

**AGE FRIENDLY CITIES CRITERIA: AN IDEAL TYPE**

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO  
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES  
OF  
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY**

**BY**

**HATİCE NAZLI DÜLGER**

**IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS  
FOR  
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE  
IN  
THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL POLICY**

**SEPTEMBER 2015**

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

---

Prof. Dr. Meliha Altunışık  
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

---

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Fatma Umut Beşpınar  
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

---

Prof. Dr. Ayşe Gündüz Hoşgör  
Supervisor

**Examining Committee Members**

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Özgür Arun (AKD,GER)

Prof. Dr. Ayşe Gündüz Hoşgör (METU,SOC)

Assist. Prof. Dr. Ayşe İdil Aybars (METU,SOC)

---

---

---

**I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.**

Name, Last Name : Hatice Nazlı, Dülger  
Signature :

## **ABSTRACT**

### **AGE FRIENDLY CITY CRITERIA: AN IDEAL TYPE**

Dülger, Hatice Nazlı

Master of Science in Social Policy

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Ayşe Gündüz Hoşgör

September 2015, 122 pages

Relation between aging and environment is a relatively new understanding in literature on aging. Age friendly city concept and practical efforts are basically depends on the relation between aging and environment. Within the scope of this study, age and child friendly environment initiatives are searched in a comparative understanding. Both within different models of age friendly cities and with child friendly cities are described and the differences among them are highlighted. The purpose of this comparison is providing a clear review for age friendly cities criteria and providing an ideal type for age friendly cities criteria those are used around different locations of the world and introduced by World Health Organization.

As a result of this study, an ideal type for age friendly cities is proposed with four aspects, those are including all different criteria those are proposed by different models, having an emphasis on both social and physical environments, having a perspective of human rights of older adults and including older adults during the policy implementation and evaluation processes of being age-friendly.

**Keywords:** age friendly cities, child friendly cities, ideal type, aging in place, active aging

## ÖZ

### YAŞ DOSTU KENT KRİTERLERİ: BİR İDEAL TİP

Dülger, Hatice Nazlı

Yüksek Lisans, Sosyal Politika Anabilim Dalı

Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. Ayşe Gündüz Hoşgör

Eylül 2015, 122 sayfa

Yaşlanma ve çevre arasındaki ilişki, yaşlanma literatüründe yeni sayılabilecek bir bakış açısıdır. Yaş dostu kentler kavramı ve bu bağlamda hayata geçirilen pratik çabalar da yaşlanma ve çevre arasındaki ilişkiye dayanmaktadır. Bu çalışma kapsamında, yaş ve çocuk dostu çevre inisiyatifleri karşılaştırmalı bir anlayış çerçevesinde ele alınmaktadır. Hem literatürde yer alan farklı yaş dostu kent modelleri kendi içinde hem de çocuk dostu kentlerle karşılaştırılarak farklılıkları ve benzerlikleri ortaya konulmaktadır. Bu karşılaştırmanın amacı yaş dostu kentler için net bir gözden geçirmeyi sağlamak ve dünyanın farklı yerlerinde farklı şekillerde kullanılan, Dünya Sağlık Örgütü çalışmaları ile başlayan yaş dostu kent kriterleri için bir ideal tip önerebilmektir.

Bu çalışmanın sonucunda, yaş dostu kentler için dört ayaklı bir ideal tip önerilmektedir; bunlar, farklı modeller tarafından belirlenen tüm özellikleri barındırması, hem sosyal hem de fiziksel çevreye vurgu yapması, yaşlı bireylerin

insan hakları bakış açısına sahip olması, ve yaşlı bireyleri yaş dostu kent politikalarının uygulama ve değerlendirme süreçlerine dahil ediyor olmasıdır.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** yaş dostu kentler, çocuk dostu kentler, ideal tip, yerinde yaşlanma, aktif yaşlanma

To My Grandparents



## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

At the beginning of the acknowledgements list, first and foremost, I would like to express my deepest appreciation and respect to my supervisor Prof. Dr. Ayşe Gündüz Hoşgör. Her insight, understanding, criticisms and encouragement are the most important motivation of mine to complete this thesis. Throughout the thesis Prof. Dr. Ayşe Gündüz Hoşgör paved the way for me with her unique friendly approach. Without her support and wise advices, I would not be able to complete this research. Moreover, I would also like to thank Assoc. Prof. Dr. Özgür Arun and Assist. Prof. Dr. Ayşe İdil Aybars for their criticisms and suggestions during my thesis defense those made me to revise my study and bring it at the last and totally completed version.

Next, I would like to thank to my family; my father İsmail Dülger, my mother Nevin Dülger and my sister Elif Dülger for their limitless love, understanding and all kinds of support those they provided me during the process. I also would like to refer to my close relationship to my grandparents during my life time, it is inspired me to work on aging. Also I would like to thank to beloved Sertaç Örtücü for not to grudge his patience, love and encouragement from me during the whole process, especially for convincing me not give up other major concerns of my life. Moreover, I would like to express my sincere thanks to my friends and home mate for their understanding and support.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM.....	iii
ABSTRACT .....	iv
ÖZ.....	vi
DEDICATION .....	viii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	ix
TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	x
LIST OF TABLES .....	xii
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK.....	10
2.1. Age In Place.....	10
2.1.1. The relation between Place and Aging – Environmental Gerontology.....	11
2.1.2. Age In Place – Environmental Gerontological explanation .....	13
2.1.3. Preference of aging in place from the perspectives of policy makers and older adults .....	15
2.2. Active Aging.....	18
2.2.1. What is active aging: Definition and Determinants.....	19
2.2.2. Functionalist Theories of Aging .....	24
2.2.2.1. Disengagement Theory .....	24
2.2.2.2. Activity Theory .....	26
2.2.3. Historical Evolution of Active Aging.....	27
2.3. Age-friendly Cities .....	32
2.3.1. Historical evolution of the concept.....	34
3. BASIC APPROACHES TO AGE FRIENDLY CITIES / DIFFERENT MODELS.....	38
3.1. Age-friendly Cities of World Health Organization .....	39

3.2. Lifetime Neighborhood of Department for Communities and Local Government UK .....	43
3.3. Livable Community American Association of Retired Persons (AARP).....	47
3.4. Livable Community National Association of Area Agencies on Aging (USA).....	49
3.5. Elder-friendly Community (University of Calgary, Canada).....	53
3.6. Elder-friendly Community (The AdvantAge Initiative, USA).....	56
4. CHILD FRIENDLY CITY MODEL OF UNICEF .....	62
4.1. What is a Child-friendly City .....	62
4.2. Building blocks of a child friendly city .....	64
4.3. Historical Development of the Child friendly Cities Initiatives.....	70
5. DISCUSSION .....	72
5.1. Ideal Type.....	72
5.2. The aspects for an ideal type .....	74
5.3. Similarities and differences of Age-friendly City Models .....	76
5.4. Comparison of Age-friendly versus Child-friendly Cities .....	81
5.4.1. What is missing in age friendly city models.....	85
5.5. An ideal type for age friendly cities .....	88
5.6. Critical areas of Age Friendly Cities .....	90
6. CONCLUSION .....	97
REFERENCES .....	102
APPENDICES	
A. TURKISH SUMMARY .....	109
B. TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU.....	121

## LIST OF TABLES

### TABLES

Table 1 Criteria for an age friendly city of World Health Organization.....	43
Table 2 Criteria for a lifetime neighborhood of Department for Communities and Local Government UK.....	46
Table 3 Criteria for a livable community of American Association of Retired Persons.....	49
Table 4 Criteria for a livable community of National Association of Area Agencies on Aging USA.....	53
Table 5 Criteria for an elder friendly community University of Calgary.....	56
Table 6 Criteria for an elder friendly community AdvantAge Initiative USA.....	60
Table 7 Criteria of an age friendly city.....	78
Table 8 Age friendly versus Child friendly cities criteria.....	84

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

Aging in urban space is one of the most distinctive subjects on the agenda of many countries in today's world. The data also highlights the importance of the situation, for instance, according to Phillipson (2014, p. 5), "by 2030, two-thirds of the world's population will be residing in cities; by that time the major urban areas of the developed world will have 25 percent or more of their population people aged 60<sup>1</sup> and over."

Regardless of urbanization, the concept of population aging is again an important demographic change. It is defined, by United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs Population Division (2001, p. iii), a population in which seniors have a proportionally larger share of total. In such a case, one can think that, population ageing due to its demographic reasons behind can be considered as a success story in terms of development. Those reasons basically are, decrease in fertility and increase in life-expectancy. According to United Nations Development Program (UNDP), especially increase in life-expectancy is an indicator of human development. To be more precise, life expectancy is one of the Human Development Index dimensions (UNDP, 2014, p. 37). As a demographic indicator of human development, increase in life-expectancy can be associated with development in nutrition and health services or absence of unhealthy habits. Although aging is considered as a success story, it has also challenging parts for societies and policy makers in terms of aging well. In other words, population aging includes differing needs of society, in terms of health services, security, social participation of older adults. As a result, living longer has many different multidimensional personal and social effects. Therefore, alternative

---

<sup>1</sup>According to website of WHO (<http://www.who.int/healthinfo/survey/ageingdefnolder/en/>) the UN agreed cutoff is 60+ years to refer to the older population. Therefore, older adults within the scope of this thesis are considered as people who are aged 60 and over.

living arrangements are considered on the issue by policy makers. Basically, those alternative arrangements should be taken into consideration of the well-being, which is the condition of being contented, healthy, or successful, of older adults primarily. In connection with the living standards of older adults, the living environment has a crucial role within the context of aging well. Therefore, living environment of older adults is worth to improve for staying actively engaged older population. Under the light of information provided above, age-friendly cities concept and initiatives come to stage as policy implementations to respond the needs of aging population of cities. The concept is referred as follows by World Health Organization<sup>2</sup>,

An age-friendly city encourages active ageing by optimizing opportunities for health, participation and security in order to enhance quality of life as people age. In practical terms, an age-friendly city adapts its structures and services to be accessible to and inclusive of older people with varying needs and capacities.

When it is looked at the importance of the concept in literature and in practice, according to Greenfield et. al. (2015, p. 191), before age friendly initiatives, service providing for older adults was the primary focus of social policies and programs, this approach can be defined as traditional. However, during the last ten years, age friendly community initiatives started to be developed within aging policy. Age friendly initiatives are considered as paradigm shift by the authors, because of their focus on creating friendly social and physical environments to older adults in order to promote their health, well being and ability to stay familiar places to them while growing old, that is age in place. Moreover, while doing this, age friendly initiatives have a newest mission which is engaging different stakeholders of local for the purpose of promoting well being of older adults of that community.

According to Biggs and Carr (2015, p. 100), cities are designed for certain groups in terms of the perspectives of planners for years. The most significant group while

---

<sup>2</sup> World Health Organization website:  
[http://www.who.int/kobe\\_centre/publications/age\\_friendly\\_cities\\_guide/en/](http://www.who.int/kobe_centre/publications/age_friendly_cities_guide/en/) retrieved in 4 March 2015

doing this design was working adults. The reasons behind their priority while planning the urban space were both their productiveness and their determinant position in consumption. At this point, the question that comes to minds is whether other groups of population living in cities are taken into consideration or not. As it is noted by Biggs and Carr (2015, p. 100), the urban environment is continuously changes in terms of differing needs of the groups of population. However, it should not be forgotten that, the power of those groups are not equal in order to affect the city in terms of their own needs. Older people and children, similar with women or disabled people, are weakest groups within this hierarchy. The citation from Buffel et. al. (2012, p. 607), is also contributes to that argument, authors mentioned 'paradox of neighborhood participation' which is a concept that implies there is a paradoxical situation between being part of a city and taking part in the city. Being part of a city is viable for both children and older people. That means both older adults and children spend their time mostly in their neighborhood, compared to adults, and they are part of the city. The other side of the paradox is taking part in the city and which means contributing to decision making processes. However, children and older adults, although they spend their time in the neighborhood and being part of the city, they are not decision makers for that place. Therefore, most of the time, they are invisible in city life. As a remedy for social exclusion, the social inclusion is on the stage within the age friendly city models.

For the continuing process, according to Francis and Lorenzo (2005, p.223),

In response to largely a top-down technocratic approach to urban planning and design there has been a gradual emergence of more of an innovative approach towards the planning, design and management of cities. Participatory city planning and design, from the mid-1960s, introduced a new actor into urban decision making processes, the user.

Now urban development is not a process purely technical or political, but it is now also a socio-cultural process. The authors define the urban development as

“conversation process between individuals, groups, interests, planners and decision makers.” (2005, p. 223).

Age friendly cities can be considered as a product of the idea above mentioned. Similarly, it is valid for other groups of population living in cities, such as child and youth, women, disabled. For instance, UNICEF has efforts on making cities more child-friendly, while World Health Organization (WHO) has efforts on making cities more age-friendly. In order to support that claim, one can investigate the guidelines towards age-friendly communities of WHO (2007, p.1) and guidelines towards child friendly cities of UNICEF, (2004, p. 1). Many of those friendly environments for specific groups of population has a common point which all has criteria for calling a place “... friendly”.

The inspiration of this thesis comes from the variety and commonness of this “friendliness” discourse for spaces and different criteria those are provided by different models. For instance, according to Lui et. al. (2009, p. 117), there are different terminology and different criteria for age friendly cities within the discussion. It can be considered as a proof of a range of emphasis and different perspectives among the age-friendly city models. Some others are also highlighted the ambiguity of the age friendly city criteria, such as Menec et. al. (2011, p. 480) are also highlighted the existence of multiple age friendly frameworks and guides within the literature and lack of universally accepted definition of which criteria are included in an age friendly city.

From a social policy perspective, the increase interest on friendliness concept for cities and neighborhoods can be associated with the decentralization of welfare state, accordingly with the HABITAT II Agenda. Including age friendly cities, other forms of friendly cities can be considered as the products of mainly those two patterns.

According to Ghai (as cited in Andersen, 1996, p. vii), welfare state is started to be change and goes to new directions. Therefore, there are discussions on its future. The



reasons behind this change are defined by the author as, increase in population aging, family structure changes, slow economic growth, increase in privatization in economic and social spheres of life, increase in competition in both domestic and international arena, globalization and technological innovations. Ghai evaluates the developments those are following these reasons. According to him (as cited in Andersen, 1996, p.viii), in such a situation states should try to eliminate the negativities of welfare states. For instance, they should increase efficiency in welfare planning and implementation through greater decentralization and community participation. According to him, decentralization is thought as a tool for increasing effectiveness in service delivery while reducing absenteeism among government officials. The case, education and health institutions officials will be more interested in their local, is provided as an example. Therefore, the decentralization in welfare state trend is one of the most important motivations behind the popularity of the friendly discourse for environments.

According to UNDP (1997, p. 4), decentralization means organization of authority in order to create an effective mechanism between institutions of governance at the central, regional and local levels in order to share the responsibility. The main aim of decentralization is again defined as increasing the quality and efficiency of the governance mechanism. In other words, in order to increase effectiveness which is a challenge to solve for welfare state, decentralization which increases the authority of local level system can be considered as a tool. One of the most important features of a proper decentralization process is thought as “increasing people's opportunities for participation in economic, social and political decisions; assisting in developing people's capacities; and enhancing government responsiveness, transparency and accountability.” (1997, p. 4). From that perspective, friendly discourse for cities has an organic contact with that understanding throughout the world.

During HABITAT II Conference which took place in 1996, according to Pinsky and Mundle (1997, p. 1), there were two basic themes that are going to be evaluated and worked on by the governments those are adequate shelter for all and sustainable

human settlements. Those are the important detections about the needs of world cities. The basic motivation behind the HABITAT II Conference is the changing and challenging situation those are waiting for urban residents in the new era. One of the most important facts about urbanization in world is that, for the first time in history, half of the world's population will be living in urban space. Moreover, an important proportion of urban dwellers are living in poverty. According to authors, slums those are not officially recognized are homes of almost half of the urban population. Moreover, 600 million urban dwellers are living in poor quality housing with limited clean water, and sanitation. In the light of this information, the agenda has the emphasis on economic, social and environmental sustainability of cities. Moreover, according to determinations of the agenda, poor and inadequate policies in urban governance are thought as the responsible of environmental degradation and low quality living conditions in many cities. Due to cities' prominent role in global finance and industry the policies those are following the sustainable development are again considered as crucial. At the end, the main concern of the Agenda is summarized by Ghai as follows: "The world's cities must become sustainable, productive, safe, healthy, humane, and affordable." (As cited in Pinsky and Mundle, 1997, p. 1). An important feature of the HABITAT II within this context is that, it highlighted new directions in human settlements in terms of management of the processes. For instance, governments were started to support efforts that combined new techniques such as community based initiatives and contribution of private sector. Another highlighted new feature of the HABITAT II is the reference to the needs of women and disadvantaged groups. Moreover, the motto of "cities homes for all" is another clue for further discussion on friendly discourse of cities. All those information can be considered as the beginning of the friendliness discourse for settlements in the practice and literature.

The main aim of this thesis is, in order to provide a more clear understanding and make the assessment possible for age friendly city models, to create an ideal type<sup>3</sup> for criteria of age friendly cities. During the discussion that goes to ideal type for age friendly cities, another theme of the thesis is the analysis of child friendly city criteria. The reason behind child friendly cities discussion is that, both age friendly cities and child friendly cities have a common point, which is “age”. To be more precise, having in mind that, urban development and planning was done for the needs of working adults and the reason of ignorance of older adults and children is the same, which is age. Therefore, similarities and differences of age friendly and child friendly city models are going to be analyzed while offering an ideal type for age friendly cities within the scope of “age”. Through this ideal type, the question of “How a city is age friendly” is tried to be answered. As research questions, how different the proposed models on age friendly cities in themselves and how different child friendly cities from age friendly cities are going to be asked and answered.

The methodology for this study is a desktop review. A detailed literature review is made in order to make the analysis of age friendly cities criteria for an ideal type. Through that literature review, basic components of an ideal type are determined and necessary comparisons of criteria could be possible. Basically academic journals on gerontology especially for conceptual framework chapter are considered as the main source of information. Another important source of information for this study is some policy papers on age friendly cities. Documents those are produced by the models themselves, which are needs analysis papers and evaluation guides are taken into consideration. United Nations bodies’ policy reliefs, documents for urban rights and human rights are also mostly referred sources of information. Many discussions and information provided by this study is tried not to be blind to historical context. Therefore, historical background is tried to be mentioned for each concept that makes the study more comprehensive and a clear idea sequence.

---

<sup>3</sup> Ideal Type: From a Weberian perspective, a typification of a phenomenon built up by extracting the essential characteristics of many empirical examples of it. The purpose of an ideal type is to provide a measure against which real examples may be compared. (Dictionary of Sociology, 2001, p. 116)

With the above mentioned aim and methodology, this study is composed of six parts. After introductory chapter which provides a general overview about the study, Chapter II mentions conceptual framework for the main concepts of the study which are age in place, active aging and the age-friendly cities with the historical background of those concepts within the literature of aging.

Chapter III has six parts those are about description of age-friendly city models from world, including the international perspective of World Health Organization, models from United Kingdom, Canada and United States. Parts of this chapter are tried to highlight the basic points of Age-friendly Cities of WHO, Lifetime Neighborhood of Department for Communities and Local Government UK, Livable Community American Association of Retired Persons (AARP), Livable Community National Association of Area Agencies on Aging (USA), Elder-friendly Community (University of Calgary, Canada), Elder-friendly Community (The AdvantAge Initiative, USA). This chapter provides knowledge which brings into the age friendly city criteria for different models open. Therefore, it is a crucial chapter for determination of aspects of an ideal type for age friendly cities. Through highlighting the differing parts of those models, it is possible to gain information about the question that an ideal type will be applied, “how a city is age friendly” argument.

Chapter IV is going to give information about the child friendly models for cities depending on the model of UNICEF. While illuminating the issue child-friendly cities, their criteria and the idea behind to call a city as “friendly” in terms of age are tried to be reflected, that is another core component and a comparison tool for proposing an ideal type for an age friendly city. Realizing criteria that is prioritized for a child friendly city can provide input for age friendly cities also.

Within the parts of following Chapter V, the comparison between age-friendly city models and child-friendly city models take place. The similarities and differences between those models are highlighted. Through this comparison those two main models those are providing an insight for a city that is friendly for the beginning and

ending of the life course, can be analyzed together. This analysis will also propose inputs for the ideal type with a comparative perspective. As a result of the analysis, an ideal type for an age-friendly city is going to be discussed. Moreover, limiting parts of the concept of age friendly cities are going to be emphasized in order to provide a future perspective for studies on age friendly cities. Therefore, this thesis has a contribution to literature of social policy with exploration of a relatively new concept of “friendliness for cities” with specific emphasis on “age-friendly cities”.

In the concluding chapter, Chapter VI, the importance of the age friendly cities discussion and the necessity of an ideal type will be mentioned. Moreover, a summary of the thesis is going to have a part. Some policy suggestions will be mentioned within this chapter.

## CHAPTER 2

### CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The main aim of this chapter is linking the environment and aging. Reasons and ideas behind the research and efforts in policies depending on the relation between space and aging have great importance in terms of better understanding of age-friendly cities. Therefore, it is important to go into details of conceptualization of age-friendly cities. This chapter of the thesis is going to be basically about age-friendly cities concept and other core concepts, those are aging in place and active aging, within the path for age-friendly cities. The definitions, historical evolutions, reasons behind the existence and determinants of the concepts will be explored.

#### 2.1. Age In Place<sup>4</sup>

Age friendly cities models are basic forms of aging in place approach, which is counter of institutional care. Before theoretical approach that gave way to discussion on ageing in place with emphasis on environment and aging relation, the definition of the concept should be provided. First of all, it should be noted that, “age in place” and “aging in place” terms are used in order to refer the same thing within this part of the thesis. There are different usages of these two terms without any meaning differences.

Pastalan (1990, pp. ix-xii) defines the aging in place as “being able to remain in one’s current residence even when faced with increasing need for support because of life changes, such as declining health, widowhood, or loss of income.”

---

<sup>4</sup> Although the concept “space” is more comprehensive in terms of including social relations, the term “place” is used during the thesis due to its being the original name of the concept, in Turkish “yerinde yaşlanma”.

As cited in Davies and James (p. 111, 2011), James defines the term “aging in place” as older people’s maintaining their existence in their homes rather preferring the institutional care.

### **2.1.1. The relation between Place and Aging – Environmental Gerontology**

In order to explain the theoretical background of aging in place and age friendly cities, explanation based on environmental gerontology will be used.

According to Andrews and Phillips, environmental gerontology takes its roots from 1970s. It comes today with some contributions. During those years, the interest on the theory is gained importance and nowadays scholars are working on the relation between aging and place more commonly compared to past. In other words, there are increasing interest on the relation between aging and place within academic literature. There are two arguments about the reason of this increase (2005, p. 8). The first one is the spatial turn in social sciences which highlights the effect of place on human behavior, activity or experiences. This spatial turn has been affected by the understanding of place not only with a physical sense, but also with a complex symbolic and cultural construction. As cited in Andrews and Phillips (2005, p.9), McKeever and Coyte claim that the second reason for increased interest on this relational explanations is “unprecedented demographic, social, fiscal and technological changes that have impacted simultaneously in many countries”. Besides rapid demographic changes, the social changes those mentioned the explanation of the author is, changing relations within the families, change in understanding of institutional care. In many countries of world, the care is started not to be limited with hospitals. Due to those rapid changes, scholars working on aging try to compare and search for those new alternatives such as, aging in place and age friendly cities efforts for older adults. Wahl and Weisman (2003, pp. 616-617), supports the difference in scope of literature on aging similar with Andrews and Phillips, mentioned above. According to Wahl and Weisman,

Aging has long been regarded as a process strongly determined by a biological program inherent into organism; the explicit consideration of environmental variables having an impact on the course and outcome of human aging was an important step in the historical development of gerontology (2003, p. 617).

The role of social sciences, with a strong emphasis of learning theories in psychology, is increased in 1940s in gerontology. Therefore, aging is started to be considered as more than biological process. Through this historically important role, according to Wahl and Weisman, environmental gerontology has a considerable space within the gerontological theory, research, and practice (2003, p. 616). The definition of the discipline is provided as follows by the authors (2003, p.616), “Environmental gerontology (EG)—focused on the description, explanation, and modification or optimization of the relation between older adults persons and their sociospatial surroundings—has emerged as a subfield in its own right.”. The considerable importance of environmental gerontology within the literature is caused mostly from its emphasis on sociophysical environment understanding, which does not underestimate neither social environmental context nor physical environmental context. As cited in Wahl and Weisman, the term sociophysical is used by Canter and Craig in 1981 in order to highlight the complexity of environment. Therefore, it can be claimed that, the novelty of environmental gerontology is its argument of dual effects of physical and social environment on people, for all age groups, and for older adult residents. In addition to its being novel, the commonness and approval of environmental gerontology is high within literature on aging. This acceptance comes from its effectiveness within many discussions and research. The effectiveness of environmental gerontology is summarized by the authors as below:

Environmental gerontology theories and findings have also been applied at multiple scales, ranging from evidence-based housing design to institutional living, from the micro level of home modifications to the macro level of recommendations for “age-friendly” communities and even countries. (Wahl & Weisman, 2003, p. 616).



As it is cited above, environmental gerontology has some concerns within aging and environment relation. One of those concerns is the role of neighborhoods in terms of their proposition of both constraints and opportunities for their residents in terms of neighborhoods' different features.

To sum up, environmental gerontology provides a theoretical base for the discussion on aging in place, which is an important concept for comprehensive understanding of age-friendly cities. Besides the definition of environmental gerontology, the reasons behind the increasing interest on aging and environment relation, those are the changing demographic and social structures of societies, and the novelty of environmental gerontology are tried to be highlighted within this part of the study.

### **2.1.2. Age In Place – Environmental Gerontological Explanation**

Within this part of the study, while environmental gerontology is continuing to be explained, its specific relation to the concept of age in place is going to be provided.

According to Greenfield (2011, p. 2), in 1986, Lawton and his colleagues worked on “general ecological model of aging” and the concept of environmental press is one of the most important one within the explanation of general environmental model of aging of Lawton and Nahemow. According to that model, aging in place basically depends on the person-environment relation. If it is necessary to provide a detailed explanation, it can be said that, general environmental model of aging highlights that, a person's functioning is the result of social, biological and psychological resources those he/she has. There should be a “fit” between individuals and environment in order to have a proper functioning. When environment demands more than one's resources then individual is less likely to age in place. A helpful example provided by Greenfield is that (2011, p. 2),

If a person who becomes unable to climb stairs lives in a single story home, their ability to remain safely and comfortably within their current residence likely persists

in spite of their functional health change. However, if that person lives in a two story home and does not have supports to help them access to second floor, then they are less likely to be able to age in place.

The model gathers attention to the point of dynamic relationship between environment and the person. Greenfield (2011, p. 3), establishes a connection between the general environmental model of aging and age in place initiatives that is ecological frameworks such as general environmental model of aging pay attention to multiple domains of development. Therefore, multiple scopes of life including biological, social and psychological are tried to be supported by the age in place initiatives. This linkage and explanation seems meaningful when it is realized the multidimensionality of many models of age in place, such as age-friendly cities.

Explanations from different authors are necessary to gain a strong understanding of aging in place path coming from environmental gerontology and goes to age-friendly city models. Therefore, similar with Greenfield's explanations, Rowles and Bernard provided some information on the issue, especially with contribution of the concept of well being. As cited in Rowles and Bernard (2013, p. 3), according to Husserl, Schutz and Luckmann, for people the place that they borned, grew up and the place of living now have all influences on themselves. According to authors, where older adults live has an increasing importance on their well-being, which is another primary component of environmental gerontology.

To summarize, environmental gerontology has some critical points while explaining aging in place, those are the explanation depending on "person-environment fit", that is the determinant of a person to aging in place and its emphasis on notion of space. Within the scope of this part of the study, a closely related concept with age friendly cities is tried to be explained with its theoretical roots, which is thought to make the discussion on age friendly cities more comprehensive.

### **2.1.3. Preference of aging in place from the perspectives of policy makers and older adults**

In order to refer the importance of the concept of aging in place and age friendly cities and in order to explain its commonness in nowadays social policy, the reasons of preferences are going to have a place in this part of the study. Aging in place has a meaning for two sides. One is the side of decision makers and the other is the side of older adults who are realizing the positive and negative effects of policies or lack of policies within their lives, who are called as the user in previous parts of the study.

According to Kutsal (2011, p. 2), although nursing homes may be considered as places those enable older adults to socialize meaningfully with their peers, there are increase in discussions on aging in place, community care, which is the counter of institutional care. Therefore, in order to realize age in place, policy makers are looking forward to ways of supporting older adults through transmitting the public resources to this area of social policy. The ultimate goal for aging in place for policy makers is prevention of application of older adults to nursing homes early ages. Aging in place initiatives have been internalized by many countries from world and they aim, older adults living within the society, rather isolated nursing homes.

Similarly Kutsal's arguments, according to Iecovich, (2014, p.23), the high expenditures on institutional care are quite important aspect of favoring aging in place. By policy makers and families of older adults, aging in place is believed to be less expensive than institutional long-term care (Sixsmith & Sixsmith, 2008, p. 220). From that point of view, there is an increasing interest on the concept especially in social policy applications and practices. As cited in Kalınkara and Arpacı (2013, p. 56), Tang and Pickard argued that, new policies and services are designed accordingly. Therefore, that new demand coming from older adults is tried to be satisfied by system and help aging in place become possible and comfortable. As cited in Davies and James (2011, p. 112), Hugo mentioned that, the reality of living older adults in their homes while growing older is not a new phenomenon. Although

it is not a new phenomenon, the attention and interest on the concept is derived from its being proposed as an option for dealing with aging population. This proposition towards policies for aging in place, according to Chui, are originated from United Nation's Principles for Older Persons, including the principles of independence, participation, care, dignity and self-fulfillment. Those concepts, derived from the United Nations' Principles are going to be explained within the following parts of this chapter. As cited in Davies and James, Jones et. al. refer to the concept of aging in place as a cornerstone of public policy in community care (2011, p. 112). In terms of popularity of this terms and the shift in public policy depends on understanding of older people's role within the society. As cited in James and Davies (2011, p. 112), according to McCallum, during 50s, being old means, being in a negative phase of life. However, as noted in James and Davies, in 80s the perception towards being old is shifted to a positive meaning. That means, being old started to be no longer associated with being useless, rather the contributions of older adults to society are started to be realized. Thus, aging in place is started to be thought as a chance for older adults and for the society.

If it is necessary to refer to the other side of the situation, from the perspective of older adults, according to Kutsal (p.2, 2011), socializing within the current social context may provide life satisfaction so older adults may continue to be active and productive during their old age. Moreover, chance to increase in intergenerational dialogue is an important opportunity of aging in place.

For reason of preference of aging in place by policy makers, according to Davey (2006, p. 128), the internationally accepted idea is that, traditional institutional care keeps older people apart and medicalizes old age. Therefore, institutional care is started to be thought as perpetuates a negative view of aging. As cited in Davey (2006, p. 129), OECD document Aging, Housing and Urban Development, says that, "The aging process should no longer be viewed as an inevitable economic and social isolation from the rest of the community". Thus, aging in place means that, older

people continue living in their current environment with some sort of social or economic support rather than moving institutional care centers.

Similar with, Kutsal, as cited in Iecovich (2014, p. 23), Cutchin mentions that, aging in place is a preferred option for older adults in order to stay within a familiar environment and feeling safe. Overall context, aging in place stabilizes the wellbeing of older adults. On the contrary, changing the residential place may cause loss of social relationships, feeling of security and identity. Moreover, Chappin and Dobbs-Kepper (2001, p.44), highlight the negative effects of relocation for older adults. The possible negative effects are many, such as, emotional stress, loneliness, depression, functional deterioration and adjustment difficulties.

With reference to articles gathering data from different contexts and different countries, it can be easily said that, many older adults prefer to grow older within their own neighborhoods and houses. For instance, Borell (2006, p.1), referring to Williams (2002), Tille (1999) and Ivarsson (1996) claims that, internationally aging in place is what most older adults look forward to. Moreover, according to Wiles et. al. (2011, p. 357):

Older people want choices about where and how they age in place. “Aging in place” was seen as an advantage in terms of a sense of attachment or connection and feelings of security and familiarity in relation to both homes and communities. Aging in place related to a sense of identity both through independence and autonomy and through caring relationships and roles in the places people live.

Therefore, aging in place most of the time is considered as a meaningful option from the perspective of older adults

To sum up, as cited in Kalınkara and Arpacı (2013, p. 56), according to Lee and Wiles et. al., the concept of aging in place, is a prevalent one which refers older adults desire to continue living in a known place by them. As it requires autonomy,

independence, continuity of social support including family and friends, it is preferred by older adults. At the same time, it allows older adults to stay in social life and it provides an alternative to expensive choices of institutional care. Regarding to these ideas, ageing in place is preferable not only for older adults but also for states which is liable to provide services to older adults within the context of citizenship. Within the light of that information, it can be said that, aging in place and age friendly cities accordingly, are quite important approach which provides a more positive meaning to old age and an alternative living arrangement for urban population aging. Through this importance it is worth to develop a more clear understanding for further implications and discussions through the ideal type within the scope of this study.

To conclude, within the context of this part of the conceptual framework chapter, the basic argument aging in place, which have close contact with age-friendly cities approach, is defined especially with theoretical explanation of environmental gerontology. While discussing the concept of aging in place, the novelty of environmental gerontology, the reasons behind the preference and increasing popularity of the concept in practice is tired to be provided. As a result, aging in place is a chance compared to institutional care if it can be managed properly with participation of older adults to the process.

## **2.2. Active Aging**

The second concept within the literature on age-friendly cities is active aging which gives emphasis on productivity of older adults and to the need of older adults' staying active within social life. Active Aging concept takes its roots from Activity Theory of Aging, which ascribes a positive understanding on aging through transmitting responsibility to people and community. Definition of the concept and the discussions are going to be provided within the context of this part of conceptual framework chapter in order to be prepared to the discussions on age-friendly cities. As it is mentioned below, active aging and its determinants are strongly related with

the development of the initiatives for age friendly cities, more importantly, active aging is crucial for determination of the criteria of age friendly cities, therefore they are going to be elaborated below.

According to Aird and Buys, the two concepts are interrelated because for active aging, an age-friendly built environment is a facilitator. (2014, p.1), authors bind the two concepts by mentioning,

...additional strategies to the creation of “age-friendly” environments are needed if older people are to increase their levels of outdoor physical activity. “Active aging” promotion campaigns may need to explicitly identify the benefits of walking outdoors to ambulatory older people as a means of maintaining their overall health, functional ability, and participation within society long-term... (2014, p.1).

Within the light of that information on two concepts it can be easily said that, there is an organic relationship between active aging and age-friendly cities understanding. One can say that, with a more clear expression, age-friendly cities and communities approach and attempts should be considered as a way to a more active aging process. Therefore, it is necessary to look for definitions and determinants of active aging concept including discussions about it within the literature.

### **2.2.1. What is active aging: Definition and Determinants**

According to Policy Framework of WHO, “Active ageing is the process of optimizing opportunities for health, participation and security in order to enhance quality of life as people age” (2002, p.12). By using the word “active” WHO tries to emphasize that through retirement from work, older people do not or should not be retired from life. They can and should remain active contributors to their families, peers, communities and nations. Active ageing aims to extend healthy life expectancy and quality of life for all people as they age. The importance of the concept is that, it carries the discussion on aging over the understanding of health, by

including more social components of life course, such as life quality and independence and autonomy. Obviously being physically healthy is a core issue in order to have the other components of active aging. However, physical health should not be taken as the only component of active aging process.

According to Paul et. al. (2012, p.2), the active aging model of WHO has three pillars which are, participation, health and security. Besides those three pillars, the concept has 6 determinants and each of those has several aspects. Before going deeply those determinants and aspects related to them, it may be useful to list all of those; determinants related to health and social services, behavioral determinants, determinants related to personal factors, determinants related to the physical environment, determinants related to social environment, and economic determinants (WHO, 2002, pp. 21-30). Gender and culture are considered as the crosscutting determinants by WHO and expressed by saying that, all those list of determinants are embedded in cultural context and within gender differences by Paul et. al. (2012, p.2). Also the authors highlight four key aspects for the concept of active aging regarding the *Active Aging: A Policy Framework* of WHO. Those four key aspects are listed as follows; autonomy, independence, quality of life and healthy life-expectancy. All pillars, determinants and aspects emphasize the core points of active aging. Maintaining autonomy and independence as one grows older is a key goal for both individuals and policy makers as the document refers.

According to WHO (2002, p.13), definition of autonomy is “the perceived ability to control, cope with and make personal decisions about how one lives on a day-to-day basis, according to one’s own rules and preferences.” Independence is stressed as its difference from autonomy. It can be considered as the ability to continue the daily actions, with little or no help from outside. As cited in *Active Aging: A Policy Framework* (2002, p.13), according to again WHO, quality of life is a perception of one on his or her position in life. The perception includes culture and value systems, people’s goals and expectations within their social environment regarding the culture



and values, the place of living. It is a concept that includes social relationships and personal beliefs.

In addition to those three components of active aging, the last one and the one interwoven to others in terms of effects, is healthy life expectancy is commonly used for “disability-free life expectancy”. While life expectancy at birth remains an important measure of population ageing and the level of development of countries, how long people can expect to live without disabilities is especially important in such situations. Because, having older population many having disabilities or suffers from health problems should not be considered as a success story in terms of life-expectancy (WHO, 2002, p. 13).

In order to comprehend the active aging concept properly, it is given the determinants of active aging in many articles which are depend on the Active Aging: A Policy Framework of WHO (2002, pp. 19-32). Those determinants are also quite important due to their usefulness in the measurement of active aging. The determinants are several and categorized as their relation in the spheres of life. As it is mentioned above, determinants related to health and social services, behavioral determinants, determinants related to personal factors, determinants related to the physical environment, determinants related to social environment and economic determinants. Gender and culture are also quite important determinants due to their effectiveness on each determinant independently, therefore they are called as cross-cutting determinants of active aging. For instance, cultural values and traditions have a close contact with the perception of aging and older people in a given society. It can be interpreted as it has direct affects on the social and economic determinants. When it comes to another crosscutting determinant, which is gender, obviously the effect of it is as crucial as culture. As it is mentioned in the Policy Framework of WHO (2002, p.21), women and girls in many societies have limited access to resources compared to boys and men. Those resources are many, such as nutrition, quality education or even education, meaningful and satisfied work or health services. Women’s care giver roles within the families contribute to this secondary

position. Traditional gender roles, such as leaving formal labor market in order to take care of children, disabled or older adults family members increased the poverty that they already have been suffering and ill health when they become older. This is the case for girls and women, boys and men at the same time are more likely to suffer debilitating injuries or death due to occupational hazards, and suicide. They also engage in more risky behaviors such as smoking, alcohol and drug consumption. Thus, gender has its effects on all determinants, mostly against older women.

After mentioning the cross-cutting determinants beforehand, it is necessary to highlight the determinants. First of all, it is important to say that, there are no hierarchical relations between determinants of active aging from a life-course perspective. According to WHO's Active Aging Policy Framework (2002, p. 21), those should be taken into consideration within an equal level of importance.

The first determinant is health and social services systems and it has several aspects within itself. The highlighted ones are, health promotion, disease prevention, equal access for everybody in primary health care and long-term care. Health promotion is a process that provides people the chance to improve their health. While disease prevention is the services those are both primary and secondary prevention. From an active aging point of view, it should also be noted that, the health and social services system should guarantee the equal access of everyone, regardless of the culture and gender, to get primary health care and long-term care.

Behavioral determinants are also given importance by the Policy Framework (2002, p. 22). Tobacco use, physical activity, healthy eating, oral health, medications, iatrogenesis and adherence are listed as behavioral determinants on active aging.

Another important group of determinants of active aging are related to personal factors, which is different from behavioral factors. Those can be considered as biology, genetics and psychological factors. As it is clearly declared in *Policy Framework*, biology, genetics and psychology greatly influence how a person ages.

However, as cited in WHO's whereof document, it also should be noted that, genetics, environment, lifestyle, nutrition are combined effects on one's lifespan.

Determinants related to the physical environment are another group of determinants. This category includes physical environment, safe housing, falls, clean water, clean air and safe foods. The subheadings under physical environment refer mostly problems those cause from inadequate quality of physical environment. For instance, if one could not reach some services due to physical environment, it turns indirect cause of other problems such as falls, fires, traffic collisions or prone to isolation and related depression.

Similar with determinants related to physical environment, there are also determinants related to the social environment (WHO Active Aging: A Policy Framework, 2002, p.28). Social support, opportunities for education, protection from violence and abuse are aspects of social environment those are related with active aging. Inadequate social support affects the general health and well-being enormously and causes early death. In most societies, men have smaller social support networks when they lose their spouses. On the other hand, some other countries widowed women are completely excluded from the social life without any support. This point is quite related with one of the cross-cutting determinants; gender (2002, p. 28). As the example highlights, gender may cause the situation better or worse in different contexts and cases. Elder abuse has many reflections on different spheres. Physical, sexual, psychological and financial abuse and neglect are some of the reflections. About opportunities for education, it can be easily said that, like young people, older people are in need to learn new technologies especially those are directly related with the lifestyle of them.

The last group of determinants is economic ones (WHO, 2002, p. 30). This group of determinants includes income, social protection and work. Inadequate income, which means living in poverty, has many obstacles for any people regardless of their ages. However, older adults living in poverty have specific vulnerability due to inadequate

income. The economic determinants basically increases the risk of homelessness and inadequate nutrition, increases fail to reach to health services.

Definition, core components and determinants of active aging, such as autonomy, independence, healthy life expectancy and quality of life are also core idea behind age friendly cities. The organic relationship between the two concepts comes from their common aims, highlighting especially the autonomy and independence both proposes an alternative for policy makers in order to deal with the differing needs of increasing population aging. As it is mentioned above, active aging concept takes its roots from activity theory of aging as a counter of disengagement theory. Therefore in following parts of the study a brief discussion on disengagement and activity theories in order to comprehend the place of the concepts within literature on aging. Moreover, the similar concepts within the literature will be mentioned in the following part, those are successful and productive aging.

### **2.2.2. Functionalist Theories of Aging**

In order to provide a strong background for the explanation on active aging concept, it is necessary to refer the theories that the concept is related. Active aging concept can be considered as taken its roots from the activity theory which is classified as a functionalist social theory of aging by Powell (2005, p. 49). In order to realize the place of the concept with its novel part in the discussion on aging, it is provided basic information about disengagement theory and activity theory.

#### **2.2.2.1. Disengagement Theory**

As cited in Powell (2005, p. 47), Blaike claims that during 1930s and 1960s functionalist sociology was effective in social sciences in United States and in gerontology. As cited again in Powell (2005, p. 47), Cumming and Henry were defining old age as a “roleless role”. As cited in Estes et. al. (2003, p. 12), Lynott and Lynott consider the starting of social theories of aging with disengagement theory in

the late 1950s. Therefore, they defined disengagement theory as the first formal approach to theorizing of aging. At this point it should be noted that, before disengagement theory, according to Bowling (2005, p. 3), in 1953 Havinghurst and Albrecht was defined activity theory which is previous than disengagement theory. However, the theory gained importance after the release of disengagement theory. Authors Cumming and Henry were arguing the naturalness and inevitability of gradual withdrawal of older adults from the work and social life with the argument of efficacy of disengagement before the eventual death. To be more precise, disengagement theory argues that, withdrawal from life is beneficial for society due to unavoidable end. In that way, people may get used to the idea of death. Therefore, with its overgeneralizations, disengagement theory provides a chance to governments to decide who will work and who will not.

All in all, Hochschild claimed that (1975, p. 557), disengagement theory of aging proposed an important point to be discussed, which is “how is age related to engagement in social life?”. Hochschild argued that (1975, p. 557),

Engagement of old people varies with the general character of the society (i.e., its fit with the pre-industrial, industrial and post industrial models). It also varies with individual's particular location in any one society. For instance, work as a major organizing principle governing ties to the social world does not suddenly vanish when one grows old: that even in the absence of work one's orientation toward work remains crucial.

In spite of the fact that, although disengagement theory claims that one's age is the determinant of disengagement clearly, as it is explained above, there are many intervening variables those can be considered as determinants of disengagement regardless of age. Therefore, disengagement theory has some limitations in itself. Below, it is going to be explained the activity theory which should be taken into consideration while explaining the concept of active aging, and which can also be considered as counter of disengagement theory (Diggs, 2008, p.233). It can easily be

said that, disengagement theory proposes negative understanding towards aging, rather activity theory which is the subject of the following part, provides a more positive understanding and which is the core idea behind this study, active aging concept.

#### **2.2.2.2. Activity Theory**

One of the other functionalist theories of aging is activity theory, obviously it provides a ground for the argument on successful or active aging concepts those are started to be discussed within the path going through the age friendly cities. For activity theorists, disengagement is not a natural process and it is inherently ageist and does not promote “positive aging”.

According to Diggs (2008, p. 79), the activity theory of aging claims that, people’s life satisfaction is effected by activity level. As it is mentioned above, the activity theory is considered as contrasted with disengagement theory. Due to its seeing transference of power and roles to younger generations, disengagement theory defines the “disengagement” as beneficial for society.

From a historical point of view, according to Diggs (2008, p. 79), Havighurst and friends introduced activity theory in 1961. Havighurst and colleagues argued that “older individuals have the same psychological and social needs as middle-aged people and that the social withdrawal that characterizes old age is contrary to the needs of the aging individual.” (Diggs, 2008, p. 79). Due to loss of roles causing from for instance, retirement, loss of partner, loss of routine past activities, older adults face with isolation and decrease in self-esteem and well being. Therefore, as it is mentioned by Diggs (2008, p. 80), activity theory poses the necessity of preserving roles in order to be successfully age. The basic idea behind this proposition of activity theory is that, more active people are happier in all stages of life course.

Similar with Diggs, Powell (2005, p. 49) considers activity theory as “an anti-aging perspective”. According to him, when the roles are lost, it is important to develop a new set of roles and activities in order to replace them. However, he highlighted that, activity theory, similar with the disengagement theory neglects issues of power, inequality, and conflict between age groups.

As a result, Powell (2005, p. 49), emphasized the causality of functionalist theories of aging by saying that,

Such functionalist theories impose a sense of causality on aging by implying that one will either “disengage” or will be “active” in old age. Such theories of aging are very macro-oriented and fail to resolve tensions within age group relations that impinge upon the interconnection of race, class, and gender with age.

To conclude, those social theories of aging, especially the activity theory are important due to their providence a historical and theoretical basis for the discussion on active aging within the part towards age friendly cities. Although both have limitations, activity theory is distinctive with its positive reference to aging within society through preserving roles or adopting new roles to be functional in wider society.

### **2.2.3. Historical Evolution of Active Aging**

During the way coming towards active aging, there were some others within the literature as a chronological line. This chronology is provided within the scope of this study due to both provide background information to active aging concept and to highlight the differences within different concepts in order to provide a comprehensive view to the path.

Walker and Foster (2013, pp. 28-35) refer to historical emergence of the concept of active aging with reference to other similar concepts, those are successful and

productive aging. Those concepts have similar meanings and they sometimes are used interchangeably. However that interchange is not correct due to their differences in nature. Therefore, while providing information on historical development of the concept of active aging it is meaningful to go deeply into similarities and differences between concepts of successful or productive aging from active aging.

According to Walker and Foster (2013, p. 28-35), welfare states, when they are emerged, paying pensions have been crucially important. Within that context, there was negative perspective towards older adults as passive recipients of welfare benefits. The process of aging had been closely associated with the term dependency. Active, successful and productive aging concepts and practices can be considered as a response to that passive dependency discourse. As cited in Walker and Foster (2013, p. 33), according to Walker, in 1960s successful aging came to the stage. Successful aging, which is defined by Fernandez-Ballesteros (2011, pp.5-6) as low probability of illness, high physical and cognitive functioning and high social participation, denied the withdrawal. As cited in Aird and Buys (2014, p.2), Walker mentions successful aging as conserving the patterns and values of middle age into old age and it takes its roots from early 1960s. As cited in Moulaert and Paris (2013, p.117), Walker highlighted senior adults and society partnership. At that point, authors argue that, state will have a role which encourages social initiatives to make people engaged, informed and recognized. According to authors, successful aging depends on a psychological emphasis. As cited in Moulaert and Paris, Baltes & Baltes claim that, successful aging depends on a threefold process, those are selection, optimization and compensation in the individual. Moreover, as cited in Moulaert and Paris, Rowe and Kahn define three different characteristics for successful aging, those are “reducing the risk of diseases and disabilities”, “maintaining maximum functioning of mental and physical capacities” and remaining actively engaged in life.



After the emergence of successful aging, in 1980s in USA, the concept of productive aging started to be used. According to Walker and Foster (2013, p. 34), scholars and policy makers started to think about within the life course perspective rather than older people and old age specifically. At this point the importance of life course perspective proposed an explanation on life experiences are organized by social relationships and societal contexts have an inevitable role on how people grow old. In other words, productive ageing is a more comprehensive compared to successful aging in terms of its being more than a context within which individuals must adapt. As cited in Moulaert and Paris (2013, p. 117), according to Bass et. al., productive aging is “any activity by an older individual that produces goods and services, or develops the capacity to produce them, whether they are paid for or not”. According to Walker (2002, p. 123), productive aging is followed the successful aging in 1980s. Reason behind the emergence of productive aging is determined as sociopolitical by the author, which is switching to the perspective towards human development during the life course rather than the senior adults due to the inadequacy of chronological age while explaining the performance. Another reason behind this switch is the health care and pension concerns of policy makers. As a result through productive aging, it is tried to be extend productivity of seniors. Therefore, productive aging seems to given importance to on some form of work after retirement. Walker’s argument on productive aging which is, being focused on production of goods or services therefore, being instrumental, also supports the same idea mentioned above about productive aging (2002, p. 123). Therefore, one can say that, the understanding of productive aging has a positive perception on aging.

In following years, in 1990s, as it is mentioned by Walker (2002, p. 123), active aging concept is started to be used within literature on aging. Behind its emergence the effect of WHO is undeniable. As cited in Walker (2002, p. 124), “...the essence of the emerging modern concept of active aging combines the core element of productive aging with a strong emphasis on quality of life and mental and physical well-being.”. Active aging concept has more dimensions than any other concept. Those are, participation in society, maximization of social, physical and mental

health, continuity of dignity and human rights and creation of age-friendly environments in order to provide autonomy and independence.

All in all, it includes the basic principles of productive aging also, such as quality of life, well-being and emphasis on participation. In 1970s and 1980s, according to Foster (as cited in Walker and Foster, 2013, p. 31), the neoliberal ideology caused private market to supply individual needs while making public support or pensions to minimum. Those developments gave way to a different policy perspective which proposed an active role to older people. Changing ideologies in economy and politics, due to neo liberal understanding, are met by protests against cuts in pensions, health and social services. As an answer to protests, policy makers started to establish advisory boards including older adults at local level. As a result, the concept of active aging started to gain roots as “a vision for policy in which facilitating the rights of older people will enable the expanding population to remain healthy, whilst also fully participating in community and political processes.” (Walker and Foster, 2013, p. 33).

According to Paul et. al. (2012, p.1), the seeds of the concept of active aging is discarded during the world summit on population by WHO, in 2002. Authors claim that, active aging is determined as the main objective of health and social policies for older population. Before world summit, there were an inclination towards linking the concepts of activity, health, independence and aging well. During those process WHO used healthy aging concept and after the summit it replaced by the active aging. It is defined as a more comprehensive concept which is more than aging without major pathologies. According to Paul et. al. “active aging has psychological, social, physical and economic aspects, which are to be looked through communities’ approaches within gender and cultural perspectives” (2012, p.1). As cited in Paul et. al., Bowling has points about the biomedical perspective, which gives priority to health issues within the context of successful aging. Bowling’s ideas highlight that, biomedical perspective needs additions related psychosocial ideas. Therefore active aging is considered a response to that need. According to Paul et. al. (2012, p.2),

In overall, successful aging, active aging and other related terms as positive aging and or aging well are viewed as scientific concepts operationally portrayed by a broad biopsychosocial factors, assessed through objective and subjective indicators as well as being closely related with lay concepts.

It is also important to note that, different from other ones, for instance the concept of successful aging, the concept of active aging is less deterministic. It should not be ignored the hardship of measuring it, compared to others it is more realistic and comprehensive (Paul et. al., 2012, p.2).

With reference to citation above, Aird and Buys argue that (2014, pp. 1-3), the concept of active aging has conveniences and challenges in itself and for policy makers and researchers, those are worth to refer in order get a more comprehensive understanding about active aging. “Active aging” provides a ground for the attempts those try to refer the needs and issues of growing older population in the world, it is a concept that gathered attention to that critical demographic change. However, at the same time, it has a complex nature and some similar parts those were included by some other previous concepts as mentioned above, such as successful aging, and productive aging.

Walker and Foster (2013, p. 28), if the conditions are realized active aging can be considered as an effective model for policies on aging, a society and citizens cooperation, without any coercion and inclusive approach. Therefore, adjustments within many aspects of society should be taken into consideration, such as within family life or labor market. The effectiveness of the active aging is strongly referred by Walker in his article on a strategy to active aging. According to him (2002, p. 134), the idea and motivation behind the concept is creating a society for all ages. In such a society, everyone, regardless of their ages, can have a chance to participate and contribute to the society. While highlighting a society for all, Walker refers to several points, those are basically diminishing the barriers in labor market,

competencies, health and community care, most importantly for this study, he emphasized the active communities and community participation.

To summarize, active aging can be considered as a part of paradigm shift that age friendly cities policies are also included, which is a positive, neoliberal perspective to aging. Therefore, it is included within this study with its historical evolution, definition and explanations on its difference and specificity from other related concepts. It is important in order to carry out to the discussion on age friendly cities.

### **2.3. Age-friendly Cities**

The relation between aging and urbanization is started to taken into consideration in 21<sup>st</sup> century. When it is looked at the academic literature on age-friendly cities, the emphasis on these two realities can be realized at first glance. Population aging and challenges coming with this demographic change gave way to some policy recommendation which can be implemented as solutions to differing needs of older population for many countries.

In addition to demographic, social reasons of population aging, it is meaningful to look at the situation from the eyes of older adults, those are experiencing being old. At this point, the question “what is the meaning of being old?” comes to minds and it is meaningful to refer in order to gain a comprehensive insight about the importance of the challenges or about the importance of the efforts those are aiming to make the lives of elderly better through advancing social policies.

Vincent (2003, p. 7), provided some explanations on the “being old” from the eyes of senior adults, while doing this he is asking questions such as, “when, how and where do people think that they are old?”. In the light of this question, he highlighted the importance of the social construction of old age. Therefore, as an answer to that question, he emphasized that, one of the most important determinants of old age is other people’s behaviors. People’s senses of being old are basically associated with

the distancing of others from them. Moreover, according to Bowling (2007, p.15), there is an increase in people's expectations from old age especially in terms of health and social care. Therefore, European policy makers intended to measure the quality of life in old age in order to bring the needs and expectations of older adults from old age. The quality of life is used in order to evaluate the effectiveness and results of the social policies. As cited in Bowling (2007, p. 15), according to Lawton, it includes micro, personal, and macro, societal, influences, therefore it includes subjective and objective dimensions those are interrelated. Therefore, Bowling applied a survey to older people on quality of life. According to her survey and in-depth interviews (2007, p. 19), she has been build up some main themes for quality of life in old age, those are mainly social relationships, social roles and activities, solo activities, health, psychological well being, home and neighborhood, financial situation. In the light of those information provided by Bowling, the importance of the age friendly cities from seniors, can be attributed with quality of life perceptions of seniors. In the light of this information, the needs of older adults which are core components of the meaning of being old can be revealed. Seniors pay attention to concerned spheres of life as the positive determinants of their life quality. Therefore, it can be said that, through home and neighborhood determinant and determinants related to meaningful relationships especially, aging in place and age friendly cities accordingly has an important place in the mindset of senior citizens.

As cited in Lui et. al., age-friendly environments or products can be considered as the latest trend within this context (2009, p. 116). Like active aging age-friendly environment can be considered as a part of the understanding of the positive approach to aging. Lui et. al. (2009, p. 116) highlights this point as follows, "the building and maintenance of an age-friendly environment is widely regarded as a core component of a positive approach to addressing the challenge of population aging."

Within the light of information provided above, according to the aim of the study, age friendly cities models and the slightly different criteria are going to be discussed.

To reach that aim, the part of this chapter is provided background information related to the concept, historical development of the concept is basically the subject of this chapter.

### **2.3.1. Historical Evolution of the Concept**

After referring the relation between the two concepts, those are basis for age-friendly cities, and providing the linkage between the two, historical development of the age friendly cities concept is meaningful. According to Menec et. al. (2013, p. 2), the increased interest of especially policy makers on the discussion on age-friendly cities, gained speed after the launch of Global Age friendly Cities Project of World Health Organization (WHO). As a proof of this determination, authors refer to the members of the Global Age-friendly Cities and Communities Network, when it is created by WHO on 2010, there were only a few cities from United States, Belgium and United Kingdom. However, after a couple of years, nowadays, the network is including over 100 cities world-wide.

The Vienna International Plan of Action on Aging was adopted by the World Assembly on Aging held in Vienna in 1982 and it refers to the aging as a situation that requires integral perspective in terms of international, national and local levels. The Plan aims to guide countries in terms of their capabilities to response the needs of the aging population. While doing this basic concern of the Plan is promote the efficient action between levels those are mentioned above through cooperation in economic and technical spheres. In 1991, UN member states adopted the United Nations Principles for Older Persons, based on the Vienna International Plan of Action on Ageing.

In order to contribute to the plan, the United Nations Principles for Older Persons is announced for member states. According to UN report on the principles, they aim to encourage governments to be aware of Independence, Participation, Care, Self-fulfillment and Dignity concepts for older citizens into their national programs

(1991). These principles can be considered as the foundation for the Age-friendly Cities approach. Those five basic principles as the basis for the concept of age friendly cities are going to be briefly explained. The first one, “independence” principle emphasizes that older persons should have basic needs of a human being such as, having adequate food, shelter, clothing and health care through provision of income, family and community support. Thus, they should have work opportunities and other ways to access income. Furthermore they have to have access to educational or training programs. They should decide when to stop working and they should live in a safe place adapting their changing capacities or simply their preferences.

The second principle, which is “participation”, is about participation to social and civic life. It is stated that, older persons should be able to participate movements and associations of them. Moreover, the participation also includes that, older persons should be able to seek and develop opportunities for service to the community and to serve as volunteers in positions appropriate to their interests and capabilities.

The third principle that is mentioned on the document on the implementation of international plan of action on aging and related activities is care. According to principle of care, older people should reach the family, community and health care those are considered as the optimum level of physical, mental and psychological well-being of them. Besides, the legal services should guarantee their autonomy, protection and care and also their rights to making decision on their care in a secure and humane environment.

Another two principles those provide basis for the concept of age-friendly cities are self-fulfillment and dignity. The self-fulfillment principle refers to the realization of the potential of older persons. Regarding, they should have access to the cultural, educational, spiritual and recreational resources of the society. The principle of dignity highlights the living free from the exploitation, mental and physical abuse.

They also should be able to live free from discrimination by age, gender, ethnicity, conditions of ability like any human being (1991).

Those principles for older people and International Plan of Action on Aging gave way to a policy framework called Active Ageing: A Policy Framework which was developed by the World Health Organization's Ageing and Life Course Program as a contribution to the Second United Nations World Assembly on Aging which is held in 2002. According to Kalache and Gatti (2003, p. 4), the authors of the document, Policy Framework aimed to inform policy makers while developing and formulating action plans that promote healthy and active ageing, in light of the rapid growth of the global population over age 60, especially in developing countries. The suggestions for policy proposals highlighted in the Policy Framework were intended to guide the development of further, more specific actions at the regional, national and local levels.

The Age-friendly cities concept is a local response to encouraging active ageing by optimizing opportunities for health, participation and security in order to enhance quality of life as people age (Kalache and Gatti, 2003, p.2). The document mentioned above, leads the discussion to the concept of active aging, which provides a basis for the concept of age-friendly cities. The citation above is important in terms of highlighting age-friendly cities approach as a way of local attempts to develop active aging as a whole.

The path goes to age friendly cities is completed by WHO with the declaration of WHO Global Age friendly Cities Guide which determines the eight core components of an age friendly city which is referred many times within the following chapter of the study. Following the guide, the WHO Global Network of Age friendly Cities is founded in order to share experiences and show best practices.

To conclude, within the context of the conceptual framework chapter, basic concepts those are basis for age friendly cities which are aging in place and active aging are



defined with their importance and necessities of emergence. Moreover, age friendly cities concept and its historical story is proposed in order to provide background information for proper explanation of the idea of the study.

## **CHAPTER 3**

### **BASIC APPROACHES TO AGE FRIENDLY CITIES / DIFFERENT MODELS**

Within the context of this chapter, different models of age friendly cities around the world are tried to be explained in detail. Information about the content and the points highlighted are going to be the concern for the chapter. This clarification and detailed explanation can be considered as the core component of the ideal type that is provided within the discussion and conclusion chapters, which is the main aim of the thesis. In order to provide an ideal type for age-friendly cities, together with these models, the child friendly cities approach will be used. Therefore, age friendly models from UK, US and Canada are core inputs. The reason behind the selection of those six models is an important point which should be clarified. According to literature, as it is mentioned in previous parts of the study, the concept and practices on age friendly cities took their roots from European experience. Although there are references to age friendly cities in many other countries, most of them are following the WHO model. For this reason, the models those are evaluated are selected from European experience. Moreover, for instance about Australian experience, Lui et. al. (2009, p. 120) argues that, it focuses still on only physical side of the environment and it has limited reference to social and cultural context of an age friendly city. Another reason behind this selection is that, in the countries in which those models are used, there are provinces those are following the models. Therefore, specific examples of cities and specific good practices, such as Tokyo or New York are not mentioned within the scope of this study. Through their specified criteria and through highlighting the similarities and differences of those models, the core components of ideal type will be determined.

While searching for age-friendly communities, one can easily come up with many different names for approach and different practical websites those serve for the same purpose, which is creating or maintaining age-friendly environments, which

gives advices to city governances trying to provide more age-friendly environments to its residents. It is tried to provide a comprehensive understanding of the differences and similarities within literature on age-friendly environment. According to Lui et. al. (2009, p. 117), there are different terminologies to refer an age-friendly environment. For instance, WHO, called the term as “age-friendly cities” in 2005, the Canadian government which takes the leading role within the Global Age-friendly Cities Project of WHO, continues to use the same name for its efforts. However, USA used the term “livable communities” while UK is using “lifetime neighborhood” mostly. According to authors, that various terminology is a reflection of different emphasis on different points within the context. As it is identified by Lui et. al. (2009, p. 117), there are six basic approaches to age-friendly environment literature which are used within the scope of this study. Those six alternative preferences are, age-friendly city (WHO), lifetime neighborhood (Department for Communities and Local Government, UK), livable community (American Association of Retired Persons), Livable Community (National Association of Area Agencies on Aging, USA), elder-friendly community (University of Calgary, Canada), elder-friendly community (The AdvantAge Initiative, USA). The following parts of this chapter are specifically refer to those models of age friendly cities.

### **3.1. Age-friendly Cities of World Health Organization**

The first model that is going to be explained within this chapter is WHO model on age friendly cities, which is the first model in literature with the reference of “age-friendly” in name. According to Plouffe and Kalache, World Health Organization proposed that “an age friendly city is one that promotes active aging which optimizes opportunities for health, participation and security in order to enhance quality of life as people age.” (2010, p. 735). After the research of World Health Organization within 33 cities in 22 countries, a checklist for cities self assessment came out. It basically has eight main parts those are criteria for calling a city as “age-friendly city”. Those eight criteria are, outdoor spaces and buildings, transportation, housing, social participation, social inclusion and respect, civic participation and employment,

communication and information, community and health services. For better understanding brief information about all those eight spheres may be helpful and provided below.

According to World Health Organization's Checklist of Essential Features of Age-friendly Cities (2007, pp.1-4), The first heading for an age-friendly city is criterion about outdoor spaces and buildings and this heading has a checklist including sanitation, greenness and safety of outdoor spaces. There are also criteria about pavements' effectiveness. Effectiveness includes reserving for pedestrians, wideness enough for wheelchairs. Another important issue for checking is pedestrian crossings, whether they are sufficient in number and the traffic lights have enough time for older adults to across the road. Outdoor spaces and buildings also should be assessed in terms of sufficient special customer service arrangements, such as special queues for older adults or sufficient seating or toilets, accessible elevators, ramps (WHO, 2007, p. 1).

The second criterion for an age-friendly city is considered as transportation. Transportation has also its own checklist according to WHO. It should be assessed in terms of costs of transportation, timing (frequency), reliability in terms of timing and starting and ending points, route and stations. Effectiveness for disability and cleanness of the vehicles are also points that needed to be checked for an age-friendly city. Drivers as an important part of transportation should be aware of the needs of older adults. For instance, they should provide adequate and reliable information when asked, or they should not drive off before the older adults seated (WHO, 2007, pp.1-2).

Housing is another heading for an age-friendly city that should be checked. First of all, affordable in safe places is a must for an age-friendly city. The safe place should be close to city services and the rest of the community. Affordable home maintenance services should be guaranteed for older adults. Interior spaces of houses should be suitable for older adults (WHO, 2007, p. 2).

According to WHO, one of eight criteria for age-friendly cities is social participation. Social participation has its own checklist like other seven headings for age-friendly cities. For example, venues for events and activities should be conveniently located and easily accessible by public transport. Events should be organized at times convenient for older people. The activities and events are also assessed in terms of cost and announcements. They should be affordable and enough information about the time, place and process should be clearly given to older participants (WHO, 2007, pp. 2-3).

Respect and social inclusion should also be assessed by an age-friendly city. Older people should regularly be consulted by public, voluntary and commercial services on how to serve them better. Asking the target population gives the best results. Services and products should suit varying needs and preferences of older adults. The service should also be evaluated in terms of service staff and their attitude and behavior on older adults, they should be helpful. Community events should attract all generations including older adults. Older people should not only recognized by their past contributions, but also present contributions to the community. Schools should have a role on social inclusion and respect, they should provide a way for young people to learn about older adults and to older adults to involve schooling and keeping to learn (WHO, 2007, p.3).

Civic participation and employment is another basic criterion for an age-friendly city according to WHO. The qualities of older employees should be well promoted and a range of flexible and appropriately paid opportunities for older people to work should be promoted. The work environment should also be assessed in terms of discrimination against age and disability. Self-employment options for older people, post-retirement trainings and employment should be considered by public administrators as options for older adults (WHO, 2007, p. 3).

Communication and information should be considered as another criterion, although all others have a linkage with communication and information. First of all, a basic

and effective communication system should be reached to all members of community. Regular information and broadcasts of interest to older people should be offered. The language of communication should be assessed in terms of comprehensibility. In other words, print and spoken communication should use simple, familiar words in short, straightforward sentences. Electronic equipment, such as mobile telephones, radios, televisions, and bank and ticket machines, has large buttons and big lettering (WHO, 2007, pp.3-4).

Community and health services which are basic criteria for an age-friendly city should also be checked. First and foremost, an adequate range of health and community support services should offered for promoting and maintaining health. Health and other social services should be located at a place which can be reached easily by public transport. For older adults with disabilities, home care services should be considered clearly. The health and social services, according to WHO model, should be assessed by delivery of the service and staff. Delivery of services should be coordinated and administratively simple. Besides, staff should be helpful and respectful. There should also be staff which is trained specially to treat older adults. Community emergency planning should take into account the vulnerabilities and capacities of older people (WHO, 2007, p. 4).

In the light of these information provided above, WHO model on age-friendly cities can be considered as a model which contains both physical and social environment. Therefore, with reference to environmental gerontology, the environment which is effective on well-being of people is assessed in both cases in the age-friendly city model of WHO. That brief assessment will be widening within the discussion chapter in order to reach an ideal type for age friendly cities. For more clear explanation, the table below, which highlights the criteria of WHO model, can be used.

Table 1: Criteria for an Age friendly city of World Health Organization

<b>Physical Environment</b>	<b>Social Environment</b>
Outdoor Spaces and Buildings	Social Participation
Transportation	Social Inclusion and Respect
Housing	Civic Participation and Employment
	Community and Health Services
	Communication and Information

### **3.2. Lifetime Neighborhood of Department for Communities and Local Government UK**

Another model for age-friendly city model is developed by UK Department for Communities and Local Government, which is a part of UK government. The name of the model is Livable Communities. The definition of a lifetime neighborhood is as follows:

Lifetime neighborhoods offer everyone the best possible chance of health, wellbeing, and social, economic and civic engagement regardless of age. They provide the built environment, infrastructure, housing, services and shared social space that allow us to pursue our own ambitions for a high quality of life. (Harding, 2007, p. 6).

Within the model of United Kingdom, supporting residents to develop lifetime neighborhoods is stated as a core component. Basically this component highlights the point that, the only important thing is not what is happening in a lifetime neighborhood, but also how the decision making is done before providing or revising services in the road to create a lifetime neighborhood. Therefore, the perspective of lifetime neighborhoods emphasizes the roles on public and private sectors, voluntary and community organizations. Besides, local governments and town councils have the greater role during the process of lifetime neighborhoods. This can be considered

as a distinctive characteristic of UK's lifetime neighborhoods. In other words, it gives prior importance to participation of older adults to policies in the neighborhood, which is missing in WHO model.

There are several central themes for a lifetime neighborhood, according to Harding, those principles are, social cohesion and sense of place, built environment, housing, innovation and cross-sectoral planning, services and amenities, social inclusion.

The theme built environment is explained by Harding by emphasizing the importance of a built environment within the context of a neighborhood with a claim that containing all age groups. Older adults due to limited physical ability to move, compared to other generations, are in need of better level access to buildings and public spaces, automatic doors, handrails, good lighting, pavement and road maintenance, appropriate outdoor seating arrangements and provision of public toilets (2007, p. 16).

One of the other basic themes for a lifetime neighborhood is social cohesion and sense of space. Within this theme a clear spatial hierarchy of neighborhood meaning a clear designation of main streets, town centers, residential areas, services areas, recreational and work space, assists in navigation and interpretation of the built environment as well as making it more pleasant. According to the theme, landmark buildings can add important aesthetic qualities and create a focal point to different areas. In addition to aesthetic quality, they can be considered as useful waypoints for older people. The basic concern of older adults while hesitating to access to built environment, which is fear of crime and fear of falling of losing him/her way is also considered under the theme of social cohesion and sense of space by UK's lifetime neighborhood model.

Housing is determined as a core theme for a lifetime neighborhood by Harding saying that, "it should be noted that a high quality housing market for older people is clearly vital to the success of lifetime neighborhoods." (2007, p. 17). According to



this theme, housing market should provide a wide spectrum of choices for older adults.

Innovation and cross-sectoral planning can be considered as a connective theme which can include all other themes. An ageing population requires community-based services in local government to respond effectively to the needs of older adults. This response can only be possible with innovation. For instance, an innovative technology for health services can provide the main aim of lifetime neighborhoods, which is increased well-being of all generations including and especially for older adults. By saying cross-sectoral planning it is tried to be explained that, the relationship and communication between planners and service providers is crucial.

The theme social inclusion is another basic theme of a lifetime neighborhood, as cited in Harding (2007, p.12),

Independence alone is not enough if we want to improve the quality of life of older people and tackle exclusion. Everyone, including older people, has the right to participate and continue throughout their lives having meaningful relationships and roles. Older people's vital role and responsibility to help build social capital will become ever more apparent as our society ages.

UK Communities and Local Government Department's document of "A Sure Start to Later Life" (2006, p. 49), gave a useful explanation for social inclusion and the ideal of independence. It should be noted that, independence should not be understood as a counterpart for social inclusion. A person's desire to participate in society is unlikely to change with age. While explaining the social inclusion, lifetime neighborhood model, gives reference to World Health Organization's definition (2006, p.49). The reference to overall wellbeing, social, economic and civic capital should also be worth to note about the understanding of social inclusion of lifetime neighborhood model. Therefore, it can be said that, social inclusion cannot be thought as counter

for the principle of independence which is the core principle of the most age-friendly models, such as, WHO model and lifetime neighborhood model.

The last theme in the model of lifetime neighborhoods is services and amenities. As older people may become progressively less able to get out and about access to services and amenities is started to be considered as a core point for a lifetime neighborhood. According to Harding (2007, pp. 18-19), accessing services are an important part of daily activities, social inclusion and at the same time for independence for older people. Although local services and amenities affect quality of life for all residents, they are particularly important for senior residents.

In short, Harding (2007, p. 30), summarizes the model with its basic points. First one is that, the model is crucial for active aging within the demographic reality: aging. It can be considered as a way of making urban life easier not only for older adults but also all generations and people with disabilities. Consultation with older adults and the emphasis on access is important points of a lifetime neighborhood. Therefore, it became a model which gives priority to engagement of older adults, rather than a one size fits all understanding. Innovation is necessary for sustainable services for lifetime neighborhoods. As it is mentioned above, the cooperation between service providers and planners is a distinctive feature of the model of lifetime neighborhood. For better understanding, the table below, which includes the criteria for a lifetime Neighborhood of Department for Communities and Local Governments can be used.

Table 2: Criteria for a Lifetime Neighborhood of Department for Communities and Local Government UK

<b>Physical Environment</b>	<b>Social Environment</b>
Built Environment	Social Cohesion and Sense of Place
Housing	Social Inclusion
	Innovation and Crosssectoral Planning

### **3.3. Livable Community American Association of Retired Persons (AARP)**

Third model for age-friendly environments within the literature on age-friendly cities and practice is proposed by American Association of Retired Persons (AARP) and called the attempts “livable communities”. According to Fidler et. al. (2011, p. 690), AARP is a non-profit organization and has 37 million members in U.S. This number of member brings AARP the title of being the largest non-profit organization of U.S. It represents the people beyond their 50s with its 37 million members and its most prominent work is on livable communities.

According to Kihl et. al. the definition of a livable community is as follows, “A livable community is one that has affordable and appropriate housing, supportive community features and services, and adequate mobility options, which together facilitate personal independence and the engagement of residents in civic and social life.” (2005, p. 2). As it is mentioned above, it can be said that, housing, transportation, land use, cooperation and communication, understanding the community and planning, leadership are the basics of AARP’s perspective of livable communities (Oberlink, 2008, p. 7). The most common way for almost all models of age-friendly cities in order to determine the criteria of age-friendliness is focus group field study. Therefore, as a contribution to characteristics listed above, Kihl et. al. (2005, p. 11), provided results of a focus group field study in terms of characteristics of a livable community. According to analysis of the focus groups, it is realized by researchers that,

There is a particular emphasis on the importance of nearby quality health facilities, a reliable public transportation system, variety in housing types, a safe and secure environment, access to shopping, a physical environment that fosters walking, and opportunities for recreation and culture.

According to Fidler, et. al. (2011, pp. 691-692), AARP introduced a three-pillar strategy in order to increase the livability of communities, which are, engagement

strategy, housing strategy and mobility strategy. The engagement strategy has several aims to realize. The first one is about raising awareness of older adults in terms of livability concerns. The second aim of the strategy of engagement is that, coalition between efforts for the aim of increasing livability of communities. The last two aims of engagement strategy of AARP's livability approach are related to members of the organization. One of them is mobilizing the members to influence local-level decision making processes and the other is engaging the members to services of housing and mobility.

The importance of having an engagement strategy is explained as follows (AARP, 2005, p. 19). Community engagement includes attachment to place, social activities with friends, relationships with neighbors and informal help, local organizational membership, volunteering, interest and participation in community affairs and issues. As it is recognized within the literature on aging, aging may cause a loss of social roles for older adults. Community engagement is proposed as a remedy for this risk of losing social roles. In other words, according to AARP's community engagement feature can create an opportunity for socializing within the community through volunteering and relationships within neighborhood.

The strategy of housing has also goals similar with strategy of engagement. Those are appropriate and affordable housing for differing needs in 50s, aging in place, which means staying in their own houses until whenever they wish. The third strategy of AARP's livable communities understanding is on mobility. The specific goals of that strategy are having appropriate transportation options, driving should stay as a safe and complete option for older drivers. As it is mentioned above, with reference to Fidler, et. al. (2011, pp. 691-692), mobility strategy is discussed within the AARP's perspective is rather than a broad context of mobility, limited to transportation. All other strategies of livable communities are too much practical for AARP in U.S.

To sum up, there are distinctive features of livable community model of AARP, those are, involvement in community planning and leadership. That is to say, the model highlights the involvement of older adults to community planning, which is an important way to make the model more bottom-up. Land use, transport and mobility and housing are features of the model which are also included in almost all models of age-friendly cities. The criteria for a livable community from the point of view of AARP can be seen from the table below.

Table 3: Criteria for a Livable Community American Association of Retired Persons (AARP)

<b>Physical Environment</b>	<b>Social Environment</b>
Land Use	Cooperation and Communication
Transportation and Mobility	Involvement in Community Planning
Housing	Leadership

### **3.4. Livable Community National Association of Area Agencies on Aging (USA)**

As the forth model, the highlighted initiatives for age friendly cities by Lui, et. al. (2009, p. 118), is Livable Communities of National Association of Area Agencies on Aging of USA. The National Association of Area Agencies on Aging (n4a)<sup>5</sup>, is a non-profit association contains more than 650 area agencies on aging from all over USA.

According to the report of The National Association of Area Agencies on Aging (n4a), Making Your Community Livable for All Ages (2015, p.14), livable community is determined as a prerequisite for successful aging. That is why it is a

---

<sup>5</sup> The City of Houston, Official Site for Houston, Texas. What is the Area Agency on Aging. Retrieved from: <http://www.houstontx.gov/health/Aging/Aging-what.html> on 8 June 2015

top program and policy priority for more than a decade. Unsurprisingly, all models of age-friendly cities give priority to successful or active aging.

According to the report (2015, p. 14) the definition of a livable community for National Association of Area Agencies on Aging is provided with its responsibilities those are ensured by a livable community:

A Livable Community ensures that social supports those enables people can engage in community, affordable housing choices, enables people to get around by providing transportation options and designing public spaces with ramps, no-step entries to buildings, provides basic amenities for daily needs, fosters social interaction and community involvement through the creation of intergenerational public spaces and opportunities for engagement.

While providing those prerequisites for a livable community, the highlighted results those are tried to be reached are maximizing the independence and quality of life of older adults and enhancing the economic, civic and social vitality of the community.

Similar to other models, livable community of National Association of Area Agencies has several core components those are defined as important features of a livable community for older adults. One of the core components of a livable community is housing. The challenges in housing those should be overcome are affordable housing options, the design of houses and the limitations in coordination of housing and services. Accordingly, there is a principle that promises, livable communities should provide residents different housing types with different affordability options. Depending on the second item of housing challenges, a livable community should offer supportive housing arrangements, such as assisted living.

Planning and zoning is determined as another core point for a livable community by the report called Blueprint for Action of N4A. According to report (2007, p. 15), as prerequisite for a successful aging, safe and easy access to services, amenities, and

support networks are determined. There are two challenges those are determined under planning and zoning theme. Land use plans and zoning codes should enable and encourage housing in proximity to services and support the formation of intergenerational communities. In other words, basic components of daily life should be available for many different groups of population including older adults.

Third basic theme for a livable community in the model of N4A, is being mobile. Generally, within this theme, the model pays attention to transportation. According to the report of Blueprint for action (2007, p. 20), due to loss of physical and functional skills, driving is determined as harder for older adults compared to adulthood. Several challenges those should be overcome by a livable community are determined by the report of N4A (2007, p. 20). Those are hardship of walking on the streets due to road design, hardship of driving due to driving environment and lack of alternatives in community transportation. Therefore, the need to new design and planning of transportation is obvious. New volunteer driver programs or designing towards the needs of pedestrians or cyclists are given as examples of those new planning and innovative methodologies of transportation.

Another core theme in the model of N4A is determined as health and supportive services (2007, p. 27). Obviously, access to adequate and affordable health care is the priority for many older adults and a core component of a livable community for older adults and for all ages. A livable community should have adequate and affordable transportation to hospitals. Moreover, as an alternative to institutional care, as it is the essence of age friendly communities, a homecare or community care system should be established and coordinated properly. The model highlights the informal care. In other words, the friends and family members of older adults are prioritized in terms of getting services or benefitted from the environment.

The fifth component of a livable community for N4A is culture and lifelong learning. In terms of lifelong learning it is obvious that, the N4A model attracts attention to economic competitiveness (2007, p. 35). Therefore, a livable community should use

its cultural sites, such as libraries, universities or parks for lifelong learning opportunities of older adults.

The sixth theme of a livable community for N4A model is public safety. Within the context of sixth theme of a livable community the highlighted challenge is elder abuse. Safety is determined as the prerequisite for staying active and engaging the community by N4A (2007, p. 39). Financial exploitation, physical and mental abuse should be prevented by social service agencies and police department. Moreover, communication between neighbors may prevent the fear of safety.

Another core component of a livable community is determined as civic engagement and volunteer opportunities (2007, p. 42). Older adults' looking forward to a range of civic engagement options is considered as a challenge for this theme in N4A report. A livable community for especially older adults defines the processes those should be taken into consideration in terms of civic engagement and voluntary opportunities as follows (2007, p. 42) "Retired individuals have opportunities to use the skills and experience they've developed over time to serve their communities directly and take leadership roles, community-wide collaborations count older individuals as core leaders and intergenerational connections are routine."

To sum up, the livable community for N4A has the emphasis on physical aspects of a neighborhood with reference to planning and zoning, housing, being mobile. At the same time, there are references to social aspects such as health and supportive services, culture and lifelong learning, public safety, civic engagement and volunteerism. It can be easily seen the emphasis on two sides of the "environment". The very brief and simple table below can be used to better understand the criteria of N4A's Livable Communities.



**Table 4:** Criteria for a Livable Community of National Association of Area Agencies on Aging

<b>Physical Environment</b>	<b>Social Environment</b>
Planning And Zoneing	Health and Supportive Services
Housing	Culture and Lifelong Learning
Being Mobile	Public Safety
	Civic Engagement and Volunteerism

### **3.5. Elder-friendly Community (University of Calgary, Canada)**

Another model that is provided as age-friendly city model is elder friendly community. Elder friendly community model of University of Calgary is a result of the project that is undertaken by the University. Similar with the other models, the Elder Friendly Communities of University of Calgary is rooted from the increasing seniors' population at local and national level (Austin, et. al., 2001, p. 9). As a result, the city of Calgary has preferred to apply an aging in place discourse and has behaved accordingly. Therefore, in 2000 the Elder Friendly Communities Project has launched in Calgary. The stakeholders of the project are Calgary Regional Health Authority, the City of Calgary; Community Vitality and Protection and the University of Calgary; Faculty of Social Work. The project defined the needs and the criteria for elder friendly community from the seniors living in Calgary with a needs assessment field study.

The major categories and themes that are highlighted in the field research are, being valued and respected, staying active, building community, making ends meet, a place to call home, feeling safe, getting what you need, getting around (Austin et. al., 2001, p. 36). All these eight major categories and themes can be determined as criteria for this model to assess the age friendliness of the communities.

First category, being valued and respected, contains two themes those are caregiver contributions and attitudes towards seniors. Older adults mentioned that, the contributions of older adults to the community are most of the time underestimated, such as, care giving and volunteering. Due to that contribution they preferred to be respected. Moreover, the attitude towards them in daily life should also be respectful but not dependent. Therefore, according to results of the project older adults want to be respected but not appearing dependent or demanding (Austin et. al., 2001, p. 12).

Second category of an elder friendly community for University of Calgary is staying active, depending on the results of the field research. Staying active meaning remaining independent and involved. In terms of staying active, the major themes are determined as recreation, health care, and social activities. Health care is also grabbing mental health problems caused from living alone and isolation from the social life (Austin et. al., 2001, p. 12).

Third category for the model is building community. This category highlights the participation of older adults to the life within the community. They are active citizens and participants of the community. The major themes for this category are listed as, social supports, community, volunteerism, community development, senior residences, culture, language, community specific information peer support.

Forth category for an age friendly community is making ends meet. This category is about finances and the major theme under the category of making ends means is finance. According to the results of the field study of the project (Austin et. al., 2001, p. 13), “many seniors worried about finding affordable home repair services when it became difficult to handle small home chores by themselves.” In addition to daily stuff, health care expenses are a big case for many older adults. Moreover, the finance issue comes to stage in the issue of affordable housing.

The fifth category within the context of the model of University of Calgary is feeling safe. The category of feeling safe includes both safety and infrastructure. In other

words, it refers to personal safety in terms of the cases of emergency, crime, and environmental conditions such as snow and heavy rain. One of the interesting findings of the research on elder friendliness of University of Calgary is that (Austin et. al., 2001, p. 14), the primary issues in terms of safety, for Calgary, are environmental conditions and in-home chores, rather than crime.

The sixth category of an elder friendly community for University of Calgary model is, depending on the findings of the research, is a place to call home. This metaphoric name refers to housing and home maintenance (Austin et. al., 2001, p. 14). Similar with many other scholars Austin et. al., think that, many older adults want to age in place. In such a case, it is not fair to make older adults feel as they have to move only because of inappropriate home environment. Therefore, some assistance should be provided for older adults to make them stay in their houses. Moreover, the housing issue has also a financial part within itself. That is to say, affordable housing is a must for an elder friendly city.

Another category that is determined by the model of Elder Friendly Cities of University of Calgary is getting what you need. Under this category, there are three themes those are services, benefits information accesses and language barriers. Therefore, it can be said that, this category means getting access to information and services regardless of language barriers. As a result of the research before the model (Austin et. al., 2001, p. 16), older adults found health care and social service systems as a confusing. Similarly, they don't know how to fill out their forms or where they can get some assistance for certain things. In addition to information about the services, older adults are in need of assistance in order to use the new methods of reaching to the certain services.

The last category for an elder friendly community is called getting around by University of Calgary. This category has two theme, those are transportation and physical access. Although many older adults are still active drivers in Calgary, they do not know until when they can stay active in driving (Austin et. al., 2001, p. 16),

there are also many those need to public transportation options. Especially in the case of Calgary, while organizing transportation services, the snowy weather should be taken into consideration. Therefore, as a basic need, transportation and physical access is a core point of an elder friendly community.

To sum up the model of Universtiy of Calgary, it determined more or less the similar criteria to other models. Those criteria are gathered under eight core categories, those are, being valued and respected, staying active, building community, making ends meet, feeling safe, a place to call home, getting what you need and getting around. Those referred criteria for each model will be evaluated within the discussion chapter in order to reach the criteria that an ideal type should contain.

For better and clear understanding it can be referred the table which is prepared with social and physical environment distinction.

**Table 5:** Criteria for Elder friendly Community of University of Calgary

<b>Physical Environment</b>	<b>Social Environment</b>
Being Mobile (Getting Around)	Being Valued and Respected
Housing	Access to Information and Services (Getting What You Need)
	Maintaining Independence and Involvement in Activities
	Building Community

**3.6. Elder-friendly Community (The AdvantAge Initiative, USA)**

The last model which is going to be explained within the scope of this thesis is elder friendly community from AdvantAge Initiative. According to Oberlink and Gursen (2006, p. 3), The AdvantAge Initiative is a project of the Center for Home Care Policy and Research. The center is an independent research center within the Visiting

Nurse Service of New York. The initiative is established in 2000 and has been working for more than ten years with communities. The AdvantAge Initiative developed its criteria for an elder friendly city through a research on a group of older adults living in United States. During the field research similar to WHO model, Advantage Initiative asked to participants in the focus groups some specific questions in order to describe the ideal community in which to grow old. In the light of this information, the Initiative defined four basic criteria for an elder friendly city with its checklists. Therefore, an elder friendly city addresses older people's basic needs, optimizes their physical and mental health and well-being, maximizes independence for the frail and disabled, and promotes older peoples' social and civic engagement. As it is mentioned above, Advantage Initiative is worked with many communities in US within the cooperation of local governments. Moreover, it conducted a national survey which represents the averages and norms for US society. This national survey results are proposed as a comparison tool for communities.

In order to better understand, the definition of an elder friendly community is done by Oberlink and Gursen as follows (2006, p. 3), "A community-building effort, the AdvantAge Initiative provides a framework for creating communities in the U.S. where older adults can enjoy healthy, independent, productive and satisfying lives."

After providing basic information on AdvantAge Initiative on elder friendliness of communities in US, it is meaningful to provide more detailed information about the determined criteria and checklist of the Initiative. The first domain is determined as address basic needs of older adults, this domain has several themes behind it those are, providing appropriate and affordable housing, promoting safety at home and in the neighborhood, assuring no one goes hungry, providing useful information about available services. As it is mentioned above, the Initiative has prepared a checklist for each category of an elder friendly community. According to information on the checklist (Feldman, et. al., 2004, p. xx), affordable housing is tried to be assessed through the percentage of older adults those are spending more than 30 % of their income, percentage of people age 65+ who want to remain in their current residence

and are sure about they will be able to afford it in the future and the last indicator for this domain is whether the house is modified for ease of mobility and for safety. Another indicator for the first domain, which is addressing older people's basic needs are safety and livability of the neighborhood. The indicators of this point are about feelings of older adults. In other words, percentage of older adults who feel themselves safe or unsafe is determined as criteria for assessing the elder friendliness of a community. Problem reporting of older adults about the neighborhood is an indicator of safety. Moreover, satisfaction of older adults with the neighborhood as a place to live is considered as an indicator of an elder friendly city. The third criterion within the first domain is "people have enough to eat". This can be measured with the percentage of older adults who skip meals due to lack of money. As it is mentioned above, one of the criteria for an elder friendly community is assistance services on useful services. The indicators of the assistance are determined as follows: percentage of seniors who do not know whom to call if they need information about services in their community, percentage of people age 65+ who are aware/unaware of selected services in their community and percentage of older adults with adequate assistance in activities of daily living (Feldman, 2004, p. xx).

After the first domain of an elder friendly community, which is satisfying basic needs of older adults, the second domain is optimizing physical and mental health and well-being. The themes behind this domain are, promoting healthy behavior, supporting community activities that enhance well-being, providing ready access to preventive health services and providing access to medical, social and palliative services. For measuring the theme healthy behavior and health services, an elder friendly city should look up the rates of screening and vaccination for various conditions among older adults, percentages of older adults who feel depressed and anxious and apply to a health care professional. For measuring the healthy behavior, an elder friendly city should look up percentage of older adults who participate in regular physical exercise. For preventive and necessary medical care, the checklist includes the minimization of problems in terms of using medical care. This minimization includes payments for care services including drug receipts and some

specific areas of medical care such as dental care and eyeglasses. In terms of palliative care services, which means temporary solutions for medical problems, should be available and advertised properly for older adults in order to make those services known among older adults.

Third basic domain for an elder friendly city, according to AdvantAge Initiative in US is maximization of independence for the frail and disabled people. Unsurprisingly the first theme for this domain is transportation. Transportation should be accessible and affordable for older adults. Accessibility and affordability of transportation can be measured by the percentage of older adults who have access to public transportation. In addition to transportation, mobilizing resources to facilitate living at home is another theme of independence of disabled people. This theme is also the core for the discussion on age-friendly environments. Therefore, community should enable people to live comfortably and safely at home. The indicators of living at home comfortably are about to adequate assistance during activities of daily living (ADL). Moreover, for this theme of this domain, caregivers should be mobilized to complement the formal service system (Feldman et. al., 2004, p. xx).

The last basic domain which is determined by AdvantAge Initiative and as cited in Feldman et. al. (2004, p. xx), is promoting social and civic engagement of older adults people. In order to do that, an age friendly city should foster meaningful connections with family, neighbors and friends, should promote active engagement to the community life. Moreover, providing meaningful opportunities for paid and voluntary work is a criterion for one city to call itself as an elder friendly community. Furthermore, an elder friendly community should give elder friendly issues a community wide priority. In order to do those, residents of the community should maintain connections with friends and neighbors. Indicators for this communication are considered as percentage of older adults who socialized with friends or neighbors in the past week. Moreover, civic, cultural, religious, and recreational activities should include older residents. The measurement of the inclusion to activities can be

percentage of older adults who attended religious, cultural, sports and art events in the past week. Another indicator under this theme is determined as opportunities for volunteer work. Another theme under the heading of social and civic engagement is that, community residents should help and trust each other. Tool meaning indicator of helping and trusting each other are percentage of older adults who live in helping communities. Moreover, in terms of civic participation appropriate work should be available to those who want it. To measure this theme there is an indicator which is percentage of older adults who would like to be working for pay.

To sum up, AdvantAge Initiative has decided four basic domains for an elder friendly community those are, addressing basic needs, promoting social and civic engagement, optimizing physical and mental health and maximizing independence of frail and disabled people. Although it named only four basic criteria, those are more comprehensive and include basics of an elder friendly community, similar with the other models. In the light of information provided within this part of the study, it can be said that, AdvantAge Initiative gives priority to basic principles of aging in place idea, those are independence, social aspect of the environment and active and healthy aging concepts. The table below with distinction of physical and social environment can be used in order to have a clear vision about the criteria those are determined by the model.

Table 6: Criteria for Elder friendly Community of AdvantAge Initiative, USA

<b>Physical Environment</b>	<b>Social Environment</b>
Address basic Needs	Maximizes Independence
Maximizes Independence	Promotes Social and Civic Engagement
	Optimizes Physical, mental health and well being

To conclude this chapter, it should be noted that, details those take place within some models with their similar and different parts should be taken into consideration in the



path towards ideal type for age friendly cities. That will be discussed in following chapters with contribution to child friendly city models for the same purpose. Child friendly city model of UNICEF is the subject of the next chapter.

## **CHAPTER 4**

### **CHILD FRIENDLY CITY MODEL OF UNICEF**

Within this chapter, the child friendly city models are tried to be explained from UN initiatives on child friendliness. UNICEF has a Child Friendly Cities Initiative and some checklists for policy makers and practitioners. Child friendly city model is considered as another core component within the path towards an ideal type for age friendly cities. Comparison with age friendly and child friendly cities provides valuable input for the discussion on ideal type. Those two models have an emphasis on age spectrum and two are about the urban space usage of the groups at the beginning and end of the life course. Therefore, child friendly approach of UNICEF should be explained in details similar to age friendly city models.

While explaining the model of UNICEF, it is referred the historical evaluation of such an effort to create child friendly environments. In other words, the point that is tried to be clarified is that, when and how the development of the concept is realized. Moreover, what were the reasons behind that pursuit in the international arena.

#### **4.1. What is a Child-friendly City**

First of all, before going into details of the discussion and definitions of the efforts, it is necessary to note that, within this part of the chapter, if it is not written specifically the name, the word Convention is always used for the Convention on the Rights of the Child, which is the basic document for child friendly cities efforts of UNICEF.

According to Topsümer et. al., (2009, p. 6), a child friendly city is ensuring visibility of children's rights and visibility of children in the decision making mechanisms starting with child friendly perspectives of local government mechanisms. The emphasis on the local in this context, according to authors, aims starting from the

cities enlarging the perspective to state level and finally reaching a worldwide application of children's rights.

As it is mentioned above, the mainstay of child friendly cities is the Convention on the Rights of the Child. Therefore, a basic explanation of the convention can be made understanding easier. First of all, as it is written by Topsümer et. al. (2009, p. 6), the Convention admits people under their 18 years old as children and basically aims to protect the right to live, right to protection from any kind of violence, right to develop and participate to social life. Moreover, there is a room within the Convention about children with specialties such as disabled children. The arrangements within the scope of the Convention include special and different contexts such as the state of war or conflict, the state of divorce of the parents, state of financial inability to support the child or the cases for children in penitentiaries. In the light of this brief information, it is the most comprehensive document on children's rights in the world. Moreover, it is the first document which provides legal legitimacy to all those rights.

According to UNICEF's document of Building Child Friendly Cities: A Framework for Action (2004, p. 1), a child friendly city's goal should be to promote children's rights within local governments. In other words, a child friendly city should aim to implement the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child at local level. The local government has an increasing role in terms of direct communication and service providence. Accordingly, the rights that a child friendly city should guarantee are listed as follows within the UNICEF's report (2004, p. 1),

Participation of children to community, social life and decisions about the city, children's access to basic services such as health care, education and shelter, drinking safe water and have proper sanitation, being protected from exploitation, walk safely in the streets on their own, meeting friends and play, have green spaces for plants and animals, living in an unpolluted environment, participation in cultural and social events

In the light of this information provided above, there are four major issues those are critical for a child friendly city. Those four issues can be defined as safety, green space, access and integration. As cited in McAllister (2008, p.48), Spencer and Wooley have mentioned the issue of safety in terms of feeling of security and its effects on physical and mental health. Especially when the subject of safety issue is child, the concerned can be considered as more sensitive in the eyes of parents and decision makers. Plenty of green space is also an important part of a child friendly city. As cited in McAllister, exposure to green space makes children to develop a sense of environmental responsibility. Access to variety of services and amenities is another requirement of a child friendly city for the well being of children. Therefore, local governments should investigate the ways to make public space more accessible for children. The last issue which is critical for a child friendly city is the issue of integration. According to McAllister (2008, p. 54), if the integration can be achieved, it will be a major contribution to especially social health of the children and is essential in order to create a remedy for social isolation.

As cited in Topsümer et. al. (2009, p. 9), the UNICEF document of Building Child Friendly Cities: A Framework of Action, lists some goals in order to create a child friendly environment. Therefore, with reference to that policy document, the building blocks of a child friendly city are going to be defined within the next part of this chapter.

#### **4.2. Building blocks of a child friendly city**

Similar with the age friendly cities, child friendly cities has also core components. Those components can be considered as effective in operationalization of the concept and measurement. Moreover, they can be considered as the essential criteria for claiming a city as child friendly. Therefore, those standards are important for this study in order to make the comparison with age friendly cities and suggesting an ideal type for them.

According to information provided by UNICEF report (2004, p. 4), The Committee on the Rights of the Child, the human rights Treaty Body monitors the implementation of the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC). This monitoring body has prepared general measures of implementation for the CRC. Therefore, there are nine elements of a child friendly city, those are children's participation, a child friendly legal framework, a city-wide children's rights strategy, a children's rights unit or coordinating mechanism, child impact assessment and evaluation, a children's budget, a regular state of the city's children report, making children's rights known, independent advocacy for children. Those elements are called as building blocks of a child friendly city by the framework report (2004, p. 8).

After listing the nine elements of a child friendly city, it is meaningful to briefly explain them. Children's participation element refers to effective involvement of children's to issues and decisions those affect them. According to UNICEF, (2004, p. 7), informing and involving children to process of decision making, especially for the items those will have direct or indirect effects on lives of children is quite important for a city claiming to be a child friendly city. However, it is not enough to organize informative or discussion meetings within the agenda of adults, transmitting information to children necessitates the difference on the conventional ways of communication due to specific situation of children. Therefore, a child friendly city should find many examples of positive involvement and should give way to more room to develop new and innovative participatory practices with children (2004, p. 8). The checklist as it is mentioned above tries to guide practitioners and policy makers of local government by asking whether respect for children's views in the public and in families could be established. Another point that is highlighted within the context of checklist is whether children are consulted on all matters affecting them or not. The third core point within the checklist is about the participation of "specialist" groups of children. It is important whether they are consulted and involved in "specialist" issues on children or not. Those specialist issues can be defined as; children in care, children in trouble on juvenile justice issues, etc.

The second element of a child friendly city refers to legal procedures those aiming to promote and protect children's rights. In this element, the highlighted point is that, a local government, within the scope its authorization, should promote and protect children's rights at local level. UNICEF, while explaining the legal procedures emphasized that, although it is quite difficult to make child- friendly policies, it is not enough to revise the legal procedures only. In other words, it does not have a meaning without a proper implementation of legal procedures and increasing the information on public and service providers. Therefore, while reviewing the laws and other legal procedures, there should be experts and children consulting (2004, p. 9).

According to checklist that is provided by UNICEF (2004, p. 9), there should be a national review of legislation related to children's rights. That review has a strong relationship in terms of revision of local level responsibilities and legal procedures of the local government. Other elements of check list are about the appropriate methodology and principles about the revision of local legal procedures. The appropriateness has its roots from the Convention's foundation principles. One of the most important issues that is in checklist gives priority to special legal revisions towards the needs of children in difficult circumstance, such as are there enough consultancy or care services for those children.

The third element that is specified by UNICEF's framework for action for creating child friendly cities is the city-wide Children's Rights Strategy. This means depending on the Convention on children's rights, a necessity of comprehensive strategy for the city governance. As it is written in UNICEF (2004, p. 9), states are encouraged to prepare national plans for action for children in the World Summit for Children in 1990 and by the 2002 UN General Assembly Special Session for Children. Therefore, the local level action plans should be convenient with those national plans. Those local plans can be considered as facilitators of national plans in terms of proper operation of the national action plans. One of the most important points about a local action plan is defined by UNICEF (2004, p. 9) as follows:

Going beyond statements of policy and principle, the Strategy needs to set real and achievable targets in relation to the full range of economic, social and cultural and civil and political rights for children. More than a list of good intentions, it must include a description of the process of implementation for all children in the city. A key purpose of the Strategy is fulfilling the non-discrimination principle in the Convention.

Moreover, the strategy similar with legal procedures should be known by public, children, adults and service providers. It should be arranged for children's understanding, such as it should clear of from complicated words in it. It should be noted that, a strategy should be revised within set duration; it should be a dynamic document and should be revised according to monitoring reports within local context. The checklist includes points about the proper methodology during the preparation of local strategy, such as including children and experts to the process properly. Other points are related with the appropriateness of the strategy with four basic foundations of the Convention (2004, p. 11).

In addition to a general strategy, the fourth element prioritizes the children's perspective through a children's rights unit or coordination mechanism. The ground of having a local coordination mechanism is the existence of procedural differences within the working principles of local governments of different countries or even cities. According to UNICEF's framework for child friendly cities (2004, p. 12),

The basic aim of such a unit is creating a mainstreaming within the agenda of local government and monitoring and evaluating the agenda. Therefore, it should be a separate unit from other service providing for children units within the local government. However, there should be coordination between this department and other service providing departments. Moreover, the contact points to be reachable for children can be considered as a responsibility of such department.

Fifth element of a child friendly city is determined by UNICEF as a controlling mechanism which aims to monitor before, during and after processes of policies and

practices in terms of appropriateness to the aims. The Convention lays down to ensure the best interests of the child as a condition for states those are signed the Convention. The point is that, any government can know whether the necessities of the Convention are realized without a monitoring or assessment. The needs assessment researches should be implemented before the policy, which is created accordingly should also be assessed for its real impacts. In the light of this information, it can be said that, the checklist has points related to timing and methodology of the assessment. Moreover, it does not forget to refer to special cases those necessitates special policies and laws intended to marginalized groups of children.

A children's budget, the sixth element of the child friendly city ensures that whether an appropriate budget is allocated for children's needs within the city. A budget analysis can also be considered as a tool for measuring whether a state or a local government allocates the maximum extent of available resources to promote children's rights statement of the Convention or not. In other words, states and local governments should be on the track through budget analysis. In the checklist for this principle, there is the emphasis on the share that is allocated to children within the whole budget of the city governance. Transparency of the budgeting process is also one of the points those are highlighted within the checklist. (UNICEF, 2004, pp. 8-15).

A regular State of the City's Children Report, which is the seventh element, has the similar aim with UNICEF's annual report on the State of World's Children. Therefore, its goal is providing data and sharing it with public, including policy makers and all other stakeholders. Knowing the current and previous state of one group will also enable the future projections and those should be considered as core documents to make the situation better through realizing the needs (UNICEF, 2004, p. 15).



One of the most important points those are highlighted by the checklist is that, the research and report has the motivation to make visible the invisible or unknown problematic issues. In other words, the primary interest of the report should not be just repeating what is already there. Such an effort can inhibit evidence based policy-making. The checklists are about the appropriateness of the content of the report and its availability to key decision and policy makers and service providers or professionals. Besides availability, the proper use of data in the processes of policy development has a crucial importance within the checklist.

The eighth element of a child friendly city is recognized as making children's rights known, which means creating or increasing awareness on children's rights among public including adults and children. One of the important issues in the Convention, therefore in the child friendly cities checklist is making children's rights known as it is mentioned above, at this point the education system of the states and local governments is a tool for creating this recognition. Ensuring knowledge can be possible through different methods and the checklist offers to a child friendly city a strategy to ensure that transmission of knowledge to adults and decision makers (2004, p. 16).

The last element for a child friendly city is, as it is listed above, independent advocacy for children meaning to let non-governmental organizations work to promote children's rights through lobbying and advocacy. (2004, p. 4). In other words, non-governmental organizations working for children in many states have a large role on the children's policy (UNICEF, 2004, p. 17). The checklists include whether the city government considers NGOs as partners, and whether NGOs advocate for children's rights to influence decision making. One of the important points in terms of NGOs is that, there should be youth or child driven NGOs in conjunction with the participation of children to the processes of decision making.

To sum up, above it is tried to be explained the building blocks of a child friendly city which aims to protect and promote children's human rights in order to increase

well-being of children. Therefore, according to information provided above, one can easily said that, the legitimacy of a child friendly city approach comes from the Convention on the Rights of the Child.

#### **4.3. Historical Development of the Child friendly Cities Initiatives**

According to Woolcock and Gleeson (2007, p. 3), the inclination to the relation between children's well being and urbanization is started in 1960s in North America and Europe. Woolcock and Gleeson (2007, p. 3), related the growing interest of research on the relationship between urbanization and children's needs to establishment of a ten year program in 1968, called Growing Up in Cities, coordinated by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). After the program discussion focused on sometimes general questions and sometimes with very specific questions, such as, how environment is effective on child psychology or how children play grounds should be designed. During those years the efforts on children's issues are defined as devoid of children's voice and children are defined as basic part of the modernization process. Following years, in 1980s, as cited in Woolcock and Gleeson (2007, pp. 3-4), Homel and Burns wrote that, research into children's issues focused on how the physical environment impacted on the social and mental development of children. Those are, from a critical perspective, blamed as being top-down approaches which underestimated the subject of the issue, children. In 1990s, the attempts of UN are took back the discussion on children's position in urban space with HABITAT II meeting in Istanbul and the Child friendly Cities Initiative of UNICEF.

As it is mentioned in Riggio and Kilbake (2000, p. 201), after the conference, the Child-Friendly Cities Initiative (CFCI) is established in 1996. The reason ground the establishment of initiative was that, a child's well being is a preliminary element of a healthy society. Moreover, the Convention on the Right of the Child as a basic document with its sanction power, gives the initiative the legal and international legitimacy.

As it is mentioned in Riggio and Kilbake (2000, p. 201), and depending on the Convention “All children have the right to have access to basic services and to enjoy opportunities for development, whether they live with their families or alone, in slums, on pavements or in squatter colonies.” The reasons those are important motives behind supporting children’s rights with child friendly cities are some facts. For example, according to Sawhill and Chadwick (1999, p. 1), there is increasing number of children living in cities with the risk of being the poor adults of the future. Moreover, as cited in Topsümer et. al. (2009, p. 7), according to Minujin et. el., children are composed of the half of the population that is living under the poverty line.

As Riggio and Kilbake wrote, a global Secretariat for Child-Friendly Cities was established at the UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre (IRC) in Florence. The secretariat includes UNICEF, UNCHS/Habitat, Italian Committee for UNICEF and an Italian NGO. According to information that is provided by the authors (2000, p. 201), the aim of the secretariat is providing support for especially municipalities in terms of improving quality of life of children .The secretariat is planned to do this with information sharing and networking with interested municipalities. In order to realize the exchange of information among those city municipalities, CFCI partners came together with meetings. For instance, the meetings with civil society organizations, business and media, central governments, national and international agencies and local authorities came together in Accra, Ghana, in 1997 and in Italy, in 1998 and 1999. The meetings had a mission to provoke the investment on children and women development policies.

To conclude, within the context of the forth chapter of the study; child friendly cities’ definition, trends those gave way to initiatives working on this field, building blocks of child friendly cities, historical evolution and goals of the child friendly cities are provided in order to carry the discussion to an ideal type and determining the areas of ideal type. Moreover, the information provided in this chapter is valuable to make the comparison possible between those two perspectives.

## **CHAPTER 5**

### **DISCUSSION**

The basic aim of this chapter is providing a discussion on the age friendly cities criteria as ideal type. In order to provide a successful analysis, the comparison of age friendly city models among themselves and the comparison of child friendly cities model are going to be provided. The idea behind this comparison is that, both initiatives having the same purpose, which is making lives easier and fair, for different age groups living in city are analyzed together. This comparison contributes to a fully covered model for age friendly cities and highlights the missing parts of each other. Through that proposition of an ideal type for age friendly cities, the discussion can be transmitted to further suggestions for age friendly cities, which is the novelty of the study and its contribution to literature. To sum up, this chapter will help to discuss the argument of the thesis which is suggesting an ideal type and more clear understanding for age friendly cities for both scholars and policy makers.

#### **5.1. Ideal Type**

Within the context of this study, Weberian ideal type concept keeps ground in order to make the further comparisons possible in terms of age friendly cities. Therefore, it is meaningful to refer the concept of ideal type.

According to Demirel (2013, p. 365), Weber used mostly two methods in order to explain the social issues that he interested in, those models are “ideal type analysis” and “historical type analysis”. As cited in Demirel, according to Weber in order to understand the social structure, that structure should be known through specific features. For instance, one who wants to understand the bureaucracy, which is another contribution of Weber to social sciences, should be aware of specific features of bureaucracy those are different from other phenomenon. Depending on this understanding, Weber uses ideal types with a comparative understanding and

highlights the unique characteristics of bureaucracy. As mentioned in Demirel (2013, p. 365), according to Ergun, ideal types are not real however, they are strongly related with reality. They are not average situation within phenomena, an assumption or a description of the reality, rather they are experimental and utopic types. Kızılcelik, mentioned in Demirel (2013, p. 365), explains ideal type by saying ideal types does not have any relevance with any value consent, they are abstract and through distinctive features of a social phenomena, they are analytically constructed tools.

According to Werner (2009, p. 41), one of the aims of the creation of the concept of ideal type is that, it can be serve to compare the different social elements. Therefore the ideal type is explained by the author, with reference to Weber (2009, p.41), as “a conceptual way to bring together certain relationships, or events in life, by comparing both the internal and external social features or characteristics of a phenomenon.”. Those explanations can be considered as the importance of the concept in social sciences. Moreover, another significance of it is giving chance to capture the significance and value of a phenomenon within its description. To sum up, an ideal type can be used to clarify phenomenon for purpose of analysis (Swedberg, 2005, p. 120).

Another aspect that should be highlighted while explaining the ideal type concept of Weber and its relation with this study is the ways of usage of the concept, which refers to functionality of it. As cited in Werner (2009, p. 41), first of all Weber defined ideal type for different usages and reasons. First area of usage of ideal type is making judgement for determination of the type's existence in reality. Regarding the existence for determination whether is it clear or understandable enough. The second way to use ideal type is to compare analysis between societies or between different elements of the same society. Third way to use ideal type is reducing ambiguity among those societies or different elements. The forth way of using ideal type is the formulation of new concept because the ideal type invites dialogue between

researchers and scholars when comparing given types to new or proposed types or phenomenon.

In the light of the information provided above, when it is looked at the functionality of Weberian ideal type, it can be said that, within the scope of this thesis, the ideal type is tried to be created for age friendly cities with several aspects those are explained below. The highlighted functions, in other words the area of uses ideal type for this study are reducing ambiguity in the term age friendly cities is obvious within the literature. There are different initiatives but there is not a universal framework for the studies for researchers and policy makers. Therefore this study, as it is mentioned in the Introduction chapter, tries to provide a baseline for further research on age friendly cities in order to provide a measurement point for further research and initiatives of local governments. Moreover, the ideal type, although age friendly cities concept is already existing, through this study, researchers in this field get a chance to have an idea about the different initiatives around the world and most importantly, the study provides a comparison with child friendly cities and similar and different points within those models. This can be considered as the platform of dialogue for those efforts. The idea behind this effort is providing an answer to those many different age friendly city models and their criteria.

## **5.2. The aspects for an ideal type**

While discussing and proposing an ideal type, it is important to note the aspects those are evaluated should be mentioned. In other words, it is important to highlight the criteria those are taken into consideration while proposing an ideal type within the light of age-friendly and child friendly models. During the process of determination of the aspects of ideal type, firstly, the common points of age friendly cities are tried to be highlighted. The first common point of those models is the emphasis to both physical and social environment, which is the basic idea behind environmental gerontology and aging in place, accordingly behind age friendly cities. After this commonness, the different points of models is tried to be evaluated and the different

criteria are tried to be realized in order to include them to ideal type. As a result of this comparison in terms of criteria, it is realized that some distinctive emphasis existing on criteria. Moreover, it is realized that, beyond the criteria, models have differences in terms of participation of older adults to the processes of policy making.

Moreover, evaluation of child friendly cities takes an important point to the discussion on ideal type, which is the missing part in age friendly cities, that is human rights perspective and mechanisms those are ensuring the sustainability of the efforts, such as coordination mechanisms, ensuring ... friendly budgeting in cities. Those are more structural criteria rather than practical and service oriented, different from age friendly models.

With reference the previous parts of the study, the important areas of an ideal type are realized. An ideal type should have an emphasis on both physical and social aspects of environment, should integrate human rights and local services approaches, should include the population group, in this case, the older adults, not just in the needs analysis phase of the construction of an age-friendly city, but also in policy and decision making processes, should include all specific areas of current age friendly models. Besides the evaluation of different age friendly city models and child friendly model of UNICEF, those areas of ideal type determination are highlighted by some reference to literature. Thus, the importance of the aspects of ideal type can be proofed. First of all, Lui et. al. (2009, p. 118), emphasized the equal importance of physical and social aspects of the environment. Within an environmental gerontological perspective, it is obvious that, considering environment as just physical environment is going to be a deficient idea. Secondly, again, Lui et. al. (2009, p. 118), highlighted the importance of a participatory model. This means that, an ideal age-friendly city model should include older adults to criteria determination –needs analysis- and policy making process. This means that, the criteria those are previously proposed should not be strict. On the contrary, those should be flexible with consultation and participation of older adults in terms of

differing needs of the population for well being in an urban environment. Moreover, after determination of criteria for an age friendly city, one should also keep incorporating the user, which is older adults, to the following processes of evaluation and developing new alternatives. Third feature of an ideal age-friendly city is that, it should refer to all criteria within current models. At that point, the comparison and integrate the propositions of the models is important. Forth area of idealizing an age-friendly city is its integrating approach of human rights based understanding and another more practical perspective. This criterion for an ideal age-friendly city comes with reference to child friendly city model of UNICEF (2004, p. 4). Those criteria, as it is mentioned above, are reached with detailed desktop review on age and child friendly cities and determined accordingly.

### **5.3. Similarities and Differences of Age-friendly City Models**

After specifying the areas of an ideal age-friendly city, then analyzing the models of age friendly cities accordingly is helpful to better understand one of the criteria that is defined by ideal type, which is including the mentioned aspects by different models. After that, within the scope of this chapter, it is going to refer the child friendly city model and its understanding of children's rights in terms of determination of child friendly features of a city. The following paragraphs discuss the models of age-friendly cities in terms of their balance of including social and physical aspects of environment. Moreover, the distinctive features of each model take part within this chapter of the study.

As it can be seen from the detailed explanation of the models of age-friendly cities in the previous chapter, there are some similar and different criteria those are recognized by the models and some points those are emphasized by different models. While some models highlight more the physical characteristics of living environment, others give emphasis on social environment. However, all those six models have such references to both aspects of city life.



In WHO model, the social and physical aspects are equally take part. Outdoor spaces and buildings, transportation, community and health services and housing can be considered as physical aspects those WHO proposes for an age-friendly city. Social inclusion and respect, social participation, civic participation and employment and communication and information can be considered as social aspect. Lifetime neighborhood of UK, has housing, built environment in the physical aspects and social inclusion, social cohesion and sense of place, innovation and cross sectional planning as social aspects of city life. Livable community of American Association of Retired Persons (AARP) has land use, transport and mobility, housing in physical aspect. Cooperation and communication, public education and involvement in community planning and leadership are highlighted points of AARP model in terms of social aspect. Livable community model of National Association of Area Agencies on Aging highlights the planning and zoning, transportation, housing, health and supportive services in terms of physical part of environment and culture and lifelong learning, public safety, civic engagement and volunteer organizations in the social aspect. Elder friendly community model of University of Calgary, proposes being mobile, housing, information and services within the side of physical. Moreover, the model includes, building community, maintaining independence and involvement in activities, being valued and respected and safety in financial and personal terms in social aspect. Lastly, elder friendly community of the AdvantAge Initiative, aims at housing and maximizing physical independence and it refers importance of communication and information under the heading of addressing basic needs. Furthermore, model refers to social aspect including promoting civic and social engagement and safety.

Within the light of summary information about models, it can be said that, all has references to both aspects and there is no extreme models in terms of balance of social and physical aspects of environment. In order to make the differences and similarities, the table that is provided below can be used, with reference to Lui, et. al. (2009, p. 118). However, depending on the detailed explanation of age friendly city models, the table is developed within the scope of this study. That mostly similar

point within age friendly city models, which is referring both sides of the environment, therefore should be included as ideal type as it is mentioned in the previous part of this chapter. One of the most common points within all models is their reference to physical and social environment.

Table 7: Criteria of an age-friendly city

<b>Age-friendly City (World Health Organization)</b>	<b>Lifetime Neighbourhood (Department for Communities &amp; Local Government, UK)</b>	<b>Livable Community (American Association of Retired Persons)</b>	<b>Livable Community (National Association of Area Agencies on Aging, USA)</b>	<b>Elder-friendly Community (University of Calgary, Canada)</b>	<b>Elder-friendly Community (The AdvantAge Initiative, USA)</b>
Outdoor spaces and buildings	Built environment	Land use	Planning and zoning	–	–
Housing	Housing	Housing	Housing	Housing (A place to Call Home)	Addresses basic needs
Communication and information	–	Cooperation and communication	Culture and lifelong learning	Access to information and services (Getting What You Need)	Addresses basic needs
Social participation	Social cohesion and sense of place	–	–	Maintaining independence and involvement in activities	Promotes social and civic engagement
Respect and social inclusion	Social inclusion	–	Public safety	Being valued and respected/Financial security/Personal safety	Addresses basic needs (safety)

Table 7 (continued)

Civic participation and employment	Innovation and crosssectoral planning	Involvement in community planning	Civic engagement and volunteer organization	–	Promotes social and civic engagement
Community and Health Services	Services and Amenities	Leadership	Health and Supportive Services	Building community	Optimizes physical, mental health and well-being

One of the differing features of age friendly city models is the reference to participation. This difference is also included in the ideal type as an aspect. That means, an age friendly city should be dynamic and open to participation of older adults to policy making process. Under the scope of this discussion it is important to note that, many models has priority while constructing an age friendly framework for their cities, the experiences and needs of older adults. Therefore, starting from the WHO model all of them make needs analysis field studies at the beginning. The reference and detailed explanation of the models are seen supportive to this claim. Lui et.al. (2009, p. 119), "...the literature clearly supports the idea that older people's lives and experiences should be used as a starting point to identify desirable community services and support".

In fact, research with older adults and previous data that are existing local governments data bases were used by models. Although, the efforts for needs analysis should not be underestimated, some models do not integrate older adults to policy making or decision making mechanisms continuously. For instance, WHO or AdvantAge Initiative models use traditional methods of making voice of older adults audible, that is making the needs assessment at the beginning and accept the first results enough for policy making. For this reason, WHO model is criticized as being top-down and insisting on one-size fits all understanding. On the other hand, Calgary model besides needs assessment, asks older adults for policy making or service providing process also, it is a more interactive model. Therefore, it can easily said

that, a bottom-up policy approach is more favorable compared to a top-down model, which is going to take part in the ideal type at the end of the part of this study.

The third aspect of an ideal type of an age friendly city, which is inclusion of all aspects, is a product of the comparison and realization of different criteria between current models. All areas and the distinctive characteristics of some models, those should be taken into consideration while discussing the ideal type. For instance, lifetime neighborhood of UK has an emphasis on innovation and crosssectoral planning which is worth to mention. In a case of an age friendly city, the major responsibility is on the shoulders of local authorities and actors. Therefore, the crosssectoral planning is an important aspect, local private sector, city councils and municipalities are defined as partners during the process. Although this feature is determined as a criterion for a lifetime neighborhood, the reference to the point of partnerships is referred by other models as well, however as a methodology rather than a criteria. One of the distinctive characteristic is financial security which is under elder friendly community of University of Calgary model. The National Association of Area Agencies on Aging has also proposes the culture and lifelong learning aspect to its model, which is distinctive and a part of participation of older adults to social life. Moreover, leadership is the feature of AARP's livable community model, which gives older adults the role of leading within their community. Distinctive features, those are highlighted here were explained in details within the scope of Chapter III, under specific headings of each models.

Those are going to be included while proposing an ideal type at the end of this part of the study. Outdoor spaces, public buildings (the land use), housing, transportation (staying physically mobile), communication and information, culture and lifelong learning, social cohesion (sense of space), public safety, civic participation and employment, leadership, community and health services and building community are going to be included by an ideal type for an age-friendly community.

#### **5.4. Comparison of Age-friendly Versus Child-friendly Cities**

This part of the discussion is going to refer the comparison between age and child friendly city models. Comparison is needed in order to see the different and similar parts of the two headings, due to their common reference to “age” while proposing criteria for well being of urban residents, as it is explained in previous chapters. Through highlighting the similarities and differences the ideal type will be explained properly with a more comprehensive perspective.

The basic difference between age friendly cities and child friendly cities is that, child friendly city model of UNICEF has a strong emphasis on child rights. In order to explain this difference it is going to refer the rights perspective of child friendly cities first. Secondly, it is going to be referred to the roots of the child friendly cities, which is HABITAT II declaration and the emphasis on decentralization in the declaration. The reason to refer the decentralization, meaning delegation of responsibility to local actors, is its similarity with age friendly cities. When it is looked from a historical perspective, it can be said that, efforts for child friendly cities took their roots from the UN Conference on Human Settlements (HABITAT II) in 1996, (Biggs and Carr, 2015, p. 100).

According to UNICEF (2004, p. 1), the necessity of such an initiative on child friendliness for cities is resulted from the recognition of several important trends. Those trends are defined as urbanization, decentralization and important space of cities within the context of political and economical systems of nations.

In the declaration of the HABITAT II (2006, p. 1), it is basically declared that, the heads of governments and states, are going to apply the universal goals of ensuring adequate shelter for all and making human settlements safer, healthier and more livable, equitable, sustainable and productive. Furthermore, about the child friendly cities discussion, it is said in the declaration that (2006, p. 2), within the scope of sustainable development, women’s, children’s and youth’s specific needs for safe,

healthy and secure living conditions are recognized. Therefore, during the HABITAT Conference, eradication of poverty and discrimination, promotion of human rights are determined as goals. Moreover, providing services for basic needs, such as education, nutrition and life-span health care services, and adequate shelter for all are also determined as basic goals from that time on for especially local governments. Besides those decisions the emphasis on participation to social life of all vulnerable groups is a point of declaration that attracts attention (2006, p. 2). While making all those commitments, the defined method to reach the goals are also mentioned in the declaration it is said that (2006, p. 3),

We adopt the enabling strategy and the principles of partnership and participation as the most democratic and effective approach for the realization of our commitments. Recognizing local authorities as our closest partners, and as essential, in the implementation of the Habitat Agenda, we must, promote decentralization through democratic local authorities and work to strengthen their financial and institutional capacities in accordance with the conditions of countries. We shall also increase our cooperation with parliamentarians, the private sector, labor unions and non-governmental and other civil society organizations.

As a result, the Conference in Istanbul highlights an understanding of cooperation and solidarity as it is mentioned above, it defines the partners for decided goals with increasing responsibility of local stakeholders, for especially in terms of sustainable urban development. Through the conference and Agenda 21, the willingness of local governments to provide solutions to complex problems of urban living is increased. Therefore, a goal that is make cities more livable for all is started to be considered at local level.

After mentioning the decentralized understanding of child friendly cities, in order to refer its rights based understanding the principles of the content's roots should be taken into consideration. The basic content of the child friendly initiative takes its roots from UN Declaration on the Rights of the Child, declared in 1989. According

to UNICEF report on Building Child Friendly Cities: A Framework for Action (2004, p. 7), the building blocks of child friendly city come from the four key principles of the Convention. As cited in UNICEF (2004, p. 8), the principle of non-discrimination (article 2), gives the feature of being aware of including all groups, those all groups may be working children, disabled children, or children from different ethnic groups, etc. to a child friendly city. As cited in UNICEF (2004, p. 8), best interests (article 3 of the Convention), ensures that a child friendly city should take into consideration primarily the best interests of the child for all actions and policies. The third foundation, as it is written by UNICEF is “every child’s right to life and maximum development (article 6)” highlights the necessity of maximizing the survival and mental, physical, spiritual, psychological and moral development of all children in the context of local community. The fourth and the last foundation of both Convention and a child friendly city is listening to children and respecting their views (article 12). According to this foundation it can be said that, a child friendly city should give priority to hear and listen the voices of children as right holders and active citizens (2004, p. 8).

The emphasis on the rights based approach of child friendly city model brings the basic difference from age friendly cities to the stage. Therefore, it is added to ideal type for age friendly cities as an aspect. One of the most important differences within the understandings of age friendly cities and child friendly cities is that, age-friendly communities have emerged through a policy focus on active ageing with emphasis to more on services those are primarily the work of local governments. On the other hand, the child-friendly cities program is more grounded in a rights-based approach. The situation can be considered as an asset for ideal type. If it is argued that, older adults and their specific needs, similar with children’s case, are not taken into consideration in urban life, then they are discriminated. Therefore, similar with child friendly city approaches age friendly city approaches should have a basic side of rights. This difference is caused from the fact that, according to Biggs and Carr (2015, p. 102), the age-friendly literature seems trying to justify the economic potential of population ageing. When it is looked at the criteria of those two models,

those are in age-friendly city models are basically related to physical and social environment, such as land use, housing, transportation, social and civic participation, communication and information and in some models innovation. On the other hand, the criteria in Child-friendly Cities model of UNICEF, are determined as children’s participation, a child friendly legal framework, a city-wide children’s rights strategy, a children’s rights unit or coordinating mechanism, child impact assessment and evaluation, a children’s budget, a regular state of the city’s children report, making children’s rights known, independent advocacy for children. To better understand a simple table that is provided below can be used in terms of what criteria is existing in models of age-friendly and child friendly cities within the perspective on Unites Nations bodies, UNICEF and WHO.

Table 8: Age-friendly VS Child-friendly Cities Criteria

<b>Age Friendly</b>	<b>Child Friendly</b>
1. Outdoor spaces and buildings	1. Children’s participation
2. Transportation	2. A child friendly legal framework
3. Housing	3. A city-wide Children’s Rights Strategy
4. Social participation	4. A Children’s Rights Unit or coordinating mechanism
5. Respect and social inclusion	5. Child impact assessment and evaluation
6. Civic participation and employment	6. A children’s budget
7. Communication and information	7. A regular State of the City’s Children Report
8. Community and health services	8. Making children’s rights known
9. Community Building	9. Independent advocacy for children



Within the light of the table above, it can be said that, age friendly cities and child friendly cities are two models those have the same purpose, which is making cities more friendly for different groups of population with differing needs, the older adults and the children. However, those two approaches have different priorities and approaches for the same purpose. Therefore it can be said that, an important similar point between those two ground models is their purpose. Both initiatives on child friendliness and age friendliness consider optimal living in cities in terms of age and age-related needs of the population. In other words, both conceptualize urban space in terms of age and both goes further than considering the environment as only physical environments. Age friendly cities and child friendly city models go beyond the physical environment and give attention to social environments as well. Therefore, it is important to note this features of models as a positive feature, which an ideal type should include. The analysis of both models provides an input for determination of ideal type aspects, which is rights based approach.

#### **5.4.1. What is missing in age friendly city models**

In this part the details of the different understanding of the two models will be provided. In child friendly cities, the children's participation to decision making processes is defined as a criterion. However, in the case of age friendly it is one of the methods which is used by some models, and a feature of the ideal type. A child friendly legal framework is about local procedures and its being children's rights sensitive. However, there is no such reference in age friendly city models. A city wide children's strategy means that, having promotion of children's rights in the city's future and current strategic plans. Moreover, a children's rights unit or coordination mechanism is more than a practical institution which organizes the services for children. It tries to propose mainstreaming the children's rights at city level. It also has a mission to coordinate the rights approach for each specific child friendly city because of different legislations in different countries and even in different cities. This feature of a child friendly city prevents it from being top-down or being insisting on one-size fits all understanding, different from age friendly cities

examples. Child impact assessment and evaluation is one of the most important features of a child friendly city, which enables the monitoring and evaluation of the implementation those are proposed for promoting the rights of the children in the city. The evaluation whether the implementations work for their purpose or not is a missing part of age friendly cities approaches. Although there may be individual efforts of the cities to assess the implementations, it is still missing in the full understanding and modeling, which may harm the sustainability of the understanding. Another point which is defined as a building block of a child friendly city is a children's budget which suggests allocation of financial resources of a city to supply the solutions to children's needs. In other words, it suggests enough financial resources to children dwellers of the city, which is again a more comprehensive understanding and lack in age friendly city approach. A regular State of City's Children's Report is again one of the different characteristic of a child friendly city from an age friendly city. This characteristic that is defined by UNICEF has a similar purpose with impact assessment with slight differences. This case the aim is not making an impact assessment; rather it is an effort to see the needs areas. A similar understanding exists in the understanding of age friendly cities while defining the checklists for the age friendliness. However, as it is mentioned above, it is for some models for the first time only. Furthermore, there is a principle for a child friendly city which is making children's rights known. This principle has not an equivalent in age friendly cities. Independent advocacy for children's rights has its legal base from convention on children's rights. However, there is no reference to advocacy in many age friendly city models.

At that point, taking into consideration to absence of rights perspective in age friendly cities, the human rights of older adults issue should be briefly discussed. The absence of such a perspective for older adults is caused from the absence of universal criteria for older adults' human rights. Within the discussion on older adultshuman rights, there are some opinions those are in favor of providing a rights document and there are also some opponents.

According to Fredvang and Biggs (2012, p. 8), the efforts those aim to protect human rights came into agenda after world wars and are basically universal, regardless of sex, religion, nationality, ethnic origin, age, or any other status. In December 2010, with resolution 65/182, in order to discuss and strengthen the human rights of older adults the UN General Assembly organized an Open-Ended Working Group on Ageing. The discussions in the working group aim to determine whether a distinct human rights convention to protect older adults' human rights or not. The arguments for a convention are as follows; there are specific forms of violations of rights based on old age, there are gaps in the human rights documents those affect the dignity of older adults. Moreover, implementation of the legal document is going to remove the prejudices towards older adults. One of the most important arguments of those who are in favor of the convention on older adults rights is that, "drawing attention to older people in this way will strengthen the struggle against ageism" (Fredvang and Biggs, 2012, p.15). On the other hand there is a group of people who are against the convention within the open-ended working group. They are basically support that, there drawing attention to the issue may increase the marginalization of older adults (Fredvang and Biggs, 2012, p. 13). However, it is obvious that, there are distinctive challenges those are experienced by older adults based on age, such as discrimination, poverty, abuse and violence, problems due to physical and mental health. Therefore, a convention on rights of older adults will foster political will to refer the issue, will make the triteness of the human rights of older adults. Moreover, a convention will make monitoring possible for right defenders. One of the most important benefits of a convention on older adults' human rights is defined as "Marking a paradigm shift from a traditional medical/social welfare model of older persons to the view of older persons as rights-holders." (Fredvang and Biggs, 2012, p. 18). Although there are many other benefits, it is not going to be discussed within the scope of this study. However, from the last point of view, a convention and the criteria for age friendly city prepared accordingly can be considered as a view of older adults as right holders in cities. Such a document can be considered as beneficial for sustainability of age friendly cities initiatives and can be considered as another ground for the efforts.

When it is looked at the urban rights, age friendly cities have some ground. According to European Declaration of Urban Rights, citizens of European towns have a right in some specific areas, those are listed as (1992, pp. 1-2):

Security, an unpolluted and healthy environment, employment, housing, mobility, health, sport and leisure, culture, multicultural integration, good quality architecture and physical surroundings, harmonization of functions, participation, economic development, sustained development, services and goods, natural wealth and resources, personal fulfillment, inter-municipal collaboration, financial mechanisms and structures, equality.

Those are defined as the areas of the rights of a city dweller in Europe. According to the areas, the charter highlights the equality also. This area can be considered as a basis for age-friendly cities, due to its reference to the responsibility of local governments to apply the rights to all city dwellers, regardless sex, age, ethnic background, religious belief, social, economic or political position and disability. In that case, when the areas of urban citizen rights, the criteria for an age friendly city are compared, it can be said that, an age friendly city understanding includes many of these areas without any reference to the charter. However, the point is that, an age friendly city is not proposing a following, sustaining or monitoring mechanism like child friendly cities approach. In this case, when it is compared to child friendly city models, the reason for that seems the lack of a convention on rights of older adults.

### **5.5. An Ideal Type for age friendly cities**

In the light of the discussion above, an age friendly city is a place which enables older adults to live without any limitations and discrimination due to their age. According to determined areas of an ideal type, an age friendly city should combine the understanding of an environment for both side, those are social and physical environment. The models those are discussed within the context of this thesis are including both sides of environment. More specifically, as a combination of all

models an age friendly city should have criteria referring all fields of the models those are discussed. Specific criteria are, buildings (built environment), transportation, housing, services especially in terms of health, communication and information, culture and lifelong learning, community planning, social participation, social inclusion and respect, civic participation, security in terms of physical and financial, employment, innovation, cross-sectoral planning.

Moreover, as it is mentioned above, an age friendly city should have an understanding in terms of rights for older adults, with reference to child friendly city model of UNICEF. For instance, children's participation in a child friendly urban environment is defined as a criterion within the scope of model. This criteria is always highlighted within the literature in age friendliness and also models, however, it is not defined as a criterion. For an ideal type, this point should be taken into consideration. Moreover, a child friendly legal framework for legislations in the city and a city-wide children's rights strategy can be adapted for older adults. The reason behind this deficiency comes from lack of specific rights for older adults within literature. Furthermore, a unit for children's rights coordination is effective for a common agenda for service providers. It can also be adapted to age-friendly cities. Impact assessment and evaluation is again a monitoring mechanism that may increase efficiency of policies. In this case, it should be noted that, it is valid for age-friendly city models. However, it is not defined as a criterion. There are singular efforts and progress reports of specific initiatives. Similarly, a regular report on children's situation is not a criterion for age-friendly cities. Another criterion for child friendly city is a children's budget. However, older adults are not a primary group of population in order to determine the distribution of budget within the urban environment. It is not a surprising situation when it is thought the economical role of older adults in a liberal economy. As evidence to the claim of a child-friendly city has the basis of children's rights, there is a criterion called making children's rights known. In the case of age friendly cities literature, there is no such an emphasis. Thus, one can claim that, due to similar behavior towards children and older adults within society, there should be an effort for making human rights of older adults

known, can be an important awareness raising activity for making lives of older adults fair within the society. Independent advocacy for children's rights can also be adapted to human rights of older adults. There is such an emphasis in the literature. However, again it is not a criterion for age-friendly cities.

## **5.6. Critical Areas of Age Friendly Cities**

Within the scope of this part of the study, it is going to be discussed some critical areas of age friendly cities concept and practical efforts. Critical areas are points those should be taken into consideration by policy makers and researchers for future and further research. They are basically, the situation for deprived urban area, the emphasis on only urban space and the absence of gender criteria in age friendly cities. Moreover, there may be potential risks about age friendly cities for older adults. Those should not be underestimated by policy makers with a pre acceptance of age friendly city model can be applied within all cities and for all senior citizens. There should be always a process of needs analysis and attitude meter in order to have an idea of the user, the older adults, before starting efforts on age friendliness. Therefore, those four critical areas are going to mention briefly in this part.

The first important critical area of the discussion on age friendly cities, is the poor neighborhoods in cities. To better understand, it can be referred to Menec et. al. According to writers (2011, pp. 480-481),

...We must acknowledge that issues can manifest themselves differently across localities. For example, older persons living in a multi-ethnic poor neighborhood in a city might experience their community very differently than older adults living in a less ethnically diverse town located in an otherwise sparsely populated rural area.

In order to overcome such an argument, some preconditions for an age friendly initiative should be proposed. There are socio economic differences within different cities, so it is important to highlight some features of cities such as largeness and

socio economic backgrounds. In order to be realistic it should be noted that, how big the cities those are called or trying to be called as “age friendly”. According to Fitzgerald and Caro (2014, p. 2), the reason of calling the initiatives as “age friendly city” or “age friendly community” is an evidence of its relation with whether the place is large municipality or a district or neighborhood. Age friendly city title can be adapted to both municipal places and smaller ones. However, this does not mean that, any city can start to implement policies to make itself age friendly. Some preconditions for being an age friendly city is determined by authors, those are population density, climate and weather, topographical features, social and civic organization, health and social services (Fitzgerald and Caro, 2014, pp.4-6). Those preconditions should be analyzed and improve to realize in order to pursue core and secondary features of an age friendly city. For instance population density and proportion of older adults within the population of the specific place can be considered as a motivation for starting the age friendly initiatives at that place. Climate is also important for determining the types of the activities that older adults can participate, especially their being outdoor or indoor activities. Extreme topographical features most probably propose challenges to efforts of being age friendly. Moreover, if there is no any structure of social or civic participation for example as the conflict times, then it is hard to start an age friendly initiative in that place. Similarly a health and social services structure can be considered as a meaningful organization of age friendly cities. Within the light of this information, it can be said that, for starting an age friendly initiative for a community, a social and physical infrastructure should be realized.

Second issue which should be mentioned as a criticism is the concept’s limited reference to gender determinant. Gender as it is mentioned by UN HABITAT (2012, p.1), gender roles are important determinants in the migration and urbanization processes. Accordingly feminist research emphasizes the gender sensitive understanding to local governance and urban planning and design area. The argument behind this necessity is the experiencing life in cities differently of women, men and LGBTI people. The risk of being assaulted and experiencing violence of

women and girls is quite more than men in daily life in cities. As it is mentioned by UN HABITAT, gender is a crosscutting issue for almost all social analysis and it is obviously a determinant in urban policy planning, due to its differing effects depending on gender.

In addition to urban policy planning gender has significant effects on aging. In other words, people experience old age differently depending on their gender. Therefore, according to HelpAge (2002, p. 1), older women are more likely to have had a disadvantageous life, when it is compared to older men. Moreover,

They have more chance of being widowed and losing access to property. Poor education, nutrition and access to services and the labor market in earlier life often leave them with poor health and few resources in old age. But HelpAge International's research findings have suggested that women rather than men are more able to diversify their sources of income and support in hard times, and in these situations contribute substantially to household and family income. Men, on the other hand, tend to suffer from declining capacity to meet their traditional role as breadwinners on entering old age, which can leave them extremely vulnerable. (HelpAge, 2002, p. 1)

In the light of that information, gender is an important determinant while offering a model for an age friendly city that should be specifically taken into consideration in terms of both aging and urban planning and which is inadequate within the existing literature and practice of age friendly cities.

The third limiting part of the concept is its lack of reference to rural space. Although the term age friendly cities is self expressed, the issue about rural space and its conditions for older adults should not also be underestimated, which contains different dynamics than urban space. There are some attempts those are tried to transmit the discussion on rural space. Especially in Canada, Federal/provincial/territorial age-friendly rural/remote communities project has been started and the project team produced a guideline to rural and remote communities as



responsible of well being of the older adults population living these places. The initiative has similar objectives with the urban context initiatives. The policy document lists its objectives as follows:

To increase awareness of what seniors need to maintain active, healthy and productive lives within their communities by identifying indicators of age friendly rural or remote communities; and to produce a practical guide that rural and remote communities across Canada can use to identify common barriers, and to foster dialogue and action that supports the development of age-friendly communities (2006, p. 4).

Therefore, although there are initiatives which have rural older adults and their relations with rural place, they also take their roots from the age-friendly cities project and initiatives rather than being genuine. Although, the rural context should be mentioned within such efforts similar with age friendly cities, it is not meaningless to start with cities. Within the following paragraphs, reasons to discuss age friendly cities first are tried to be emphasized.

According to Phillipson (2004, p. 964), there are several reasons behind this trend. The first and foremost is the effect of population aging on cities. Second one is the transformation of cities through the effects of globalization, with its effects of gathering attention on cities. The third one is the trend aiming to understand urban poverty, social relations in neighborhoods in terms of ethnic, gender and age based groups in urban sociology. The forth reason behind is realization of aging especially in deprived city centers creation of risks for older adults. The current cities, has contradictions in themselves. Phillipson argues that (2004, p. 964), "... between the demands of hyper mobile minority on the one side and the needs of a majority including older people, women living alone with children, disabled people and other groups, on the other side.". This contradiction, created an interest on those different groups of people and their living standards in cities.

Phillipson (2004, p. 969), after providing reasons towards the inclination to urban context within the aging in place literature, he highlights the necessity of that inclination with a more recovered way. He emphasized that, urban environments are less advantageous to older adults compared to rural environments or retirement communities. One of the realities that he mentioned is that, future older adults will be living more in urban space. Older people need therefore to be central to building a sustainable and inclusive urban environment. Another determination in terms of the importance of focus on urban older adults is that, the relationship between people and place is more important today compared to past. According to Phillipson (2004, p. 969), “Older people aging in place within cities may be the first in their families to achieve a sense of residential stability – living in the same house for three, four or even five decades.” Thus, relocation for that generation is harder compared to past generations. This is provided as an evidence to work on urbanization and aging together and to bring urbanization as core issues of gerontology.

Similarly, Beard and Petitot (2010, p. 428), determined the processes of urbanization and aging as two demographic changes those almost all countries in the world is started to experience. Moreover, their explanation has a reference to level of development of countries. As cited in Beard and Petitot, the report of State of the world population, held by United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), in 2050, “It is expected that, a quarter of urban populations in less developed countries will be over the age of 60 years. In developed countries, 80 percent of older people already live in urban areas”. Another point which is notable in the explanation of Beard and Petitot is data which directly links the urbanization and aging through providing proportion of older adults living in urban space. Similarly, Buffel et. al. (2012, p. 598) mentioned the linkage between urbanization and aging as follows, by 2030, two thirds of the world population will be residing in cities with one out of four of them will probably be over their 60s. As many other author have referred which are cited above those two demographic trends in the world should be taken into consideration together, especially while providing some analysis of the needs of that specific part

of the population living in cities. Those explanations can also be considered as the reasons behind the highlighting of urban space rather than rural.

The last critical issue in the context of discussion on age friendly cities is the possible negative effects of aging in place for older adults. The portrait of beneficial perception towards aging in place, which is mentioned within previous chapters of the study, should not cause the understanding of there is no negative aspects of aging in place. There are counter arguments to aging in place and those possible negativities of the practices should also be taken into consideration by policy makers. As mentioned by Sixsmith and Sixsmith (2008, p. 220), although there are still no very much research on potential risks or negative effects of being at home, there may be risks and negative effects of ageing in place on older adults, especially the ones within the group of oldest-olds. The controversial situation highlights the need of studies and policies on the issue. One of the possible risks of aging in place is about the care discussions. According to Burgess and Burgess, (2006, p. 3), increasing age may mean decreasing physical functions and vanishing independent living automatically. In other words, it is likelihood that one can lose his/her physical functions when he/she become old. The physical functioning which is defined as, activities of daily life such as, bathing, eating, clothing, and basic activities of daily living such as, preparing food, using telephone, money management and taking pills, affect ageing in place.

As it is mentioned above, aging in place can provide a chance to older adults to maintain their social relationships. This case, for instance living close to their family or friends may provide older adults to informal care options in a situation of emergency. As cited in Davies and James, Chui argues that,

If older people are confronted with an unstable environment, they will suffer from immense stress. If they are moved involuntarily to a new and unfamiliar environment, they are deprived of environmental resources like social networks, familiarity with the physical environment and the like (2011,p. 114).

However, the acceptance of living with family and friends as a default positive idea can cause a burden for older adults in some cases. For instance, living close to family and friends may not also be considered as an advantageous, according to information provided by James and Davies, within the Northern Island Survey (2011, p.114), it is a considerable increase in the proportion of older residents resisting assistance from family members and prefer to pay for formal care. For many respondents the reason behind this preference is not burden to their children (2011, p. 115).

Although older adults do not have a basic priority to live close to their family or friends, they may still remain in their homes having formal home-care. Therefore, aging in place may maximize their sense of security, meaningful social participation. Through those social arches of the concept, when it is designed and governed well, it may still provide older adults independence and increase life quality (James, & Davies, 2011, p.118).

To conclude, this chapter is designed in order to highlight the critical areas of age friendly cities concept and practice. Those are basically four points, which are, lack of reference to gender and rural space, critical position of existing features of a city, which required proposing some prerequisites for age friendliness and possible risks and negative effects of age friendly cities. Those are highlighted in order to contribute future research on age friendly cities. The following chapter will be the conclusion which provides general concluding remarks for the study.

## CHAPTER 6

### CONCLUSION

Age friendly cities are gaining importance around the world as a response to aging which is a global demographical transformation, coming with challenges to countries. Specifically aging is an important area for social policy. Moreover, the relation between aging and space is started to be constructed. Age friendly cities have a place at that intersection with aging population in urban space. Within the scope of this study, age friendly cities criteria are chosen as topic for the study. The necessity of clarification for age friendly cities criteria is obvious within the literature. For instance, Lui et. al., (2009, p. 119) mentioned the necessity of further clarification and further study on age friendly cities. Age friendly cities criteria, within the scope of this study is taken into consideration with child friendly cities. The child friendly cities, due to its giving reference to age and use of city, is chosen as a comparison structure in order to reach an ideal type. In other words, while discussing the ideal type for an age friendly city, the child friendly cities is chosen as a comparison tool, because of its reference to age similar to age friendly cities. Child friendly cities model is considered as the most prominent because, in relation to age friendly cities both promise a suitable place for different age groups living in urban space. Both are important parts of the intergenerational space discussions.

Age friendly cities can be considered as the suggestion as a way to response the challenge of population aging in cities. The contextual background of the practices is related with the decentralization of welfare state and giving the authority to plan and implement the policies to local governments.

All in all, within the scope of this thesis, it is tried to discuss the different criteria for age friendly cities in order to provide an ideal type as a tool for comparison, from a Weberian point of view. In order to do that, first of all I tried to clarify the related concepts those give way to discussion on age friendly cities. Those concepts were

aging in place and active aging. During explaining the concept of aging in place, the relation between space and aging is tried to be evaluated from environmental gerontology perspective. Aging in place is using in the practice in order to provide an alternative living arrangement to cope with the challenges of population aging in especially urban context. Due to its being preferred option by policy makers and older adults in a decentralized welfare state context, preference of aging in place for policy makers, which is decreasing the number of seniors having institutional care due to its economic advantages and for older adults, which is mainly social continuity, is discussed within the second chapter, called conceptual framework. Age friendly cities are one of the models of aging in place. In the phase of explanation of the second concept, which is active aging, first of all the determinants and definition of the concept is provided. While providing explanation for the concept activity theory is referred due to its providence ground for active aging. Active aging concept is the most current, modern and comprehensive concept among the similar ones, those are productive and successful aging. Its core feature of continuing having roles in life provides the philosophy of age friendly cities with its reference to social parts of the environment. Historical background for concepts is considered as an important emphasis for this study, similarly while explaining the concept of active aging historical evolution of the concept is mentioned. The last phase of the second chapter is about the core concept of the study, which is age friendly city. Its historical evolution is provided within the chapter two, before mentioning different models in practice. As a result, conceptual framework chapter is full of background information about the emergence of age friendly cities.

In the third chapter of the thesis, the main point is different models of age friendly cities, those are Age-friendly Cities of WHO, Lifetime Neighborhood of Department for Communities and Local Government UK, Livable Community American Association of Retired Persons (AARP), Livable Community National Association of Area Agencies on Aging (USA), Elder-friendly Community (University of Calgary, Canada), Elder-friendly Community (The AdvantAge Initiative, USA). Within the models the criteria and context of the models are tried to be explained.

The reason behind this detailed explanation is making the differences and similarities possible to reach an ideal type. In order to suggest an ideal type, the distinctive features of the social reality should be mentioned. That analysis gave way to the determination of some aspects of the ideal type, which are having reference to physical and social environment together, including different criteria those are proposed by different models and including older adults to the process of age friendly cities policy making.

In the fourth chapter of the study is about child friendly cities. The definition, building blocks and historical development of the concept are referred in the chapter. Moreover, the necessity of the child friendly city is also referred. While explaining the points in the chapter, the aim is providing a comparative understanding to reach an ideal type for age friendly cities. Therefore, the explanation of age friendly cities gave one of the aspects of ideal type, which is the right based perspective to age friendly cities. The meaningful evaluation of child friendly cities provided an important point of the study, which is mentioned above, right base approach.

In the following chapter, which is the fifth chapter, the point that is tried to be emphasized the ideal type of age friendly cities. Before going into discussion, the basic information about Weberian ideal type is provided. After basic information, age friendly cities within themselves are compared. This comparison directed the discussion to ideal type criteria. After that, age friendly and child friendly understanding is elaborated again in order to refer the ideal type, through detected similarities and differences. Both cases are thought to be included in ideal type. Moreover, the aspects for ideal types are determined accordingly. Limitations about the concept and some critical points are provided within the chapter of discussion in order to be beneficial for further research and policy making. That ideal type as the main concern of the thesis is an important contribution to the literature on aging from a social policy perspective, because there is a scarcity of the work which make the mind of researchers and policy maker clearer. There are different and scattered references in the literature. This study can be considered as a more systematic

approach to the concept of age friendly cities with its theoretical background, context and practical examples and evaluations.

As policy suggestions, beyond the ideal type, a gender perspective should be integrated and fully grasped within the age friendly city efforts. As it is explained in the discussion chapter, both the population aging and urban design cannot be comprehensive without a gender perspective. For elaborating aging, from a social policy perspective, gender should have a special influence due to the different experiences that are caused from gender. Similarly through urban design the gender is an important determinant. Therefore, age friendly cities those are a combination of aging and urban design perspectives should refer to the gender as a core component.

Moreover, through a participatory understanding, age friendly cities should be evaluated in terms of its effects on older adults. During this evaluation, NGOs working on aging in cities and defending human rights of older adults should also be included in the process. Some models, those are discussed within the scope of this study, are directly models those are proposed NGOs. Although there is an important role of NGOs besides local governments, they also should be included to the process of policy implementation and assessment as consultants. Therefore, sustainability and efficiency of the efforts can be realized properly.

Furthermore, cities should assess their potentials and limitations in advance to apply age friendly city policies, in order to realize a healthy age friendly city. As it is mentioned within the critical areas of age friendly cities part, climate should be considered as a pre condition for age friendly cities. For instance, very cold places although they may have public buildings or outdoor spaces may not give possibility to older adults to be outside and may create a disadvantageous situation for being an age friendly city.

To sum up, age friendly cities are gaining importance in the literature on aging and social policy. There are many initiatives that are called under different names aiming



to the same goal, making lives of older adults living in urban space better. The ideal type which is proposed by this thesis, is aiming to remove the ambiguity within the discussion by providing some aspects and making comparison easier. As a reference to positive understanding of age friendly cities, they are worth to apply in aging societies.

## REFERENCES

Aird, R. L., Buys, L. (2014). Active Aging: Exploration into self-ratings of “being active”, Out-of-Home physical activity, and participation among older Australian adults living in four different settings. *Journal of Aging Research*, Hindawi Publishing Corporation, 1-12.

American Association of Retired Person, (2005). *Beyond 50.50: A report to the nation on livable communities: creating environments for successful aging*. Retrieved from: [http://assets.aarp.org/rgcenter/il/beyond\\_50\\_communities.pdf](http://assets.aarp.org/rgcenter/il/beyond_50_communities.pdf)

Andrews, G. J., Phillips, D. R. (2005). Geographical studies in aging: progress and connections to social gerontology. In Andrews, G. J., Phillips, D. R. (Eds.), *Ageing and Place: perspectives, policy, practice*. New York: Routledge.

Austin, C., Flux, D., Ghali, L., Hartley, D., Holinda, D., McClelland, L., Sieppert, J, Wild, T. (2001). *A Place to Call Home: Final report of the elder friendly communities project*.

Beard, J. R., Petitot, (2010). Aging and Urbanization. *Public Health Reviews*, 32(2), 427-450

Biggs, S. & Carr, A., (2015). Age and child friendly cities and the promise of intergenerational Space. *Journal of Social Work Practice*, 29(1), 99-112. Retrieved from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02650533.2014.993942>

Borell, L., (2006). *Aging in Place*. Retrieved from: [http://www2.zf.uni-lj.si/ri/publikacije/starostniki2006/1\\_Borel.pdf](http://www2.zf.uni-lj.si/ri/publikacije/starostniki2006/1_Borel.pdf)

Bowling, A. (2007). Quality of life in older age: What older people say. In Mollenkopf H. & Walker A. (Eds.), (pp. 15-33). Springer: UK.

Buffel, T., Phillipson, C. & Scharf, T., (2012). Aging in urban environments: Developing ‘Age-friendly Cities’. *Critical Social Policy*, 32(4), 597–617, doi: 10.1177/0261018311430457

Burgess, A., Burgess, C. G. (2007). Aging in place: present realities and future directions. *Forum on Public Policy*, 2007 (1). Retrieved from: <http://www.forumonpublicpolicy.com/archive07/burgess.pdf>

Center for Home Care Policy and Research. (2006). Survey narrative: 2005 community survey adults aged 65 and older in St. Joseph County: Oberlink, M. R., Gursen, M.

Chappin, R., Dobbs-Kepper, D. (2001). Aging in place in assisted living: philosophy versus policy. *The Gerontologist*, 41(1), 43-50.

Davey, J. (2006). "Aging in place": The views of older homeowners on maintenance, renovation and adaptation. *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand*, 27, 128-141.

Davies, A., James, A. (2011). *Geographies of Aging: Social Processes and the Spatial Unevenness of Population Aging*. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Limited.

Demirel, D. (2013). Max Weber'in sosyoloji kuramı. *Turkish Studies - International Periodical For The Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic*, 8(12), 361-369.

Diggs, J. (2008). Activity Theory. In the *Encyclopedia of Aging and Public Health*. Loue, S., Sajatovic, M. (Eds.), (pp. 79-81).

Estes, C. L., Biggs, S. & Phillipson, C. (2003). *Social theory, social policy and aging: A critical introduction*. Maidenhead, Open University Press.

Federal/Provincial/Territorial Ministers Responsible for Seniors. (2006). *Age-Friendly Rural and Remote Communities: A Guide*. Retrieved from: [http://www.swsd.gov.nl.ca/grants/pdf/af\\_rural\\_remote\\_guide.pdf](http://www.swsd.gov.nl.ca/grants/pdf/af_rural_remote_guide.pdf)

Feldman, P. H., Oberlink, M. R., Simantov, E., Gursen, M. D. (2004). *A tale of two Americas: Community opportunities and challenges: Advantage Initiative 2003 National Survey of adults aged 65 and older*. Center for home care policy and research.

Fernandez-Ballesteros, R. (2011). Active aging: Conceptual and methodological issues [PowerPoint slides]. Retrieved from:  
[http://www.euro.centre.org/data/1315992081\\_89732.pdf](http://www.euro.centre.org/data/1315992081_89732.pdf)

Fidler, D., Olson, R. & Clement, B. (2011). Evaluating a Long-Term Livable Communities Strategy in the U.S., *Futures*, 43, 690-696,  
doi:10.1016/j.futures.2011.05.010

Fitzgerald, K. G., Caro, F. G. (2014). An overview of age-friendly cities and communities around the world. *Journal of Aging & Social Policy*, 26, 1–18, doi: 10.1080/08959420.2014.860786

Francis, M., Lorenzo, R. (2005). Children and city design: proactive process and the 'renewal' of childhood. In Spencer, C., Blades, M. (Eds.), *Children and their environments* (pp. 217-237). New York, Cambridge University Press.

Ghai, D. (1996). Foreword. In Esping-Andersen, G. (Eds.). *Welfare states in transition national adaptations in global economies*. (pp. vii-ix). London Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.

Greenfield, E. A. (2011). Using ecological frameworks to advance a field of research, practice, and policy in aging-in-place initiatives. *The Gerontologist*, 52(1), 1-12.

Greenfield, E. A., Oberlink, M., Scharlach, A. E., Neal, M. B., Stafford, P. B. (2015). Age-friendly community initiatives: conceptual issues and key questions. *The Gerontologist*, 55(2), 191–198, doi:10.1093/geront/gnv005

Harding, E., (2007). *Towards Lifetime Neighbourhoods: Designing sustainable communities for all - A discussion paper*. West Yorkshire: Queen's Printer and Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office. Retrieved from:  
[http://www.ilcuk.org.uk/files/pdf\\_pdf\\_40.pdf](http://www.ilcuk.org.uk/files/pdf_pdf_40.pdf)

HelpAge International. (2002). Gender and Aging Briefs. Retrieved from:  
<http://www.globalaging.org/elderrights/world/gender.pdf>

Hochschild, A. R. (1975). Disengagement theory: A critique and proposal. *American Sociological Review*, 40, 553-569.

Iecovich, E. (2014). Aging in place: From theory to practice. *Anthropological Notebooks*, 20(1), 21-33.

Kalache, A., Gatti A., (2003). *Active Aging: A Policy Framework*. World Health Organization Noncommunicable Disease Prevention and Health Promotion Ageing and Life Course Programme. Retrieved from:  
[http://whqlibdoc.who.int/hq/2002/WHO\\_NMH\\_NPH\\_02.8.pdf?ua=1](http://whqlibdoc.who.int/hq/2002/WHO_NMH_NPH_02.8.pdf?ua=1)

Kalınkara, V., Arpacı, F. (2013). Yerinde Yaşlanma. Proceedings from VII. Ulusal Yaşlılık Kongresi. Karabük, 54-60.

Kihl, M., Brennan, D., Gabhawala, N., List, J. & Mittal, P. (2005). Livable communities: An evaluation guide. AARP Public Policy Institute.

Kutsal, Y. G. (2011). Yaşlanan Dünyanın Yaşlanan İnsanları. *Proceedings from Symposium on Geriatrics*.

Lui, C. W., Everingham, J., Warburton, J., Cuthill, M., & Bartlett, H. (2009). What makes a community age-friendly: A review of the international literature. *Australian Journal on Ageing*, 28, 116-121.

McAllister, C. (2008). Child Friendly Cities and Land Use Planning: Implications for children's health. *Environments Journal*, 35(3), 45-61

Menec, V. H., Hutton, L., Newall, N., Nowicky, S., Spina, J. & Veselyuk, D., (2013). How 'age-friendly' are rural communities and what community characteristics are related to age-friendliness? The case of rural Manitoba, Canada. *Ageing and Society*, 35(1), 2-21, doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0144686X13000627>

Menec, V. H., Means, R., Keating, N., Parkhurst, G. & Eales, J. (2011). Conceptualizing age-friendly communities. *Canadian Journal on Aging*, 30, 479-493.

Moulaert, T. & Paris, M. (2013). Social Policy on Ageing: The Case of “Active Ageing” as a Theatrical Metaphor. *International Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1 (2).

National Association of Area Agencies on Aging. (2007). The blueprint for action: developing a livable community for all ages. Retrieved from: <http://www.n4a.org/files/n4aMakingYourCommunityLivable1.pdf>

National Association of Area Agencies on Aging. (2015). *Making your communities more livable: What is working?*, Stephanie K. Firestone.

Oberlink, M. R. (2008). Opportunities for creating livable communities. AARP Public Policy Institute.

Office of the Deputy Prime Minister. (2006). A sure start to later life ending inequalities for older people: A social exclusion unit final report. London: Office of the Deputy Prime Minister.

Pastalan, L. A. (1990). Preface. In Pastalan, L. A. (Eds.), *Aging in place: the role of housing and social supports* (ix-xii). New York: Haworth Press

Pinsky, M., Mundle, C. (1997). *Cities and Homes for All: The Habitat Agenda*

Paul, C., Ribeiro, O., Teixeira, L. (2012). Active aging: An empirical approach to the WHO Model. *Current Gerontology and Geriatrics Research*, 2012, doi: 10.1155/2012/382972

Phillipson, C. (2004). Urbanization and aging: towards a new environmental gerontology. *Aging and Society*, 24(6), 963-972

Plouffe, L., Kalache, A., (2010). Towards Global Age-friendly Cities: Determining Urban Features that Promote Active Aging. *Journal of Urban Health: Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine*, 87(5), 733-739

Powell, J. L. (2005). *Social theory and aging*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, United States of America.

Riggio, E. & Kilbane, T. (2000). The international secretariat for child-friendly cities: a global network for urban children. *Environment&Urbanization*, 12(2), 201-205.

Rowles, G. D., Bernard, M., (2013). The meaning and significance of place in old age. In Rowles, G. D., Bernard, M. (Eds). *Environmental gerontology: making meaningful places in old age*, 3-24. New York, Springer Publishing Company.

Sixsmith, A., Sixsmith J. (2008). Ageing in Place in the United Kingdom, *Aging Int*, (32), 219-235.

Swedberg, R. (2005), *The Max Weber Dictionary: Key Words and Central Concepts*. Stanford, Stanford Social Sciences.

The Brookings Institution. (1999). *Children in Cities: Uncertain Futures*. Washington, DC: Sawhill, I. & Chadwick, L.

The Center for Public Policy. (2012). *The rights of older persons: Protection and gaps under human rights law*. Melbourne: Fredvang, M., Biggs, S.

The European Urban Charter. (1992). Retrieved from:  
<http://www.migm.gov.tr/AvrupaKonseyi/EuropeanUrbanCharter-1.pdf>

The HABITAT Agenda, (2006). *Istanbul Declaration on Human Settlements*. Retrieved from: <http://www.unhabitat.org/declarations/ist-dec.htm>

Topsümer, F., Babacan, E. & Baytekin, E. P. (2009). Şehir ve Çocuk: Çocuk dostu şehir girişiminin şehir imajına katkısı. *İstanbul Üniversitesi, İletişim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 35, 5-20.

UNICEF, Innocenti Research Center, International Secretariat for Child Friendly Cities. (2004). *Building child friendly cities: a framework for action*. Florence: UNICEF Innocenti Research Center.

United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs Population Division, (2001). World Population Aging: 1950-2050. Retrieved from: [http://www.un.org/esa/population/publications/worldageing19502050/pdf/preface\\_web.pdf](http://www.un.org/esa/population/publications/worldageing19502050/pdf/preface_web.pdf)

United Nations. (1983). Vienna International Plan of Action on Aging 1982. Retrieved from: <http://www.un.org/es/globalissues/ageing/docs/vipaa.pdf>

United Nations. (1991). Implementation of the International Plan of Action on Aging and related activities. Retrieved from: <http://www.un.org/documents/ga/res/46/a46r091.htm>

United Nations Human Settlement Program (HABITAT). (2012). Gender Issue Guide: Urban planning and design. Nairobi, UN HABITAT.

United Nations Development Programme. (2014). *Human Development Report 2014: Sustaining Human Progress: Reducing Vulnerabilities and Building Resilience*. USA, Malik, K.

Vincent, J. (2003). *Old Age*. Routledge: New York.

Wahl, H., Weisman, G. D. (2003). Environmental gerontology at the beginning of the new millennium: reflections on its historical, empirical, and the theoretical development. *The Gerontologist*, 43(5), 616-627.

Walker, E., Foster, L. (2013). Active aging: rhetoric, theory and practice. In Ervik, R., Linden, T. S. (Eds.), *The making of aging policy* (27-52). UK: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.

Werner, T. P. (2009). The well role ideal type theory: A companion to Parson's sick role ideal type in the social system (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Fielding Graduate University, United States.

Wiles, J. L., Leibing, A., Guberman, N., Reeve, J., & Allen, R. E. S. (2011). The meaning of "Aging in Place" to older people. *The Gerontologist*, 52, pp. 357-366.



Woolcock, G. & Gleeson, B. (2007). Child-Friendly Cities: Critically Exploring the Evidence Base of a Resurgent Agenda. *State of Australian Cities Conference 2007*.

World Health Organization, (2007). Checklist for Essential Features of Age-friendly Cities, 1-4. Retrieved from:  
[http://www.who.int/ageing/publications/Age\\_friendly\\_cities\\_checklist.pdf](http://www.who.int/ageing/publications/Age_friendly_cities_checklist.pdf)

World Health Organization: Noncommunicable Disease Prevention and Health Promotion Department, Aging and Life Course. (2002). Active Aging: A policy framework.

## APPENDICES

### APPENDIX A: TURKISH SUMMARY

Kentsel alandaki yaşlanma günümüzde dünyanın birçok ülkesi için önemli bir çalışma alanı olmaya başlamıştır. Artan ilginin en temel nedeni kuşkusuz demografik dönüşümlerdir. Phillipson'a göre (2011, p. 5), "2030 yılına kadar, dünya nüfusunun üçte ikisi kentlerde yaşıyor olacaktır ve yine o zamana kadar gelişmiş ülkelerin önemli kentsel alanları nüfuslarının dörtte biri 60 yaş ve üzerinde olacaktır.". Değişen sosyoekonomik ve demografik şartlar kentleri artan bir yaşlı nüfusla, onların değişen ihtiyaçlarıyla baş etmeye zorlamaktadır. Bu nedenle alternatif yaşam düzenlemeleri aranmakta ve yaş dostu kentler bu bağlamda ortaya atılmaktadır. Yaş dostu kentler aktif yaşlanma ve yerinde yaşlanma kavramlarına bağlı olarak bu alternatiflerden en önemlisi olarak tartışılmakta ve uygulanmaktadır.

Bu tezin amacı, literatürde yer alan ve küçük de olsa farklılıklar barındıran yaş dostu kent kriterleri için bir ideal tip yaratmaktır. Tez kapsamında geliştirilen ideal tip önerisi iki şekilde hazırlanmıştır. Birincisi literatürde sıkça rastlanan yaş dostu kent modellerinin kendi içinde karşılaştırılması, ikincisi ise, UNICEF'in (Birleşmiş Milletler Çocuklara Yardım Fonu) çocuk dostu kent modeli ile yaş dostu kent modellerinin karşılaştırılmasıdır. Birinci karşılaştırmanın yapılma sebebi, literatürde birden fazla, farklı isimde ve farklı vurgularla karşılaşılan yaş dostu kent modellerinin varlığıdır. İkinci karşılaştırmanın sebebi ise çocuk dostu kent modelinin de yaş dostu kent modeline benzer şekilde sahip olduğu kent kullanımının "yaş" ile ilişkilendiriliyor olmasıdır.

Yaş Dostu Kentler tartışması literatürde paradigmada önemli bir değişim olarak nitelendirilmektedir. Bu nitelendirmenin nedeni Greenfield ve arkadaşlarına göre (2015, p. 191) şudur, yaş dostu kentler tartışmasından ve uygulamalarından önce yaşlanma literatürünün temel noktası geleneksel servis sağlama tartışması idi ve 60

yaş üstü bireyler pasif servis tüketicileri olarak görülmektedirler. Bu bakış açısı yaşlanma literatüründe negative bir bakış açısı olarak algılanmaktaydı ve toplumda yaşlanmaya ve yaşlılara dair negative tutumun pekişmesine neden olmaktadır. Ancak yaş dostu kentler uygulamalarından sonra yaşlanma tartışmalarında yaşlı bireyler için dost bir sosyal ve fiziksel çevre yaratılması tartışılmaya başlanmıştır. Kentsel planlama yaklaşımı da bu gerçekliğin altını çizmektedir. Biggs ve Carr'a göre (2015, p. 100), 1960'lara kadar, kentler üreten ve tüketimde belirleyici rol oynayan çalışan yetişkinler için düzenlenmekteydi. Ancak 1960'lardan sonra kentsel planlamada kullanılan etkisi artmaya başlamıştır. Yaş dostu kentleri de bu anlayışın bir parçası olarak düşünmek yanlış olmayacaktır.

Kentsel planlamada artan kullanıcı etkisine ek olarak, yaş dostu kentlerin yanı sıra dünya literatüründe etkisini artıran ve Türkiye'de de uygulamaları gözlemlenen kadın dostu, çocuk dostu, engelli dostu kentler gibi kavramlar oluşmaya başlamıştır. Bu durumun nedenleri arasında HABITAT II toplantısının etkileri ve refah devletinin ademi merkezileşmesi gösterilebilmektedir. Ghai'ye göre (Andersen'de bahsedildiği gibi, 1996, p. vii), nüfusun yaşlanması, aile yapısındaki değişiklikler, yavaşlayan ekonomik büyüme, hayatın ekonomik ve sosyal alanlarının özelleşmesi, ulusal ve uluslararası arenada artan rekabet ve küreselleşme nedeniyle refah devletinin geleceği tartışılmaya başlanmıştır. Bu noktada da refah devletinin etkililiğinin artırılması gerekmiş ve ademi merkeziyetçilik ile politika geliştirme ve uygulama sorumluluğu yerel yönetimlere aktarılmaya başlanmıştır. Yukarıda da bahsedildiği gibi kentler için “dost” kavramları temel olarak bu iki gelişmenin sonuçları olarak görülebilir.

Yaş dostu kentler için belirlenen kriterler arasında bir ideal tip önerisi çalışmasının yöntemi olarak literatür araştırması tercih edilmiştir. Temel olarak gerontoloji konulu akademik dergiler, politika notları, incelenen modellerin kendileri tarafından üretilen dokümanlar, Birleşmiş Milletler organlarıca hazırlanan politika önerileri, kentli hakları ve insan hakları belgeleri bu tezde sıklıkla kullanılan bilgi kaynakları olmuştur. Bu sayede edinilen bilgiler ideal tipin önerilmesinde kullanılacak

kriterlerin belirlenmesine katkı sağlamış ve çalışmanın temelini oluşturmuştur. Söz konusu yorumlanmış, karşılaştırılmış ve Weberyen bir tarzda ideal tip önerisinde bulunulmuştur.

### **Kavramsal Çerçeve**

Çalışmanın kuramsal arka planının oluşturulmasında üzerinde durulan 3 temel kavram vardır, bunlar yerinde yaşlanma, aktif yaşlanma ve yaş dostu kentlerdir. Pastalan'a göre (1990, pp. ix-xii), yerinde yaşlanma; kişinin değişen hayat koşulları karşısında destek ihtiyacının artmasına rağmen bulunduğu yaşam alanında kalmaya devam edebilmesi anlamına gelmektedir. Bu kavram, yaşlanma literatüründe 1940'larda etkisini artırmaya başlayan çevresel gerontoloji teorisine dayanmaktadır. Çevresel gerontolojinin literatüre en önemli katkılarından birisi ve sıkça kullanılmasının arkasındaki neden yaşlanma literatürüne kazandırdığı çevrenin yalnızca fiziksel olarak algılanmaması gerektiği fikridir. Çevresel gerontoloji, yaşlanmada hayat kalitesinin ve kişilerin refahının belirlenmesinde önemli rolü olan çevreye sosyal bir boyutun da dahil edilerek incelenmesinden bahseder; ki bu durum yaş dostu kentlerin de temelini oluşturan fikirdir. Teorinin önemli parçalarından olan genel ekolojik modele göre kişi ve çevresi arasındaki uyum onun fonksiyonunu ve işlevini belirler. Siyasa yapıcılar ve yaşlanan bireyler tarafından farklı gerekçelerle tercih edilmeye başlanan yerinde yaşlanma alternatifleri içinde en önemlilerden birisi yaş dostu kentlerdir.

Aktif yaşlanma kavramı ise, Dünya Sağlık Örgütü (DSÖ) tarafından ortaya atılmış, kendisine benzer kavramlardan belli noktalarda farklılıkları olan ve içlerinde en kapsamlı olan kavramdır ve yaş dostu kentlerin temel dayanağını oluşturması bakımında bu tezin içeriğinde önem taşır. Özünü yaşlanma sonucunda kaybedilen sosyal roller yerine yeni roller edilmesi gerekliliği ve yaşlanmanın hayattan geri çekilme anlamına gelmemesi gerekliliği vurgusu yapan Aktivite Teorisi'nden alan aktif yaşlanma kendisinden önce kullanılan üretken ve başarılı yaşlanma kavramlarıyla kıyaslandığında daha fazla boyuta sahiptir. Bu tez kapsamındaki

önemi ise yaşlı bireylerin yaşamlarında çevrenin etkisine ve sosyal aktifliğe yapmış olduğu vurgudur. DSÖ'ye göre (2002, p. 12) aktif yaşlanma, insanlar yaş alırken sağlık, toplumsal hayata katılım ve güvenlik gibi alanlardaki koşulların belli bir standartta tutulması çabası olarak tanımlanmıştır. Aktif yaşlanma için 6 tane belirleyici tarif edilmiştir, bunlar; sağlık ve sosyal servislerle ilgili belirleyiciler, kişisel faktörlerle ilgili belirleyiciler, davranışsal belirleyiciler fiziksel ve sosyal çevre ile ilgili belirleyiciler, ekonomik belirleyicilerdir. Bunların yanı sıra tüm bu belirleyenleri de etkileyen çapraz belirleyiciler tanımlanmıştır, bunlar kültür ve toplumsal cinsiyettir. Aktif yaşlanmanın yaş dostu kentler tartışmasındaki önemi yukarda da belirtildiği gibi çevrenin aktivite üzerinde etkili oluşuna yaptığı vurgudan kaynaklanmaktadır.

Yaş dostu kentler kavramının yakın tarihine bakmak da açıklanacak olan 6 modelin daha iyi anlaşılmasına zemin hazırlayacağından önemlidir. Kavramın temellerinin 1982 yılında Viyana'da gerçekleştirilen Birleşmiş Milletler Birinci Dünya Yaşlanma Toplantısı'nda atılmıştır. Bu toplantı sonrasında Viyana Uluslar arası Yaşlanma Hareket Planı ve BM Yaşlı Bireyler için Prensipler dokümanları hazırlanmıştır. Belirlenen prensipler; yaşlıların bağımsızlığı, yaşlıların bakımı, yaşlıların kendilerini gerçekleştirebilmeleri, yaşlıların sosyal hayata katılımları ve onurlu bir yaşam sürmeleri olarak belirlenmiştir. 2002 yılında Madrid'de düzenlenen ikinci toplantı sonrasında DSÖ Aktif Yaşlanma için Politika Çerçevesi'ni hazırlamış ve kullanıcılara sunmuştur. Ardından DSÖ Küresel Yaş Dostu Kentler Ağı'nı iyi örneklerin paylaşımı ve deneyim aktarımı amacıyla kurmuştur.

DSÖ yaş dostu kentleri şöyle tanımlamaktadır: yaşlı bireylerin yaşam kalitelerini artırabilmek için aktif yaşlanmayı destekleyen, sağlık, katılım ve güvenlik koşullarını belirleyen kentlerdir (2010, p. 735).

### **Yaş Dostu Kent Modelleri**

Dünya literatüründe farklı şehirler tarafından takip edilip uygulanan, farklı yaş dostu kent modelleri vardır. Bu bağlamda literatürdeki 6 model incelenmek üzere

seçilmiştir. Seçilen modeller kavramın dayandığı Avrupa deneyiminden yola çıkılarak sınırlanmış, Avustralya ve Japonya deneyimi inceleme dışında tutulmuştur. Avustralya deneyimi çoğunlukla sosyal çevreyi içermediği ve odak noktasının halen fiziksel çevre olduğu için dışarda tutulurken, Japonya deneyimi DSÖ modelini takip ettiği için incelemenin dışında tutulmuştur. İncelenen modelleri sırasıyla saymak gerekirse, DSÖ modeli ilk sırada yer almaktadır. Bunu; Birleşik Krallık Çevre ve Yerel Yönetimler Birimi'nin önerdiği Yaşam Boyu Çevre modeli, Amerikan Emekli İnsanlar Kurumu'nun önerdiği Yaşanabilir Çevre modeli, Amerikan Yaşlanma Bölge Ofisleri Ulusal Topluluğunun önerdiği Yaşanabilir Çevre modeli, Kanada Calgary Üniversitesi Yaşlı Dostu Çevreler modeli, Yaşlı Dostu Çevreler modeli Amerikan AdvantAge (YaşAvantaj) İnisiyatifi modelleridir.

İncelenen ilk model olan DSÖ modelinde bir yaş dostu kent için belirlenen kriterler net bir şekilde açıklanmıştır, bunlar; açık alanlar ve binalar, meskenler, ulaşım, sosyal katılım, sosyal içerme ve saygı, aktif vatandaşlık ve istihdam, iletişim ve bilgiye erişim, toplum ve sağlık hizmetleridir. Kriterlere bakılarak denilebilir ki DSÖ modeli, bir yaş dostu kent için hem sosyal hem de fiziksel çevreye eşit önem vermektedir (DSÖ, 2007, pp.1-4).

İncelenen ikinci model Birleşik Krallık Çevre ve Yerel Yönetimler Birimi'nin önerdiği Yaşam Boyu Çevre modeli olmuştur. Bir yaşam boyu çevre herkese mümkün olan en iyi sağlık, refah, sosyal ekonomik hayata katılım şansı sunan bir çevredir. Sosyal birleşme ve mekana bağlılık hissi, kurulmuş çevre, mesken, yenilik ve katılımcı planlama, servis sağlama ve sosyal içerme bu modelin bir yaşam boyu çevre için belirlediği kriterlerdir (Harding, 2007, 12-19).

Üçüncü model, Amerikan Emekli İnsanlar Kurumu'nun önerdiği Yaşanabilir Çevre modeli olmuştur. Bir kentin Yaşanabilir bir Kent olduğunu iddia edebilmesi için belirlenen kriterler ise mesken, ulaşım, arsa kullanımı, işbirliği ve iletişim, çevre planlamasına katılım ve yaşlı bireylere verilen liderlik olmuştur (AARP, 2005, p. 19).

Dördüncü model, Amerikan Yaşlanma Bölge Ofisleri Ulusal Topluluğunun önerdiği Yaşanabilir Çevre modelidir. Kriterler ise, mesken, planlama ve bölge kullanımı, mobil olma, sağlık ve destekleyici servisler, kültür ve hayat boyu öğrenme, güvenlik, aktif vatandaşlık ve gönüllülük şansı olarak belirlenmiştir (n4a, 2015, p.14).

Yaş dostu kentler için önerilecek ideal tipin oluşturulmasında kullanılmak üzere incelenen modellerden beşincisi Kanada Calgary Üniversitesi Yaşlı Dostu Çevreler modeli olmuştur. Bu model de diğerleri gibi kent ve mahalleler düzeyinde yaşlı bireylerin mevcut durumlarını ve ihtiyaçlarını araştırdıktan sonra yaşlılar ve aileleri için destekleyici bir çevre önerisinde bulunmaktadır. Yine diğer modeller gibi belli kriterler ortaya atmaktadır, bunlar; yaşlı bireylere değer verilmesi ve saygı duyulması, yaşlı bireylerin aktif kalmaları, topluluk yaratma, ihtiyaçların karşılanması, güvende hissetme, “yuva” denilecek bir mesken, çevrede dolaşabilme olarak belirlenmiştir.

Bu çalışma kapsamında incelenen altıncı ve son model olan Yaşlı Dostu Çevreler modeli Amerikan AdvantAge (YaşAvantaj) İnisiyatifi tarafından hayata geçirilmektedir. Model sayıca diğerlerinden daha az olan ancak kapsamının çok da zayıf olmadığı dört kriter önermiştir, bunlar; temel ihtiyaçların karşılanması, fiziksel, zihinsel sağlığın ve refahın uygun seviyeye getirilmesi, bağımsızlığın azamileştirilmesi, sosyal ve sivil hayata katılımıdır.

### **Çocuk Dostu ve Yaş Dostu Kentler Kriterlerinin Karşılaştırılması**

UNICEF’in Çocuk Dostu Kentler modeli daha yukarıda da belirtildiği gibi ideal tip önerisinde bir karşılaştırma mekanizması olarak kullanılmıştır. Bu sayede kentsel çevreyi yaş temelli dezavantajlı bir grup için incelemesi ve iyileştirmeye çalışması bakımından yaş dostu kent inisiyatifleriyle aynı amacı taşımaktadır. Topsümer ve arkadaşlarına göre (2009, p. 6), bir çocuk dostu kentte; çocukların yaşadıkları çevredeki sosyal hayata ve kentle ilgili kararlara katılabilmeleri, sağlığa, eğitime,

barınma olanaklarına ulaşarak temel ihtiyaçlarını karşılayabilmeleri, temiz içme suyuna ve hijyene ulaşabilmeleri, her türlü sömürüden korunabilmeleri, arkadaşlarıyla oynayabilmeleri, yeterince yeşil alana sahip, kirlenmemiş bir çevrede yaşayabilmeleri gerekmektedir.

Yukarıdaki alıntıdan da anlaşılacağı gibi çocuk dostu kentlerin de çocuklara sağlanacak hizmetlere vurgusu vardır, ancak çocuk dostu kentlerle yaş dostu kentler arasındaki en büyük farklılık kriterlerin belirlenmesi konusunda ortaya çıkmıştır. Çocuk Dostu Kentler için belirlenen kriterler (UNICEF, 2004, p. 4), çocuk katılımı, çocuk dostu yasal çerçeve, kent bazında çocuk hakları stratejisi, çocuk hakları birimi veya koordinasyon mekanizması, etki ölçümü ve değerlendirilmesi, çocuk dostu bütçeleme, düzenli olarak hazırlanacak kentin çocukları durumu raporu, çocuk haklarının bilinirliğinin artırılması, çocuklar için bağımsız savunuculuk. Kriterlerden de anlaşılacağı gibi, çocuk dostu kentler dayanağını Çocuk Haklarına Dair Sözleşme'den almakta ve çocukların insan haklarına vurgu yapmaktadır. Woolcock ve Gleeson'a göre (2007, p. 3), Çocuk Dostu Kentler inisiyatifinin başlangıcı 1960'larda Kuzey Amerika ve Avrupa'da gerçekleşmiştir. 1968'de UNESCO (Birleşmiş Milletler Eğitim, Bilim ve Kültür Kurumu) Şehirlerde Büyümek aslı on yıllık bir program başlatmış ve çocuk haklarına dair kentsel çalışmalara yön vermiştir. 1980'lerde konu hakkındaki çabalar genel olarak "fiziksel çevre çocukların sosyal ve zihinsel gelişiminde nasıl etkilere sahiptir" sorusuna aranan yanıtlar şeklinde ilerlemiştir. 1990'larda daha önce de bahsedilen HABITAT II toplantısı UNICEF'in çocuk dostu kentler üzerine çabalarının başlangıcı olarak düşünülmektedir. Takiben 1996'da UNICEF Çocuk Dostu Kentler İnisiyatifi resmi olarak kurulmuştur (Riggio and Kilbake, 2000, p. 201).

### **Yaş Dostu Kent Kriterleri için İdeal Tip Önerisi**

Tüm bu karşılaştırmalardan, modellerin kendi içinde ve çocuk dostu kent modeliyle kıyaslamaları sonucunda yaş dostu kentler için önerilecek olan ideal tipin yaratılmasında kullanılacak dört temel alan belirlenmiştir. Demirel'e göre (2013, p.



365), ideal tip Weberyana anlamda sosyal yapıyı anlamak için kullanılan soyut bir yöntemdir. Sosyal yapıyı anlamak için o yapıyı diğerlerinden ayıran ve kendi içinde muhakkak barınması gereken özelliklerini vurgular. Bu çalışma kapsamında önerilecek olan ideal tipin amacı, literatürde herhangi bir birlik olmayan bir kavram olan yaş dostu kentler kriterlerinin birbirleriyle kıyaslanabilir olmasını sağlamaktır. Werner (2009, p. 41), ideal tipi şöyle tanımlamaktadır: “çeşitli ilişkileri, veya hayattaki olayları bir araya getirerek, dahili ve harici sosyal özelliklerini ve karakteristiklerini karşılaştıran bir kavramsal yöntem. Buna ek olarak, ideal tip kullanımı hakkında önemli bir bilgi de kullanılacağı alanlardır, bir başka deyişle, ideal tipe neden ihtiyaç duyulduğu ve nerelerde kullanıldığı önemlidir. Weberyana anlamda Werner’in altını çizdiği ideal tip kullanımları aşağıdaki gibidir:

1. Tipin gerçekte varlığıyla ilgili, yeterince anlaşılır ve net olup olmadığında dair yargılarda bulunmak.
2. Toplumlar arasında veya bir toplum içerisindeki farklı unsurlar arasında karşılaştırmalar yapmak.
3. Bu toplumlar ya da unsurlar arasındaki belirsizliği gidermek,
4. Yarattığı disiplinler arası diyalog ortamı sayesinde yeni konseptler oluşturmak .

Bu amaçlar doğrultusunda önerilen ideal tip için 4 temel alan belirlenmiştir. Bu alanlar: sosyal ve fiziksel çevreyi birlikte ele alıyor olması, insan hakları anlayışını ve hizmet sağlama anlayışını bir arada barındırıyor olması, yaşlı bireyleri politika yapım sürecine dahil ediyor olması, farklı modeller tarafından önerilen tüm kriterleri içeriyor olması. Tez boyunca kullanılan “yaşlı bireyler” kelime grubuyla ifade edilen grup DSÖ’nün kabul ettiği 60 yaş ve üzeri insanlardır. İdeal tip için önerilen ilk unsur incelenen tüm modeller tarafından sağlanmaktadır.

Daha açıklayıcı olmak gerekirse, DSÖ modelinin açık alanlar ve binalar, ulaşım ve mesken ile hizmetler kriterleri fiziksel çevreyi, iletişim ve haberleşme, sosyal hayata katılım, saygı ve sosyal içerme, aktif vatandaşlık ve istihdam sosyal çevreyi

vurgulamaktadır. Birleşik Krallık modelinin binalar ve insan eliyle yapılan çevre kriteri ile mesken kriteri fiziksel çevreyi, sosyal içerme, mekansal aidiyet, topluluk planlamasına katılım, yenilikçilik ve katılımcı planlama ile hizmetler sosyal çevreyi vurgulamaktadır. Benzer bir şekilde Amerikan Emekliler Birliği modeli çevre planlaması, ulaşım ve mesken konularını vurgulayarak fiziksel çevrenin altını çizmekte ve işbirliği ve iletişim, topluluk hayatının planlanması ve liderlik konularına vurgu yaparak sosyal çevreye gereken önemi vermektedir. Bunun yanı sıra dördüncü model olan Amerikan Bölge Yaşlanma Birimlerinin Ulusal Topluluğu'nun Yaşanabilir Çevre modeli ulaşım, mesken ve bölgesel planlamayı ön plana çıkartarak fiziksel çevreye vurgu yapmaktadır. Sosyal çevre için ise kültür ve yaşam boyu öğrenme, güvenlik, gönüllülük ve hizmetleri ön plana çıkartmaktadır. Calgary Üniversitesi'nin Kanada'da ortaya koyduğu perspektife göre ise mobil olmak, mesken konuları fiziksel çevreye vurgu yapmakta ve bilgi ve hizmetlere erişim, bağımsızlığın devamlılığı ve sosyal hayata katılım, güvenlik ve saygı konularını da sosyal çevre bileşenleri olarak sunmaktadır. Son model olan Amerikan YaşAvantaj İnisiyatifi de benzer bir şekilde sunduğu dört farklı kriter altında çevrenin iki alanına vurgu yapmaktadır. Modelin kriterleri diğer modeller kadar kesin ayrımlar taşımamaktadır.

Yaşlı bireylerin politika yapma süreçlerine dahil edilmesi bir yaş dostu kent ideal tipi için bir kriter olarak belirlenmiştir. Bu düşüncenin arkasında DSÖ modelinin tepeden inme olduğu eleştirisi yatmaktadır. Tepeden inme olduğu düşüncesi ise, yaş dostu kentlerin oluşturulması için önerdiği modelde kentlerde yaşayan 60 yaş ve üstü bireyleri politika yapma süreçlerine dahil etmemesi onun yerine yalnızca geleneksel bilgi toplama modellerini kullandığı argümanından kaynaklanmaktadır. Tam tersi, Birleşik Krallık Topluluklar ve Yerel Yönetimler Birimince önerilen Yaşam Boyu Çevreler modeli ihtiyaçların belirlenmesi, politikaların geliştirilmesi, uygulanması ve etkilerinin ölçülmesi aşamalarında yaşlı bireylere söz hakkı tanımaktadır. Bu durumda bir yaş dostu kentin yaşlı bireylerin tüm sürece katılımına izin veriyor ve teşvik ediyor olması önemli bir kriter olarak ideal tipin bir parçası haline getirilmiştir.

İdeal tipin bir diğere önemli ayağı tüm modellerce belirlenen kriterleri içeren bir ideal tip olmuştur. Dolayısıyla yukarıda kısaca açıklanan tüm modeller tarafından belirlenen tüm kriterler, ki bunlar; binalar, ulaşım, mesken, hizmetler (özellikle sağlık alanında), iletişim ve haberleşme, kültür ve hayat boyu öğrenme, mahalle planlaması, sosyal hayata katılım, sosyal içermeye ve saygı, aktif vatandaşlık, fiziksel ve finansal güvenlik, istihdam, yeni teknolojiler ve katılımcı planlama olarak sıralanmıştır.

Çocuk dostu kentlerle yapılan kıyaslanmanın sonucunda ortaya çıkan ve ideal tipin içermesi gerektiği düşünülen en önemli maddelerden birisi, yaş dostu kentlerde eksik kalan insan hakları bakış açısıdır. Bu eksikliğin kaynağı çocuk haklarından farklı olarak yaşlı bireylerin insan haklarını uluslararası bir arenada kabul ettiren bir belgenin olmayışı olarak açıklanmıştır. Bu bağlamda tartışma yaşlı bireylerin insan haklarını tanıyacak ve çocuk dostu kentlere benzeyen şekilde yaş dostu kentlerin sürdürülebilirliğini sağlayıp dayanak olacak bir belgenin hazırlanması ile ilgili konuya gelmiştir. Bu konuda, karşı argümanlar olsa da; Fredvang ve Biggs'de yer alan argümanlara göre (2012, p. 13), böyle bir belge yaşlı bireylere karşı önyargıları azaltacak, ayrımcılıkla mücadelede savunuyu aracı olarak kullanılabilir ve bu alanda çalışmak için siyasetçilerde bir istek ve ilgi uyandıracaktır. Böyle bir belgeye dayandırılarak çalışılan yaş dostu kentlerde de yaşlı bireyler geleneksel hizmet alıcılar olarak değil haklı ve kentli bireyler olarak görülecektir.

### **Yaş Dostu Kentlerde Eleştirel Konular**

Yaş dostu kentler tartışması konusunda yapılan literatür çalışması sonucunda eleştirel yaklaşılması gereken üç konu başlığı belirlenmiştir. Bunlar dezavantajlı mahalle ya da şehirler, kırsal kesime yapılan sınırlı vurgu ve toplumsal cinsiyet konusunun hiç vurgulanmaması olarak sıralanabilir. Sırasıyla açıklamak gerekirse, Menec ve arkadaşlarına göre (2011, pp. 480-481), yaş dostu kentler konusu kendini farklı yerelerde farklı şekillerde gösterecektir, örneğin çok uluslu ve yoksul mahallelerde

yaşlanan kişiler tam tersi özelliklere sahip yerelerde yaşlanarlardan çok farklı deneyimlere sahip olabileceklerdir. Bu durum karşısında Fitzgerald ve Caro tarafından (2014, p. 2), yaş dostu kentler için bazı önkaşullar belirlenmiştir, bunlar; nüfus yoğunluğu, iklim ve hava koşulları, topografik özellikler, sosyal organizasyon, sağlık ve sosyal servislerdir. Yani, bir kentin yaş dostu kent olduğunu iddia etmesi, yaş dostu kent olmak için inisiyatifler yaratması için öncelikle bahsedilen koşullara dair bir ön hazırlık yapması gerekliliği politika önerileri arasındadır. Eleştirilere konu olan ikinci konu ise yaş dostu kentlerin tamamen kent hayatına odaklanmış olması ve kırsal yaşlanmayı görmezden gelmesi hakkındadır. Literatürde rastlanan yalnızca Kanada’da uygulanan ve DSÖ yaş dostu kentler kriterlerini takip eden yaş dostu kırsal alanlar çalışmalarıdır. Üçüncü en önemli eleştirel yaklaşım gerektiren alan ise yaş dostu kentlerin toplumsal cinsiyet konusuna hiç değinmemesidir. Oysa toplumsal cinsiyet hem yaşlanma literatüründe hem de kent kullanımı anlamında belirleyici bir role sahiptir. HelpAge’e göre (2002, p. 1), kadınlar hayatın her döneminde oldukları gibi yaşlanma sürecinde de erkeklerle eşit değildirlir ve bu süreci eşit şekilde yaşamazlar. Örneğin, kent hayatından erkeklerle eşit şekilde faydalanamamakta ve yaşlanma sürecinde de erkeklere kıyasla daha dezavantajlı konumdadırlar.

Sonuç olarak konuya dair politika önerileri arasında toplumsal cinsiyet eşitliğinin sağlandığı ve içerildiği bir yaş dostu kent anlayışı kurmak, yaşlı bireylerin daha fazla katılım sağladığı bir izleme mekanizması, bu alanda çalışan sivil toplum örgütlerinin aktif katılımıyla geliştirilen çözümlere yer verilmesi yer almaktadır. Bunlara ek olarak önerilen ve çalışmanın temel sorunsalı olan ideal tip önerisi de bir politika önerisi olarak değerlendirilmelidir. Yaş dostu kentler hakkında dünya literatürünü tarayan ve birçok bilgiyi bir araya getirerek aralarında kıyaslama yapan bu çalışma, çocuk dostu kentlere de “yaş” ve “kent” odağı nedeniyle kıymet vermiştir. Çocuk dostu kentlerin tanımını, tarihsel gelişimini ve kriterlerini araştıran çalışma yaş dostu kentlerin çocuk hakları temelinde gelişmesine ve kriterlerini bu perspektiften kurmasına vurgu yapmakta ve aynı bakış açısını yaş dostu kentler için önermektedir. Bunun yanı sıra yaş dostu kentleri kendi arasında kıyaslayarak yaş dostu kent kriterleri için bir ideal tip önermektedir. Dolayısı ile denilebilir ki, çalışmanın

literatüre en önemli katkısı farklı alanlardan ve aynı alanın farklı bölümlerinden topladığı bilgilerle kapsamlı bir ideal tip önermesidir. En önemli özgün yanı ise insan hakları bakış açısını yaş dostu kentler için önermesidir. Yaş dostu kentler, yaşlanma konusunda sahip olduğu pozitif bakış açısıyla ve doğru yönetildiği takdirde denenmeye değerdir.

## APPENDIX B: TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU

### ENSTİTÜ

- Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü
- Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü
- Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü
- Enformatik Enstitüsü
- Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü

### YAZARIN

Soyadı : DÜLGER  
Adı : HATİCE NAZLI  
Bölümü : SOSYAL POLİTİKA

**TEZİN ADI** (İngilizce) : AGE FRIENDLY CITIES CRITERIA: AN IDEAL TYPE

**TEZİN TÜRÜ** : Yüksek Lisans  Doktora

1. Tezimin tamamından kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir.
2. Tezimin içindekiler sayfası, özet, indeks sayfalarından ve/veya bir bölümünden kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir.
3. Tezimden bir bir (1) yıl süreyle fotokopi alınamaz.

**TEZİN KÜTÜPHANEYE TESLİM TARİHİ:**