

The Effectiveness of Urban Areas on Citizens' Level of Satisfaction in Life Quality in Kouhdasht

Aliakbar Anabestani

Associate Professor of Geography and Rural Planning, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Mashhad, Iran

Samad Amrai

M.A. in Geography and Urban Planning, Islamic Azad University Malayer Branch, Malayer, Iran

Ahmad Roumiani*

PhD Candidate in Geography and Rural Planning, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Mashhad, Iran

Received: 8 October 2015

Accepted: 21 April 2016

Expanded Abstract

1. Introduction

Life quality is a transdisciplinary concept which has been recently explored in human fields. The concept has been proposed in social and economic analyses and emphasized the accessible resources in cities. According to the available statistics, nearly half of the world population is living in cities, which is expected to rise in the forthcoming decades. In general, this may be due to the efforts of many people to satisfy their needs and appropriate facilities in the urban life.

2. Theoretical framework

One of the indicators of sustainable urban development is the development of urban areas. Therefore, the development of urban areas indicates a process through which the capital obtained by the society can increase to improve the life quality of residents. Thus, it is safe to say that the development of urban areas includes all issues related to housing, economic development, citizens' participation, social welfare, sense of security, promotion of education, and environmental issues with which all these factors are interconnected. In this sense, the life quality issue is proposed. Personal life quality is presented as an understanding of person's life; on the other hand, the aim of using life quality is to help people use high life quality. Life quality is a complex and multidimensional concept influenced by some variables such as time, location, and personal and social values. In this study, four perspectives of Rajeb are discussed, including sociological perspective, social and geographic sciences, and urban planning. As for the life quality perspective, two approaches are used: 1) Scandinavian approach, 2) American approach.

3. Methodology

The research is done to evaluate the role of urban areas by emphasizing on life quality in Kouhdasht. Such research requires a perspective having a holistic view. The research is of the applied type and the methodology used is descriptive-analytic. Library and field methods (observations, questionnaires, & interviews) were used to collect the data. To analyze the data, the descriptive and inferential along with qualitative analysis statistical methods were used through the SPSS software. Likert questionnaire was used in order to evaluate the role of urban areas development in sustainable development while emphasizing on life quality in four indicators, including social, cultural, economic, and environmental indicators. In the current research, the population included 95 thousands urban residents. The sample size included the 322 questionnaires having 85 items each which were calculated with an error of 0.05. The questionnaires were then randomly distributed among the residents. To rank and rate the quality of the areas, the municipality heads' opinions were used in a qualitative manner.

4. Discussion and Conclusion

Recently, life quality has become a conventional subject for sociologists and planners; therefore, life quality is a multidimensional concept in social sciences which is effective in most fields in society. It has also occupied a special place in literature regarding the development, whereas some researchers have considered it as a missing link. With urbanization boom and the issues arising from it, life quality and relaxation in the urban areas in recent decades has led to the development life standards in urban areas. The study area under investigation is within the city limits of Kouhdasht (Lorestan Province) in the south-western slopes of the Zagros Mountains with an age of over a

*. Corresponding Author: aromyani@gmail.com

hundred years which has faced great changes in terms of urban furniture. The city, like other cities of the country in the past three decades, life quality has been considerably increased since the start of with the prospect of planning process in the country. In this sense, on the one hand, people's attitudes toward lifestyle and life quality in these areas have been considered. On the other hand, the infrastructures of the areas have attracted the urban managers and planners' attention, which has provided the grounds for improving life quality in the city. In this study, thus, the geographic, natural, social, economic and skeletal areas are discussed. The participants were asked to state their level of satisfaction about the areas in question. The results indicated that most of the participants were

satisfied with their geographic areas with the highest rank, whereas the skeletal area achieved the lowest rank. According to the responses, the urban areas were ranked, Kounaeiha was at the highest rank and Shiravand was at the lowest rank, whereas Kounaeiha in economic and skeletal areas was at the second rank. As this area was near the city center, it achieved the first rank. Since Shiravand was far from the city center, it achieved the lowest rank. The life quality in Kouhdasht has improved given the economic, social conditions and the feasibility of facilities, and the hypothesis is thus confirmed.

Keywords: Urban areas, Sustainable development, Life quality, Kouhdasht

References (in Persian)

1. Ahadnejad, M., & Najafi, S. (2014). Assessing the quality of life in urban neighborhoods in relation to social justice (Case study: Islamabad neighborhood and the city staffs of Zanjan). In S. Kilig (Ed.), *Proceedings of the International Conference on Online Green Economy* (pp. 1-15), Babolsar, Research Center of Torud North, Iran.
2. Aliakbari, A. (2009). Governmental urban economics of Iran: A case study of Ilam. *Journal of Economic Research School of Economics*, 66(39), 209-235.
3. Barati, K., & Yazdanpanah Shahabadi, M. R. (2011). Examining the relationship of social capital and quality of life in the city: A case study of the new city campus. *Society of Cultural Research in Humanities and Cultural Studies*, 11(3), 49-25.
4. Ebrahimzadeh, I., Mohammed, F. & Ismailzadeh, H. (2011, December). *Examining the role and importance of social capital in a dynamic urban economy with an emphasis on good urban governance: A case study of Tehran Metropolis*. Paper presented at the 1st conference of Urban Economics, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Mashhad, Iran.
5. Ghiasvand, E. (2009). The effects of social capital on life quality of the residents in urban neighborhoods. *Journal of Consulting Engineers in Iran*, 45(6), 28-22.
6. Hajinejad, A., & Zamani, H. (2011). Survey and ranking factors influencing residents' satisfaction with the quality of the living environment (case study): Comparing the old and new physical of Shiraz City. *Journal of Human Geography Research*, 43(77), 143-129.
7. Hajipour, Kh. (2006). Base neighborhood planning and urban management in developing an effective approach. *Journal of Fine Arts*, 26(37), 46-37.
8. Jajarmi K., & Kalteh, E. (2006). The assessment of quality of life indices in citizens: A case study of Gonbad Qaboos. *Journal of Geography and Development*, 4(8), 5-8.
9. Khakpour, B., Mafi, E. & Bavan Gori, A. R. (2009). The role of social capital in the area of sustainable development. *Journal of Geography and Regional Development*, 12(7), 81-84.
10. Lotfi, S., Gheisari, H., Ahar, H., & Manuchehri, A. (2012). Analysis of the impact of access to community facilities in the quality of urban life (Case Study: Maragheh). In R. Hashempoor (Ed.), *Proceedings of the First National Conference on Urban Planning and Architecture of the Time* (pp. 1-22), Qazvin, Iran.
11. Rahnama, M. R., & Abaszadeh, G. R. (2007). *Principles, principles and models of assessment in physical form*. Mashhad: SID publications.
12. Sarrafi, M. (1998). *Principles of regional development planning*. Tehran: Plan and budget Organization Press.
13. Zokaei, M. S., & Roshanfeker, P. (2006). The relationship between social capital and quality of life in urban neighborhoods. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 32(23) 1-37.

References (in English)

1. Allen, J. C., Vogt, R. J., & Cordes, S. (2002). *Quality of life in rural Nebraska: Trends and change*. Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1004&context=caripubs>.
2. Beumer, C., Valkering, P., & Ruelle, C. (2010). *Envisioning a sustainable urban neighborhood*. The Netherlands, Maastricht: Maastricht University ICIS.
3. Cowan, R., & Hall, P. G. (2002). *The dictionary of urbanism* (Vol. 67). Tisbury: Streetwise Press.
4. Epley, D. R., & Menon, M. (2008). A method of assembling cross-sectional indicators into a community quality of life. *Social Indicators Research*, 88(2), 281-296.
5. Gold, J. & Kolb, W. (1997). *A dictionary of the social sciences*. (Z. Mazandarani, Trans.). Tehran: Mazyar Publications.
6. Lee, H. Y. (2008). An analysis on the development capacity of an urbanized area for urban growth management. *Journal of the Korean Urban Geographical Society*, 11(1), 1-18.
7. Levent, T. B., & Nijkamp, P. (2006). Quality of urban life: A taxonomic perspective. *Journal of Studies in Regional Science*, 36(2), 269-281.
8. McMahon, S. K. (2002). The development of quality of life indicators: A case study from the City of Bristol, UK. *Ecological Indicators*, 2(1), 177-185.
9. Moro, M., Brereton, F., Ferreira, S., & Clinch, J. P. (2008). Ranking quality of life using subjective well-being data. *Ecological Economics*, 65(3), 448-460.
10. Pal, A. K., & Kumar, U. C. (2005). Quality of Life (QoL) concept for the evaluation of societal development of rural community in West Bangal, India. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Rural Development*, 15(2), 83-93.
11. Phillips, D. (2006). *Quality of life: Concept, policy and practice*. London: Routledge.
12. Roback, J. (1982). Wages, rents and the quality of life. *Journal of Political Economy*, 90(6), 1257-1278.
13. Roslan, A., Russayani, I., & Nor Azam, A. (2010). The impact of social capital on quality of life: Evidence from Malaysia. *European Journal of Economics, Finance and Administrative Sciences*, 4(3), 113-122.
14. Royuela, V., & Suriñach, J. (2005). Constituents of quality of life and urban size. *Social Indicators Research*, 74(3), 549-572.
15. Schmit, R. (2002). Considering social capital in quality of life assessment: Concept and measurement. *Social Indicators Research*, 65(58), 403-428.
16. Baycan levent, T., & Nijkamp, P. (2006). Quality of urban life a taxonomic perspective. *Journal of Studies in Regional Science*, 36(2), 1-5.
17. Cowan, R. (2002). *Dictionary of Urbanism*. London, England: Street Wise Press.

How to cite this article:

Anabestani, A. A., Amrai, S., & Roumiani, A. (2016). The effectiveness of urban areas on citizens' level of satisfaction in life quality in Kouhdasht. *Journal of Geography and Urban Space Development*, 2(2), 139-152.

URL <http://jgusd.um.ac.ir/index.php/gud/article/view/40168>

ISSN: 2322-2832