Abstract

Considerable researches have been undertaken on sense of place over the years. Researches on sense of place have been examined in relation to different categories of people such as older adults, migrants and refugees, ethnic groups and many of researches these have focused majorly on the adults, and relatively limited attention has been paid to children. Majority of these researches on children’s sense of place have been carried out in different countries of the world such as New Mexico, U. S. A., South Korea among others, excluding Nigeria, most especially her traditional towns. There is therefore the need of this research, because children in Nigeria, though naive, have tendencies of developing sense of place with the environment they reside in, as they grow. Their sense of place can also be significant in the development of their identity, security and sense of belonging. The study used data acquired from both primary and secondary sources. Primary data were obtained through field observation and questionnaire administration. Multistage sampling technique was employed in gathering the primary data. Firstly, the study area was divided into three zones (core, transition and suburban), based on existing groupings from literature. Due to the fact that the study focused on children, schools in these zones were the focus of obtaining data for the study. Therefore, in the second stage, a total of 88 Primary Schools (public and primary) were identified from the stated residential areas comprising 21, 47, and 20 respectively. 3, 4, and 2 areas were selected from the total number of the areas in the core, transition and suburban area respectively. Following this, ten students each were randomly selected from each school. Therefore, a total of 90 questionnaires were administered, from which 83 were recovered. Secondary data such as maps were obtained from relevant sources. In analysing the data obtained, appropriate descriptive and inferential statistical techniques were employed. It was established from the findings that children only had an average sense of place in the study area. However, the measurements of sense of place revealed that children in the core area had higher sense of place than those in the transition and suburban areas. It also revealed that place dependence contributed mostly to their sense of place in the study area. More so, the common factor that contributed majorly to their sense of place was safe neighbourhood, while the activities that contributed to their sense of place were playful indoor activities and most especially watching cartoons. The study concluded that the closer the children were to the city centre, the higher the sense of place. The study recommends in order to ensure that children’s sense of place in the area were strengthened, they should be taught the
core values of the study area and their welfare and suggestions should be prioritized when making decisions concerning the study area.
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1. Introduction

Everyone belongs to a place which indicates an environment they interact with and derive meaning in (Butterworth, 2000; Stedman, 2003). The Institute of Place Management (2013) defines place as a location that has meaning to people. As time goes on, people inhabiting a place have certain experiences based on their knowledge of the place through their senses (Erasmus & De Crom, 2015). These experiences of place are multi-sensory, stimulating and involving all the senses. The senses therefore help people, individuals, as well as society integrate the features of topography, natural conditions, “symbolic” meanings, and the built form through their value systems, to form a sense of place (Jiven and Larkham, 2003). Sense of place is developed through experience and knowledge of a particular “place” (Woods, 2013; Hodgetts et al., 2010; Shamai & Ilatov, 2005; Tonts & Atherley, 2010). It is about the psychological and functional connections between people and places. It is often referred to as the atmosphere of the place, the quality of the environment and the attraction of the place that causes a sense of well-being which helps in binding people to a place and also makes them want to return to the place (Billig, 2005; Tonts & Atherley, 2010). When a sense of place is developed, it provides feeling of security, belonging and stability (Hodgetts et al., 2010; Tonts & Atherley, 2010). Therefore, every individual, even children, being an integral part of a place, develop sense of place as they become familiar with the place they inhabit. Children become aware of their surroundings as they grow and spend time in their area of residence, right from a tender age, they build up feelings about their environment which could be positive or negative (Jack, 2008). According to Jack, children sense of place depends on developing clusters of positive cognitions linked to the meaning of specific places. As they participate in activities in their environment, their experiences are shaped by the information that they receive through their senses. Direct and repeated experiences of places in childhood, together with the social meaning attached to them by children and others (e.g. parents, teachers and peers), tend to have the biggest influence on the subsequent development of sense of place (Jack, 2008). From a very young age, children develop feelings and emotions about their everyday environments which induce powerful, positive or negative images. Positive images are developed when they show happiness at being in it and regret or distress at leaving it, and when they value it not only for the satisfaction of physical needs but for its intrinsic qualities (Jack, 2008). Negative images are developed when the children are exposed to bad occurrences in the environment. Positive and negative images children develop about their environment, which make up their sense of place occur on multiple scales. As identified by Derr (2002) there is the child-scale experience of places, through activities such as fort-making, climbing trees, or playing games with friends; there is a family-scale experience of place that provides an historical and cultural context for experiences; and there is a community-level sense of place, where broader cultural values and place relations take shape. Drawing from this, each scale of sense of place is important in what children learn from it, in what benefits they gain, and ultimately the type and extent of connections they will hold for place and nature.
Therefore, examining children sense of place is particularly important because children are inclusive of their environment and their opinions could help in arriving at better development of their place. This is because children’s place reactions are often very different to those expressed by adults, it provides a pointer to what sorts of environments children find most satisfying (Derr, 2002). Ile-Ife as a place provides a unique research opportunity to examine children’s sense of place because of the variety and range of livelihoods and connections to the land that exist within the region. It is a place referred to as the origin of the Yoruba descendants. Being an area of such value and importance, adults have been the focus of researches on sense of place in the area. However, children sense of place will be considered because (though they are naive) they will have specific experiences and knowledge about Ile-Ife that could trigger their interest in the place. In the long run, their sense of place will help maintain their identity of the area and preservation of the identity of the place in the future.

1.2 Statement of Research Problem
Considerable researches have been undertaken into sense of place over the years. Researches on sense of place have been examined in relation to different categories of people such as older adults (Cuba & Hummon, 1993; Wiles et al., 2009); migrants and refugees (Shamai & Ilatov, 2005; Wen Li, Hodgetts, & Ho, 2010); ethnic groups (Shamai, 1991); and tourists (Kianicka, Bucheker, Hunziker, & Muller-Boker, 2006). Many of researches these have focused majorly on the adults, and relatively limited attention has been paid to children. This is because it is of the notion that sense of place is developed when a person resides in a place for many years. However, contrary to this, sense of place will be considered in relation to children. This will help determine whether and how children develop sense of place with their environs. This is due to the fact that children in a little way might also have relevance in the environment they belong, and their views about their place can be incorporated to achieve better planning of their environment. There abound literature on children, their development, wellbeing and attachment to people. (Fattore, Mason, & Watson, 2007; Frankel, 2007). However, there has been little consideration on children sense of place and their attachment to place. Majority of these researches on children’s sense of place have been carried out in different countries of the world such as New Mexico (Derr, 2002), U. S. A. (Lim, 2006); South Korea (Min, 2006) among others, excluding Nigeria, most especially Ile-Ife. There is therefore the need of this research, because children in Nigeria, though naive, have tendencies of developing sense of place with the environment they reside in, as they grow. Their sense of place can also be significant in the development of their identity, security and sense of belonging.

Studies on sense of place generally have been considered within a vast range of disciplines and practices such as (geography, environmental psychology, anthropology, sociology, and education, among others). However, studies on children’s sense of place have been well dominated by researchers from the educational sector, where it is believed that a fuller understanding of children’s sense of place is necessary in designing educational approaches. Despite this fact, children’s sense of place will be considered in relation to environmental psychology and planning in general, because it could help understand the significance of children in the present and future development of their environment.

Many different continuums have been used when measuring a sense of place. They include place attachment (Hernandez et. al., 2007; Manzo, 2003), place identity (Brown and
Raymond, 2007), place dependence (Brown and Raymond, 2007) and place satisfaction (Soini, Varaala & Pouta, 2012. Incorporating this idea, these concepts will be used in this study to measure the level of sense of place of the residents. In addition to these, since children are the focus of the research, their ‘friendship’ with the place will be used to measure their sense of place. The purpose is to find the different levels of intensity that children feel towards the place where they reside. Therefore, drawing upon the gaps identified above, this research is intended to fill them by providing answers to the following questions: How do children perceive, represent, and construct meaning regarding their place; what are the facilities available within children’s locality that could contribute to their sense of place, How can children’s sense of place be measured using place attachment, dependence, identity, and what factors and activities frame children’s sense of place.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Sense of Place

According to Davenport & Anderson (2005), places bring about ‘how we make sense of the world’, influence our behavior, and play a central role in developing and maintaining self- and group-identity. Places can act “to define the individuals to themselves and to the world”, especially when people fulfil a particular role in that place such as a nurse in a local hospital, or a child taking on the role of student at a local school (Rivlin, 1982). According to Twigger-Ross and Uzzell (1996), place is a means to distinguish oneself from others, to preserve a sense of continuity, to build positive self-esteem, and to create a sense of self-efficacy. It is based on the symbolic meanings attributed to the setting by an individual (Casakin & Billig, 2009; Hodgetts et al., 2010; Rooney et al., 2010; Stedman, 2003; Tonts & Atherley, 2010). Sense of place is inherent in ‘place’ and as explained by Allen et. al. (2009), sense of place is the “value people attach to specific landscape locations. Therefore, sense of place is not inherent to the physical setting, but rather in the interpretations of the setting by a person, which are developed from their experience within the community (Casakin & Billig, 2009; Hodgetts et al., 2010; Stedman, 2003; Tonts & Atherley, 2010).

Research has shown also that a sense of place is created through the physical structure and the sociological makeup of the community (Billig, 2005; Kianicka et al.,2006; Tonts & Atherley, 2010; Warrick & Alexander, 1998). In essence, sense of place is not created from the location itself but from the involvement between people and between people and place (Hodgetts et al., 2010; Jorgensen & Stedman, 2001; Shamai & Ilatov, 2005; Tonts & Atherley, 2010). It addresses emotional, rational, symbolic, and spiritual aspects of the relationship between people and their physical environment. (Casakin & Billig, 2009).

It is also referred to as the atmosphere of the place, the quality of the environment and the attraction of the place that causes a sense of well-being that helps bind community members together and also makes people want to return to the place (Billig, 2005; Tonts & Atherley, 2010; Williams, Patterson, Roggenbuck, & Watson, 1992). Nonetheless, sense of place is a multidimensional and multidisciplinary notion that encapsulates the meanings of the social and natural landscape to individuals and groups, and their role in performing daily activities (Massey and Jess, 1995; Stedman, 2003; Carter, Dyer, & Sharma, 2007). The multidimensionality of sense of place can be better conceived and understood by concepts
of place attachment, place identity and place dependence, which are regarded as the measurements of sense of place (Canter, 1997; Jorgensen and Stedman, 2001).

2.2. Factors that influences sense of place

Research has shown that a sense of place is created through the physical structure and the sociological makeup of the community (Billig, 2005; Kianicka et al., 2006; Tonts & Atherley, 2010). Majorly, three factors have been identified by researchers as contributing to sense of place. They are the physical factors, social factors and personal characteristics (Smith, 2011). In terms of the physical factors, some studies have shown the significance of the physical environment, such as parks, amenities and housing (Braubach, 2007; Chapman & Lombard, 2006; da Luz Reis & Lay, 2010; James et al., 2009; Potter & Cantarero, 2006; Uzzell, Pol, &Badenas, 2002), as contributing to sense of place. In the same vein, others have found factors such as belongingness and social support (Adriaanse, 2007; Braubach, 2007; Tartaglia, 2006; Wood, Frank, & Giles-Corti, 2010; Young, Russell, & Powers, 2004) and friendship as social factors that contribute to sense of place. Personal factors such as age, length of residence, homeownership, education, ethnicity, number of people known in the community (Obst & Stafurik, 2010; Ross, 2002) have also been found to be important factors of sense of place.

2.3. Children and sense of place

There is a common saying that children are leaders of tomorrow. The Children and Young Persons Act (CYPA) defines a child as ‘a person under the age of fourteen years’. Based on literature, children possess certain characteristics unique to them. They are energetic set of people, active and full of enthusiasm. According to Crivello (2008), they are characterized by being interested in people and differences, starting to develop close ties with friends outside of the family, starting to seek independence; caring about acceptance and approval of friends and family, competitiveness, being sensitive to praise, recognition, and criticism, having capacity for self-evaluation, possessing strong sense of right and wrong and like to discuss among others. Thus, because of their delicate nature, they are usually held and placed in high regard, especially by the government and organizations that are interested in children (Boyden, 2006). UNICEF as an organization gave convention rights for children all around the world. The convention rights provided that children should not be discriminated, should be respected and their views and consent should be consulted when making decisions.

However, despite all these, children are often the most affected by adverse circumstances because of their relative immaturity and their lack of social power (Boyden and Mann 2005). Children, possessing specific characteristics have been interests of researchers’ overtime, although they have frequently been amongst the least visible groups in social research. According to Crivello (2008), a wide range of studies which have been carried out on children all around the world and are usually about health and education. Child-focused research positions children at the centre around which key research questions, descriptions, interpretations and analyses are made. Involving children at different points in this process affirms children as competent social actors, the ‘experts in their own lives’, and therefore valid sources of data (Langsted 1994, Crivello, 2008). This involves recognising their agency and vulnerabilities, as well as their potential for resilience in the face of adversity (Boyden and Mann 2005; Schoon 2006; Ungar 2005). While childhood is marked by diversity,
children’s lives and development do share some common features, notably that they share a largely marginalized structural position in relation to adults, although this generalization breaks down at an individual level (Boyden 2006; James 2007; Jones and Sumner 2007; Harper et al. 2003; Punch 2002; Woodhead and Faulkner 2008). Common researches on adults have been on sense of place. This feature of sense of place is also common to children, in that that their perspectives are always different from that of adults. According to researches on children’s sense of place Lim (2010); Min (2006); and Derr (2002), their sense of place is usually developed by the way they perceive and use their space and place (Jack, 2008). These researchers noted that, there are a wide range of factors, linked to children’s personal characteristics, family circumstances and the wider environmental and cultural contexts in which they live, that influence their use of space. These factors provide important insights into the way that different groups of children with varying implications develop sense of place (Moore and Young, 1978; Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Jack, 2008).

3. Methodology

Data was obtained from both primary and secondary sources, in order to facilitate the accuracy of the study carried out. Primary data for this study was collected through field observation and questionnaire administration. These methods were used for the purpose of this study in order to gather genuine information from respondents. Information to be elicited through the questionnaire administration include the facilities that are available within the locality of the children, factors that determine their sense of place as well as questions on the measurements of sense of place which include place attachment, place identity and place dependence. The study population and sampling frame for this research were the children residing within the three residential areas in Ile-Ife. These areas were the core areas, transition areas, and the suburban areas.

The sampling procedure used for this study was multi-staged sampling. In the first stage, stratified sampling was used. The study area, Ile-Ife had been subject to different classifications by different researchers. The most common were the classifications into wards and into areas in a typical traditional town. The different wards in the study area are: Iremo, Ilode, Ilare, More and Okerewe. However, since these wards are represented in the latter classification and in order to obtain the required primary data, the study adopted the classification of the town into different strata common to a typical traditional town. They included: the traditional town centre (core area), middle income area (transition area) and high income area (suburban). The forth, unique to the study area were the post crisis residential area that emerged through the last communal Ife-Modakeke crisis (Badiora and Afon, 2013). According to Afon and Badiora (2013), there are eight areas in the core, ten in the transition and four in the suburban areas. Because the study is majorly on children, schools in these zones were the focus of obtaining data for the study. A total of 88 Primary Schools (public and primary) were identified from the stated residential areas comprising 21, 47, and 20 respectively (See Table 3.2). Three (3), four (4) and Two (2) areas were selected from the total number of the areas in the core, transition and suburban area respectively. Both public and private primary schools were sampled from these selected areas. From the data obtained, public schools were concentrated in the core area while the transition and
the suburban areas consisted of majorly private schools. Therefore, one public primary school and two private schools were purposively selected each from the core areas. From the transition and the suburban areas, three private schools each were selected. Following this, ten students each were randomly selected from each school. Therefore, a total of 90 questionnaires were administered, from which 83 were recovered. In analysing these questionnaire, both descriptive and inferential statistics were used for the study. Descriptive statistics such as cross-tabulation was used, while inferential statistics used included one-way ANOVA, Chi-Square and Mean analysis. For example, ANOVA was used to check the level of significant difference in age distribution of the children in the study area.

4. Findings and discussion

This section presents the information obtained through the analysis of the questionnaires administered and the interpretation of the findings. The section is divided into two main sub-sections. In the first section, the residents’ sense of place using place attachment, place dependence, place identity, while second section examined the factors and activities that contribute to children’s sense of place.

4.1 Children sense of place in the study area

Children are doubtlessly parts of the environment and no matter how little, they may have their views about the environment. These views could be as a result of their experiences within the environment which could make them attached, dependent or identify with the study area. These form the development of their sense of place in the study area. In doing justice to examining residents’ sense of place in the study area, children were asked whether or not they liked Ife. Findings of the study as presented in Table 1 revealed that 57.8% of the respondents liked the study area, while 42.2% of the respondents indicated that they did not like it. Majority (79.3%) of those that liked Ife, the study area were residents of the core area. This could be because the culture and practices of the town, being a traditional one might have been instilled in them. It is possible that they might be involved the traditional activities and other things that happen in the town, because they are centrally located and within the hub of the town. On the other hand, most (66.7%) of the respondents that didn’t like Ife were those living within the suburban area. This could be as a result of the fact that they are located far from the town hub and might not be aware of the major happenings in the town.

Also, in establishing further whether children had sense of place in the area, they were asked whether or not they would love to continue living in the study area, Ife. As presented in Table 1 of the respondents indicated that they would love to continue living in the area, while 49.4% would not want to spend their life time in the area and would cease any opportunity to leave the area.
Also, in establishing further whether children had sense of place in the area, they were asked whether or not they would love to continue living in the study area, Ife. As presented in Table 2, 50.6% of the respondents indicated that they would love to continue living in the area, while 49.4% would not want to spend their lifetime in the area and would cease any opportunity to leave the area. Although, the percentages within the whether they liked Ife did not tally exactly with their continuity of stay within the area, findings revealed that they correlated, in that there were higher percentage (65.5%) of respondents in the core area willing to continue living in the area while there were also higher percentage (74.1) of those in the study area who were not willing to continue living in the area. However, the percentage of those willing to continue living in Ife (50.6%) surpassed those who were not willing to remain (49.4%).

Respondents’ attachment, dependence and identity within the study area and each of the core, transition and examined respectively. For each of the measurements, certain indicators or attributes were provided. These indicators presented the different ways respondents could be attached dependent on the area, as well the attributes that defined their identity with the area. Respondents rated their level of agreement on these indicators using a 5-point Likert Scale. Options provided within the scale were Strongly Disagree (1), Disagree (2), Not Sure (3), Agree (4) and Strongly Agree (5). In analyzing the expressions from respondents of these indicators, on the 5-Point Likert scale and for the adequate description of these indicators, a common method of generating index stipulated in the methodology was employed. Sense of place (SoPISA–Study Area) was generated to measure the attachment of respondents with the study area following the particular process stipulated in the methodology. It was arrived at by the ratio of the sum of the indices to all strategies and total number of strategies rated. Thus:

\[
\text{PAI} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{5} i \times X_i}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \text{PAI}_i}
\]

This approach had been used by various researchers in evaluating and measuring individuals’ perception about certain attributes or indicators (Smith, 2013; Jorgensen & Stedman, 2003). The significance of employing this method is that it helped in determining the index of every indicator, and as regards place attachment, place dependence and place identity, it helped what indicators were the strongest and weakest in determining these within the study area.

Ratings on the Likert scale or the index of any of the indicator higher than the mean index indicated an optimistic and affirmative expression from the respondents about the indicator.
as defining their attachment with the study area. On the other hand, indices of indicators below the mean showed negative expressions from the respondents. This meant they do not agree that such indicator defined their attachment with the study area. Having examined respondents’ place attachment, dependence and identity with the area and it was expedient that the sense of place of respondents within zone were derived. In order to determine the respondents’ sense of place, in the zones, place attachment, place dependence and place identity indices were summed up and divided by three (3). The equation employed was given as:

\[
\frac{\sum PAI + PDI + PII}{n = 3} = SoPI
\]

Where SoPI = Sense of place index; PAI, PDI, and PII are indices of place attachment, dependence and identity respectively

4.1 Children sense of place in the core area of the study area

Presented in Table 3 are certain indicators of attachment provided, which revealed ways residents could be attached to the study area. Among such indicators were: respondents born and bred in the area, being proud of the place, miss the area when away, have many friends and playgroups there. As presented in Table 4.21, the calculated Place Attachment Index for core area (PAIC\textsubscript{CA}) was 3.31 and it indicated that children were not sure of their attachment in the area. This is because the value ranked under ‘not sure’, on the Likert Scale. However, the Table also presented the summary of the respondents’ perception of each of the indicators that defined their attachment with the study area by stipulating the PAI of each place attachment indicator. Among the indicators to which residents agreed to which affirmed their feelings toward the study area were: being proud of the area (3.79) and have many friends there (3.59). However, the ones with the lowest mean (3.03) were ‘being born in the area’ and ‘involved in what goes on there’. The latter still revealed the positive emotional bond of respondents to the area, as they indicated that they were attached to the study area based on other factors and not because they were born in the area. Other indicators showed that respondents were averagely attached with the area.

The study, as revealed in Table 3 showed that the place dependence index of the core area (PDI\textsubscript{CA}) was 3.54. This indicated that residents within the core area generally agreed to their dependence on the area, because the mean index which was close to ‘4’ ranked under variable ‘Agree’. It revealed that respondents showed a positive expression to two attributes concerning their dependence on the area, having their indices above the mean index. These attributes were: ‘My parents work here’ (4.0) and ‘I would like to complete my education here’ (3.97). On the other hand, respondents expressed their perception about other attributes as not being determinants of their reliance on the study area. This is because they had their indices lower than the mean index. In essence respondents have an average dependence on the area dependence in the core area.

The place identity index of the area within the core area (PII\textsubscript{CA}) as shown in Table 3 was 3.28. This indicated that residents within this zone generally were not sure of their identification with the area. This is because the mean index was slightly above ‘3’ and ranked under variable ‘Not Sure’. Further analysis revealed that three attributes (identifying strongly with
the area, the area says a lot about them, among others) identified each had a mean of 3.31 which indicated that respondents were not sure of their identity with the area. However, the lowest mean was 3.17 and was attributed to being born in the area. It also showed that respondents were not sure whether their identity depended on being born in the area. These could be as a result of the fact that respondents are young and naïve and their minds are still growing. Hence, they could not give the certain level of identity in the area. Having measured the respondents place attachment, dependence and identity with the area, it was expedient that the overall sense of place was derived.

Table 3: Respondents’ Sense of Place within the Core Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sense of Place Attributes</th>
<th>SWV</th>
<th>PAI</th>
<th>MD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place Attachment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am proud of the place.</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have many friends here.</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I miss the area when I’m away.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I cannot leave my parents</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I defend it when someone criticize it.</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel secure here.</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know the place very well.</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel among here than anywhere else.</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have so many playgroups here.</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would not like to move out of here.</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I always want to be involved in what is going on here.</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was born in the area and love to remain there</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Dependence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My parents work here, so I’m here</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will love to complete my education here</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No other place can be compared with this area</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I derive satisfaction in visiting places in this area than any other</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>-0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I identify strongly with the area even when somewhere else</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The area means a lot to me</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staying in the area says a lot about me and who I am</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was born in the area and love to remain there</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PAI = 3.31  PDI = 3.54  PII = 3.28

Hence, as presented in the calculation below, the derived index of sense of place determined within the core area was 3.38 (Table 3), and it indicated that respondents slightly had sense of place in the core area. This could be as a result of the peculiarities of
the core area. The core area in Ife are more of shanties with deteriorated buildings. Children while growing up might have noticed these and maybe affected their likeness of the area. Moreover, findings indicated that place dependence (3.59) mostly contributed to their sense of place in the area.

\[
\text{SoPlCA} = \frac{3.31 + 3.54 + 3.28}{3} = \frac{10.29}{3} = 3.38
\]

4.2 Children sense of place in the transition area of the study area

Summarized in Table 4 are the indicators of emotional bond within the transition area. The place attachment index within the transition area (PAITA) was 3.29. This indicated that residents within this area generally were not sure of their attachment with the area, because the mean index ranked under ‘not sure’. However, the Table also presented the summary of the respondents’ perception of each of the indicators that defined their attachment with the study area by stipulating the PAI of each place attachment indicator. The indicators to which residents agreed to were: being proud of the area (3.78) and defend the area when criticized (3.59). Other indicators showed that respondents were generally not sure whether the indicators could be used to measure their attachment with the area. These include indicators such as ‘miss the area when away’ with an index of 3.37 and others such as ‘feel secure’, born and bred, have many friends and playgroups had mean of 3.19 which was also the lowest.

The place dependence index of the core area (PDICA) indicated that residents within the transition area generally agreed to their dependence on the area, because the mean index which was close to ‘4’ ranked under variable ‘Agree’. It revealed that respondents showed a positive expression to two attributes concerning their dependence on the area, having their indices above the mean index. These attributes were: ‘My parents work here’ (4.0) and ‘I would like to complete my education here’ (3.78). On the other hand, respondents expressed their perception about other attributes as not being determinants of their reliance on the study area. This is because they had their indices lower than the mean index. In essence respondents have an average dependence on the area dependence in the core area.

The place identity index within the transition area (PIITA) was 3.19, as indicated in also in Table 4. This indicated that residents within this zone generally were not sure of their identification with the area. This is because the mean index was slightly above ‘3’ and ranked under variable ‘Not Sure’. Further analysis revealed that the four attributes (identifying strongly with the area, the area says a lot about them, among others) identified each had a mean of 3.19 which indicated that respondents were not sure of their identity with the area. This could be as a result of the fact that respondents were young and naive and their minds are still growing. Hence, they could not give the certain level of identity in the area.
Having measured the respondents' place attachment, dependence and identity with the area, it was expedient that the overall sense of place was derived. Hence, as presented in the calculation below, the derived index of sense of place determined within the transition area was 3.34, and it indicated that respondents slightly had sense of place in the transition area. As presented in the calculation below. However, findings indicated that place dependence (3.54) mostly contributed to their sense of place in the area.

\[
\text{SoP}_{\text{transition}} = \frac{3.29 + 3.54 + 3.19}{3} = \frac{10.02}{3} = 3.34
\]
4.3. Respondents’ Sense of Place in the Suburban Area

Presented in Table 5 is a summary of the residents’ perception of the indicators that contributed to their attachment within suburban area. The calculated PAISA was 2.52. Unlike the core and transition areas, with higher indices ranked in between agree and not sure, the index of the suburban area was quite lower and ranked between disagree and not sure. This showed that residents slightly disagreed and were not too sure of the attachment indicators as contributing to their place attachment in the suburban area. Although generally, majority the attributes showed that respondents were not sure of their attachment with the area. However, the attribute ‘I am proud of this place’ had the highest mean of 2.78 while the lowest mean (2.22) was attributed to ‘I was born in the area and love to remain there’. This showed that respondents in the suburban disagreed to the fact that they attached to the area because they were born there. Generally, findings from the study about this zone showed a lower degree of affection of residents towards the study area compared to the two previous ones. The lower degree of place attachment could be related to the peculiarity of the suburban area. It is usually at the outskirt of the town. Since majority of the parents of those residing there are high income earners (as expected), they are likely to be more exposed beyond the four walls of Ile. Therefore, they may prefer other places to Ile, which is a traditional town, since children are mostly moved by what they see and are able to enjoy.

The place dependence index of the suburban area (PDISA) was 2.97. It indicated that residents within this distance from the ocean generally were not sure of their dependence on the area, because the mean index which was is close to ‘3’ ranked under variable ‘not sure’ on the Likert scale. The only attribute to which respondents showed a positive expression to about their dependence on the area was because their ‘parents worked there. Attributes such as ‘I would love to complete my education here’ and ‘I love visiting places in this area’ had mean of 3 and 2.52 respectively which showed that respondents were not sure of them; while respondents disagreed to ‘no other place can be compared to this area’ with a mean of 2.37. The table showed that the place identity index of the area within suburban area (PIISA). This indicated that residents within this distance from the ocean generally were not sure of their identification with the area. This is because the mean index was slightly below ‘3’ and ranked under variable ‘Not Sure’. Three of the four indicators revealed that respondents were not sure of their identity with the area. The indicators include ‘the area means a lot to me (2.67)’, ‘staying in the area says a lot about me (2.67)’ and I identify strongly with the area (2.52). The fourth attribute revealed that respondents disagreed to the fact that their identity was based on being born in the area.

The analysis of the three zones (core, transition and suburban) above, revealed the level of sense of place children had in the area and the discrepancy in their sense of place. The study revealed that children generally had an average sense of place in the study area. However, in the core area they had higher sense of place than those in the transition and suburban areas. Those in the suburban area had the least sense of place and this could be as a result of their exposure to other places and the fact that Ile-Ife is a traditional town and is not fully developed.
Having measured the respondents’ place attachment, dependence and identity with the area, it was expedient that the overall sense of place was derived. Hence, as presented in the calculation below, the derived index of sense of place determined within the transition area was 2.68, and it indicated that respondents were not sure of their sense of place in the suburban area. However, findings indicated that place dependence (2.97) mostly contributed to their sense of place in the area.

\[
\text{SoP}_{\text{suburban}} = \frac{2.52 + 2.97 + 2.56}{3} = \frac{8.05}{3} = 2.68
\]

The sense of place of respondents could not be possible without the influence of some factors. These factors are cumulative as they make up certain socio-economic characteristics, the reasons why they chose to live in the area, the peculiarities of the area and many more. Hence, the next sub-section discusses these factors that influence children sense of place in detail.

4.4 Factors that determine children sense of place in the study area

Respondents were provided with a range of factors that covered the three aspects (physical social and personal factors) that influenced residents’ sense of place. More so, respondents expressed their perception of such factors and the rated at which they influence their sense of place. Therefore, in order to critically examine these factors and their influence on respondents’ sense of place, index generating method as stipulated in the methodology was employed. Respondents rated their level of agreement on these indicators using a 5-point Likert Scale. Options provided within the scale were Strongly Disagree (1), Disagree (2), Not Sure (3), Agree (4) and Strongly Agree (5). From their responses, an index called Factors Influencing Sense of Place Index (FISISA) was generated for the zones in the study area. Indices higher than the average index indicated a positive agreement of residents.

Summary of the results of data analysis as presented in Table 5 identified the variables influencing sense of place in the different zones of the study area. From the Table, the variables that significantly influenced sense of place in the core area had a mean score ranging from 3.0 to 3.93 on a 5-point Likert scale. These variables include born and bred in the area (3.93), Parents work in Ife (3.72), Many friends in Ife (3.38), Many playgrounds in Ife (3) safe and secure neighbourhood (3.28) and neighbourhood is very accommodating (3.0), among others. However, the factor that contributed most to children sense of place in the core area was being born and bred in the area and because parents worked in Ife. Similarly, the variables that significantly influenced sense of place in the transition area had a mean score ranging from 2.7 to 3.3 on a 5-point Likert-type scale. Although, on an average scale, the most important variable influencing sense of place within this zone was ‘safe neighbourhood’

In the suburban however, there was no major factor found to influence respondents’ sense of place in the area. All the factors were ranked under not sure and disagree on the Likert
scale, ranging from 2.37 to 2.82. Nevertheless, the factor with the highest mean were born and bred in the area, parents work in Ife, many friends in Ife. They all had a mean score of 2.82 which is represented by ‘not sure’ on the Likert scale. Generally, the factors that influenced children sense of place in the core, transition and suburban were generally had 2.97, 3.22 and 3.39 as their means respectively.

Table 5. Factors determining children sense of place in the study area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Core</th>
<th>Transition</th>
<th>Suburban</th>
<th>Study Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Born and Bred</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents work in Ife</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many friends in Ife</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many Playgrounds in Ife</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities available in the area</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many good schools</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Neighborhood</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ife is Beautiful</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood in Ife is safe and secure</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood is very accommodating</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Aggregated Mean                          | 3.24  | 3.0        | 2.6      | 2.95       |

5. Conclusion and Recommendation

The study examined the sense of place of children in Ile-Ife, Osun State. Judging from the discussions above, it can be affirmed that children had a minimal level of sense of place in the study area. Moreover, the study established that there was a variation in the sense of place of children in the three zones (core, transition and suburban). This was evident in that residents were not attached on the same level within the three residential zones neither were their level dependence and identity same. The sense of place of children in the core area was found to be greater than those in the transition and suburban area. Hence, the study revealed that the closer to the city centre, the higher the sense of place. However, the study generally showed that children’s sense of place in the study area was highly due to their dependence on the area, mainly because their parents resided there. More so, children exhibited their level of dependence on the area by wanting to complete their education there.

Based on the findings, the study identified certain areas of improvement expected in the study area. The recommendations are the following: The study showed that children averagely had sense of place in the study area, and their sense of place were not as strong as expected. In order to ensure that children’s sense of place in the area were strengthened, they should be taught the core values of the study area and their welfare and suggestions should be prioritized when making decisions concerning the study area.
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