

The geographer Yi-Fu Tuan coined the term *topophilia* to describe “the affective bond between people and place” (Duncan and Duncan, 2001:41). He said that this bond may be stronger for some individuals than for others and can be expressed differently by people from different cultures (Duncan and Duncan, 2001:41). Topophilia is an affective response to place, but it is also “a practice that can actively produce places for people” (Duncan and Duncan, 2001:41). That is, the bond people have to a place can help to change the nature of that place. Bachelard (1969) also discusses topophilia in *The Poetics of Space*, arguing that “the life of the mind is given form in the places and spaces³ in which people dwell and those places influence human memories, feelings and thoughts. Inner space is externalized and outer space brought within” (Malpas, 1999:5). Bachelard argues that this bond between people and place means that an investigation of places is essential “in any phenomenological/psychoanalytic study of memory, self and mind” (Malpas, 1999:5).

The related idea of ‘sense of place’ has received more attention than Tuan’s topophilia, but the two ideas are closely linked. Rose explains that “senses of place develop from every aspect of individuals’ life experience and ... senses of place pervade everyday life and experience” (1995:88). Rose notes that while one’s sense of place can be very personal, it is “shaped in large part by the social, cultural and economic circumstances in which individuals find themselves” (1995:89). Rose (1995) provides a working definition of a sense of place. She says that the idea of a sense of

place usually assumes that places have no inherent meanings, only the meanings given to them by humans. Beyond this agreement, Rose identifies three main arguments about the nature of senses of place.

1. A sense of place is seen as natural. Sometimes it is argued that a sense of place is a territorial instinct and some argue that it is a survival instinct. (Rose, 1995:98).
2. “A sense of place is seen as a result of the meanings people actively give to their lives ... a sense of place can be seen as part of our cultural interpretation of the world around us” (Rose, 1995:99). Some writers have argued that “it is an awareness of cultural *difference* which may encourage a sense of place to develop” (Rose, 1995:99) and that power relations are important in understanding a sense of place.
3. “A sense of place is part of the politics of identity” (Rose, 1995:103). This includes the idea of defining oneself in opposition to an ‘other’ (Rose, 1995:104).

Tuan, however, makes a distinction between ‘rootedness’ and a ‘sense of place’. While the first set of arguments above may be relevant for the concept of rootedness, Tuan would argue that only the second and third points actually relate to a ‘sense of place’. The distinction Tuan makes is that “rootedness implies being at home in a unselfconscious way. Sense of place, on the other hand, implies a certain distance between self and place which allows the self to appreciate a place” (Tuan, 1980:4). In short, “rootedness is unreflexive” (Tuan, 1980:6). Rootedness is “a knowing that is the result of familiarity through long residence” while a sense of place is “a knowing that is the result of conscious effort” (Tuan, 1980:8). This important distinction will be discussed further below.

³ Bachelard (1969) appears to use the terms ‘place’ and ‘space’ interchangeably.

- porary world (*security*)
- iv) home is a secure base around which identities are constructed (*security and identity*).

The psycho-social approach to home concentrates on the individual's psychological experiences of home. For example, Porteous argues that the home provides humans with all the satisfactions that territory provides to many species of animal, namely identity, security and the stimulation of its occupants (1976: 383). Personalization of one's home promotes security and identity, while the defence and modification of one's home promotes stimulation (1976:383–385). Such descriptions of home as a place where one feels ontologically secure also focus on the 'satisfactions' of identity and security and, to a lesser extent, stimulation. For example, Dupuis and Thorns state that ontological security is experienced in the home when the following four conditions are met:

- i) home is a site of constancy in the social and material environment (*security*)
- ii) home is a spatial context in which day to day routines of human existence are performed (*security*)
- iii) home is a site where people feel most in control of their lives (*stimulation*) because they feel free from the surveillance that is part of the contem-

⁸ Rather than the family, as the family is just one specific form of household (Saunders and Williams, 1988:82).