

From Home to Community and Settlement: Sense of Place in Different Scales

Shmuel Shamai^{1,2}, Sara Arnon^{1,2} and Izchak Schnell³

¹*Tel-Hai College, Upper Galilee, 12208, Israel*

²*Golan Research Institute, University of Haifa, POB 97, Kazrin, Israel, 12900*

³*Tel-Aviv University, Department of Geography and the Human Environment, Tel-Aviv, Israel*

KEYWORDS Attachment to Place. Uprooted People. Lost Places. Temporary Residence. Region

ABSTRACT This research disassembles the factors included in the concept of sense of place into its components. The study took place among 120 evacuees from both Gaza and northern Samaria. The research investigates what factors affect the creation of an attachment to place and what characterizes each level separately. It was found that the physical landscape is important both for the new place and the previous place and along with the landscape, there are different specific aspects: the attachment to home is primarily connected to the basic family circle, attachment to settlement is primarily formed by attachment to the community circle, and the attachment to the region is ideological.

SENSE OF PLACE

The term sense of place has been discussed in the literature in a variety of ways. There are different approaches to describe the attitudes of the people towards the places they live and there are different terms to describe these attitudes. These include terms such as national identity and regional awareness and also attachment to the place, which contains a multi-level dimension of place. Thus the term attachment to place is quite similar to the term sense of place with respect to the focus of this study.

In quantitative and qualitative research, differences have been found in sense of place according to cultural, social and physical components. The term "place" involves the combined human and physical environment, and includes attitudes and human emotions toward it.

Shamai and Kellerman (1985) indicate the association between sense of place (region) and socio-cultural, political, and administrative aspects of regional boundary demarcation, physical aspects of place, which together constitute attachment to place.

An empirical example of the importance of the physical landscape, the geographical environment, appears in the research of Eisenhauer et al. (2000). The researchers found that the two leading reasons were connected to their families and their friends (37%) and environmental characteristics (landscape) (34%). Out of four

sub-samples, in two sub-samples, environmental characteristics were most important. Interviewees cited the landscape with comments expressing sentiments stemming from the physical uniqueness of the area, the landscapes, the weather, geological factors, the environmental location, the place as inducing serenity, and physical characteristics including animals in nature. Kaltenborn (1997) has found that a range of attributes, including the natural and cultural environment, family and social activities, history and traditions, are all important in the development of affective bonds with places.

Feelings towards places are varied. Empirical studies have pointed out that the variety of feelings towards a place is culturally related. For example, a study conducted in Hong Kong found that homeowners expressed stronger connections than renters (La Grange and Ming 2001). Shamai and Kellerman (1985) found that in regions with unique scenery, with clear geographical borders, and with regional cooperative organizations, there were higher degrees of awareness than in other regions of Israel. In contrast, personal variables (such as age, number of years in a particular settlement and number of years in the region, country of birth and years of education) almost did not contribute to explanations of differences in the regional awareness, of the respondents (Shamai and Kellerman 1985). Other empirical studies also have pointed out that the variety of the levels regarding feelings towards a place are culturally, socially and physically related (Hay 1998; Hernandez et al. 2007; Lewicka 2010).

Address for correspondence:
Shmuel Shamai,
E-mail: shamai@research.haifa.ac.il

This article examines place comparatively, starting from the home, continuing with the type of settlement and the region. The term "place" is devoid of particular territorial delineations. It may range from a private home to any part of the globe (May 1970). This study examines the sense of place for different levels of place.

Most of the research lack of distinction between various levels of place when referring to the sense of place. For example, Eisenhauer et al. (2000) compared attachment to place of four different places in Utah, US, and ignored the different levels of place scale. In contrast, there are a few studies which deal with different levels of place separately (for example, Shamai 1991). However, up to now, no distinction has been made according to changing levels of place in order to investigate whether there are special characteristics of connection to place according to the changing levels of place, that is, for home, settlement and region. This research deals with that question.

The research studies that have taken more than one type of place into account demonstrate that attitudes towards place and their predictors may differ depending on the place scale. For instance, in one study participants chose three places with which they identified most, ranging from city district to the world. City was selected far more often than district/neighborhood or country or region (Lewicka 2010). However, Shamai and Ilatov (2005), who studied attachment to town, region and state in Israel among groups of immigrants and long-time residents, did not find a clear pattern of relationship between scale of place and intensity of attachment. They also found that the intensity of attachment to the city, region and state are positively correlated among themselves.

This study deals with relocated/uprooted people, thus there is an opportunity to examine sense of place of the previous and current place. "Uprooting" or "removal" is a kind of migration that is defined by two main characteristics: 1. People who are removed are coerced and do not leave by free will. 2. Removal involves a permanent and irreversible change of dwelling place.

Uprooting is not a one stage occasion; it is a longitudinal and complicated process that starts with the anticipation stage, continues with the stage of the actual uprooting and then, the last

stage, the period after removal, the relocation and rehabilitation period, which is generally a process that takes a long time. This research deals with this prolonged last stage.

Many research studies point out that immigration is a stressful situation which causes severe problems and difficulties (Boneh 1993; De Wet 1993). Four main influences have been observed by different investigators in different uprooting events (Erikson 1972; Fried 1972; Erikson 1976; Ager 1999): physical pressure; psychological pressure; social-cultural pressure and positive reactions. As this study deals with relocated people, an interesting aspect will be probed: the relations to their current and previous settlement and region with the added dimension of a longitudinal study.

THE GAZA STRIP AND NORTHERN SAMARIA

The residents of the Gaza Strip and northern Samaria had settled there for both ideological motives and in order to improve their standard of living (Schnell and Mishal 2005). In August 2005 the evacuation took place. Twenty-one settlements were destroyed in the Gaza Strip. In northern Samaria, four settlements were evacuated. During the period between the announcement of the "disengagement" until it was carried out, the residents experienced a period of uncertainty regarding the implementation of the removal and their futures following the disengagement. The SELA Administration (Administration for Assistance to Settlers from the Gaza Strip and Northern Samaria) was established to aid the displaced citizens in the process of resettlement and to try to assist in their rehabilitation until they were permanently settled. Most of the uprooted were first referred to temporary residences in hotels, and later to temporary residence in various settlements throughout the country, until permanent housing could be build. Thus, the state of uncertainty continued even during the period after the displacement.

This research deals with the implications of situations of forced evacuation, the reactions of the uprooted in relation to the creation of a connection/attachment to the new place with a variety of criteria: to the home and to the settlement and region, which is a connection/attachment which was formed under conditions of

uncertainty and crisis experienced by the evacuees. The research investigates what factors affect the connection to the new place, focusing on a unique group of uprooted people who are in various stages of being resettled, some who have already moved on from being uprooted to progressing in their permanent settlement and some who are still looking for a place to set down their roots.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND METHODOLOGY

- What are the factors which affect the creation of attachment to place (both to the new place and to the previous place) in regard to geographic factors (physical landscape), socio-psychological factors (quality of life, community activity, coping with personal problems) and background demographic variables (gender, age, length of time in the settlement, religiosity) and variables which should lead to less uncertainty (employment and a permanent home)?
- What characterizes each level of place separately regarding attachment to place?

The empirical research tools which were used to investigate the intensity of attachment to place were questionnaires on which respondents were asked to mark their sense of attachment to their present and former places of residence, to their present and former region, and towards the state using a scale of 11 rankings, from +5 (a very positive attachment) to -5 (a very negative attachment), while a grade of 0 indicated lack of any attachment. This tool was developed and published by Arnon, Ilatov, Shamai (Shamai and Arnon 2005; Shamai and Ilatov 2005).

From October 2007 to November 2008, 120 adults were interviewed in depth and were asked many questions regarding both their attachment to place and a range of additional variables.

FINDINGS

Background Data

Age of the Interviewees ranged from 20 to 70 years old. They had lived in their previous settlement between one and twenty-seven years, with an average of fourteen years.

Educational Background of the Interviewees: Thirty-two percent had completed up

to and including 12 years of study, 32% had completed non-academic post-high school studies, and 37% had an academic diploma.

Sixty-six of the interviewees (55%) were women and 54 (45%) were men. Sixty-nine percent had been born in Israel and the rest (31%) had been born in a variety of other countries. Years of immigration to Israel ranged from 1948 to 2001. The median year was 1979. Twenty percent of the interviewees stated that they were secular, 18% were traditional and 62% were orthodox.

Sense of Place of the Current and the Previous Place

The previous place for most evacuees was very central to their lives and they were united in personal, communal and national life. The lost place had shaped their Zionist identity, as it was consolidated during their residence there. Thus, it is not surprising that they still have very strong positive feelings towards their previous (lost) place, as apparent in Table 1.

From the data in Table 1, it is clear that the attachment to previous place is very intense three years after the disengagement. There was not even one interviewee who expressed negative attachment to any of the three types of previous place which were investigated! About 80-90% stated that they felt the strongest possible intensity of positive attachment (+5). This was expressed in the average intensity of attachment to settlement and region which is very high, 4.7 and 4.8. For example, in research conducted in Kiryat Shmona (Shamai and Ilatov 2005) in 2001, one year after the Israel Defense Forces withdrawal from Lebanon, 57% of the interviewees indicated level five in connected to place, and 59% felt the same about the region. The average intensity of attachment to the settlement and to the region was 4.0. Kiryat Shmona at the time was experiencing a period of "normalcy" without shelling from over the border. The gap demonstrates the great strength of attachment to place among the evacuees.

In contrast, the attitude towards their present place was significantly lower in intensity. The closer to the inner circle (from region to settlement to home), the weaker is the attachment and the negatively intense reactions increase (from 14% towards region, to 20% towards settlement, and to 30% towards the home). The

Table 1: Attachment to previous and present place: Distribution in percentages, averages and standard deviation

	<i>Previous home</i>	<i>Present home</i>	<i>Previous settlement</i>	<i>Present settlement</i>	<i>Previous region</i>	<i>Present region</i>
-5 Very negative attachment	-	13.6	-	11.0	-	6.5
-4	-	4.5	-	3.7	-	2.8
-3	-	9.1	-	3.7	-	2.8
-2	-	1.8	-	2.8	-	1.9
-1	-	0.9	-	-	-	-
0	1.8	19.1	0.9	13.8	1.8	15.7
1	-	10.0	0.9	12.8	-	13.0
2	2.7	14.5	-	13.8	0.9	10.2
3	4.5	12.7	5.3	19.3	-	24.1
4	7.2	7.3	14.2	9.2	7.3	7.4
5- Very positive attachment	83.8	6.4	78.8	10.1	89.9	15.7
Sum total-%(N)	100.0(111)	100.0 (110)	100.0 (113)	100.0 (109)	100.0 (109)	100.0 (109)
Average	4.7	0.2*	4.7	1.0*	4.8	1.6*
Standard deviation	0.9	3.1	0.8	3.0	0.8	2.8

*Paired t-test, between previous place and present place, $P > 0.000$

intensity of attachment to the home is the lowest and in fact, it is on the level of “no attachment”. While the attachments to the three previous places were high and were almost completely identical in intensity, the attachment to the new places increases to the extent that the place is larger, or alternatively, attachment becomes lower as the place becomes smaller and becomes more concrete.

When comparing between attachment to present place and previous place on the three levels (home, settlement, region) the gap in the paired t-test is significant (in all three, $P = 0.000$). When comparing the differences in standard deviations, homogeneity is salient in relation to the intensity of attachment to previous place in comparison to the heterogeneity with regard to the intensity of attachment to the present place.

Fifty-four 54 respondents were living in their permanent settlements (45%); the rest, more than half (55%) were still not living in their permanent settlement points. When differences in levels of intensity of sense of place are probed among these two groups, the differences are noticeable, as apparent in the Table 2.

The results indicate that many of the respondents have negative feelings about their current place and this is mainly true of those who do not yet reside in their permanent settlements. It appears that for those who are living in their permanent settlements, the average strength of attachment to their places is more positive for the three levels of place which were investigated, and the gaps between the two groups are significant on the three levels, according to the t-test. The respondents who are not living in their permanent settlement of residence were ranked around a value of 0 which means no attachment. A negative average of attachment to place on the scale used in this research is rare, and thus, the negative attachment to the present home is striking. It becomes clear that the factor of uncertainty has great significance regarding sense of place. It is difficult to develop a positive attachment to place when one does not know where s/he will live.

Moreover, living in a place which is unlikely to be your permanent home settlement leads to a sense of alienation towards it. Twenty-one to thirty-eight percent cited a negative attitude for

Table 2: Attachment to present places of residence according to permanent or temporary settlement of residence

	<i>Living in the permanent settlement</i>			<i>Not living in the permanent settlement</i>			<i>t-Test</i>	
	<i>% of those with negative attachment</i>	<i>Average</i>	<i>Standard deviation</i>	<i>% of those with negative attachment</i>	<i>Average</i>	<i>Standard deviation</i>	<i>Calculated value of T</i>	<i>Level of significance (P)</i>
Present Home	20	1.1	3.1	38	-0.55	2.9	2.8	0.005
Present Settlement	12	1.9	2.9	29	0.2	3.0	3.1	0.002
Present Region	6	2.6	2.3	21	0.7	2.9	3.6	0.001

each of the levels of place in the various criteria among those who were not living in their permanent settlement of residence in contrast to from 6% to 29% correspondingly, of those who were living in their permanent settlement.

The internal connections between levels of attachment of place were examined (Table 3) for the three levels (home, settlement and region) in the past and in the present. The internal connections between the three present places are very strong and this is also true for the three places from which the respondents were evacuated. In contrast, there is no connection between the previous places and the present ones. (It is either low in intensity or trivial, but almost always in the opposite direction.)

The Effect of Background Demographic Variables

The effect of gender was examined and it became clear that both men and women demonstrate similar patterns on the subject. There were no gaps great enough to be statistically significant. In addition, the intensity of attachment to home was investigated in relation to difference in religiosity (secular/traditional and religious orthodox/ultraorthodox). The findings regarding the three groups revolve around the intensity of non-attachment (secular 0.9, traditional -0.3, and religious 0.1). In a test of variance, the gaps were not significant. Using the Scheffe post-hoc test, the gaps between the pairs were not found to be significant.

The connections between attachment to the three different places at different times, and number of years of living in the previous settlement, as well as age of the respondents were investigated (using Pearson correlations) and all were lower than a level of 0.3 (in absolute value).

The respondents were asked about five possible reasons for coming to the previous settlement in Gaza or in northern Samaria. Fifty-seven percent answered positively to the possibility "ideological/religious mission", 49% cited "improvement in quality of life- landscape and environment", 29% answered positively to the possibility "self-realization as a person", 26% - "Due to friends/ relatives, and only 13% mentioned that an improvement in their economic status was a factor drawing them to settle in Gaza or in northern Samaria. Connections between attachments to the three different levels of place were investigated before and after the evacuation, for the five reasons for migration to the previous settlement (according to Pearson's correlations) and all were lower than the level of 0.3 (in absolute value).

Attachment to place was investigated among those who were employed at the time of the interview in contrast to those who were unemployed. No significant differences were found between the two groups according to the t- test regarding attachment to settlement and to region, but there was a significant difference (according to the t-test) in attachment to the homes they were living in at the time of the interview; the employed demonstrated a stronger attachment in contrast to the unemployed.

Table 3: Internal connections (according to Pearson's correlations) between levels of attachment to place on three levels (home, settlement and region) in the past and in the present

		Attachment to present home	Attachment to previous settlement	Attachment to present settlement	Attachment to previous region	Attachment to present region
Attachment to Previous Home	R	-0.12	0.50	-0.14	0.50	-0.04
	N	110	111	108	109	107
	P	0.223	*0.000	0.164	*0.000	0.625
Attachment to Present Home	R		-0.09	0.53	-0.05	0.50
	N		110	108	108	107
	P		0.362	*0.000	0.582	*0.000
Attachment to Previous Settlement	R			-0.12	0.83	-0.09
	N			109	109	108
	P			0.230	*0.000	0.335
Attachment to Present Settlement	R				0.01	0.73
	N				107	106
	P				0.960	*0.000
Attachment to Previous Region	R					-0.06
	N					107
	P					0.571

The significant gaps regarding the temporariness/permanence of the place of residence and the employment instability indicate the effect of the uncertainty, which rises and has a significant effect on the strength of attachment to place, to the point of alienation from the place when referring to the home.

Factors Affecting Attachment to Previous and Present Home, Settlement and Region

The pool of data makes it possible to refer to the research question of what factors affect the creation of attachment to various levels of previous and present place. Clusters of variables were investigated, connected to feelings, physical landscape, quality of life, community activities and coping with personal problems.

Various feelings were examined, most of them negative, but also positive feelings which came up during the entire process and afterwards. Correlations were examined between intensity of attachment to place when living in the previous settlement, Gaza or northern Samaria, and the present place; and the feelings immediately after the disengagement and those at the time of the interview, three years later. We did not relate to correlations of low intensity which had an absolute value of under 0.3. Only the data for correlations having an absolute value of 0.3 and greater (in all of them $P < 0.003$) are presented in Table 4.

From the data presented in Table 5, it can be concluded that the strength of attachment to the previous home is connected to feelings of pain and anger, of abandonment and uncertainty, mostly both in the past and at present. In con-

trast, positive attachment to the present home expresses hope in the past and present, and inverse relations to the present state of uncertainty and stress. Feelings for the present and previous homes are still connected to the strength of attachment to these places. Attachment to the present settlement is linked (negatively) with present pressure and stress, and (positively) with present hopes. Attachment to previous settlement is not connected to any of the feelings and this is true as well for attachment to previous and present regions.

It should be noted that feelings place the home in a central position. The home draws the great majority of feelings, for good and for bad: Reinforcement of attachment to the previous home is accompanied by reinforcement of negative feelings (and the opposite) and, reinforcement of attachment to the new home is accompanied by reinforcement of positive feelings (and the opposite). The problems and personal distress are projected mainly on the strength of attachment to present home.

According to the results of Table 5, when investigating the connection between the various factors and the strength of attachment to the various places before and after disengagement, it becomes clear that:

- There is a sweeping and comprehensive connection to the physical landscape (on the three levels of attachment to place, both in the past and in the present).
- The ideological issue is related to all levels of attachment to place, primarily in the past and less in the present.
- The quality of life is related primarily to attachment to present settlement and not to attachment to present home or region.

Table 4: Pearson's correlations (having an absolute value of correlation coefficient of at least 0.3) and attachment between previous and present places of residence, and feelings immediately after the disengagement and at present

	Attachment to previous place			Attachment to present place		
	Home	Settlement	Region	Home	Settlement	Region
Anger in the past	0.348					
Anger in the present						
Pain in the past						
Pain in the present	0.388					
Abandonment in the past	0.339					
Abandonment in the present	0.368					
Uncertainty in the past	0.336					
Uncertainty in the present	0.331			-0.305		
Pressure, stress in the past						
Pressure, stress in the present				-0.402		-0.414
Hope in the past				0.311		
Hope in the present				0.412		0.321

Table 5: Pearson's correlations (with an absolute value of correlation coefficient of at least 0.3) between attachment to previous and present places of residence, and various factors before and after the disengagement

	<i>Attachment to previous place</i>			<i>Present place</i>		
	<i>Home</i>	<i>Settlement</i>	<i>Region</i>	<i>Home</i>	<i>Settlement</i>	<i>Region</i>
<i>Physical Landscape</i>						
I became strongly attached to the landscapes of the place I live\ed.	0.309	0.490	0.580	0.302	0.400	0.455
<i>Ideology</i>						
My living in the region was/is important.	0.304	0.405	0.459		0.431	
<i>Family</i>						
The community was/is a good place to raise children.	0.468				0.340	
<i>Community</i>						
Quality of life					0.457	
I was/am personally willing to contribute to the community	0.414	0.388	0.301		0.394	0.317
My community was/is characterized by its cohesiveness.					0.403	
I was/am strongly attached to the community.					0.432	0.350
There was/is mutual assistance among residents in my community.					0.431	

- The community is perceived as the population of the settlement and it plays a key role in the creation of attachment to place in the present settlement. In all six of the variables, there was a medium or higher connection with the present settlement. The level of attachment to present settlement directly depends on community integration.

Multivariate Analysis

In order to examine the factors which affect attachment to the present and previous settlement a stepwise regression was performed in which the independent variables with a significant cumulative effect were entered into the procedure. The data was divided into two groups based on level of religiosity: secular and traditional—45 respondents, and religious (of all types)—74 respondents.

First the dependent variable, attachment to previous settlement was examined (on a scale of 11, ranging from -5 to +5) and the following independent variables:

- I was strongly attached to the landscape of the place.
- I was strongly attached to the community.
- I felt that my residing in the region was important to the state.
- I realized myself as a person.
- I advanced economically.

- I felt that I had influence on the future of the state.
- There was mutual assistance among the residents.
- The settlement was a good place to raise children.
- Quality of life.
- High quality population.
- I was personally willing to contribute to the community.
- The settlement was characterized by community cohesiveness.
- There was community cultural life.
- I felt safe from harm in life and limb.

From an analysis of the results of the regression regarding the dependent variable: attachment to previous settlement, it was found that for the secular-traditional group, the variable which was first in importance was "I was strongly attached to the landscape of the place." The variable second in importance was "The settlement is characterized by community cohesiveness". The sum of the explained variance of attachment to previous settlement of the secular and traditional group (R^2) was 0.318.

While, for the secular and traditional group the factor which was first in importance was attachment to the physical landscape; among the religious respondents, first in importance was the ideological factor. Among both groups, the community factor was found to be second in

Table 6: Regression analysis- Dependent variables: Strength of attachment to previous home, to settlement and to region

		<i>R</i>	<i>R</i> ²	<i>P</i>
<i>Home</i>	Good place to raise children	0.473	0.224	0.000
	Landscape	0.599	0.359	0.000
	Contribution to the community	0.638	0.408	0.000
<i>Settlement</i>	Landscape	0.614	0.337	0.000
	Community cohesion	0.667	0.445	0.000
	My living here is important to the state	0.688	0.473	0.000
<i>Region</i>	Landscape	0.688	0.473	0.000
	My living here is important to the state	0.719	0.517	0.000

importance in explaining variance in the attachment to the previous settlement.

When examining attachment to the new settlement with regression analysis, it was found that, for the secular-traditional group, the only variable with meaningful statistical significance was "I am personally willing to contribute to the community" ($R^2=0.325$).

Regarding the religious group, the variable with the greatest statistical significance was: "The settlement is a good place to raise children" and the second most significant was "I am strongly attached to the community of the 'absorbing' settlement" ($R^2=0.366$). While attachment to the previous settlement is made up of communality plus (physical landscape for the secular/traditional group, and ideology among the religious), attachment to the new settlement rests principally on community for both groups.

In order to investigate the variables affecting attachment to place, we carried out regressions with the dependent variable for all levels of attachment to previous place separately, and the independent variables cited above. The results are detailed in Table 6.

The data indicates that physical landscape is the variable which is common in importance for all three levels of place. The higher the measure, the more important it is. The importance of landscape is not dependent on a unique criterion of the place, in contrast to the other variables. It appears that the sense of place is "landscape plus": landscape as a basis with the addition of unique variables for each level. On the level of home, the variable of family (bringing up children) and contribution to the community is added. On the level of settlement, the community aspect is included, and to a lesser extent, the ideological aspect. On the regional level, only the ideological aspect is added to landscape. It appears that the "additional" as-

pect (the "plus") to the geographical-landscape on the regional level is first of all, ideological. On the settlement level it is the community, with a "trickle" of ideology, and on the home level, it is the family, with a "trickle" of community.

DISCUSSION

This research focuses on a subject which is seemingly without focus, amorphous and complex: sense of place. To this end, the concept has been disassembled into its contributing factors according to two principal criteria: according to various measures (home, settlement, and region) and according to a variety of factors (like physical landscape, social, community, family, ideological and others).

This research attempts to organize the overly generalized literature which (unintentionally) blurs the different levels of place and does not distinguish between the various criteria.

The event which was investigated was a situation in which a minority who had been uprooted from their homes, were already living in their new homes, some of them, in their permanent settlement and many others who still did not have permanent homes or settlements. At this intermediate stage, we can identify the factors which are characteristic of those who have formed an attachment to their new place in contrast with those who have not, by comparing between groups and by comparison to the strong attachment they had felt to their previous place.

When investigating the results according to Fullilove's model, a more complex picture emerges in comparison to the model (Fullilove 1996). According to the model, uprooted people create confusion rather than familiarity, nostalgia rather than attachment and alienation rather than identity. This picture characterizes some of the Gaza evacuees who certainly communicate confusion regarding their new place rather

than the intimate acquaintance they had with their previous place. Without a doubt, nostalgia is an important component in their attachment to their previous place. For example, one of the evacuees stated: "Ganim was the love of my life. I wanted to be there until the end of my days. Whoever has not lived in Samaria and has not had the historical experienced of living there, doesn't know what he has missed in his life. I am happy that I was part of our settlement and I will always continue to tell others about it with great love and nostalgia." Alienation also exists; and there are those who feel alienated from their new places. For example, one of the interviewees stated: "As far as I am concerned – I have been disengaged from my family and friends as well, since each of them went off to another place. (We were not enabled to be together!) And I still have not found my home."

But that is only a partial picture. Some of the evacuees and recreated their positive place attachment, with increasing familiarity with the new place and creation of a new identity, in which the old identity usually was not erased but the new one developed alongside it: identification with the elements of geographical landscape on the three levels of place (home, settlement and region) and the addition of new elements which are detailed below.

It appears that the demographic background variables (gender, age, number of years living in the settlement, religiosity), as well, have no effect on the intensity of attachment to place (previous and current). On the other hand, considering the factors involved in personal stability, it appears that those who are living in their permanent settlement have a more positive attachment to all three levels of place than those who are not, and the gaps between the two groups are statistically significant for attitudes towards the present home, the present settlement and the present region.

Regarding the employment status of those who were working at the time of the interview in comparison to those who were unemployed, employment as a personal and family resource was perceived as important in the development of attachment on the closest level: the home. When examining the factors affecting attachment to place, findings indicate the importance of the home (and the family) as a focus for the inundation of feelings. Intensification of attachment to the abandoned home is positively cor-

related with intensity of negative feelings which are increasing (anger, pain, abandonment, uncertainty, stress, tension). On the other hand, intensity of attachment to the new home rises in inverse proportion to some of the negative feelings and in direct proportion to positive feelings (acceptance and hope).

The principal research question which was investigated dealt with the factors affecting the creation of attachment to place in terms of various criteria. It became clear that the physical landscape has a strong connection to attachment to place and that this connection "crosses" place and time: It is relatively strong on all levels of place and during different periods and it appears to be an important dimension in understanding the creation of attachment to (the new) place, and, on the other hand, the preservation of attachment (with regard to the abandoned place). This finding emphasizes the weight of the geographical and physical dimensions of the place, above and beyond the social aspects of community as establishing and enrooting a sense of place. Another important aspect, "a good place to raise children", is positively correlated with attachment to present and previous homes. The home is perceived as connected to family life, and the family is an important value which affects attachment to home but not attachment to settlement or to region.

The importance of attachment to present settlement is striking for all of the community variables which were examined. Attachment to settlement means the ultimate connection to the community. For the place which was abandoned, the previous community is meaningless – it does not exist any longer. Indeed, in the present situation, there is no connection between attachment to present place on the three levels (home, settlement and region) and to past communities. On the other hand, there is a link between attachment to the community of the present settlement, and mainly to the settlement itself, but also to the region. This strengthens the equation: attachment to settlement = community.

A comparative examination of seculars-traditional people in contrast to the religious raises the importance of religion. While the attachment to previous settlement is made up of "communality plus" (in which the "plus" is the physical landscape for the secular-traditional group and the ideological aspect among the religious), the attachment to the new settlement is first and foremost based on community in both groups.

Attachment to the new place signifies dualism: between reliance on nostalgia and protest against the loss of their previous attachment, and, on the other hand, hope for a new life, between a feeling of temporariness and a sense of putting down new roots, between looking back in anger and looking forward with hope.

The heart of the attachment to home consists of aspects connected directly and indirectly to the nuclear family (raising children, employment, permanent home and settlement) and to personal feelings (positive feelings strengthening the attachment to home, and the opposite). Personal and family coping also affect attachment to home.

A positive attachment to settlement means a positive feeling of community. The community is the basis for attachment to settlement; without it, attachment to settlement is absent or negative. The previous community (which has disappeared) was also the basis for attachment to the previous settlement.

A connection to the physical landscape has great weight in attachment to place; even when the place has been abandoned. There are intense memories of the physical landscape, as expressed in statements like: "We lived in a paradise" or "It was the most beautiful place in the world". As the community has broken apart, the physical landscape is what remains, and it also has a great weight for attachment to new places.

The aphorism written by the noted Hebrew poet Saul Tchernichovsky: "a person is molded by the landscape of his homeland", perhaps should be changed to "the landscape of the homeland is molded by the perception of man".

From an analysis of correlations and regressions regarding the contexts between three levels of attachment to place, both previous place and present place, an image of the dominance of physical landscape is (again) portrayed. Added to this factor is another salient aspect in each of the levels: the family on the level of the home, the community on the level of settlement and ideology on the level of region.

It is important to note that in all situations, a sense of place is built on a permanent aspect and a changing aspect: The landscape is the permanent element, both linking and strengthening, and it is important both for a new place and for the previous place. In a state of nostalgia for the past, and especially fixation on the past as viewed in the experiences of the settlers,

landscape is a tangible factor which one can hold on to when remembering the place of the past. Landscape has the power to preserve nostalgia and to give it form. Added to landscape are the additional aspects: construction of the attachment to home is primarily connected to the inner circle of family and attachment to settlement is mainly constructed by the community circle, while attachment to the region is ideological, as settlers project on attachment to the national and ethical circles, for good and for bad.

Uprooted people are like trees which have been uprooted and are seeking new soil to put down roots. Some have already begun to take root in the new earth, thanks to their successful personal coping and to their connection to a sense of community, but some have remained disconnected and they are actually in a stage in which the community of the past has turned into an imagined community of nostalgia, while a sense of real community which they had experienced in the past has not yet taken shape. They had been in a state of "place-yes-ness" in their previous settlement. Some of them have feelings of "place-less-ness" in their new place, and some have feelings "place-yes-ness".

REFERENCES

- Ager A 1999. Perspectives on the refugee experience. In: Ager (Ed.): *Refugees: Perspectives on the Experience of Forced Migration*. London: Cassell, pp. 1-23.
- Boneh D 1993. *Settlement of the Bedouins in the Negev: Policies and Realities 1967-1992*. Jerusalem: Institute for Research of Israel (Hebrew).
- De Wet C 1993. A spatial analysis of involuntary community relocation: A South African case study. In: MM Cernea, SE Guggenheim (Eds.): *Anthropological Approaches to Resettlement: Policy, Practice and Theory*. Boulder: Westview Press, pp. 321-350.
- Eisenhauer BW, Krannich RS, Blahna DJ 2000. Attachment to special places on public lands: An analysis of activities, reason for attachments and community connections. *Society and Natural Resources*, 12: 421-441.
- Erikson KT 1972. *Everything in its Path: Destruction of Community in the Buffalo Creek Flood*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Erikson KT 1976. Loss of communality at Buffalo Creek. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 133(3): 302-251.
- Fried M 1972. Grieving for a lost home. In: R Gutman (Ed.): *People and Buildings*. New York: Basic Books, pp. 229-248.
- Fullilove MT 1996. Psychiatric implications of displacement: Contributions from the psychology of place. *The American Journal of Psychiatry*, 153(12): 1516-1523.
- Hay R 1998. A rooted sense of place in cross-cultural perspective. *Canadian Geographer*, 42(3): 245-266.

- Hernandez B, Hidalgo M, Salazar-Laplace M, Hess S 2007. Place attachment and place identity in natives and non-natives. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 27(4): 310–319.
- Kaltenborn BP 1997. Nature of place attachment: A study among recreation homeowners in Southern Norway. *Leisure-Sciences*, 19(3): 175-189.
- La Grange A, Ming Y 2001. Social belonging, social capital and promotion of home ownership: A case study of Hong Kong. *Housing Studies*, 16(3): 291-310.
- 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.
- May J 1970. *Kant's Concept of Geography*. Toronto: Department of Geography, University of Toronto.
- Schnell Y, Mishal S 2005. *The Settlers of Katif Region*. Jerusalem: Plosheimer Institute for Policy Research (Hebrew).
- Shamai S, Kellerman A. 1985. Conceptual and experimental aspects of regional awareness: An Israeli case study. *Tijdschrift Voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, 76(2): 88-99.
- Shamai S 1991. Sense of place: An empirical measurement. *Geoforum*, 22(3): 347-358.
- Shamai S, Ilatov Z 2005. Measuring sense of place: Methodological aspects. *Tijdschrift Voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, 96(5): 467-476.
- Shamai S, Arnon S 2005. Sense of place of the Golan youngsters. In: M Reuveni, M Livneh, M Hartal, M Inbar, S Shamai (Eds.): *Advances in the Golan Research: Man and Landscape*. Tel Aviv: Ramot Publishing – Tel Aviv University, pp. 175-186 (Hebrew).