

The Effect of Physical Capacities on the Place Attachment from the View of Teenagers in Tehran

Zahra Khodaei¹, Mojtaba Rafiean^{*2}, Hashem Dadashpoor³, Ali Akbar Taghvaei⁴

1. PhD Candidate of Urban Planning, Iran
2. Associate Professor, Urban Design and Planning Department, Faculty of Art and Architecture, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran
3. Assistance Professor, Urban Design and Planning Department, Faculty of Art and Architecture, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran
4. Associate Professor, Urban Design and Planning Department, Faculty of Art and Architecture, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran

Received: 30 December 2014 Accepted: 5 June 2015

Extended Abstract

Introduction

This essay embarks on a research about the effects of community capacities on certain selected districts in the city of Tehran. The urban space can be created based on different patterns of people in the various places and neighborhoods. Another option would be an urban space as seen from the perspective of those who understand different cities based on their mental capacity. In this way, the same number of people and different understanding of urban space was seen. The method of this research has been an analytical and dialectic process.

Methodology

This study has been concluded with distribution of 475 application forms, field and district observation, and oral interviews with teenagers between 12 and 16 years old, from certain districts such as Elahieh in district 1, Narmak in district 8, Hashemi in district 10 and Yaftabad in district 17. It is necessary to mention that all these districts were chosen in an analytical and systematic way. The major goal of this research has been the dialectic evaluation of the factors existing or could be created between community capacities and the place attachment for the certain sample districts. To create physical capacity, 16 questions were asked. To investigate the effects of the independent variable component (Physical capacity) on independent variable (place attachment), we used Stepwise multiple regression analysis.

Results and Discussion

Just 11.2 percent of teenagers have positive evaluation of the physical capacity of their local area. About 79.8 percent have medium evaluation and 9.1 percent have negative assessment. Average evaluation of the respondents is ranged from 0 to 100 and equal to 50.2, i.e., approximately equal to the midpoint of the range. The greatest average from the questions of the physical capacity is related to neighborhood crowding and the lowest average is related to harmful

* Corresponding Author: rafiei_m@modares.ac.ir

insects and vermin and refer to Game-net and coffee-net. In this paper, place attachment index and physical capacity of the four districts were studied separately. To that end the Parametric F test (One-way analysis of variance) and also Tukey test (significant difference) were utilized to cluster the selected neighborhoods and to answer the question that; which of the neighborhoods from the index review are either similar to each other or different from each other. In all the variables of the community capacity index (the residential properties, environment recognition, annoying use and activities, environmental features and local features) there was a significant difference between the studied neighborhoods. Tukey test results show that from the component of residential properties, Hashemi District is located in one cluster and other districts are located in other clusters. Therefore, the teenagers of three districts such as Narmak, Elahiye and Yaftabad compared with those of Hashemi District have significantly better living conditions from the point of residential properties. From the point of environment recognition, Hashemi and Yaftabad districts are in one cluster and, Narmak and Elahiye districts are in the other different clusters. Hence, the teenagers of Elahiye compared with those of Narmak have the better recognition of the environment. From the point of annoying use and activities, Hashemi and Yaftabad districts are located in one cluster and Narmak and Elahiye district in another cluster. Thus, the teenagers of Elahiye and Narmak districts in comparison with those of Hashemi and Yaftabad have the lowest annoying use and activities. From the point of environmental features, Hashemi and Yaftabad districts are located in one cluster. On the other side, Yaftabad and Narmak districts are formed in other cluster and finally the Narmak and Elahiye districts can be placed in one cluster. From the point of local features, Hashemi district along with Elahiye and Narmak districts are located in one cluster and Narmak and Yaftabad districts are formed in other cluster. In general, the results of Tukey test indicates that Hashemi district is located in one cluster, Yaftabad and Narmak districts in other cluster and from the other side, Narmak and Elahiye district can also be formed one cluster. Therefore, Hashemi district has the lowest capacity for community capacities among all other districts and at the same time the Elahiye District has the highest level of potential for community capacities. In order to evaluate the variables; the Pearson associative parameter is utilized. This factor for the correlation between physical capacity variable and attachment index is equal to 0.514. This value suggests a strong correlation between the two variables. In other words, if the physical capacity is high, the attachment of teenagers to place will be increased. Among the components of physical capacity, environment recognition factor has the highest correlation with the place attachment variable. Pearson associative parameter is 0.564 that shows the strong correlation between the two variables. Except the variable of annoying use and activities, other factors are positively correlated with the place attachment variable. Given that a significant amount of all components is less than 0.05, the correlations observed in the sample with 5% maximum error can be generalized to the target population.

Conclusion

The regressive analytic process indicates that all three components of physical capacities (environment cognition, local possibilities and environmental characteristics) with the place attachment variable has strong multiple correlation. All three components of the analysis for physical capacities are clarifying the place attachment variable. This is in association with F test, all the affiliation variables and clarification variables are decipherable and could be generalized based on the statistics.

Keywords: community capacity, physical investment, place attachment, teenagers, Tehran City.

References

1. Aligholizadeh Firouzjaye, N., 2008, The effects of tourism on economic, social and environmental dimensions: A case study of rural areas of the central region of Noushahr. Ph.D dissertation. Tehran University: Iran, (in Persian).
2. Bardiananejad, R., 2008, An investigation of application and potential of northern harbors of Iran. Journal of geographical context, 15, 56-75, (in Persian).
3. Boonyobhas A., 1996, Tourism planning concept for Ko Samui, Thailand: a sustainable environment development approach (Doctoral dissertation, Texas A&M University).
4. Delavar, A. Rezaei, A. Ahmadvand, A., 2007, A comparative study of sense of security in Tehran, Yazd and whole of the country. Journal of Security, 4, 153-186, (in Persian).
5. Ghadami, M., 2008, Modeling the Urban and Tourism Development In the Framework of Sustainability (Case Study: The City of Kelardasht), PH.D Thesis, University Of Tehran, (in Persian).
6. Ghadiri, M, Estelaji, A & Pazoki, M., 2010, Sustainable Tourism(Rural - Nomadic), University of Tehran Publication, Tehran, (in Persian).
7. Ghodrati, H., Sardarnia K.A., Moltafet H., Barashd A.M., 2010, Social networks and institutions of law and order (case study of Mashhad). Journal of Social layout, NO.4, 7-26.
8. Haidari, R., 2010, Principles of tourism planning, SAMT, Tehran, (in Persian).
9. Hajiesmaeli L., Kianpour M., 2014, Tourism Security and its challenges in Isfahan according to The View of Travel Agency Managers, Security and Social order Strategic Studies, No. 2, 45-60, (in Persian).
10. Hall, C.M., 2001, Trends in ocean and coastal tourism: the end of the last frontier? Ocean & Coastal Management, 44(9), 601-618.
11. Hezar Jaribi J., 2011, Feeling Social Security from the Viewpoint of Tourism Expansion, Geography and Environmental planning, NO. 2, 121-143, (in Persian).
12. Kamran, F., & Nazarlou, S., 2010, A survey on the economical-social effective factors of peace of mind and social security on female postgraduate students majoring in demography in Tehran city, Social Research, NO.6,43-56, (in Persian).
13. Long, P.T., Perdue, R.R., & Allen, L., 1990, Rural resident tourism perceptions and attitudes by community level of tourism. Journal of travel research, 28(3), 3-9.
14. Mansfeld, Y., & Pizam, A., 2006, Tourism, Security and Safety: From Theory to Practice, Elsevier
15. Marjavaara, R., 2008, Second home tourism. The root to displacement in Sweden.
16. Mathieson, A., & Wall, G., 1982, Tourism, economic, physical and social impacts. Longman.
17. Milman, A., & Pizam, A., 1988, Social impacts of tourism on central Florida. Annals of Tourism Research, 15(2), 191-204.
18. Nabavi, S.A., Hosainzadeh, A.H., Hosaini, S.H., 2011, Study of effecting of social and economic factors on societal security feeling, Journal Applied Sociology, No.4, 73-96, (in Persian).
19. Navidnia, M., 2003, Introduction to Social Security, Strategic Studies Quarterly, No.19, pp.57-76, (in Persian).
20. Navidnia, M., 2006, Theoretical Reflection about Social Security, With Emphasis on Diversity of Security”, Journal of Strategic Studies, NO.31, 53-79, (in Persian).
21. Papolizadi, M. H., Saqai, M., 2006, Tourism (Nature & Concept), SAMT Publication, Tehran, (in Persian).
22. Pizam, A., 1978, Tourism's impacts: The social costs to the destination community as perceived by its residents. Journal of travel research, 16(4), 8-12.
23. Rajabipour, M., 2003, An introduction of sense of security on the real security basis, Journal of military knowledge, 18, 54-78, (in Persian).

24. Ranjbaran, B., Zahedi, M.W., 2007, tourism recognition, four gardens publication, Esfahan, (in Persian).
25. Rothman, R.A., 1978, Residents and transients: community reaction to seasonal visitors. *Journal of Travel Research*, 16(3), 8-13.
26. Shahivandi, A. Raiesi vanani, R. Soltani, M., 2011, Social and Psychological Effectiveness on Foreign Tourists Attraction (Case Study of Esfahan City Foreign Tourists in 2010). *Journal of discipline and military security*, Volume 13, 137-166, (in Persian).
27. Sharpley, R., 2001, *Rural Tourism*, Translated. R. Monshizadeh, & F. Nasiri, Vol.1, Monshi Publication, Tehran, (in Persian).
28. Statistical Center of Iran, 2011, *Statistical yearbook*, Tehran, , (in Persian).
29. Tarlow, P., 2014, *Tourism Security: Strategies for Effectively Managing Travel Risk and Safety*. Elsevier.
30. UNEP., 2009, *Sustainable Coastal Doxe.*,2010, <http://www.lincoln.ac.nz/About-Lincoln-University/outreach/Geography/tourism-impacts/>.
31. Zaki, M., 2005, *An introduction of tourism sociology. The first national conference on the role of industry in Mazandaran and Tehran's development*. Resanesh publications, (in Persian).
32. Ziaei, M. & Torabian, P., 2010, *Assessment of social tourism acceptable changes in host society of Iran; Parishan wetland as a case of study*, *Geography*, NO.27, 205-225, (in Persian).

Archive of SID