ethnic clusters which is a common phenomenon, both within dwelling units and within neighbourhoods. The townsman who chooses to live with or near co-ethnics increases the predictability of his environment while at the same time minimizes the anxiety and stress that derive from uncertainty. This practice also facilitates the expression and satisfaction of affection among co-ethnics.

In spite of the changes that have taken place over the decades, social and behavioural boundaries between ethnic groups has retained its significance, this is because it seems to affect where one lives, with whom one associates, for whom one votes among others. Against this background, the typical African urban city is viewed as a cluster of partly overlapping ethnic enclaves each with a distinct set of perspectives and practices. Although these enclaves are geographical realities but more importantly they are behavioural realities. In fact it can be argued that because the residents of a typical African city represents many ethnic groups, there is often no single set of standards shared by a predominant majority of the city dwellers. Instead there are many distinct or partially overlapping sets (Hanna & Hanna, 1971).

Consequently, it is widely accepted that culture generally influences environmental behaviour. Yet how and to what extent this happens has been a major research priority (Paolisso 2001, Burn, 2000). By largely dictating the goals and values for which people strive as well as their behaviour patterns, culture provides opportunity for particular behaviours in the environment (Burn, 2000). Indeed culture has been defined as whatever one has to know or believe to operate in a manner acceptable to its members. This is often referred to as the progenitor of group identity encapsulated in the profound statement ‘if we share this culture then we recognize that we belong to each other’. Furthermore researchers have argued that culture is encapsulated as community environmental beliefs and values encapsulated in the concept of the ‘dangerimu’ (my “townsman” in Hausa language).

Indeed scholars agree that no society is mono-ethnic and that there is clearly a multiplicity of needs, desires and aspirations to be met (Lee & Parrot, 2004). This implies that the use of houses and neighbourhoods reflect certain cultural and social values and ideals. As has been indicated in Rapoport (1982) it is fascinating to study the landscapes created by various ethnic and cultural groups of relatively smaller scale. This study therefore aims to explore the relationship between culture and place attachment. The paper therefore has as its main objective, to establish the influence of culture in the formation of residential enclaves in an urban setting. Specifically it explores the mechanism whereby ethnic affinity influences the formation of place attachment. The paper uses quantitative data through the use of self administered questionnaire and secondary data to answer the research objectives.

2. Literature Review

It has been universally acknowledged that the city attracts a myriad of colourful social backgrounds representing various ethnic nationalities (Abdulkarim & Abudularshid, 2010). These often presents two scenarios - one in which people are bonded closely together by kinship and tradition or the other in which people come together on the basis of individual self-interest. From the first perspective urban dwellers would need to seek out the favour of others to fulfil the same collective needs. Whereas in the second perspective, urban dwellers display little sense of community, are characterized by the erosion of close and enduring social relations. It has been argued that cultural characteristics influence the way people interact in urban residential context. Furthermore cultural identities manifested as ethnic enclaves is seen as largely responsible for such behavioural outcomes as place attachment. Some literature suggests that people may be attracted to a particular area because of several factors, chief among which may be friendliness of the people, safety, social interaction and community spirit (Lumumba 2010). Indeed it was argued that ethnic considerations dominated the initial and subsequent mobility of migrants to the city. Migrants often prefer to settle close to friend or relatives or in areas where the majority of the households
are of the same ethnic background, thus leading to the creation of ethnic enclaves over time in the urban morphology of cities. This may then manifests in expression of ethnic or religious identity pervading an entire community (Ergenoglu et al) where strong family or community ties ensure that individual behaviour is subject to relatively higher social control by family, friend, community or religion (Karakus, et al, 2010; Hanna & Hanna, 1971).

2.1. Culture as Ethnic Identity

In our quest to understand urban residential preferences manifested as place attachment, and urban residential segregation, we cannot overlook the influence of culture or ethnic preferences. This is because diversity of culture is a major concern among scholars in many societies. It is firmly believed that culture can assist greatly, in explaining certain urban and residential phenomena (Lee & Parrot, 2004). This is because by largely dictating the goals and values for which populations of people strive as well as their behavioural pattern, culture provides opportunities for particular types of behaviour in urban environments (Burn, 2000). This suggests that culture regulates and patterns human behaviour. Culture influences action in this way by shaping a repertoire or “tool kit” of habits, skills and styles (including language and speech from which people construct strategies of action). These strategies of action are cultural products; the symbolic experiences of mythic lore and ritual practices of a group or society. They create moods and motivations, ways of organizing experience and evaluating reality, modes of regulating conduct and ways of forming social bonds This means that when we notice cultural differences, (Lee & Parrot, 2004), how people approach life is shaped by their culture (Ergenoglu et al). To put this in boarder perspective Rappoport (1982) suggests that one definition of culture is in terms of people’s ability to co-act effectively. This implies that different cultures have different setting and the behavior appropriate to apparently similar settings may vary in different cultures. These variables may hamper the development of an interactive sense of community (Hanna & Hanna 1971). Rapoport (1982) went on to explain the effect of the environment on behaviour. He argued that environment must be culture specific in order to work and that such schema actually guide responses by making certain response more likely. This is actualized by limiting and restricting the range of likely and possible responses without being determining. In the urban context therefore the behavioural outcome of this phenomenon crystallizes in the form of landscapes created by various ethnic and cultural groups at a microscopic scale.

2.2. Culture As An Instrument Of Urban Structure

Scholars have for long recognized the place of culture in the formation of urban ethnic enclaves (Lumumba 2010, Hanna & Hanna, 1971). They suggest that the main reason for the initial location choice were related to being closer to relatives showing that non-economic considerations were the major driving forces such as need to maintain ties with their kin in order to get support during the difficult times in the city. Yet for others, the initial motive to move is economic, nevertheless the success of subsequent residential careers and continued stay is seen to be significantly influenced by socio-cultural consideration and family networks (Lumumba 2010). This is because most city dwellers’ ties and identities are closest with an ethnic group that relate to people outside the urban area. These ties and identities are being constantly reinforced because most residents are to some extent encapsulated in their own ethnic network. This often serves as a partial barrier between them and the wider urban social system (Hanna & Hanna, 1971). These may then lead to differing cultural processes depending on the scope of the ethnic overlap. Such process as enculturation where individuals begin to learn the lifestyle, behaviours and habits of the society they live in, or acculturation which is the cultural interaction between individuals or groups coming from various cultures in a community. This can result in the reformation of lifestyles and habits,
but this takes place very slowly and often times imperceptibly they often span several generations (Ergenoglu et al).

2.3. Place Attachment And Ethnic Identity

Place attachment has been defined as the development of affective bond or link between people or individuals and specific places (Ujang, 2010). It is expressed through the interplay of affections and emotions; knowledge and beliefs, behaviours and actions. Place attachment theory postulate that physical settings are expressive, creating messages about resident identity, neighborliness and commitment. Residences are often a source of pride, a vehicle for identity display and visible symbol of community standards and territorial commitment (Brown et al, 2004; Gauvain & Altman, 1982). Bonds of attachment are cultivated by the accumulation of memories, the active investment of effort in personalizing or decorating one’s house or environment. Place attachment is also reflected in the functional bonding between people and places and is often described as place dependence. Similarly place attachment and place identity is closely related. While the latter refers to an individual’s incorporation of place into the larger concept of self, the former is conceptualized as the special bonds developed with certain settings that have deep meanings to residents (Gifford, 1997). Scholars have suggested that identity of place just as place attachment is determined not only by physical (functional) components but also by the meaning and associations developed between people and places (Ujang, 2010). They imply that a strong sense of attachment to a particular place is influenced by racial, ethnic or class identity. Therefore place attachment is identified based on consensus from stratified user groups according to their perceived roles and socio-cultural characteristics.

It is also reinforced when a place is perceived as important to the users on the basis of its ability to fulfill their functional needs while supporting their behavioural goals better than a known alternative (Ujang, 2010). Furthermore literature suggests that meaning and attachment are influenced by culture and past experience. It is also associated with the symbolic importance of a place as a repository of emotions and relationships that give meaning and purpose to life, relating the sense of belonging which are important to a person’s sense of well-being.

Scholars have also highlighted the fact that despite mobility and globalization, place continues to be an object of strong attachment (Michalos & Zumbo, 2000). The literature was able to highlight some important variables of place attachment as sense of community which has been referred to as the sense that one was part of a readily available (Pain, 2000) mutually supportive network of relationship (Mannanini & Fedi, 2009). This is related to other variables such as social interaction, trust and norms – rules specifying appropriate and desirable behaviour while forbidding undesirable behaviour (Dekker, 2007). It has also been said that residential neighbourhoods mirror a wide variety of environmental and cultural influences and that dwelling forms evolve in response to a variety of interactive forces (Gauvain & Altman, 1982), differentiation and practices.

2.4. The Study Area

Lagos was for a very long time the political and commercial capital of Nigeria until 1993 when the political capital was moved to Abuja. However, in spite of the movement, the city remains the commercial capital of the country. As is common with a large number of African cities of similar standing, Lagos has over the decades witnessed the development of predominant ethnic enclaves which has dotted the cities residential landscape. In order to capture the essence of this development, this study chose six of the most identifiable ethnic enclaves in the city namely: Obalende, Aguda/Surulere, Orile, Ajegunle, Makoko and Isale-Eko enclaves of the city.
Obalende is reputed to be, a reference point in the residential composition of the Hausa/Fulani in the cities. These are characterized by a set of people who, in addition to being seen as living a simple lifestyle are reported to have a strong sense of communal spirit. Added to this is the largely homogenous religious view which not only reinforced their cultural views but also serves as a strongly communal identity.

Aguda/Surulere is also reputed to be a major enclave of people of Igbo ethnic origin, they are noted for their republican way of life and are reported to place economic relations strongly on their interactions. Similarly, the Orile area of the city is reported to be majority inhabited by the Yorubas from the Kwara state. These people have a strong ethnic affiliation that marks them out from the indigenous Yorubas of the city. The Ajegunle area is also reported to be the bastion of ethnic minorities from the south-south region of the country. They are mainly, Ijaw, Itsekri and the Urhobos who are known for their cultural and social benefit. Makoko in the other hand is known to be a traditional enclave of the Eguns and the Iljes. They maintain ties to their ancestral homes in Badagry, the waterside and even as far as the Republic of Benin in the South western border. They maintain in strong dialectical identity and are known to bind for economic

Isale-Eko on the other hand is a known bastion of the indigenous. Eko (Lagos) Yoruba speaking people. They are known to process and exhibit a strong attachment to their community often preferring it to apparently more comfortable parts of the city.

It must be emphasized that these enclaves were subtle coping mechanisms of the socio-economic realities of the population that form the bulk of these enclaves as majority of them can be said to belong to the group of the economically disadvantaged segment of the population.

3. Methodology

3.1. Conceptual Framework

It is analytically advantageous to view the city as a cluster of partly overlapping ethnic enclave, each with its own set of behavioural imperatives based on ethnic sentiments. Fig.3. Similarly, how users perceive built environment can contribute much to how these environments evolve,(Cozens, et al, 2002 Alison, P. 2002)
3.2. Survey Strategy

The survey was conducted using questionnaire administered by the researcher and trained assistants, this is because there is practically little motivation for respondents, being low income earners to fill out questionnaires by themselves. The questionnaire was administered through purposive random sampling in all the six selected ethnic residential enclaves (Mohammad et al., 2010). A total of 210 self-administered in all the six communities at an average of 35 number per community. Out of the total 210 Questionnaires administered 139 were male and 71 were female.

3.3. Questionnaire

The questionnaire we used in this study contained questions concerning respondents attitude to place attachments, residential segregation, age sex, ethnic preferences and socio-economic characteristics.

3.4. Variables for Analysis

The research questions addressed in this study are: (i) Does cultural identity correlate with place attachment. (ii) What are the variables that correlate with place attachment. (iii) Which of the constituent ethnic groups have the strongest affiliation and (iv) Does length of residency correlate with place attachment, cultural views and sense of community?

To address the first and second research questions; the Dependent Variable (place attachment) was represented by the indicator “I like to stay here because many of the residents are from my ethnic group”. This is rated in a 5-point Likert Scale from “Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree”. The independent variables are for sense of community as indicated by the question “How would you rate sense of togetherness in your community”, rated on a 5 point Likert scale from “Very Good” to “Very Poor”. The second independent variable which is an indication of connectedness to respondents cultural view is “How often do you go to your Hometown” measured Yearly. Twice a year, or Rarely. The third is participation in cultural gathering which is an indication of identity measured on a Yes/No rating.

The fourth variable which is an indicator of social network and relationship is indicated by the question “In my view it is easier to cooperate with people of the same ethnic group”, also measured on a 5 point Likert scale from ‘strongly’ ‘agree’ to ‘strongly disagree’. The third research question was addressed by the question “It is better to live with people from the same ethnic group in the same community” measured on a likert scale of “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree”. These were then analyses using nominal regression and parameter estimate. The fourth research question which is to test the relationship of Length of
Residency to the variables of sense of community, place attachment and cultural views were also analyzed using Regression Analysis and Correlation Coefficients.

Limitation: The obvious limitations of this study are that this is not a longitudinal study that might help to establish a longer term trend and of course limitation in sample selection as a result of lack of data on population size.

4. Results and Discussions

The test of reliability of the questionnaire using standardized Cronbach’s Alpha yielded 0.746 (74.6%). This suggests that the instrument of evaluation is highly reliable (74.61%>70%). There is also an internal consistency in the instrument used for data collection. To further validate the adequacy of the instrument, ANOVA test was carried out which yielded P =+0.000 < 0.05.

4.1. Characteristics of Respondents

The characteristics of respondents are shown in Table 1. The 210 respondents comprised 132 Yoruba 21, Igbo, 43 Hausa/Fulani, 7 Edo, 3 Urhobos and 1 each of Ibibio, Ijaw, Itsekiri and Esan respectively. Also of the total, 139 were male and 71 were female. Also regarding age, 114 of the respondents were 30 years and below, a further 62 were between 31 and 40 years while 34 are 41 years and above.

The table also indicated that each of the selected communities are dominated by particular tribes for example in Aguda we have more people of Igbo extraction while in Obalende, the area is dominated by the Hausa/Fulani tribe while Isale-Eko is dominated by the indigenes of Lagos.

| Table 1: Description of Respondents | Ethnic Origin |
|------------------------------------|--------------|
| No. of Respondents                |              |
| Gender:                           |              |
| Male                              | 132 (62.9)   |
| Female                            | 78 (37.1)    |
| Age:                              |              |
| 30 Years or below                 | 60 (28.6)    |
| (31-40) Year                      | 43 (20.5)    |
| 41 Years or above                 | 27 (12.9)    |
| Community:                        |              |
| Lagos                             | 110 (52.4)   |
| Community                         | 100 (47.6)   |
| Length of Residence:              |              |
| Lagos                             | 23 (10.9)    |
| Community                         | 11 (5.2)     |
| Tenancy:                          |              |
| Owner                             | 24 (11.4)    |
| Farmer                            | 74 (35.3)    |
| Others                            | 34 (16.2)    |

The table also indicates that each of the selected communities are dominated by particular tribes for example in Aguda we have more people of Igbo extraction while in Obalende, the area is dominated by the Hausa/Fulani tribe while Isale-Eko is dominated by the indigenes of Lagos.
4.2. Cultural Views and Place Attachment

The result of the correlation and multiple Regression analysis is indicated in Table 2 and Table 3 respectively.

Table 2: Culture and Place Attachment

| Correlations Analysis | Place Attachment | Sense of togetherness | How often do you go to your hometown? | Ethnic cultural gathering | It is easier to cooperate with people of the same ethnic group than with others |
|-----------------------|------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| Place Attachment      | 1.000            | .411*                 | .447*                                 | .223*                    | .417*                                       |
| Sense of togetherness | 1.000            | 1.000                 | .424*                                 | .013                     | .265*                                       |
| How often do you go to your hometown? | 1.000             | 1.000                 | .171*                                 | .185*                    |                                             |
| Ethnic cultural gathering |                   |                       | 1.000                                 | 1.000                    |                                             |
| It is easier to cooperate with people of the same ethnic group than with others |                   |                       |                                       | 1.000                    |

* Correlation is significant at 5% level. Note: Multiple correlation (R) = 0.861 (86.1%). Adjusted $R^2 = 0.741$ (74.1%). $F = 28.927$ (Significant at 5% level).

The correlation results indicated that there is significant direct correlation between place attachments and each of the variables (Sense of togetherness, hometown travelling, ethnic cultural gathering and Cooperation within the same ethnic group). Further, the multiple correlations (R) obtained as 0.861 (86.1%) is the overall correlation between place attachments and the variables, which explained it, indicating that there is high correlation. The adjusted regression coefficient of determination ($R^2$) obtained as 0.741 (74.1%) explained the amount of information about place attachments accounted for by the four variables. The F test suggested the model is adequate judging from the fact that the P-value $=0.000 > 0.05$. The effect of each of the variable on place attachment is investigated using regression analysis. This result implies that in all the identified communities, bond of attachment(as sense of community), connectedness with their roots as indicated by occasional travels home, participation in culture related gathering and cooperation among members are strong indicators of place attachment.

Table 3: Significance of Relationship of Culture and Place Attachment

| Regression Coefficients | Unstandardized Coefficients | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
|-------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|---|------|
| (Constant)              | 1.341                      | .147                      | 9.114 | .000 |
| Sense of togetherness   | .136                       | .040                      | .214 | 3.374 | .001 |
| How often do you go to your hometown? | .207                       | .046                      | .283 | 4.505 | .000 |
Looking at the P-values of each of the independent variables, the results indicated that they all have significant effect on place attachments since P-values 0.001, 0.000, 0.036, 0.000 < 0.05, respectively. Hence, this suggests that place attachment of the respondents in the various communities is determined by sense of togetherness, how often they travel to their hometown, ethnic cultural gathering and level of cooperation with their ethnic group. However, cooperation with the same ethnic group contributes the highest effect on place attachments. This is shown in figure 4.

![Fig 4: Direct effect of Variables on Place Attachments Using Standardized Coefficient](image)

**4.3. Group with Strongest Cultural Affinity**

Normal Regression shows that the model is adequate since p-value 0.997 > 0.05 in the goodness-fit test. The result also suggested that cultural view origin has significant relationship with ethnic origin.

Overall Effect of Ethnic Affiliations (Cultural views) on Place Attachments: From the Pearson’s correlation coefficient, the result suggested that there a significant direct relationship between place attachments and cultural views. The overall effect of cultural views on place attachments is also significant from the Pvalue =0.000 < 0.05 in the regression analysis in table 4.
Importantly parameter estimate in Table 5 indicated that given exponential B value of 8.048 for the Hausa/Fulani respondents, they have about eight times as strongly ethnic affiliation as the various Yoruba groups (0.984) and about 5 times those of the Itsekiri groups.

Table 4 & Table 5 * Correlation is significant at 5% level. Note: Multiple correlation (R) = 0.724 (72.4%). Adjusted R² = 0.524 (52.4%). F = 78.551 (Significant at 5% level).

Table 5: Parameter Estimate of the Cultural affinity of Ethnic Groups

| Tribe/Ethnic Origin | B       | Std. Error | Wald | df | Sig. | Exp(B) | 95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B) |
|---------------------|---------|------------|------|----|------|--------|----------------------------------|
|                     |         |            |      |    |      |        | Lower Bound                       |
|                     |         |            |      |    |      |        | Upper Bound                       |
| Yoruba              | Intercept | 4.910     | 4.972 | .975 | 1    | .323   | 4.972                             |
|                     | CV       | -.016     | 2.976 | .000 | 1    | .966   | 2.976 - 4.972                     |
| Igbo                | Intercept | 3.895     | 5.048 | .595 | 1    | .440   | 3.895                             |
|                     | CV       | -.530     | 3.026 | .031 | 1    | .816   | 3.026 - 5.048                     |
| Hausa/Fulani       | Intercept | 1.143     | 5.084 | .001 | 1    | .978   | 5.084                             |
|                     | CV       | 2.085     | 3.031 | .473 | 1    | .491   | 2.085 - 5.084                     |
| Ibibio             | Intercept | 2.816     | 6.011 | .219 | 1    | .640   | 2.816                             |
|                     | CV       | -         | 3.805 | .240 | 1    | .624   | 3.805 - 6.011                     |
|                     |           | 1.865     | .016  | 1    | .892   | 1.865                             |
| Ijaw                | Intercept | 4.635     | 5.698 | .662 | 1    | .416   | 5.698                             |
|                     | CV       | -         | 3.812 | .771 | 1    | .380   | 3.812 - 5.698                     |
|                     |           | 3.347     | .019  | 1    | .892   | 3.347                             |
| Itsekiri            | Intercept | 1.016     | 7.463 | .019 | 1    | .892   | 7.463                             |
|                     | CV       | .609      | .000  | 1    | .380   | 1.016 - 1.609                     |
| Urhobo             | Intercept | 3.914     | 5.335 | .538 | 1    | .463   | 5.335                             |
|                     | CV       | -         | 3.273 | .325 | 1    | .569   | 3.273 - 5.335                     |
|                     |           | 1.865     | .000  | 1    | .946   | 1.865                             |
| Edo                 | Intercept | 2.656     | 5.241 | .257 | 1    | .612   | 5.241                             |
|                     | CV       | -.414     | 3.147 | .257 | 1    | .889   | 3.147 - 5.241                     |
| Esan                | Intercept | 4.910     | 2.976 | .975 | 1    | .323   | 4.910                             |
|                     | CV       | .016      | .000  | 1    | .996   | 2.976 - 4.910                     |

Reference: Customized
4.4. Length of Residence, Place Attachment, Cultural view and Sense of Community

The Regression Analysis of the variables suggests that there is significant positive relationship length of residence between them. (Table.7). This implies that increased length of residence will most likely result from increase in the value of the other variables. Figure 4 shows that place attachment contributed highest in direct effect to length of residency. Indeed the strength of the contributions of each variable is demonstrated in Table 8 and laid out graphically in Figure 5.

Table 7: Relationship of Length of Residence, Cultural view and Sense of Community

|                            | Length of Residence in the community | Sense of togetherness in the community | Cultural Views | Place Attachments |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------|------------------|
| Length of Residence in the community | 1.000                               | .186*                                 | .114*         | .151*            |
| Sense of togetherness in the community | 1.000                               | .462*                                 | .415*         |                  |
| Cultural Views             |                                      |                                       | .534*         |                  |
| Place Attachments          |                                      |                                       | 1.000         |                  |

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (1-tailed).

Table 8: Strength of the Relationship

|                            | Unstandardized Coefficients | Standardized Coefficients | t       | Sig.    |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|---------|---------|
|                             | B                           | Std. Error                | Beta    |         |
| (Constant)                  | 15.551                      | 3.367                     | 4.618   | .000    |
| Sense of togetherness in the community | .675                      | .775                      | .069    | .872    |
| Cultural Views              | 3.766                      | 2.269                     | .141    | 1.660   |
| Place Attachments           | 2.400                      | 1.008                     | .198    | 2.381   |

Dependent Variable: Length of Residence in the community.

Fig 5: Direct effect of Variables on Length of Residence in the community Using Standardized Coefficient
5. Conclusions

The study set out to investigate the relationship between ethnic affiliation and place attachment all leading to the formation of ethnic enclaves as a necessary component of urban structure. Consequently, the paper agrees with previous studies about the importance of sense of community, ethnic attachment, cultured participation and ethnic cooperation in the formation of place attachment. It further confirms the significance of aggregate cultural views in place attachment. It also confirms the relationship of length of residency (Baker & Palmer, 2006) to place attachments, cultural views and sense of community. The study suggests that sense of togetherness, connectedness to one’s root, participation in cultural gathering and cooperation with people of one’s ethnic origin are significant predictors of place attachment. It also indicates their willingness with people of same ethnic origin is the highest contributor variable. The study also suggests that people of Hausa/Fulani ethnic has the strongest affiliation amongst others long in Lagos. The study shows that place attachments, cultural views and sense of togetherness in the community are significant predictors of length of residency with place attachment contributing the highest. The finding seems to suggest policies in urban renewal and city evolution and development must take into consideration the ethnic peculiarities of urban residential populations more so as policy makers hope to develop the so called inclusive heterogeneous metropolitan cities of the future. Further research is therefore advocated especially in the area of variables that affect urban residential development to extend the frontiers of the findings of this study.
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