

Article

Semantic Transformation of Public Open Spaces: Republic Square of Bursa

Sibel Polat*

Bursa, Turkey

Neslihan Dostoglu**

Istanbul, Turkey



Abstract

Today, urban dilapidation experienced in many city centres related to different reasons affect also public open spaces which become a current issue with discussions about privatisation, disappearance and obsolescence. In this context, public open spaces become an important agenda to revitalize city centres and to rediscover them again in terms of “loss of place identity” issues and efforts “to reinforce place identity”. Thus, the aim of this study is to investigate transformation of public open spaces in terms of identity and urban memory. In this context, the identity of Republic Square located in Bursa city centre was analysed from past to present. Different methods were used to realize this case study, such as archival and literature review, basic observation and deep interviews with 30 users. As a conclusion, it was revealed that environmental aesthetics are still sustained in the square, but spatial experiments and behaviours of users have changed in a negative way due to the power of global capital related to the changing social structure in cities.

Key words: identity; public open space; public life; meaning; Republic Square; Bursa

1. Introduction

Identity is a concept that defines a person according to his characteristics and distinguishes people from others, emphasizing the differences between people (Hortaçsu 2007). Similar to people, public open spaces which are defined as empty

*Sibel Polat, email: sibelpolat@uludag.edu.tr, Faculty of Architecture, Uludag University, Bursa

** Neslihan Dostoglu email: n.dostoglu@iku.edu.tr Faculty of Architecture, Istanbul Kultur University, Turkey

spaces that are open and accessible to all, regardless of gender, race, ethnicity, age or socio-economic level have also identities which consist of abstract and concrete qualities and which distinguish them from others. When studies about public open spaces are examined, it is seemed that there are many factors related to the identity of public open spaces such as the rhythm of time, socio-economic structure, natural and built environments, public rights and needs, planning-design approaches, implementation processes, legal regulations and meanings attributed to place (Carmona ve ark. 2003). Grouping these factors into three dimensions such as planning-design-implementation, use and governance and meaning, enabled us to understand and analyse these factors more easily and systematically. The dimension of planning-design-implementation include the factors related to the social and physical environments, while the dimension of use and governance include the factors related to the capacity to meet public rights and needs and the success of governance of public open spaces. The final dimension meaning is related to environmental aesthetics, spatial behaviours of users, spatial experiences of users, and social structure (Polat 2013). In this study, factors which create the meaning of the public open spaces have been revealed.

2. Identity and Meaning in Public Open Spaces

Meaning is defined as the thing which is tried to be explained by a statement, a design, and idea or a work. To give a meaning to a public open space by an individual/society, firstly it should be designed and implemented whether based upon a plan or spontaneously, in other words it has to exist first, then it can be adopted and used. The meaning of space which cannot be personally experienced is not in question (metaphysical spaces are excluded). On the other hand, given meanings to the space may change usage of the space and may affect planning, design, implementation processes and the governance of space (for protecting or changing the meaning of space). Therefore, factors that form meaning in public open spaces should be examined.

Meaning (which is one of the basic elements of aesthetic theory) has many different levels and many theoretical approaches were developed to conceptualize the subject. According to Lang (1987), empirical aesthetics can be utilized in environmental design since behavioural sciences are based upon the analysis of aesthetic experience with scientific experiments and within this context environmental aesthetics can be evaluated with formal and symbolic aesthetics approaches. Formal aesthetics which are based on Gestalt approaches are based on sensory perception. Lynch (1975) had performed studies based on Gestalt principals, and searched legibility of cities with city images by cognitive studies based upon urban memory. Public open spaces may involve urban image elements (paths, borders, regions, nodes and landmarks) which increase the legibility of city. How public open spaces imagined by users are important within this context and meanings based on urban legibility should be analysed for defining place identity in public open spaces.

Symbolic aesthetics concern with relational meanings of environment which give pleasure to people. Personality of individual, the social group and culture which he/she is involved, the culture and most importantly education level effect perception and symbolic interpretation processes. However, socializing process realize in social and cultural environment as well as in a geographical environment. Built and natural environments are rich for symbols. Therefore, abstract and physical variables which may have meaning should be examined in public open spaces. Those are; defined as building form, space form, material, lighting, colour, and sound which are physical properties based upon sensory perceptions and abstract properties belonging to built environment such as location name, an individual/an event related to a building and architectural style (Lang 1987).

Needs such as privacy, personal space and territorialisation in relation to a specific culture, are effective in providing environmental comfort and a sense of quality (Gür 1996). Within this scope; spatial behaviours in public open spaces determine how much public open spaces are appreciated and who appreciate them. Sometimes groups which appreciate space may prevent others to use the space and this case decreases the publicity level of space. Also, another subject related to spatial behaviour is usage habit. This behaviour effects space usage density, and cause a place to be forsaken/non-preferred, live/attractive. Therefore, meanings related to appropriation which developed based on spatial behaviour of users and meanings related to usage habits should be analysed.

On the other hand, in phenomenological approaches it is highlighted that spatial experience is necessary to understand the structure of time- space relationship and to read the multi layered structure of space (Aydınlı 2008, Goldstein and Elliot 1994, Seamon and Sowers 2008, Yürekli 2008). Experience in public open spaces depends on interaction between user and space. According to Carr et al (1992) public space experience provides meaning which increase in time and if they are positive they form bonds between user and space from the first experience. These bonds can be formed between space and the life of individual /an esteemed group/ a culture/ universe, or bonds which are formed from individual's psychological and biological realities to other worlds. These bonds form a sense of belonging. The space which has a sense of belonging is also appreciated, protected and used. Bonds and belongingness may provide some start points for design, usage, and governance of public spaces. Therefore meanings related to spatial experience should be analysed for defining the place identity in public open spaces.

However, meanings are developed within a social environment. Space is shaped with life and includes ideological meanings in defining, sensing, explaining, producing, consuming briefly in living (Karabey 1980). A country's, regions, or city's political, economic, demographical, social, cultural structure and changes which are observed in those may format the contents of public life and physical properties of public spaces. Within this context effects of governmental power may be concealed and also it can be

reflected over public space as a direct propaganda form of dominant ideology. Naming and arranging streets, iconography of buildings, and street furniture are the ways to convey messages to public space. (Çelik 2007). On the other hand, type and sources of power phenomenon in public open spaces may be religious or economical as it is seen in market/church squares in history in medieval time. According to Sennett (1996) aim of constructing boulevards in 19th century is to prevent probable rebellions as well as making access of people easier to stores in the boulevards and increasing the consumption. According to Lefebvre (2007) in 20th century society where capitalist production and possession relationships (created by industrialization) are dominant since the 1960's, has created closed circuit (production-consumption- production) daily life which was programmed within suitable urban frameworks. In the present time, there is mutual benefit relationship between governmental and economic powers and those powers shape the urban space according to principals of capitalism and participates in the accumulation of profit (Ayran 1996).

Also, publicity levels in public open spaces differ according to public behavioural rules and public usage types in a society. Even though public open spaces present a free behavioural area with respect to private spaces, being open to foreign people and general observation makes obligatory the regulation of behaviour in public space according requirements of common life. (Kostof 1991). Within this context as publicity can be determined by laws and prohibitions determined by governments or by cultural structure of society.

In addition to this, meaning is not independent from function; publicity of a space is also related to how much it is used for public functions. Function is formed by four components such as action itself, realizing type of action, side and related activities which have become a part of action system, and meaning of action. Hierarchy here starts from substantial objective and continues with targets with respect to usage, values and symbolic targets (Rapoport 1990). Kostof (1999) defines public space as a stage for rituals, ceremonies, social activities, coincidences and interaction. Within this context public spaces can be defined as spaces where formal and/or social activities are realized. Social events strengthen the identity and urban memory. Within this context meanings both based upon space-power- ideology relationship and the meanings based on type and publicity level of space should be evaluated for place identity of public open spaces.

Starting from those conceptual explanations it can be said that the identity of public open spaces are formed by environmental aesthetics, spatial behaviour of users, spatial experience, and the degree of publicity and type (Table 1). Subjects that form relationships with space firstly reach to the substantial and beneficiary; then reach an abstract diagnosis from substantial experiences. Experiences start with the perception of abstract geometrical forms of structural architectural space, ecological experiences and then extend to a political, social, economic, cultural, and the symbolic, which can only be perceived subjectively (Gür 1996).

Table 1. Factors belonging to the dimension of meaning

| Meaning attached to environmental aesthetics | Meaning attached to spatial behavior of users | Meaning attached to spatial experience of users | Meaning attached to social structure |
|---|--|--|--|
| Formal meaning | Appropriation | Having bonds | To reflect the relationship between space-power-ideology |
| Symbolic meaning | Usage habits | Belonging | The degree and the type of publicity |

On the other hand, if a space has an identity it can be defined as a “place”. While space can be seen as an open and abstract blank, place is the special part of this blank where people have given a special meaning to it. “Belonging” rule governs here. (Madanipour 2010, Certau 2008). “Spirit of place” which is interpreted as “meanings belonging to place” can be considered as related with Heidegger’s “existence” concept. According to Norberg Schulz (1984); people reside in an environment when they get used to live there, when they define themselves with that place briefly and when they give there meaning. Therefore, a place always provides a base for individual identity since it is embodied by seeing, feeling and smelling probabilities. (Neil 2004).

The feeling of place of a city is basically shaped by collective character of spaces. Gathering places of cities reflect spiritual status and values of a certain culture, time and people by including many activities, providing suitable environment for social interactions. Place identity concept mentions the distinctive properties of human spatial life and includes the properties which are sensed by people rather than its objective properties, which distinguish that place from others and meanings which are attributed to that place (Bilgin 1997).

In this context, Codol (1987) emphasises that the feeling of identity can be considered to be derived from various dimensions of self-image, such as the conception of one’s differences from others, unity and permanence, and positivity and power over the material and social environments. At this point, public open places also can be evaluated whether they have the feeling of identity. They can be examined whether they are different from others, they have historical continuity in terms of their functions and buildings and they have power over their environments.

3. Case Study: Republic Square of Bursa

Different analysis, including interpretive-historical, quantitative, and qualitative strategies, were used in this study. During the qualitative analysis, the authors conducted in-depth interviews with 30 users in December 2010. They used semi-structured interview forms, recorded the interviews which lasted 1- 2.5 hours and then analysed the audio recordings. The users were randomly selected from professionals (such as previous mayors, freelance/salaried architects and urban planners) from local authorities, governmental institutions, non-governmental organisations and universities or from local people who work or live in the case study area.

The profile of the users can be summarized as such: 57% of users were men, 43% of users were between 40-59 years old, 54% of users had a bachelor's degree, 34% of users were architect or urban planners, 20% of users had an income of around 1500-2000 Turkish liras per month, 64% of users were living in the central municipality Osmangazi, 64% of users were born in Bursa.

For the dimension of meaning, users were asked how meanings attached to environmental aesthetics, spatial behaviour, spatial experience and social structure changed in the Republic Square from past to present. In terms of meanings attached to environmental aesthetics, it was investigated how the image of the case study area changed over time. Also, the users were asked that which paths are widely used in the area, how the borders of the area are perceived, whether the area is defined as a special district, whether there is a node and a landmark in the area. Also, the users were asked that what the buildings or other elements in the Republic Square express in terms of their site plan, architectural style, shape, material, lighting and colour. Besides, the users were questioned that whether the name of Republic Square means something to users and whether this place is associated with anything, anybody or any event.

In terms of meanings attached to spatial behaviour, the users were asked that whether the users and usage habits of the Republic Square have changed. In terms of meanings attached to spatial experience, it was asked that whether there have been any connections between the users and the space and whether they have a sense of belonging to the Republic Square. In terms of meanings attached to social structure, it was asked that whether the Republic Square has reflected any kind of power and whether the balance of public-private has changed in the area and what kind of public uses it has served (formal/social). In terms of place identity, it was asked that whether the Republic Square is different from the city's other squares and why it is different, whether it carries a historical continuity and whether it has power over the city and and it has the characteristics of a centre.

4. Results

In this study, the findings of the first two periods rely on the archival research and the literature review, the findings of two last periods were obtained by the deep interviews.

- Sarayonu between 1862 and 1923

The first period is between the date 1862 when Ahmet Vefik Pasha started working in Bursa as an inspector and the date 1923 when the Republic was established in Turkey. It was necessary to start analyses from the 19th century, because there had been a great earthquake in Bursa in 1855 and after that, redevelopment of the city became an important subject in the Ottoman Empire. Thus, Ahmet Vefik Pasha, who was a well-educated, sophisticated and innovative governor and who had chance to observe Haussmann's urban operations in Paris, was charged to rebuild Bursa (Aslanoğlu 2000). To define the identity of Sarayonu in this period, political and legal-administrative changes, the governor who oriented the planning process in the city as the powerful representative of the Ottoman Empire, eclectic architectural projects which responded to the new governmental and public functions in the area came forward in the dimension of planning-design-implementation. In the dimension of meaning; different formal and symbolic meanings related to the environmental aesthetics, to the spatial and power relations attached to the social structure. Also, the dilemma in relation to the degree of publicity and the relationship between traditionalism and modernism occurred.

The case study area was located on the main street of the city (Saray Street) and the first governmental palace (Konak) was built in 1863 by Ahmet Vefik Pasha in this area after the Tanzimat Reforms, the place started to be called Sarayonu (it refers to the front of the palace). On the other hand, the first theatre which was symbolic of the Western life style was also built in this area (contrasting to male dominated coffee houses in the area (Saint-Laurent 1996)). Sarayonu was located in a critical position in the city, near the historical commercial centre and was the neighbour of the Setbasi quartier where a western life style was dominant. This in-between position emphasized the building styles and life styles in the area. The facades of the buildings reflected the Western style, while the interior space design was organized with a traditional sensibility. Thus, Sarayonu became a new administrative and social centre, a door opening to the West, a threshold which connected the traditional life in the old commercial centre to modern life. In addition to these, the Empire became visible for the public by means of the government buildings and Sarayonu became a reflector of the political power and the ideology of Westernization. A new type of publicity taught by the elitist governors developed under the pressure of the first Constitutional Era as a part of Westernization.

- The Republic Square between 1923 and 1950

The Republic Square established in the second period emerged between the time when the Republic was established in Turkey and in 1950 when, the first multi-party election was realized in Turkey. This period is generally known as Single-Party Period. To define the identity of Republic Square in this period, political and legal-administrative changes, the governor who oriented the planning process in the city as the powerful representative of the Turkish government, the foreign city planners who were invited to plan big cities of Turkey, the importance of creating squares and new governmental buildings reflecting modernist architectural styles in the area came forward in the dimension of planning-design-implementation. In the dimension of use and management, efforts to meet new functional and the psycho-social need to create a new society gained importance, these developments caused different formal and symbolic meanings, in relation to environmental aesthetics, space and power relations attached to the social structure and construction of national identity (in terms of the publicity, the dimension of meaning, in varying types and degrees).

The Republic Square was born with the construction of the new governor building, the courthouse and the finance building in 1925. In 1940, a modernist community centre building was also constructed in the area (Akkılıç 2002). In terms of formal aesthetics, while governmental buildings defined a governmental centre in the city, the Ataturk Sculpture which was placed in the Republic Square in 1931, became an important landmark for the citizens. In addition, it was seen that the names of the many public open spaces were changed depending on the spirit of the period, for instance, instead of Palace Street, Ghazi Pasha Street which expresses Ataturk; instead of New Road, Ismet Pasha Street which expresses the first prime minister of Turkey (Akkılıç 2002).

In terms of meanings attached to social structure, the new Turkish central government tried to legitimize its power in urban spaces. In this context, new legal regulations were accepted to make expropriations to create a trilogy such as avenue-square-governmental buildings system in Turkish cities (Aritan 2008). These efforts became widespread in the majority of Turkish cities and also the Republic Squares were indicators of this approach. It became the signature of the Kemalism and the central government (Figure 1).

In terms of meanings dependant on the degree and the type of publicity, the Republic Square produced a conservative publicity which was defined by state elites to provide public interest as a need of modernization. The governmental uses such as ceremonies and celebrations were dominant in the area which served as the administrative and cultural centre.



Figure 1. Republic Square 1930'S (Bursa City Museum Archive)

- The Republic Square between 1950 and 1980

The third period discussed here covers the duration between the multi-party selections to the 80s. Bursa City and Republic Square have both been affected since this period when rapid urbanization depended on migration, which occurred due to political issues and in relation to industrialization that had occurred all around the country. In this period, issues such as changes in the political, demographic, economic structures and legal procedures, capital owners as actors who direct the planning process, builders and sellers, unearned incomes, urban density increases within planning, design and implementation dimension, meeting functional and psycho-social needs that are in the foreground of the identification with Republic Square. These processes have created formal and symbolic meanings and also meanings which have provided for the construction of a collective identity based upon the spatial experience and behaviours of users. It was observed that the publicity level and the type shifted from being official to being social with respect to meanings based on social structure.

In this period, the Republic Square was a place that is the most important transportation axis of city, a node point where different roads intersect, including symbolic elements such as the Ataturk Sculpture, the Clock Tower in historical city centre, urban reference points such as the Governor Building, the Theatre and Kafkas Pastry Shop. From the symbolic point of view space, name is called as Sculpture/In front of Sculpture between people, this name is sourced by Ataturk Sculpture which locates in this area, therefore space is incorporated with Republic and Ataturk, also it was determined that architectural style of Governor Building , Courthouse, and Finance Building recall the early Republican period.

For meanings based upon spatial behaviors, it was determined that the Republic Square was embraced by all Bursa citizens, practices such as protesting in public areas, meeting in daily life, walking, shopping, eating/drinking, taking photos of festivals and ceremonies, which are practiced annually.

For meanings based upon spatial experience, it was determined that they have founded connections with the square rather individually as well as socially and users who lived their childhood and their early period(s) in Bursa embrace this square more symbolically and physically, feeling a belonging for this area because of their life experience.

For meanings based upon social structure, the Republic Square has witnessed many demonstrations before the 1960 coup which highlights the relations between space-power-ideology. However, the Republic Square have been effected by the plans which were made within context of industrialization, migration and urbanization (which ocured after the 60's was insufficient); urban planning decisions which are for the benefit of the people, what's powerful from an economic point of view. The decrease of public ownership, increasing privatization, the increase in commercial and financial functions have developed based on rising of the cities vertically and horizontally and the increasing density of the city. In this sense, the official ideological identity of the Republic Square (which is the most important public space in city centre) that was dominant at previous periods have started to decrease by increasing commercial structures and commercial complexes in this period, as the space has become suitable for the mechanisms and operations of Capitalism. For meanings based upon publicity level and type, usage in daily life continues: public usage such as the Bursa Festival which has social aspects has been added to official public usages in square. In this period, the Republic Square had a lively publicity whose social side is associated by urbanites, is the dominant type of subjective usage.

- The Republic Square between 1980 and 2010

The fourth period covers the period from 1980's to the present time. Developments in all functions by neo-liberal politics and the trends related to globalization (coming to fore by the 90's) affected Bursa City and the Republic Square. Within this period, changes in the social and administrative structure in addition to metropolitanisation and the abandonment of the city centre within planning-design-implementation dimension, inadequacies in user rights and needs and small-scale projects which are realized by local authorities against those in use and the dimension of governance have come to the fore. In terms of the dimension of meaning, it was seen that space-user interaction has decreased and global ideology is prevailing within the space.

When urban images in the Republic Square are evaluated for meanings based upon environmental aesthetics; it was seen that paths which are used most by users are pavements in Ataturk Street, in particular in front of Setbasi, the underpasses, and the

north south connections. Within context of borders; it was seen that the large scale Gokdere and Setbasi bridges in the eastern side, the different buildings between the Finance Building and the City Museum which are defined as a separate region because of differences of levels, and trees around Ataturk Sculpture are defined as limiters. For regions; the Republic Square is to be considered as the part of a region which is defined as the historical city centre. It was also mentioned that the Republic Square has come to fore within the city since it includes registered buildings which have similar properties according to their construction period and architectural style, since it includes the symbolic the Ataturk Sculpture and because of its name. As a node point, the Republic Square has been defined as a junction where important roads intersect in Sculpture (Heykel) region. The things which will come into mind are Ataturk Sculpture and Governor and Theatre Buildings for monumental elements, Ataturk, and Kafkas Pastry Shop as the meeting point. (Figure 2)



Figure 2. Republic Square, 2011 (Sibel Polat Archive)

For symbolic meanings based upon built environment in the Republic Square; it was determined that the Ataturk Sculpture, and the name of the place (Heykelonu) which is caused from this sculpture and historical structures which have same architectural style describe the space. Answers which are given for what Republic Square represents are focused on Turkish Republic, Ataturk, state, ceremony and Bursa city.

It was highlighted from meanings based upon spatial behaviours that square is mostly used by young people and students and square is not symbolic embraced as it is before. It was mentioned that it does not have old usage potential, only the Kafkas Pastry shop is still used as meeting point, and Heykel is used as reference point in address

description. Square is used mostly for shopping by low mid income group and as a meeting point for transportation because of habits. In this manner, it is mentioned that demand for shopping center which defined as public open private spaces has decreased the liveliness in centers, region has been left with its own destiny, usage habit of this area has decreased because of both dense traffic and since people meet their requirements from shopping centers which are close to them.

For the meanings based upon users' spatial experiences; it was observed that generally individuals form connections with Republic Square because of memories which they had experienced and founded social connections which provide them to share symbolic meanings for ceremonies, celebrations, commemorations, and activities which they have participated. For the feeling of belonging; people who was born in Bursa or people who live in Bursa more than ten years declare that they feel belonging to Republic Square and people who live less than ten years mention that they do not feel belonging to Bursa.

Meanings based upon social structure in Republic Square indicate that power of ideology has disappeared and public spaces have been reshaped according to principles of globalism as seen in many cities.

For meanings based upon publicity level and type; publicity which is left, impoverished and prohibited come to the fore depending on the transformation in public life. Also even though its past effect has decreased for usages having official aspect point of view users define the Republic Square as a meeting point for official where social rituals such as ceremonies, celebrations, commemorations, activities and demonstrations are realized. They mentioned that with developments in communication technology for social usage, space is not a location for spending time anymore and transformed into a place which is passed for just necessities.

5. Discussion and Conclusion

As a conclusion, in the first period Sarayonu can be described as a place, because of the experiences and the meaning attributed to it. Thus, Sarayonu had the feeling of identity. In terms of difference, it was the sole place where the new public spaces and functions (government palace and the theatre) were. In terms of permanence, it protected itself till the Republican period, and also it had power over the city because of its administrative function. It was the reflection of the power of the Ottoman Empire. Briefly, in this period Sarayonu can be described as a threshold which represented the political power and ideology and which exhibited a public life under pressure and a public life to be taught to become westernized.

Also, in the second period It is obvious that the Republic Square had also the feeling of identity in this period. In terms of difference, it was the sole place which included administrative-cultural functions and the Ataturk Sculpture. In terms of permanence,

the old functions were sustained in the area. New governmental and public buildings were built on the old government palace and the theatre. Thus, it had power over the city because of its administrative function and its symbolic representation of government, Ataturk and the Turkish Republic. Briefly, in this period the Republic Square can be described as a modernist scene which represented the political power, the Republic ideology, national identity and a conservative public life.

It is seen that the Republic Square once again had the feeling of identity in the third period. In terms of difference, it became the main centre of the city with its functions and public buildings, and it gained a symbolic meaning with the Ataturk Sculpture, with its name and being a meeting and reference point. Besides, the Republic Square gained both physical and semantic continuity by including the public buildings, the theatre, the Ataturk Sculpture and the clock tower. Also, it had power over the city because of being the main centre and its symbolic content. In short, the Republic Square during this period, can be described as an encounter area where the collective identity was built in Bursa and the changing ideologies and a vital public life exhibited.

In the fourth period, it is obvious that the Republic Square has difficulties in sustaining its identity. During the deep interviews with the users, it was expressed that, in terms of difference, the area is still unique because of having Ataturk Sculpture and four public buildings which represent the Republican period. These are also effective in terms of permanence. However, it was stated that, the area is no more the only administrative centre and socialization area in the city. In addition to this, urban memory has weakened because of disappearing old functions (closing old shops, patisseries, restaurants and tearooms) social structure (loosing friends and acquaintances) in the area. In terms of power, as the Republic Square lost being the only centre in the city, it has not got power as much as before, it is effective only in terms of its symbolic context and location. In short, the Republic Square during this period, can be described as a transition area where an inhibited and weak public life is presented and which is dominated by the global ideology.

At this point, from the case of Republic Square, it is thought that if the related institutions start working to sustain public open spaces located in the city centre by making different dimensional analysis, producing necessary urban design decisions with interdisciplinary and participatory methods in a holistic perspective and implement these decisions step by step, Bursa will have significant gains in terms of the quality of public life.

References

Akkılıç, Y. (2002). 'Republic Square'. *Bursa Encyclopedia*. Vol: 1, İstanbul: Harman Ofset.

Arıtan, Ö. (2008) 'Modernleşme ve Cumhuriyetin Kamusal Mekan Modelleri', *Mimarlık*, (342): 49-56.

Aslanoğlu, A. R. (2000) *Kent, Kimlik ve Küreselleşme*. Bursa: Asa Kitapevi.

Aydınlı, S. (2008) 'Mekandan Mekansala: Mekanın Zamansallığı/Zamanın Mekansallığı' In: Şentürer, A., Ural, Ş., Berber, Ö., Uz Sönmez, F. (eds), *Zaman-Mekan*, İstanbul: Yem Yayın. pp.150-161.

Ayran, N. (1996) Çoğulcu Toplumda İdeoloji ve Mimarlık. In: Aydın, N. (ed.), *İdeoloji, Erk ve Mimarlık Sempozyumu Bildiri Kitabı*, İzmir: Çimentaş Matbaası, pp. 33-39.

Bilgin, N. (1997) *Siyaset ve İnsan*. İstanbul: Bağlam Yayıncılık.

Carmona, M., Heath, T., Oc, T., Tiesdell, S. (2003) *Public Places- Urban Spaces*. Oxford: Elsevier.

Carr, S., Francis, M., Rivlin, L.G., Stone., A. M. (1992) *Public space*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Certau, M. (2008) *Gündelik Hayatın Keşfi I*. Ankara: Dost Kitabevi.

Codol, J. P. (1984) 'Social differentiation and non- differentiation'. In: H. Tajfel (ed). *The Social Dimension: Volume 1: European Developments in Social Psychology*. New York: Cambridge University Press. pp. 314-358.

Çelik, Z. (2007) 'Sokaklar ve Kentleşme Süreci' In: Çelik, Z., Favro, D., Ingersoll, R.(eds.), *Şehirler ve Sokaklar*. İstanbul: Kitap Yayınevi, pp. 7-14.

Goldsteen, J. B., Elliott, C. D. (1994) *Designing America: Creating Urban Identity*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

Gür, Ş. Ö. (1996) *Mekan Örgütlenmesi*. Trabzon: Gür Yayıncılık.

Hortaçsu, N. (2007) *Ben, Biz, Siz, Hepimiz*. Ankara: İmge Kitabevi.

Karabey, H. (1980) *Kent Olgusu*. İstanbul: Kent Basımevi.

Kostof, S. (1991) *The City Shaped: Urban Patterns and Meanings Through History*. New York: Bulfinch,

Kostof, S. (1999) *The City Assembled: Elements of Urban Form Through History*. London: Thames And Hudson.

Lang, J. (1987) *Creating Architectural Theory: The Role of the Behavioral Sciences in Environmental Design*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

Lefebvre, H. (2007) *Modern Dünyada Gündelik Hayat*. İstanbul: Metis Yayınları,

Lynch, K. (1975) *The Image of the City*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Madanipour, A. (2010) *Whose Public Spaces?* London: Taylor and Francis.

Neil, W. J. V. (2004) *Urban Planning and Cultural Identity*. London: Routledge

Norberg-Schulz, C. (1984) *Genius Loci: Towards a Phenomenology of Architecture*. New York: Rizzoli.

Polat, S. (2013) *Mimari Kimliği Değerlendirmek İçin Bir Yöntem Önerisi: Bursa Cumhuriyet Alanı Örneği*, Bursa: Nilüfer Belediyesi Yayınları.

Rapoport, A. (1990) *The Meaning of the Built Environment*. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press.

Saint-Laurent, B. (1996) Bir Tiyatro Amatörü: Ahmet Vefik Paşa ve 19. Yüzyılın Son Çeyreğinde Bursa'nın Yeniden Biçimlenmesi. In: Dumont, P., Georgeon, F. (eds), *Modernleşme Sürecinde Osmanlı Kentleri*. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları. pp.79-98.

Seamon, D., Sowers, J. (2008) *Place and Placelessness, Edward Relph*. In: Hubbard, P., Kitchen, R., Vallentine, G. (eds.) *Key Texts in Human Geography*. London: Sage, pp. 43-51.

Sennett, R. (1996) *Kamusal İnsanın Çöküşü*. İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları.

Yürekli, F. (2008) 'Zaman ve Mimarlık'. In: Şentürer, A., Ural, Ş., Berber, Ö., Uz Sönmez, F. (eds), *Zaman-Mekan*, İstanbul: Yem Yayın. pp. 162-163.