PHYSICAL ATTRIBUTES ON PLACE ATTACHMENT IN MALAYSIAN URBAN PARKS

HADI EBADI

UNIVERSITI TEKNOLOGI MALAYSIA
PHYSICAL ATTRIBUTES ON PLACE ATTACHMENT IN MALAYSIAN URBAN PARKS

HADI EBADI

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the award of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Architecture)

Faculty of Built Environment
Universiti Teknologi Malaysia

NOVEMBER 2015
Dedicated to my beloved family especially my parents, brother and sister and my supportive supervisor – Assoc.Prof. Dr. Hasanuddin bin Lamit. Thank you very much for being supportive, helpful and understanding.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

In the name of Allah the Most Beneficent the Most Merciful, first and foremost, I thank God for everything that has made this dissertation possible. I would like to show my appreciation to those who were the source of inspiration. I would like to especially express my deep gratitude to my supervisor, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Hasanuddin bin lamit who was abundantly helpful and offered invaluable assistance, unrelenting support and expertise.

And finally, my parents, my siblings and also Dr. Sayedehsan Alavi ghahferokhi that provided me with love and understanding. Their constant encouragement and emotional support kept my vigor and life line alive during the course of this research.
ABSTRACT

Well-designed and properly equipped parks including physical attributes have resulted in a significant increase in the level of place attachment and the visitation rates of urban parks and recreation areas. The relationship between individuals and places is known as place attachment. The lack of parks’ physical attributes, special characteristics as well as internal and surrounding environment of the parks are the factors prohibiting visitors’ experiences to the parks. Moreover, fast urbanization in Malaysia leads to the lack of allocated areas and physical attributes for open spaces and urban parks in the cities. Therefore, place attachment and park visitation within the urban parks in Malaysia has been decreased. In the present study, the relationship between parks environment and visitors’ requirements is examined, in order to improve their attachment and visitation to parks. To this end, it aims to scrutinize this phenomenon by investigating the influence of physical attributes on the level of place attachment and visitation rates of Malaysian urban parks. In this study, a model for the physical attributes is constructed comprising two dependent variables, i.e. place attachment and park visitation which are connected through place satisfaction. The model can contribute to a better understanding of physical attributes and its role in user attachment and visitors. To answer the research questions, a questionnaire was designed. Three parks in different states of Malaysia were selected to be evaluated according to experts rating and a pilot study. To gain initial information on the topic, several observations were carried out to identify the physical attributes of the parks as well as to observe the subjects prior to designing questionnaires. Stratified random sampling was employed to collect data from a sample of 400 visitors of various age groups visiting the park. The participants were selected randomly from those who use the park. The collected data were analysed using structural equation modelling (SEM) and smart PLS software. The results showed that, four dimensions of place attachment are existing in Malaysian urban parks and physical attributes directly affect to increase the level of place attachment and rate of visitation; also the physical attributes such as walking path, trees and jogging track as the main attributes affecting people to attending the urban parks. The findings raise the awareness of urban planners and designers’ attention to the pivotal role of the physical attributes in providing more beautifully landscaped parks for the visitors. This will contribute to the stronger place attachment and higher visitation rates of the parks in Malaysia.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

Parks and open spaces are the major elements of the built environment that affect the quality and nature of urban communities. Parks are able to satisfy the individual requirements while they are safe, attractive, and have a rich variety of amenities and features (Mohamed & Ahmed, 2012; Jacobs, 1961). Similarly, parks have an extraordinary role for the users spending time, performing activities, and seeking out a new attachment and some experiences while they interact with nature and other visitors (Kaczynski & Henderson, 2008; Negra & Manning, 1997; Snepenger et al., 2007). Participating in open space activities either a passive or active type can reduce the stress (Said et al., 2004) and promote the psychological well-being of the visitors (Hipp & Ogunseitan, 2011; Davis et al., 2009; Korpela et al., 2009; Kaplan, 1989; Hayward & Weitzer, 1984).

As it is known, the physical and social characteristics of parks have the possibility of influencing park attachment and visitation; therefore, understanding of how people use parks is a significant goal and fits in well with the environmental attitudes to health promotion (Cohen et al., 2010). Parks with the physical attributes were visited in a quantitative exploration by Mohamed Ahmed (2012) when the physical attributes are imperative for encouraging park visitation. A wide range of users may be supported while parks encompass a variety of features and amenities (Giles-Corti et al., 2005; Kaczynski & Henderson, 2008). Parks are an inseparable part
of everyday life experiences where the visitors use the physical attributes accompanied by the environment and participate in special events frequently use (Harmon, 2005).

As shown in Figure 1.1, the physical attribute is recognized by some researchers as a potential concept that can influence the place attachment and park visitation (Dredge, 2010; Mohamed & Ahmed, 2012; Ramkissoon et al., 2012; Scannell & Gifford, 2010a; Sobel, 2003; Whyte, 1988). These concepts could be connected by place satisfaction (Ramkissoon, 2013). The argument rests on the premise that park attachment and visitation are likely to happen by influencing the physical attributes in the environment.

![Diagram showing the relationship between physical attributes (PHA), place attachment (PA), park visitation (PV), and place satisfaction (PS).]

**Figure 1.1:** Physical attribute in association with place attachment and park visitation via place satisfaction.

The studies conducted by Prayag and Ryan (2012) and Yuksel et al. (2010) revealed that place attachment influence place satisfaction and simultaneously has an important role in determination of park visitation (Mohamed Ahmed, 2012).
1.1.1 Park Visitation

The physical attributes and family/companion associations are the essential purposes for the attachment to special public places like parks (Eisenhauer et al., 2000). Because of these factors, parks regularly become favourite places and hold special meanings for many people (Ferreira, 2012). The visitors depend on the environment which meet the desired experience; these can increase the attachment and visitation of open spaces (Scannell & Gifford, 2010a). There are some studies that examined the association of the physical activity and park visitation in social and cultural factors (Ries et al., 2009; Whyte, 1988). Whyte (1988) argued that the physical attributes of parks have a profound effect on visitation rates.

1.1.2 Place Attachment

Research on place attachment is developed in several fields such as environmental psychology, architecture, natural resource management, environmental education, and tourism (Kyle et al., 2005; Halpenny, 2010; Ramkissoon et al., 2012; Raymond et al., 2011; Vaske & Kobrin, 2001).

A number of studies have shown that place attachment and the physical attributes are significantly related (Devine-Wright & Howes, 2010; Gosling & Williams, 2010; Halpenny, 2010; Hernández et al., 2010; Raymond et al., 2011). Thus, the physical attributes of a park are important factors that contribute towards place attachment in such places. A study carried out by Alexander et al. (2012), revealed that the physical attributes associated with place attachment influence the individual’s sense of attachment. In addition, the results highlighted the importance of the physical attributes in reinforcing place attachment (Alexander et al., 2012).

The experts have asserted that based on the types of place attachment, the effect of each dimension on visitation rate is different (Mohamed Ahmed, 2012; Scannell & Gifford, 2010b; Stedman, 2002). Also, the difference of place attachment dimensions
and their connections with the physical attributes are investigated in various studies (Halpenny, 2010; Kyle et al., 2005; Vaske & Kobrin, 2001).

Ramkissoon (2013) stated that place attachment has four different dimensions involving place dependence, place identity, place affect, and place social bonding; however, only a few studies have taken into account place attachment as a multidimensional construct studies (Ramkissoon et al., 2013). Ayeghi and Ujang (2014) asserted that the park visitation is affected by place attachment. Accordingly, there is a need to merging all four dimensions of place attachment and their subsequent effect on park visitation in one single theoretical model.

1.1.3 Place Satisfaction

A performed action by an individual or a group that promotes or leads to the sustainable use of natural resources is called place satisfaction (Sivek & Hungerford, 1989, 1990). Whenever a place would be well-known and considerable for the users and would be able to satisfy their essential needs and the way for achieving their goals and participating in favourite activities much better than another choice, the attachment is developed (Williams et al., 1992). Researchers and scholars have made noticeable theoretical and methodological improvements in this sphere (Kyle et al., 2005).

Some findings from different literature supported the influence of place attachment on the individual satisfaction (Prayag & Ryan, 2012; Yuksel & Bilim, 2010), and scrutinized the relation between place satisfaction and attachment of national park visitors (Sivalıoğlu & Berköz, 2012). Also, other studies suggested that place satisfaction has an important role in determination of park visitation rate (Mohamed Ahmed, 2012; Ramkissoon et al., 2012; Stedman, 2002; Uzzell, Pol, & Badenas, 2002).

One conceptual issue which poses a challenge is to disregard the multifarious and multifaceted essence of place attachment. Therefore, the hypotheses for the present study were adopted from the pioneering research by Whyte (1988) and
Mohamed Ahmed (2012) who claimed that the physical attributes influence place attachment and park visitation. The physical attributes are introduced by existing research as a potentially useful idea in order to promote place attachment and park visitation. In this regard, it is notable that people’s perception of cities and also the way they use public open spaces in developed countries may be different (Ujang, 2008). Thus, the factors that can impact on place attachment in Malaysia may also be different from other countries. Hence, in this study, there was the need to determine whether the physical attributes influence place attachment to the urban parks in Malaysia.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Asia Pacific has the reputation as the most densely populated area, in particular, its significant urban regions in the world. Owing to rapid urbanization process, general society places, parks, roads, and squares get to be eyes of a city and are assumed the imperative parts for the urban occupants who cannot bear the cost of private amenities (Mutiara, 2012).

Open spaces are considered as a place for the social experiences and associations which reflects the issues and difficulties of its users (Sakip, S. R. M., Akhir, N. M., 2015). People form a sort of attachment to the places in public lands such as recreational areas that constitute an interesting sense of place (Eisenhauer, et al., 2000).

Because of fewer organized activities, 39% decrease in the park visitation and physical activities is reported (Cohen, D. A, et al., 2009). Moreover, the physical activity was associated with the availability of perceived facilities (Ries, 2009). The park visitation rate declines when there are no good physical attributes in the parks (McCormack, G. R , 2010).

Globalization and rapid urbanization in developing countries have brought about the replacement for the traditional urban components with the modern segments.
Malaysia as one example is facing with the cities growing at a remarkable rate and leading to creating a new area (Ayeghi & Ujang, 2014).

According to Eisenhauer (2000), there are two main reasons that impede the attachment to and visitation of a special place, namely lack of place attachment and physical attributes of an environment. The issues related to the parks in Malaysia are categorized into two parts as below:

1.2.1 Lack of Attachments

In Malaysia, public parks are going to be designed to interest all age groups and cultures particularly in an urban area to socialize (Sakip Siti Rasidah, 2014). As opposed to urban parks in western countries, urban parks in Malaysia have received very little attention from the scholars. The reason could be that Malaysia lacks park satisfaction, tradition, history, and do not meet the need of the users and (Ali, 2006).

Urbanization growth in Malaysia causes some physical changes in the cities which result in losing green spaces such as parks and dropping place attachment. The cities in Malaysia are missing the place identification; therefore, the relationship between the local scenery and landscape in Malaysia are diminishing and the urban areas are separating from the local culture (Ujang, 2008) which leads to the decrease of the importance of and attachment to the places (Ayeghi & Ujang, 2014).

There have been an inadequate investment in upgrading the recreational facilities. The numerous researchers accept that the lack of attachment and absence of attractive places are an essential justification for why it is hard to elevate the level of place attachment, park visitation, and physical movement (Gordon-Larsen P, 2006; Mohamed Ahmed, 2012; Romero AJ, 2005).
1.2.2 Lack of Proper Physical Attributes

The physical attributes are imperative for encouraging park visits (McCormack, 2010) and a quantitative exploration proposed that if the parks do not meet the need for appropriate attachment and physical attributes, it will result in a lack of visitation (Mohamed Ahmed, 2012). Distinguishing proof of the physical attributes and characteristics of place that add to place attachment have not been addressed enough, so the physical and practical qualities of a place impact on the level of dependency and attachment as a stage for the activities and social communication (Ujang, 2012).

Parks and public spaces in Malaysia do not seem to improve the attachment and encounters as more people patronize them (Tabassum & Sharmin, 2013). Some studies demonstrate that some parks need more visitors, while others are utilized more widely (Cohen, 2007), so the reality shows that all the parks do not meet the need of the users and they lack the attachments as well as the poor use of the physical attributes which leads to the decrease in place satisfaction and park visitation. It is clear that there is a need to improve the physical attributes in urban parks.

Malaysian parks still have not been shaped very well (Malek, 2012). Mansor, & Said (2008) stated that the green infrastructure and open spaces in Malaysian towns and cities are not well structured. This issue is reflected in the decreased park usage as well as attachment to parks. Ali and Hadi, (2006) claimed that the physical attributes of Malaysian parks seemingly do not meet the needs of the community, so this depends on the users’ goals which require an understanding of their needs for place attachment. In other words, when a place does not meet the users’ needs, they cannot develop attachments to the place.

The physical attributes and place attachment are interrelated which means that the absence of the physical attributes also leads to the lack of place attachment to a place. In summary, this can be expressed that the physical attributes of parks in Malaysia are underutilized and do not sufficiently address the users' needs;
consequently, this leads to the lack of attachment as well as satisfaction and visitation to the parks.

1.3 Research Gap

Research in this area can be found under the constructs of physical attributes, place satisfaction, and park visitation as well as four dimensions of place attachment: i. Place dependence (Kyle, *et al.*, 2005) ii. Place identity (e.g., Cuba & Hummon, 1993; Proshansky, Fabian, & Kaminoff, 1983; Schroeder, 2002) iii. Place affect (Ramkisson, 2014) iv. Place social bonding (Hammitt, Backlund, & Bixler, 2004). The place attachment construct in this study was used because it represents the most concise explanation for the type of place connection as considered here which is based on the physical attributes.

Even a variety of dimensions inside of place attachment are studied but the researchers working in place attachment issues have varied in their conceptualization. Some studies are based on a two-dimensional place attachment concept encompassing place identity and place dependency (Bricker & Kerstetter, 2000; Kyle, Absher, & Graefe, 2003; Moore & Graefe, 1994; Williams, Patterson, Roggenbuck, & Watson, 1992). Additionally, recent studies incorporated place affect and social bonding into the definition of place attachment (Kyle *et al.*, 2005; Ramkisson, 2014). So there is a lack of examining all dimensions of place attachment in one single concept.

As tabulated in Table 1.1, place attachment has been studied within a variety of contexts, including residential, work, and recreation communities. Some researchers discuss the place connection to their home communities (Pretty, Chipuer & Bramston, 2002; Tuan, 1980; Williams, McDonald, Riden & Uysal, 1995). Also, Milligan’s (1998) research concerned to relocate the coffee shop and memories led to the increased place attachment. In the context of recreation, Bricker and Kerstetter (2000) used different levels of attachment in the parks and considered two primary reasons for the attachment to public lands and special places i.e. physical attributes and people connection in Utah (Eisenhauer, Krannich, & Blahna, 2000).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Author and Context of Study</th>
<th>Parameters of study</th>
<th>Major Finding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Tuan (1980)</td>
<td>used the construct of rootedness</td>
<td>Discuss the place connection of the! Kung Bushmen, Congo Pygmies and Tasaday of Mindanao to their home communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Williams, McDonald, Riden and Uysal (1995)</td>
<td>used residential community attachment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pretty, Chipuer and Bramston (2002)</td>
<td></td>
<td>examine attitudes toward tourism development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Milligan’s (1998)</td>
<td>relocated campus coffee shop employees</td>
<td>meaningful memories led to increased place attachment to the original coffee location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation communities</td>
<td>Bricker and Kerstetter (2000)</td>
<td>measured higher on the place attachment scale</td>
<td>the American River exhibited differing levels of attachment based on their level of specialization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kaltenbom &amp; Williams, 2002</td>
<td>measured higher on the place attachment scale</td>
<td>residents of Femundsmarka National Park, Norway differed in their landscape preferences based on place attachment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walker &amp; Chapman, 2003</td>
<td>measured higher on the place attachment scale</td>
<td>express empathy toward Elk Island National Park in Alberta, Canada, than those who expressed lower place attachment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eisenhauer, Krammich &amp; Blahna, 2000</td>
<td>Physical features and family/friend connections</td>
<td>the primary reasons for attachment to special places on public lands in Utah</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in the Table 1.1, many studies were conducted in developed countries. Thus, a study on the place attachment based on the physical attributes in recreational areas and parks in developing countries such as Malaysia needs more research. Moreover, according to the stated gaps, although sufficient researches are
conducted in the scope of place attachment; however, scant research is done on the place attachment based on the physical attributes and place satisfaction in the context of urban parks.

1.4 Research Hypothesis

Families and friends either males or females visit the parks individually or in groups. The visitors would prefer to visit the well-designed parks where the physical attributes are adequate, so the visitors can probably form an attachment. Place attachment and its relationship to the physical attributes, place satisfaction, and park visitation would make the parks useful and can encourage people to visit them more frequently and satisfactorily.

Here 4 hypotheses are defined as below:

H1: Place attachment consists of four sub-dimension in Malaysian urban parks.

H2: A system of parks in a public area that make people attached to visit frequently will only be successful when the recreational physical requirements are considered in all stages of the park system.

H3: The visitation of parks can be improved through modifying of the physical attributes.

H4: the relationship between place satisfactions and place attachment will affect park visitation.

1.5 Research Questions

The following research questions were posed to achieve the aim of the study:
3. What are the physical attributes which influence place attachment in Malaysian Parks?

4. What dimensions of place attachment are operational in Malaysian parks?

5. What is the effect of place satisfaction on place attachment and visitation in Malaysian parks?

6. What factors of physical attributes influence more on park visitation?

6.1 Research Objectives

From the formulated gaps and problems which were discussed in the previous sections, the objectives of this research are stated as:

1. To investigate the influence of physical attributes on place attachment in the Malaysian parks.

2. To explore different dimensions of place attachment in Malaysian urban parks.

3. To investigate the impact of physical attributes on park visitation in Malaysian parks.

4. To examine the role of place satisfaction with place attachment and park visitation
6.2 Research Questions:

The aim of the research is to investigate the relationships of place attachment and the physical attributes of the parks to attach and visit Malaysian parks frequently. Therefore, it investigates the physical attributes, all four dimensions of place attachment, place satisfaction, and park visitation in Malaysian urban parks. This would reveal the influence of physical attributes on what and importance of place attachment dimensions in Malaysian parks which could lead increasing the park visitation rate.

6.3 Justification of Research

Trauer (2005) (p. 8) states:

“The connection between the physical characteristics of place and people’s attachment had been neglected in previous studies. Understanding how the physical attributes of a recreation area affect attachment is sorely needed by those who make planning and managerial decisions”.

The knowledge linking the physical attributes to place attachment is in its infancy and it is shrouded in mystery which park characteristics and conditions will draw more people to encourage parks visitation and the idea that parks should be improved in utilities because a population-wide handling for insufficient physical activity is relatively new (MacDonald, 2010). Thus, there is a need to explore how the parks can encourage the visitors to park visitation based on relationship between the physical attributes and place attachment.
6.4 Significance of the Study

The purpose of this study is to further the state of knowledge about the physical attributes and structure of place attachment and influence on park visitation. The study is significant in order to respond to the statement of the problem and research gap.

The relationship between the physical attributes of an urban park and place attachment results in parks’ sustainable planning and design in the contexts of Malaysia. This achievement will also affect the formation of attachments between people-place and park visitation.

The results also provide some evidence to support the general argument that place attachment can lead to the development of recreational opportunities and satisfaction that encourage more visitations.

Understanding the concept of place attachment and aspects that contribute to it can enable the government planners and designers to identify shared and challenged meanings and values assigned to a particular place.

The exploration of place attachment’s dimensionality (i.e., place identity, place dependence, place affect, and place social bonding) in this study also may facilitate to understand the role of place attachment.

6.5 Scope and Limitations of the Study

The scope of this study is organized by the following statements:

1. This research has looked at the urban parks in public spaces of urban areas in the context of sustainable development.
2. The importance physical attributes is based on the relationship between place attachment and park visitation.

3. Other finding are added in the chapters five (Ethnics, Genders) and also international visitors, different ages and education are omitted from the questionnaire.

4. In this study, after utilizing the appropriate assessment tool and conducting a pilot study, the Merdeka park (Johor Bahru), KLCC park (Kuala Lumpur), and Botanical Garden (Kuala Lumpur) were selected as study areas.

1.10.1 Limitations

Non-parks users are not examined in this research and the respondents were visitors from all age groups that visited the parks and the individuals under 18 years old were excluded, since the way of examining their ideas is beyond the scope of this research.

This study considers the visitors’ characteristics in relation to gender, age group, ethnic background, and education level.

Environmental conditions can influence the attachment to people (Griffitt, 1970) such that people in uncomfortable climates were more likely to disagree with the strangers than people in comfortable climates. It indicates that place attachment may also be affected by weather; however, climate conditions were not controlled for in this study.

6.6 Definition and Terms

*Place attachment:* “is a set of positive opinions and emotions formed by an individual about “…a physical site that has been given meaning through interaction”
(Milligan, 1998, p.2). The meaning given to the site can take different forms: place identity, place dependence, place social bonding and place-based affect’.

**Place connection:** “incorporates various parts of the person-place relationship, e.g., place identity, place dependence, and place-based affect and place social bonding (Larkissoon 2014, Harmon, 2005)”.

**Place identity:** “is conceptualized meaning the place for individual as symbolic (Kyle, Graefe, Manning & Bacon, 2003), in particular, the extent to place signifies how the individual sees himself/herself (Proshansky, et al., 1983; Williams, et al., 1992)”.

**Place dependence:** “is conceptualized as the opportunities for goal and activity needs as setting provides (Stokols & Shumaker, 1981)”.

**Place affect:** “is conceptualized as the positive or negative sensation towards a place (Rosenburg, 1960). Items were adapted from previous scales measuring affect (Vescio, et al., 2003)”.

**Place social bonding:** “is conceptualized as community aspects of place bonding; it is primarily peoples’ emotional ties to a geographic location”.

**Park Visitation:** “The purpose of people visiting the parks including: the time people spend, use the facilities, participating in programs, social interaction and else namely called park visitation. In addition, the purpose and frequently of visit to the parks is the nature of park visitation (Mohamed Ahmed, 2012)”.

**Place satisfaction:** “Is defined as the utilitarian estimation of a place to address fundamental issues ranging from services to physical characteristics (Stedman, 2002)”.
Physical Attributes: “is a set of park facilities and physical environment such as lake, chairs and other physical attributes which encompasses into two active and passive zones (Keyl et al 2005)”.

Successes design park: “A success park design is a park with plentiful activities and facilities that enable individuals to move from one place to another simply and without disturbing other users from their actions (Molnar, D. et al., 2015)”.

Successful place: “is the place that accommodate diversity of uses and user must be accessible by all, allow and motivate social interaction among different kind of users, and easily maintain stable between freedom and security (Matthew et al., 2010Kayden, 2000)”.

Service area: “The amount of resources should be spatially distributed equally even to the residents of community, secondly, and the resources being spatially distributed to meet the needs of users and finally the resources being spatially distributed to respond to market demand stated by the residents (Bedimo-Rung et al., 2005)”.

6.7 Thesis Organization

This research is composed of five chapters which is organized as shown in Figure1.2.

Chapter 1 gives a background about the problems of Malaysian parks regarding to place attachment, satisfaction, and park visitation. The aim and objectives, research questions, gap and scope of the study, the justification for the study, the significance of this study, definitions of the terms and keywords of the study, and lastly thesis organization have been discussed in the chapter.
Chapter 1  
Introduction

Introduces the issues of the research, research background, research problem, research assumption, aim, objective, research questions, research gap, scope, significance, definition of terms and organization of the study.

Chapter 2  
Background & theoretical framework

Review on definition of place attachment and its dimensions, and types of parks, characteristics of park, physical attributes that influencing place attachment, benefits of park visit, place satisfaction in parks, physical attributes that influencing park visitation and finally conceptual frame work.

Chapter 3  
Methodology

Site selection, research methodology using questionnaire, open ended questions, and all techniques used in analysis Structural Equation Modeling (SEM), Smart PLS.

Chapter 4  
Data Analysis

Using structural equation modeling (SEM) and analysis by smart PLS software with four different testing and validation testing such as: Internal Consistency, Cronbach alpha and Composite Reliability and Convergent method to gain research agenda.

Chapter 5  
Discussion and Conclusion

Presents research findings and the discussion. The findings on the categories of physical attributes factors that influence place attachment in Malaysian parks are explained. Then, the findings about the places attachment and its dimensions that effect on place satisfaction and on park visitation. Finally the physical attributes factors that influence on park visitation. Conclusion, implication of the study, limitation to the scope of the study, further study and recommendation will also be discussed in this chapter.

Figure 1.2: Thesis organization.

Chapter 2 begins with the history and definition of place attachment, attachment theory, different dimensions of place attachment, parks and open spaces, physical attributes and facilities standards and classifications; park benefits to people; place satisfaction and physical attributes factors that affect park visitation.

Chapter 3 outlines the research questions of the study, tools, and techniques used in the study to analyse and process the data as well as ensuring the reliability and validity of the tools and tests.

Chapter 4 presents the research findings. The findings on the categories of physical attribute factors that influence place attachment and park visitation in an urban parks are explained. Then, the findings about the place attachment’s dimension that is operational in Malaysian parks is reviewed.
Chapter 5 present discussion and conclusion. The discussion on the overall findings. Conclusion, limitation to the scope of the study, recommendation and contribution of study will also be discussed in this chapter.
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