Journal of Engineering Science and Technology
Special Issue on STAAUH, November (2024) 278 - 290

PERCEIVED CHARACTERISTICS IMPACTING NEIGHBOURHOOD SATISFACTION IN BANGSAR: MODERATED BY PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS

R. USHA DEVI C. RAJARATNAM[1],
HAIRUNNISA MOHAMAD IBRAHIM[2,*], MALARVILLY A/P RAMAYAH[3]

[1]School of Diploma and Professional Studies, Taylor's College, Taylor's Lakeside Campus, No. 1 Jalan Taylor's, 47500, Subang Jaya, Selangor DE, Malaysia
[2] School of Pre-University Studies, Taylor's College, Taylor's Lakeside Campus, No. 1 Jalan Taylor's, 47500, Subang Jaya, Malaysia
[3]School of Accounting and Finance, Faculty of Business and Law, Taylor's University, Taylor's Lakeside Campus, No. 1 Jalan Taylor's, 47500, Subang Jaya, Malaysia
*Corresponding Author: Hairunnisa.mohamadibrahim@taylors.edu.my

Abstract

Neighbourhood satisfaction is a crucial indicator of urban liveability from the perspective of a resident. This study aimed to investigate the neighbourhood satisfaction among Malaysian citizens who are currently residing in Bangsar. It's a quantitative study which obtained 416 respondents using online close ended questionnaire based on purposive sampling technique. The collected data was analysed using PLS-SEM statistical tool. The findings based on the first objective indicated that the perspective of Malaysian Bangsar residents, the satisfaction towards the perceived characteristics such as green space, neighbourhood attachment, safety and security as well as social cohesion are significant determinants of neighbourhood satisfaction. In contrary, satisfaction with accessibility at neighbourhood level is not a significant predictor of neighbourhood satisfaction. In terms of second objective, the findings revealed that the neighbourhood physical characteristics are strong moderators of the relationship between all the neighbourhood perceived characteristics constructs and neighbourhood satisfaction in Bangsar from the perspective of Malaysian who are currently residing in Bangsar. Therefore, it is crucial for Kuala Lumpur City Hall planners to prioritize neighbourhood attributes to foster neighbourhood satisfaction, which is vital for achieving sustainable urban liveability in Bangsar among Malaysian residents

Keywords: Bangsar, Malaysian, Neighbourhood satisfaction, Perceived characteristics, Physical characteristics.

1. Introduction

Bangsar is a well-known suburban township within Kuala Lumpur city, Malaysia. It is situated approximately 4 km from the city centre. It started off as a rubber estate and today stands proud as a vibrant suburb which boast a multicultural population with a mixed blend of development. Its pivotal to recognize and acknowledge the demographic characteristics of this suburb township as its crucial for local town planners and policymakers as well as residents to understand the challengers that lay ahead of this are in the face of aggressive development to this said area.

As a suburban area with a high population density, Bangsar has undergone tremendous urbanisation and development throughout time. According to studies, Bangsar's growing population density is a result of its strategic position, easy access to facilities, and energetic way of life [1]. Due to the area's vertical expansion and compactness, high-rise residential and commercial constructions, it has encountered many challenges.

The Kuala Lumpur Structure Plan 2040 is a framework for spatial development and planning which will translate into the development and local planning stages. The vision for Kuala Lumpur is to be a CITY FOR ALL. This vision is founded on the people's desire for Kuala Lumpur to continue to grow dynamically while adhering to the principles of fairness, sustainability, and stimulating growth. Sustainable Development Goals 11 (SDGs) are indeed part of the agenda to ensure a holistic city for Kuala Lumpur. Despite numerous initiatives by the government of Federal Territory to improve urban viability and in accordance with Sustainable Development Goal 11 of the United Nations, these problems persist. Current research on urban liveability, which focuses primarily on Greater Kuala Lumpur as a whole or city centre, neglects the nuances of specific city dwellers in sub-urban residential are such as Bangsar.

One of the major problems in Bangsar is the lack of urban green spaces and public spaces. It is evident that there is a lack of quality living spaces that support healthy lifestyle (open green public spaces, sufficient air to breathe, walkways). These communal spaces must be protected and preserved to decrease the risk and impact of climate change dangers. Moreover, the is a lack of intra-movement walkways within Bangsar. This is further exacerbated by the fragmented society which needs cohesive and collective community building. The Edge Malaysia [2] recently reported there insufficient gated-and-guarded developments within this neighbourhood, which then relates to security issues.

There have been numerous instances of robbery and snatch theft. Selamatkan Kuala Lumpur (SKL) concurs with the notion that Bangsar lacks adequate living conditions to promote a healthy lifestyle, particularly with regards to the availability of accessible green public spaces and pathways for movement. This concerned NGO also mentioned the need for institutional land and open spaces to be protected from development [2]. Such challenges pertaining Bangsar neighbourhood characteristics will affect urban liveability in terms of neighbourhood satisfaction and neighbourhood happiness.

Hence, it is crucial to study both physical and perceived characteristics of Bangsar that influence the liveability of its Malaysian residents. In addition, this study will investigate how specific physical (city form), and factors affect perceptions of urban social and environmental sustainability influences

neighbourhood satisfaction as well as neighbourhood happiness [2]. Therefore, the aim of this paper would be firstly investigated which of the perceived characteristics in Bangsar influences the neighbourhood satisfaction in Bangsar. Followed by the next aim whether the relationship between the satisfaction with perceived characteristics and neighbourhood satisfaction moderated by the physical characteristics which comprises of distance to amenities from home as well as distance to park from home.

2. Literature Review

Urban planning and community psychology researchers are progressively focussing on the correlation between accessibility and neighbourhood satisfaction. The concept of urban liveability is very closely related to urban happiness, urban quality of life and urban well-being [3]. In understanding urban quality of life neighbourhood satisfaction has played a significant role among researchers in urban settings. Satisfaction with residential neighbourhoods, a key domain of an individual's life, is positively associated with life satisfaction [4].

Neighbourhood satisfaction is the most common measure used in empirical studies that assess liveability within built environments for urban planning purposes [5]. Neighbourhood satisfaction, a complex and multidimensional concept referring to residents' overall contentment and happiness with their living environment, is impacted by several variables [6]. Previous empirical investigations showed that urban residents' objective and subjective well-being [7] determine neighbourhood satisfaction.

Employment status, education, housing ownership, length of residence, and physical neighbourhood characteristics including amenities, park area, and tree covers [4] were studied for objective well-being. Subjective well-being includes perceived neighbourhood characteristics like social participation, social interaction, safety and security [7], access to services and facilities [3], perceptions of the built/environmental fabric and walking and cycling infrastructure [8], job opportunity, cost of living, and nature and recreation.

2.1. Neighbourhoods perceived characteristics and neighbourhoods' satisfaction

The perceived characteristics such as accessibility, green space, neighbourhood attachment, safety and security as well as social cohesion plays crucial role in determining neighbourhood satisfaction. Accessibility, defined as the ease of reaching preferred places, is a pivotal component in assessing an individual's satisfaction with their area [9]. The physical architecture of the built environment, particularly the configuration of the roadway network, can affect urban appeal and functional cohesion [10].

The connection between neighbourhood pleasure and accessibility, however, might not be clear-cut as the impact of accessibility on neighbourhood satisfaction may be mitigated by the proximity to parks and green areas [11]. However, some study found that connectivity by walking as well as connectivity by transport [12] and accessibility [13] was insignificant in predicting neighbourhood contentment and therefore do not affect neighbourhood satisfaction.

On the other hand, past studies found a positive influence of green spaces in influencing neighbourhood satisfaction. Green space which focuses on quantifiable characteristics of the natural environment, like plant cover and open spaces, have been demonstrated to directly and indirectly contribute to overall neighbourhood satisfaction [14]. Research indicates that a higher rate of greenery and reduced construction density correlate with elevated levels of neighbourhood satisfaction [14]. Abass and Tucker indicated neighbourhood attributes such as street configuration, tree density, and the availability of sidewalks and other pedestrian-friendly infrastructure are significant indicators of individuals' satisfaction with their local neighbourhood [10].

Moreover, neighbourhood attributes, including street trees, sidewalks, communal open areas, and community spaces, have been recognised as significant indicators of neighbourhood satisfaction [15]. The green space physical design components enhance the attractiveness and liveability of a neighbourhood, hence improving residents' satisfaction [3]. Well-planned neighbourhoods featuring ample greenery, open areas, and communal facilities are generally more gratifying for inhabitants [6]. Brown et al., on the other hand revealed that there was no evidence that green space or congestion had any measurable effects on life satisfaction in a city [16]. Similarly, that the availability and distance of public green social spaces green space is an insignificant predictor of quality of neighbourhood in the city [4].

An individual's emotional and psychological link with their local community is called neighbourhood attachment, whereas neighbourhood satisfaction is their overall opinion of their neighbourhood as a desirable place to live [17]. Neighbourhood attachment boosts satisfaction. Research also suggests that neighbourhood affiliation strongly affects satisfaction. Neighbourhood attachment and satisfaction are crucial to urban planning and community development [18].

Significant study has examined how a neighbourhood’s physical features affect people's safety or insecurity [19]. These findings emphasize the importance of community safety in neighbourhood satisfaction, with insecure residents reporting lower levels of contentment [18]. Research shows that a neighbourhood’s architectural and physical elements, especially lighting and infrastructure, can greatly impact people's safety and overall satisfaction [5]. Community spaces and building quality also improve safety and neighbourhood happiness.

Beyond the physical environment, a neighbourhood’s social features, such as neighbourly ties and community, affect safety and happiness [20]. Social relationships with neighbours and a strong sense of community affiliation promote safety and contentment with a neighbourhood [21]. Urban pleasure was positively impacted by social relationships, as judged by official and unofficial interactions and activities among people. Mouratidis and Yiannakou [22] reported a positive link between social features and neighbourhood satisfaction in high-density urban settings.

2.2. Neighbourhood physical characteristics as moderators

Distance to park will be one of the constructs under neighbourhood physical characteristics. Previous studies have highlighted the intricate relationships between neighbourhood satisfaction, accessibility, and park distance. According to studies, locals' satisfaction with their neighbourhood can be significantly impacted by how often they use and perceive the advantages of the surrounding outdoor spaces [23]. Even though other resources are generally inaccessible, residents who live closer to

parks and green spaces may find the neighbourhood more accessible and fulfilling [24]. The proximity to parks has been recognized as a possible moderator in the correlation between green space and neighbourhood happiness [25].

Burrows indicate that the accessibility of parks may be less significant than an individual's motivation and affinity for nature, further emphasizing the role of personal involvement in engaging with green spaces. Additional research indicates that individuals within a 20-minute radius of a park in Thessaloniki were inclined to make substantial contributions to assist the project, underscoring the significance of accessibility and closeness to green spaces [7].

However, the correlation between park proximity and neighbourhood pleasure is not straightforward. It is a complex interplay of cultural, social, and sociopsychological aspects [26]. The closeness to parks is a significant factor [22]. Those living near parks or recreational areas may feel a heightened sense of safety and security as these environments promote community, facilitate social interaction, and provide access to nature and greenery. Furthermore, parks and green spaces are linked to increased physical activity, mental rejuvenation, and overall well-being, thereby enhancing neighbourhood satisfaction and fostering a stronger connection to the local community [27].

The proximity and availability of public spaces can significantly influence residents' feelings of safety and their overall assessment of the neighbourhood's quality of life [19, 20]. Access to amenities and services is vital to neighbourhood satisfaction [1]. Residents with convenient access to amenities like parks, stores, and community facilities tend to be more satisfied with their neighbourhood. The existence and quality of these amenities may significantly influence the connection between accessibility and neighbourhood happiness [27].

The relationship between green space, neighbourhood affiliation, safety, and cohesion is moderated by amenities, which determine neighbourhood satisfaction. We know that accessible urban green spaces boost neighbourhood satisfaction. Green areas' organized allocation and visual attractiveness boost urban dwellers' happiness, with those from functioning green spaces reporting higher neighbourhood satisfaction [3]. Recreational and retail facilities, which include neighbourhood amenities, attenuate this association by increasing green space value [4].

Insufficient amenities can reduce green space benefits and happiness [24]. Stronger neighbourhood attachment increases satisfaction, according to hypothesis. Quality and availability of amenities promote social integration and strengthen this relationship. Recreational benefits of accessible green spaces boost neighbourhood happiness [24]. The Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment notes that high-quality built environments, smart green space distribution, and competent management increase resident contentment [16, 17].

Neighbourhood attachment and satisfaction are interconnected concepts influenced by physical attributes, communal spaces, and social integration [1, 6, 18]. Amenities such as parks, community centres and retail facilities positively influence the relationship between neighbourhood attachment and satisfaction. Superior quality amenities enhance this positive correlation, as accessibility and quality of amenities can affect people's perceptions and overall contentment with their environment [27].

Individuals with strong neighbourhood attachment typically express greater happiness with their living environment [18]. Accessibility to amenities significantly influences residents' perceptions of their environment [3, 4]. Prioritizing high-quality public facilities alongside fostering community relationships could enhance overall resident contentment. Neighbourhood attachment fosters satisfaction through emotional ties with the physical environment; however, satisfaction is even greater when excellent amenities are available [6].

The local environment, including safety and facilities, affects neighbourhood satisfaction. Safety is crucial, but amenities moderate it [20]. Parks and shopping reduce safety issues and boost neighbourhood appeal [15]. Safety and contentment are stronger in places with better facilities [1,18]. Lack of amenities may worsen safety issues [11]. Residential pleasure is strongly influenced by neighbourhood cohesion and amenities [9, 10].

The quantity and quality of local facilities moderates the positive association between community cohesion and neighbourhood happiness [1, 18]. Parks and community centres improve socialization and pleasure [27]. Accessible and high-quality local amenities can boost neighbourhood cohesion and citizen happiness [18]. Hypothesizing that better amenities will reinforce this correlation. Conversely, poor amenities may reduce cohesion and resident participation and pleasure [27]. Residents are predicted to be happier with convenient access to amenities, highlighting their relevance in socializing and meeting everyday needs.

3. Research Methods

3.1. Sample and questionnaire

The researcher can observe a "population" of items and people. Majid et.al [1] say the population have many survey components. Study participants will be Bangsar residents. Majid et al. define sampling as selecting a statistically representative sample from the population [1]. Researchers used deliberate sampling to determine this study's sample. One non-probability sampling method is "purposeful sampling," in which the researcher selects a sample based on specified standards that match the study's goals and are likely to answer the relevant questions. Several factors will determine purposeful sample characteristics:

- Respondents are Bangsar locals.
- Citizens of Malaysia

This study used critically examined relevant literature to create the questionnaire. Rowley noted that deductive research questions are based on relevant hypotheses. This study used a closed-ended questionnaire. Two components comprise this study's question. The first portion addresses physical neighbourhood factors, which strongly predict neighbourhood-level urban liveability, and the second is demographic questions. The first section questions were adapted from Douglas et al. [24] and Mouratidis and Yiannakou [22].

3.2. Analytical methods

SPSS 22.0 (IBM, USA) is used for descriptive statistics and independent sample t-tests to compare background variables to research variables. SmartPLS 3.0 evaluates latent-observed variable relationships using PLS-SEM and a reflecting

measurement model. Analytical tool PLS-SEM finds or creates prediction models. It analyses causal relationships between latent variables better than the general linear structural relationship model, making it appropriate for exploratory research. Although covariance-based structural equation modelling (CB-SEM) uses a covariance matrix and requires bigger samples for robust estimations, PLS-SEM can be used with lower sample sizes. PLS-SEM was chosen to achieve solid results despite the study's small sample size.

This study explores the moderating effects of physical factors (e.g., distance to facilities, parks), although PLS-SEM moderation analysis needs elucidation. Interaction terms were added to the structural model and bootstrapped to examine moderation effects. To ensure accurate estimations, Chin [3] recommended a PLS sample size of at least ten times the number of measurement elements per construct.

4. Result

4.1. Demographic characteristics

The demographic breakdown of a population by proximity to facilities and parks, ethnicity, religion, age, gender, neighbourhood, education level, and working area. Most people (42.8%) reside between 500 and 1000 meters from facilities, 35.9% inside 500 meters, and 20.9% above 1000 meters. 42.2% live less than 500 meters from parks, 32.4% between 500 and 1000 meters, and 25.5% more than 1000 meters. The largest ethnic group is Indian (44.1%), followed by Chinese (31.4%), Malays (15.7%), and others (8.8%). Most of the population is 60 or older (31.4%), followed by 50-59 (22.9%), 40-45 (17.6%), 30-39 (16%), and 18-29 (12.1%). There are more women (52.6%) than men (47.4%). The most people live in Taman SA (22.5%) and Lucky Garden (20.9%), followed by Bukit Bandaraya (16.3%), Bangsar Park (13.4%), Bangsar Baru (13.4%), and Taman Bangsar Pertama (12.1%). Tertiary education is the most common (82.4%), followed by secondary (13.4%), vocational (3.3%), primary (0.3%), and no formal education (0.7%). Finally, 61.8% of workers live in Kuala Lumpur. This breakdown showing the socio-demographic and geographical distribution of the examined area's population shows a relatively educated, diversified ethnic and religious population concentrated in urban neighbourhoods.

4.2. Model assessment using PLS-SEM

In accordance with Hair, Hollingsworth, Randolph, and Chong's recommendations, Table 1 displays the PLS-SEM analysis of the measurement model [19]. Indicators above 0.70 indicate reliability, while those below 0.40 indicate convergent validity. Construct validity is demonstrated by the analysis, which reveals that AN1 and NS3 have the highest and lowest values. It is advised that the AVE and composite reliability (CR) values be greater than 0.50 and 0.70, respectively.

4.3. Discriminant validity

Table 1 the HTMT criterion were used in cross-loading measurements to ensure discriminant validity. All HTMT values remained below the 0.90 threshold, as recommended by Hair et al. [19]. This confirms that the constructs are distinct, and that the measurement model satisfies the discriminant validity requirements.

Table 1. Heterotrait-Monotrait ratio (HTMT).

	AN	GS	NA	NS	SS	SC
Accessibility						
Green Space	0.778					
Attachment	0.485	0.611				
Satisfaction	0.637	0.781	0.704			
Safety	0.445	0.494	0.284	0.505		
Social Cohesion	0.227	0.108	0.165	0.187	0.171	

4.4. Structural model analysis

Path coefficients for modelled construct relationships are generated by PLS. The bootstrap method determined the significance of these coefficients, yielding t-values for each path estimate. The model's result prediction performance was assessed using R^2 and predictive relevance [19]. Hair et al. [19] classify R-Square values of 0.67, 0.33, and 0.19 as strong, moderate, and weak. High model fitness is indicated by the endogenous latent variable Neighbourhood Satisfaction (NS) R-squared score of 59.3%. Hair et al. [19] suggested evaluating multicollinearity. The endogenous variables' variance inflation factors (VIFs) were all below 4, indicating no collinearity. Standardized root mean square residual assessed model fit. The SRMR value for this study model was 0.071, below the 0.08 criterion, indicating good fit [19].

Table 2 shows the results of hypothesis testing regarding factors influencing neighbourhood satisfaction. Out of five hypotheses, four were supported based on significant p-values (<0.05). Green Space ($\beta = 0.393$, $p = 0.000$), Neighbourhood Attachment ($\beta = 0.353$, $p = 0.000$), Safety and Security ($\beta = 0.153$, $p = 0.000$), and Social Cohesion ($\beta = 0.146$, $p = 0.000$) were positively associated with neighbourhood satisfaction. However, Accessibility ($\beta = 0.037$, $p = 0.509$) did not show a significant effect, leading to its rejection. This suggests that green spaces, attachment to the neighbourhood, safety, and social cohesion are key drivers of neighbourhood satisfaction, whereas accessibility alone does not significantly impact it in the given context.

Table 2. Direct relationship path coefficient.

Hypothesis	Path	Beta	T-statistic	P-value	Decision
H1	**Accessibility -> Satisfaction**	0.037	0.662	0.509	Not Supported
H2	**Green Space -> Satisfaction**	0.393	6.855	0.000	Supported
H3	**Attachment -> Satisfaction**	0.353	8.835	0.000	Supported
H4	**Safety and Security -> Satisfaction**	0.153	3.843	0.000	Supported
H5	**Social Cohesion -> Satisfaction**	0.146	3.658	0.000	Supported

Table 3 compares two models assessing the relationships between distance metrics and neighbourhood satisfaction (NS). Model 1 examines the distance to amenities from home, while Model 2 focuses on the distance to parks. Significant

path coefficients suggest notable positive effects on NS. Across both models, all proposed hypotheses (H1–H5) are supported (not rejected). Model 2 shows stronger effects overall, with the highest path coefficient (0.325) for "AN*P -> NS," highlighting the impact of access to parks. Both models suggest that proximity to amenities and parks positively moderates between perceived neighbourhood characteristics neighbourhood satisfaction.

Table 3. Structural model results with moderator.

Model 1 (Distance to amenities from home)			Model 2 (Distance to park from home)		
Relationships	**Path coefficient**	**Structural relationship**	**Relationships**	**Path coefficient**	**Structural relationship**
H1a: AN*A -> NS	0.134**	Not rejected	**H1b: AN*P -> NS**	0.325**	Not rejected
H2a: GS*A -> NS	0.112**	Not rejected	**H2b: GS*P -> NS**	0.111**	Not rejected
H3a: NA*A -> NS	0.014*	Not rejected	**H3b: NA*P -> NS**	0.015*	Not rejected
H4a: SS*A -> NS	0.234**	Not rejected	**H4b: SS*P -> NS**	0.218**	Not rejected
H5a: SC*A -> NS	0.041**	Not rejected	**H5b: SC*P -> NS**	0.124**	Not rejected

5. Discussion

A study of Malaysians living in Bangsar found that satisfaction with perceived characteristics like green space, neighbourhood attachment, safety and security, and social cohesion affected neighbourhood satisfaction. The key factor affecting Bangsar residents' neighbourhood pleasure is attachment. Under the neighbourhood attachment construct, Bangsar residents' neighbourhood satisfaction was influenced by factors like feeling attached, proud of the neighbourhood, at home in the neighbourhood, and missing it when they were away. Previous research has shown that neighbourhood connection and satisfaction are crucial to urban planning and community development [8, 9, 20].

Green space will be the next strong antecedent of neighbourhood satisfaction, showing that Bangsar inhabitants value nature, public green spaces, parks, and open spaces for outdoor activities, and tranquillity. The effect of contentment on green space and neighbourhood satisfaction also showed a substantial favourable impact [22, 24]. Future studies should include green space, according to the literature [14]. Bangsar residents' neighbourhood pleasure would then depend on safety and security. Bangsar inhabitants are happier with the neighbourhood because they feel safe strolling alone at night, feeling safe in the day, and not worrying about crime.

The last factor affecting Bangsar residents' neighbourhood happiness is social cohesion. Bangsar locals value working together on any proposed project to improve my neighbourhood, participating in a neighbourhood social organization, and volunteering. Different urban communities have similar results [11]. In this study, Bangsar residents' neighbourhood satisfaction was not predicted by neighbourhood accessibility. A good network of walkways, suitable pedestrian crossings, and convenient transportation by foot and bicycle were not deemed essential factors in Bangsar neighbourhood satisfaction.

Like this study, Abass and Tucker [10] found no significant correlation between walking and transport connections and neighbourhood satisfaction. Douglas et al. [24] also found that infrastructure for walking and cycling did not predict respondents' satisfaction with their neighbourhood when modelled using more broad public realm quality criteria. Thus, city planners must emphasize neighbourhood features including green space availability, attachment, safety and security, and social cohesiveness to improve Bangsar people' contentment. Strong city planner-Bangsar neighbourhoods association relationships will help create a functional, liveable neighbourhood that is more satisfying to live in. City planners' initiative to increase "rukuntetangga" in Bangsar neighbourhood associations will strengthen community relations and make Bangsar a better place to live.

Distance to amenities and parks from home have moderated the relationship between satisfaction with perceived characteristics like accessibility, green space, neighbourhood attachment, safety and security, social cohesion, and neighbourhood satisfaction in Bangsar. Bangsar residents are happier with green space, neighbourhood attachment, safety and security, social cohesion, and neighbourhood satisfaction when facilities are closer to home. Dist. to amenities from home moderated neighbourhood accessibility satisfaction. Shorter distances to amenities from home increase accessibility satisfaction and neighbourhood satisfaction for Bangsar residents. More contented neighbourhood residents have easy access to parks, stores, and community services [27].

In Bangsar, distance to park from home is also a strong moderator of satisfaction with perceived characteristics like accessibility, green space, neighbourhood attachment, safety and security, social cohesion, and neighbourhood satisfaction. The presence of a park near a Bangsar resident's home boosts contentment with all perceived attributes and the neighbourhood. Thus, when the park is convenient to Bangsar residents, it will increase mobility, green space use, sense of belonging, safety, and community engagement, which will boost neighbourhood satisfaction [27].

This study used neighbourhood physical elements as moderators, unlike the urban social sustainability (USS) model, which incorporated physical factors as determinants [27]. The study differed with Mouratidis and Yiannakou [22], which found a direct association between physical elements, perceived neighbourhood features, and urban liveability. This study added to the literature on residents' perception of amenities and neighbourhood satisfaction by including two key moderators: physical characteristics like distance to amenities and distance to park from home. Physical aspects of the neighbourhood, such as distance to amenities and parks, moderate the association between perceived neighbourhood attributes and neighbourhood satisfaction for Bangsar inhabitants. Having parks and amenities closer to house increases green space usage, safety and security, social cohesion, and neighbourhood connectedness, which increases Bangsar neighbourhood satisfaction.

6. Conclusion

In conclusion from the perspective of Malaysian citizens those who are residing in Bangsar, the satisfaction on perceived characteristics namely availability of green space, formation of neighbourhood attachment, feeling safe and secured as well as social cohesion would be necessary characteristics required in enhancing their neighbourhood satisfaction. Therefore, it is essential for the Kuala Lumpur City

Hall planners to prioritise these neighbourhood attributes in ensuring the formation of neighbourhood satisfaction which is essential for sustainable urban liveability in Bangsar among Malaysian residents. Closer relationship and meet up between the Kuala Lumpur city hall and Bangsar neighbourhood or resident associations will provide an opportunity for both parties in making Bangsar neighbourhoods residents perceived neighbourhoods.

This research findings can contribute to the Social Impact Assessment (SIA) implementation guidelines which is one of Kuala Lumpur City Hall's commitment to ensure future development are well planned, effective, and positively impact the social well-being and welfare of urban residents. Future research may utilise this framework to compare the neighbourhood satisfaction between high-density and low-density urban neighbourhoods in Malaysia to study whether there is a similarity or difference in the predictors of neighbourhood satisfaction. Furthermore, this framework can be used in other neighbourhoods with different geographically settings within Malaysia and other countries which are facing rapid urbanisation.

Acknowledgements

This project was initiated and funded by Taylor's University through Taylor's Internal Research Grant Scheme under Liveable Urban Communities – Impact Lab Grant (TIRGS-ILG) (Impact Lab Project code: TIRGS-ILG/1/2023/SDS/001).

Disclosure Statement/Ethical Statement

Taylor's University Human Ethics Committee concluded that this study poses no ethical issues of concern. This approval is valid until the project end date of December 2025.

References

1. Majid, U. (2018). Research fundamentals: Study design, population, and sample size. *Undergraduate Research In Natural And Clinical Science And Technology* (*URNCST*) Journal, 2(1), 1-7.
2. The Edge Malaysia (2011). Pros and cons of investing in a gated-and-guarded community. Retrieved September 5, 2024, from: https://www.theedgemalaysia.com/article/pros-and-cons-investing-gated-and-guarded-community
3. Chin, W.W. (1998). *The partial least squares approach to structural equation modeling.* In Marcoulides, G.A. (Ed.). *Modern methods for business research*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers, 295-336
4. Ibrahim, H.M.; Ramayah, M.; and C. Rajaratnam, R.U.D. (2024). Satisfaction with Kuala Lumpur city hall services: A study on public housing Sri Sabah via CSMS model. *Planning Malaysia: Journal of the Malaysian Institute of Planners*, 22(3), 559-574.
5. Mullenbach, L.E.; Mowen, A.J.; and Baker, B.L. (2018). Assessing the relationship between a composite score of urban park quality and health. *Preventing Chronic Disease*, 15, E136.
6. Liu, H.; Li, B.; Liu, Q.; Li, Y.; Zhao, J.; Wang, X.; Cui, C.; and Zeng, S. (2023). What do local people really need from a place? Defining local place qualities

with assessment of users' perceptions. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 20(2), 1269

7. Eilert, D.W.; and Buchheim, A. (2023). Attachment-related differences in emotion regulation in adults: A systematic review on attachment representations. *Brain Sciences*, 13(6), 884.
8. Latinopoulos, D. (2022). Evaluating the importance of urban green spaces: a spatial analysis of citizens' perceptions in Thessaloniki. *Euro-Mediterranean Journal for Environmental Integration*, 7(2), 299-308.
9. Hur, M.; Nasar, J.L.; and Chun, B. (2009). Neighbourhood satisfaction, physical and perceived naturalness and openness. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 30(1), 52-59.
10. Abass, Z.I.; and Tucker, R. (2018). Residential satisfaction in low-density Australian suburbs: The impact of social and physical context on neighbourhood contentment. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 56, 36-45.
11. Neal, Z.P., and Brutzman, B. (2023). The role of personality in neighbourhood satisfaction. *PLoS ONE*, 18(3), e0282437.
12. Bertram, C.; and Rehdanz, K. (2015). The role of urban green space for human well-being. *Ecological Economics*, 120, 139-152.
13. Chae, J. (2023). A flexible model for spatial volatility with an application to the Chicago housing market. *Spatial Economic Analysis*, 18(3), 387-409.
14. Greenfield, E.A. (2015). Healthy aging and age-friendly community initiatives. *Public Policy & Aging Report*, 25(2), 43-46.
15. Liu, R.; and Xiao, J. (2020). Factors affecting users' satisfaction with urban parks through online comments data: Evidence from Shenzhen, China. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(1), 253.
16. Cowan, M.; Dupré, K.; and Fernando, R. (2024). Exploring the relationship between urban design and social capital: A systematic quantitative literature review. *Architecture*, 4(3), 493-514.
17. Chiang, Y.-C.; and Li, D. (2018). Metric or topological proximity? The associations among proximity to parks, the frequency of residents' visits to parks, and perceived stress. *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening*, 38, 205-214
18. Permentier, M.; Bolt, G.; and van Ham, M. (2010). Determinants of neighbourhood satisfaction and perception of neighbourhood reputation. *Urban Studies*, 48(5), 977-996.
19. Hair, J.F.; Sarstedt, M.; Ringle, C.M.; and Mena, J.A. (2012). An assessment of the use of partial least squares structural equation modeling in marketing research. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 40(3), 414-433.
20. Hadavi, S.; and Kaplan, R. (2016). Neighbourhood satisfaction and use patterns in urban public outdoor spaces: Multidimensionality and two-way relationships. *Urban Forestry and Urban Greening*, 19, 110-122.
21. Ciorici, P.; and Dantzler, P. (2019). Neighbourhood satisfaction: A study of a low-income urban community. *Urban Affairs Review*, 55(6), 1702-1730.
22. Mouratidis, K.; and Yiannakou, A. (2022). What makes cities livable? Determinants of neighbourhood satisfaction and neighbourhood happiness in different contexts. *Land Use Policy*, 112, 105855.

23. Bonaiuto, M.; Aiello, A.; Perugini, M.; Bonnes, M.; and Ercolani, A.P. (1999). Multidimensional perception of residential environment quality and neighbourhood attachment in the urban environment. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 19(4), 331-352.
24. Douglas, O.; Russell, P.; and Scott, M. (2019). Positive perceptions of green and open space as predictors of neighbourhood quality of life: Implications for urban planning across the city region. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, 62(4), 626-646.
25. Lee, S. (2021). The safety of public space: urban design guidelines for neighbourhood park planning. *Journal of Urbanism: International Research on Placemaking and Urban Sustainability*, 15(2), 222-240.
26. Corcoran, R.; Ujhelyi Gomez, K.; Simpson, G.; Goodall, M.; Bennett, K.; Gabbay, M.; Wilson, T.; Obe, D.A.; Pennington, A.; Bagnall, A.-M.; and South, J. (2023). The wellbeing in place perceptions scale: Structure, validity, reliability and correlates during COVID times. *International Journal of Community Well-Being*, 6(3), 259-278.
27. Ringel, N.B.; and Finkelstein, J.C. (1991). Differentiating neighbourhood satisfaction and neighbourhood attachment among urban residents. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 12(2), 177-193.