# **Open Spaces and Human Interaction**

Dasimah Omara, Filzani Illia Ibrahimb, Nik Hanita Nik Mohamadc

<sup>a</sup>Centre of Studies for Town and Regional Planning, <sup>b</sup>Centre of Postgraduate Studies, <sup>c</sup>Centre of Studies for Landscape Architecture, Faculty of Architecture, Planning & Surveying, Universiti Teknologi Mara (UiTM)

dasimah629@salam.uitm.edu.my

### Abstract

There are various studies on how open spaces provide a positive reaction to human. Apparently, in relation to open spaces, Malaysia has received very little attention from researchers. The objective of this paper is to provide valuable insights into how human interact with outdoor urban environments. The analysis in this study will address human-human interaction and human-nature interaction in the open spaces at Taman Tasik Shah Alam in Selangor, Malaysia. The findings of this study will show the main domains of interaction towards open spaces together with the perceived benefits to the open spaces users.

Keywords: Open Spaces; Physical Health, Outdoor Urban Environment; Human Interaction

eISSN: 2398-4295 © 2017. The Authors. Published for AMER ABRA by e-International Publishing House, Ltd., UK. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/). Peer-review under responsibility of AMER (Association of Malaysian Environment-Behaviour Researchers), ABRA (Association of Behavioural Researchers on Asians) and cE-Bs (Centre for Environment-Behaviour Studies), Faculty of Architecture, Planning & Surveying, Universiti Teknologi MARA, Malaysia. http://dx.doi.org/10.21834/ajbes.v2i6.36

#### 1.0 Introduction

Open spaces can be seen as among vital social infrastructure that is required in any housing development. It plays an important role in improving environmental ecosystem (Marzukhi, Karim, & Latfi, 2012). The major function of open space is to satisfy people's recreational need (Chiesura, 2004). Arifin (2005) claimed that open spaces with its plant represents as a green open space that act as production for the oxygen, controlling the surrounding ecosystem and controlling the soil water. Moreover, open spaces also take the role as a buffer towards sounds, wind, dust and the sun. But the truth is the designer will plan the open spaces based on real or perceived notions of recreation needs. The three important devices according to Philips (1996) in measuring the successfulness of open spaces are good design, proper management and supportive people. Apart from that, open spaces are positive elements of our urban environment and landscape. Properly designed open spaces are an asset to the entire city (Philips, 1996).

According to Federal Department of Town and Country Planning of Peninsular Malaysia (2004) open space means any land whether enclosed or not which is laid out or reserved for laying out wholly or partly as a public garden, park, sports and recreation ground, pleasure ground, walk or as a public place. Chiesura (2004), defined open space as a space that is exposed to the environment or external factors by means of a nature orientated outdoor recreation and trail-related activities and can be divided into two which are public open space and private open space. Public open space is for the public enjoyment whereby the private open space is to fulfil certain group of society.

#### 2. 0 Literature Review

People's relationship with the open spaces is different based on some factors such as socio-economic, gender, type of activities and park facilities. According to Mutiara & Isami, (2012) people's involvement and interaction in the open spaces can enhance the sense of belonging to people and at the same time increase the degree of neighbourhood attachment. According to Matsuoka & Kaplan, (2008), they provide a valuable insights into how human interact with outdoor urban environments, which included open spaces itself. Thus, they come out with major themes that are directly linked to the open spaces that are the human-nature interaction and human-human interaction. As for the human needs, the variables to be measured are social interaction, citizen participation, and a sense of community as shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Theoretical Framework of Human Interaction in Open Spaces (Matsuoka & Kaplan, 2008)

Author	Nature nee	eds		Human need	Primary Data		
	Contact with nature	Aesthetic Preference	Recreation/ play	Social interaction / privacy	Citizen Partici pation	Sense of Community	Quantitative / Qualitative Data

Austin (2004)	•			•		•	Qualitative
Chiesura (2004)	•		•	•	•		Quantitative
Gobster (2001)	•	•	•		•	•	Both
Oguz (2000)	•	•	•	•			Qualitative
Ozguner and Kendle (2006)	•	•		•			Quantitative
Abu-Ghazzeh (1996)	•				•	•	Qualitative
Crow et.al (2006)	•	•	•	•			Quantitative
Dokmeci and Berkoz (2000)	•	•		•			Quantitative
Hull et.al (1994)	•					•	Qualitative
Lucy and Phillips (1997)	•					•	Qualitative
Vogt and Marans (2004)	•	•	•	•			Qualitative
Herrington &Studtman (1998)	•			•			Qualitative
Coles and Bussey (2000)	•			•	•		Both
Simson (2000)	•	•				•	Qualitative
Yuen and Hien (2005)	•	•	•	•			Qualitative

#### 2.1 Issues On Human Interaction

According to Rasidi, Jamirsah, & Said (2012), there is an increasing trend of research regarding on significance of open spaces. The growing scarcity of open space is at concern of local authorities nowadays since there are not much of quality open spaces areas left.

Malaysia is developing towards' urban and suburban landscapes, hence maintaining quality of open spaces needs a vital attention in ensuring open spaces are fully utilized, and the users are interact towards the nature or human (Rasidi et al., 2012). Issues investigated concern the human interaction for open spaces, the emotional component involved in their experienced of nature and the benefits perceived.

# 3.0 Methodology

#### 3.1 Variables Measured

This research explores human interactions in open spaces and the perceived benefits from the interactions towards the area. The unit of analysis is the various range of age group of the open spaces in Shah Alam Lake Garden, Selangor, Malaysia. The approach in dividing the variables into two major categories were for collecting data systematically and to see how daily usage pattern of open spaces was related to the interactions (Rasidi et al., 2012).

## 3.2 Methods

A total of 500 of survey questionnaires were distributed within the study area. However, only 427 reliable respondents were taken for further analysis due to the other 73 respondents left the questionnaires blank. Respondents were provided with a survey form with few subsections to determine their level of background, such as gender, income, companionship, mode of transportation to the open spaces, frequency of visits and time spend per visits. The respondents also were asked their main purposes of coming to the open spaces that are can be divided into two sub-sections that are human-nature interaction or human-human interaction.

# 3.3 Study Area

The selected study area for the study is Shah Alam Lake Garden, which serves as the urban park. It functions as one of the favorite retreat of the residents in the vicinity in the evening and during the weekends. It is a man-made lake with beautiful landscape in the middle of the city center of Shah Alam which can be divided into three sections namely the east, the west and the central. The east section is called Tasik Damai whereby the west section is called Tasik Permai. As for the middle section is called Tasik Indah. The total are for this urban park is 43 hectares with well built raised platform at certain sections of the lake for the users to enjoy the nature and water habitat surrounding the area. There are a number of facilities available includes a water theme park called Wet World Shah Alam, a floating seafood restaurant that serves Malaysian cuisine, children playgrounds, benches and kayak for rent facility. The urban park also hosts numerous events including international events such as the annual International Orchid Exhibition and the International Roat Show



Figure 1: Panoramic view of Taman Tasik Shah Alam (Section West)



Figure 2: Panoramic view of Taman Tasik Shah Alam (Section East)



Figure 3: View of Activities and Users in Taman Tasik Shah Alam

## 4.0 Results and Discussions

The data were coded into SPSS software for descriptive statistical analysis. The main focused this analysis is to understand the relationship of human-human interactions and human-nature interactions that occurred in the open spaces area. However, additional attributes such as users' gender, race, age group, and home distance to open spaces were also considered to give additional information about the relationship. Descriptive analysis in Table 2gives a cross-tabulation overview of the number of users by gender involved in activities according to specified days.

Table 2: Descriptive Findings of Personal and Visit Information of the Respondents

		Descriptive Fig	ndings	•			
Categories	Variable Measured		0	Gender	N=428		
			Male	Female	All	%	
Personal	Age Group	13-19 years old	45	26	71	16.6	
Information		20-50 years old	133	198	331	77.3	
		50-60 years old	14	8	22	5.1	

Marital status		-	60 years and				
Marital status				0	4	4	.9
Nearby   Yes   103   77   180   42.1		Marital status		139	125	264	61.7
Nearby   Yes   103   77						161	37.6
No			Divorce	0	2	2	.5
Come from   Home   116   156   272   63.6   College or school   61   51   1112   26.2   26.2   College or school   61   51   1112   26.2   26.2   College or school   61   51   1112   26.2   26.2   26.2   27   27   27   27   27   27   27		Nearby	Yes	103			
Visit Information		,	No	89	159	248	57.9
Name		Come from	Home	116	156	272	63.6
Range			College or school	61	51	112	26.2
Range			Office		15	23	5.4
Name			Others		14	21	4.9
Visit   Frequency of visits   First time   18   25   133   31.1		Range	Less than 1km	29	14	43	10
Visit Information			1km-2km			100	23.4
Visit Information			2km-5km	81	52	133	31.1
Visit Information         Frequency of visits         First time times a week         120         102         222         51.9           Day of visits         Frequency of visits         First time         18         25         43         10           Day of visits         Weekend times         121         116         21         31         7.2           Visit Information         Frequency of visits         First time         18         25         43         10           Visit Information         Frequency of visits         First time         18         25         43         10           Visit Information         Frequency of visits         First time         18         25         43         10           Visit Information         Frequency of visits         First time         18         25         43         10           Visit Information         Frequency of visits         First time         18         25         43         10           Visit Information         Frequency of visits         First time         18         25         43         10           Visit Information         Frequency of visits         Weekend         72         145         217         50.7           Visit Information <t< td=""><th></th><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>							
Race   Race   Race   Alay   173   223   396   92.5		Job					
Race   Malay   173   223   396   92.5							
Race							
Visit Information         Frequency of visits         First time         18         25         43         10           Visit Information         Frequency of visits         First time         18         25         43         10           Once a week T2 Twice a week F3 Twice a week Week Week Week Week Week Wore than three times a Week H3 Three times a Weekadays 14         14         5         19         4.4           Both F3 T5 51         108         25         10         23.4         65.7           Time of visits         Weekend 121         160         281         65.7           Weekdays 14         24         38         8.9           Both 57         51         108         25.2           Time of visits         Morning 36         16         52         12.1           Evening 148         214         362         84.6           Afternoon 2         0         2         .5           Night 5         6         11         2.6           Time spends 7.10 minutes 101         109         210         49.1           30 minutes-1hour 59         93         152         35.5           More than 1 hour 24         27         51         11.9           Public transportation Motorcycle 72 </td <th></th> <td>_</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>		_					
Visit Information         Frequency of visits         First time         18         25         43         10           Once a week Information         Frequency of visits         First time         18         25         43         10           Once a week For Twice a week For Twice a week Week Wore than three times a week Weekend         14         5         19         4.4           Day of visits         Weekend         121         160         281         65.7           Weekdays         14         24         38         8.9           Both         57         51         108         25.2           Time of visits         Morning         36         16         52         12.1           Afternoon         2         0         2         .5           Night         5         6         11         2.6           Afternoon         2         0         2         .5           Night         5         6         11         2.6           Time spends         5-10 minutes         8         7         15         3.5           More than 1 hour         24         27         51         11.9           Transportation         More than 1 hour         2		Race					
Visit Information         Frequency of visits         First time         18         25         43         10           Once a week Information         72         145         217         50.7         50.7         7         50.7 <th></th> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>							
Visit Information         Frequency of visits         First time         18         25         43         10           Once a week Information         72         145         217         50.7         50.7         50.7         50.7         7         50.7         50.7         7         50.7         7         50.7         7         50.7         7         50.7         7         50.7         7         50.7         7         4.4         8         8.9         1         1.4         24         38         8.9         9         1         1.4         1.4         1.4         24         38         8.9         1.4         1.4         24         38         8.9         1.4         1.4         1.4         1.4							
Prequency of visits	Vioit		Others	U	2	2	.5
Twice a week Three times a week More than three times  Day of visits Weekend Both Both Firm of visits Morning Evening Afternoon Firm spends Time spends Time spends Time spends Transportation Transportation Motorcycle Car Others Other		Frequency of visits	First time	18	25	43	10
Three times a week  More than three times  31 18 49 11.4  Day of visits  Weekend 121 160 281 65.7  Weekdays 14 24 38 8.9  Both 57 51 108 25.2  Time of visits  Morning 36 16 52 12.1  Evening 148 214 362 84.6  Afternoon 2 0 2 .5  Night 5 6 11 2.6  Time spends 5-10 minutes 8 7 15 3.5  10-30 minutes 101 109 210 49.1  30 minutes-1hour 59 93 152 35.5  More than 1 hour 24 27 51 11.9  Transportation On foot 54 68 122 28.5  Public transportation  Motorcycle 72 14 86 20.1  Car 61 140 201 47.0  Others 0 0 0 0 0  Companionship Alone 44 29 73 17.1  With partner or 114 124 238 55.6			Once a week				
week         More than three times         31         18         49         11.4           Day of visits         Weekend times         121         160         281         65.7           Weekdays         14         24         38         8.9           Both         57         51         108         25.2           Time of visits         Morning         36         16         52         12.1           Evening         148         214         362         84.6           Afternoon         2         0         2         .5           Night         5         6         11         2.6           Time spends         5-10 minutes         8         7         15         3.5           10-30 minutes         101         109         210         49.1           30 minutes-1hour         59         93         152         35.5           More than 1 hour         24         27         51         11.9           Transportation         0n foot         54         68         122         28.5           Public transportation         5         14         19         4.4           Companionship         Alone			Twice a week	57	43	100	23.4
More than three times				14	5	19	44
times 31 18 49 11.4  Day of visits Weekend 121 160 281 65.7  Weekdays 14 24 38 8.9  Both 57 51 108 25.2  Time of visits Morning 36 16 52 12.1  Evening 148 214 362 84.6  Afternoon 2 0 2 .5  Night 5 6 11 2.6  Time spends 5-10 minutes 8 7 15 3.5  10-30 minutes 101 109 210 49.1  30 minutes-1hour 59 93 152 35.5  More than 1 hour 24 27 51 11.9  Transportation On foot 54 68 122 28.5  Public transportation  Motorcycle 72 14 86 20.1  Car 61 140 201 47.0  Others 0 0 0 0  Companionship Alone 44 29 73 17.1  With partner or 114 124 238 55.6				• •	Ü		
Day of visits    Weekend				31	18	49	11.4
Weekdays     14     24     38     8.9       Both     57     51     108     25.2       Time of visits     Morning     36     16     52     12.1       Evening     148     214     362     84.6       Afternoon     2     0     2     .5       Night     5     6     11     2.6       Time spends     5-10 minutes     8     7     15     3.5       10-30 minutes     101     109     210     49.1       30 minutes-1hour     59     93     152     35.5       More than 1 hour     24     27     51     11.9       Transportation     On foot     54     68     122     28.5       Public transportation     5     14     19     4.4       Motorcycle transportation     72     14     86     20.1       Companionship     Alone     44     29     73     17.1       With partner or     114     124     238     55.6		D ( : ::					
Both   57   51   108   25.2     Time of visits   Morning   36   16   52   12.1     Evening   148   214   362   84.6     Afternoon   2   0   2   .5     Night   5   6   11   2.6     Time spends   5-10 minutes   8   7   15   3.5     10-30 minutes   101   109   210   49.1     30 minutes-1hour   59   93   152   35.5     More than 1 hour   24   27   51   11.9     Transportation   On foot   54   68   122   28.5     Public   transportation   5   14   19   4.4     Car   61   140   201   47.0     Others   0   0   0   0     Companionship   Alone   44   29   73   17.1     With partner or   114   124   238   55.6		Day of visits					
Time of visits			•				
Evening 148 214 362 84.6 Afternoon 2 0 2 .5 Night 5 6 11 2.6 Time spends 5-10 minutes 8 7 15 3.5 10-30 minutes 101 109 210 49.1 30 minutes-1hour 59 93 152 35.5 More than 1 hour 24 27 51 11.9 Transportation On foot 54 68 122 28.5 Public transportation Motorcycle 72 14 86 20.1 Car 61 140 201 47.0 Others 0 0 0 0 0 Companionship Alone 44 29 73 17.1 With partner or 114 124 238 55 6		Time of viole					
Afternoon 2 0 2 .5 Night 5 6 11 2.6 Time spends 5-10 minutes 8 7 15 3.5 10-30 minutes 101 109 210 49.1 30 minutes-1hour 59 93 152 35.5 More than 1 hour 24 27 51 11.9 Transportation On foot 54 68 122 28.5 Public transportation 5 14 19 4.4 Motorcycle 72 14 86 20.1 Car 61 140 201 47.0 Others 0 0 0 0 Companionship Alone 44 29 73 17.1 With partner or 114 124 238 55.6		TIME OF VISITS	•		. •		
Night   5   6   11   2.6			•				
Time spends 5-10 minutes 8 7 15 3.5 10-30 minutes 101 109 210 49.1 30 minutes-1hour 59 93 152 35.5 More than 1 hour 24 27 51 11.9 Transportation On foot 54 68 122 28.5 Public transportation Motorcycle 72 14 86 20.1 Car 61 140 201 47.0 Others 0 0 0 0 0 Companionship Alone 44 29 73 17.1 With partner or 114 124 238 55.6							
10-30 minutes 101 109 210 49.1 30 minutes-1hour 59 93 152 35.5 More than 1 hour 24 27 51 11.9 Transportation On foot 54 68 122 28.5 Public transportation		Time spends					
30 minutes-1hour 59 93 152 35.5  More than 1 hour 24 27 51 11.9  Transportation On foot 54 68 122 28.5  Public transportation 5 14 19 4.4  Motorcycle 72 14 86 20.1  Car 61 140 201 47.0  Others 0 0 0 0  Companionship Alone 44 29 73 17.1  With partner or 114 124 238 55.6		Timo oponido					
Transportation     More than 1 hour 24 27 51 11.9 On foot 54 68 122 28.5 Public transportation     54 68 122 28.5 12.0 12.0 12.0 12.0 12.0 12.0 12.0 12.0							
Transportation         On foot Public transportation         54         68         122         28.5           Motorcycle transportation         5         14         19         4.4           Motorcycle Car G1         72         14         86         20.1           Car G1         61         140         201         47.0           Others         0         0         0         0           Companionship         Alone Alone Alone Alone Alone With partner or Alone With partner or Alone A							
Public transportation 5 14 19 4.4 Motorcycle 72 14 86 20.1 Car 61 140 201 47.0 Others 0 0 0 0 0 Companionship Alone 44 29 73 17.1 With partner or 114 124 238 55.6		Transportation					
Transportation  Motorcycle 72 14 86 20.1  Car 61 140 201 47.0  Others 0 0 0 0  Companionship Alone 44 29 73 17.1  With partner or 114 124 238 55.6		· ·	Public	_	4.4	40	4.4
Car 61 140 201 47.0 Others 0 0 0 0 Companionship Alone 44 29 73 17.1 With partner or 114 124 238 55.6			transportation	5	14	19	4.4
Car 61 140 201 47.0 Others 0 0 0 0 Companionship Alone 44 29 73 17.1 With partner or 114 124 238 55.6				72	14	86	20.1
Companionship Alone 44 29 73 17.1 With partner or 114 124 238 55.6				61	140	201	47.0
With partner or 114 124 238 55.6							
' 114 174 738 55 6		Companionship		44	29	73	17.1
friends			•	114	124	238	55.6
			friends	117	147	200	55.0

## 4.1 Purpose of Using Open Spaces

In the survey, the respondents were asked about their purpose of using the open spaces. The questions are divided into two major themes that are human-nature interaction and human-human interaction. The subthemes under human-nature interactions are; contact with nature, aesthetic preference, and recreational purposes. As for the human-human interaction subthemes, it includes social interaction and privacy, citizen participation, and community events. The result can be seen in Table 3.

Table 3: Overall Percentage of Respondents' Purposes to Taman Tasik Shah Alam

	Human-Natur	e Interaction		Human-Human Interaction					
	Contact with nature	Aesthetic Preference	Recreational Purposes	Social Interaction	Citizen Participation	Community Events			
Yes	274	90	305	193	34	39			
Percentage	64.0	21.0	71.3	45.1	7.9	9.1			
No	154	338	123	235	394	389			
Percentage	36.0	79.0	28.7	54.9	92.1	90.9			
Total	428	428	428	428	428	428			
Total Percentage	100	100	100	100	100	100			

Thus, in Table 3, it can be seen that the highest percentage of respondents coming to Taman Tasik Shah Alam is for the recreational purposes (71.3%) with the total number of 305 people. It is followed by contact with nature (64%) with the total number of 274 respondents, social interaction (45.1%) with total respondents of 193, aesthetic preference (21%) with 90 respondents, community events (9.1%) with 39 respondents and lastly, citizen participation (7.9%) with the total number of respondents 34.

# 4.2 Satisfaction Level of Interactions in Relation to Open Spaces

The respondents were asked to rate their level of satisfaction with the human-nature interaction and human-human interaction. The subthemes were then divided into several topics such as the design of the open spaces, the natural and physical elements of the open spaces, the ability to pursue the interaction required, the sense of calmness and happiness in the open spaces, the appreciation of the open spaces towards the level of interactions and the overall satisfaction level of interactions that respondents experienced in the open spaces. Table 4 shows a summary of overall satisfaction level of respondents.

Table 4: Overall Satisfactory Level of Interactions by Respondents

	Human-Nature Interaction						Human-Human Interaction					
	Contact with Nature				Recreation/ Play		Social Interaction/ Privacy		Citizen Participation		Sense of Community	
Frequency (n) Percentage	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%
Not Available	7	1.6	10	2.3	4	.9	5	1.2	5	1.2	3	.7
Strongly Disagree	1	.2	5	1.2	5	1.2	5	1.2	4	.9	6	1.4
Disagree	11	2.6	5	1.2	7	1.6	10	2.3	22	5.1	41	9.6
Moderate	137	32.0	129	30.1	118	27.6	168	39.3	206	48.1	198	46.3
Agree	217	50.7	234	54.7	247	57.7	182	42.5	145	33.9	142	33.2
Strongly agree	55	12.9	45	10.5	47	11.0	58	13.6	46	10.7	38	8.9
Total	428	100	428	100	428	100	428	100	428	100	428	100
Mean	3.6846		3.6519		3.7290		3.6145		3.4486		3.3645	

Table 4 shows the overall satisfactory level of interactions by respondents can be seen as at the satisfied level. The highest satisfactory levels is for recreational and play with the total mean of 3.7290, whereby followed with contact with nature (3.6846), aesthetic preference (3.6519), social interaction and privacy (3.6145), citizen participation (3.4486) and lastly sense of community with the total mean of 3.3645.

# 4.3 Perceived Benefits of Interactions in Open Spaces

In this section, the respondents were asked to rate their level of perceived benefits and opinion toward Taman Tasik Shah Alam. The respondents are rated through their level of unity with nature, the unity with themselves, and sense of freedom, recreational satisfaction, adventure, and happiness. The respondent was also asked on the vitality of open spaces as part of the city sustainability. Table 5 shows the satisfactory level of perceived benefits by respondents.

In Table 5, the respondents were asked for their perceived benefits of open spaces to their daily activities. Majority of the respondents agreed that the open spaces can bring them happiness with the total mean of 3.7290. They also agreed that the open spaces provide them a sense of freedom with the total mean score of 3.6682. It is followed by the needs of recreational satisfaction (3.5514), unity with self (3.5304), unity with nature (3.4626) and lastly the sense of adventure (3.3154). The respondents were also asked the question on the vitality of open spaces as part of the city sustainability, and they respond with the highest score of mean 3.8341.

Table 5: Satisfactory Level of Perceived Benefits by Respondents

	Perceived Benefits and Opinion													
	Unity with Unity with Nature self		Freedom		Recreationa I Satisfaction		Adventure		Happiness		Vitality of Open Spaces			
Frequenc y (n) Percenta ge	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%
Not Available	5	1.2	6	1.4	4	.9	5	1.2	4	.9	4	.9	7	1.6
Strongly Disagree	6	1.4	2	.5	0	0	6	1.4	13	3.0	6	1.4	4	.9
Disagree	22	5.1	15	3.5	12	2.8	31	7.2	65	15.2	9	2.1	4	.9
Moderate	18 8	43.9	180	42.1	159	37.1	146	34.1	150	35.0	142	33.2	117	27.3
Agree	16 7	39.0	186	43.5	196	45.8	186	43.5	154	36.0	189	44.2	202	47.2
Strongly agree	40	9.3	39	9.1	57	13.3	54	12.6	42	9.8	78	18.2	94	22.0
Total	42 8	100	428	100	428	100	428	100	428	100	428	100	428	100
Mean	3.4626		3.4626 3.5304 3.6682		2	3.5514		3.3154		3.7290		3.8341		

### 5.0 Conclusion

In conclusion, this study has shown that the open space is vital to the city sustainability. Human interactions are important in relation to the open spaces as both elements respond well to each other. The interactions not only benefited the human but at the same time positively effects natural ecosystem as both elements correlate with each other. This study also has shown that the nature and human interactions needs elements of open spaces such as the green spaces, water elements, physical attributes to enhance the interactions between human-human and human-nature.

Hence, further recommendations are recommended for ensuring the city sustainability especially in terms of human-nature and human-human interaction. As for human-nature interactions, among the aspect such as ecological and biological diversity should be taken into consideration as forest has lost its identity due to development of new cities. For human-human interaction, a lot of aspects for further recommendation of the study can be enhanced in terms of psychological benefits and human wellness.

# Acknowledgement

The authors would like to thank all officers of Research Management Institute of Universiti Teknologi MARA particularly whom in charge for this research grant. This research is

funded by Fundamental Research Grant Scheme (FRGS) from Ministry of Higher Education, Malaysia.

## References

Chiesura, A. (2004). The role of urban parks for the sustainable city. Landscape and Urban Planning, 68(1), 129–138. doi:10.1016/j.landurbplan.2003.08.003

Department of Town and Country Planning, Selangor (2004). National Physical Plan. Ministry of Housing and Local Government Malaysia. Malaysia

Marzukhi, M. A., Karim, H. A., & Latfi, M. F. (2012). Evaluating the Shah Alam City Council Policy and Guidelines on the Hierarchy of Neighborhood Open Space. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 36(June 2011), 456–465. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.03.050

Matsuoka, R. H., & Kaplan, R. (2008). People needs in the urban landscape: Analysis of Landscape And Urban Planning contributions, 84, 7–19. doi:10.1016/j.landurbplan.2007.09.009

Mutiara, S., & Isami, K. (2012). Characteristic of Public Small Park Usage in Asia Pacific Countries: Case Study in Jakarta and Yokohama City, 35(December 2011), 412–419. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.02.106

Philips, L.E., (1996). Parks: design and management, United States of America: McGrawHill.

Rasidi, M. H., Jamirsah, N., & Said, I. (2012). Urban Green Space Design Affects Urban Residents' Social Interaction. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 68(November), 464–480. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.12.242

Shuib, K.B., (2008). Context, concept and purpose of park and protected areas, Shah Alam: Recreational Park Planning.