

# ID 1484 | CITY VERSUS SUBURB: THE EFFECTS OF NEIGHBOURHOOD LOCATION ON PLACE ATTACHMENT AND RESIDENTIAL SATISFACTION

Elif Aksel<sup>1</sup>, Çağrı İmamoğlu<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>I.D. Bilkent University

[eaksl@gmail.com](mailto:eaksl@gmail.com)

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Emotional connections of people with their environment have been investigated in various disciplines and certain crucial constructs have come out such as place attachment and place satisfaction obtaining attention in environmental psychology. Place attachment was defined as an essential element of personal identity and it was associated with certain constructs which can be analysed in both personal and community context (Anton & Lawrence, 2014; Brown & Raymond, 2007; Jorgensen & Stedman, 2001; Proshansky, Fabian, & Kaminoff, 1983). Place satisfaction was defined as “multidimensional summary judgement of the perceived quality of a setting” which means it is a concept generated by assessing physical and social attributes of an environment in terms of fulfilling a person’s needs (Stedman, 2002, p. 564).

There have been multiple attempts to define place (Altman & Low, 1992; Easthope, 2004; Soja, 1998; Tuan, 1979). Place embraces the physical space through experiences and perspectives of the people (Relph, 1976; Sack, 1997; Stedman, 2003; Tuan, 1977). Spaces transform into places by use of meanings which are given to a setting (Tuan, 1977). Furthermore, Altman and Low (1992) define place as “the environmental setting to which people are emotionally and culturally attached” (p. 5). The construct of place indicates a space which is given meaning by way of individual, group or cultural approaches (Altman & Low, 1992). Moreover, Jorgensen & Stedman (2001) also proposed a framework of sense of place containing three constructs which are place attachment, place dependence and place identity.

Altman and Low (1992) define place attachment as “symbolic bonding which gives a sense to places culturally and emotionally” necessitates symbolic and affective connections with a number of environments (p. 6). It is also defined as an emotional tie between people and certain places (Brown & Raymond, 2007; Hidalgo & Hernández, 2001). Apart from these, Scannell & Gifford (2010) present a conceptual framework including three components to provide a definition of place attachment. This framework defines place attachment by analysing it in three dimensions which are person, process and place.

Place identity is defined as the cognitive significance of a place in terms of conserving experiences, emotions and relationships of people which gives a sense and purpose to life (Williams & Vaske, 2003). It is also defined as an element of self-identity which improves self-esteem and evokes a sense of belonging to a community (Williams & Vaske, 2003). The places which make people feel special, self-controlled and steady tend to be identified with the concept of identity (Anton & Lawrence, 2014). Proshansky et al. (1983) also claims that place identity is a cognitive base of self-identity including various cognitions associated with past, present and physical environments which describes the presence of individuals.

Place dependence originates from functional evaluation of a place in terms of satisfying a person’s needs by allowing them to reach their goals (Shumaker & Taylor, 1983). Place dependence is associated with the physical opportunities and characteristics of the place and it presents required conditions in order to fulfil and promote certain purposes (Mandal, 2016). It refers to how settings offer certain opportunities in terms of accomplishing the aims of individuals (Jorgensen & Stedman, 2001). Additionally, rootedness is another element which is defined as mental situation of being, a mood or a feeling in a certain place (Tuan, 1980). It can be stated that place rootedness is associated with certain feelings and behaviours which improve attachment to specific places. The concept of rootedness brings along increased satisfaction with a person’s present conditions where he or she lives in (McAndrew, 1998).

Place attachment can be investigated in environments of various scales such as homes, neighbourhoods and cities. The scale of place takes a considerable role in terms of influencing affective ties of individuals with their environments and the way they perceive (Casakin, Hernández, & Ruiz, 2015; Hidalgo & Hernández, 2001; Lewicka, 2010). Neighbourhood is one of the places affecting emotional bonds by creating sense of attachment especially in social context. Shumaker & Taylor (1983) define neighbourhood

attachment as “positive affective bond or association between individuals and their residential environment” (p. 233). It is a socio-psychological process creating individuals’ emotional bonding to their social and physical environment (Comstock et al., 2010) . In other words, neighbourhood attachment demonstrates a feeling of pleasure with the residential environment. In addition, the construct of satisfaction depends on physical and social features of environments which meet needs of individuals (Galster, 1987). Attitudes, meanings and knowledge related with cognitive evaluation of an environment take a considerable role in terms of determining place satisfaction (Stedman, 2002). Mesch & Manor (1998) define place satisfaction as an assessment of physical and social characteristics of a place. Place satisfaction in neighbourhood is related to residents’ evaluation of their neighbourhood environment (Hur, Nasar, & Chun, 2010). The factors affecting neighbourhood satisfaction can be analysed in three sections which are individual, social and environmental (Ibem & Aduwo, 2013). Individual factors are associated with personal or family attributes such as age, gender, income level and family size (Fornara, Bonaiuto, & Bonnes, 2010; Hay, 1998; Zhang & Lu, 2016). Moreover, social atmosphere of a neighbourhood is stated as determining. Social environment is perceived to be significant in terms of creating sense of place and place attachment. Social relations with neighbours, sense of community and sense of privacy, safety and local involvement can be presented as leading elements in order to provide satisfaction for residents in social way (Fornara et al., 2010; Sirgy & Cornwell, 2002; Zhang & Lu, 2016). The elements related with built environment are also considered to have an impact on neighbourhood satisfaction. Green open spaces, recreational areas, architectural style, building quality and size can be given as effective components (Sirgy & Cornwell, 2002; Zhang & Lu, 2016).

The current study aimed to investigate how neighbourhood location affects place attachment and residential satisfaction. We hypothesised that the residents living in the areas away from the city centre have higher level of place attachment compared to those living in city centre. It was explored by comparing two neighbourhoods; one in the city centre, the other away from the city centre. Moreover we expected that the residents living in the areas in city centre have higher level of residential satisfaction compared to those living away from the city centre. The relationship between neighbourhood location and residential satisfaction was analysed by assessing physical and social aspects of the neighbourhood which influence neighbourhood satisfaction. Apart from these, we examined if there is an association between residential satisfaction and place attachment or not as it was stated in the literature.

## 2 METHOD

### 2.1 RESPONDENTS

The respondents of this study were 135 residents from Ayrancı and Çayyolu neighbourhoods in Ankara. The sample group included 75 female and 60 male respondents aged between 19 to 85 years. Mean age was 47. Sixty-one respondents from Ayrancı and 74 respondents from Çayyolu took part in this study.

### 2.2 SETTING

The study was carried out in Ayrancı and Çayyolu which are two different neighbourhoods under the jurisdiction of Çankaya Municipality of Ankara. Ayrancı located in the centre of the city, surrounded by Dikmen to the south and Kavaklıdere to the northeast. Moreover, Turkish Grand National Assembly is located at the northern part of Ayrancı. This neighbourhood is divided as Aşağı Ayrancı and Yukarı Ayrancı. The socio-economic status of this neighbourhood is between upper middle and lower high classes; age distribution of the residents generally is between 30-34 years and 65 years above (“Ayrancı Bölge Raporu” (Ayrancı Region Report), 2017).

Çayyolu is in the southwest part of the Ankara. It located 17 kilometres distant from the city centre. It was settled down as a village then it was transformed to neighbourhood after 2004. The socio-economic status of Çayyolu is above upper middle class and age distribution of the residents generally is between 30-34 years and 50-54 years (“Çayyolu Bölge Raporu” (Çayyolu Region Report), 2017).

### 2.3 INSTRUMENTS

This study was assessed with two questionnaires which are Place Attachment Scale (Lewicka, 2010) and Perceived Residential Environment Quality and Neighbourhood Attachment Scale (Fornara et al., 2010). These scales distributed in Ayrancı and Çayyolu included 85 questions which were 7-point Likert scale (1=strongly disagree, 7=strongly agree). The first part of the questionnaire included questions related with respondents' demographic information such as age and gender, education level, length of residence and their neighbourhood. Place Attachment Scale (Lewicka, 2010) consisted of 12 items related with place identity and place bonding/rootedness. Perceived Residential Environment Quality and Neighbourhood Attachment Scale (Fornara et al., 2010) asked 66 statements related with physical and social features of the neighbourhood.

### 2.4 PROCEDURE

Two different neighbourhoods of Ankara; one in the city centre, the other away from the city centre were compared. Primarily, questionnaires were distributed to obtain data by using snowball sampling method. Respondents answered the questionnaires in their homes or workplaces. Then they were collected and analysed to reveal the influence of neighbourhood location on level of place attachment and residential satisfaction. Primarily, factor analysis was conducted for two scales to investigate which elements are the most effective on place attachment and residential satisfaction. Then, multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used to explore differences between locations and socio-demographic features such as gender on the level of place attachment and residential satisfaction. Apart from these, correlations were carried out to examine the relationship between the factors shaping place attachment and residential satisfaction. The statistical analyses were conducted by using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS 21.0).

### 3 FINDINGS

Factor analysis on place attachment revealed the factors by investigating the most influential components on the level of attachment. It generated two factors and they were named as place identity and place bonding/rootedness. The first factor place identity emerged with an eigenvalue of 5.01 which accounted for 41,721% of the variance; the second factor place bonding/rootedness with an eigenvalue of 1.24 and 10,316% of the variance. The first factor consisted of three items about cognitive significance of a place associated with the construct of place identity. The internal consistency of this factor was 0,823. The second factor included five items which measure dependence of respondents by marking their positive and negative feelings about the place (see Table 1). The internal consistency for this factor was 0,813.

Statements	Factor 1	Factor 2
	Place Identity	Place Bonding/Rootedness
I am proud of this place.	0,885	
It is a part of me.	0,826	
I feel secure here.	0,694	
I know this place very well.		0,762
I don't like this place.		0,752
I miss it when I am not here.		0,721
I defend it when somebody criticizes it.		0,706
I leave this place with pleasure.		0,582

Table 1 - Items of Place Identity and Place Bonding/Rootedness and its loadings

For residential satisfaction fourteen factors were determined in first stage. In order to decrease the load generated by many components second analysis was performed and four factors were created by ranking in high order. The first factor was created with an eigenvalue of 3.73 which accounted for 26,670% of the variance, the second with an eigenvalue of 2.17 and 15,498%, the third with an eigenvalue of 1.3 and 9,523%, the fourth with an eigenvalue of 1 and 7,173% of the variance.

Items forming the Factor 1 were related with general evaluation of a neighbourhood in terms of external connection and transportation, educational services, neighbourhood attachment, upkeep and sociability (see Table 2). The internal consistency for this factor was found to be 0,818. Questions related with

external connection and transportation asked about the connection of neighbourhood with other parts of the city, frequency and quality of public transportation. Questions about educational services analysed the schools in terms of quality, availability and access. Neighbourhood attachment was examined by measuring place identity, bonding and dependence to neighbourhood. Questions measuring upkeep asked about maintenance of neighbourhood in terms of streets, roads and signs. Sociability was understood by questions asking about how easy to make friendship and social relations with others.

Elements creating Factor 2 consisted of five themes which are parks and green areas, social care, commercial services, social life and activities, parking and accessibility (see Table 2). The alpha level for this factor was 0,754. Relaxation spaces such as parks and green areas in neighbourhood were the first component creating Factor 2. Social care services such as health opportunities, nursing services and care for elders were also significant. Commercial services of neighbourhood were evaluated by diversity and arrangements of shops and stores. Social atmosphere of neighbourhood, relaxation and entertainment activities offered for residents were influential on Factor 2. Availability of parking areas for cars and comfort in accessibility was found significant in terms of satisfying residents' needs.

The third factor represented environmental health and aesthetics in neighbourhood (see Table 2). General environmental condition of neighbourhood was analysed in terms of environmental cleanliness, air purity and noise level. Moreover, appearance of buildings was evaluated by looking their colour and design. The internal consistency for this factor was 0,772. Apart from these, building volume defined the fourth factor in itself. Dimensions and volumes of buildings were found as effective in creating this factor. The alpha level for this factor was 0,815.

Statements	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4
	General evaluation	Relaxation/care services and accessibility	Environmental health and aesthetics	Building volume
External connection and transportation	0,719			
Educational services	0,638			
Neighbourhood attachment	0,635			
Upkeep	0,607			
Sociability	0,603			
Parks and green areas		0,699		
Social care		0,690		
Commercial services		0,674		
Social life and activities		0,672		
Parking and accessibility		0,576		
Environmental health			0,826	
Building aesthetics			0,629	
Building volume				0,856

Table 2 - Items of Factor 1, Factor 2, Factor 3, Factor 4 and its loadings

One way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) test was applied if there is a difference in the level of place attachment in Ayrancı and Çayyolu or not. Results indicated that there is no significant difference in terms of neighbourhood location between the residents' level of place attachment. ( $\lambda=0,997$ ;  $F(2, 132) = 1.539$ ,  $p>.05$ ).

For residential satisfaction, one way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) showed that there is a significant difference between two neighbourhoods in terms of level of residential satisfaction. The residents living in the city centre had higher level of residential satisfaction compared to those living away from the city centre. ( $\lambda=0,449$ ;  $F(4, 130) = 39.842$ ,  $p<.001$ ).

Moreover, according to correlation results there is an association between place attachment and residential satisfaction (see Table 3). It showed that there is a statistically significant correlation between the all factors influencing residential satisfaction and place bonding/rootedness. (Pearson's  $r: 0,539$ , Sig. (2-tailed): 0,000), (Pearson's  $r: 0,228$ , Sig. (2-tailed): 0,008), (Pearson's  $r: 0,332$ , Sig. (2-tailed): 0,000), (Pearson's  $r: -0,255$ , Sig. (2-tailed): 0,003). Furthermore place identity was statistically significant correlated with general evaluation of neighbourhood, environmental health and aesthetics. (Pearson's  $r: 0,544$ , Sig. (2-tailed): 0,000), (Pearson's  $r: 0,381$ , Sig. (2-tailed): 0,000).

		Place Bonding/ Rootedness	Place identity	General evaluation	Relaxation/ care services and accessibility	E. health and aesthetics	Building volume
Place Bonding/ Rootedness	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)	1	,588	,539	,228	,332	-,255
			,000	,000	,008	,000	,003
Place Identity	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)	,588	1	,544	,103	,381	-,169
		,000		,000	,233	,000	,051
General evaluation	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)	,539	,544	1	,242	,325	-,280
		,000	,000		,005	,000	,001
Relaxation/care services and accessibility	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)	,228	,103	,242	1	,395	,044
		,008	,233	,005		,000	,615
Environmental health and aesthetics	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)	,332	,381	,325	,395	1	-,090
		,000	,000	,000	,000		,297
Building volume	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)	-,255	-,169	-,280	,044	-,090	1
		,003	,051	,001	,615	,297	

Table 3 - Correlations between place attachment and residential satisfaction

#### 4 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In the current study, we examined the relationship between level of place attachment and residential satisfaction according to neighbourhood location. We hypothesised that there is a difference in the level of place attachment of two neighbourhoods; the residents living in the areas away from the city centre have higher level of place attachment compared to those living in city centre. However the results of analysis demonstrated that there was no significant difference in the level of place attachment in terms of neighbourhood location. Feldman (1990) conducted a survey in two different areas of city and found that the residents identified themselves with a type of settlement. Her other study also indicated that small part of the sample group did not feel attachment to any settlement type; the experiences, values and manners were significant in terms of creating attachment (Feldman, 1996). In this study living in the city centre or living from away the city centre was not found as influential on level of place attachment. It can be inferred that emotional ties, past experiences, memories and personal ideas are influential on creating attachment to places.

Contrary to place attachment, there was a significant difference in the level of residential satisfaction of the respondents in two neighbourhoods. As it was expected the residents living in the areas in city centre have higher level of satisfaction compared to those living away from the city centre. In line with previous studies the elements related with built environment such as building aesthetics, upkeep, external connection and transportation were effective on neighbourhood satisfaction (Sirgy & Cornwell, 2002; Zhang & Lu, 2016). Former studies also found that parks, green areas and social activities were also other significant factors on residents' in terms of satisfying their needs (Bonaiuto, Fornara, Ariccio, Ganucci, & Rahimi, 2015; Fornara et al., 2010; Sirgy & Cornwell, 2002). Apart from these, Bonaiuto et al. (2015), Hur and Morrow-Jones (2008), Hidalgo and Hernández (2001) stated that there is a significant relationship between place attachment and place satisfaction. Pearson's correlation results indicated that there was an association between place attachment and residential satisfaction as it was expressed in literature. Place bonding/rootedness factor creating place attachment was statistically significant correlated with the all factors influencing residential satisfaction. Place identity factor was also statistically significant correlated with general evaluation of neighbourhood, environmental health and aesthetics. In accordance with previous research satisfaction in physical and social opportunities of environment were found significant in influencing affective bonds of individuals in terms of creating sense of attachment (Fornara et al., 2010; McAndrew, 1998; Shumaker & Taylor, 1983; Stedman, 2002).

In this study housing type was not taken into consideration in terms of determining its influence on place attachment and residential satisfaction. However level of place attachment and residential satisfaction can be related to type of housing. There may be a difference between living in apartments and living in detached houses. For future studies influence of housing type can also be investigated. Apart from this, socio-economic status can make difference for level of place attachment and residential satisfaction. This study was conducted with the residents having similar income levels. Future research can examine if socio-economic status of residents affect level of place attachment and residential satisfaction or not.



## BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES

- Altman, I., & Low, S. (1992). Place Attachment - Human Behavior and Environment. Human Behavior and Environment - Advances in Theory and Research (Vol. 12). [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4684-8753-4\\_12](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4684-8753-4_12)
- Anton, C. E., & Lawrence, C. (2014). Home is where the heart is : The effect of place of residence on place attachment and community participation. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 40, 451–461. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2014.10.007>
- Ayrancı Bölge Raporu. (2017). Retrieved February 26, 2017, from <https://www.zingat.com/cankaya-ayranci-bolge-raporu>.
- Bonaiuto, M., Fornara, F., Ariccio, S., Ganucci, U., & Rahimi, L. (2015). Perceived Residential Environment Quality Indicators ( PREQs ) relevance for UN-HABITAT City Prosperity Index ( CPI ) \*. *Habitat International*, 45, 53–63. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.habitatint.2014.06.015>
- Brown, G., & Raymond, C. M. (2007). The relationship between place attachment and landscape values: Toward mapping place attachment. *Applied Geography*, 27(2), 89–111.
- Casakin, H., Hernández, B., & Ruiz, C. (2015). Place attachment and place identity in Israeli cities: The influence of city size. *Cities*, 42(PB), 224–230. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2014.07.007>
- Comstock, N., Miriam Dickinson, L., Marshall, J. A., Soobader, M. J., Turbin, M. S., Buchenau, M., & Litt, J. S. (2010). Neighborhood attachment and its correlates: Exploring neighborhood conditions, collective efficacy, and gardening. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 30(4), 435–442. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2010.05.001>
- Çayyolu Bölge Raporu. (2017). Retrieved February 26, 2017, from <https://www.zingat.com/cankaya-cayyolu-bolge-raporu>.
- Easthope, H. (2004). A place called home. *Housing, Theory and Society*, 21(3). <https://doi.org/10.1080/14036090410021360>
- Feldman, R. M. (1990). Settlement-identity: Psychological bonds with home places in a mobile society. *Environment and Behavior*, 22(2).
- Feldman, R. M. (1996). Constancy and change in attachments to types of settlements. *Environment and Behavior*, 28(4), 419–445.
- Fornara, F., Bonaiuto, M., & Bonnes, M. (2010). Cross-validation of abbreviated perceived residential environment quality (PREQ) and neighborhood attachment (NA) indicators. *Environment and Behavior*, 42(2), 171–196.
- Galster, G. (1987). Identifying the correlates of dwelling satisfaction: An empirical critique. *Environment and Behavior*, 19(5), 539–568.
- Hay, R. (1998). Sense of place in developmental context. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 18, 5–29. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jevp.1997.0060>
- Hidalgo, M. C., & Hernández, B. (2001). Place attachment: Conceptual and empirical questions. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 21(3), 273–281.
- Hur, M., & Morrow-Jones, H. (2008). Factors that influence residents' satisfaction with neighborhoods. *Environment and Behavior*, 40(5), 619–635.
- Hur, M., Nasar, J. L., & Chun, B. (2010). Neighborhood satisfaction, physical and perceived naturalness and openness. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 30(1), 52–59. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2009.05.005>
- Ibem, E. O., & Aduwo, E. B. (2013). Assessment of residential satisfaction in public housing in Ogun State, Nigeria. *Habitat International*, 40, 163–175.
- Jorgensen, B. S., & Stedman, R. C. (2001). Sense of place as an attitude: Lakeshore owners attitudes toward their properties. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 21(3), 233–248. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jevp.2001.0226>
- Lewicka, M. (2010). What makes neighborhood different from home and city? Effects of place scale on place attachment. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 30(1), 35–51. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2009.05.004>
- Mandal, A. (2016). Size and type of places , geographical region , satisfaction with life , age , sex and place attachment, 47(1), 159–169.
- McAndrew, F. T. (1998). The measurement of “rootedness” and the prediction of attachment to home-towns in college students. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 18(4), 409–417. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/jevp.1998.0078>

- Mesch, G. S., & Manor, O. (1998). Social ties, environmental perception, and local attachment. *Environment and Behavior*, 30(4), 504–519.
- Proshansky, H. M., Fabian, A. K., & Kaminoff, R. (1983). Place-identity: Physical world socialization of the self. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 3(1), 57–83. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0272-4944\(83\)80021-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0272-4944(83)80021-8)
- Relph, E. (1976). *Place and placelessness*. London: Pion.
- Sack, R. D. (1997). Homo Geographicus a Framework for Action, Awareness, and Moral Concern. In *Philosophy of Social Science*.
- Scannell, L., & Gifford, R. (2010). Defining place attachment : A tripartite organizing framework. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 30(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2009.09.006>
- Shumaker, S. A., & Taylor, R. B. (1983). Toward a clarification of people-place relationships: A model of attachment to place. In N. R. Feimer & E. S. Geller (Eds.), *Environmental Psychology: Directions and Perspectives* (Vol. 2, pp. 19–25). Praeger.
- Sirgy, M. J., & Cornwell, T. (2002). How neighbourhood features affect quality of life. *Social Indicators Research*, 59(1), 79–114. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s1>
- Soja, E. W. (1998). Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and other real-and-imagined places. *Capital & Class*, 22(1), 137–139.
- Stedman, R. C. (2002). Toward a social psychology of place: Predicting behavior from place-based cognitions, attitude, and identity. *Environment and Behavior*, 34(5), 561–581. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013916502034005001>
- Stedman, R. C. (2003). Is It Really Just a Social Construction?: The Contribution of the Physical Environment to Sense of Place. *Society & Natural Resources*, 16(8), 671–685. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08941920309189>
- Tuan, Y. (1977). *Space and place: The perspective of experience*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Tuan, Y. (1979). Space and Place: Humanistic Perspective. In *Philosophy in Geography* (pp. 387–427). <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-009-9394-5>
- Tuan, Y. (1980). Rootedness and sense of place. *Landscape*, 24, 3–8.
- Williams, D. R., & Vaske, J. . (2003). The measurement of place attachment: Validity and generalizability of a psychometric approach. *Forest Science*, 49(6), 830–840.
- Zhang, C., & Lu, B. (2016). Residential satisfaction in traditional and redeveloped inner city neighborhood: A tale of two neighborhoods in Beijing. *Travel Behaviour and Society*, 5, 23–36. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tbs.2015.08.001>

## **ID 1497 | SHAPING PROCESS AND IMPACT MECHANISM OF THE THIRD SPACE UNDER BLOCK RENEWAL: AN CASE BASED ON KNOWLEDGE & INNOVATION COMMUNITY RENEWAL PROJECT**

Bowen Chen<sup>1</sup>  
<sup>1</sup>Tongji University  
[1967114471@qq.com](mailto:1967114471@qq.com)

### **1 INTRODUCTION**

In the rapid process of urbanization and modernization in China, many cities have made great changes in function, structure, space capacity, infrastructure and other aspects. (Tong Ming, 2014). However, as a public space for daily life, alienation has not brought into full play its social value. For example, privatization is serious, attractive and dynamic, loose in relation to the region. Compared with those of traditional city life is full of modern city, the trial in a rational level, but the life experience and cultural characteristics, is almost completely failure (Camino Sitte, 1990). As China's economic development has