



Evaluation of Sense of Place with Respect to Demographic Changes

Ayşegül TANRIVERDİ KAYA^{1,*}

¹ *Düzce University Faculty of Art, Design and Architecture, Department of Architecture, Düzce-Turkey*

Article Info

Received: 26/01/2017

Accepted: 29/09/2017

Keywords

Place

Place attachment

Sense of place

Konuralp

Abstract

The city in Turkey now known as Konuralp was important during the Ottoman period and is the site of the ancient city of Prusias ad Hypium. With a rich historical past in the Hellenistic period, Konuralp also has the legacy of the historical Ottoman city fabric in its vernacular architecture, as seen in its old plot and street patterns. At present, the site of the ancient residential area of Prusias ad Hypium and the neighborhoods nearby are under pressure from the new settlements created in the aftermath of the 1999 earthquake, as well as from the growth of the university. This study aimed to research the relationship between the changing demographic features and the sense of place amongst the new inhabitants of the neighborhoods which have changed since the 1999 Düzce earthquake and after the founding of the university campus. Accordingly, the components effective on the sense of place in these residential neighborhoods have been reviewed through quantitative methods and via a questionnaire.

1. INTRODUCTION

The demands of economic growth provoke rapid over-urbanization and this leads to a new phenomenon in planning practice: placelessness, i.e., the making of standardized landscapes and a built environment that fosters insensitivity to the significance of place. Globalization and the demands of economic growth are seen in cities as a homogenization of culture and the entire way of living, as well as an annihilation of the historical and traditional urban fabric. Because of the abovementioned reasons, different disciplines have become increasingly interested in the emotional bonds that people create with their places of residence (Lipovac 1997; Lewicka 2008). Over the last few decades, “place” has been observed in the domains of sociology, humanistic geography, urban planning and philosophy. There is a common agreement among researchers that this interest is a reaction to the politically and economically driven processes of over-urbanization, globalization, migration, and integration of world territories that threaten the unique identities of places (Lewicka, 2010).

There are different concepts referring to feelings about place. According to Edward C. Relph (1976), the variety of an individual’s experiences of a place can be focused in three essential ways:

- by exploring the different components and intensities of place experience as
- a very deep linkage between people and the places in which they live and which they experience;
- by analyzing the nature of the identity of places and of people with places;
- by illustrating the ways in which the sense of place and attachment to place are
- manifested in the making of places and landscapes.

Place attachment is a sentimental bond to a place that develops from direct experience by living, working, or vacationing in the place, from indirect engagement through books or visual media, or some combination thereof (Relph, 1976). Love of one’s hometown or a favorite lakeshore, a desire to protect a rural area or a historic urban structure from demolition, may be, have ever visited are each an example of place attachment.

Cross (2001), asserted that sense of place have composed of two different notions: “The first notion, the types of bonds, we have different type of relations with places. The second aspect, variety of attachment to

*Corresponding author, e-mail: aysegulkaya@duzce.edu.tr

community and a particular place, depth and types of attachments to a certain place.” She was not try to describe senses of place that comprehend both of these aspects, she argued that we can create a more meaningful understanding of people’s attachments to places by thinking about relationships to place and community attachments as two different but related aspects of sense of place. According to her study conducted with residents of Nevada County, she described different types of connections with place, which she categorized into the six types of relationships. She argued that people are likely to have more than one relationship with a single place, and those relationships are likely to change over time.

The sense of place has been defined as the combined set of the place meanings and place attachments that a person or a group develops for a place. Sense of place is a comprehensive concept in which an individual feels places, perceives them and attaches meaning to them. This concept consists of knowledge of, belonging to, attachment to and commitment to a place or part of it. It is something that we ourselves create in the course of time because of the result of habit or custom. Understanding the fundamental aspects of sense of place can be effective in assessing the level of public attachment to places and the inclination of people towards places (Hashemnezhad et al., 2013).

Place attachment is usually understood as the set of emotional ties that people develop with their places of residence. The research presented in this paper concerns the attachment to permanent places of residence only. Despite the large variety of places with which people may identify, the usual focus of environmental research is on the neighborhood. Sense of place, according to this study, is an immersive concept that includes attachment to a place and awareness of the environment. Here, place means a combination of physical and human environments and is defined as any locality or space that has become imbued with meaning by the human experience of it (Semken et al, 2009).

As a consequence, the concept has been extensively argued in environmental psychology, and there now exist published psychometric instruments designed to measure each of the two principal components of sense of place: place attachment and place meaning. Schultz mentioned the principles related to place; the mental image that that is formed and creates the meaning and sense of place is described in Table 1 (Ghoomi et al., 2015).

Maria Lewicka divides the components creating sense of place into three physical, social and demographic categories. Each category contains a number of factors, as described in Table 2.

Table 1. Main principles of Schultz model of sense of place (Ghoomi et al., 2015).

Criteria	Components
Typology	Feelings Sense and evaluation of the Environment Communication Socialization
Topology	Landscape (natural entities) Built environment
Morphology	Place and Character

Table 2. Main principles of Lewicka model of sense of place (Lewicka, 2010).

Criteria	Components
Physical	Type of housing Building size House yard
Social	Social neighborhood relations Feeling of security
Social and Demographic	Age and Education Length of residence Family size

This author has suggested a theoretical framework based on those of the above two authors' principles (Tables 1 and 2) that is shown below in Table 3.

Table 3. *Developed theoretical framework for components of sense of place*

Criteria	Sub-criteria	Theoretician
Physical and visual features	Type of housing Content of the neighborhood	Lewicka and Schultz
Social characteristics and activities	Social neighborhood relations Being with others Opportunity for social interaction	Lewicka and Schultz
Demographic characteristics	Age and education Length of residence Income	Lewicka
Identity	Place and character, Perception and understanding of the environment	Shultz

2. MATERIAL

Düzce is a provincial capital city located in the Western Black Sea Region. The ancient city of Prusias ad Hypium (Kieros, Üsküpü, Konuralp) was located 8 km north of Düzce within the borders of the suburb of Konuralp. The neighborhoods of Hüseyin Kıl, Terzialiler, Çiftepınarlar, Orhangazi, Murat Demir and Yörükler are the main research materials in this study.

The first known information about the ancient city goes back to the 3rd century BC (Zeyrek and Çelik, 2005). Some researchers have mentioned that Heracles was considered the mythological founder of the city. The historian Memnon documented the existence of Prusias as a colonial city connected to Heracleia. After the second half of the 3rd century AD, the city became smaller and poorer due to the economic difficulties in Rome. When the Byzantine Empire began to lose power, Anatolia was left to the Turks and the Ottomans began their rule in 1323 (Özlü, 2009). They called the Düzce plain 'Konrapa' or 'Konur Alp' as a tribute to Orhan Ghazi's commander Konur Alp. Prusias had been an ancient city and a stopping point for travellers and scientific researchers on their way to Asia Minor. The ruins of the amphitheater, gymnasium, and agora in Prusias revealed by the excavations and scripts have proved it to have had the main characteristics of every Hellenistic city. Thus, historically, Konuralp was a Hellenistic city, while also having the legacy of the Ottoman city fabric, as seen in the vernacular architecture and old plot and street patterns (Zeyrek and Çelik, 2005).

3. METHOD

3.1. Participants and samples

First of all, a review was conducted of the literature relevant to the concepts of place and sense of place. The components for developing a theoretical framework for a sense of place were assessed, as shown in Table 5. In order to carry out the research in six neighborhoods of Konuralp, in June 2015 a survey method was applied to determine the effects of the demographic and physical factors on sense of place. Face-to-face interviews were conducted with 10% of the residents randomly selected from each of the sample area neighborhoods (Table 5). The results were analyzed by SPSS software. The frequency and mean values were used to evaluate the demographic features of the applicants of the sample area. First, demographic features were analyzed, and then the effects of the demographic features on the variables were analyzed. The mean difference between variables was examined via the Kruskal-Wallis test, with a significance level of 0.05.

Table 5. Number of neighborhood respondents and gender distribution

Neighborhoods	2015 Population Aged 18+ years	Number of participants 10%	Men	%	Women	%
Çiftapınarlar	1239	124	83	66.9	41	33.1
Terzialiler	537	53	49	67.1	24	32.9
Murat Demir	756	76	15	42.9	20	57.1
Hüseyin Kıl	726	73	41	51.9	38	48.1
Orhangazi	693	69	48	67.6	23	32.4
Yörükler Köyü	598	59	48	76.2	15	23.8
Total	4549	454				

3.2. Measures

3.2.1. Demographic characteristics

Demographic measures included information on participants' education (five levels), income, residential duration in the present neighborhood (five levels), and reasons for settlement in Konuralp.

3.2.2. Physical and visual features

Physical features of the environment included the type of housing and (in the six neighborhoods) the best qualification about the surroundings of the residence which was approved of in the interview. Two types of housing were included: apartment blocks and single two- or three-storey houses with a garden.

3.2.3. Social characteristics and activities

In the survey interviews, questions were asked about neighborhood relations and satisfaction with social spots and social activities and about negative feelings about Konuralp. Participants evaluated Konuralp according to the given social and cultural statements in the survey based on a 5-point Likert scale.

3.2.4. Identity

Neighborhood features were graded from best to worst on a scale from 1 to 7. In addition, participants were asked to rank seven properties describing their neighborhood from best to worst.

3.2.5. Survey questions

Q1. Education?

1. Illiterate 2. Literate 3. Elementary/Middle school 4. High school 5. University

Q2. Occupation?

1. None 2. Officer 3. Laborer 4. Student 5. Self-employed
6. Housewife 7. Retiree 8. Farmer 9. Faculty member

Q3. Monthly family income?

1. none; 2. 0-1000 TL; 3. 1001 -2000TL; 4. 2001-3 000 TL; 5. 3001-5 000TL; 6. 5 000TL +

Q4. Length of residence in Konuralp?

1. 0-5 years 2. 6-10 years 3. 11-15 years 4. 15-25 years 5. 25+ years

Q5. Reasons for settling in a Konuralp neighborhood? If you came to Konuralp afterwards, what was your reason for coming?

1. Work 2. Education 3. Immigration 4. Elderly parents 5. Other (marriage, retirement, etc.)

Q6. Please, rank the features of your neighborhood that you appreciate from 1 to 7 on the chart given below.

Statements about neighborhoods	
I have a garden and I can grow fruits, vegetables and so on.	
Neighborhood relationships are good; generally, everyone knows each other.	
It is close to the university hospital.	
It is an old and historical neighborhood.	
The view is spectacular.	
It has clean air and is healthy.	
The ground is safe from earthquakes.	

Q7. Please, give your evaluation of Konuralp from 1 to 5 according to each of the statements given below.

	I certainly don't agree	I don't agree	I have no idea	I agree	I absolutely agree
	1	2	3	4	5
Archeological excavation must be done.					
The history of Düzce starts at Konuralp.					
Konuralp's traditional urban fabric has been destroyed.					
Konuralp's museum must be developed and art and cultural facilities must be increased.					
There must be places that improve social life.					
I love Konuralp and like living here.					

4. RESULTS and DISCUSSION

In this research, the time interval was organized according to the number of days in one year. Using the calculation [$\text{year} \times 12 \times 30$] for the formulation of the duration of the settlement of the residents, five time intervals were categorized. Time intervals were classified as the first period (1982 and before), the second period (1982-1997), the third period (1997-2003), during which the 1999 earthquake and foundation of the university occurred, the fourth period (2003-2014), characterized by the growth of the university, and finally, the fifth period (2014-2015). These constituted the five time scales used in this research study. The residents who came after 2014 were evaluated as newcomers.

This study aimed to measure the sense of place of Konuralp neighborhoods. Konuralp is a historical town which faced an influx of population in the aftermath of the 1999 earthquakes and as a consequence of the growth of Düzce University. According to the data obtained from the survey carried out on the research area, amongst the neighborhoods, three (Terzialiler, Çiftepinarlar, Orhangazi) were settled mainly via immigration or due to elderly parents. After the year 2003, 77% of the inhabitants in Murat Demir declared that they had settled in the neighborhood for their job; the participants from this neighborhood were the wealthiest and most educated inhabitants of all the studied neighborhoods. Moreover, the population of Yörükler increased after the year 2003 and, as can be seen from Table 6, the population of students is the highest in this neighborhood.

Table 6. Neighborhood population characteristics

Neighborhood	Çiftepınarlar	Terzialiler	Murat Demir	Orhangazi	Yörükler	H.Kıl
Education (%)						
Elementary/Middle school	48.4	45.2	5.7	38.0	30.2	46.8
High school	19.4	24.7	14.3	28.2	44.4	36.7
Academy	32.3	23.30	25.7	29.6	20.6	7.6
Post-graduate and above	0.0	0.0	54.3	0.0	0.0	1.3
Income (TL)						
0-2000	56	80.3	30	53.4	42.9	88.6
2000-3000	30.1	16.4	0	24	46	6.8
3000-5000	13.9	2.8	16.7	22.6	11.1	4.6
5000+	0	0	53.3	0	0	0
Length of residence						
Before 1982	55.6	65.8	2.9	39.4	41.3	38.5
1982-1997	10.5	17.7	8.6	26.8	22.2	24.4
1997-2003	4.8	1.4	11.4	4.2	1.6	21.8
2003-2014	29	15.1	77.1	29.6	34.9	5.1
2014 and after (Last year)	0	0	0	0	0	5
Reasons for settling in Konuralp						
Work	10.2	8.9	64.3	14.3	5.5	17.7
Education	23.7	12.5	0	24.3	38.2	1.3
Immigration /elderly parents	57.6	73.2	3.6	57.1	50.9	55.7
Other (marriage, retirement, etc.)	8.5	5.4	32.1	4.3	5.5	25.3
Type of Residence						
Apartment	32.3	12.3	34.3	35.2	38.1	7.6
Single house with garden	67.7	87.7	65.7	64.8	61.9	92.4

The first choice for the best feature of the neighborhood was garden ownership and the ability to grow crops (Table 8). When the percentage of the type of the residences is examined, the reason can be understood (Table 9). The percentage of the applicants who live in Hüseyin Kıl neighborhood chose that first option by 77.2%; their income level of 0-1000 Turkish lira was the lowest among the neighborhoods. The intimacy of the neighborhood residents and their social relations also seemed important for the participants. However, 40.9% of those who lived in Orhangazi neighborhood indicated that neighborhood relations were not so good; this option was the lowest of all in this neighborhood (Table 10). Secondly, in the Murat Demir neighborhood, 88.5% of the participants were resident in the neighborhood after 1997 and 25.7% of the participants were academic members; participants rated this option at the low level of 22.7% (Table 7). In addition, these two neighborhoods have a higher percentage of apartment-style buildings than the other neighborhoods.

The findings obtained from the survey show that the participants who were resident prior to 1982 were the ones who most wanted archeological excavations to be carried out. They felt that the ancient city should be uncovered and that Konuralp was the starting point of Düzce's history. Additionally, they wanted Konuralp's museum be developed and art and cultural facilities to be increased. They loved Konuralp and liked living there much more than the newcomers. Factually, a longer length of residency was shown to increase the love for living in Konuralp (Tables 11 & 12). The longest residency was concentrated in the Terzialiler and Çiftepınarlar neighborhoods (Tables 6 & 12). According to the data, the inhabitants living there since 2003 were the second-largest group wanting archeological excavations of the ancient city and increased museum, art and cultural facilities.

Table 7. Distribution of neighborhood occupations

Job		Neighborhood %						Total
		Çiftelipinar	Terzialiler	Orhan Gazi	Murat Demir	Hüseyin Kıl	Yörükler	
Unemployed	Number	0	2	0	1	14	4	25
	Neighborhood	0.0	2.7	0.0	2.9	17.7	6.3	4.2
Officer	Number	13	4	3	6	6	2	50
	Neighborhood	10.5	5.5	4.2	17.1	7.6	3.2	8.5
Laborer	Number	15	16	13	1	17	2	99
	Neighborhood	12.1	21.9	18.3	2.9	21.5	3.2	16.8
Student	Number	28	10	18	1	1	22	91
	Neighborhood	22.6	13.7	25.4	2.9	1.3	34.9	15.4
Self-employed	Number	17	8	17	7	9	16	93
	Neighborhood	13.7	11.0	23.9	20.0	11.4	25.4	15.8
Housewife	Number	11	11	11	3	24	6	98
	Neighborhood	8.9	15.1	15.5	8.6	30.4	9.5	16.6
Retiree	Number	32	18	8	7	8	4	98
	Neighborhood	25.8	24.7	11.3	20.0	10.1	6.3	16.6
Farmer	Number	7	4	1	0	0	7	26
	Neighborhood	5.6	5.5	1.4	0.0	0.0	11.1	4.4
Faculty member	Number	1	0	0	9	0	0	10
	Neighborhood	.8	0.0	0.0	25.7	0.0	0.0	1.7

Table 8. Ranking of neighborhood features

Statements about neighborhoods	N		Mod	Mean	Median
	Valid	Missing			
I have a garden and I can grow fruit, vegetable and so on.	445	0	1	3.09	2.00
Neighborhood relationships are good, generally everyone knows each other.	444	1	2	3.15	2.00
Close to the university hospital	443	2	3	4.06	4.00
Historical and old neighborhood	441	4	4	4.15	4.00
The view is spectacular	444	1	5	3.86	4.00
It has clean air and is healthy	444	1	6	4.38	5.00
The ground is safe from earthquakes	443	2	7	5.2	6.00

In particular, the inhabitants who had been living there since 2003 and those having higher education and incomes than the others wanted an increase in the places providing social life. In contrast, in the Hüseyin Kıl neighborhood, where 62.9% of the participants had settled before 1997, the inhabitants exhibited an insensitive attitude towards Konuralp; this neighborhood's participants cared the least about the communal sense and least loved or liked living in Konuralp (Tables 13 & 14).

Table 9. Percentages of best features of the neighborhood

Your neighborhood * I have a garden and I can grow fruits, vegetables and so on. Cross tabulation										
		%	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Total
Your neighborhood	Çiftelipinar	Your neighborhood	27.4	16.9	5.6	2.4	4.8	7.3	35.5	100.
		I have a garden..	13.2	30.0	18.9	6.3	16.2	22.0	44.4	21.0
		of Total	5.8	3.6	1.2	0.5	1.0	1.5	7.5	21.0
	Terzialiler	Your neighborhood	38.4	16.4	6.8	15.1	2.7	12.3	8.2	100.
		I have a garden..	10.9	17.1	13.5	22.9	5.4	22.0	6.1	12.4
		of Total	4.7	2.0	0.8	1.9	0.3	1.5	1.0	12.4
	Orhangazi	Your neighborhood	29.6	12.7	5.6	12.7	9.9	14.1	15.5	100.
		I have a garden..	8.1	12.9	10.8	18.8	18.9	24.4	11.1	12.0
		of Total	3.6	1.5	0.7	1.5	1.2	1.7	1.9	12.0
	Murat D.	Your neighborhood	25.7	11.4	8.6	14.3	11.4	5.7	22.9	100.
		I have a garden..	3.5	5.7	8.1	10.4	10.8	4.9	8.1	5.9
		of Total	1.5	0.7	0.5	0.8	0.7	0.3	1.4	5.9
	Hüseyin K.	Your neighborhood	77.2					3.8	19.0	100.
		I have a garden..	23.6					7.3	15.2	13.4
		of Total	10.3					0.5	2.5	13.4
	Yörükler	Your neighborhood	17.5	7.9	9.5	19.0	22.2	12.7	11.1	100.
		I have a garden..	4.3	7.1	16.2	25.0	37.8	19.5	7.1	10.7
		of Total	1.9	0.8	1.0	2.0	2.4	1.4	1.2	10.7

Table 10. Percentages of the best features of the neighborhood

Your neighborhood * Neighborhood relationships are good; generally, everyone knows each other. Cross tabulation										
		%	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Total
Your neighborhood	Çiftelipinarlar	Neighborhood	13.7	32.3	22.6	9.7	6.5	13.7	1.6	100.0
		Relationships are	25.0	17.2	33.3	20.0	14.0	26.2	9.1	21.1
		of Total	2.9	6.8	4.8	2.0	1.4	2.9	0.3	21.1
	Terzialiler	Neighborhood	6.8	30.1	23.3	16.4	15.1	6.8	1.4	100.0
		Relationships are	7.4	9.4	20.2	20.0	19.3	7.7	4.5	12.4
		of Total	0.8	3.7	2.9	2.0	1.9	0.8	0.2	12.4
	Orhangazi	Neighborhood	10.0	25.7	10.0	12.9	18.6	10.0	12.9	100.0
		Relationships are	10.3	7.7	8.3	15.0	22.8	10.8	40.9	11.9
		of Total	1.2	3.1	1.2	1.5	2.2	1.2	1.5	11.9
	Murat D.	Neighborhood	5.7	17.1	5.7	11.4	8.6	37.1	14.3	100.0
		Relationships are	2.9	2.6	2.4	6.7	5.3	20.0	22.7	5.9
		of Total	0.3	1.0	0.3	0.7	0.5	2.2	0.8	5.9
	Hüseyin K.	Neighborhood	12.7	77.2			6.3	3.8		100.0
		Relationships are	14.7	26.2			8.8	4.6		13.4
		of Total	1.7	10.4			0.8	0.5		13.4
	Yörükler	Neighborhood	7.9	20.6	14.3	25.4	17.5	11.1	3.2	100.0
		Relationships are	7.4	5.6	10.7	26.7	19.3	10.8	9.1	10.7
		of Total	0.8	2.2	1.5	2.7	1.9	1.2	0.3	10.7

Table 11. Kruskal-Wallis analysis of neighborhood demands relevant to length of residency

	Traditional historical houses must be protected.	Archeological excavation must be done.	The history of Düzce starts at Konuralp.	Konuralp's traditional urban fabric has been destroyed.
Chi-Square	5.408	10.622	59.902	4.178
df	4	4	4	4
Asymp. Sig.	.248	.031*	.000*	.382
	There must be places that improve social life.	High and dense housing is necessary.	I love Konuralp and like living here.	Konuralp's museum must be developed; art and cultural facilities must be increased.
Chi-Square	17.188	8.082	63.846	17.484
df	4	4	4	4
Asymp. Sig.	.002*	.089	.000*	.668

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level

Table 12. Interpretive table of Kruskal-Wallis analysis of neighborhood demands relevant to length of residency

	Time interval	N	Mean Rank		Time interval	N	Mean Rank
Archeological excavation must be done.	Before 1982	202	316.47	There must be places that improve social life.	Before 1982	202	305.06
	1982-1997	81	274.32		1982-1997	81	269.72
	1997-2003	23	273.34		1997-2003	23	278.91
	2003-2014	134	282.87		2003-2014	134	307.00
	The last year	4	219.25		The last year	4	71.50
The history of Düzce starts at Konuralp.	Before 1982	202	344.00	I love Konuralp and like living here.	Before 1982	202	343.11
	1982-1997	81	288.02		1982-1997	81	290.97
	1997-2003	23	250.37		1997-2003	23	277.28
	2003-2014	134	234.84		2003-2014	134	223.71
	The last year	4	169.88		The last year	4	171.50
Konuralp museum must be developed; art and cultural facilities must be increased.	Before 1982	202	310.00				
	1982-1997	81	260.20				
	1997-2003	23	276.29				
	2003-2014	134	306.15				
	The last year	4	125.00				

Table 13. Kruskal-Wallis analysis of participant demands according to neighborhoods

	Traditional and vernacular architecture must be preserved.	Archeological excavation must be done.	The traditional urban fabric of Konuralp has been destroyed.	Green areas are decreasing.
Chi-Square	101.716	121.159	49.205	115.933
df	8	8	8	8
Asymp. Sig.	.000	.000	.000	.000
	High and dense housing is necessary.	There must be places that improve social life.	I love Konuralp and like living here.	Konuralp museum must be developed; art and cultural facilities must be increased.
Chi-Square	68.422	304.123	137.201	278.145
df	8	8	8	8
Asymp. Sig.	.000	.000	.000	.000

Table 14. Interpretive table of Kruskal-Wallis analysis of participant demands according to neighborhoods

Neighborhood	N	Mean Rank	Neighborhood	N	Mean Rank
Traditional and vernacular architecture must be preserved.	Çiftepınarlar	124	There must be places that improve social life.	Çiftepınarlar	124
	Terzialiler	73		Terzialiler	73
	Orhangazi	71		Orhangazi	71
	MuratDemir	35		Murat Demir	35
	Hüseyin Kıl	79		Hüseyin Kıl	79
	Yörükler	63		Yörükler	63
Archeological excavation must be done.	Çiftepınarlar	124	High and dense housing is necessary.	Çiftepınarlar	124
	Terzialiler	73		Terzialiler	73
	Orhangazi	71		Orhangazi	71
	MuratDemir	35		Murat Demir	35
	Hüseyin Kıl	79		Hüseyin Kıl	79
	Yörükler	63		Yörükler	63
The traditional urban fabric of Konuralp has been destroyed.	Çiftepınarlar	124	I love Konuralp and like living her.	Çiftepınarlar	124
	Terzialiler	73		Terzialiler	73
	Orhangazi	71		Orhangazi	70
	MuratDemir	35		Murat Demir	35
	Hüseyin Kıl	79		Hüseyin Kıl	79
	Yörükler	63		Yörükler	63
Green areas are decreasing	Çiftepınarlar	124	Konuralp museum must be developed; art and cultural facilities must be increased.	Çiftepınarlar	124
	Terzialiler	73		Terzialiler	73
	Orhangazi	71		Orhangazi	71
	MuratDemir	35		Murat Demir	35
	Hüseyin Kıl	79		Hüseyin Kıl	79
	Yörükler	63		Yörükler	63

5. CONCLUSION

Place is the basic concept in environmental psychology and also in the urban planning discipline. Generally, the planning process is forced by the demands of economic growth and carried out mostly without taking into account the meaning of the place or region itself together with the life that belongs there. The majority of researchers agree that the development of emotional bonds with places is necessary for psychological balance and healthy adaptation in order to overcome identity problems and to give people a sense of stability that helps involve them in local activities and daily life (Lewicka. 2010).

For this study, a historical town was chosen as a research area with the aim of examining the relationship between the demographic features, especially income and education, with respect to the sense of the residential environment. Education and income in particular lead to expectations from one's living space. The main point is that an individual's sense of place is under the influence of different factors like age, income, education, degree of knowledge, experiences, culture and tendencies that all play significant roles in forming this sense. Therefore, a set of these factors affecting a person's sense and reactions might be positive or negative towards different places. If one has a negative sense about a place, he might be unconcerned about that place and be insensitive towards current events occurring there. When people feel a positive sense about a place, it means that they love that place and want to be involved and communicate within it. Therefore, the fate of that place is important for them and they feel responsibility towards that place. It is clear that if a person spends much time in that specific place and forms more connections there, his emotional feelings toward that place will increase as well. Thus, place attachment is created.

There is a feeling of belonging to a place. The emotional bonds of people and places arise from locales that are at once ecological, historically built, social and symbolic environments. There is not only knowledge of the name of the place but interest in its history and symbols, as well as a feeling of being part of it and sharing a common destiny. The sensitivity to a place and questions about place, such as "What is happening in the place?" and "What is the value of the space?" are the starting point of the relationship with the place.

The initial condition for attachment to a place is to respect its symbols, history and traditional environment. It is evident that as a person's cognition of that place's features (physical, performance and meaning) increase, the place sense of the person gets stronger and more effective. Time also is an important scale for place attachment, and this study showed that the attachment to a particular place becomes stronger with the length of time spent there. Moreover, newcomers who have high levels of education and income lack a positive emotional or mental connection, even if they have dependent-type relationships and their physical relationship with a place is typically based on the need to be near a job or another person (Cross, 2001). However, as seen in the survey results, there is no evidence related to place alienation towards Konuralp. People who are alienated often have a negative assessment of the place, do not identify with the place and are not highly satisfied with the place (Brown et al., 2003). The Murat Demir neighborhood, which was populated after the year 2003, displayed similar results as older neighborhoods that identified with the place goals for preservation of traditional, vernacular architecture and historical ruins, and they all agreed that archeological excavations must be conducted. The results showed that newcomers who are well-educated and wealthy share the destiny and goals of the town, while also declaring their needs concerning the lack of places for social activities. Identifying with the place goals occurs when the majority of the people of a place recognize the goals of the place and are in conformity with them. This level implies a fusion and blending with the interests and needs of the place. It means that there is a devotion, allegiance, and loyalty to a place. People are deeply attached to their place (Shamai, 1991). In contrast, the survey rates of one of the older neighborhoods, Hüseyin Kıl, revealed high unemployment and lower education and income levels than the others. This neighborhood displayed alienation from Konuralp common goals and ideals. This study thus showed that lower socio-economic features may cause an insensitive attitude towards the environment, or it can be said that the environment is not given priority over other issues. This attitude may lead to alienation towards the residential area, which is an undesirable conclusion. In summary, it has been assumed that a developed sense of place and place attachment can be used as a driving force to shape a common sense and sensitivity in terms of the conservation of the historical environment in the planning process.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

No conflict of interest was declared by the authors

REFERENCES

- [1] Brown B., Perkins D.D., Brown G. (2003). Place attachment in a revitalizing neighborhood: Individual and block levels of analysis. *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 23, 259–271.
- [2] Cross A.J. (2001). What is sense of place? 12th Headwaters Conference. Western State College, November 2-4, 2001.
- [3] Ghoomi H.A., Yazdanfar S.A., Hosseini S.B., Maleki S.N. (2015). Comparing the components of sense of place in the traditional and modern residential neighborhoods. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 201, 275 – 285.
- [4] Hashemnezhad H., Heidari A.A., Hoseini M.P. (2013). “Sense of place” and “Place attachment”. *International Journal of Architecture and Urban Development* 3. 1, winter 2013.
- [5] Lewicka M. (2008). Place attachment, place identity, and place memory: restoring the forgotten city past. *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 28, 209-231.
- [6] Lewicka, M. (2010). What makes neighborhood different from home and city? Effects of place scale on place attachment. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 30, 35-51.
- [7] Lipovac N. (1997). Space and place. *Prostor* 5, 1(13).

- [8] Özlü Z. (2009). An ancient Ottoman city in the western Black Sea-Prusias ad Hypium, Italik press, İstanbul (In Turkish).
- [9] Relph E. (1976). Place and Placelessness. London:Pion Limited.
- [10] Semken S., Neakrase J.J., Dial R.E., Baker D.R. (2009). Factors That Influence Sense of Place as a Learning Outcome and Assessment Measure of Place-Based Geoscience Teaching. Electronic Journal of Science Education (Southwestern University) 13, 2, 136-159.
- [11] Shamai S. (1991). Sense of place: An empirical measurement. Geoforum 22, January 3, 347-358.
- [12] Zeyrek T., Çelik G. (2005). Prusias ad Hypium (Kieros). İstanbul: Ege Press. (In Turkish)