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Abstract. The history of Yogyakarta City still holds many “millions” of tangible and intangible meaning. The history has brought Yogyakarta City known as a City of Philosophy that is realized in the spatial layout of the city, one of them is the philosophy axis. In this research, the historical objects have been studied the main elements that become the icon and to be grouped into four objects. There are Tugu Area, Malioboro Area, Zero Kilometer Area, and South Square Area located on the philosophy axis. Another consideration, these four objects are supported by other space forming elements become a place that has a “spirit” of cultural heritage to gather and interact with local communities and tourists in the public space. The purpose of this research is enriching knowledge about the main elements of historical objects. Besides that, the purpose of this research is to support Yogyakarta City to realize world Heritage City by UNESCO about cultural heritage. This research uses mix methods. Qualitative methods by conducted the survey and collected the literature. The observation and interviews towards informers and involves the perception of local communities and tourists with 327 respondents in Yogyakarta City. While the quantitative method for a non-parametric test with different test Mann Whitney U using SPSS 17 program. This research uses spatial and descriptive analysis to explain the main elements of historical objects and examine their relationship with local communities and tourists perception. The result of this research that Malioboro Area has the important corridor in historical value that associated with historical events and historical figures, style building, and culture. As well as Malioboro public space that has the meaning of the spirit of life for urban residents and the heart of the city, which means the inheritance of all things. The results of this research are expected to provide of place attachment towards all mainly historical objects “spirits” of cultural heritage for people to gather and interact. The importance of the psychological dimension of the environment to help the psychological well being in urban as a concern for architects, planners in shaping, developing a city in the future, especially public space. Also, the results of this research are expected Yogyakarta City to keep become a magnet for the traveler as Tourism Destination Object.
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Introduction

Yogyakarta is one of the cities that has a wealth of history and culture that are still found until today. History of the founding of Yogyakarta began from the Mataram Kingdom in the 17th century until the entry of Dutch colonial. The collapse of the Mataram Kingdom was marked by the signing of the Giyanti Agreement between Pangeran Mangkubumi with VOC (Vereenigde Oost-indische Compagnie) (Dutch) on 13 February 1755. In this agreement has explained that Mataram was split into two regions, there are Surakarta and Yogyakarta. The concept of spatial planning of Yogyakarta City cannot be separated from Pangeran Mangkubumi who later titled Sri Sultan Hamengku Buwana I.

Yogyakarta City as a City of Philosophy, in spatial layout, was applying the philosophical value of culture as the image of the city. Lynch (1960) was mentioning that in the development of a city, the image of the city has a role as a former of the city identity, and as an adder to the attraction of the city. Therefore, the image of the city has a clear and strong will affirm the identity and face of the city so as to make the city has an attraction and interesting. In this research, the main elements of historical objects are also the mental map elements of the city (cognitive map) which important components of physical (tangible) have special meaning in history and culture and other important values, and the formers of the image of the city.

The historical objects have been studied in this research are the main elements that have been grouped into four objects. The four objects have a special (high value) that are on the philosophy axis. Besides to the primacy of the value of historical objects, each of the four objects is an icon or symbol of Yogyakarta City
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which has a spirit of place. Tugu, Malioboro, South Square, and Dutch colonial buildings at Zero Kilometer located in the heart of the city that has a spirit of place for gather people (public). A spirit of place of the four objects now has provided a public space for gathering and interacting, especially for local communities (natives and newcomers). Also, refers to the main elements of historical objects sur-rounded by other space forming elements (support/secondary elements) physically.

Public space in this research is being in a revitalization effort by the Yogyakarta Government, such as Zero Kilometer Area. While Tugu and Malioboro Area have been completed the revitalization phase. Currently, the four objects have a public space that becomes a place for the communities to gather and interact as well as a cultural tourism for the tourists. In this research, the purpose is enriching knowledge about historical objects. In this paper, the researcher describes how substantial the local communities (public/society) and the tourist’s assessment towards the historical object, mental map elements of the city (cognitive map), and a spirit of place based on the perception of the four objects. Certainly also sharpened by involves informers 1,2,3 (resource persons) who had competence in the disciplines of urban spatial, culture, and architecture.

Literature Review

In 1972 the UNESCO General Conference adopted the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World’s Cultural and Natural Heritage in article 1 is explained that cultural heritage by the following classifications: monuments, groups of buildings and sites. In operational guidelines for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention in article 4 is explained that “the cultural and natural heritage is among the priceless and irreplaceable assets, not only of each nation but of humanity as a whole. The loss, through deterioration or disappearance, of any of these most prized assets constitutes an impoverishment of the heritage of all the peoples of the world. Parts of that heritage, because of their exceptional qualities, can be considered to be of ‘Outstanding Universal Value’ and as such worthy of special protection against the dangers which increasingly threaten them” (UNESCO, 2005).

“OUV means cultural and/or natural significance which is so exceptional as to transcend national boundaries and to be of common importance for present and future generations of all humanity. As such, the permanent protection of this heritage is of the highest importance to the international community as a whole. The Committee defines the criteria for the inscription of properties on the World Heritage List. (UNESCO, 2005)”. The process of world heritage assessment consists of three main pillars, nominated inheritance must meet at least one criterion established by UNESCO, must meet the criteria of integrity and authenticity, and must meet the criteria for protection and management.

Department for Culture of Yogyakarta Government (2015) that Yogyakarta City has fulfilled three criteria contained in the OUV. There are criteria I, represent a masterpiece of human creative genius; criteria II; exhibit an important interchange of human values, over a span of time or within a cultural area of the world, on developments in architecture or technology, monumental arts, town-planning or landscape design, and criteria VI; be directly or tangibly associated with events or living traditions, with ideas, or with beliefs with artistic and literary works of outstanding universal significance (Yogyakarta City of Philosophy, 2015). The formation of Yogyakarta City is essentially an implementation of the concept of Pangeran Mangkubumi (Sri Sultan Hamengku Buwana I) based on the understanding of the philosophy of human life in the form of setting the architectural of the building, vegetation arrangement, cultural values order (philosophical-ritual), and government regulation (Department of Culture, 2015).

In a broad sense, cultural heritage is a result of human processes and activities rather than a biophysical product (Aplin, 2002). Heritage can grow individuals who are associated with the main elements of the city with regard to cultural heritage. Inheritance can be an important life as part of the hereditary history and tradition in preserves cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1984). It can be said that the object of heritage value is a former of the city identity that re-quires a long time process and sequence of occurrence in shaping it. Lynch (1960) has the concept of legibility or ease of a place under-stood cognitively and ‘read’ by a person so that the concerned can be oriented in the environment, related to paths, nodes, edges, districts, and landmarks has become the basic infrastructure for various advanced studies, and an emphasis on the physical order of space. The physical identity that is easily captured by the observer is an object that is used as a reference (navigator) of the region. Environments identity is not only based on the buildings but also can be components such as street elements and others.

The main elements of historical objects in this research have an appeal in the historical aspect, the importance of historical objects, uniqueness and authenticity element, as well as other ‘magical influences’. The 2008 ICOMOS Quebec Declaration on the Preservation of the Spirit of Place (ICOMOS, 2008) sought to connect ideas of intangible heritage with non-tangible concepts of material place, such as genius loci, under the concept of the spirit of place. Norberg-Schulz (1980) describes the genius loci, reflecting the uniqueness of a place, distinguishing one place from another. Without the presence of genius loci, a place has no meaning and will arise events that are not personal but general. It can be fully revealed that the genius loci is the soul/energy of place. These spirits inhabit all places and give meaning, keep and inspire the place with feelings. The genius loci symbolize individual strengths that complement a place with personality and character in the form of a quality that is more than a fact. The task of the genius loci is to maintain a feeling of an animating presence.

A spirit of place can affect the quality of life better for the public welfare. This matter enabling mutual interaction of residents, and thereby improving their quality of life (Newman, 1980). Related with social value, culture may provide a key contribution to the city’s social assets and cohesion and to their social sustainability (see, e.g., Tavano Blessi, Trem-
blay, Sandri, & Pilati, 2012), as well as to the development of a sense of place (e.g., Sandler, 2007). Duany, et al. (2000) says the presence, for example, green open space or waterfronts, not only provides people with a place to engage in various recreational activities but also offers to escape from the routine of daily life, making more happy, more healthy, and more relaxed, and ultimately improving the quality of life. Like the square, a type of civic places that allow people to socialize and interact with each other in the public (Carmona, Heath, Oc, & Tiesdell, 2003; Childs, 2004; Cooper-Marcus, C. & Francis, 1998; Lynch, 1981; Tibbalds, 1992).

There is a deterministic belief among architects and urban planners that well-planned and developed public spaces generate socially desirable behavior and attitudes (Alexander, 1977; Gehl, 1987; Project for Public Spaces, 2000; Whyte, 1980). Truly public spaces encourage social interaction among individuals with diverse interests, opinions, and perspectives (Young, 1990; Németh, 2006). Most of the research in this area focuses on ‘flagship’ urban public spaces, and the changes in their level of publicness following a redevelopment or improvement process (e.g., Akkar, 2005a, 2005b; Madanipour, 1995, 2003; Van Melik, Van Aalst, & Van Weesep, 2007). The UK government also recognizes the links between the built environment – particularly built heritage – and quality of life (Tweed & Sutherland, 2007). With considering how built heritage contributes to the satisfaction of human needs.

**Methods**

This research was conducted in Yogyakarta City which is along the philosophy axis. The philosophy axis is a straight line that longitudinal north-south from Tugu Yogyakarta to Panggung Krapyak which is right in the center or core of Yogyakarta City. The philosophy axis is used as the basis for taking the object of this research, there are four objects selected in this research, that is;

a) Tugu Area,

b) Malioboro Area,

c) Zero Kilometer Area, and

d) South Square Area.

The four objects located in the cultural heritage of Yogyakarta City which becomes ‘the silent witness’ the establishment of Yogyakarta City. It shows the great history have occurred in the past that carry the Yogyakarta City is known as the City of Culture. The number of relics of the building as a valuable asset brings impact to the Yogyakarta City until now. Where the relics of these buildings, especially the four objects in this research as well as the main elements of the city that is easily recognized/memorized for the local communities and tourists. Another reason for the primacy of the four objects chosen because it is located in the heart of the city in Yogyakarta which becomes ‘the breath of people’s lives’

This research uses mix-methods. Qualitative methods by conducted the survey and collected the literature descriptively. The field survey included observation and interviews with resource persons (stakeholders) and distributed questionnaires of 327 respondents. Questionnaires were distributed to involves local communities perceptions of 260 respondents (170 were natives and 90 were newcomers, (with a ratio of 65:35) and tourists were 67 respondents (62 were domestic tourists and 5 were foreign tourists) in Yogyakarta City. Comparison of the number of respondents between natives and newcomers is obtained from the information of Yogyakarta Government (Central Bureau of Statistics) which is then calculated from the magnitude of the population in Yogyakarta City, especially the sub-districts passed by the philosophy axis.

Questionnaires are data collection techniques to capture public perceptions towards questions related to the research by giving writ-ten questions to a select number of people and can be used as samples to represent the com-munities in the research area. In this research the distribution of questionnaires using strati-fied random sampling. Assessment of the perception of local communities and tourists conducted in this research with qualitative methods, which then analyzed descriptively by SPSS version 17. The level of significance/level of trust used in this research is 95% (0.05), which is generally conducted in social research. Therefore the data comes from the same variance (homogeneous), then it is done by using non-parametric test with a different test “Mann-Whitney U”, which is included in quantitative methods.

**Result and Discussion**

**The Study Area**

Four objects located on the philosophy axis in Yogyakarta City were chosen as the setting for the study. The objects research is Tugu, Malioboro, Zero Kilometer, and South Square (Figure 1). This research is in the first ring with delineation of natural elements that’s the river and man-made elements that’s the building. Delineation of in the east is Code River, in the west is Winongo River, in the north is Tugu, and in the south is Plengkung Gading (Figure 2).

**Fig. 1. Research Area on the Philosophy Axis.**

Source: Department for Land and Spatial Planning, 2015, modified by Author 2017.
The Tugu was built by Sri Sultan Hamengku Buwana I shortly after Sultan occupied the Kraton (palace) in 1756. On June 10, 1867, earthquake happened to demolish the building of Tugu. The Tugu was rebuilt that was planned by Opzichte van Waterstaat JWS van Brussel. Under construction supervision by Patih Danurejo and inaugurated by Sri Sultan Hamengku Buwana VII accompanied by Resident Yogyakarta J. Mullenmeister on October 3, 1889. The Tugu itself located in Jetis Sub-district, where Jetis Sub-district has Indische Architectural Style (Figure 3). Conditions in Jetis Sub-district, now is a lot of high hotels, less adopt local culture, and buildings that do not interpretation ‘elements of Jogja’.

The Malioboro etymologically has to mean is ‘be a wandering wali’. The function of Malioboro in 1755-1945 was ceremonial, politics, and economic, in 1945-1950s changed into politics, culture, and economic, and in 1950 until now there is a change of Malioboro function as economics and tourism (Septirina SN, et al., 2016). Malioboro condition was found many vegetation planted on the east side of the road, as well as the pedestrian area the east of the road is wider than on the west side of the road. In 2017, the revitalization of Malioboro has just been done, now Malioboro is equipped with furniture pedestrian, such as benches, dump on the east side of the road (Figure 4). While on the west side of the road is still the same as in previous years used for a particular lane, such as Andong, pedicab, and bicycle (Figure 4). The building style in Malioboro Area is Indische Architectural Style, Chinese Architectural Style, Javanese Architectural Style, and mixing (Figure 4).

The Zero Kilometer located nodes of Margamulya Street and Pangurakan Street. The Zero Kilometers are important buildings among others of them is the Indonesian Post Office, BNI 46, Central Bank, Vredeburg Fortress, Presidential Palace, and others (Figure 5). The architectural style of the building in Zero Kilometer-meter is the Indische/Transitional /Modern Co-lonial Architectural Style. In addition, many important events occur in Zero Kilometer which is a dispute between Indonesia, Netherlands, as well as Japan in seizing the territory.

The South Square Area was originally used as a training ground for warrior and served as a procession lane in the funeral ceremony of a Sultan’s who will be buried in Imogiri (tombs of kings and families) (Department for Culture, 2015). Today, South Square serves as a place visited by people and tourists to enjoy historical objects. The point that is still interesting is the existence of two Banyan Trees (Ficus benjamina), the attractions at night, and at the weekend there are events such as archery (in Javanese; jemparingan), bird competition, or something related to intangible cultural heritage. Not far from South Square there is Plengkung Gading, the buildings of the Kraton complex, such as Sitihinggil, Kedhaton yard, and residential buildings of the community with Javanese Building Style (Figure 6).
Yogyakarta until now recognized as a locus (place) of Javanese culture which is widely known. Cultural heritage not only about tangible heritage, but also intangible heritage. Based on observations and literature, the intangible heritage still held by the Government, the Kraton, and the community of several things can be seen in Table 1.

Table 1. Intangible Heritage.

| Characterization | Description |
|------------------|-------------|
| Photos (represent only) | The mythical story, event or festival of culture, beliefs, music, song, on performing arts, traditional culinary arts, ceremony, and fabric/cloth. |

The Respondents

Contribute to local communities perception in assessing the important elements of historical objects can provide their views on the relics of tangible cultural heritage. This is very giving of information, especially in planning the Yogyakarta City in the future as a city known for its culture. Criteria of respondents selected in this study are natives and newcomers who live around the philosophy axis that is expected to give an explanation of how aspects of the place attachment, namely the local communities to the architectural heritage that is around. Data collection using questionnaires was distributed to 170 were natives and 90 were newcomers.

In this research, local communities respondents are natives aged between 20-30 years old as much as 40.6% and aged between 31-40 years old as much as 29.4%. While new-comers, the majority of the survey respondents aged between 20-30 years old were 67.8%. Gender for both natives and newcomers respondents was dominated by men who achieved ± 52%. The last level of education is mostly senior high school, it can be said that they are currently taking Diploma/Bachelor-1. The last education from natives respondents as much as 56.5% and newcomers respondents as much as 68.9% are senior high school.

The involvement of tourist perception in this research also becomes a part in giving the assessment to the heritage building which is in the philosophy axis as the icon of Yogyakarta City. Distribution of questionnaires given to the tourist’s respondents as much as 67 people.

Criteria of respondents selected were tourists who have visited/toured in four objects. A total of 67 respondents who were interested to fill out the questionnaire, 5 respondents came from foreign tourists who came from India, Japan, Singapore, and Spain which was at that moment in Malioboro Area and Zero Kilometer Area.

The contribution of tourists in filling the questionnaire is as part of the Yogyakarta City which is a favorite tourist destination objects for tourists because of the uniqueness of cultural tourism. Based on gender, female respondents were 64.2% and men respondents were 35.8%. Most of the travelers are aged between 20-30 years old were 62.7% with their last education is Bachelor 1, where the purpose of their visit/tour is the release of the busy work and studying program of postgraduate. That matter seen from the questionnaire from their have employment as a private employee of 34.3% and as a college student of 26.9%. More than 50%, tourists who travel to the Yogyakarta City is not the first but has 5 to 10 times (especially domestic tourist).

Overall the criteria of all respondents above 17 years old and knew about the four objects of research. In this paper, the natives and newcomers were tested to prove there is a difference or not, while tourists to know they’re the notion, and compare the results of the three categories of respondents. The results of this research are divided by three substances regarding historical objects, mental map elements of the city and the spirit of place can be seen in table 2.

Historical Objects

Historical objects are an important part of history, architecture, culture, and also tourism as a priceless relic because it can still be seen and felt to this day. The survey results through of the distribution of questionnaires are found that Malioboro Area received a very high rating by tourists than the Tugu Area, Zero Kilometer Area, and South Square Area. With mean value on historical objects of 4.24 which means tourists strongly agree that Malioboro Area is a historical object that has a very high historical value or 4.21. It is seen that Malioboro Area has a pedestrian in every right-left of Malioboro Street there is building style which is important in the historical event, and the existing culture can still be seen from the event, the attractions organized by the Government and the community. This is the main attraction for tourists, especially in terms of cultural tourism visible from the respondent’s rate tourists at 4.45, which means very high.

Relates to the historical objects leaving important elements that are able to bring memories of person to remember of the city identity ever visited. Malioboro Area and Tugu Area are a strong image of the city for tourists. This looks very high against Malioboro Area with a value of 4.36 and Tugu with a value of 4.24. Of course, this is supported by good protection and management along Malioboro Street which still stands the heritage of the building with a fairly well-maintained of originality/authenticity where tourists rate of 4.12/agree...
and 4.09/agree with it. While Tugu is a landmark of the Yogyakarta City is judged by tourists have originality/authenticity with a value of 4.19/agree and have an important value in historical events be-cause Tugu is ‘the silent witness’ of the establishment of Ngayogyakarta Sultanate with a value of 4.09/agree.

The valuation of the local communities to historical objects that are near with them into doubt of the place attachment to a historical object spiritually. This is indicated began to gradually consciousness of local communities of the value of historical objects that are so precious. Based on observations, historical objects for some local communities are used solely for personal gain (financial gain). It is seen in a number of commercial areas, such as the center of souvenirs and culinary. In addition, the heritage buildings that have been assessed have style building of originality/authenticity sold to investors with the reason the cost of the land and building tax is rated high annually. This is the result of interviews with informers and local community leaders.

**Mental Map Element of the City**

The valuation of tourist respondents to mental map elements of the city have the same value between Tugu Area and Malioboro Area with 4.04/agree. Tourists assessing with a very high weight of 4.39 where Malioboro Area is a region the Yogyakarta City. The notion of tour-ists to Malioboro Area is a city element that is imageability and legibility as a center of cultural tourism with a value of 4.21 or very high. Malioboro Area is known by tourists as a center for traditional shopping, especially souvenirs along shops Malioboro Area. From that, tourists enjoy Malioboro by walking while looking at souvenirs, such as T-shirts, antique goods, as well as typical Jogia food such as Sate Kere, Pecel, Bakmi, and so on. This makes the tourist memory keep in mind of Malioboro with a strong corridor as an emphasis on the north-south axis, especially their memory of the Kraton which is on one philosophy axis with Malioboro. Tourists assessing Malioboro has a strong corridor/line of 4.12/agree. It almost very strong about Malioboro has a strong corridor/line.

The Malioboro Area gives a lot of a mil-lion meaning and impression for the tourists. This is seen from tourists assessing Malioboro has a physical design expression that reflects of identity the city a very strong meaningful culture and historical value in Yogyakarta City. This is assessed by tourist respondents a very high of 4.28 about Tugu. There are five question items with values that are not significantly different. Tugu can be said as the nodes of Yogyakarta City with a value of 4.13, the elements of the city that is imageability and legibility with the value of 4.12, as the area of Yogyakarta City with a value of 4.12, can provide guidance as a reference with a value of 4.10, and as a landmark with a value of 4.10. Thus it can be concluded that Tugu is an icon of a city as a mental map (cognitive map) that attachment the memory of tourists about Tugu and surrounding areas. Furthermore, tourists assessing 4.04 where South Square Area is a physical design expression that reflects of identity the city meaningful culture and historical value in Yogyakarta City. It can be said that tourists have the allure (temptation) of its own with the meaning of South Square, such as the existence of two Banyan Tree (Ficus benjamina), Elephant cage, and buildings that are part of the Palace Complex with the Javanese Architecture that can still be seen by tourists.

The assessment of local communities towards the mental map element of the city as a whole shows doubt on the four research ob-jects. However of the four objects are shows that Tugu Area as an option for local communities as the mental map element in Yogyakarta City compared to other objects. The newcomers assessing of 4.06 that Tugu is a physical design expression that reflects of identity the city a very strong meaningful culture and historical value in Yogyakarta City. In this case, the natives also share the value of 3.89/agree with other objects. Public perception about Tugu has an important value in historical events and figures that is Sri Sultan Hamengku Buwana I as architect/visionary. In addition, newcomers also assessing of 3.90/agree that Tugu can be said as a region the Yogyakarta City. Not much different from the natives of 3.91/agree that Tugu can be said as a region the Yogyakarta City. Based on field survey, Tugu Area has a distinctive architectural style. Especially, Jetis Sub-district has Indische Architectural Style. For example is the building of the Ex Hotel Toegoe, Kedaulatan Rakyat (newspaper) Office, and much more.

**Spirit of Place**

The 2008 ICOMOS Quebec Declaration on the Preservation of the Spirit of Place is defined as the tangible (buildings, sites, landscapes, routes, objects) and the intangible elements (memories, narratives, written documents, rituals, festivals, traditional knowledge, values, textures, colors, odors, etc.), that is to say the physical and the spiritual elements that give meaning, value, emotion, and mystery to place (ICOMOS, 2008). As a city of cultural heritage, the Yogyakarta City has a privilege located on the philosophy axis. Along the philosophy axis, there are the main elements of historical objects that have public space to be enjoyed by the communities and tourists.

Based on the results of this study, Malioboro becomes a spirit of place for natives, newcomers, and
tourists compared with other objects. For the natives, overall Malioboro got a value of 3.52 with the highest value of 3.88 which emphasizes that Malioboro is a corridor to meet, gather, and release the longing (community life). It reminds that Malioboro can provide space and facilities that meet them, such as wide space, availability of parking, etc. Also with the attractions that are served by the community such as music community in the evening. In addition, Malioboro got a value of 3.74 that Malioboro is the heart of the city, which means the inheritance of all things. This can be seen from the natives answer by choosing the street elements in Malioboro, such as lamps and benches are unique. The feature of street lamps owned in Yogyakarta City and not owned by other cities.

The newcomers assessing Malioboro on an item of the spirit of place got a value of 3.53, this average value is not much different from the assessment given by the natives. The highest value by natives stating that Malioboro is the heart of the city, which means the inheritance of all things with a value of 3.86. This means that newcomers depend on Malioboro as a place for them to enjoy the beauty of the city in preserving the culture in which their life now. The next valuation is given that Malioboro is the place to social interaction and release the longing with a value of 3.56. Based on interviews to newcomers, Malioboro is fun and pleasure place to meet or gather with friends or families with the same village background. This case is found when the newcomers who have family status and live in Yogyakarta City to see/meet relatives of one hometown.

The valuation of tourist respondents in assessing Malioboro the value of 4.12 that Malioboro has the spirit of place. In contrast to the communities, tourists are more pressing Malioboro is public space to escape themselves from the routine of daily life (fatigue) (urban well-being) the value of 4.06. 76.1% of the background of their education is Bachelor 1 with employment are private employees and postgraduate students. The purpose of their visit to Malioboro is to take a walk and see the panorama. Furthermore, travelers who assessing of 4.01 is Malioboro is the heart of the city, which means of all things. Reading in the tourist sites is cultural tourism is warm growing a new trend among tourists where the tendency to seek something unique and authentic to a culture. How precious the uniqueness, beauty, and cultural values become the tourist attraction in their visit to enjoy the Yogyakarta City, especially in Malioboro.

The perception of the local communities and tourists to Malioboro is the spirit of life for the urban citizens get a value that is close to significant. The natives assessing the value of 3.47/agree, newcomers the value of 3.40/agree, and tourists the value of 3.91/agree. Based on survey results in Malioboro Area, neither the local communities nor the tourists have yet to feel the quality of life for the welfare, especially for the local communities. Environmental conditions give effect when they want to enjoy Malioboro, lack of vegetation causes reluctance to enjoy Malioboro especially the local communities. Similarly, what is perceived by tourists, Malioboro has not been able to provide a cold (mind) environment. Allegedly, this is due to Malioboro has just completed the revitalization process, while the planting of trees in the Malioboro Street is in the process of growth. The planted trees are Gayam Tree (Inocarpus fagifer) (In Javanese; ayom) and Javanese Asem Tree (Tamarindus indica) (In Javanese, sengsem).

### Different Test of “Mann-Whitney U”

In this research different tests were used to prove the differences of perceptions of natives and newcomers. Different tests function to know the relationship or meaningful difference between two variables (natives and new-comers). Hypothesis testing in this research is determined based on the result of prasarat test that is a test of data normality and homogeneity of data. From the results of a test of data normality and homogeneity of data, will be determined what test equipment is most suitable to use. Based on the results of preliminary test analysis, it is found that the majority of data is not normally distributed, but the data comes from the same variance (homogeneous).

With the Levene statistic method, it is seen that the significance value is greater than the alpha (>0.05) can be seen in Table 3. Where the level of significance/level of trust for social research is 95% (0.05). Therefore it can be assumed that the prasarat test is not fulfilled and for further analysis done by using non-parametric test by different test “Mann-Whitney U” can be seen in Table 4. Based on results obtained different test by using “Mann-Whitney U” from the result of the difference of perception between natives and newcomers, there is no difference.

| Objects | Test of Homogeneity of Variances | Levene Statistic | df1 | df2 | Significance Value |
|---------|---------------------------------|-----------------|-----|-----|-------------------|
| Historical |                                 | 3.851           | 1   | 258 | 0.051             |
| Mental Map Element of the City |                                 | 0.760           | 1   | 258 | 0.384             |
| Spirit of place |                               | 2.273           | 1   | 258 | 0.133             |

### Conclusion

The research indicates the significance of the tangible heritage and intangible heritage attachment in shaping the heritage city. Cultural heritage is a great asset and a proud to be pre-served. The main elements of historical objects become of identity the city because of its has architectural style and historical background. Moreover, the supporting elements that sustain from the main elements should be protected and managed properly. Unfortunately, the proliferation of buildings not in the context of the environment can reduce the attractiveness. The soaring of the cost of the land and building tax is considered to be very burdensome for the owners. This needs cooperation between the Government, the owner of the building/land, and the whole society.
Based on the results of the distribution of questionnaires, both natives and newcomers in assessing the main elements of historical objects that also become mental map elements of the city above average or agree. Researchers think it “looks flat”. While the spirit of place of the four objects selected by local communities based on the availability of public space that is equipped with soft elements, street elements, and adequate facilities such as parking area. Otherwise, tourists are more appreciated with the culture of Yogyakarta City. Original/authentic cultures and good protection and management are an attraction for them. Furthermore, tourists have memories with the Yogyakarta City as a strong the image of the city, imageability, and legibility.

Malioboro as corridor/routes becomes an option for local communities and tourists. Pedestrian as public space of Malioboro has the meaning of the spirit of life and heart of the city, which means the inheritance of all things both tangle (buildings) and intangible (cultural attractions). Based on the preferences, many of them seek the atmosphere of the evening to enjoy the beauty of the city while nostalgic. The researcher suggests improving place attachment in all the main elements of historical objects to be distributed evenly and to all levels of local communities. Historical objects are crucial to being done in order to survive and increase as well as give a good impact on the local communities welfare (environmental psychology).

To get the predicate of World Heritage City by UNESCO is not easy. The local communities need to be spiritually motivated to support Yogyakarta as a Heritage City. Four objects in the research that Tugu as monuments, Malioboro as corridor/routes, Zero Kilometer Area as the groups of buildings, and South Square as sites are tangible elements as the spirit of place in Yogyakarta City. With the spirit of place in public space to gather and interact can provide awareness to continue to attend for cultural heritage. Researchers argue, through soft elements are expected to be input in the planning of public spaces in urban areas. It aims to be more in demand by local communities and tourists, such as the use of trees that have sense and meaning in the philosophy.
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### Table 4. Test Statistics with “Mann-Whitney U”.

| Test Statistics² | Historical Objects | Mental Map Element of the City | Spirit of place |
|------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| Mann-Whitney U   | 7331.500           | 6959.500                      | 7396.000        |
| Z                | -.561              | -1.209                        | -.446           |
| Asymp. Sig.      | .575               | .227                          | .656            |
(2-tailed)

*Grouping Variable

### Table 2. The Perception Score of Natives, Newcomers, and Tourists.

| Items | Tugu Area (TG) | Malioboro Area (MB) | Zero Kilometer Area (ZK) | South Square Area (SS) |
|-------|----------------|---------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|
| NT    | NC             | TR                  | NT                       | NC                     | TR                     |
| HISTORICAL OBJECTS | 3.91 | 3.94 | 4.09 | 3.82 | 3.80 | 4.21 | 3.74 | 3.67 | 3.48 | 3.86 | 3.88 | 4.04 |
| TG/MB/ZK/SS has an important value in historical events, style of building, and culture [outstanding universal value, historical value] | 3.79 | 3.84 | 4.19 | 3.72 | 3.69 | 4.09 | 3.61 | 3.34 | 3.30 | 3.82 | 3.77 | 4.10 |
| TG/MB/ZK/SS has an originality/authenticity [authenticity] | 3.70 | 3.68 | 3.93 | 3.71 | 3.78 | 4.12 | 3.56 | 3.52 | 3.37 | 3.66 | 3.47 | 3.78 |
| TG/MB/ZK/SS has good protection and management [heritage city management] | 3.86 | 3.76 | 4.24 | 3.77 | 3.67 | 4.36 | 3.64 | 3.42 | 3.34 | 3.73 | 3.60 | 3.88 |
| TG/MB/ZK/SS has a tourist [the image of the city] | 3.68 | 3.64 | 4.19 | 3.72 | 3.70 | 4.09 | 3.61 | 3.34 | 3.30 | 3.82 | 3.77 | 4.10 |
attraction

[tourist attraction]

|     | 3.83 | 3.73 | 4.00 | 3.93 | 3.69 | 4.45 | 3.71 | 3.76 | 3.51 | 3.81 | 3.82 | 4.10 |
|-----|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Mean value | 3.81 | 3.79 | 4.09 | 3.79 | 3.78 | 4.24 | 3.65 | 3.54 | 3.40 | 3.78 | 3.69 | 3.98 |

MENTAL MAP

ELEMENTS OF THE CITY

TG/MB/ZK/SS is a physical design expression that reflects of identity the city with meaningful culture and historical value in Yogyakarta

[identity in urban]

When someone is lost, you give directions

TG/MB/ZK/SS as a reference

|     | 3.71 | 3.63 | 4.10 | 3.72 | 3.54 | 4.09 | 3.68 | 3.32 | 3.16 | 3.54 | 3.20 | 3.82 |
|-----|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Map | 3.89 | 4.06 | 4.28 | 3.78 | 3.91 | 4.12 | 3.72 | 3.79 | 3.46 | 3.78 | 3.66 | 4.04 |

[navigator]

TG/MB/ZK/SS is a city element that is imageability and legibility

[imageability and legibility]

TG/MB/ZK/SS as landmark of the city

[landmark]

TG/MB/ZK/SS Area can be regarded as district of the Yogyakarta City

|     | 3.81 | 3.69 | 4.09 | 3.71 | 3.63 | 4.09 | 3.70 | 3.47 | 3.40 | 3.58 | 3.42 | 3.85 |
|-----|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| District | 3.91 | 3.90 | 4.12 | 3.84 | 3.86 | 4.39 | 3.71 | 3.60 | 3.40 | 3.67 | 3.63 | 3.91 |

[district]

TG/MB/ZK/SS can be regarded as node of the Yogyakarta City

[node]

TG/MB/ZK/SS can be regarded as edge of the Yogyakarta City

[edge]

TG/MB/ZK/SS can be regarded as path of the Yogyakarta City

[path]

|     | 3.77 | 3.64 | 3.87 | 3.70 | 3.34 | 4.12 | 3.67 | 3.38 | 3.46 | 3.49 | 3.39 | 3.70 |
|-----|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Mean value | 3.76 | 3.61 | 4.04 | 3.69 | 3.53 | 4.04 | 3.65 | 3.43 | 3.33 | 3.56 | 3.39 | 3.80 |

A SPIRIT OF PLACE

TG/MB/ZK/SS is the heart of the city, means the inheritance of all things

[heart of the city]

TG/MB/ZK/SS is meet, gather, and release the longing

[community life]

TG/MB/ZK/SS is the spirit of place for urban residents

[spirit of the place]

|     | 3.29 | 3.17 | 3.55 | 3.47 | 3.40 | 3.91 | 3.20 | 3.28 | 3.09 | 3.33 | 3.30 | 3.36 |
|-----|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
TG/MB/ZK/SS is public space to escape themselves from the daily routine (fatigue)  

[urban well-being, city neighborhoods]  
Atmosphere is something that is sought after from 

| TG/MB/ZK/SS [atmosphere] | 3.21 | 3.19 | 3.33 | 3.56 | 3.43 | 3.96 | 3.28 | 3.24 | 3.10 | 3.44 | 3.51 | 3.75 |
|--------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|

Mean value: 3.27, 3.28, 3.40, 3.52, 3.53, 3.98, 3.26, 3.38, 3.10, 3.43, 3.48, 3.59

Mean value; 1.00 – 1.80: Strongly Disagree, 1.80 – 2.60: Disagree, 2.60 – 3.40: Doubt, 3.40 – 4.20: Agree, dan 4.20 – 5.00: Strongly Agree. (reference: Umar, 2005)

Source: Author, 2017 (based on field survey from May-September)
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