

DO TOURISTS REALLY INTEND TO REVISIT KOTA BHARU CULTURAL HERITAGE ZONE?

Nik Mohd Aizat Nik Mohd Adib, Syakir Amir Ab Rahman, Shunji Suzuki & Nor Nadiyah Najib

ABSTRACT

Cultural and heritage values in most countries have been recognized as resource of social and economic development. However, due to the post modernization of tourism attractions recently has affected few old and heritage sites. Sense of place is believed as one the factors to support the tourists' motivation including revisiting the place. The study aims to assess the tourists' motivation to revisit and the sense of place in Kota Bharu Cultural Heritage Zone. 445 questionnaire survey were distributed among domestic and international tourists and were analyzed using ANOVA test. The result indicates that sense of place in Kota Bharu Cultural Heritage Zone does not influence the tourists' motivation to revisit. The study recommends the state government, local authorities and tourism players to enhance and rejuvenate the ambience of the heritage zone, in order to improve the number of tourist's arrival to Kelantan hence sustaining the local economic.

Keywords: Sense of place; Heritage site; Frequency of Visit; Kelantan

INTRODUCTION

Today, tourism is one of the main contributors of one nation development in economy, social and environment. Heritage tourism is one of the tourism classifications. The countries with rich culture and physical heritage are focusing on sense of place on heritage site in ensuring the continuation of heritage tourism. Sense of place plays a major role in ensuring tourists visit the heritage site thus guaranteed the continuation of the heritage tourism in particular place. Sense of place is the factors that cause intention to revisit destination with a favorable image and specific destination attributes. The organized heritage tourism in social, economy and environment sector will lead to sustainable tourism which eventually lead to sustainable development. Since sense of place and tourist's intention to revisit heritage site is related, the research on Kelantan's heritage site associated with sense of place and tourists revisit intention has been done. Number of tourists visit to Kelantan was around 5 million people in year 2017 that recorded the lowest percentage among other states in Malaysia (Kelantan Tourism Information Centre, 2017). Few claims that this result due to the lack of sense of place and authenticity with Kelantan cultural heritage site. To date, limited study has been done to assess and validate the sense of place relationship with tourism area particularly historical cultural places in Kelantan whether the tourist's intention to revisit is significant with the authenticity of historic places in Kelantan. Therefore, this paper is to assess the relationship between sense of place among tourist's intention to revisit Kota Bharu Cultural Heritage Zone whether tourists revisit intention is significant with the zone's sense of place.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Sense of place is associated with one person emotion towards the particular place derived from our past experienced in relation of the social, economic and culture (Jorgensen & Stedman, 2006; Kyle, Graefe, Manning, & Bacon, 2003). Furthermore sense of place which comprises of place identity, place attachment and place dependent (McCunn & Gifford, 2014) repeatedly connected to the attitude, experience and perception of people towards particular place. It also defines by Tan, Tan, Kok, & Choon (2018) that sense of place is a attachment that relates individual and their meaningful places. While McCunn & Gifford (2014) and Pretty, Chipuer, & Bramston (2003) mention bonding and emotion associated with individual perceptions of their identity with relation to the physical environment become the central concept of sense of place. In addition, Arazi Idrus, Faris Khamidi & Mahmoud Sodangi (2010) and Cole & Hall (2009) state while the heritage is far from relics and ancient practice from the past. It is all about community's past and present that considers valuable which intend to pass it to the future generation. Heritage is something that impossible to be created again. When we talk about heritage site, it comprises of distinct culture or significant physical structure. The connection between sense of place and heritage site is when the tourist have close personal feeling for the heritage site, they will revisit thus ensuring the vibrant and sustainable tourism of that place (Liu, Li, & Kim, 2017).

Frequency of visit refers to the number of times or period a place is visited by a tourist (Assaker, Vinzi, & O'Connor, 2011; Fakeye & Crompton, 1991). Thus, attractiveness attributes need to be perfected by tourism organizers and local authority as they will affect the decision of tourists in choosing their destination and the tendency to revisit it (Hasan & Azlizam, 2018). Furthermore Kencana & Darmayanti (2017) and Gross & Brown (2008) state tourists who are satisfied with their tour experiences will tend to revisit the destination. In recent years, tourists change their behavior in choosing a destination from a leisure place to a psychologically destination (Siti Intan Nuriana & Lui, 2018). They prefer to visit a place that can make them learn more and their willing to pay more on the destination that it becomes a way for tourist to express inquisitiveness and satisfy curiosity in historical building and authentic cultural setting. A nice environment and atmosphere, good services are needed to remain a sustainable destination for tourist to perform revisit to that place. In addition, Raadik & Cottrell (2015) and Lew (2014) state that destination image or sense of place is one of the most important factors that cause intention to revisit destination with a favorable image and specific destination attributes.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

(i) Research design and sampling

The study is using quantitative method which the data acquired from the questionnaire survey. It includes the process of data collection from tourists who visit Kota Bharu Cultural Heritage Zone. The questionnaire survey applied closed-ended questions with ordered choices required the respondent to answer all the questions. The choices form a continuum of responses, such as those provided by likert scales and numerical ranges. The range is from 'strongly disagree' to 'strongly agree'. Then, ANOVA statistical analysis method will be used to analyze the data. The

respondents for the study were domestic and international tourists who visited the zone from September until December 2019. The sample size for the tourists was based on Yamane's formula which has been used to determine the minimal sample size for a given population size and therefore be considered suitable for determining an appropriate sample size (Wynveen, Schneider, & Arnberger, 2018). There were 5,321,957 tourists visiting Kelantan in 2018. Thus, by using the total number of tourists visiting Kelantan as the size of population ($N = 5,321,957$) with 95% confidence level ($P = 0.5$), the estimated sample size was calculated as 400. Therefore, a minimum of 400 respondents using simple random sampling will be accepted as minimum number to be asked to answer the questionnaire survey.

(ii) *Sense of Place Scale*

This study using tourist's level of sense of place was based on Cottrell & Cottrell (2019) set of psychometric scale. This study involves 10 scales which are Built Environment scale, Inherent Sociocultural Scale, Transactional Sociocultural scale, Significant scale, Memory scale, Aesthetic scale, Purposeful scale, Informational scale, Well-being scale and Character scale. The Cottrell & Cottrell (2019) set of psychometric scale had been used in other sense of place research by Counted (2019).

(iii) *Study Area*

The location of study area is in Kota Bharu Cultural Heritage Zone or 'Zon Warisan Budaya' which situated in Kota Bharu district the capital of state of Kelantan. It was gazetted by Kota Bharu Municipal Council-Islamic City (MPKB-BRI) in year 1991 as cultural heritage zone since it has various museums and former royal iconic buildings that are unique with traditional Kelantanese architecture, mostly built century ago. It covers an area of 12 hectares. The zone layout is based on location of royal palace and government buildings of Kota Bharu in 1844. According to Kota Bharu Local Plan 2020, the zone itself is classified under special area plan of cultural heritage. Kota Bharu Cultural Heritage's buildings can be categorized into royal palace, museum, monument, square, mosque, hotel, restaurant, shophouses, shopping and facility. With the zone gazetted as cultural heritage zone, it has been set up as prime tourism destination in Kota Bharu.

RESEARCH FINDINGS

(i) *Respondents' Demographic Characteristics*

The initial sample consisted of 500 questionnaires of whom 55 did not complete all the surveys. These incomplete questionnaires included missing sections in the survey instrument. Therefore, the data from 445 respondents were analyzed in this study.

Table 1: Respondents' Socio-demographic

Variables	Components	Domestic		International		Total	
		Unit	%	Unit	%	Unit	%
Gender	Male	171	38.4	20	4.5	191	42.9
	Female	233	52.4	21	4.7	254	57.1
Age	15-20	150	33.7	2	0.4	152	34.2
	21-30	160	36.0	26	5.8	186	41.8
	31-40	57	12.8	10	2.2	67	15.1
	41-50	25	5.6	3	0.7	28	6.3
	51-60	10	2.2	0	0.0	10	2.2
	61-70	2	0.4	0	0.0	2	0.4
Marital status	Single	272	61.1	22	4.9	294	66.1
	Married	121	27.2	13	2.9	134	30.1
	Widowed	6	1.3	1	0.2	7	1.6
	Divorced	5	1.1	5	1.1	10	2.2
Occupation	Student	189	42.5	10	2.2	199	44.7
	Government servant	129	29.0	9	2.0	138	31.0
	Private	73	16.4	16	3.6	89	20.0
	Pensioner	4	0.9	0	0.0	4	0.9
	Others / unemployed	9	2.0	6	1.3	15	3.4
Education	SPM/O-level	61	13.7	1	0.2	62	13.9
	STPM/matriculation/ A-level	13	2.9	0	0.0	13	2.9
	Certificate	17	3.8	3	0.7	20	4.5
	Diploma	182	40.9	8	1.8	190	42.7
	Bachelor degree	108	24.3	13	2.9	121	27.2
	Master degree	14	3.1	9	2.0	23	5.2
	Phd	8	1.8	6	1.3	14	3.1
	Others	1	0.2	1	0.2	2	0.4
Origins		404	90.8	41	9.2	445	100

Source: Questinnaire Survey (2019)

According to the Table 1 above, the gender distribution was 57.1% female respondents and 42.9% male respondents. The dominant age group of the respondents was 21 to 30 years old (41.8%), followed by 15 to 20 years old (34.2%), 31 to 40 years old (15.1%), 41 to 50 years old (6.3%) and 51 to 60 years old (2.2%), whereas 61 years and older, made up the smallest group, representing 0.4% of the respondents. Most of the respondent's marital status was single (66.1%). It was followed by married (30.1%), divorced (2.2%) and widowed (1.6%). In terms of occupation,

44.7% comprised of students, 31.0% comprised of government servants, 20.0% comprised of people working at private company, 3.4% comprised of ‘others’, whether running business or unemployed and 0.9% which smallest respondents was the pensioner. Most of the respondents with 90.8% reported that they were Malaysian, whereas 9.2% of the respondents were international travelers. In terms of level of education, 78.2% of the respondents had a university education level; 42.7% of the respondents had a diploma education, 27.2% had bachelor degree education and 8.3% had post graduate education. 16.8% of the respondents had a secondary school education. No respondent in the research study was at the primary level or below. The result shows the relatively high educational attainment of the respondents.

ii) Respondents’ Trip Characteristics

Table 2: Respondents’ Trip Characteristics

Variables	Components	Domestic		International		Total	
		Unit	%	Unit	%	Unit	%
First Visit	Yes	143	32.1	34	7.6	177	39.8
	No	261	58.7	7	1.6	268	60.2
Frequency of Visit (FOV)	0 time	143	32.1	34	7.6	177	39.8
	1-4 times	126	28.3	3	0.7	129	29.0
	5-7 times	57	12.8	2	0.4	59	13.3
	8 times or more	78	17.5	2	0.4	80	18.0

Source: Questionnaire Survey (2019)

According to Table 2 above, in the category of first time visit to Kota Bharu Cultural Heritage Zone, 60.2% of respondents have visited the zone while 39.8% of the respondents did not have previous experience with the area. Furthermore, the frequency of visit by respondents shown 39.8% of respondents that never visited Kota Bharu Cultural Heritage Zone and it was followed by respondents who have visited the zone for 1 to 4 times (29.0%), respondents who visited 8 times or more (18.0%) and respondents who visited 5 to 7 times (13.3%).

iii) Tourists Perception on Sense of Place

Table 3: One-way ANOVA Test of Frequency of Visit

Components	df	F	Sig. Value	Significant
Built environment scale				
Building color	3, 441	2.288	0.078	No
Materials which fit the setting	3, 441	1.487	0.217	No
Has attractive buildings	3, 441	3.528	0.015	Yes
Character scale	df	F	Sig. value	Significant

Clean	3, 441	2.486	0.060	No
Alive	3, 441	3.383	0.018	Yes
Peaceful	3, 441	0.199	0.897	No
Distinctive	3, 441	1.788	0.149	No
Harmonious	3, 441	1.277	0.282	No
Balanced	3, 441	3.614	0.013	Yes
Well-maintained	3, 441	1.051	0.370	No
Simple	3, 441	3.059	0.028	Yes
Spacious	3, 441	2.459	0.062	No
Open	3, 441	0.233	0.873	No
Inherent socio cultural scale	df	F	Sig. value	Significant
Historic	3, 441	0.440	0.724	No
Authentic	3, 441	8.221	0.000	Yes
Has the spirit of people	3, 441	10.980	0.000	Yes
Fits within the larger context Kota Bharu	3, 441	2.092	0.101	No
Support the function of Kota Bharu	3, 441	0.197	0.898	No
Feel the sense of history	3, 441	13.683	0.000	Yes
Transactional sociocultural scale	df	F	Sig. value	Significant
Offers a sense of belonging	3, 441	1.437	0.231	No
Provide opportunities for interaction with others	3, 441	0.757	0.519	No
Civility	3, 441	2.079	0.102	No
Generates respects for the individual	2, 442	0.673	0.511	No
Has a distinct energy	3, 441	4.787	0.003	Yes
Feel a part of the community	3, 441	7.256	0.000	Yes
Significance scale	df	F	Sig. value	Significant
Meaningful	3, 441	6.885	0.000	Yes
Significant	3, 441	0.382	0.766	No
Interesting	3, 441	0.475	0.700	No
Valuable	3, 441	0.656	0.579	No
Memory scale	df	F	Sig. value	Significant
Familiar	3, 441	3.530	0.015	Yes
Well-known	3, 441	9.012	0.000	Yes
Memorable	3, 441	2.616	0.051	No
Feel a sense of connection	3, 441	2.427	0.065	No
Feel i know it well	3, 441	3.647	0.013	Yes
Feel a sense of nostalgia	3, 441	1.173	0.319	No
Aesthetic scale	df	F	Sig. value	Significant
Beautiful	3, 441	1.471	0.222	No

Aesthetically pleasing	3, 441	1.508	0.212	No
Pleasing to look at	3, 441	1.659	0.175	No
Generates a positive sensory experience	3, 441	3.438	0.017	Yes
Feel a sense of awe	3, 441	1.706	0.165	No
Feel a sense of appreciation	3, 441	0.730	0.534	No
Purposive scale	df	F	Sig. value	Significant
Meets my expectations historical site	3, 441	1.598	0.189	No
Support my role at historical site	3, 441	0.995	0.395	No
Informational scale	df	F	Sig. value	Significant
Understandable	3, 441	1.935	0.123	No
Provides a sense of direction	3, 441	1.885	0.131	No
Has a distinct landmark	3, 441	2.057	0.105	No
Is easy for me to find my way around in	3, 441	2.640	0.049	Yes
Makes way-finding seem intuitive	3, 441	1.214	0.304	No
Provides info	3, 441	1.625	0.183	No
Well-being Scale	df	F	Sig. value	Significant
Safe	3, 441	1.769	0.152	No
Comfortable	3, 441	3.103	0.026	Yes
Warm	3, 441	2.169	0.091	No
Serene	3, 441	2.512	0.058	No
Reassuring	3, 441	0.952	0.434	No
Revitalizing	3, 441	0.591	0.621	No
Feel in control	3, 441	2.553	0.055	No

Source: Questionnaire Survey (2019)

Based on Table 3 above, Built Environment Scale's result indicates one item significant differences in relation to frequency of visit of respondents to Kota Bharu Cultural Heritage Zone, 'has attractive buildings' ($F(3,441) = 3.528, P < 0.05$). The other two items record no significant differences in relation to frequency of visit of respondents in Kota Bharu Cultural Heritage Zone, 'building color scale' ($F(3,441) = 2.288, P > 0.05$) and 'material which fit the setting' ($F(3,441) = 1.487, P > 0.05$). The sense of place referring to Build Environment in Kota Bharu Cultural Heritage Zone does not influence the tourist's decision to revisit the zone.

Character Scale's result indicates three items shown significant differences in relation to frequency of visit of respondents to Kota Bharu Cultural Heritage Zone, 'alive' ($F(3,441) = 3.383, P < 0.05$), 'balanced' ($F(3,441) = 3.614, P < 0.05$) and 'simple' ($F(3,441) = 3.059, P < 0.05$). The other seven items shown no significant differences in relation to frequency of visit of respondents to Kota Bharu Cultural Heritage Zone, 'clean' ($F(3,441) = 2.486, P > 0.05$), 'peaceful' ($F(3,441) = 0.199, P > 0.05$), 'distinctive' ($F(3,441) = 1.788, P > 0.05$), 'harmonious' ($F(3,441) = 1.277, P > 0.05$), 'well-maintained' ($F(3,411) = 1.051, P > 0.05$), 'spacious' ($F(3,441) = 2.459, P > 0.05$) and 'open'

($F(3,441) = 0.233, P > 0.05$). The sense of place referring to character in Kota Bharu Cultural Heritage Zone does not influence the tourist's decision to revisit the zone.

Inherent Socio-cultural Scale's result indicates three items shown significant differences in relation to frequency of visit of respondents to Kota Bharu Cultural Heritage Zone, 'authentic' ($F(3,441) = 8.221, P < 0.05$), 'has the spirit of people' ($F(3,441) = 10.980, P < 0.05$) and 'feel sense of history' ($F(3,358) = 13.683, P < 0.05$). The other three items shown no significant differences in relation to frequency of visit of respondents to Kota Bharu Cultural Heritage Zone, 'historic' ($F(3,441) = 0.440, P > 0.05$), 'fits within larger context of Kota Bharu' ($F(3,441) = 2.092, P > 0.05$) and 'support the function of Kota Bharu' ($F(3,441) = 0.197, P > 0.05$). The sense of place referring to inherent socio-cultural in Kota Bharu Cultural Heritage Zone does not influence the tourist's decision to revisit the zone.

Transactional Socio-cultural Scale's result indicates two items shown significant differences in relation to frequency of visit of respondents to Kota Bharu Cultural Heritage Zone, 'has a distinct energy' ($F(3,441) = 4.787, P < 0.05$) and 'feel a part of the community' ($F(3,441) = 7.256, P < 0.05$). The other four items shown no significant differences in relation to frequency of visit of respondents to Kota Bharu Cultural Heritage Zone, 'offers a sense of belonging' ($F(3,441) = 1.437, P > 0.05$), 'provide opportunities for interaction with others' ($F(3,441) = 0.757, P > 0.05$), 'civility' ($F(3,441) = 2.079, P > 0.05$) and 'generates respect for the individual' ($F(2,442) = 0.673, P > 0.05$). The sense of place referring to transactional socio-cultural in Kota Bharu Cultural Heritage Zone does not influence the tourist's decision to revisit the zone.

Significant Scale's result indicates one item shown significant differences in relation to frequency of visit of respondents to Kota Bharu Cultural Heritage Zone, 'meaningful' ($F(3,441) = 6.885, P < 0.05$). The other three items shown no significant differences in relation to frequency of visit of respondents to Kota Bharu Cultural Heritage Zone, 'significant' ($F(3,441) = 0.382, P > 0.05$), 'interesting' ($F(3,441) = 0.475, P > 0.05$) and 'valuable' ($F(3,441) = 0.656, P > 0.05$). The sense of place referring to significance in Kota Bharu Cultural Heritage Zone does not influence the tourist's decision to revisit the zone.

Memory Scale's result indicates three items shown significant differences in relation to frequency of visit of respondents to Kota Bharu Cultural Heritage Zone, 'familiar' ($F(3,441) = 3.530, P < 0.05$), 'well-known' ($F(3,441) = 9.012, P < 0.05$) and 'feel like I know it well' ($F(3,441) = 3.647, P < 0.05$). The other three items shown no significant differences in relation to frequency of visit of respondents to Kota Bharu Cultural Heritage Zone, 'memorable' ($F(3,441) = 2.616, P > 0.05$), 'feel a sense of connection' ($F(3,441) = 2.427, P > 0.05$), and 'feel a sense of nostalgia' ($F(3,441) = 1.173, P > 0.05$). The sense of place referring to memory in Kota Bharu Cultural Heritage Zone does not influence the tourist's decision to revisit the zone.

Aesthetic Scale's result indicates one item of the scale shown significant differences in relation to frequency of visit of respondents to Kota Bharu Cultural Heritage Zone, 'generates a positive sensory experience' ($F(3,441) = 3.438, P < 0.05$). The other five items of the scale shown no significant differences in relation to frequency of visit of respondents to Kota Bharu Cultural Heritage Zone, 'beautiful' ($F(3,441) = 1.471, P > 0.05$), 'aesthetically pleasing' ($F(3,441) = 1.508, P > 0.05$), 'pleasing to look at' ($F(3,441) = 1.659, P > 0.05$), 'feel a sense of awe' ($F(3,441) = 1.706, P > 0.05$) and 'feel a sense of appreciation' ($F(3,441) = 0.730, P > 0.05$). The sense of place referring to aesthetic in Kota Bharu Cultural Heritage Zone does not influence the tourist's decision to revisit the zone.

Purposive Scale's result indicates all two items of the scale shown no significant differences in relation to frequency of visit of respondents to Kota Bharu Cultural Heritage Zone, 'meets my expectations of historical site' ($F(3,441) = 1.598, P > 0.05$) and 'support my role at historical site setting' ($F(3,441) = 0.995, P > 0.05$). The sense of place referring to purposive in Kota Bharu Cultural Heritage Zone does not influence the tourist's decision to revisit the zone.

Informational Scale's result indicates one item of the scale shown significant differences in relation to frequency of visit of respondents to Kota Bharu Cultural Heritage Zone, 'is easy for me to find my way around in' ($F(3,441) = 2.640, P < 0.05$). The other five items shown no significant differences in relation to frequency of visit of respondents to Kota Bharu Cultural Heritage Zone, 'understandable' ($F(3,441) = 1.935, P > 0.05$), 'provides a sense of direction' ($F(3,441) = 1.885, P > 0.05$), 'has a distinct landmark' ($F(3,441) = 2.057, P > 0.05$), 'makes way-finding seem intuitive' ($F(3,441) = 1.214, P > 0.05$) and 'provides info' ($F(3,441) = 1.625, P > 0.05$). The sense of place referring to informational in Kota Bharu Cultural Heritage Zone does not influence the tourist's decision to revisit the zone.

Well-being Scale's result indicates one items of the scale shown significant differences in relation to frequency of visit of respondents to Kota Bharu Cultural Heritage Zone, 'comfortable' ($F(3,441) = 3.103, P < 0.05$). The other six items one items of the scale shown no significant differences in relation to frequency of visit of respondents to Kota Bharu Cultural Heritage Zone 'safe' ($F(3,441) = 1.769, P > 0.05$), 'warm' ($F(3,441) = 2.169, P > 0.05$), 'serene' ($F(3,441) = 2.512, P > 0.05$), 'reassuring' ($F(3,441) = 0.952, P > 0.05$), 'revitalizing' ($F(3,441) = 0.591, P > 0.05$) and 'feel in control' ($F(3,441) = 2.553, P > 0.05$). The sense of place referring to well-being in Kota Bharu Cultural Heritage Zone does not influence the tourist's decision to revisit the zone.

DISCUSSION

The sense of place of Kota Bharu Cultural Heritage Zone does not influence the tourists' decision to revisit the heritage zone. The result is aligned with the mainstream studies where sense of place is related to tourist emotion and perception to the place. The tourists' emotion fuels their motivation to travel which related to their psychological needs. It will determine whether a visit is successful or not, how their overall experience influence their future travel visit. In general Kota Bharu Cultural Heritage Zone's sense of place failed to fulfill the psychological needs of tourist in revisiting the site. Frequency of visit is about physical place, culture, activities, environment and infrastructure attractiveness since it will affect the decision of tourists in choosing their destination and the tendency to revisit the place. In this study, Built Environment character did not show strong distinct physical features such as building color and building materials since it did not affect the tourist revisit to the site. Different buildings materials such as wood and concrete looks familiar with no unique value. The local government should refurbish the buildings to be more attractive without compromise the original physical characteristic. The destination image, specific attributes and historic value are the factors of revisit among tourists to the heritage zone. The historic value of the site did not obviously emerge and fail to influence the emotion of tourists. It is because the historic value of each building did not properly present and the information of each buildings is not explained in the brochure and inside the building. The information given did not enough to trigger for the tourists to appreciate Kelantan history and revisit Kota Bharu in the future. The

insignificant relation of tourist decision in revisiting Kota Bharu Cultural Heritage Site due to several reasons. First, there is no annual cultural or historic events in the heritage zone that may attract tourists for their second visits. Furthermore, tourism image hold influences on the quality of visit perceived by the tourist. The brand and promotion of the heritage zone is not widely known either in the brochure or social media hence make tourist less intend to revisit. Siti Intan Nurdiana & Lui (2018) mentions modern tourist prefer to visit a place that can make them learn more and their willing to pay more on the destination that it becomes a way for tourist to express inquisitiveness and satisfy curiosity in historical building and authentic cultural setting.

CONCLUSION

Conclusion The result indicated that sense of place in Kota Bharu Cultural Heritage Zone does not influence the tourist's decision to revisit the zone hence this study has identified and explored the gap in tourism research in term of sense of place relationship with tourist behaviors particularly tourist revisit intention to the historical site. It is important for government and business owners in planning attractions for tourist and sustaining the area in term of social and economy factors in Kelantan. The ANOVA analysis between sense of place items with respondent's frequency of visit surely help the tourism operators in identifying which area they should focused on improving and enhancing. The study discloses that heritage tourism relates to sense of place in relation of authentic site, historical site, distinctive site, harmonious site, well-maintained site and clean site which are part of sense of place scale. To develop tourism industry, sense of place is a topic that should not be neglected. Furthermore, this study contributes to the body of knowledge by providing empirical evidence for the needs of academic research and development in the future.

REFERENCES

- Arazi Idrus, Faris Khamidi, & Mahmoud Sodangi. 2010. Maintenance management framework for conservation of heritage buildings in Malaysia. *Modern Applied Science*, 4, 66-77.
- Assaker, G., Vinzi, V.E., & O'Connor, P. 2011. Examining the effect of novelty seeking, Satisfaction, and destination image on tourists' return pattern: a two factor, non-linear latent growth model. *Tourism Management*, 32, 890-901.
- Cole, D. N., & Hall, T. E. 2009. Perceived effects of setting attributes on visitor experiences in wilderness: variation with situational context and visitor characteristics. *Environmental Management*, 44, 24-36
- Cottrell, J. R. & Cottrell, S. P. 2019. Sense of place predictors of perceived effects of a proposed island to mainland bridge on future experience. *Island Studies Journal*, 14, 187-204.
- Counted, V. 2019. The role of spirituality in promoting sense of place among foreigners of african background in the netherlands. *Ecopsychology*, 11, 101-109.
- Fakeye, P. C., & Crompton, J. L. 1991. Image differences between prospective, first-time, and repeat visitors to the Lower Rio Grande Valley. *Journal of Travel Research*, 30, 10-16.
- Gross, M. J., & Brown, G. 2008. An empirical structural model of tourists and places: progressing involvement and place attachment into tourism. *Tourism Management*, 29, 1141-1151.

- Hasan, M. Z., & Azlizam, A. 2018. Kuala Selangor perceived attractiveness as a domestic tourism destination. *Journal of Tourism, Hospitality & Culinary Arts*, 10, 63-80.
- Jorgensen, B.S., & Stedman, R.C. 2006. A comparative analysis of predictors of sense of place dimensions: attachment to, dependence on, and identification with lakeshore properties. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 79, 316-327.
- Kelantan Tourism Information Centre. (2017). Kelantan Tourist Arrival Statistic.
- Kencana, E., & Darmayanti, T. 2017. Causality between frequency of visit with tourists satisfaction: a multi-group analysis. *Udayana Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 1, 128-135.
- Kianicka, S., Buchecker, M., Hunziker, M., & Müller-Böker, U. 2006. Locals' and tourists' sense of place. *Mountain Research and Development*, 26, 55-63.
- Kyle, G., Graefe, A., Manning, R., & Bacon, J. 2003. An examination of the relationships between leisure activity involvement and place attachment among hikers along the Appalachian Trail. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 35, 249-273.
- Lew, A. 2014. Cultural geographies of tourism: Image, identity, and place. *Tourism Geographies*, 16, 171-173.
- Liu, X., Li, J., & Kim, W. G. 2017. The role of travel experience in the structural relationships among tourists' perceived image, satisfaction, and behavioral intentions. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 17, 135-146.
- McCunn, L. J., & Gifford, R. 2014. Interrelations between sense of place, organizational commitment, and green neighborhoods. *Cities*, 41, 20-29.
- Mina Najafi & Mustafa Kamal. 2011. The Concept of Place and Sense of Place In Architectural Studies. *World Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology*, 5, 1100-1106.
- Park, D., Lee, G., Kim, W. G., & Kim, T. T. 2019. Social network analysis as a valuable tool for understanding tourists' multi-attraction travel behavioral intention to revisit and recommend. *Sustainability*, 11, 1-17.
- Pretty, G. H., Chipuer, H. M., & Bramston, P. 2003. Sense of place amongst adolescents and adults in two rural Australian towns: The discriminating features of place attachment, sense of community and place dependence in relation to place identity. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 23, 273-287.
- Raadik C, J. & Cottrell, S.P. 2015. Sense of place influences on perceived environmental change effects on future holiday experiences to Saaremaa, Estonia. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 15, 425-446.
- Siti Intan Nurdiana & Lui, E. 2018. Satisfaction drivers and revisit intention of international tourists in Malaysia. *Journal of Tourism, Hospitality, and Environment Management*, 3, 1-13.
- Tan, S. K., Tan, S. H., Kok, Y. S., & Choon, S. W. 2018. Sense of place and sustainability of intangible cultural heritage – The case of George Town and Melaka. *Tourism Management*, 67, 376-387.
- Wynveen, C., Schneider, I. E., & Arnberger, A. 2018. The context of place: Issues measuring place attachment across urban forest contexts. *Journal of Forestry*, 116, 367-373.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

NIK MOHD AIZAT NIK MOHD ADIB

International Islamic University Malaysia
nikaizat86@gmail.com

SYAKIR AMIR AB. RAHMAN (Corresponding Author)

International Islamic University Malaysia
syakiramir@iium.edu.my

SHUNJI SUZUKI

Shibaura Institute of Technology
sshunji@shibaura-it.ac.jp

NOR NADIAH NAJIB

PLAN Malaysia
nornadiah@planmalaysia.gov.my