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ABSTRACT

The five senses, namely, sight, taste, hear, smell and touch, contribute to form a unique relationship between tourists’ perception and their destinations. However, research on tourist sensory experience that systematically employs broad multidisciplinary approaches in Malaysia is still limited. Moreover, linking the tourist sensory experience with cultural heritage attractions would reveal appreciation values towards the attractions through senses. Therefore, this study aims at gaining insights into sensory experiences among tourists in an urban heritage destination area. A multi-method quantitative approach is adopted to identify the tourists’ sensory experiences around the Melaka Historical City Council’s (MBMB) Core Zone area. A questionnaire as a guide map is designed using items and attractions identified through content analysis of journal articles and travel materials. A total of 268 international tourists have participated in the survey. The analyses yielded seven main findings: walking and cycling influence the sensory experience, visualisation of sensory mapping presents the creation of ‘tourists space’ through sensory experiences, sensory profiling reveal the ranking of each sensory, cultural heritage provides higher appreciation values of sensory experience in comparison to sensory satisfaction, tourists have emotional attachment and joyful quality experience, there are positive relationships in the overall tourist sensory experience, and there were negative and positive impressions towards the cultural heritage attractions based on sensory experiences. This study contributes to the conceptual development of the tourist sensory experience process in the urban heritage destination, the survey mapping technique in evaluating the tourist sensory experience, and the indicators for tourist sensory experience in the Core Zone area of Melaka World Heritage Site. The findings are beneficial for the management of the sensory quality in preserving and conserving the cultural heritage, specifically in the Core Zone area of Melaka World Heritage Site.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses an overview of this study regarding the tourists’ sensory experience in an urban heritage destination. This chapter begins with a research background and problem statement so as to highlight the importance of tourist experience in appreciating the values of cultural heritage attractions via a multitude of senses. This chapter also further elaborates on the research questions and objectives as well as the significance of the study, study approach, scope of the study, operational definitions and organisation of the thesis.

1.2 Research Background

Historically, the idea of sensory experience forming a relationship between a human and an environment was highlighted by Tuan (1974, 1975). This idea has paved the way for further discussions among anthropologists (Tuan, 1974, 1978; Relph, 1976, 1987; Zube et al., 1975, 1982; Rodaway, 1994), psychologist (O'Shaughnessy 2004; Johnson and Freeman, 2010), marketers (Hirschman and Holbrook 1982; Schmitt, 1999; Krishna, 2012; Hultén, 2011, 2012; Dani and Pabalkar, 2013; Krishna and Schwarz, 2014; Krishna et al., 2016), and also sociologists (Powell, 2010; Klejnack et al., 2013; Mehta, 2013). In general, sensory experiences are mainly discussed within the place-making concept. However, the current research has utilised this place-making concept into a more specific concept of giving meaning to sense (Rodaway, 1994; Powell, 2010). This sense-making
concept that has been integrated into the tourism studies was originally adopted from Urry’s idea of ‘Tourist Gaze’ in 1990 (Pan and Ryan, 2009).

In tourism, the sensory experience is important in enhancing a holistic tourist experience as well as in forming relationships between tourists and destinations. Nonetheless, tourist experience could have by all means, brought in some positive or even negative impressions of quality experience (Nawjin 2011; Lee et al., 2011; Matteucci, 2016) based on the tourists’ sensory experience. As mentioned before, the turning point for tourist experience was inaugurated by Urry’s (1990) “Tourist Gaze” in which it was emphasised that through the gazing of the landscape and townscape of a destination, the fundamental element of tourist experience could be acquired. However, Urry’s tourist experience idea has drawn criticisms as it has been argued that the tourist will only experience corporeal exposure through all the five multisensory stimulations.

Numerous studies in this field have examined the visual (Crang, 1997; Urry, 2002; Mirzoeff, 2006; Urry and Larsen, 2011), gustatory (Hashimoto and Telfer, 2006; Kivela and Crotts, 2006; Lin et al., 2011; Everett, 2008, 2012; Berg and Sevón, 2015), auditory (Gibson and Connell, 2007, Farsani et al., 2017), and olfactory (Dann and Jacobsen, 2003; Low, 2006) sensory perception. Of all these, studies in the areas of the visual and gustatory sensory perception have dominantly contributed towards the understanding of the sensory perception role within a variety of tourism studies, yet neglected the role of tactile perception. Furthermore, in assessing the tourist sensory experience, previous studies have viewed this from two different perspectives in tourism studies, namely, tourism geography, which focuses on sensuous geographies (Dann and Jacobsen, 2003; Hashimoto and Telfer, 2006; Gibson and Connell, 2007; Everett, 2008, 2012; Larsen and Urry, 2011; Urry and Larsen, 2011), and tourism marketing, which focuses on sensory marketing (Kivela and Crotts, 2006; Pan and Ryan, 2009; Lin et al., 2011; Diţoiu and Căruntu, 2014; Berg and Sevón, 2015; Xiong et al., 2015; Agapito et al., 2012, 2013, 2014, 2017). Deemed vital to these two fields of tourism studies, the tourist sensory experience has provided a lot of information on the role of each sensory experience of visual
(sight), gustatory (taste), auditory (hear), olfactory (smell) and tactile (touch) perceptions.

These sensory perceptions provide a better understanding of the tourist sensory experience process which are the relationship of sensory satisfaction, quality experience and place attachment as a part of conceptual framework to understand the tourist sensory experience process within a destination (Hall and Page, 2006; Agapito et al., 2013). It can be seen that the recent tourism studies in respect to holistic tourism experience have looked into the importance of multisensory studies (Pan and Ryan, 2009; Larsen and Urry, 2011; Dițoiu and Căruntu, 2014; Kim and Fesenmaier, 2015, 2017; Agapito et al., 2012, 2013, 2014, 2017). However, the importance of sensory experience in the context of heritage tourism is still insignificant (Poria et al., 2004; Zhang, 2017). Apparently, urban heritage brings various influences towards fostering positive impressions of pleasurable and memorable (quality) experience (Urry, 2002; Vong and Ung, 2012; Ujang, 2014a; Moy and Phongpanichanan, 2014; Zhang, 2017). This is because sensory experience is seen as fundamental for the tourist to gain knowledge of heritage tourism especially in the context of urban heritage destinations.

Similarly, previous studies which highlighted sensory experiences in Malaysia had discovered that most of them focused on visual (Shamsuddin and Ujang, 2008; Ismail and Mohd-Ali, 2011; Mohamed et al., 2012; Shamsuddin et al., 2012; Samadi et al., 2012, Samadi and Yunus, 2012b; Jaafar et al., 2012), and gustatory (Jalis et al., 2009; Roozbeh et al., 2013; Yusoff et al., 2013; Jalis et al., 2014; Omar et al., 2015). In recent years, the multisensory experience studies was explored due to the importance of understanding the tourist experience at a destination (Zainol et al., 2013; Jusoh et al., 2013; Zainol 2014); however, the study in multisensory experience is still limited in Malaysia. Even though Malaysia offers different types of tourism destination, however the cultural heritage of Melaka has attracted 16.28 million tourists encompassing 11.22 million domestic tourists and 5.05 million international tourists in 2016 (Tourism Promotion Division, 2017). One of the reasons is due to the unique factors of cultural landscape elements in Melaka.
Melaka is the most dominant urban heritage destination alongside with George Town, Penang after being listed as the World Heritage Sites (WHS) by United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) on 8th July 2008. Melaka and George Town have been jointly listed as the WHS because of their strong characteristics of living heritage and historical city for almost 500 years along the Straits of Malacca. Hence, Melaka and George Town have owned their Outstanding Universal Values (OUV) based on four criteria through their long history from the glorious port of the Melaka Sultanate (ca. 1400), until the occupation of the Portuguese, Dutch and British (Chin and Jorge, 2005; De Witt, 2010; Melaka Historical City Council, 2011a, 2011b). As a result, Melaka offers various eclectic architectural traces from the different eras (i.e., the Melaka Sultanate, the Portuguese, the Dutch and the British) such as The Stadthuys, A’Famosa, shophouses and also the vibrant and unique characteristics of Malay, Chinese, Indian, as well as Peranakan Baba and Nyonya cultural landscapes. Thus, Melaka provides a strong influence of sensory experience for its tourists to appreciate each unique element of the cultural heritage attractions from the built heritage, local food, arts and crafts as well as the local people’s daily activities.

Based on previous literature, studies that focused on the multisensory experience in both Melaka and George Town are still limited even though there are a few studies that acknowledged the sensory experience influences on pleasurable experience (Rahman et al., 2011; Zainol et al., 2013). Precisely, an interesting study of historical sites in Melaka conducted by Zainol et al., (2013) revealed that the appreciation values of multisensory experience were based on the modes of transportation such as walking, cycling, car and boat. This has shown that the tourists moved around the historical sites with the influence of multisensory experience especially under a strong influence of visual perception (Samadi et al., 2012; Zainol et al., 2013). Therefore, the attractions from the tangible and intangible aspects of the cultural heritage in Melaka would establish a ‘tourist space’ around the attractions based on the influence of sensory experience and create the meaning of the area through sensory profiling.
The main issue that needs to be highlighted is the excessive attention given on tourism-oriented development that have resulted in degradation of the authenticity and identity of historical sites in Melaka as a living heritage and the busiest port for 500 years (Mohamed et al., 2001; Abidin et al., 2011; Said et al., 2013a; Othman et al., 2013). A lot of concerns raised against the changes of urban fabrics and also the loss of identity of Melakan cultural landscape among academics, activists of different non-governmental organisations, and especially the local people, who have experienced the utmost impacts, have been addressed. These however, have neglected the tourists’ point-of-views which perceive them as a part of this cycle because Melaka is one of the important destinations for tourism industry in Malaysia. Therefore, the present study is highly relevant in terms of providing yet another platform to observe the tourists’ appreciation values for the cultural heritage attractions in Melaka.

1.3 Problem Statement

Currently, academics have realised the importance of sensory experience in understanding the holistic tourism experience (Crouch and Desforges, 2003; Pan and Ryan, 2009; Gibson, 2010, 2012; Kim, 2014; Zainol, 2014; Xiong et al., 2015; Kim and Fesenmaier, 2015, 2017; Agapito et al., 2012, 2013, 2014, 2017). Therefore, the study on tourist sensory experience is no longer seen as a subjective topic as the new evolution in tourist sensory experience has been geared towards the eclectic methodological approach of quantitative and qualitative approaches (Agapito et al., 2014). Although the tourist sensory experience has started to receive attention in the literature of tourism studies, there are still a myriad of issues that have not been adequately discussed by Malaysian academics such as Zainol et al., (2013), Jusoh et al., (2013), Ujang and Muslim (2014), and Zainol (2014). For example, some of the issues included: factors that influence tourist sensory experience, the form of sense-making tourism based on the creation of ‘tourist space’, the sensory profile, and the process of tourist sensory experience as well as the methodological perspective of empirical-analytical technique in assessing the appreciation values based on the tourists’ perspectives. Furthermore, there is also the issue on the influence of
experience in enhancing the appreciation values towards urban heritage as well as to safeguard the sustainability of urban heritage specifically in Melaka. Hence, the knowledge on tourist sensory experiences can ensure Melaka to remain competitive in the urban heritage’s market.

The first issue that needs to be highlighted is the conceptual development of the tourist sensory experience (i.e., visual, gustatory, auditory, olfactory and tactile) in the context of urban heritage destination. The present study has discovered that there has been scarcity of previous studies addressing the role of visual, gustatory, auditory, olfactory and tactile sensory perceptions precisely in appreciating any cultural heritage attractions. Moreover, to understand the role of each of the sensory perceptions, academics have emphasised that there is a need for current studies to gain insights into the differing perspectives of different fields of study (Franklin and Crang, 2001) such as human geography, consumer behaviour or psychology, and especially the sociological perspective to understand the form of relationship between people and place in terms of ‘experience’ and also the ‘senses’ (Gibson, 2010, 2012; Cohen et al., 2013; Hill et al., 2014). The present research has attempted to fill in the gaps by reviewing the academic journals and books as well as the related non-academic books and promotional materials of printed materials (brochures, travel magazines) and also electronic materials (travel blogs, websites). Lack of research in the holistic sensory experience, particularly in the area of cultural heritage attractions, was the driving factor that led to the identification of the elements of cultural heritage attractions affected by the senses in the present study. Therefore, by identifying each of these elements, the gap in understanding the importance of tourist experience and also the role that each sensory aspect plays, can be bridged so as to further understand and appreciate these interesting cultural heritage attractions particularly within the context of Malaysia.

Likewise, the lack of previous studies examining the link between tourism geography and tourism marketing in order to gain an understanding of the form of tourism sense-making that creates the ‘tourist space’ around the attractions and also the form of sensory profile of a destination (Pan and Ryan, 2009; Gibson, 2010). Lew (2012) has highlighted that the understanding of sensuous geography would
lead to better planning in managing the tourists’ experiences and also result in better promotional and marketing strategies for the destination. Hence, the study attempts to fill the gaps by means of understanding how the tourists’ sensory experience formed a ‘tourist space’ and the construction of sensory profile for the study area based on the empirical-analytical technique to assess the sensory values.

Therefore, this study would demonstrate a utilitarian conceptual framework in understanding the tourist sensory experience process taken from Agapito et al. (2013) which is related to the concept of tourism sense-making via tourists’ perspectives. In this regard, this study has responded to the limitation of empirical research that developed the dimensions and scales in relation to the role of each sensory perceptions of visual (see), gustatory (taste), auditory (hear), olfactory (smell) and tactile (touch). To highlight, previous research has only tested on single indicator of sensory perception (Diţoiu and Căruntu, 2014; Agapito et al., 2014, 2017) or quality of tourist experience (Kim et al., 2010; Hosany and Gilbert, 2010; Hosany et al., 2015) or even place attachment (William, 1992; William and Vaske, 2003; Tsai, 2012; Campelo et al., 2014) in relation to tourism studies. However, there is still a limitation on the empirical-analytical research that supports the relationship between these three indicators of sensory satisfaction, place attachment and the quality of tourist experience, even though previous research has corroborated the relationship between these indicators through the concept of tourist experience.

The second issue of concern is the methodological approach to understand the form of tourism sense-making. Previous literature revealed that the contemporary studies in assessing tourists had been directed to the eclectic research method (Schmitt, 1999; Agapito et al., 2014). However, there was a domination of qualitative method in the tourist sensory experience studies and only few integrated the qualitative and quantitative methods. In different fields of study, the current research in assessing the place values based on the knowledge of landscape values has shifted the methodological approach by adopting the survey mapping technique (Brown, 2005, 2006; Raymond and Brown, 2006; Brown and Raymond, 2007, Brown et al., 2014; Rohrbach et al., 2015; Pietilä and Fagerholm, 2016). The relevance of using such technique is to provide more information on the tourists’
own perceptions about the attractions, in which crucial for the applied land use planning. On top of that, the cognitive mapping that was emphasised by Powell (2010) has strengthened the use of mapping method for sensory studies. Zainol et al., (2013) employed the 0 to 3 points to assess the appreciation values of urban sensory experience based on the tourists’ viewpoints for which has set a new approach to the technique of understanding the form of sensory values in appreciating the urban sensory elements. Therefore, this study sought to fill the gaps in the methodological approach by bridging these two perspectives to form the sensory values by using the survey mapping technique based on the tourists’ views. The richness of information based on the sensory values provides the knowledge of the ‘tourist space’ form and sensory profile of the areas of study. Moreover, the previous studies have highlighted that the unique factors of cultural heritage attractions (Aziz et al., 2011, Shamsuddin et al., 2012, Samadi et al., 2012, Jaafar et al., 2012, Jusoh et al., 2013, Zainol et al., 2013) are based on the cultural landscape of Melaka such as the unique architecture of religious buildings (the mosques, Chinese temples, Hindu temple and the churches), the authentic taste of the local food and the unique characteristics of the history and lifestyle of the Peranakan Baba and Nyonya community. Hence, these unique factors are the cultural heritage elements that contribute to the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) for Melaka. Thus, by integrating these unique factors into the survey mapping technique, the present study would provide a method to evaluate the tourist sensory experience which that could be implemented in the assessment of sensory quality for urban heritage destination.

The third issue is regarding the managing of tourist experience based on a proper planning and management for mass tourism industry by decreasing the tourism impacts. The overcrowding, improper tourist behaviour towards the artefacts or monuments such as littering, interacting more with other tourists rather than the locals, polluting and other things that create annoyance and disturbance (Shackley, 1998, 2001; Pedersen, 2002) would reduce the quality of tourist experience, authenticity of heritage attractions and result in tourists’ negative impressions towards the destination. In other words, tourists will not be satisfied with their sense of visual experience of sighting other people littering or vandalising the artefacts or monuments, as well as seeing other tourists disturbing their focus from the
monuments, listening to vehicle noise around the monuments, or even sniffing the
smoke from vehicles which in turn creates pollution around the area of attractions.
Therefore, this present study provides various discussion into managing tourist
experience by understanding the tourists’ experiences based on the senses. Based on
the information in the survey mapping technique, the planners, marketers and
management body of the Melaka World Heritage Site (WHS) such as the Melaka
Historic City Council (MBMB), Melaka State Government, Jabatan Warisan Negara,
and Perbadanan Muzium Melaka (PERZIM) could maximise the tourism activities in
the ‘tourist space’ based on the identification from sensory mapping and sensory
profiling. Moreover, the impacts of tourism such as improper tourist behaviour, noise
pollution and environment hygiene can be identified and the efforts can be taken to
decrease these impacts as suggested by the recommendations made based on the
findings of research. For that reason, the management should not only focus on the
visual quality of physical attributes as has been implemented in the Conservation and
Management Plan (CMP) and Special Area Plan (SAP) in 2008 and which were
revised in 2011, but also through the assessment on the sensory quality for the
Melaka World Heritage Site (WHS). Moreover, the management can utilise these
elements of cultural heritage attractions from the tourist sensory experience study as
indicators to enhance and improve the sensory quality around the Core Zone area of
Melaka WHS.

To sum up, these three main issues contributed to the justification of the
problem investigated in the present study which has viewed the importance of the
tourist sensory experience as fundamental to the tourist experience in three aspects,
namely, conceptual, methodological and the management. The knowledge of the
fundamental of the tourist experience from the tourist sensory experience study
would strengthen the understanding on the aspects of cultural heritage elements
influencing their sensory experience. Consequently, this information could be
utilised to maximise the senses-space usage and design the tourism activities or
itineraries based on the sensory experience.
1.4 Research Questions

The problem statement triggered several questions meant to elicit insights on the importance of tourist sensory experience in an urban heritage destination, especially in the context of Melaka WHS. Therefore, the present study addressed the research questions:

1. What are the unique factors of cultural heritage attractions around the Core Zone area of Melaka WHS that influence the sensory experience?
2. Is it possible to form the sensory mapping to show the creation of ‘tourist space’ around the Core Zone area of Melaka WHS?
3. What is the sensory profiling of Core Zone area of Melaka WHS based on the tourists’ sensory experience?
4. What is the overall tourist sensory experience process of the urban heritage destination?

1.5 Research Objectives

The aim of this study was to gain insights on tourist sensory experience in an urban heritage destination. Thus, four research objectives were formed based on the research questions. The research objectives of this study were:

1. To determine the unique factors of attractions that contribute to the tourist sensory experience.
2. To determine the visualisation of the ‘tourist space’ formation based on sensory mapping in order to understand the tourist sensory experience.
3. To determine the sensory profiling based on the tourists’ sensory experience.
4. To determine the overall tourist sensory experience process of the cultural heritage attractions at the urban heritage destination.
1.6 Contribution and Significance of Study

This study would be significant for developing the overall conceptual framework of tourist sensory experience process, methodological approach and also practical values in relation to understanding and managing the holistic tourist sensory experience in the context of cultural heritage tourism particularly in an urban heritage destination. Therefore, this study would contribute to academic knowledge and also in managing the tourist experience. In this regard, this study has supported the need for the current academic knowledge to study the importance of human senses to increase the intensity of tourism experience quality. By doing so, it would contribute to an in-depth understanding of the tourist’s perceptions through their senses which would provide innovative and creative planning as well as strategic promotional and marketing activities.

From the academic perspective, this study would be significant because of the limitation in previous studies that focused too much on the senses’ roles and development of variables and items of sensory perception especially for urban heritage destinations. Hence, this study would add to the body of knowledge in relation to the development of variables and items of sensory perception and to understand the overall tourist sensory experience process in the context of urban heritage destination especially in term of Malaysian perspective. Additionally, this study would significantly contribute to the methodological aspect of valuing the attractions based on the tourists’ sensory experiences.

The systematic approach in valuing the attractions based on the tourist sensory experience would provide a new paradigm that contributes to the management of tourist experience. In light of the Malaysian tourism industry, the so-called new paradigm would enhance the portrayal of Melaka image as one of the UNESCO WHS, the appreciation of Outstanding Universal Values (OUV) and the understanding of sense’s influenced cultural heritage attractions. As a result, the tourists’ evaluations of quality experience and their attachment to tourism products would be improved through their engagement and involvement in tourism activities through sensory experience. In short, this study would offer the directions in
1.7 Research Design

The research is planned to be undertaken in four stages. The following figure illustrates the four stages in this study (see Figure 1.1).

**Figure 1.1**: Flowchart for the Study
1.7.1 Stage 1 – Literature Review

This study began with an extensive literature review in relation to ‘experience’ and ‘senses’ in different fields of study such as anthropology, psychology, marketing and sociology, especially tourism studies. To review previous literature, the process had involved a variety of primary and secondary sources such as reports from related agencies, journals, and articles from travel magazines, websites, as well as other promotional materials. The aim at this stage was to be familiar with the current trend in both academic literature and tourism industry, especially in Malaysia and Melaka to be exact. It was through this stage that the development of conceptual framework based on the research aim, questions, and objectives managed to be established. Furthermore, this stage had provided a great deal of input in terms of knowledge in developing related factors to the elements of attractions that could be possibly influenced by tourists’ sensory experiences especially in the context of urban heritage destination. Review of literature on previous studies such as Samadi et al., (2012), Ja’afar et al., (2012), Zainol et al., (2013) and Jusoh et al., (2013) has identified the strong influence of the Melaka cultural heritage attractions on the tourist sensory experience. Even though Zainol’s et al., (2013) study had been conducted on the influence of the mode of transportation in appreciating the urban sensory elements in Melaka, however, the study had not concentrated on how the cultural heritage elements of physical and spiritual attributes could influence the values appreciated from the perspective of the tourist sensory experience. Therefore, the present study provided another platform for further investigation into the influence of cultural heritage elements from the perspective of the tourist sensory experience which has yet to be conducted in Melaka.

1.7.2 Stage 2 – Development of Research Method

This stage was vital towards achieving the research aim, research questions, and research objectives. In doing so, the multi-method quantitative study was used to look in-depth into the holistic visitors’ sensory experiences at the cultural heritage
attractions. The multi-method quantitative study is the use of qualitative and quantitative approaches in assessing the data needed, but both approaches are analysed in the nature of quantitative approach. The survey mapping technique based on the questionnaire is designed and distributed to the international tourist to provide vast information of tourists’ sensory experience in the Core Zone area of Melaka WHS.

Primarily, the qualitative data was used to collect and document the cultural heritage attractions which were influenced by the five senses. Then, the qualitative data were analysed and coded in terms of deductive content analysis based on quantitative approach of frequencies and percentages. This approach had employed two main data collection methods. First, the data had been collected from the content analysis of previous academic journals, articles, books and agency reports to reveal the overall tourists’ sensory experiences in Malaysia, precisely at the Melaka World Heritage Site (WHS). In addition, promotional materials such as brochures, travel magazines, travel blogs and websites, academic journals and non-academic articles or books were also used to develop more detailed items for sensory perceptions in the context of study area.

Then, the data from previous literature and promotional materials were included during the stage of designing the questionnaire and then, the questionnaire was distributed to the international tourist as a guide map. After few series of pilot testing, the variables and items were finalised and copies of the questionnaire were distributed in the Core Zone area of Melaka WHS at the selected two sampling sites. Simple random sampling technique was used because the details of the survey needed to be explained thoroughly and that required a face-to-face interaction with the respondents. Each respondent was given a flexible time frame to value each of the attractions during their visit and then, they would have to drop the questionnaire off at the receptionist during their check out from their accommodation.
1.7.3 Stage 3 – Data Collection and Data Analysis

The survey was conducted within five months and 268 survey forms were used for the data analysis. The descriptive and inferential analyses were made on the data so that interpretation of the results could be made. The qualitative data of four open-ended questions were analysed and coded based on the deductive content analysis. This was a part of construct validation through the content validity approach to validate each of the variables and items in terms of holistic tourist sensory experience in the study area.

1.7.4 Stage 4 – Conclusion

From the data analysis and validation stage of content validity, it was anticipated that interpretations of the results should be able to answer the research questions thus achieving the research aim as well as the research objectives that were formulated in the earlier stage of this study. Hence, through these interpretations, the study would be able to reveal the holistic tourist sensory experience at urban heritage destinations specifically in the Core Zone area of Melaka WHS.

1.8 Scope of Study

The study of exploring the tourists’ sensory experiences in the context of cultural heritage attractions specifically in an urban heritage destination is still a new study, especially in Malaysia. The approach of tourist sensory experience point-of-views in assessing appreciation values towards cultural heritage attractions was employed in order to show the relevance of studying something as fundamental as tourist experience. In fact, it would give impactful implications on managing the cultural heritage attractions which are constantly influenced by the tourists’ sensory experiences. Hence, the scope of the study remained focused entirely on the tourists’ perspectives in the Core Zone area of Melaka WHS to better understand their
evaluation of the cultural heritage attractions, through their five senses of seeing, tasting, hearing, smelling and touching.

1.9 Operational Definitions

In this section, the meaning and definition of each term often used in this study is explained as follow:

1) Sense-making: Sense-making refers to giving meaning to the experience (Rodaway, 1994; Woodside, 2011) within a space in the context of tourism studies. In this research, the elements of cultural heritage attractions that influence the tourist sensory experience within the Core Zone area of Melaka WHS are seen as the foundation to understand the formation of ‘tourist space’. Moreover, the survey mapping technique provides the visualisation of sensory mapping as well as the sensory profiling between the St. Paul’s Civic Area (Zone 1) and Residential and Commercial Area: Jonker Walk (Zone 2).

2) Sensory perception: The perception of human senses is referred as the interpretation of sensory responses to the external stimuli and activities that have been carried out clearly, and each response provides a satisfaction to the environment (Tuan, 1975). In this research, the sensory values provide interpretation on the sensory responses during the visitation. While the sensory satisfaction provides an interpretation of the tourist sensory experience towards the cultural heritage elements at the urban heritage destination in the context of Core Zone area of Melaka WHS.

3) Cultural Landscape: Cultural landscape refers to the place that is formed through the social, economic and environment of the human culture (Ramsay, 2015; Cramley et al., 2017). In this research, the cultural landscape around the Core Zone area of Melaka WHS has provided the unique factors of cultural heritage elements through the living traditional
culture especially in the religious activities, traditional economic activities and the lifestyle of the locals.

4) Cultural Heritage: Cultural heritage refers to the monuments or artefacts and the social factors from human activities that create the place of heritage from generation to generation such as religions, customs and folk heritage (Ahmad, 2006). In this research, the cultural heritage involved physical attributes such as colonial architecture of mosques, temples, churches and museums, and also the spiritual attributes such as the aura and sensory that formed by the cultural landscape from the religious and economic activities (Samadi and Yunus, 2012b).

5) Urban Heritage: Urban heritage refers to the historical environment within the functional environment and the physical environment that influenced by the cultural, political, physical, perceptual and economic relationships (Edwards et al., 2008). This research concentrated on the Core Zone area of Melaka WHS in which the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the living testimony has contributed to the unique factors of the cultural landscape and the colonial architectures ever since the Portuguese invasion until the British occupation.

6) Place attachment: The attachment or a bonding between an individual and a particular place or setting (William et al., 1992; Hidalgo and Hernandez, 2001; Agapito et al., 2013) reflects the user’s identity, their dependence on the setting and emotional attachment (Shamsuddin and Ujang, 2008; Kim 2014). In this research, the place attachment provides an understanding on the importance of tourist sensory experience in influencing the attachment of the tourist towards the urban heritage destination at the Core Zone area of Melaka WHS.

7) Quality experience: The outcome or result of the satisfaction is obtained through the travellers’ experiences based on their involvement in tourism activities and their interactions with the attraction (Chen and Chen, 2010; Kim et al., 2014). In this research, quality experience provides an evaluation of tourist sensory experience towards the urban heritage destination at the Core Zone area of Melaka WHS based on the Destination Emotion Scale (DES) that has been developed by Hosany et al., (2015).
1.10 Thesis Structure

This thesis is divided into six chapters. Table 1.1 shows an overview of each chapter.

**Table 1.1: Overview of the Thesis Structure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Summary of the chapter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chapter 1: Introduction</strong></td>
<td>This chapter provides an overview of the overall structure of this thesis. It explains in brief the research background and related issues which then formulated the research questions and the research objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chapter 2: Literature Review</strong></td>
<td>Starts with the multidisciplinary perspectives to discover the relations between ‘experience’ and ‘senses’ which then being adopted in tourism studies. It provides a platform for the place-making concept towards the contemporary concept of tourism sense-making for two main fields in tourism studies (tourism geography and tourism marketing). Moreover, it provides the knowledge of the role of each sensory perception in appreciating the attractions and the framework development of tourist sensory experience process at the urban heritage destination. Then, this chapter continues with the review on the historical background of Melaka which bring the knowledge of the cultural heritage attractions around the historical area of Melaka and also the issues or problems related to the changes in Melaka and their effects towards the tourism-oriented development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chapter 3: Research Methodology</strong></td>
<td>This chapter provides a critical discussion of developing and designing the research method in order to achieve the aim of the research. A detailed discussion of developing and designing the survey mapping technique.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chapter 4: Results and Discussion</strong></td>
<td>This chapter presents the results of the survey revealing the sensory mapping and profiling as well as the hierarchy of sensory experience of the study area. It also reveals the relationship between sensory perceptions, quality of experience and the place attachment of the tourist sensory experience process in relation to urban heritage destinations. Furthermore, the results reveal the positive and negative impressions via the tourist sensory experience point-of-views.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chapter 5: Conclusion</strong></td>
<td>Concludes and summarises the results by answering the research questions intended to achieve the research objectives. Furthermore, it discusses the implication and the limitation of this study and suggests future research on what can be done to provide more knowledge in evaluating the tourists’ sensory experiences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.11 Conclusion

This chapter introduces the study of tourist sensory experience in an urban heritage destination. It discusses the current issues that lie within the body of tourist experience knowledge as well as the issues on the management aspect in the selected study area. As such, the research objectives and research questions were formulated to provide the knowledge of tourist sensory experience at the cultural heritage attractions.
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