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Abstract

Immigrating can be a difficult transition for people leaving their homeland to join a new and often vastly different community and culture. There is increasing interest in how a sense of place and a sense of belonging in new environments can be built in migrant communities. In the process of migration and living in a new physical, social, and cultural context, immigrants often need to uphold their cultural heritage to maintain psychological and physical stability, but they need to balance this with integration into the new society. To accommodate a cohesive multicultural society for all citizens, it is essential to understand how immigrants perceive their new environment and how they make connections in a new land through a process of cultural renewal. This thesis uses Australian context to explore culture as an issue in park design and interpretation, in addition to the importance of the physical environment in relation to perception, imagination, and meaning of place after migration. While the policy of ‘multiculturalism’ has had a rocky road in Australia since the optimistic 1970s, the impact of diverse cultures can be observed in cities and suburbs across the country.

Urban green spaces, from private home gardens to public parks and botanical gardens, play an important role in the life of immigrants. Besides the psychological and restorative effects of these spaces, they are also places that provide opportunities for recreation, and social gatherings. For many ethnic communities, parks are central places in which they can celebrate collective cultural values, and hold events such as festivals. In particular, frequent visits to public park spaces by non-English-speaking immigrants in cities with white majority cultures draws attention to the ways these spaces are perceived and used differently by a wide range of people. This study aims to raise awareness of cultural factors as an important issue in park design and management, and investigates the influence of culture on both understanding and design of park landscapes.

The thesis reviews different uses and appreciation of urban park landscapes by non-English-speaking immigrants, and develops an alternative predominant perspective of the Australian park landscape. It builds on theories of place, habitus, and landscape
as cultural phenomena, and investigates new uses of park spaces by recent
generations of immigrants to Australia. It questions the extent to which Australian
public parks contribute to the sense of inclusivity, or alienation, experienced by non-
English-speaking immigrant users of these spaces. The main focus is on the Iranian
community of Melbourne, Australia, and their engagements with urban park spaces
before and after migration in two different landscape contexts: Iran and Australia.
The research explores the Iranian-Australians understanding of urban parks and their
natural and cultural landscapes and includes a range of experiences of these
environments in Iran and Australia (Melbourne). The approach acknowledges past
studies and explores Iranian views of the interrelationship between people and the
physical environment and how these contrast with Australian attitudes.

Mythical notions of park landscapes that have evolved in Iranian and Australian
cultures, and the desire of non-English-speaking immigrants in relation to the use of
urban park spaces, have given rise to dialectical attitudes towards these spaces and
their meanings. Subsequently, two different landscape myths, ‘Paradise’ and
‘Arcadia’, are examined as significant influences on landscape architecture
frameworks, the former in Iran and the latter in Australia. It is argued that the
‘Paradise’ myth and Persian garden characteristics have infused landscape
architecture and garden/park design in Iran and also other countries in the world.
Furthermore, the ways nature ideologies and design frameworks have been referred
through Iranian people’s engagement with park environments and their patterns of
use in both contexts are discussed. Cultural landscapes, narratives, and ideologies are
investigated to identify the social and cultural experiences and processes that shape
those engagements and understanding.

This thesis investigates historical, philosophical, and architectural park characteristics
and seeks their influences on the usage of these spaces by observation, survey
questionnaires, Q methodology with photographs, and semi-structured in-depth
individual interviews. This study draws attention to the importance of physical
settings, spaces of enclosure and stillness, and social and passive practices in urban
park landscapes by non-English users. It raises a crucial question about how urban
park planning and design in multicultural Australian cities can support non-English-speaking immigrants’ activities in these spaces, and thus foster social cohesion.
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1 Chapter One: Introduction

Urban and public park landscapes are significant features of contemporary urban environments and are perceived as designed landscapes. They constitute a significant budget commitment on the part of local councils and some state governments, but have received limited research into the multifaceted ways they are used (Veal 2006). There is therefore a need for investigation into the usage of urban parks by various kinds of users. It is estimated that there are over 50,000 urban parks in Australia covering 3.4 million hectares (ABS 1998). In Sydney, urban parks have a higher rate of utilisation than any other out-of-home leisure facility (Veal 2006). Therefore, research on the way parks function as well as their physical and socio-spatial qualities may help us maximise the use of these public spaces.

Parks are different in size, history, design, ornamental embellishments, planting, facilities, maintenance, and patterns of use. Their constitutive elements, including trees, grass, pathways, benches, ponds, fountains, gardens, playgrounds, and sporting facilities, are pragmatic and their composition yet illustrate different ideologies of nature-making. Parks are not ideologically neutral spaces; they exist for specific ecological, social, political, and economic reasons that shape how people perceive and use them (Byrne & Wolch 2009). The etymology of the word ‘park’ refers to ‘enclosed’ or ‘captive’ nature, which suggests that urban parks are socially mediated ecologies with deep roots (Byrne & Wolch 2009; Olwig 1995). The English aristocracy established the first public parks in early 19th century, and imported a pastoral aesthetic to London by creating residential squares (Lawrence 1993). Conflicts over access to urban green spaces then resulted in the opening of the Royal Parks to the public, and later in the creation of public parks. This pattern repeated elsewhere in Europe and the United States (Byrne & Wolch 2009; Lawrence 1993; Marne 2001; Thompson 1998), the evolution of urban parks later resulting in increasingly complex park spaces functionally segregated into playgrounds, museums, outdoor concert venues, and public garden spaces (Byrne & Wolch 2009).
In modern-day Australia, people visit parks for a wide range of reasons including active recreation such as dog walking, swimming, riding bicycles, running, and playing sports, and passive recreational pursuits such as walking, picnicking, fishing, celebrating, and playing with children. However, the prevalence of these activities differs among people according to their ethnicity (Byrne & Wolch 2009; Hayward 1989). Understanding the different ways groups of people use and perceive parks may improve public park space planning in multicultural cities. According to Australian Bureau of Statistics (2012), recent arrivals to Australia comprise increasing numbers of people born in Asian countries. The 2011 census data demonstrates that, 47% of immigrants were from India, 35% from China, and only 11% from the United Kingdom. The 2006 census data shows that 193,633 people born in the Middle East resided in Australia in that year, which accounts for 4.4% of the overseas-born population. Almost 40% of those from the Middle East were born in Lebanon, 16.8% were born in Iraq, 15.7% in Turkey, 11.6% in Iran, 4.0% in Israel and 3.6% in Syria (ABS 2008). This changing demography is altering how parks are used in Australia, and since Australian public parks have developed within a particular cultural tradition, it is essential to rethink park design and management today.

### 1.1 Multicultural Urban Landscape Design

Helen Armstrong argues that the future of Australian cities depends on how much we can depict our differences in terms of migrants’ contribution to Australia’s cultural pluralism, and how much we can consider the traditions and values of diverse cultures and their subsequent evolution into an ‘Australian way of life’ (Armstrong 2001b, p. 58). How can ethnic communities maintain their culture, yet also transfer it into a new form of life? Or, conversely, how can they change the Australian way of life as their practices eventually influence other people, including previous immigrants? They are not only immigrants who try to adapt the way of life that exists in the place they've arrived, but also the place they've arrived to adapts to cater for the needs of new immigrants. These questions address the needs of various cultural groups in a global city, and reflect the importance of meaningfulness of places to the people who use them, often referred to by urban planners as ‘sense of place’. By
seeking the ‘meaning’ of places in their physical design and also in a deeper understanding of the complex meanings of place, adaptation of urban redevelopment may be achieved (Main 2007). Hence, it is essential for urban planners and landscape designers to be aware of various place meanings defined by diverse ethnic perspectives, and the ways landscapes may develop new meanings for their users in global cities. Drawing on the concept of cultural landscape, this thesis argues that particular landscape settings and features can be used differently or given new meanings by newcomers and ethnic minority users. The role culture plays in the process of granting meaning to the landscape is examined, in addition to how people use and understand urban parks after migration.

Research on different natural landscape uses and preferences begins to provide an understanding of the ways in which cultural differences and physical contexts influence place meaning and attachment (Main 2007). Do natural environment design and form have different influences and meanings for various users? In a study of the importance of public spaces in immigrant neighbourhoods, Main (2007) proposed two concepts regarding the relationship between design and place meaning. Firstly, meaning of place is constructed by people within specific social and cultural contexts and is not inherent in the physical design of place. Secondly, the design, qualities, and characteristics of the physical landscape influence the meaning that is constructed by people. Considering these concepts, the present study seeks to detect the extent to which cultural contexts and the design and layout of parks affect the place meanings generated by immigrants and vice-versa.

When designing spaces, urban planners need to consider culture to avoid creating what Edward Relph called ‘placelessness’, or inauthentic physical environments in urban spaces (Relph 1976). The idea of sense of place, in the case of immigrants’ experiences of urban parks, refers to the ways individuals see and interpret the park spaces and cultural and recreational activities undertaken there, which all leads to ‘imprinting the park with a group’s identity’ (Byrne et al. 2013).

It is through acts like these that humans have always made themselves ‘at home’ in new environments. And it is arguable that human life is dependent
on having at least some places where people are at home (Byrne, Goodall & Cadzow 2013, p. 116).

The notion of cultural landscape is highly complicated when we consider multiple cultures. In order to understand the perception, experiences and needs of diverse cultural groups in urban park spaces, we need to know the cultural characteristics and focus of different communities in relation to natural environments. The concept of ‘ethnic community’ is very complex and includes the notion of ‘shared identity’ on the basis of, in part, country of birth, language, ethnicity, and religion. One of the important means for a group to gain representation and thus counter marginalisation is community identification and cohesion. Studies of the various perspectives on parks and gardens can bring to visibility not only different views of nature, but also the communities themselves. The idea of a ‘cultural landscape’ suggests that nature is a realm that is experienced and produced by people and invested with cultural values and meanings (Thomas 2002).

1.2 Parks and Gardens

Parks and gardens represent nature within urban contexts and have a wide range of benefits for human wellbeing. They have been found to contribute positively to the life of urban dwellers, both physically and psychologically (Rishbeth & Finney 2006). Urban green spaces play an important role in the life of immigrants. Understanding how immigrants perceive their new environments and how they make connections in a new land through the process of cultural renewal is essential in shaping a multicultural society for all citizens. The combination of physical environment and human complexities in urban milieus demonstrates how social identity can be understood and addressed, both in personal responses to place and in the design of the public realm (Rishbeth & Finney 2006).

The importance of assessing and managing culturally significant sites, and a concern for the concept of ‘place’ more broadly in Australia arose after the World War II. In the 1970s, a large-scale landscape planning framework was established to help guide the manner in which humans shape and interact with the land. George Seddon, who
raised the theoretical arguments relating to the perception of the Australian cultural and natural landscape, suggested that cultural and natural worlds are profoundly interconnected and what people make of these two worlds depends on what they are told, what they have learnt, and where they learnt it (Saniga 2012, p. 222; Seddon 1972). Saniga (2012) argues that Australia followed the United States in applying landscape perception research to develop better landscape practices. Research by American landscape architects on the notion of establishing different landscape character types was based on the presence of interesting landforms, water courses, and vegetation types and patterns. The American investigations into landscape perceptions at the time, in some respects, were based on the landscape architects’ judgments of visual aesthetics for landscape scenery, which had not been tested in public landscape perception studies.

By the 1980s, most of the states in Australia had seen developments in landscape assessment. Approaches for landscape assessment and planning in large-scale projects were developed by both public and private practice. As a result of these developments in landscape assessment and scenic perception, the complex factors of scenic quality assessment and the visual impacts of alterations became more visible. There was also a great gap observed between expert and public opinion, which indicated the need for careful, long-term research. Even though planning techniques and training in visual resource assessment have not advanced in Australia, government acceptance that landscape assessment is an important component of land management and decision-making is the result of efforts of people who introduced it to, and tested it on, the Australian scene (Saniga 2012).

Creating landscape, in architecture, is informed by a mechanistic conception of nature as a predictable system that can be controlled by humans. In the process of landscape creation, ‘social justice environmentalists’ believe ‘environmental racism’ is the source of environmental problems, from which non-white people suffer disproportionately. These environmentalists argue that nature includes people and their activities and so is inseparable from issues of socio-economic status and racial discrimination (Coates 1998; Schwab 1995).
The usage of public parks in the 20th century has changed with shifts in spatial population distribution. For instance, a rise in the number of private gardens in suburbs has led to more private access to leisure space and fresh air than previously. But, as suburban gardens cannot fulfil all the needs of people in relation to green spaces, the number of suburban parks has also increased along with expansion of suburban zones. Thus, more substantial open spaces for games, childhood development, and health with a focus on communities were provided. Public parks have been described as the boundary between ‘wild’ and ‘civilised’ space (Holmes, Martin & Mirmohamadi 2008); however, this ‘boundary’ has not yet been comprehensively defined, and so needs further cultural, social, historical, ecological, and architectural studies. Nonetheless, geographic studies of park-making reveal that, historically, parks tend to be ideologically charged spaces. However, there has been limited research on who uses contemporary parks and for what purposes. Research on park use in leisure studies as well as in public health lacks historical specificity and does not account for the spatiality of parks. Geographers have begun to address this conceptual and empirical gap, but it is important to recognise the potential of parks in urban spaces to reduce social and environmental problems (Byrne & Wolch 2009).

It is important to note that both park user characteristics and park features may impact on perceptions of parks. Park spaces may be perceived as welcoming, safe, and accessible, or scary, wild, and intolerant. The way a person perceives a park depends on their background (Golledge & Stimson 1997). Park design may also influence the way people perceive and use these spaces. Moreover, park design features mirror cultural and ethno-racial ideologies in relation to appearance and use of space (Byrne & Wolch 2009). There is limited research on the use of Australian contemporary parks, the idea that parks can reduce social/environmental problems, and reasons for different perceptions of parks by various users. This thesis suggests that to address these issues we need to focus on cultural significances that contribute to cultural landscape and different usage of parks, rather than merely expecting immigrants to adapt a particular cultural heritage. It is also necessary to increase public park usage by various ethnic communities in order to develop social cohesion.
1.3 Cultural Aspects of the Landscape

Forms capture the physical, tangible aspects of landscape including landforms, fauna and flora, and human-created structures. Relationships encompass the associations between people and a given landscape, and the relationships that develop amongst people who have a common association with a landscape. Relationships can be evidenced in many ways including in spirituality, myths, sense of place, stories, and through art such as literature and song. Practices refers to dynamics in the landscape – both human practices (such as activities, traditions, and customs) and natural processes (such as ecological flows and water cycles) (Stephenson 2005, pp. 187-8).

‘Landscape’, ‘culture’, and ‘values’ are slippery and emotive words in the English language and all have more than one definition. New ways of seeing and thinking about the world are continuing to change their meanings, while migration also contributes to distributing new ideologies and meaning in this regard. According to the particular context, ‘landscape’ encompasses the material aspects of a physical area including its natural aspects, and its mythological and constructed aspects.

‘Landscape’ is mainly associated with concepts such as naturalness, functional integration, and national and regional identity, likewise it has a traditional association with picturesque improvement (Stephenson 2005; Swaffield 1991), particularly in English cultural tradition.

1-1: Definitions of key terms as they are used in this thesis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wilderness</td>
<td>Wilderness is a culturally and historically expression of a certain colonialist’s way of seeing nature (Ginn &amp; Demeritt 2009).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature</td>
<td>Nature is a geographical concept that contains human history, which changes over time and varies from place to place (Ginn &amp; Demeritt 2009).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>Landscape is a physical area visible from a particular location which has the power to actively (re)produce relationships among people and between people and their material world. Landscapes carry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
symbolic or ideological meanings that reflect back and help
(re)produce or challenge social identities and social practices (Morin 2009).

**Garden**
A garden is ‘a piece of ground fenced off from cattle and
appropriated to the use and pleasure of man: it is, or ought to be,
cultivated’ (Repton 1816; Turner 2005, p. 1). Garden-making began
in West Asia then spread eastward and westward representing ideas
about nature (Turner 2005).

**Persian Garden**
The Persian Garden is one of the historical symbolic forms of
creating the paradise version of Eden on earth, which has been a
reference for landscape design.

**Public Landscape**
A public landscape is a place that facilitates people’s needs and
expectations, protects their rights, and offers people a variety of
meanings to attach to the landscape. A public landscape is a public
space which is ‘accessible to everyone, where anyone can
participate and witness, in entering the public one always risks
encounter with those who are different, those who identify with
different groups and have different opinions or different forms of

**Urban Park**
Urban Parks are large green public spaces within the urban
environment that are mainly designed based on cultural values
which contribute to their overall identity.

Contemporary interpretations of the concept of ‘culture’ suggest that it is a dynamic
process whereby people actively construct group life (Anderson & Gale 1992;
Johnston et al. 2000; Stephenson 2005). People are considered to live culturally
rather than in cultures, and culture is defined as a generative source of human
practices (Ingold 1994; Stephenson 2005). The term ‘value’ is considered to be a
social construct created in the cultural context of a specific time and place. Values
can be identified when they are expressed by people of the cultural context or those
who are in a position to observe and understand it (Bluestone 2000; Stephenson
2005, p. 17). Here, the term ‘value’ refers to the qualities and characteristics that
have some worth and importance for a person, discipline or group (Mason 2002), and signifies something that is important to them.

### 1.4 Theoretical Background of Cultural Landscape

The concept of the cultural landscape was introduced by Sauer (1925) who was also the founder of cultural geography, and (Jackson 1951), who recognised that landscape was layered by human action over time, and was an expression of particular cultural groups. Cultural landscape was located within historical and heritage studies by Melnick (1981), Melnick (1983), Russell (1988), and Taylor (1992a). The other forms of cultural landscape study have been conducted by cultural geographers such as Lowenthal (1975), Lowenthal (1985), and Cosgrove and Jackson (1987). Lowenthal presented the concept that cultural landscape could be read as texts or through texts such as landscape paintings and writings, and Cosgrave, Jackson, and Daniels developed it by reading the iconography of the landscape through art expressions. Investigating visual aspects of the landscape has a long and respected history and have been explored by a number of scholars such as Hunt and Willis (1988). However, as Helen Armstrong argues, these studies were translated to Australia ‘relatively unmediated by landscape planners using the same parametric methods’ (Armstrong 2001a, p. 81).

Cultural landscape has also been evaluated phenomenologically by other geographers to represent the value of everyday life embedded in the cultural landscape (Lefebvre 1991; Relph 1976; Tuan 1974). The concern of ‘everyday life’ allowed cultural landscape scholars to enter into postmodern discourse that legitimated numerous ways of interpreting cultural landscapes in relation to tensions between the global and the local. The notion of ‘narrated landscape’ has then evolved as a result of this shift in cultural landscape studies using discourse analysis from the pioneering work of the British geographers (Burgess, Limb & Harrison 1988; Jackson 2003).

Cultural landscape contains a variety of physical and non-physical components that are given significance based on aesthetic, historic, scientific, or social values.
However, cultural significance here plays an important role in constructing both physical and non-physical components and developing cultural landscape. The common approach to specifying cultural significance in Australia relies on the assessment of these four core elements. The primary reasons for assessment are to recognise which places are culturally significant, to whom the places are culturally significant, and why they are significant (Canning & Spennemann 2001). Of the four core elements, social value is perhaps the most difficult to measure, as the depth of community feeling and attachment to cultural or natural environments needs to be considered. Without actively involving local communities, much potentially vital information may be ignored. The emphasis on Anglo-Celtic historical associations in Australia fails to recognise that different cultural communities may value components of the cultural landscape for completely different reasons (Canning & Spennemann 2001). Implying a particular cultural landscape needs to be understood in the terms of its actual users and their cultural understanding - rather than an imagined shared understanding.

Recognising social value means also recognising the validity and value of traditions, life-ways, patterns of use, and cultural identities that are perhaps alien and incongruent to one’s own, but nonetheless may imbue places with special meaning(s) and significance (Canning & Spennemann 2001, p. 460).

The present research has employed a general definition of cultural landscape as proposed by O’Hara (1997) and further developed by Sim and Armstrong (2001), as follows:

The cultural landscape is a constantly evolving, humanised, landscape. It consists of a dialectic between the natural physical setting, the human modifications to that setting, and the meanings of the resulting landscape to insiders and outsiders. Continuous interaction between these three elements takes place over time. Cultural landscapes can be represented as stories, myths and beliefs, which may be applied to all landscapes including wilderness landscapes, ordinary landscapes or designed landscapes. The concept of cultural landscape therefore embodies a dynamic understanding
of history, in which past, present and future are seamlessly connected (O'Hare 1997; Sim & Armstrong 2001, p. vii).

In Australia, as Armstrong (2001) points out, cultural landscape was originally located in the heritage realm and the importance of meanings in cultural landscape was not made thoroughly explicit, except for the work of Johnson (1993) in What is Social Value? Australian urban cultural landscape scholars Armstrong (1994), and Jacobs (1992) further investigated cultural geography and used phenomenology to reveal the complexity of meanings in their interpretations of urban cultural landscape. Armstrong has explored the culturally-inclusive interpretations of cultural landscape values, and Jacobs examined hidden power relations in heritage landscapes. In order to investigate different understandings of the landscape by immigrants, the present thesis approaches Australian cultural landscape and individuals’ engagements with them as mediated by their cultural background. A number of scholars have conducted extremely valuable investigations on this subject in recent years (Byrne, Goodall & Cadzow 2013; Byrne et al. 2006; Byrne & Wolch 2009; Goodall et al. 2004; Thomas 2001; Thomas 2002).

The present thesis seeks to generate new understandings of the cultural roots of non-English immigrants’ perception of and interaction with urban park spaces. The thesis in particular explores Iranian immigrants’ perception, experiences, expectations, and recreational activities in urban park landscapes both in Iran and Australia. Furthermore, it investigates landscape physical elements and settings, as well as their ideology and philosophy of design in both contexts, and seeks the relationship between these two fields of exploration.

In other words, the thesis aims to investigate the culturally explicit experiences of parks that were built based on a particular culture, and examines new experiences and engagements with park landscapes in a different cultural, social and physical context. It is expected that the outcomes will illustrate the perceived information, values, the rate of satisfaction or expectations, and the way habitus is transmitted into a new landscape by Iranian immigrants. The present study examines the meanings of urban park landscapes, with a focus on culture and physical settings, as
determined, on the one hand, by ‘insiders’ in Iran and, on the other hand, by Iranian immigrants in Australia, considered ‘outsiders’. Culture does not only include social phenomena, but is also ‘profoundly spatialised and intimately connected with sense of place’ and is linked both to ‘real geographies’, that is, physical sites, and ‘imaginative geographies’, that is, sites with shared meanings (Stratford 1999, p. 2).

1.5 Aims of the Research

This thesis aims to understand how Iranian immigrants in Melbourne perceive urban park environments compared with their previous experiences in Iran. Ethnicity is highlighted as an issue in park management and interpretation in Australia, in addition to the importance of the physical environment in relation to perception, imagination, and meaning of place after migration. Cultural landscape, narratives of nature, and ideologies are also investigated to identify the social and cultural experiences and processes that shape those engagements and understandings. A key component of this investigation concerns the role of narratives in both understanding and design of constructed natural spaces, and the way they address patterns of use among a group of people. This study also aims to illustrate different perceptions of urban park landscapes by Iranian immigrants, as a representation of non-English-speaking immigrants, and their preferences of their settings associated with their culture. This project aims to bring to visibility the non-English communities and ethnic minorities in Australian society and seeks planning strategies to develop sustainable urban parks and increase their usage in Australia.

1.6 Objectives

1) To contribute to the body of knowledge of urban parks in multicultural societies.

2) To raise awareness of cultural diversity in the use of urban parks and its significance in urban planning and design.

3) To investigate the relationship between urban park settings and the experiences associated with ‘place meaning’ in Iran and Australia.
4) To examine the relationship between cultural values and factors, and the use and understanding of urban park spaces.

5) To explore the reflections of culture and landscape narratives on perception, use, and design of park spaces, and landscape architecture.

1.7 Research Questions

The way places and localities are given meaning by immigrants and their practices and imagination require greater consideration through cross-cultural studies. As much of the landscape and place research considers social rather than physical components of ethnicity, less is known about the effect of characteristics of the physical environment and form on users’ perception (Main 2007). How are urban park spaces given meaning by ethnic minority users? And does culture affect the use and understanding of park spaces after migration?

Research Question 1: How do experiences of favourite aesthetic places of Iranian users in urban park landscapes result in place identity?

a) What are the spatial aesthetic values of urban park landscapes in Persian culture?

b) Are these values being attributed to Australian urban park spaces after migration? How?

Research Question 2: How do personal and cultural meanings of place in urban park environments contribute to place attachment for Iranian migrants?

a) What are the spatial cultural values of urban park landscapes in Iran?

b) Are these cultural values attributed to Australian urban park spaces after migration? And how?

Research Question 3: Which characteristics of the physical environment in park landscapes in both contexts encourage social and recreational practices and foster a sense of belonging? And what sort of recreational activities are preferred by Iranian users? And why?
1.8 Project Description

This thesis aims to investigate place meaning in park landscapes as mediated by culture, and the way culture influences the development of parks throughout the history of a particular nation. It questions how place meaning in park spaces may be constructed after migration and explores differences between place of origin and place of migration in this regards. It highlights non-English ethnic minorities’ cultures of park visiting and seeks how they may contrast the dominant culture.

This study analyses the meaning of park landscapes using a three-dimensional model: the physical aspects of landscape with a focus on landscape aesthetic setting preferences, personal meaning (i.e. person–landscape relationships including familiarity and memory and cultural values in particular settings or features of the landscape), and social and recreational interactions (i.e. involvement in social and recreational activities), based on the three-part model of place meaning which will be explained in Chapter Two. The study describes landscape narratives and cultural identity, and elaborates on landscape layouts as representations of landscape identity. Mobility and continuity of cultural identity are used to explore factors that affect place meaning after migration in relation to park environments.

This thesis is organised into ten chapters. Chapter One is an introduction, which provides a general overview of the research study, theoretical basis, and research questions. A literature review has been divided into three parts – Chapters Two, Three, and Four. Chapter Two explores the theoretical bases of the research, and seeks different factors that contribute to a ‘sense of place’, with a particular focus on the perspectives of immigrants and the three-part model of place meaning. It also focuses on park landscapes as ‘public places’, and introduces concepts of ‘Paradise’ and ‘Arcadia’ as two important landscape narratives in relation to park design and understanding, the former in Iran and the latter in Australia. In Chapter Three, historical perceptions and interpretations of Australian cultural landscape are

a) How might Australian urban park landscape characteristics and management strategies support these activities?
explored. This chapter reviews the literature on Australian landscape history and
mythological notions of ‘bush’ and ‘Arcadia’ in Australian culture and examines their
reflections on art, literature, landscape design, and Australian contemporary urban
park characters.

Chapter Four reviews studies on non-English immigrants’ engagements with
Australian parks. In this chapter I develop a theoretical framework, combining
concepts debated in the reviewed studies. The concepts of habitus and landscape as
cultural phenomena are discussed in the context of urban parks, which builds a
platform for more detailed study of the appreciation and usage of park landscapes
by non-English-speaking immigrants. This chapter introduces approaches
appropriate for investigating park setting and character, and aims to fill a gap in the
literature regarding how park design may influence perception and usage by
immigrants.

Chapter Five presents the methodological approach and research design employed
in the study, which incorporates both qualitative and quantitative analysis. The
methodology involved individual interviews, surveys, and presenting photographs of
urban park spaces in Tehran (Iran) and Melbourne (Australia) to Iranian immigrants,
whose responses were then evaluated by the Q methodology. This chapter also
introduces case studies and develops an interpretation of park-making in two
different contexts based on architectural, ideological, historical, and cultural roots of
the two countries.

Chapter Six analyses the major findings of the research, and outlines the major
themes regarding the relationship between park settings, cultural landscape, and
place meaning. Chapter Seven reports and discusses the results based on the data
drawn from observations, questionnaire, Q methodology, and interviews, and
addresses each of the research questions.

Chapter Eight further elaborates on Iranian cultural landscape as mediated with their
preferences of recreational activities in urban parks, and investigates contemporary
engagement with these spaces in Iran. Furthermore, narratives and evolution of
cultural attitudes of Persian gardens and urban parks are explored. Design
characteristics and new demands of urban life are argued to contribute to the perception of spatial value and preferences of recreational activities of contemporary urban park landscapes among Iranian people.

Chapter Nine further explores the cultural and historical roots of two identified landscape narratives ‘Paradise’ and ‘Arcadia’ - as powerful landscape narratives in eastern and western cultures. Cultural ideologies and systems of beliefs are examined in relation to these landscape narratives. The chapter concludes that landscape myths have the power to affect different aspects of a culture such as literature and art, and can effectively establish new ideas in other cultural settings and landscape architecture.

Chapter Ten summarises the main findings of the research and further elaborates on the question ‘how might Australian urban park landscape characteristics and management strategies support the activities of non-English-speaking immigrants?’ and seeks planning strategies for landscape design in multicultural Australian cities. The limitations of the study are outlined and suggestions for future research are provided.
Chapter Two: Place Meaning

This chapter reviews the main research areas that have contributed to the concept of ‘place meaning’ – planning, psychology, and sociology. It aims to explore the factors that grant meaning to places with a particular focus on immigrants’ perspectives. Using a three-part model of place meaning, the review explores the concept of place in relation to how people value places and behave in them. Further, the review discusses immigrants’ perspectives in terms of ‘insideness’ and ‘outsideness’ and explores to what extent physical, personal, and social environments may influence sense of place. This chapter also discusses Bourdieu’s concept of ‘habitus’ in association with sense of place, and its effect on immigrants’ perceptions of and activities in a new place. Drawing on theories of place and habitus as a sense of place, this chapter examines how these factors may influence creation of place meaning in park landscapes by immigrants. This examination leads to the derivation of ‘place identity’, ‘place attachment’, and ‘sense of belonging’ concepts, which provide a basis for the research questions of the present study and rationale for applying particular research methodologies.

2.1 Place

Since 1970, the concepts of ‘place’ and ‘place meaning’ have been investigated by various academic disciplines such as architecture, geography, urban sociology and planning, and social and environmental psychology. Understanding how the social, physical, and personal environments of a place contribute to its meaning among a group of people is a significant theme for urban planners and architects. In their study of place meaning, anthropologists pay more attention to cultural and symbolic meaning than the physical characteristics of a site. Similarly, sociologists concentrate on places as social settings rather than physical settings. Psychologists, with the exception of environmental psychologists, mostly focus on individual and group experiences of place (Main 2007). Thus, there is still a need for investigation into the influence of culture and the physical characteristics of sites on place meaning especially by architects and planners.
This thesis aims to examine what urban park landscapes mean to people from different cultures, and how they make sense of place through landscape experience. It is thus essential to investigate cultural parameters in relation to engagement with the constructed landscape. Helen Armstrong suggests that ‘an understanding of how places reflect the experience of migration needs to focus on those theoretical areas that address sense of place, belonging, knowing one’s place and the cultural complexity’ (Armstrong 2004, p. 3). There is increasing interest in how sense of place and sense of belonging in new environments can be built in migrant communities. It is argued that the usage of open space for different activities is a reflection of childhood experiences and cultural preferences (Rishbeth 2001).

Place connects the environment to people or groups and plays a role as a ‘repository of collective memory’, and this active relationship can be expressed as a sense of place and belonging. Therefore, ‘the conflation of places and memories is consistent with communitarian particularity, and reinforces the common practice of conceiving of place-based social relations as particularistic’ (Entrikin 1997, p. 264).

While there are key anthropological studies on culture and environment, the literature about how post-war and more recent immigrants appropriate, use, and perceive natural environments is not extensive. For example, do culture and previous experiences of nature affect migrants’ perceptions of nature in their new landscape? In a global world conditioned by mobility, it may be important to understand the factors that affect immigrants’ perception of place and the phenomenon of the sense of belonging as mediated by their approach to nature.

### 2.2 Place Definitions

The definition of ‘place’ in this thesis is: a physical space that is loaded with meanings through personal, group, or cultural processes (Altman & Low 1992, p. 5; Main 2007, p. 8; Milligan 1998, p. 5; Tuan 1977, p. 6). Similarly, Speller defines ‘place’ as: ‘a geographical space that has acquired meaning as a result of a person’s interaction with the space’ (Speller 2000, p. 45). Thus, ‘place’ is a physical space that has been culturally and historically inscribed with meanings and continues to be granted new
meanings by different groups or individuals. Edward Relph examined place in relation to people’s identity of and with place. Identity of place, as stated by Relph, is ‘persistent sameness and unity which allows that [place] to be differentiated from others’ (Relph 1976, p. 45). This persistent identity of a particular place relates to three factors: (1) the physical setting; (2) the meanings that are created by individuals and groups through their experiences and intentions; and (3) the activities and events that take place (Relph 1976). Identity in relation to place, as defined by Relph, refers to more thoroughly understanding places as important centres of our experiences of the environment. Relph addresses this lived intensity of meaning between a person and place through the concept of ‘insideness’ and ‘outsideness’, which is the level of attachment, importance, and involvement that a person or group has for a place (Relph 1976, Tuan 1974, 1977), and describes people’s feeling of being part of a place. Tuan argues ‘sense of place’ and ‘rootedness’ are different concepts, where sense of place is an awareness of a positive feeling towards a place, and rootedness is a feeling of being at home (Hauge 2007; Tuan 1974, 1977).

Insideness is a person’s feeling of a place in which they are safe, enclosed, and comfortable (Relph 1976). Insideness is feeling ‘at home’ in a place, or belonging to it, and greater feelings of insideness indicate stronger identity with that place. In contrast, outsideness represents a lack of connection with a place, and a feeling of strangeness, separation, and isolation, like ‘a traveller might look upon a town from a distance’ (Relph 1976, p. 49). Relph argues that the highest level of sense of place experience is existential insideness, which refers to a deep merging with a place and the experience of home, for instance, in a community and region. On the other hand, existential outsideness is a sense of ‘strangeness and alienation’, like the feeling newcomers experience in an unfamiliar place (Seamon & Sowers 2008, p. 45).

Newcomers, such as immigrants, are likely to experience outsideness in a new place, but how may feelings of insideness be facilitated after migration? Positive affective ties to place have been referred to by numerous expressions, including ‘sense of place’, ‘place attachment’, ‘place identity’, and ‘place dependence’, which cannot easily be separated as they have almost parallel definitions (Hauge 2007). However, the need for conceptual clarity still exists in interdisciplinary works on place
‘Place identity’ can be defined as aspects of identity that are linked to place (Hauge 2007), and can be described as part of self-identity. If self-identity asks the fundamental question ‘Who am I?’ then place identity asks ‘Where am I?’ and ‘Where do I belong?’ (Altman & Low 1992, p. 10; Main 2007, p. 9). As an aspect of place identity theory, there has been increasing interest in the subject of how immigrant communities can make sense of place and sense of belonging to new locations (Macfarlane, Fuller & Jeffries 2000; Rishbeth 2001; Roe 2012, p. 197). However, since immigrants are both placed and unplaced through the process of migration it is important to know which parameters affect immigrants’ sense of place and how they contribute to place making or placelessness.

Places are manifestations of a deeply felt environment by the people who live in them, and to investigate the phenomenon of place it is essential to explore the phenomenon of ‘placelessness’, that is, lacking a sense of place (Relph 1976). Earlier phenomenological perspectives on place considered that modernity and internationalisation create placelessness (Relph 1976). Several scholars argue that internationalisation causes places to become increasingly irrelevant and personal relationships to places and to other persons become less stable (Gustafson 2001). Others argue that globalisation brings localisation (Beck & Camiller 2000; Massey & Jess 1995; Robertson 1995; Robertson & Khondker 1998), and how people relate to places – mobility/cosmopolitanism or immobility/localism – is an important expression of social stratification (Albrow 1997; Bauman 1998; Castells 1996; Gustafson 2001, p. 5; Hannerz 2001). These arguments highlight the importance of understanding the roles and meanings of places in the everyday lives of people, and connections to place by newcomers.

2.3 Three-part Classification of Place in Main Research Areas

The attribution of meaning to places has been extensively researched. Relph identifies the variety of ways in which places are experienced, and defines three components of place: physical settings, meanings, and activities. Among these components, meaning is the most difficult to clarify (Gustafson 2001; Tuan 1977). Canter (1977) identified a similar three-part model of place from a psychological
perspective, in which place is a result of the relationship between action, conception, and physical attributes, and claims that the impacts of physical attributes on psychological and behavioural processes need more consideration. Given that places are conceptualised differently by individuals it is essential to consider the varying perspective of users in the place (Canter 1977; Gustafson 2001, p. 6). Similarly, Canter approached place as a psychological concept and developed a more complex ‘facet theory’ with four interrelated facets of place: (1) functional differentiation (i.e. various activities undertaken), (2) objectives (i.e. individual, social, and cultural aspects of place experiences), (3) design (i.e. physical characteristics of place), and (4) scale of interaction (i.e. the importance of environmental scale), with a number of sub-categories in each facet (Canter 1997; Gustafson 2001, p. 6).

There are important resemblances in the theoretical place models of Relph and Canter, both of them identifying the ‘basic elements’ or ‘constituents’ of place. Relph values the authenticity and particularity of specific places as a phenomenologically oriented humanistic geography, while Canter sees place as a ‘technical term’ and considers Relph’s definition of place to be ‘romantic’ (Canter 1988; Gustafson 2001). In accordance with both models, to clarify the term ‘place’ and broaden its relevance across disciplines, it is essential to examine the various properties of place, including physical aspects (i.e. location, settings, and design ideology) and human aspects (i.e. culture, beliefs, social traditions, and personal involvements), and the way these influence each other.

Gustafson suggests a framework for analysing what makes places meaningful, considering the relationship between theoretical conceptualisations of place, people’s everyday experiences, and notions of place (Gustafson 2001). He investigated place-related theories, and found that meanings of place can be categorised into three groups – self, others, and the environment (see Figure 2-1) with a number of basic dimensions and sub-meanings between these three poles. He suggests that this analytical framework can support empirical and theoretical discussions relating to meanings of place in contemporary life (Gustafson 2001). Figure 2-1 illustrates the broad themes and wide range of meanings of place attributed by the respondents in Gustafson’s study. Gustafson states that it is
important to consider the relationships between the three poles, as the meaning of place may be situated there. His study argues that to investigate the meanings of places for different users in society it is essential to consider the physical setting and location of places, the social relationships and self-thoughts or imaginations of place in this setting, and the relationship between these dimensions.

![Diagram](image.png)

**Figure 2-1: Meanings of place spontaneously attributed by respondents (Gustafson, 2001)**

### 2.4 Different Approaches to Place

To investigate the various perspectives of place and people–environment relationships, there are different approaches to considering place. These approaches comprise: 1- physical and planning approaches, which explore physical aspects of places and the ways they might be evaluated by users to result in place identity; 2- psychological approaches, which focus on emotional, cultural, and affective bonds between individuals and places, and specific personal relationships that lead to place
identity and attachment; and 3- social and activity-based approaches, which investigate how people act in places, and how the concept of belonging as a product of performativity enables individuals to grant meaning to places, causing identification with place. These three intertwined approaches provide a bedrock for proposing research questions and applying research methodologies in the present thesis.

2.4.1 Physical and Planning Approaches

Urban planners, environmental designers, environmental psychologists, and architects consider the role of the physical environment in individuals’ lives (Appleyard 1981; Kunstler 1996; Main 2007). Some sites are considered to have a higher ‘sense of place’ than others (Main 2007, p. 22; Milligan 1998, p. 5). This is due to the values that various individuals find in place, which not only includes physical aspects of place but also cultural, personal, and social meaning, connotations and memories. Some planners and architects link the design and meaning of places directly, and many urban planners have a complex understanding of place meaning. Furthermore, while the concepts of ‘sense of place’, ‘place attachment’, ‘place dependence’, and ‘place identity’ have been broadly defined, the dimensions of people’s emotional relationships to places suggested by these definitions have not been fully examined (Main 2007; Manzo 2003, p. 47). Research on people’s relationship with places, especially in multicultural contexts, has grown dramatically in recent years (Aner 2014; Byrne, Goodall & Cadzow 2013; Daukste-Silasproģe 2013; Goodall 2012; Mazumdar & Mazumdar 2012; Roe 2012; Ryan 2015). Yet, there is a need for more research on people’s feelings and perceptions of place. In doing so, it is essential to first outline the theories on place to achieve an understanding of how people make places out of different spaces, and what factors influence this process of place-making and their sense of place.

Relationships to place include a wide range of physical settings and emotions, and are ever-changing and dynamic. These relationships are both conscious and unconscious. For instance, we may be attached to places in which we feel comfortable and secure on an unconscious level because these are usually places
with which we are very familiar. Relationships to place also exist within a larger socio-political domain. People choose environments and places that are more congruent with their self-concept, finding and modifying settings to better represent their sense of self (Hormuth 1990; Twigger-Ross & Uzzell 1996). In fact, ‘relationships to places can be a means through which we consciously express our worldview and explore our evolving identity’ (Manzo 2003, p. 53). People interact with the world around them and choose where to live consciously based on their needs and self-concept and, thus, they are active shapers of their environments (Manzo 2003). Given that associations between people and place can occur both consciously, through interactions with others and the physical environment, and unconsciously, through developing self-concept (Manzo 2003, p. 57; Proshansky, Fabian & Kaminoff 1983), it is essential to gain a better understanding of the developmental processes behind forming emotional relationships with places (Manzo 2003, p. 57). Furthermore, favourite places have been found to afford restorative experiences that lead to emotional self-regulation, which is integral to the development of place identity. Environmental self-regulation provides a foundation for understanding restorative person–environment interactions and links restorative environment research with research on place identity (Korpela & Hartig 1996).

The literature on people’s relationships with nature shows that people seek out meaningful places (Bragg 1996; Fishwick & Vining 1992; Fredrickson & Anderson 1999; Hartig, Mang & Evans 1991; Kaplan & Kaplan 1989). These meaningful places can disconnect them from the concerns that they may have in their lives, and generate a sense of restoration and relaxation. Studies on the restorative effects of natural environments illustrate that contact with natural settings can improve self-esteem and sense of competence. Similarly, nature is often used as a temporary escape from people’s daily routines and can reduce mental fatigue (Hartig, Mang & Evans 1991). Research on people’s relationship with nature and public spaces indicates that these places are important and can change our self-concept, and even be a source of spiritual inspiration (Manzo 2003).

This thesis examines how experiences in favourite aesthetic places in urban parks might result in place identity for Iranian immigrants as a representative of non-
English immigrants. Their subjective viewpoints and preferences of aesthetic landscape settings in urban parks will be investigated. The present study also aims to explore which characteristics or features of urban park landscapes may contribute to creating favourite aesthetic places and lead to place identity.

Figure 2-2: The relationship between favourite aesthetic places in urban parks and place identity

The identity of a place is the special character that distinguishes it from other places, and reflects its cultural origins and heritage (Butina-Watson & Bentley 2007). The emotional significance of the physical environment is one of the considerable debates in place-associated research (Main 2007, p. 36). Cultural identity can be linked to place, either through notions of local culture or calculated constructions of national identity (Massey & Jess 1995). Place identities are often contested with the changing meanings of place across different groups, and are the result of battles over rival interpretations of the past - according to social, economic, cultural, or environmental factors - and the future. However, cultural identities may be stabilised by places and they can give them different concepts such as ‘home’, the ‘imagined origin’ and a place to ‘return to’ (Anderson 2006). Place identity has been conceptualised as ‘the cognitive connection between the self and the physical environment’ (Kyle, Graefe & Manning 2005, p. 155). According to Proshansky (1978), place identity is defined as ‘those dimensions of self that define the individual’s personal identity in relation to the physical environment by means of a complex pattern of conscious and unconscious ideals, beliefs, preferences, feelings, values, goals, and behavioural tendencies and skills relevant to this environment’ (Proshansky 1978, p. 155). From this perspective, physical settings provide an opportunity for individuals to express and affirm their identity (Kyle, Graefe & Manning 2005, p. 155).
2.4.2 Psychological Approaches

In the past few decades, psychological interpretations have been a prominent source of place attachment research. The role of place in the development of self-identity is one of the most important explanations for place attachment in the psychology literature (Chawla 1992; Cooper Marcus 1992; Main 2007, p. 17; Proshansky, Fabian & Kaminoff 1983). In traditional psychology, ‘self-identity’ refers to the concept of personal beliefs, interpretations, and evaluations regarding self, which develops through individual and social processes involving assimilation of beliefs, rules, and values (Main 2007, p. 18; Proshansky, Fabian & Kaminoff 1983, p. 58). Developing a cultural identity is complex in contemporary societies, and may be even more complicated for members of minority groups (Phinney, Lochner & Murphy 1990; Spencer & Markstrom-Adams 1990). Forging an identity in a minority ethnic group requires balancing background influences with immersion in a new culture and a new place.

Scholars have described the concept of place attachment as a phenomenon of human–place bonding, and label it with a number of terms, such as the aforementioned ‘sense of place’, ‘rootedness’, and ‘insideness’. Most of the conceptualisations base these concepts on affect, emotion, and feeling (Kyle, Graefe & Manning 2005, p. 155; Low & Altman 1992). Low and Altman also note that these emotional qualities are supported by cognition (i.e. thought, knowledge, and belief) and practice (i.e. action and behaviour). Therefore, place attachment is an interplay between emotions and affect, beliefs and knowledge, and actions and behaviours (Kyle, Graefe & Manning 2005, p. 155).

An emotional and affective bond between a place and an individual varies in intensity from immediate sensory delight to deeply rooted attachment (Tuan 1974). Thus, places can be perceived differently by their users depending on the kinds of ideals and values they bring to them, and their rootedness in the place. Considering migration as a significant issue in sense of place, some immigrants need to ‘renew their ties to place’ to achieve sustainability, and ‘reconnect with that place they call home’ (Hay 1998, p. 264).
The development of feelings towards a familiar place is defined as ‘place attachment’ (Kyle, Graefe & Manning 2005, p. 155; Milligan 1998; Relph 1976; Tuan 1980) 2005, p. 155; Milligan 1998; Relph 1976; Tuan 1980). It is theoretically and empirically difficult to separate concepts like ‘place attachment’, ‘place identity’, and ‘place identification’ (Hauge 2007; Speller 2000). Moreover, constructing each of them can affect developing another. Nonetheless, the effect of place on identity can be seen as the result of ‘a holistic and reciprocal interaction between people and their physical environment’ (Hauge 2007, p. 45).

Analysis of place attachment has been studied in various disciplines including human geography, environmental psychology, community sociology, and urban planning; however, place dependence and place identity have been primarily investigated in the environmental psychology literature (Williams et al. 1992, p. 31). The concept of place-dependence has been described as a kind of attachment related to the potentials of a particular place in terms of satisfying and supporting the needs and goals of an individual in comparison with other similar available settings (Stokols & Shumaker 1981; Williams et al. 1992, p. 31). Place identity is a process of ‘environmental self-regulation’ in which the environment plays an important role in regulating social interaction as well as creating and maintaining one’s self. The physical environment in this sense is momentous for the individual (Korpela 1989, p. 244). Thus, a place can be a resource for satisfying behavioural or experiential goals, and also an essential part of one’s self that results in strong emotional attachment (Williams et al. 1992, p. 32). In this approach, place identity refers to both social and personal aspects of place, and place attachment is the result of satisfying needs and goals in a place together with specific personal relationships.

The built environment can communicate qualities of the self, such as social rank and moral reputation (Rapaport 1982; Relph 1976). Studies have demonstrated that the physical world such as buildings, artefacts, and other material objects maintain ‘social memories’ (Main 2007, p. 36; Zerubavel 1996), and signify history, relationships, current practices, and goals (Main 2007, p. 36; Rochberg-Halton 1986, p. 91). The physical world can also assist to make distinctions between self and group, and
contribute to connect the common social past and social identity while providing a way to establish past interactions (Main 2007, p. 36; Milligan 1998).

More recently, Finch (2015) explores poetics of place inspired by human geographers and philosophers such as Doreen Massey and Tim Cresswell who have as he believes, reshaped the concept, removing its associations with fixity and various sorts of conservatism. Finch argues that Massey considers place as something not tied to ‘coherent and homogenous’ identities about ‘time-space compression’ (Finch 2015, p. 9; Massey 1994, p. 146). However, Cresswell and more especially Malpas suggest ways of conceptualising the specific difference between inner and outer worlds, or place and its negation. Malpas develops Heidegger’s concentration on place found in his later essays and lectures and asserts that, ‘place refers us, first, to that underlying structure of placedness that is essential to our being as human’ (Finch 2015, p. 9; Malpas 2012, p. 63).

Drawing on the above theories and considering the role of culture and the physical environment in inspiring meaning for immigrants, this thesis examines how meaningful places in urban park environments may contribute to place attachment for Iranian respondents. It also considers which characteristics of the physical environment in urban park landscapes may stimulate the nature of the self, and produce meaning and personal or cultural relationships, in both contexts. Memories and past experiences of park landscapes are examined to seek their relationships with the perception and preferred usage of park spaces after migration. It seeks to address the question ‘how do Iranian immigrants’ personal engagements with park landscapes generate an emotional attachment that results in place attachment?’

---

**Figure 2-3:** The relationship between physical environments that reveal the nature of the self and place attachment
2.4.3 Social and Activity-Based Approaches

Social and cultural approaches to understanding place meaning have enhanced consideration of the symbolic role of places (Altman & Low 1992). Place attachment is a symbolic relationship shaped through shared emotional and affective cultural meanings in a particular space, which creates roots for the personal and group understanding of and relationship with the place (Low 1992, p. 165). Sociological factors also influence place meaning and attachment, such as age, gender, and ethnicity. Research shows that attachment increases with age (Brown & Perkins 1992; Goudy 1982; Main 2007, p. 11; Sampson 1988), and women seem to form greater attachment to places than men (Brown & Perkins 1992; Main 2007, p. 11). The attachment to a place is partly the result of how people act with each other within that place (Pellow 1992, p. 189).

According to Casey (1993), social structures and cultural practices are the fundamental aspects of a place and the lived body is also derived of social and cultural processes (Casey 1993; Escobar 2001, p. 143). From an anthropological perspective, as cultures are carried into places by bodies, emplacement of all cultural practices must be highlighted. Thus, it is necessary to consider all cultural practices valued by different groups of people, together with their expectations and preferences. One of the interesting questions that arises through this approach is, ‘how can notions of attachment and belonging be mobilised to construct individual and collective identities?’ (Escobar 2001, p. 149; Lovell 1998).

According to Doreen Massey, ‘the global can be found in, and is part of the local’, which means places are no longer separate and bounded entities; rather they are interlinked and open. Places all over the world are not just used or perceived by the local people, but also by other users (Massey 1994). Massey argues that place is a process that the outside environment produces it in various ways for different individuals, inclusive of various identities and histories. Specific attributes of a place are no longer locally determined, rather they are made by social processes and people’s interactions with that place (Cresswell 2004, p. 74; Gielis 2009, p. 277). Therefore, it is essential to rethink the concept of place in the new globalised world.
and particularly in multicultural contexts, rather than focusing on traditional notions of place.

Massey’s concept of ‘global sense of place’ highlights the importance of ‘rejecting false nostalgia for pre-modern singular and coherent places, and embracing instead the culturally multiple, dynamic and connective aspects of place in a globalising world’ (Massey 1994, p. 149; Mendoza & Morén-Alegret 2013, p. 763). Mendoza et al. (2012) asserts that although the discussion of ‘place’ and ‘sense of place’ has been very widespread in geography since the mid-1970s, there is a gap in the academic literature in reflection regarding methods for studying the relationship between ‘place’ and migration. Methodological difficulties in capturing and evaluating the relevance of ‘place’ for migration processes have been assigned as a major reason for this failure (Mendoza & Morén-Alegret 2013).

Armstrong proposes the phenomenon of ‘belonging’ as a way to think about the notion of place, and suggests this is particularly relevant to migration studies (Armstrong 2004, p. 4). Bourdieu puts more emphasis on actions, and argues that place meaning is constructed through activities. He introduces the concept of ‘habitus’ as ‘a sense of one’s (and others’) place and role in the world of one’s lived environment’ (Hiller & Rooksby 2002b, p. 5). Bourdieu believes that habitus is an open concept, because actors’ dispositions are constantly subjected to a range of experiences. ‘The dispositions that comprise habitus may be affected by these experiences in terms of being either reinforced or modified’ (Hiller & Rooksby 2002b, p. 6).

Leach (2002) sketches a framework for a tentative theory of identification with space by bringing together three theoretical models: a theory of how we ‘territorialise’ and make sense of place through a process of narrativisation, how a sense of belonging to that space is achieved through ‘performativities’, and how eventual identification with a particular space is built thorough a series of ‘mirrorings’. The concept of belonging as a product of performativity enables us to go beyond the limitations of narrative, by giving meaning to the environment in accordance to collective and individual behaviour. Identification in an architectural environment takes place
through an equivalent process of ‘mirroring’. This process is dependent on the ‘interjection’ of the external world into the self, and the ‘projection’ of the self onto the external world in a way that the one ‘reflects’ the other (Leach 2002).

In order to investigate this process of identification with space, particularly after migration, this thesis questions which characteristics of the physical environment in park landscapes may encourage social and recreational practices and foster a sense of belonging? What sort of recreational activities are preferred by Iranian users? And why? To address these questions, a broad range of cultural, historical, and ideological investigations of Persian attitudes towards nature and their contemporary use of urban parks will also be undertaken (see Chapter Eight).

![Figure 2-4: The relationship between social and recreational practices in place and sense of belonging](image)

### 2.5 Habitus and Sense of Place

The concept of ‘habitus’ was introduced in 1977 by Bourdieu, a French social philosopher, who argues that the structures constitutive of a particular type of environment generate habitus, ‘systems of durable, transposable dispositions’ (Bourdieu 1977, p. 72). These structures are the product of past conditions in which habitus was created among members of a community (Ryan 2015). Bourdieu’s concept of habitus has been interpreted by numerous scholars. In his study of landscape archaeology, Johnson (2007) demonstrates that actions of individuals with the same cultural background or structure connect to Bourdieu’s concept of habitus, and defines practice as the ‘way in which abstract structures and norms of “culture” are translated into actions on the ground’ (Johnson 2007, p. 142).
Drawing on Bourdieu’s theory in association with the relationship between structure (i.e. non-human aspects of place) and agent (i.e. human aspects of place), the social practice of individuals cannot be fully determined by structures, while practice is not separate or free from structures. Instead, agents and structures are interwoven and mutually constitutive through practices (Aner 2014). Aner (2014) relates habitus to the concept of sense of place in order to develop an understanding of the motives into which sense of place is integrated. Place experience and attachment are intimately associated with people’s life stories and the way people make use of past experiences of place to orient themselves in the present. Aner’s study argues that the musings of early human geographers such as Relph and Tuan on sense of place can be related to the perspectives of Bourdieu on social practice.

In the light of the association of place with habitus and identity, Savage et al. (2005) argue that people feel comfortable when there is correspondence between habitus and the place they live in. As places are dynamic, relational mobility leads to a greater variety in places of importance in people’s lives, and therefore they may feel at home not in only one, but in several places (Savage, Bagnall & Longhurst 2005).

This thesis highlights immigrants’ efforts to maintain continuity with the place of origin in the context of urban parks and the fusion or transnationalisation of two places: here and there. It examines the processes by which Iranian immigrants’ belonging is built or reinforced through activities in and perceptions of urban park spaces and their specific social and spatial meanings.

Bourdieu’s framework is drawn on here to explain why people choose a specific landscape scene, and how belonging is generated by the relationship between habitus and field, which is always in process (Benson 2014). This thesis highlights that although habitus is a process that is mutable and adaptable (Bourdieu 1977; Bourdieu 1992), but for the first generation of immigrants place meaning in urban park landscapes is mainly structured by users’ habitus and past experiences of these spaces.
2.6 Landscape and Identity

Landscape is a physical area visible from a particular location which has the power to actively (re)produce relationships among people and between people and their material world – and become a ‘place’. Landscapes carry symbolic or ideological meanings that reflect back and help (re)produce or challenge social identities and social practices (Morin 2009). Landscape is mediated by symbols and imagery that impact on the spatial practices of everyday life, and the symbolic landscape is a manifestation of myths and legends, which remain a powerful means of allocating space (Merrifield 1993, p. 526). How the physical landscape may produce a sense of place and how it influences community culture or vice versa are crucial questions in relation to place in geographical and urban studies. The best model of sense of place, place attachment, and satisfaction links the attributes of the environment with characteristic experiences (Stedman 2003).

In Australia, national parks are usually large areas of land with unspoilt landscapes and a diverse number of native plants and animals, where no commercial activities such as farming are allowed and human activity is strictly monitored (Australian Government 2015). In contrast, the term ‘urban park’ means large green spaces within the urban environment that are mainly designed based on cultural heritage values which contribute to their overall identity. Both national and urban parks are considered as public places associated with nature and leisure activities. Nature in this thesis is a geographical concept that contains human history, which changes over time and varies from place to place (Ginn & Demeritt 2009). A public place facilitates people's needs and expectations, protects their rights, and offers people a variety of meanings to attach to the place. Accordingly a public landscape is a public space which is ‘accessible to everyone, where anyone can participate and witness, in entering the public one always risks encounter with those who are different, those who identify with different groups and have different opinions or different forms of life’ (Iveson 1998, p. 28; Young 1990, pp. 239-40).

The term garden however means ‘a piece of ground fenced off from cattle and appropriated to the use and pleasure of man: it is, or ought to be, cultivated’ (Repton
Garden-making began in West Asia then spread eastward and westward representing ideas about nature (Turner 2005), and in most cases gardens were private or semi-private environments. The term ‘garden’ in the present thesis refers to: 1- urban botanic gardens as cultural landscapes that are mostly used for scientific study of collected, growing plants, public exhibition, and public recreation, especially in Australia; 2- historical gardens, which are highly interwoven with cultural identities; 3- suburban home gardens.

Garden-making was one of the earliest activities undertaken by new arrivals to Australia, and is considered as an act of both memory and re-settlement. However, it did not begin with the arrival of Europeans; Aboriginal land management had already shaped the landscape, which was perceived by the colonists as ‘wildernesses’. Wilderness, here defines as a culturally and historically expression of a certain colonialist’s way of seeing nature (Ginn & Demeritt 2009). Garden-making also provides the circumstances for building complex cultural identities through the interaction between past and present places. Non-Anglo immigrants’ gardens are important in the study of the history of migration to Australia, and have functioned as a way for immigrants to belong to (white) Australian culture (Holmes, Martin & Mirmohamadi 2008). Since new immigrants in Australia seek places for symbols of their homeland, gardens have frequently differed from what urban planners and architects had schemed (Graham & Connell 2006; Morgan, Rocha & Poynting 2005). This is due to cultural differences between immigrants and Anglo-Australians, which result in creating places that mediated with culture and past experiences by immigrants in order to obtain a sense of belonging in a new environment.

Nevertheless, the process of non-English-speaking immigrants producing a sense of belonging may be different in the context of parks as public spaces, which is the focus of this thesis. Although there are fewer chances to interfere in the physical arrangement of public spaces in comparison with the private ones, the meaning and expectations of ‘parks’ may be different in various cultures. Furthermore, since, urban parks have both restorative qualities attributed by nature and recreational facilities; they can be used for various purposes. Considering the wide range of
activities urban parks can provide, it is crucial to know various purposes of park visiting in order to increase park usage.

Reviewing studies of place - the three-part approaches to the notion of place – and habitus as a sense of place resulted in extracting concepts of ‘place identity’, ‘place attachment’, and ‘sense of belonging’. It also led to the argument that ‘the first generation of immigrants may engage in a process of place making in urban park landscapes structured by their habitus and past experiences of these spaces’. In order to examine how these notions are interpreted by immigrants and what are their expectations of urban parks and why, the research questions and the methodology of the present research draw upon these concepts. Accordingly, the methodology contributes to investigating sense of place associated with existence of meaningful places in urban parks based on the following components:

a) Place identity: favorite aesthetic attributes of urban parks
b) Place attachment: personal and cultural meanings of place and emotional attachments to park landscapes
c) Sense of belonging: social and recreational practices in park landscapes structured by user’s habitus and past experiences

Considering the multi-contextual (Australia and Iran) nature of this thesis, a range of qualitative and quantitative methods are applied to address: 1- How experiences in favourite aesthetic places in urban park landscapes might be evaluated by Iranian users, and result in place identity? 2- How do personal and cultural meanings of place in urban park environments contribute to place attachment for Iranian migrants? 3- Which characteristics of the physical environment in park landscapes may encourage social and recreational practices and foster a sense of belonging? And what sort of recreational activities are preferred by Iranian users? And why?

2.7 Cultural Factors Contributing to Landscape Identity in Iran and Australia

Attitudes towards ‘nature’ have been addressed by a range of geographers and landscape historians, ethno-historians, ecological anthropologists and landscape historians.
planners since the beginning of this century (Bauer, Wallner & Hunziker 2009; Bhatti & Church 2004; Cooper 2006; Gobster 2001; Hayes & Marangudakis 2001; Hunt 2011; Sherrod 2006; Silbernagel 2005). As this area of study becomes internationalised, there are increasing overlaps and parallel developments. Certain national traditions have also been detected during the formative years of environmental history (Coates 1998) to investigate how individuals -based on their cultural background, find value in natural environments and what they do in these spaces.

One of the fundamental ways that people shape and make sense of experience and landscape is ‘narrative’. Narratives offer ways of shaping landscapes and contribute to the formal concerns of design. Thus, it is essential to ask: ‘what systems of belief are established through stories? And how does one sort out the many layered (personal, ethnic, regional), multiple, and often contested, stories of a place?’ (Potteiger & Purinton 1998, p. 3). Every narrative, even the personal, plays an important role in making places. Spatial narratives, unlike verbal narratives, are a silent but persistent expression (Potteiger & Purinton 1998).

‘Eden’ has a strong narrative role in human history and has been referenced, as inspiration, source, and metaphor, in natural landscape design and cultivated gardens in both the east and west. While the desire for a perfect and eternal garden was common in different cultures, there are various and particular perceptions and imaginations that arise from the ancient narratives (see Chapter Nine). Since the desire for Eden never disappeared, humanity’s attempts to define perfection throughout history have resulted in attempts to create Edenic gardens on earth. The east and west had various experiences, in relation to creating and enjoying these earthly Edens, which resulted in establishing two significant concepts of garden: ‘Paradise’ and ‘Arcadia’ (see Chapter Nine).

The economy of Arcadia was largely pastoral, and was known for its streams and springs, its forests, and its fine sheep. The notion of Arcadia as a rural idyll has influenced west attitudes to nature and landscape identity (see Chapter Three). Paradise, on the other hand, describes the pleasure parks of the Persian nobility from the Old Persian word *pairidaeza*, which means enclosed by a wall (Eisenberg 1998).
The Persian garden is one of the symbolic forms of creating the paradise version of Eden, and historically a reference for landscape design. It is a walled garden in forms of squares and rectangles as a geometric framework, with two channels of water. These gardens were usually places for contemplation, philosophising, relaxation, and gathering and have influenced park design in Iran in various ways (see Chapter Eight). ‘Paradise’ and ‘Arcadia’ as two powerful landscape narratives have impacted park characteristics, the former in Iran and the latter in Australia, and contrast each other both in terms of the design and people’s understanding of park landscapes (see Chapters Eight and Nine).

The next two chapters aim to obtain an understanding of Australian cultural landscape and the ways it is interpreted by various users (i.e. insiders and outsiders). Chapter Three investigates the Australian context in relation to: cultural landscape, landscape myths, and Anglo-Australians’ attitudes towards nature; and their influences on Australian park characteristics. Studies on immigrants’ usage and understanding of park landscapes in Australia will be reviewed in Chapter Four to investigate how park spaces are perceived and used by non-English-speaking users.
Chapter Three: Australian Mythical Landscape and Its Role in a Multi-Cultural Society

To understand how newcomers and established immigrants perceive cultural landscapes that have been imbued with a nationality’s cultural and mythical meanings, it is crucial to begin by exploring the landscape myths and natural values of that nationality and their roots. Examining whether immigrants perceive or prefer those values requires a wider understanding of immigrants’ culture, values, nature activities and preferences. This chapter analyses Australian cultural landscape and nature myths, and their reflections on the written and artistic interpretations of landscape. It examines the mythology surrounding the ‘bush’ and ‘Arcadia’ and how these are intrinsic to Anglo-Australian consideration of natural landscapes, landscape design, and, urban park character in Australia. These characteristics, along with the influence of the English picturesque and the existence of wide open spaces, have resulted in landscapes that illustrate the aesthetic of nature and well facilitate sporting activities. However, how are these landscapes, which are culturally meaningful for insiders, perceived by new comers? And what are non-English immigrants’ expectations of urban park environments? In this chapter and also the next chapter, the following question is considered: ‘how do landscape characteristics and settings, which have roots in Anglo-Celtic culture and ideology, respond to the new patterns of demand for recreation in multicultural Australian society?’

3.1 Landscape Myths and National Identity

Myths are messages passed through time and generations, which are used and reused. They embody people’s values and influence their way of perceiving reality, and subsequently guide their behaviour (Short 1991). In this sense, myths contain varying degrees of fiction and reality, although they may be claimed to have taken place in time. National myths are usually defined by events that have taken place in a specific country and among a particular community. John Rennie Short (1991) identified the major sets of myths and values of the wilderness, country, and city in
his book *Imagined Country*. He notes that to establish and maintain a national identity, it is essential to consider social ideas about the physical environment, including national environmental ideologies and associated mythologies.

Short (1991) argues that urban myths are based on the urban hierarchy. In western culture, the view that cities are the setting for civilised life has its roots in the classical world, in which the city represented the unit of social and political organisation. In contrast, western attitudes towards the countryside from ancient times to the present have been shaped by the term ‘pastoral’, which means ‘pertaining to shepherds’ (Short 1991, p. 30). Theocritus, born in Sicily between 300 and 310 BC, is recognised as the originator of the western pastoral tradition, whose idylls recalled his youth on the island of Kos. The term ‘idyll’ is now used to refer to an idealised scenery of the countryside, and a symbol for a lost youth, memory, and imagination. Nostalgia in western culture is the basis of the role of countryside in national identity, it also becomes the image of the country while the term ‘country’ is indicative of rural land and native land (Short 1991). In ancient Greek mythology Arcadia was considered to be a utopian wilderness, inhabited by the god Pan and other spirits, but was also a vision of pastoralism and harmony with nature.

When the British arrived to establish a colony in Australia in 1788, they saw a wilderness that required transformation. Therefore, in Australia, for instance, national histories include different stories of creating a country from the forests and grasslands, and this modification of the wilderness has a specific place in Australian identity. The arrival of Europeans and the superimposition of white economic and cultural power was the end of the dominance of Aboriginal environmental ideology in Australia (Short 1991). Since colonisation, there have been two competing environmental ideologies in Australia: white Australian culture that involves the commodification of resources, and the mode of perception and resource evaluation of Aboriginal people. Indigenous relationships with the land are described as ‘ontological belonging’ (Dudgeon et al. 2010, p. 33). Their spiritual beliefs connect them with the land and to all natural things, which means they preserve nature intact and experience the land as a symbolic and spiritual landscape rather than only a physical environment (Dudgeon et al. 2010).
The English settlers overlooked the Indigenous history and mythology of the natural landscapes, and even in the present time Australians have only a limited understanding of the intricate comprehension of the landscape possessed by their country’s first inhabitants. Misconceptions about the environment at the time of British colonisation led to an understanding that the land of ‘droughts and flooding rains’ had always been an untamed wilderness. While the country’s traditional owners were predominantly hunters and gatherers, in fact, they had been modifying the landscape for their own purposes for tens of thousands of years. Due to these misconceptions and their prior appreciation of landscape aesthetics, early colonial painters distorted their view of the Australian landscape with a veneer of romantic and nostalgic images of English landscapes (Murphy 2015).

3.2 Anglo-Australian Landscape Myths

The Anglo-Australian colonists were more interested in reshaping the land than understanding it, and throughout the 19th century sought to make Australia a new England in the South Seas (Dunlap 1993). From the mid-19th century, the view of Australia as a Garden of Eden was developed both in Australia and in Britain. Carol Lansbury (1970) demonstrates how the myth of a happy rural life in England was transferred to Australia by writers such as Charles Dickens and Charles Reade (Lansbury 1970). Thus, Australia became the lost Arcadia for many Britons and Americans (Short 1991). Arcadian imagery was brought to Australia by some of the early colonists who saw resemblances in eastern Australia, which had been prepared by the Indigenous people (Seddon 2006). About 150,000 people migrated to Australia from Britain between 1830 and 1850, and they were not only recipients of the Arcadia myth, but also effective propagators. In the 1860s, this rural model was replaced by the symbol of the yeoman farmer in public debate, and emphasis was placed on individual farming families rather than rural society (Short 1991).

The Arcadian setting has been romanticised in Australian culture and literature, along with associated values and behaviours (Seddon 2006). A set of correlated myths and attitudes, including the golden age Edenic view and the pastoral imagery projected by the church, have played a significant role in dictating a particular form of land use
in Australia. However, Dunlap (1993) identifies efforts to redefine national mythology and justify the new nation after Federation in 1901, arguing that Anglo-Australians found mythical material in the ‘bush’, and the Australian natural environment became a matter of national pride. Stories of nature were established in an attempt to relate on an emotional level with the Australian landscape as ‘home’. However, this process was involved with applying some changes to the landscape they had found in order to conflate their origins and Australian landscape as an imagined Arcadia. These changes not only include forming and modifying natural landscapes but also importing trees and some other plants by early settlers.

### 3.3 The ‘Bush’ and ‘Arcadia’ in Australian Cultural Landscape

In Australia, the environmental ideology of the ‘bush’ is a counterpoint to urban life and symbolises the power of nature. The term ‘bush’ has been used from the 19th century in Australia and means ‘everything beyond urban limits’, and thus is at times viewed as hostile (Taylor 1992). It is still widely used in everyday speech and can also mean a ‘wilderness of natural eucalypt forest and woodland’ (Taylor 1992b, p. 128). This relationship between landscape and society reflects the 19th century view that the bush represents hard-working life away from the city, where workers could be free from the urban working conditions of industrial Britain. As part of the Australian landscape narrative in relation to the bush myth, it may still persist among many Australians.

The concept of the bush in this thesis refers to the natural and pastoral characteristics of the landscape and does not include the Australian gothic in relation to a menacing view of the bush. However, Arcadia is an idealised version of the bush that refers to a harmony with nature and an idyllic wilderness, which considered as a lost Eden.

The ‘bush’ served as inspiration for many Australian poets, novelists, and short story writers in the 19th century and early 20th century. Notions of nostalgia, including English writers mourning the loss of the English ‘Arcadia’ and a vanished frontier were very popular in rural Australia in the late 19th century. Writers also started to claim that people in the bush were far happier than in urban spaces, describing the value
of rural life, which contrasted with the way the city robbed people of their usefulness and sense of equality. The incorporation of the bush involved not only the introduction of new forms of industrialisation, but also indicated that country characteristics can be still visible in the city (Waterhouse 2000).

By establishing cultural ownership of the landscape in the 19th century, the Indigenous people were effectively removed. In creating landscapes, the European artistic conventions were used in western scientific terms and did not consider the place meanings the Indigenous owners had bestowed on the land (Fox & Phipps 1994; Verrocchio 2001, p. 159). This meaning of the land, or the ‘authentic environment’, is not a condition of the physical world, but is a situation of connectedness with the world. Authenticity here is the very source from which meaning is gained, and cannot be created through the manipulation of form (Dovey 1985).

In the 20th century, a simpler conception of the bush replaced the complex, 19th-century understandings. Nostalgic celebration of the bush among urban dwellers emphasised the progress and prosperity that rural Australia had brought to the nation. Moreover, transformations in rural and urban Australia altered the representations of Aboriginal people and Europeans who lived and worked in the bush (Waterhouse 2000). Ken Taylor examined the Australian traditions of the rural vernacular, the bush, and attitudes towards landscape among British Anglo-Saxon Australians and found a deep attachment to an Australian sense of place. Underlying much of the nostalgia for the past, particularly the white European past, has its roots in the British settlement of Australia as a penal colony and then as a rural Arcadia for free immigrants (Taylor 1992b).

3.4 Reflections of the Myths in Painting and Writing

Australian attitudes towards country have been widely depicted by painters and artists. Landscape paintings include romantic wildernesses, pastoral idylls, bush legends, and rural mythology (Taylor 1992b, p. 133). Many of the images by Australian artists in the late 19th century represented pastoral landscapes – ‘blazing sun’, ‘heat’, ‘blonde pastures’, and ‘heroic workers’ (Thomas 1976, p. 159). Arcadia is
a timeless theme in art as an agricultural paradise of nymphs and shepherds, in the pre-classical golden age. Art historian Bernard Smith summarises the significant role of art in the Australian landscape:

For Europeans this country has always been a primordial and curious land. To the ancients the antipodes was a kind of nether world; to the people of the Middle Ages its forms of life were monstrous; and for us, European by heritage (but not by birth) much of this strangeness lingers. It is natural therefore that we should see and experience nature differently in some degree from the artists of the northern hemisphere. We live in a young society still making its myths. The emergence of myth is a continuous social activity. In the growth and transformation of its myths a society achieves its own sense of identity. In this process the artist may play a creative and liberating role (Smith 1976a, p. 166).

Artistic impressions in the 1830s still reflected European colonial pastoral visions. This became a national view in the latter half of the century. Landscape painting was the dominant artistic genre from the 1860s to the 1960s; however, Australian artists gradually became more emotionally involved with their subject matter. Australian landscape artists imposed an aesthetic order upon the wilderness, which has been as influential as the pastoral orders in natural and urban environment conservation (Smith 1976b).

Australian pastoral landscape imagery has been profoundly depicted in paintings by Glover¹ and von Guérard². As a conservative painter of Romantic mountains and pastoral Arcadia in London, Glover emphasised general pastoral qualities, (see Figure 3-1). In the 1850s and 1860s, von Guérard painted pastoral landscapes of white

---

settlers. Von Guérard arrived in Australia three years after Glover had died. His output was different but two important themes in his work were romantic landscapes and homestead scenes (see Figure 3-2).

Figure 3-1: A view of the Artist’s House and Garden (1835) by John Glover (Art Gallery of South Australia, Adelaide), Source: (Short 1991, p. 200)

Figure 3-2: Eugene von Guérard Tower Hill 1855 oil on canvas 68.6 x 122 cm Warrnambool Art Gallery, Victoria. On loan from the Department of Sustainability and Environment Gift of Mrs E. Thornton, 1966, Source: (Short 1991, p. 202)
By the 1860s, the Romantic era was passing and Realism had arrived with Louis Buvelot\(^3\), who settled in Melbourne and, although some of his paintings depict sheep in the western district, Buvelot preferred the intimate suburban farms near Melbourne (Thomas 1976). According to Thomas (1976), ‘landscape art is deeply concerned with additions and adjustments to the landscape, not only physical but also emotional’ (Thomas 1976, p. 164).

Furthermore, pastoral landscape imagery as ‘the indispensable vehicle of colonial poetry’ in Australia (Elliott 1967, p. 63; Taylor 1992b, p. 130) was used by poets such as W. C. Wentworth, Charles Harpur, Henry Parkes, and Charles Tompson from 1820 to 1850. For example, Wentworth (1823), in his poem ‘Australasia’, describes Australia as the new Arcadia and ‘A new Britannia in another world!’ (Taylor 1992b, p. 130).

Their, too, on flow’ry mead, or thymy steep,
To tend with watchful dog the timid sheep;
And, as their fleecy charge are lying round,
To wake the woodlands with their pipe’s soft sound,
While the charm’d fauns and dryads skulking near,
Leave their lone haunts and list with raptur’d ear.

(Barton 1866, p. 27).

After the middle of the 19th century, the extent of bush songs and ballads increased, which, along with the contributions of Australian poets, writers, and painters, resulted in an increasing sense of national identity (Powell 1977). This was part of a movement to create an Australian culture that integrated the ‘bush’ with the pastoral landscape, which became and has remained, metaphorically, part of the Australian iconography (Taylor 1992b, p. 131). The sense of Australianness has also been

continuously enriched in the 20th century in the tradition of poetry. Judith Wright, among others, contributed a poet’s vision of Australia, for instance, describing the pastoral landscape of New England, north of Sydney, where her forebears settled (Taylor 1992b, p. 132), in the poem ‘South of My Days’:

South of my days' circle, part of my blood's country,
rises that tableland, high delicate outline
of bony slopes wincing under the winter,
low trees, blue-leaved and olive, outcropping granite-clean, lean, hungry country. The creek's leaf-silenced,
willow choked, the slope a tangle of medlar and crabapple
branching over and under, blotched with a green lichen;
and the old cottage lurches in for shelter
(Sadler, Hayllar & Powell 1992, p. 51).

Taylor questions ‘whether the myths will crumble with the effects of non-English-speaking immigrants over the past 25 years, the development of Indigenous history awareness, and the new urban attitudes towards rural Australia’ (Taylor 1992b, p. 133). Given the existing widespread attitudes towards cultural landscapes and their meanings, and the great number of visitors to historic places in Australia, Taylor concludes, such changes will not replace the cultural myths but rather will enrich and reinforce them. However, Taylor does not mention how these mythical landscapes may affect non-English-speaking immigrants’ understanding and usage of natural landscapes in Australia - the next chapter elaborates on non-English-speaking immigrants’ views and expectations in Australian parks.

Eventually, around 1888, after a hundred years of settlement in Australia, and when centennial celebrations provoked a search for national identity, the pastoral landscape became a principle visual image of Australia for its mainly urban population, and a central concern of leading artists. A large number of museum-scale canvases at the time depicted images of pastoral life and landscapes (Thomas 1976).
Exploration of landscape myths and their reflections in Australian culture, art, and literature reveals that Australian pastoral landscape imagery has broadly influenced Anglo-Australian understanding and expectations of their country’s landscapes. Imposing an aesthetic order upon the wilderness which has been as influential as the pastoral order, and the Anglo-Australian deep love of natural landscapes, have contributed to consideration of natural landscapes as tamed, aesthetic, and open spaces. These considerations have also affected landscape planning in Australia and led to the creation of numerous parks and gardens in Australian cities. The next section investigates this process in detail and examines how this viewpoint affected garden/park planning in Australia.

3.5 History of Landscape Architecture in Australia

In the 19th century, the designed landscapes of Australian cities were overseen by landscape architects and surveyors, engineers, curators, park superintendents, and landscape gardeners. Moreover, the creation of Melbourne’s public parks and gardens can also be credited to horticulturalists (Saniga 2012). The distinction between a public garden and park is not always clear. In general, a garden is an area in which horticulture is strongly practised. William Robert Guilfoyle (1840-1912) was a self-trained landscape designer who reshaped Melbourne’s Royal Botanic Gardens from a collection of plants into a public landscape reflecting social values and paying homage to Australia’s native flora. Guilfoyle, in *Australian Plants Suitable for Gardens, Parks, Timber Reserves, etc*, suggests using a wider range of Australian native plants in parks, streets, and home gardens, and many of the trees illustrated in this book still exist in the Royal Botanic Gardens today (Guilfoyle 1910; Saniga 2012, p. 27).

Australia’s earliest public garden in Sydney was located on land adjoining the first Government House, and was Australia’s first official botanic garden. At the site, there was already a fine natural garden of angophoras, banksias, eugenias, and eucalypts. In 1965 the Garden History Society was established to increase public awareness of the value of historic gardens and the need to protect them. The International Council on Monuments and Sites in 1971 declared that a historic garden is: ‘an architectural
and horticultural composition of interest to the public from the historical and artistic point of view’ (Watts & Barrett 1983, p. 13).

Evidence of the influences on Australia’s first gardens can be found in Thomas Shepherd’s lectures on landscape gardening in Australia, which were published in 1836 (Watts et al. 1983). The lectures increased the concept of broad parklands around country estates and the idea that indigenous Australian trees already present could be a part of park scenery. The desire of 18th century English landscapers to recreate a rural landscape had been altered early in the 19th century by new theories of the sublime and the picturesque. This is also observable in landscape paintings explained in the previous section. The sublime, one of the major themes within Romanticism, comprised grandeur of thought and emotion, and it migrated to the colonies with, among others, von Mueller, a director of Melbourne Botanic Garden. In a Romantic sense, von Mueller felt he faced his own human frailty in a rugged, trackless country with challenging natural elements. Gold rush travellers were similarly shown to have Romantic views of the Australian landscape (Verrocchio 2001). In contrast to the sublime, picturesque refers to an artistically composed representation of the natural world. The term ‘gardenesque’ describes a picturesque design furnished with exotic plants. Subsequently, terraces, flower beds, and fountains were introduced and rural estates started using a more decorative approach to garden design. The change in garden fashion was fast and widespread in Australia, and when time and money became available, the gardenesque became a strong influence, particularly in Victoria. Westbrook (1995) describes the transformation of the urban garden in the 19th century in Australia:

The 19th century witnessed a conceptual as well as social transformation of the urban garden. The picturesque park of the aristocratic 17th and 18th century dilettantes, where individual display was submerged beneath a concern to represent often highly complex philosophical and political ideas
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4 Thomas Shepherd (1779 - 1835), proprietor of the Darling Nursery, Sydney, was a practical gardener who lectured on horticulture and landscape gardening and encouraged the cultivation of New South Wales plants. See https://www.anbg.gov.au/biography/shepherd-thomas.html
within the framework of an Arcadian classicism ... was replaced by a new type of park which emphasised within an increasingly secular, scientific world view (Westbrook 1995, pp. 7,8).

There were few public gardens in Victoria before 1850, which were made for the purpose of leisure and decoration. In the 1860s, there was little consistency in garden design, although they contained some decoration, their paths were usually curved, and the trees were small. Murndal Road Tahara, Southern Grampians Shire, is at the heart of a pastoral run formerly known as Spring Valley, with historically significant characteristic patterns of early land settlement and large-scale pastoral enterprise in Victoria. Murndal Road with its ‘Richmond Park’, ‘Cowthorp Oak’ and ‘Coronation Avenue’ attempted to recreate an English landscape setting in the Australian countryside. In contrast, city gardens such as Rippon Lea, one of Australia's finest grand suburban estates and the first to achieve National Heritage listing, had extensive orchards and kitchen gardens (Watts & Barrett 1983).

Some of the similarities in approach of Victorian landscape architects and designers of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century, such as Stones and Guilfoyle, were that they liked designing broad landscapes that controlled external space, while elements such as buildings were used as identifying devices. Stones and Guilfoyle both employed the elements of composition, scale, form, control of space, exploitation of light and shade, and sympathetic relationships of materials in their work (Yencken & Gunn 1976). There are also some major differences reflected in the gardens created during this time. For instance, Guilfoyle’s designs chiefly incorporated exotic plants and high maintenance lawns to reproduce traditional European experiences. On the other hand, Ellis Stones used indigenous and native plants in his gardens, claiming that they were well adapted to the soils and climate and thus survived better. Regardless of deliberate use of native plants, landscape design often takes place where either there is an existing native character or in sites that adjoin other sites that still retain their native vegetation (Yencken & Gunn 1976).
3.6 The Emergence of Urban Parks and International Flow of Ideas

Gardens became a significant part of life in Victoria after the gold rush (1850) due to the reticulated water supply in Melbourne, the temperate climate, and a wide interest in horticulture and garden-building across the city. Gardeners and nurserymen arriving from Britain, who had trained in the great gardens of Britain and Europe, increased the enthusiasm for gardening. Most of the botanic gardens in Victoria are influenced by the English landscape revival movement, with picturesque elements such as arbours, rockeries, and ponds, or formal arrangements such as urns, fountains, and statues. Summer houses, ferneries, and bandstands could also be found in botanic gardens to offer resting places and entertainment to the people who visited them. In the 19th century in Melbourne a different kind of public garden was also popular, the pleasure garden. These pleasure gardens often had ornamental plantings, among which were arranged attractions such as theatre, menageries, artificial lakes, mazes, pavilions for dancing, fountains, grottoes, and bowling alleys (Watts & Barrett 1983, p. 58).

Australian landscapes also have been influenced by international ideas and the testing of these ideas in the Australian context. Architect and town planner John Sulman (1849-1934), who suggested landscape schemes in places such as Belmore Park in Sydney, proposed strong axes and perspective surrounded by public buildings in the design. Australia’s first garden suburb, in south-east Sydney, was also planned by Sulman, in 1913, modelled on Letchworth Garden City in England. In the first half of the 20th century, most Australian landscape designers were trained horticulturalists, and the significant source of training was the English apprenticeship system. The potential of Melbourne’s temperate climate for growing diverse plants led to a broad range of writings on gardens and horticulture in the first half of 20th century, many of which were penned by Edna Walling (1895-1973) (Saniga 2012).

A wave of international ideas characterised post-war Australia and particularly its public spaces after the World War II. Widespread post-war immigration led to a transfer of European and American garden design knowledge as new immigrants joined Australian designers. Latvian Ilmars Berzins (1921-1993) migrated to Australia...
from Germany in 1948 and was one of the qualified landscape architects employed by Sydney’s City Council’s Parks and Gardens Division in 1951. Berzins introduced a European sensibility to the design of public open spaces in Sydney. In Melbourne, Lorand Sebestyen (1901-2005), a structural engineer, translator, landscape designer, rare plant collector, pianist, and photographer from Hungary, was a structural designer in the City Architect’s Department of Melbourne City Council from 1949 to 1966. He designed the Kennedy Memorial in Treasury Gardens and helped create the Arts Precinct (Saniga 2012, pp. 82-7).

The great landscape traditions of Victoria, according to Saniga (2012), were established by Governor La Trobe, and the first four directors of the Melbourne Royal Botanic Gardens, Arthur, Dallachy, von Mueller, and, above all, Guilfoyle. The inner-city parks of Melbourne, the Yarra River bank and the Botanic Gardens all took their present shape and layout under their guidance. The considerable early interest and activity in botany and landscape was brought by Guilfoyle, and his other public and private gardens in Victoria also follow traditional English landscape design.

Guilfoyle applied a new approach, which appreciated aesthetic and recreational values as much as scientific values in garden design. This included transplanting great numbers of trees of all sizes, and creating wide, curvilinear paths with lawns and groups of plants, which replaced straight, narrow paths lined with trees. Guilfoyle established a picturesque quality with the inclusion of rural ornaments and follies, a result of his broad personal exploration of colonial frontiers. Additionally, Guilfoyle incorporated a severed portion of the Yarra River into an enlarged ornamental lake, as a consequence of an ambitious engineering project to straighten the Yarra River, which besides its aesthetic quality, became a focal point for the gardens (Lewi, Saniga & Smith 2014). Melbourne has the greatest number of surviving public gardens in Australia, including the Domain, and the Alexandra, Carlton, Fitzroy, Treasury and Flagstaff gardens, which provide breathing space, and a soothing environment for exercise and relaxation (Watts & Barrett 1983, p. 165).

Eventually, demographic expansion produced by the growth of cities during the industrial revolution increased the need of land reservations for public recreation and
raised the perceived need for ‘urban parks’. These newly proposed public parks had a significant impact on the spatial use of the 19th century city. Urban parks formed, along with public squares and streets, as spaces of political representation and social relations. The symbolic structures of the urban park represent the value structures of the society; however, it was a site of both refuge and social theatre. This new type of public park was to replace the social settings of the 18th century – the private pleasure gardens from the iconography of the private picturesque park estates for both public entertainments and private assignations (Westbrook 1995).

3.7 The Influence of Myths on Park Characters

Landscape myths influenced Australian culture and understanding of natural landscapes not only via interpretations in art and literature, but also via landscape-making and park planning. Arcadian attitudes to the countryside and the concept of the bush beyond urban limits have both influenced the characteristic of Australian parks as idealised natural landscapes and refuges from the challenges of urban life. Therefore, it was preferable for parks to have few symbols of urbanised settings to create a stronger sense of ‘bush’ and to illustrate aesthetic order upon the wilderness to develop idealised ‘Arcadian’ scenes. These cultural desires of park characters have resulted in the creation of tamed, yet wide natural landscapes. Subsequently, the influence of bush and Arcadia myths, and attitudes towards constructed natural landscapes among Anglo-Saxon Australians have caused an extensive trend towards English picturesque and broad, natural open spaces in the design of parks.

The present study suggests that this cultural guiding framework of design, derived from the mythical notions of the ‘bush’ and ‘Arcadia’, have granted more natural and less urbanised characteristics to public parks. Although passive activities such as walking, sitting, and picnicking are undertaken in park spaces, these characteristics have also led to the design of large open spaces in parks with fewer considerations in terms of staying in space for longer hours and for various social/passive purposes. This study argues that ‘stillness’, as duration of stay in park landscapes for social/passive purposes, needs specific provisions and settings, particularly to
encourage visitors to engage in social activities and stay for longer in urban parks, which may increase park usage and reinforces social cohesion.

3.8 Open Space and Contemporary Patterns of Demand for Recreation in Australian Parks

Considering the largely white European history and mythology that have led to contemporary Australian perceptions of nature, and subsequent park and garden design, this thesis questions: how do more recent immigrants in Australia appropriate, use, and perceive Australian parks? Also, how do the culture or experiences of nature of non-English immigrants affect their perception of a new park landscape? This thesis raises a cultural question about urban park design in particular that how do urban park landscape characters and settings, which are based on Anglo-Celtic culture and ideology, respond to the contemporary patterns of demand for recreation in Australia?

In Veal’s (2013) view, Australia’s open space standards have never been based on any publicly documented rationale. Instead, they are largely drawn from British and American open space standards and were apparently established without any reference to contemporary patterns of demand for recreation in Australia. Nonetheless, Veal (2013) points out, ‘while national standards for open space planning have long been subject to criticism, their use is still advocated in a number of Australian state planning guidelines’ (Veal 2013, p. 224).

In his study of Australian urban open spaces or parks, using Melbourne as an example, Max Nankervis (1998) questions whether the open space developments are appropriate and in the best interests of social equity. Connecting urban open space with outdoor sport as two concepts that arguably are integral to Australian identity, he claims that the ‘politics of sport’ has become part of the ‘politics of open space’, although 19th-century urban planners did not necessarily recognise the role of this sporting ideal. Thus parks, especially in the more distant suburbs, were less well landscaped and gradually became home to different kinds of sporting teams, mainly cricket and football. At the same time these open spaces were also being alienated
as sites for public use and the problem of the parks’ functions became obvious. Over time, certain notions about the use of these spaces developed (Nankervis 1998). It is also important to note that prioritisation of sporting facilities in parks that has been influenced by the dominant English culture may not be in accordance with sport provisions desired by other cultures.

Differences between the ways Anglo-Australians and non-English immigrants use urban parks are not restricted to sporting facilities in these spaces. According to the observation there are also fewer tendencies towards using parks at night among Anglo-Australians. However, activities such as exercising, dog-walking, having barbeques and picnics, nature watching, supervising children on play equipment, holding festivals and celebrations, and sports such as golf, cricket, and football, have been observed to be broadly undertaken in urban parks by Anglo-Australians.

Nankervis’ (1998) questions whether Australian urban parks should be considered as places that their mythical nature and identity are fixed, considering the increasing population of non-English-speaking immigrants in Australian cities and the fact that natural open space is still preferred in urban park design. Although urban parks are categorised as urban ‘open space’ in landscape planning and urban literature (Lynch 1981; Woolley 2003), or urban ‘green space’ (Green-Spaces-Task-Force 2002), designing such a park as a large, open space may discourage visitors from remaining there for long or engaging in social activities. Accordingly, park planners have a crucial role in defining ways of using park spaces more effectively. It is suggested that more user-led design of the parks both in their entirety and in their detail is needed (Tisma & Jókövi 2007) to create spaces that foster inclusion among various ethnic groups in multi-cultural societies.

The next chapter reviews studies on contemporary patterns of demand for recreation in Australia - particularly non-English immigrants’ engagements with Australian park landscapes. It investigates how Australian cultural landscape is seen by these immigrants, and how parks may contribute to the sense of inclusivity, or alienation, experienced by non-English immigrant users.
Chapter Four: Non-English-Speaking Immigrants’ Engagements with Australian Park Landscapes

The loss of one place and the need to make a home in another place are inevitably in the act of migration. A sense of ‘home’ may be unattainable, but it can be sought by creating specific place-centred memories (Holmes, Martin & Mirmohamadi 2008). To examine the contemporary patterns of demand for recreation in multicultural Australia, this chapter focuses on non-English-speaking ethnic minorities’ perception of parks, as residents who are dissimilar to Anglo-Celtic Australians. It reviews studies on non-English-speaking immigrants’ use and appreciation of the Australian built environment and particularly park landscapes. It investigates their engagements with park environments and their park culture and values in relation to use of these spaces.

This chapter examines how Australian park landscapes are seen through the lens of immigrants’ park culture, and how they may contribute to the sense of inclusivity, or alienation, experienced by non-English-speaking immigrants’ users. To investigate how cultural parameters may affect perceptions of the landscape, this chapter develops notions of ‘habitus’ and landscape as a cultural phenomenon that frames people’s perception and use of natural landscapes.

Furthermore, the present thesis aims to fill a gap in the literature of the way cultural settings in Australian urban parks may be perceived by non-English-speaking immigrants and the ways they use different park spaces. It will explore how culture and past park use patterns may mediate interactions with new park environments, and how park design may affect these interactions.

4.1 Ethnic Minorities and Park Use

According to Anderson and Gale (1992), ethnicity is a concept that describes our belonging to a group and separates us from other groups of people, whereas culture
defines people’s perception of the world, behavioural patterns, and preferences. The ways in which ethnic and cultural differences are lived and managed has been recently highlighted by scholars in the field of sociology in a range of national and international settings (Butcher 2011; Holloway, Wright & Ellis 2012; Neal et al. 2013; Wright, Ellis & Holloway 2011; Wright, Holloway & Ellis 2011). As Neal at al. (2013) argue, the concept of segregation, in understanding current forms of multi-ethnic social relations, continues to dominate many of the debates. Hall’s (2001) concept of multicultural cities describes the policy response to the growing visibility and presence of ethnic communities at the heart of British life as ‘multicultural drift’ (Hall 2001). However, Neal et al. (2013, p. 312) suggest that Hall’s concept of multicultural drift can be expanded to include spatial manifestations in the new geographies of multicultural residency in smaller cities and suburbs, and also in changing settlement patterns in established multicultural areas.

A study of barriers and incentives to urban park use in Melbourne by Chinese, Italian, Vietnamese, Greek, and Indian ethnic communities identified that second generation Australians, who generally speak a language other than English at home, have low participation rates in urban parks (Croy & Glover 2009). This shows that the issue of park alienation is not restricted to first generation of immigrants or a single minority culture, multiple cultures are also involved. Their study reviews three categories of barriers to participation in leisure activities in Melbourne’s urban parks: 1- intrapersonal (personal) barriers, such as low personal interest in leisure; 2- interpersonal (interactional) barriers, such as a lack of people for accompaniment; and 3- structural (supply) barriers, such as not having an appropriate location or opportunities, time, season, or financial resources. This study also emphasises the role of culture in using urban parks and acknowledges differences in leisure patterns and recreation activities (Croy & Glover 2009).

Leisure theorists have presented four interconnected explanations for ethno-racially differentiated park use: marginality, race/ethnicity, assimilation and acculturation, and discrimination. Marginality theory describes socio-economic barriers that affect when and how ethnic minorities can visit and use parks such as accessibility or entry fees (Byrne & Wolch 2009; Washburne 1978). This hypothesis privileges class, and
fails to recognise how racism can act as a vehicle of socio-economic domination (Byrne & Wolch 2009; Floyd 1998).

Ethnicity theory asserts that due to different ‘subcultural styles’, developed over generations, people of colour have different leisure preferences and activities (Washburne 1978). Some research suggests that African-American and Latin-American ethnic groups prefer wild nature rather than managed landscapes because of their cultural background (Gobster 2002). This theory often combines ethnicity with ‘subcultural variations’ as a form of self-imposed differentiation (Floyd 1998; Hutchison 1988). Ethnicity theory also highlights race and ignores within-group variations in custom, language, behaviour, and norms (Byrne & Wolch 2009).

On the other hand, acculturation/assimilation theory explains that ethnic minorities use parks differently because they have not adjusted to the predominant values of mainstream society (Floyd 1998; Ho et al. 2005; Hutchison 1987; Shaull & Gramann 1998; Washburne 1978). These theorists argue that newcomers will adopt the culture, behaviour, and norms of more dominant social groups (Floyd, Gramann & Saenz 1993). This hypothesis emphasises Anglo-normativity, based on the assumption that ‘assimilation is inevitable and desirable’ (Byrne & Wolch 2009, p. 15; Floyd 1999).

Discrimination theory explains ethno-racially differentiated park use. It asserts that ethnic minorities experiencing discrimination in parks may avoid using them or change the way they use these spaces. It has been suggested that changing the composition of park management and adding more ‘minority’ representation may increase park use rates among ethnic groups (Byrne & Wolch 2009). However, Byrne and Wolch (2009) argue that all of these explanations are problematic, and emphasise that the challenge for geographers is how to reconceptualise ethno-racially differentiated park use to embrace space and place. In other words, it is crucial for geographers or landscape architects to analyse ethno-racial understanding and usage of park spaces through elaborating on the concept of place.
4.2 Migration and the Built Environment in Australia

Migration and resettlement in a new cultural community is identified as a stressful situation in migration studies (Hage 2011; Lobo 2013; Lu 2010). The displacement from family and friends, familiar customs and surroundings in the migration process has been attributed to mental health problems and risk behaviours (Lu 2010). Difficulties in establishing new social networks, and the loss of social support, result in feelings of loss and loneliness which also exacerbate the negative impact of the stressful process (Bhugra 2004). Therefore, immigrants make efforts to maintain their cultural identities, and these efforts are often manifested through the way they perceive, use, and arrange the built environment.

In the 1970s, the Australian Government adopted the policy of ‘multiculturalism’ to recognise the right of migrants to maintain and express their cultural identities and ensure they have equal access to services and opportunities. In the present time, ‘everyday multiculturalism’ is a dynamic reality in the lives of most Australian citizens (Byrne, Goodall & Cadzow 2013). Nature and environment may be one of the most challenging subjects of culture in terms of land management decisions in multicultural societies. Issues about nature and social construction and the implications of this for environmental management have been debated broadly in various studies (Head, Trigger & Mulcock 2005).

Culture is not a fixed concept or entity, but is a dynamic mixture of symbols, beliefs, languages, and practices created by people (Anderson & Gale 1992, p. 3). Head et al (2005) suggest three notions of culture in their study. The first is the broad notion that links culture to mythical and irrational parts of human life. Second is the opinion that culture is separable from other dimensions of life, rather than being understood in all its dimensions. The third notion relates culture to a high level of difference, specifically linking it to indigenous or ethnic minorities rather than the majority culture(s). In this view all humans have some beliefs about the world and their relationship to it. Diverse ‘cultures of nature’ can create conflict over land management decisions, and cultural analyses play an important role in clarification of these conflicts (Head, Trigger & Mulcock 2005).
Cultural differences in relation to immigrants’ expectation of natural and built environments in Australia have been examined in recent years. For example, to seek the influences of the country of migration on the built environment, Graham and Connell (2006) found that Greek immigrants’ home gardens reflect more elements of Australian culture than those of Vietnamese migrants. This may be due to the longer residence of Greeks in Australia which has resulted in closer assimilation, especially in the subsequent generations of immigrants. Regardless of the duration of habitation, migrants’ relationship with their origin country continues to affect the natural and built environments that they create around their homes, and thus the Australian landscape is increasingly influenced by diverse cultural garden designs (Castles 1993; Graham & Connell 2006).

Another study on historical and contemporary presence of immigrant minorities and their impact on the built environment in rural Australia found that non-Anglo-Celtic immigrants have transformed the rural landscape by constructing public and private spaces and altering the physical environment to express their cultural heritage. It is argued in this study that these built sites can impact on the dynamics of social cohesion and inter-cultural relations in multicultural communities (Jordan, Krivokapic-Skoko & Collins 2009). On the other hand, vocal opposition has been documented from non-Muslim residents against proposals to build mosques in several Sydney suburbs (Dunn 2003). Similar conflicts over symbols of ethnicity in the built environment have been reported in Chinatowns in Sydney and Melbourne (Anderson 1990). Jordan et al. (2009) argue that the struggle of cultural minorities for control over the use and design of space has political significance. Although planners are responsible for attempting to fulfil the needs of all citizens, the concept of ‘planning for all’ is not easy to put into practice.

Due to differentiation in climate and cultural parameters, and the influence of these on built environments and people’s understanding and expectations of them, both built and natural environments are likely to be perceived differently by immigrants. Buijs et al. (2009), in a study on cultural differences in landscape perception, found that Muslim immigrants in the Netherlands show higher preferences for urban, tamed and managed landscapes, and are more interested in the functional aspects
of natural environments including utilitarian values and intensive management. It is suggested that this is because of the divine task in Islam to manage nature and to bring culture into wild areas, and also due to the lack of the tradition of viewing landscape as scenery in Islamic culture (Buijs, Elands & Langers 2009). However, it is essential to consider that cultural perception of nature is not restricted to religion, as many other cultural factors are also involved.

Australian studies have compared Aboriginal and other recreational relations to the natural environment. According to the previous chapter the first Australian settlers overlooked the Indigenous history and mythology of the natural landscapes, and inscribed their own romantic and nostalgic ideals to the natural environments according to the landscapes of their birth country (Murphy 2015). Palmer (2004) examined the use of Kakadu National Park in the Northern Territory by two groups of users: 1- recreational fishers and bushwalkers, who saw the landscape as a place for recreation and leisure; and 2- the traditional Aboriginal owners, who saw the landscape as a place connected to material resources for practical usage and spirituality (Palmer 2004b). It is evident that understanding and reading the landscape appears to be highly cultural and framed by past experiences of places.

Consideration of culture as an important factor in ethnic minority groups’ interactions with park landscapes is required to identify how immigrants’ culture is transferred into a new context. In doing so, the concept of transculturalism in relation to immigrants’ understanding and use of space, and as an important factor extracted from the literature, is elaborated on.

4.3 Migration and Transculturalism

Globalisation allows migrants to carry their ‘imagined communities’ with them, and actively use new communication opportunities to maintain their identities. Modern advances in air travel, internet, and social media allow maintenance of connections with countries of origin and may also decrease the degree of adoption of the new culture. The relational understanding of ‘home’ as imagined and lived focuses on the
socially constructed nature of places for immigrants containing dominant meanings of identity (Lobo 2013).

Social networks have a vital role in this process, which means more frequent and secure relationships with parents, friends, and colleagues in both the country of origin and the country of settlement, to maintain identity. In the period after migration migrants develop their identities as double attachments to the host country and the origin country. The process of migration often results in the establishment of common identities in the form of ethnic, language, and religious communities, or larger social groups in the host country. In those multi-ethnic and multicultural societies, a domestic sense of belonging to communities across the border gradually emerges. Hence, developing transnationalism includes behaviours and activities that connect two countries as a result of possessing two national identities. In answering the question: ‘is it possible to feel “at home” across the border?’, it is argued that individuals are likely to re-draw the parameters of their identity at their new home (Madsen & Van Naerssen 2003, p. 68).

Transculturalism is defined by Ortiz (1965) as a synthesis of two phases occurring simultaneously, deculturalisation of the past and miscegenation with the present, which results in reinventing new common culture. In other words, individuals’ identities are no longer singular, but in fact multifaceted. Transculturalism is not a total objective reality; it derives from a conscious subjective component that expresses itself in a public space (Cuccioletta 2002; Ortiz 1965).

Transculturalism is distinguished, in particular, by its emphasis on the problematics of contemporary culture, most particularly in terms of relationships, meaning-making, and power formation. However, transculturalism is as interested in dissonance, tension, and instability as it is with the stabilising effects of social conjunction, communalism, and organisation. It seeks to illuminate the various gradients of culture and the ways in which social groups ‘create’ and ‘distribute’ their meanings. Equally, though, transculturalism seeks to illuminate the ways in which social groups interact and experience tension (Lewis 2002, p. 24).
The evolving social structures, and narratives of difference, identity, displacement, and loss assist in reshaping and understanding local culture and place (Chambers 2008; Murland 2009). In her study on the problem of defining forms of the migrant house in Australia, Lozanovska (2011) notes that scholars argue migrants develop a mix of cultural practices from two cultures. This blending of cultural practices proposes the more contemporary theory of different identities and transcultural belonging (Lozanovska 2011). This binary condition is also multivalent according to factors such as age, generational differences, and gender.

In accordance with transculturalism, immigrants may adopt multiple park cultures derived from both the origin and host countries; however, this may not mean that they assimilate into the dominant park culture. The next section examines non-English-speaking immigrants’ relationships, meaning-making, and engagements with park environments. It seeks to illuminate the ways in which different social groups ‘create’ and ‘distribute’ their meanings in a new landscape setting and how they interact with and experience these spaces. Cultural identity reproduced through the process of transculturalism is likely to affect the understanding and usage of park spaces. The previous chapter highlighted that the Australian cultural landscape has contributed to considering natural open spaces in park landscapes. The present chapter investigates the sense of inclusivity or alienation experienced by non-English-speaking immigrant users of these spaces, and explores how non-English-speaking immigrants’ patterns of park use may or may not fit into these spaces.

4.4 Non-English-Speaking Immigrants’ Engagements with Australian Parklands

A manifestation of Australian multiculturalism can be seen in the use of public parks and gardens by non-Anglo-Celtic immigrants, which has been illustrated in different ways by various studies. Research shows distinctive patterns of use by non-English-speaking immigrants in the visitation of parks. For example, a preference for ‘garden’ parks and water features in parks has been observed among Vietnamese and Arab Australians (Byrne, Goodall & Cadzow 2013). For Arabic immigrants, water is
considered to be a scarce and precious resource, with connotations of ‘paradise’; on the other hand, for Vietnamese people it evokes memories of their homeland with its paddy fields, high rainfall, and rivers. Vietnam’s high population and agricultural base causes people to understand landscape as a place for social relations, personal experiences, and human engagement, full of smells and sounds. Vietnamese Australians also have been found to view parks as places for contemplation, remembering the past, and fishing. However, Arab Australians’ pattern of use includes activities such as praying in parks and breaking meals during Ramadan (Byrne, Goodall & Cadzow 2013; Thomas 2002). These studies found that for both groups, observing the ‘bush’ elements of park environments is pleasurable; however, few expressed a desire to walk in it.

Arabic, Vietnamese, and Macedonian immigrants all like to participate in large group picnics in parks, which helps them build and maintain intergenerational social networks and can be seen as a form of place-making and developing place attachment (Byrne, Goodall & Cadzow 2013). Furthermore, large groups of immigrants socialise in park spaces in state-organised cultural festivals or community gatherings on special days. Macedonians have a tradition of socialising in outdoor settings, such as the huge annual Macedonian picnics in the Royal National Park in Sydney. In Australia, group picnics allow them to practice their national culture, speak in their native language, sing, dance, socialise, and introduce newcomers, which all lead to social cohesion. Public parks seem to be important places for immigrants across different ethnic groups to hold gatherings, cultural celebrations, and festivals. Immigrants bring their homelands with them, both aspects of their homelands and imaginations of their homelands, including traditions and cultural knowledge, and social traditions of natural space use (Goodall 2012). For example, memories of Macedonian landscape continue to influence people’s perception of the environment, with even the sense of smell mediated by cultural experience – Macedonians insist that the Australian bush is bereft of smell to them. Similarly, Anglo-Irish, Vietnamese, and Arabic Australians were found to bring with them, and also pass onto their children, memories of place and environment (Goodall 2012).
Arabic immigrants from Lebanon, Palestine, Syria, and Iraq living in Sydney’s Georges River frequently use parklands along the river, and the river itself for relaxation, fishing, jet-skiing, and other recreational pursuits, and also use park spaces in various religious ceremonies such as Eid-ul-Fitar in Ramadan. Arabic Australians practising faith and spirituality share the enjoyment of feeling close to God in natural settings. They also build social relationships to sustain stronger support networks and ethno-specific identities, sharing food cooked over open coal fires, and undertaking activities they enjoyed in their old homes, recalling memories, and teaching them to their children. Moreover, practising relaxation, physical leisure, and sport in park environments make them feel a greater sense of belonging both socially and environmentally (Goodall 2012). Vietnamese people similarly enjoy contemplating landscapes, and also interacting with them based on their cultural determinants (Thomas 2002).

According to Goodall (2012), in contrast with the many positive associations immigrants have with parks, some have negative experiences. For example, Arabic Australians worry about the increase in antagonism particularly from Anglo-Australians after September the 11th, and especially for Muslim women who wear a hijab. When Arab immigrants were asked about their hopes for the future regarding parks, they suggested improving water quality and accessibility, more parks to be open after sunset particularly during Ramadan, more education about the different ways that people use parks, and better safety in parks for everyone. These expectations indicate immigrants’ desire for safe places and social and passive activities in parks, to reconnect to their memories of such places in the past and maintain their cultural identity.

In their process of transculturalism, Arab immigrants seek to make the new ‘place’ reflect their traditional understanding of nature in a new environment. They build attachment to new places through practising familiar and meaningful ‘everyday’ activities. Goodall (2012) argues if public land managers are to be responsive to the changing needs and values of an increasingly multicultural citizenry, then they need to work towards a fuller understanding of the full spectrum of needs and values. Thus, parks might be useful to address the cultural complexity of contemporary Australia,
and may play an important role in consolidating the feelings of being an immigrant in Australia. Indeed, public demand and community standing could be enhanced if the social values of the landscape are considered as a significant priority (Thomas 2001).

4.5 Non-English-Speaking Immigrants’ Expectations of Park Environments

According to the reviewed studies, recent non-English immigrants’ expectations of parks have been found to be very similar to those they had of parks in their countries of origin, which were mostly designed around functional and utilitarian values and recreational purposes. Providing sporting facilities, evening opening hours (at least in summer), cafés, stalls, and restaurants are some of the expectations recent immigrants have of parks. However, the existence of cafés and restaurants in parks, and using parks in the evening are also not generally provided by Australian parks, in accordance with the local culture. Similarly, particular sporting activities that non-English immigrants used to undertake may differ from the sports grounds provided in Australian parks, which may alienate these immigrants.

It is crucial to consider these kinds of differences between immigrants’ expectations and current patterns of park usage to try to better fulfil their needs. Given that social interaction in parks has been found to stimulate social cohesion in multicultural societies (Peters, Elands & Buijs 2010), and considering that parks have the capacity to serve as free public places where migrant groups can gather together, they may also facilitate cross-cultural encounters. It is evident that activities such as picnicking, relaxation and observing nature, and cultural practices are undertaken by non-English-speaking immigrants in Australian parklands, which contribute to bonding and recalling ethnic and cultural identity. Moreover, spending time in parks with family and friends may accumulate a ‘sense of insideness’, and provide opportunities for different groups of park users to become familiar with other cultures and facilitate interactions between people of diverse backgrounds.

Does the modern-day design and planning of parks reflect the increasing populations of non-English-speaking immigrants in multicultural Australian cities? It is essential
for landscape designers and architects to know how particular park settings are perceived and used by all citizens, including non-English-speaking immigrants. This thesis aims to decipher whether multicultural Australian society may better satisfy the expectations and needs of non-English ethnic minority communities in urban park settings. In other words, how can planning of parks respond to the demands of ethnic minorities and foster sense of place, insideness, and social cohesion?

Nature myths are part of the Australian identity and can be clearly observed in National Parks. However, it is also important to focus on the ways in which ‘urban parks’ respond to the needs of ethnic (non-English-speaking) groups to increase park usage and social cohesion. Therefore, it is crucial to find efficient strategies in the planning of urban parks in multicultural Australian cities. In doing so, gaining a better understanding of the way different park spaces are seen through the eyes of non-English-speaking immigrants may provide insight into people–place associations.

4.6 Migration and Transferring Habitus

According to recent studies, immigrants in Australian cities do not merely visit parks, but engage in processes of place-making. Through socio-cultural activities and events, parks are transformed into familiar, comfortable, and meaningful places. Research shows that migrants bring their already-formed habits, preferences, and traditions of park visitation or relationships with nature, and see the environment through the lens of their cultural background (Byrne, Goodall & Cadzow 2013; Goodall 2012; Goodall et al. 2004; Palmer 2004b; Thomas 2001). The process of place-making plays a significant role in immigrants’ sense of belonging to a community, especially for first-generation immigrants. To frame a discussion about people–place relationships and the various usages of park spaces by immigrants in multicultural Australia, this study applies Bourdieu’s theory of ‘habitus’, as developed in Outline of a Theory of Practice (Bourdieu 1977). In doing so, this thesis considers place meaning in urban parks by exploring park spaces as significant places engaging with a person’s habitus and possible changes caused by migration.
The theory of habitus explains ‘sense of place’ as a process that includes modes of bodily mannerisms, unconscious and embodied, and explains that an individual’s aspirations and ambitions are conditioned by the expected demands associated with the members of a community. Habitus influences the operational systems in which the objective world corresponds with the social distinction of communities, which are reproduced and inscribed with meanings (Bourdieu 1977; Lozanovksa 2014). Lozanovska (2014) argues that as sense of one’s place is not static, understanding how it changes requires a broad consideration of the ‘structuring structure’ and the process of transferring of one’s habitus into another ‘place’ in society. Accordingly, while the changes of the objective surroundings occur rapidly after migration, the process of ‘getting fit’ to that surrounding that includes manners of communicating, eating, ways of celebrating, and even recreational practices often takes time, or in some cases may never occur.

This can also comprise migrants’ taste. Taste, as Bourdieu argues, is a way of categorising people into class, race, and culture; however, it is also a way for the dominant groups to resist changes suggested from other parties. In the case of Australia, ethnic communities’ tastes are marginalised because they are not the same as the tastes of the dominant Anglo-Celtic community. However, Bourdieu argues that through daily rituals of use, the cultural ordering, and aesthetics of the objective world with their symbolic coding reproduces the habitus.

Habitus relates to comfort, familiarity and a disposition of one’s place in the world, but as Bourdieu states, that world is also a ‘magical’ realm that operates on bodily and unconscious levels (Lozanovksa 2014, p. 49).

Building on Bourdieu’s theory of habitus and theories of ‘sense of place’, this thesis aims to examine how immigrants’ interpret and use Australian cultural park landscapes. And how the landscape operates on unconscious levels and affects immigrants’ perceptions and uses of place and the phenomenon of the sense of belonging as mediated by their approach to nature. It seeks to understand to what extent first generation immigrants can fit their habitus of park visiting to a new and different context.
4.7 Non-English-Speaking Immigrants’ Attitudes towards Park Use

In her study of how memorable experiences of place translate into the meaningful inquiry and design strategies, Downing (2003) points out the essence of living is undoubtedly social construction, and that is because human identities are biologically driven by memory and imagination. It is argued that one of the primary biological needs of humans is expressing their selves through desires, values, and enthusiasm, and their cultures through language, physical features, and consciousness of common identity. People have individual memories of places, others, experiences, and events, which with each act of remembrance they are faced with their individuality and connectedness, each person shares the specific constructs of the world with other humans as well (Downing 2003).

Understanding how immigrants perceive their new environments and how they make connections in a new land in the process of cultural renewal is essential to provide a more cohesive multicultural society for all citizens. The combination of physical environment and human complexities in urban milieus, and the rate of change of these factors illustrate the important issues of ‘place and placelessness’ of cities according to Relph (1976). How can social identity be understood and addressed in personal responses to place and in the design of the public realm (Rishbeth & Finney 2006), and how can individuals and communities’ habitus in association with park visitation be transferred to a new context?

Non-English-speaking immigrants’ perception or expectations of Australian park landscapes may not be in accordance with the design and management purposes of these places. The reviewed studies draw attention to the fact that many immigrants do not visit Australian parks in the same ways as other citizens. Instead, they engage in a process of place-making and undertake regular and passive activities such as group picnicking in park spaces. Indeed, the same park space can have different meaning to various groups of people. It has been found that park visitation can increase sense of belonging and insideness, and develops a feeling of being home among immigrants to the extent that this feeling of belonging brings forth a sense of responsibility for the environment (Byrne, Goodall & Cadzow 2013).
A strong social context of visits to parks by immigrants has been found mostly in the form of family and large group picnics. Large group picnicking in parks by immigrants help them to build social networks in a new country, which results in both place attachment and sense of belonging. The reviewed studies also demonstrate that nature appreciation and the process of place-making in park spaces by non-English-speaking immigrants are highly associated with cultural parameters, memory, and past experiences of such spaces, as well as being together and social activities. Accordingly, cultural identity reproduced through the process of transculturalism has been revealed to affect the understanding and usage of park spaces by first generation of immigrants.

Distinctive patterns of park visitation by non-English-speaking immigrants also have been found such as: an attraction to ‘garden’ parks, a high importance of water in parks, different meanings of landscape elements, bonding with the past, cultural, religious, and social activities; and cultural festivals.

Returning to Taylor’s (1992) question of ‘whether the myths will crumble with the effects of non-English-speaking immigrants’, it seems that Australian landscape myths are not totally perceived by non-English-speaking immigrants. Distinct attitudes to park landscapes and their meanings have resulted in particular understanding and use of Australian parks based on immigrants’ background, past experience, ideals, and culture. The present study suggests that this reconnection to the memories of place and cultural identities involves ‘stillness’ in space and has largely influenced undertaking and participating in passive activities in parks. However, there is not adequate research on the meaning of particular park settings for non-English-speaking immigrants and their preferences in relation to physical settings of park spaces. There is not much known about which elements of park environments are appropriate for different activities, and whether park design and settings in the origin country play a role in this regard. How may cultural landscape influence both the physical space and people’s understanding and expectation of space and how may these influences mediate immigrants’ environmental relationships in a new context? How can park management decision-making address these relationships in the form of ‘planning’?
The present study seeks to examine the above questions by focusing on the Iranian community in Melbourne. The thesis emphasises the situation in which migration provides a context for a ‘Paradise’ cultural landscape to meet nature shaped by ‘Arcadia’ and ‘bush’ myths, and based on the characteristic of open space. It investigates how culture and narratives of nature may influence park usage and design, and aims to elaborate on different views of nature by understanding different cultural landscapes.

The phenomenon of open space alienation is the continuation of a long development tradition in Australian cities. There is also the issue regarding provision of facilities in public parks, such as kiosks and cafés. Considering the issue of new use of parks and avoiding alienation in these spaces, it is important to ask which activities should be allowed in parks. Given we live in a changing world, there is no need to limit park use to ‘traditional’ activities, nor let any activity dominate the park (Nankervis 1998).

Drawing on the importance of multiculturalism to Australian contemporary identity particularly in relation to how social space is negotiated and managed, it seems essential to rethought Australian identity in favour of a framework that provides a more equitable basis. This thesis explores how Iranian immigrants, as a representation of non-English immigrants, perceive, use, and engage with mythical urban park landscapes in Melbourne. The process of investigation will be divided into two parts: first, exploration of Iranians’ engagement with and usage of park environments and investigation of the meanings of park landscapes in Iran and Australia (Chapters Six and Seven); second, examination of the philosophy of this engagement and understanding through cultural and historical explorations of park use and design in Iran, and investigation of the influences of landscape narratives in this regards in both contexts (Chapters Eight and Nine). Next chapter introduces case studies and methods to frame the interplay of understanding and usage, and the physical settings of urban parks. In doing so, the methodology chapter draws upon the extracted concepts in Chapter Two, and aims to provide ways to address the research questions.
Chapter Five: Case Studies Information and Research Methodology

This chapter introduces case studies and the methodology and approach employed to investigate the ways in which urban park landscapes are perceived and used by Iranian immigrants in Melbourne. Drawing on theories of place discussed in Chapter Two and the three-part approach to the concept of place, this chapter aims to provide methods to understand different perceptions of and engagements with urban park spaces. One part of these methods is the technique used to elicit these stories and another is the way this material is analysed.

The process of investigation includes: a) investigations on the philosophy of design, form, and characteristics of the Melbourne case study park and selected Iranian urban parks; b) explorations of the Iranian community and their engagements with park environments, observation, survey questionnaire, and in-depth interviews. It is also discussed how different characteristics of urban parks may affect users’ understanding and expectations of these spaces.

This thesis will explain and apply Q methodology with photographs to examine how a particular landscape setting is seen and interpreted by the research participants. It is expected that these explorations provide a path to: a) exploring the influence of landscape narratives on park characters; and b) understanding Iranians’ environmental perception and behaviour in these settings. The findings will lead us to discover different views of nature and cultural landscapes. They will also provide a perspective of non-English-speaking users’ interactions and expectations of park spaces in Australia. Furthermore, the methods used to study Iranian immigrants will be applicable to other immigrants.
5.1 Study Areas

5.1.1 Ruffey Lake Park

The case study area in Melbourne is Ruffey Lake Park, an urban park in Melbourne’s eastern suburbs. It is one of the most popular parks in Manningham municipality. Ruffey Lake Park, with an area of 68 hectares, includes Ruffey Creek, large expanses of grasses, and a mixture of native and exotic trees, as well as four picnic areas, two large playgrounds, a lake, a jogging track, and a disc golf course (Manningham City Council). Ruffey Lake Park is one of the most significant areas of open space within the City of Manningham, which is comprised of the suburbs of Doncaster and Templestowe. It provides a range of important recreation and social opportunities for people in the City of Manningham and from other municipalities. The park is a place for major events such as Australia Day Festival, Park Fest, Cinema Under the Stars, and the annual community organised Passion Play (Manningham City Council July 2005). Ruffey Lake Park is used for various leisure activities such as walking, nature watching, bike riding, picnicking, and festivities. However, the prominent activity as it is illustrated in Figure 5-1, is dog walking, since the most part of the legend is about where people can take their dogs on/off leash, which shows how dog walking, as an example of Anglo priorities, is important in the park.
5.1.2 Ruffey Lake Park Background

5.1.2.1 History of settlement and land use

According to Ruffey Creek Review in 1974, the land that is now known as Ruffey Lake Park belonged to the Wurundjeri Willam clan of Aboriginal people, before European settlement. The Yarra River and its tributaries, including Ruffey Creek were the life source of the Wurundjeri who moved across the River flats and along the creeks according to the seasons and availability of food. After European settlement, the land was planted primarily with orchards such as pears, peaches, nectarines, apples, cherries, and plums until 1974. From 1966 until 1974 the separate sites that make up the Ruffey Creek Municipal Gardens reserve were bought from their various owners and in 1974 the Centre for Environmental Studies at the University of Melbourne began an environmental study on the Ruffey Creek area (Calder, Parkin & Seddon 1974).
From the mid-1960s the land now known as Ruffey Lake Park was purchased and acquired by the City of Doncaster and Templestowe over a period of more than 10 years. In 1977 the land was named the Doncaster Municipal Gardens and opened as a regional reserve, orchards were cleared, and dams filled in. Some of the remnants of original pine trees can still be seen today (Manningham City Council July 2005).

During the winter and spring of 1835 pastoralists began shipping sheep from Tasmania to the rich pastures near Melbourne. Some of these farmers turned eastward from the young colony beside the lower Yarra River, gradually moving along the river to Heidelberg, then to Warrandyte, in search of fresh grazing lands and later for gold. The discovery of gold in 1851 led to the development of Heidelberg, which became the rural centre of gentlemen’s estates and a successful market-gardening district.

In 1853 a military tailor to Governor La Trobe, John Gottlieb Thiele, purchased an initial 20 acres of virgin bush south of Ruffey Creek and beside Victoria Street. He was the first of the industrious German pioneers who formed the settlement of Waldau, a German word which is the name of a street located in south of Ruffey Park, meaning ‘a clearing in the forest’. The Thiele family were able to establish an orchard and gradually acquired more land between Church Road and Victoria Street. They purchased the north land of Ruffey Creek between the corner of Victoria Street and Cricklewood Drive that had been used for many years as a vineyard. They also purchased land between that lot and Ruffey Creek and both lots were planted with orchards. An old pear tree, about 150 years old, still grows near the creek.

Many German pioneer families were encouraged to settle at Waldau by the Thiele family. Some of them had migrated from the Rhine Valley of Germany, so it is not surprising that vineyards were established in the district in the early days. It can be said that in later years of fruit growing, peaches and lemons replaced the vines, and in many cases pears remained popular. Due to expanding family orchards, supplying water for cultivation became vital and two large dams were constructed in the gullies (Calder, Parkin & Seddon 1974, p. 105).
For many years for the visitors from Melbourne the rolling countryside of Doncaster with its orchards and dark shelter-belts of pines was a favourite place, especially during the spring and summer when the fruit trees blossomed. In May, 1966 the Council of Doncaster-Templestowe city decided to develop the Ruffey Creek area. The proposal included:

a) design based on the theme of orchard plantations with blossom in all seasons
b) supplementing existing mature trees with good specimens of species

Figure 5-2: Victoria Street, around 1905, looking north, Source: City of Manningham (Calder, Parkin & Seddon 1974)
5.1.2.2 The character of the Ruffey Creek landscape

The park landscape character should determine the recreational capability in any design concept. Calder et al. (1974) in *Ruffey Creek Reviewed* argue Ruffey Creek reserve provides the basis for an integrated landscape concept for recreational
requirements of Doncaster with its diversity of landscape features. There is another parallel aim towards a design concept that of retaining natural features as well as conserving an indication of past land use. As such, this trend in the design of Ruffey Park, which represents a particular set of cultural assumptions as well as history, is critical to the arguments of this thesis, particularly when considered in association with the historical background and cultural assumptions of the sampled users, which are further elaborated in Chapter Seven.

5.1.2.3 Design concepts of Ruffey Park

In 1966, following a design based on a theme of orchard plantations with colour and blossom in all seasons, an extensive young trees planting programme was begun and focused on the two large ornamental lakes. This design concept granted a romantic landscape garden and a picturesque English characteristic to the park. The overall effectiveness of these plantings was then voted upon and it was found that community taste has changed from a love of colour and blossom during all seasons towards the more muted colours of the Australian environment and against the use of strong colours. The primary objectives of the plantings were: 1- to screen unwanted views, 2- to establish shelter, 3- to improve wind-control, and 4- to define spaces. According to *Ruffey Creek Reviewed*, defining space in a park by belts and thickets of trees, as room-dividers, guides the eye and the feet and invites different kinds of use.

However, relying only on the thickets of trees as room-dividers is not enough in defining spaces for different kinds of use. More consideration in terms of space arrangements and settings and their suitability for various sorts of leisure activities is also required. Nevertheless, this strategy might have been taken into consideration due to the specific design concept, which was based on using natural elements and avoiding man-made structures.

Therefore, the original ambition to create a highly artificial landscape garden, something like the style of the Royal Botanic Gardens in South Yarra, changed to one of making a more natural parkland, due to a shift in wishes of the local community.
Nonetheless, it is not entirely clear which community the ‘wishes of the community’ belonged to in terms of ethnic background and cultural landscape.

Therefore, the planning instructions determined by the Council were:

a) using flowering and autumn foliaged trees extensively
b) fostering and adding native vegetation to restore the landscape to something like its original state
c) plantings on a park-like basis, with trees well-spaced and areas for picnicking, and not detailed concentrated plantings as in botanic gardens

The instructions were followed carefully; especially the first and last, and large areas were dotted with spaced exotics. The Council of the day was not successful in creating a sense of structure in the Park, therefore, it was then suggested that the instructions should have been the reverse: organising space by concentrated plantings, flowering and autumn foliaged trees should be used occasionally only, and planting should be massed, simple, and related to the established vegetation.

According to *Ruffey Creek Reviewed*, there was also another important concept in the earlier design of Ruffey Creek that is worth considering. A part of the design of the large central lake, with a fountain which threw water up into the sky, and linear planting converging on this central focus, was considered not typical of English style of either the 18th or the 19th century. It was primarily French, the monumental style of Versailles, which made a composition of an imaginative concept. The French design manner was based on powerful geometry, and using different colours. Since the Doncaster lifestyle seemed far removed from that of the glittering court of Versailles, the question arose of how this idea could fit into this area (Calder, Parkin & Seddon 1974).

According to the presented design concepts, it seems that the design of Ruffey Park was mostly influenced by the taste, expectations, and ideology of English cultural landscape, while the wishes and demands of other ethnic communities were overlooked in its design concept. Figure 5-5 illustrates the schematic design for the Ruffey Park which was presented by Calder et.al in 1974. It indicates the car parks, a
path system, picnic areas, and the structural framework of planting, while it was suggested that there was still room for more additional details such as a children’s play area, an exercise trail, or an outdoor theatre.

Figure 5-5: Schematic design map of Ruffey Lake Park, 1974, Source: City of Manningham (Calder, Parkin & Seddon 1974)

5.1.2.4 Ruffey Lake Park Masterplan, 1993

In April 1993, the City of Doncaster and Templestowe endorsed the Ruffey Lake Park Masterplan. According to *Ruffey Lake Park Management Plan* (Manningham City Council July 2005) the Masterplan proposed extensive changes to the Doncaster Municipal Gardens and officially changed the name of the park to Ruffey Lake Park.

This Masterplan included extensive capital works, the majority of which have been implemented, listed below:

- Construction of the lake
- Construction of the playground at Victoria Street with associated new carpark and picnic shelters
• Construction of the playground at the Boulevard area with associated new picnic shelters
• Construction of extensive path network
• Revegetation/landscaping works to improve the visual appearance of the park
• Construction of a boardwalk between the Bonview wetland and lake/retarding basin
• Development of an interpretive strategy for the park including the provision of major park entry signs, and four major park information maps, and provision of heritage trail signs and development of a brochure

Over $3 million was spent by the Council between 1993 and 2005 to implement the Ruffey Lake Park Masterplan. Some capital works remained not implemented as they were probably considered unnecessary. These include:

• Tea rooms/kiosks
• Native garden at Church Road North
• Visitor pavilions at the Boulevard and Victoria Street
• Additional works recommended for the amphitheatre including provision of seats

(Manningham City Council July 2005).

Ruffey Park today is one of the most significant areas of open space within the City of Manningham, with broad spaces, a lake, large expanses of grasses, and a mixture of native and exotic trees, as well as four picnic areas, two large playgrounds, and a jogging track. Many people from different cultural backgrounds use the park for picnicking, walking or sitting and nature watching, and the park facilitates activities such as dog walking, jogging, and playing golf and cricket.

5.1.3  Reason for Site Selection

Ruffey Park has been selected as a case study for this thesis due to its location in one of the Melbourne eastern suburbs where a large number of Iranian immigrants live. Moreover, it is close to Iranian Cultural School and was the place where Iranian cultural ceremonies and festivals such as 13th day of Norouz celebration and Iranian fire festival were held for years. The park is used constantly by many Iranian people as users nearby, and occasionally by the rest of the Iranian community in festivals and
cultural celebrations. The park is also a meeting place for parents whose children go to the Iranian Cultural School on Saturdays, especially those who live far from the school.

Figure 5-6: 1- Ruffey Lake Park; 2- Iranian Cultural School; 3- Westfield Shopping Centre,
Source: https://www.google.com/maps
Figure 5-7: Distribution of Iranian-born in Melbourne, 2011, Source: (ABS Fact Sheet Number A-39 2013)

Figure 5-8: Ruffey Park, Source: https://www.google.com/maps
5.1.4 Case Study Parks in Iran

The Iranian immigrants who use Ruffey Park and particularly the Iranian participants, are familiar with certain parks in Iran, therefore, the characteristics of these Iranian Parks are also important to be described. Six urban parks in Tehran have also been selected; these are Mellat, Jamshidieh, Qeytarieh, Sayee, Laleh, and Niavaran Parks. Six have been chosen to ensure that at least one of them is familiar for all of the research participants.

Figure 5-9: Iran’s case study parks, Source: https://www.google.com/maps
Niavaran Park located in Pasdaran Street, and with an area of 62,000 sqm, was built in 1969. The park was the private property of a descendant of a Qajar\textsuperscript{5} dynasty, but after the completion of the construction of Niavaran Palace ownership was transferred to the municipality of Tehran. There are various kinds of trees and flowers in the park, mostly arranged in Persian garden style. The park also provides facilities such as a library, water-views, playground, a skating rink, food outlet, pool, and sports complex. Qeytarieh Park, comprising 122,206 sqm, was built in 1973 and is located in Qeytarieh Street. The plot was a private garden at the heart of Qeytarieh Village before it was purchased by the municipality and allocated for the development plan of the neighbourhood. The park has curved paths, different flora, trees, and colourful flowers, and facilities like a cultural house, art gallery, library, prayer room, pond, and playground. The cultural house was established and opened in 1994 as a hub for training courses in arts and crafts, while local and international art exhibitions are held in the art gallery (Tehran Parks and Green Space Organisation 2007).

Sayee Park, with an area of 120,000 sqm, was established in 1958 in Vali Asr Street. In 1945, Karim Sayee, a Tehran university lecturer and the director of the Forest Foundation of Iran, established a wooded park on this plot of land. In 1958, as Tehran developed into a major town with a full-fledged municipality Sayee Park joined the list of modern public parks managed by the municipality. The park has a broad range of plantations with pond, playground, skating rink, outdoor amphitheatre, and musical water-views (Tehran Parks and Green Space Organisation 2007).

\textsuperscript{5} The Qajar dynasty was a native Iranian royal family of Turkic origin that held ancestral lands in present-day Azerbaijan which ruled Persia (Iran) from 1794 to 1925. \url{http://www.iranchamber.com}, [Accessed 16 October 2015].
Figure 5-10: Niavaran Park Map, Sources: https://www.google.com/maps & Tehran Municipality Information & Communication Technology Organisation Press, photo by author
Laleh Park is located in the city centre, near Tehran University with an area of 28 hectares, and has become a popular meeting place for young people and a picnic area for families from all over the city. The park provides pathways for walking and shaded areas for picnicking and relaxation. The park was designed in 1966 by an English designer in a 35 hectare military field called ‘Jalalieh’ on the northern side of Tehran University campus, which was constructed by order of Reza Shah⁶ in the garden of ‘Jallalieh’ in 1934. Laleh Park is surrounded by many cultural and recreational centres such as the Carpet Museum, Laleh Hotel, and the Children's Art Creative Centre to

---

⁶ Reza Shah Pahlavi, was the Shah (King) of Iran from 1925 until he was forced to abdicate by the Anglo-Soviet invasion of Iran in 1941.
the north, a tennis ground to the east, and the Contemporary Art Museum and Handicrafts Market to the west. The park provides different facilities such as a children's library, puppet theatre, amphitheatre, volleyball and small football grounds, table tennis, chess, and a Japanese Garden in its south-east corner (Mirgholami 2009).
Figure 5-12: Laleh Park Map, Sources: https://www.google.com/maps & Tehran Municipality Information & Communication Technology Organisation Press, photo by author
Jamshidieh Park is located in the north of Tehran in Omidvar Street. At 69000 sqm, it was established in 1977. The park was originally a traditional Iranian garden and belonged to a Qajar aristocrat. The park has a variety of plantations and old trees, as well as facilities such as amphitheatre, art gallery, pond, water-views, and restaurant. One of the distinctive characteristics of Jamshidieh Park is its stone pavements that evoke mountain forest paths. Mellat Park in Vali Asr Street, with the area of 340,000 sqm, is actually divided into two parts. One is a strip along Vali Asr Street, built in 1968, and the other was built upon the adjacent hills in 1974. The latter is inspired by the British garden design of an English architect, John Paulson. The plantations incorporate a wide range of flora, trees, and colourful flowers. The park also provides different recreational facilities like water-views, playgrounds, skate rinks, lake, restaurant, and mosque (Tehran Parks and Green Space Organisation 2007).

5.1.5 Design Character of Case Study Parks in Iran

Persian garden design as an ancient Iranian landscape design concept has influenced most of Iranian contemporary park characters, and the way these spaces are used. Persian garden is a cultural and historical landscape where water, plantations, and buildings are incorporated in a particular geometrical pattern. Centrality, symmetry, rhythm, and square or rectangle geometry are the most prominent features of the Persian garden layout (see Chapter Eight). Most of the contemporary parks in Iran, including the selected case study parks, comprise some Persian garden elements such as specific geometry, pavilions and other cultural/functional buildings, water features, fountains, ponds, and special order in planting trees and placing paths.

However, these contemporary parks also contain other ideas, such as English picturesque landscape, as an influence of English culture (see Figure 5-11 and 5-13). The degree of mixture between traditional and modern ideas in design is different in various parks. For example Laleh Park has more picturesque characteristics infiltrated by its English designer. Research shows that Persian garden icons, an ancient legacy, have proven capable of enduring throughout history, in Iran and even in different cultures and countries (see Chapter Nine). Its elements are still preferred in public park landscapes by Iranian people (Mokhtari & Saleem 2015).
Figure 5-13: Examples of space arrangements and settings in Niavaran and Sayee Parks.

**Niavaran Park**
- Examples of settings that provide stillness in space and social activities
  - Active Recreation Provision
  - Persian Garden Icon
  - Educational Centre

**Sayee Park**
- Paths as examples of settings that provide stillness in space and social activities
  - Picturesque style in design
  - Persian Garden Icon
However, urbanisation, population growth, and the increasing necessity of leisure activities for urban dwellers in new constructed natural environments have accelerated to the process of moving from ‘bagh’ (historical Persian garden) to ‘park’. Sociocultural factors and habitus transformation, also have contributed to the diminution of the role of traditional cultural narratives in contemporary urban park design in Iran.

Yet, some behavioural legacies from traditional ‘baghs’ are still observable among Iranian people in contemporary urban parks, which include passive activities and tendencies towards enclosure. These recreational behaviour and activities in contemporary urban parks have caused an extensive consideration towards stillness spaces and recreational provisions in park design. Accordingly, due to these considerations Iran’s urban parks are mostly places for social activities, gatherings, family fun, exercising, and relaxation and gaining vitality (see Chapter Eight). Chapter Eight elaborates on the way cultural landscapes may affect attitudes towards constructed natural environments and the Iranian community understanding and usage of parks.

5.2 The Iranian Community in Australia

Before the revolution and the establishment of the Islamic Republic of Iran in 1979, most of the migration from Iran to Australia was by service workers, particularly in the oil industry. After the revolution, Iranian migration to Australia and many other countries around the world increased dramatically. Australia also began a special humanitarian assistance program for Baha’is seeking to escape religious persecution in Iran in 1981. During the war between Iran and Iraq in the 1980s more Iranians migrated to Australia. In the latter half of the 1990s, while political and religious restrictions remained main reasons for migration, many Iranians also came under the Skilled and Family Streams of the Migration Program (Australian Government Department of Social Services 2014).
Figure 5-14: According to the 2011 Census, 17.2 per cent of the total Iran-born in Australia arrived between 2001 and 2006 and 30.1 per cent arrived between 2007 and 2011. Source: (Australian Government Department of Social Services 2014)

The 2011 Census records 34,453 Iranian-born people in Australia. New South Wales had the largest number with 15,463, followed by Victoria (7,447), Western Australia (3,722) and Queensland (3,562). Many Iranian asylum seekers have also arrived in Australia in recent years hoping to find a better life. In 2013, 70 Iranian boat arrivals were granted visas, a decrease from 1,000 the previous year. This was a result of restrictive Australian policies in relation to asylum seekers (Karlsen 2014).

Iranian-born immigrants are distributed throughout Metropolitan Melbourne, with concentrations in the local government areas of Manningham (14.3%); Whitehorse (6.8%); Monash (5.7%); Boroondara (5.3%); and Whittlesea (4.8%). Of the Iran-born in Victoria, 23.4% arrived in Australia prior to 1991, 16.6% arrived between 1991 and 2000 and 56.4% arrived between 2001 and 2011 (ABS Fact Sheet Number A-392013).
The Iranian community in Victoria is a diverse community that includes people with different religions, languages and ethnic identities. However, this community shares an identity based on cultural heritage and a sense of ethnic honour. The Iranian Society of Australia has provided Iranian immigrants with some cultural continuity, which helps them to adopt to their new home, for example celebrations of Norouz and other Iranian New Year festivals. Involvement in cultural practices can result in
maintaining identity, which can also be effective in transferring cultural traditions and
habitus to the new generation.

5.3 Data Sources and Collection

Data is collected, organised and analysed for the case studies, and collected in the
form of:

1- Observation and photographic documentation of parks in different times such
as weekdays, weekends, special ceremonies, and festivities, to record the condition
of space regarding activities that are carried out there. I have viewed immigrants as
active collaborators in the research process and tried primarily to build solid
relationships with the participants. As solid relationships developed the participants
would help me in my fieldwork more enthusiastically.

2- Questionnaires will be used to collect data about the participants and their
use and preferences in association with park spaces before and after migration. It is
estimated that around 50 survey questionnaire responses will be collected.

3- Applying Q methodology with photographs. In this method, respondents sort
images, according to a specific instruction (adapted from the literature review in
Chapter Two), which in this case is applying three sampling frames to represent the
landscape settings: 1- Landscape scenery and aesthetic values, 2- Landscape personal
and cultural values (i.e. memories) 3- Landscape social and recreational values (i.e.
exercising, family gatherings, ceremonies, or festivities), which is sorted based on
Most Valued Landscape and Least Valued Landscape. It is expected that photo sorting
questionnaires for all the 50 participants that take part in survey questionnaire
section will be completed; however, since the process is quite time consuming it may
not be conducted for all of them.

4- Semi-structured in-depth individual interviews of 10 participants in order to
gather detailed information in relation to the participants’ park culture and the ways
in which they engage with park environments before and after migration. Their
interpretations then will be analysed according to the theoretical framework discussed in the literature review chapters to support the arguments in the discussion chapter (Chapter Seven).

5.4 Q Methodology

This section describes Q Methodology as a tool to examine cultural constructions of urban park landscapes and the way those constructions define their values and meanings, from individual and group viewpoints. The name ‘Q’ has come from the form of factor analysis which is used to analyse the data.

A photo-based approach can provide a wide range of different park spaces and settings to be investigated. Some landscape research experiences have produced reliable data through the use of Q methodology with photographs in conjunction with other suitable techniques including questionnaire surveys, focus groups, extended interviews, and voice and statement recordings (Fairweather & Swaffield 2001; Jacobsen 2007; Shuib 2008).

Q methodology was created by British psychologist Stephenson (1935) and provides a base for the systematic study of subjectivity, a person’s viewpoint, opinion, beliefs, and attitude (Brown 1993). Q methodology provides a systematic means by which to examine and reach understandings about the experience of expressing an opinion (Shuib 2008). Q methodology also allows the subjective information collected from the respondents to be quantified using statistical analysis. This analysis can then be described and interpreted in ways that reflect individual or group viewpoints in association with such experience (McKeown & Thomas 1988; Shuib 2008; Van Exel & de Graaf 2005).

Q methodology using image and photograph in relation to landscapes studies has been used in research on perceptions of the environment in New Zealand (Fairweather & Swaffield 2000), on visitor experiences of landscapes in Kaikoura, New Zealand (Fairweather & Swaffield 2001), and visitors’ and locals’ experiences of Rotorua, New Zealand (Fairweather & Swaffield 2002). Q methodology has also been
applied to environmental research (Addams & Proops 2000; Barry & Proops 2000),
and landscape research with photograph as a technique to assess scenic values
(Palmer 1983, 1997; Zube, Pitt & Anderson 1974). It has also been used in assessing
residents’ classifications of landscape character (Amedeo, Pitt & Zube 1989; Palmer
1983) and cross-cultural comparisons of perceptions of scenic and heritage

Zube and Pitt’s (1981) study reports on two studies which compared scenic landscape
perceptions of Yugoslavians, West Indians and Americans of several ethnic
backgrounds. This study identified different perceptions of landscapes with and
without man-made structures among these groups. It suggests possible explanations
for differences in perceptions of scenic quality including perception as a learned
response and the magnitude of differences among cultures. Q methodology was
applied to determine how diverse individuals and groups evaluate and describe
different landscapes; and to assess the validity of using colour photographic
representations rather than in-situ experience for eliciting evaluative and descriptive
responses. Q methodology has been evaluated as having many advantages, such as
the ability to encompass a wide variety of landscape settings, to focus on respondents
(Amedeo, Pitt & Zube 1989; Fairweather & Swaffield 2002) and to also allow
sensitivity to each response (Fairweather & Swaffield 2002; Palmer 1997).

The present study focuses on the meaning of park landscapes through a three-
dimensional approach to landscape: the aesthetic aspects of landscape, personal
meaning and cultural values, and social and recreational interactions. This approach
has been made based on the three-part model of place meaning that was discussed
in Chapter Two. The approach adopts use of images of park landscapes to present to
the respondents, which will be evaluated within the Q method. In this method,
respondents sort images, according to a specific instruction. These individuals’ Q
sorts are factor analysed to identify common patterns and the subjects’ point of view
(Fairweather & Swaffield 2002).

Q method involves the sorting of photographs and analysing what respondents
interpret about them to understand their thoughts, attitudes, and values behind the
selected array (Fairweather & Swaffield 2002). This is the strategy in the present study, and the outcomes will be extended by reference to a range of dimensions including cultural identity, habitus transferring, landscape narratives, and context of non-English immigrants’ experiences.

The selection of photographs both from targeted parks in Tehran (Iran) and Ruffey Park in Melbourne, have been taken based on a three-part model of place meaning derived from the literature as generic concepts of attributing meaning to places: the physical aspects of landscape (landscape setting preferences in terms of aesthetic), personal and cultural meanings (person-landscape relationships including familiarity and memory, restoration, and cultural values in particular settings of the landscape), and social and recreational interactions (socialising, gatherings, festivity, and recreational activities). Moreover, simultaneous interviews will elicit explanations of the choices that were made. The whole process will provide a diverse set of information in association with various types of urban park interactions and perceptions by Iranian immigrants both in Iran and Australia.

The research eventually involved 50 surveys, 40 participants in Q methodology photo sorting, and 10 in-depth interviews of Iranian immigrants who had visited Ruffey Park at least once and were familiar with the specified urban parks in Tehran. Eighteen photos were selected of Niavaran, Qeytarieh, Sayee, Laleh, Jamshidieh, and Mellat Parks in Tehran and 18 photos of Ruffey Park in Melbourne. Photos were taken by the researcher in the same season (summer) apart from Photo No.1 in Iran’s parks’ cluster that shows picnicking on the 13th day of Norouz in Iran which is a traditional ceremony celebrated in March on the 13th day of spring. This photo was obtained through ‘Tabnak’ website - a professional Iranian news site. Photo No.5 in Iran’s parks’ cluster was gained from ‘Design in Nature’ book by Gholam Reza Pasebanhazrat. Photos illustrated peoples’ activities in the park, park features and recreational facilities, as well as built and natural environments of the parks.
5.4.1 Procedure

In a Q methodological study, people, called the P-set, are generally presented with a sample of statements about particular topics, called the Q-set, and are asked to rank-order the statements from their individual point of view, according to some preference, judgement or feeling about them. Therefore, people give their subjective meaning to the statements by Q sorting, and reveal their subjective viewpoint (Smith 1999; Van Exel & de Graaf 2005) or personal profile (Brouwer 1999; Smith 1999).

The Q process is designed for a systematic arrangement where a respondent usually responds in a linear fashion from a numeric value of the lowest value to the highest value. The respondents are asked to place the photograph beginning from the left or the right side of the chart and follow through until they finish. The respondents will have to evaluate their choices and make decisions relative to all photographs under the conditions of the instruction that are provided by the researcher (Shuib 2008).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of photographs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q-sort Model**

In the present study there are seven piles of photographs as shown in the above illustration. Starting from the left side, there is one photograph in pile number 1, two photographs in pile number 2, and so on. The score to be given for each pile is the highest at each ends which have the negative or positive values and decreases towards the middle pile which has the lowest score. In Q terms, the placement of answers will result in a statistical distribution in which the mean and frequency will be equal for all respondents (Brown 1980; McKeown & Thomas 1988; Shuib 2008).

Based on this designed structure I created the model in the computer and used PQ method programme, which can be downloaded from PQ method website (http://www.lrz-muenchen.de/~schmolck/qmethod/). This programme has specially
created for entering, analysing, and interpreting data in Q methodology (Schmolck 2002).

5.4.2 Conditions of Instruction

Each respondent was given the following instruction:

This study seeks to understand how Iranian immigrants in Melbourne attach values to urban park landscapes in comparison to their previous experience in Iran. It is important for us to understand how different ethnic communities like Iranian-Australians perceive urban park spaces. Our study will draw upon your personal experiences in visiting, perceiving and using park spaces so that meanings and values that were associated with place can be identified, and understood. There will be one questionnaire to be completed and six series of landscape photographs to be sorted. I will explain how to do it and will give you the instruction.

5.4.2.1 Step one

The participants were invited to sort 36 photographs from Melbourne and Iran’s park spaces (18 photographs for each), in three stages: 1- Landscape scenery and aesthetic values, 2- Landscape personal and cultural values (i.e. memories) 3- Landscape social and recreational values (i.e. exercising, family gatherings, ceremonies, or festivities), and state their perception of these landscape photographs based on ‘Most Valued Landscape and Least Valued Landscape’.

They were asked to refer to the first 18 photographs carefully and place them into three piles, based on the most and least valued landscape in relation to the given subject, and to separate the photographs based on their perception according to the categories below:

I) Photographs that you most valued (MOST VALUED)

II) Photographs that you least valued (LEAST VALUED)

III) Photographs that are neutral/not relevant (NEUTRAL)
5.4.2.2 Step two

They were asked to look again at the MOST VALUED pile and choose one photograph that they most valued and place it in the column under ‘+3’ on the right hand side of the answer sheet. Then, of the remaining photographs in this category, they chose the next two and placed them in the column under ‘+2’ (it did not matter where the two photographs were placed under the column). They followed through the process until they finished placing all the photographs of the most valued landscapes.

Next, they took out the photographs from the LEAST VALUED piles and chose one that they least valued and placed it in the column under ‘-3’ on the left-hand side of the sheet, and continued placing them under this category.

Finally, they took out the photographs from the NEUTRAL pile and placed them in the middle of the sheet. Then they were asked to write down the number of each photograph on the answer sheet. This procedure was applied for all three stages, and was repeated for the next 18 photographs of the next case study as well.

5.4.2.3 Step three

After completing the Q-sorting stage, participants were asked to explain their reasons for choosing the three top and three bottom-ranked photographs in each stage. This qualitative data formed the basis for understanding the underlying thoughts of the respondents.

5.4.2.4 Step four

In this final step, participants were asked to refer to the first Most Valued photographs of all three stages carefully and place them into two piles in the way that each includes the first Most Valued photos of each case study (Ruffey Park and Iran’s parks). We aimed to discuss which of these photos represents a setting that is close to the image of ‘paradise’ for them and why, and if there are any particular reasons for choosing it in each case study.
These individuals’ Q sorts and questioner responses were analysed to identify common patterns and the subjects’ point of view in each sample frame, which, along with individual in-depth interviews, provided a wide range of information of different interactions with and perception of urban park spaces by Iranian immigrants.

5.5 Participant Recruitment

Participation in this research was voluntary, and was achieved through simple explanation and discussion with Iranian people and asking them if they would like to take part. Following speaking with the Iranian Cultural School principle and the Iranian Poetry Meeting organiser, the group workshops for survey, questionnaire and interview were held at the Iranian Cultural School and at Poetry Meetings.

The initial contact was made through a flyer left at Iranian cultural and religious ceremonies and events. The plain language statement and explanation about the research were clarified to each participant and the survey, questionnaire and interview were undertaken after participants had signed the consent form. Once participants understood what the research was about and agreed to take part in it, they were asked to sign the Consent Form.

5.6 Survey Questionnaire and Interview Process

The questionnaire was both in English and Farsi. It included some demographic information from respondents such as age, gender, education, household, and occupation. The questionnaire also had questions on how often and why they visit urban parks, and if there were any differences in the way they use and interact with parks in Melbourne compared to Iran. The interview questions focused more deeply on their background and understanding of parks and specifically Ruffey Park, and how this evolved or changed over time or after migration.

5.7 Selection of Photographs

Initially 43 photos were taken of Iran’s park landscapes, and 32 of Ruffey Lake Park landscapes. Photos illustrated peoples’ activities in the parks, the parks’ features and
recreational facilities, as well as built and natural environments of the parks, which were taken according to the cultural associations identified in Chapter Three and Chapter Four.

Peoples’ activities in the photographs included passive and active recreations, festivals and ceremonies, gathering, and picnicking. Park features consisted of cultural associations, facilities, playgrounds, and natural and built environments. The photos showed scenic qualities and interactions with the built and natural environment of parks. Since the photo sorting process through Q methodology needed to be accomplished in three stages, 18 final photographs were selected for each case study (Iran’s parks and Ruffey Park), in order to make the process shorter and uncomplicated for the respondents. These final photos mainly include cultural associations both in terms of people activities and the built and natural environments of each context; however, they do not comprise all sorts of leisure activities carried out in urban parks and by various users.

5.8 Iran’s Parks Photos

Table 5-1: The list of statement and number of each photo in Iran’s case studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13th day of Norouz, in Mellat Park</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open space in Laleh Park</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge on the creek of Laleh Park</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cypress trees along a pathway in Laleh Park</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A paved path in Jamshidieh Park</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gathering space with artificial lights in Sayee Park</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fountains and Water Feature in Sayee Park</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground in Niavaran Park</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top view of Sayee Park from the stairs</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An entrance in Niavaran Park</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A pathway with shady trees in Sayee Park 11
Gathering space in Qeytarih Park 12
Stairs with running water in Niavaran Park 13
A path crossed by the main axis in Niavaran Park 14
Pool in Niavaran Park 15
Sport equipment in Niavaran Park 16
Plowers in Qeytarih Park 17
Flowerbeds and seats in Qeytarih Park 18

1: 13th day of Norouz, in Mellat Park
2: Open space in Laleh Park
3: Bridge on the creek of Laleh Park
4: Cypress trees along a pathway in Laleh Park
5: A paved path in Jamshidieh Park
6: Gathering space with artificial lights in Sayee Park
7: Fountains and Water Feature in Sayee Park
8: Playground in Niavaran Park
9: Top view of Sayee Park from the stairs
10: An entrance in Niavaran Park
11: A pathway with shady trees in Sayee Park

12: Gathering space in Qeytarieh Park

13: Stairs with running water in Niavaran Park

14: A path crossed by the main axis in Niavaran Park

15: Pool in Niavaran Park

16: Sport equipment in Niavaran Park
5.9 Ruffey Park Photos

Table 5-2: The list of statement and number of each photo in Ruffey Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lake view</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunny track</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter and picnic area</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stairs</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iranian cultural festival</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play ground</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open space with a map sign</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curved path</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter and trees</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathway with cypress trees</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle riding and walking in pathways</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play area with tall trees</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top view of the lake</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lake with deck
Curved path by the lake
13th day of Norouz festival
A top view of the park
Old trees and a bench

1: Lake view
2: Sunny track
3: Shelter and picnic area
4: Stairs
5: Iranian cultural festival
6: Play ground
7: Open space with a map sign
8: Curved path
9: Shelter and trees
10: Pathway with cypress trees
11: Bicycle riding and walking in pathways
12: Play area with tall trees
13: Top view of the lake
14: Lake with deck
The next two chapters explore, analyse, and discuss the collected data. Photos are analysed through the PQ Method programme, and individuals’ explanations and comments are also elaborated upon in order to investigate their perceptions, practices, and values in park landscapes.
Chapter Six: Survey & Q Methodology Data Analysis

This chapter analyses data gathered through: 1- questionnaire, in relation to the use of park spaces by Iranian participants and their experiences of these spaces. 2- Q methodology with photographs, analysing respondents’ sorted images and comments, according to a specific instruction, which is applying three sampling frames: a- landscape scenery and aesthetic values; b- landscape personal and cultural values; c- landscape social and recreational values; which were sorted based on ‘most valued landscape and least valued landscape’. 3- exploring the ways that park landscape settings (in photographs) may characterise the image of ‘paradise’ for research participants by asking them to examine ‘most valued’ photos of related parks and decide which photo is more similar to their imagery of paradise in each case study. Semi-structured in-depth individual interview data will be discussed in the next chapter to support the arguments.

6.1 Survey Questionnaire Data Analysis

The survey questionnaire was written in two languages (Farsi and English). The participants include 50 Iranian immigrants (29 females and 21 males). According to recent Census data, most Iranian immigrants in Victoria are people in the age range of 25-39, (mostly between 30-34) (ABS Fact Sheet Number A-39 2013). Therefore, due to the purpose of this research which was to investigate a range of different activities undertaken by the immigrant families, the participants were all married with an age range of 31 – 62. Twenty seven (54%) were between 30-40; 22 (44%) between 40-60; and one person (2%) over 60. Furthermore, 86% of the participants had children (three or less), and they were all educated - 14% Diploma; 58% Bachelor Degree; 22% Master Degree; and 6% Ph.D.

In order to investigate if there is any connection with Iran and to what extent the participants are associated with their previous physical environment, they were asked ‘how often do they travel to Iran?’ 80% answered they frequently visit Iran i.e.
once a year or once in 2-3 years. In answering the question ‘Is Ruffey Park close to where you live?’ 54% said ‘Yes’. The next question was ‘how often do you visit Ruffey park and why?’ followed by ‘which park did you usually visit in Iran before migration and how often? a) did you go there with your family, friends, or individually? b) did you visit there at the weekends or weekdays? c) what time in a day did you go there: morning, afternoon, or evening?’ The answers were assessed and are summarised in the tables below.

Table 6-1: The visiting frequency of Ruffey Park by the participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often do you visit Ruffey Park?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-3 times per week</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 times per month</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 times per year</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6-2: Activities undertaken in Ruffey Park mentioned by the respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities undertaken in Ruffey Park</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Festivals and Celebrations</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnicking, BBQ</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being with family and friends</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking, kids playing</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing sport and exercise</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The participants stated that they used to visit local parks in their area in Iran, while they also visited famous urban parks in Tehran as well, such as Mellat, Jamshidieh, Sayee, Qeytarieh, Laleh, Shafagh, Chitgar, Niavarn, Velenjak, and Pardisan Parks, both on weekdays and at weekends. They also asserted that they used to go to the park at
any time of the day, especially early mornings and late afternoons for socialising, walking, doing exercise, or having dinner with family and friends.

[We went to] Jahan nama, Cahitgar, Sayee, and Laleh Parks, at weekends from morning to afternoon, or to parks nearby at weekdays evenings with family and friends.

I visited Niavaran, Mellat, and Laleh Parks, 2-3 times per month, in weekday’s mornings alone, and in weekend’s afternoons and evenings with family and friends.

There was a park near the place that I used to live. Since I was a kid that park was there with a nice tennis court. It was always my pleasure to go there sometimes with family and sometimes with friends.

I went to Mellat Park, for doing exercise usually early mornings at weekends.

[We went to] the parks close to where we lived in weekend’s evenings, for doing exercise, or catching with my friends.

Subsequently, they were asked what did they do in the park and are there any differences in the way they use and interact with parks in Melbourne compared to Iran?

Table 6-3: Activities undertaken in Iran’s parks mentioned by the respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities undertaken in Iran’s parks</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socialising and being with family and friends</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking, and getting fresh air</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing sport and exercise</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnicking</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking kids to play grounds</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For doing exercise, playing, walking, skating, ... but here [Melbourne] we usually go to the park for festivals, walking or having BBQ.

... We did not BBQ in Iran’s parks but here I go to the park for relaxation, and BBQ.

For relaxation, having picnic and taking children to play grounds, but I prefer Melbourne’s parks because they are quieter and have more facilities for having picnic.

In Iran we went to parks to get fresh air and doing exercise, in Melbourne for having BBQ and gathering with friends.

In Iran we did walking and group sporting activities, or having dinner with family. Here we do BBQ, celebrating birthdays and Iranian festivals.

For picnicking, walking, getting fresh air and watching nature, and it has not changed much here.

Just in Iran we were walking around the park but children played with some equipment which located in the park. To compare parks here and Iran, I think here you feel more free to enjoy of your time.

Additionally, in answering the question ‘does the weather play a barrier or incentive role for you in using urban parks in Melbourne?’ 28% of the respondents said that ‘it is a motivation for us to go to the park’, 26% answered ‘the weather does not matter’, and 46% believed ‘in some conditions plays a barrier role’. Next Chapter analyses the survey data in more detail.

6.2 Q Methodology Photo Sorting

In order to understand more deeply how Iranian immigrants in Melbourne attach values to urban park spaces in comparison to their previous experience in Iran, the participants were asked to take part in a photo sorting stage if they had time. They were invited to sort 36 photographs from Melbourne and Iran’s park spaces (18 photographs for each), in three stages: 1-aesthetic preferences 2-cultural and personal meaning (i.e. memories) 3- social and recreational spaces (i.e. exercising,
family gatherings, ceremonies, or festivities), and state their perception based on ‘most valued landscape and least valued landscape’.

The participants who were happy to continue comprised 40 people (20 females and 20 males) with the age range of (31 – 62), 52.5% (30-40), 45% (40-60), and 2.5% over 60. 85% of the participants had children (three or less), and their educational status includes: 12.5% Diploma; 60% Bachelor Degree; 22.5% Master Degree; 5% PhD.

It is worth noting that most ‘sense of place’ studies in association with the concepts of ‘insideness’ and ‘outsideness’ often have two different participant groups. The present study, however, concentrates on a particular group of people and explores their relationships, understanding, and activities in two different contexts. The respondents are divided into two broadly defined termed ‘insiders’ and ‘outsiders’, in accordance with the case studies.

While recent research has focussed considerably on the ‘subjective’ aspects of ‘sense of place’ and ‘place identity’ in relation to the production of ‘outsideness’ and ‘insideness’ in the landscape, the role of landscape in generating values for these two groups has not received enough investigation. Hence, Q methodology has been applied in this thesis based on the specific aims of the project, which is not merely finding general landscape values. In order to seek the ways in which landscape architecture contributes to creating a ‘sense of place’, this project presents three themes as described in Chapter Two, and investigates how landscape settings can inspire values in relation to each theme. First theme highlights favourite aesthetic spaces in park environments, which lead to person-environmental interactions and place identity. Second theme includes physical environments that reveal the nature of the self, which is essential in emotional and place attachment. While third theme focuses on physical environments that facilitate social and recreational practices and emphasises performativity in space as an important factor in generating ‘sense of belonging’.

Accordingly, Q methodology is applied in three stages for each case study to provide a range of information in relation to the way the participants interpret various
landscape setting images and specify landscape settings which are appropriate for undertaking particular leisure activities.

The respondents reported that they found the photograph sorting very interesting, enjoyable and relaxing. The colour photographs of their homeland park landscapes and the familiar Ruffey Park landscapes allowed them to complete their tasks enthusiastically. All Q-sort data obtained from the respondents were individually entered into a personal computer using the PQ method software programme. The Q process provides comparative correlations between individual respondents.

The methodological procedure enabled the photograph perception ratings to be subjected to Q analysis. This procedure facilitates a systematic output of diverse viewpoints or judgment of respondents into distinct themes. The procedure repeats for each theme separately. For the purpose of this research, these themes are described as 1- landscape scenery and aesthetic values, 2- landscape personal and cultural values (i.e. memories) 3- landscape social and recreational values (i.e. exercising, gatherings, ceremonies, or festivities), which were sorted based on ‘most valued and least valued’. These themes are interpreted according to the characteristics of photographs as sorted by the respondents, and interviews about the choice of photographs and additional information are also provided.

6.3 Analysis Procedure

The PQ Method program uses the technique of analysing data in a systematic way. The first step is entering the file of statements (STATES) into the program. It is necessary that the statements describing the photographs are in the correct order, which is the same as the number that was used in the Q-sorts collected from the respondents. I accomplished the analysis process in three stages, first the 18 photos of Iran’s parks were entered and after getting the final results, the process was repeated for the next 18 photos of Ruffey Park. The program then asks to perform a few tasks such as total number of statements and total number of columns and rows to plan the specific procedure that I have designed, which has been explained in the previous chapter.
For ‘Extracting the Factors’ the ‘Principal Component Analysis’ (QPCA) was chosen because of its increased use in similar landscape research that applied Q methodology, such as research conducted by Fairweather and Swaffield (2001) and Shuib (2008). According to these studies a ‘Varimax’ rotation was also considered for ‘Rotating the Factors’ stage. Considering the particular use of the Q method (in three stages for each case study) and the number of participants in this research, two factors were selected to rotate. Each resulting final factor represents a group of people’s viewpoint that are highly correlated with each other and uncorrelated with others. ‘Flagging’ factors step was performed automatically by the program. The process was repeated for each case study three times based on the defined themes.

6.4 Q Methodology Data Analysis

6.4.1 Landscape scenery and aesthetic values

6.4.1.1 Iran’s parks’ results

Table 6-4: Factor Q-Sort Values for Each Statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13th day of Norouz, in Mellat Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open space in Laleh Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge on the creek of Laleh Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cypress trees along a pathway in Laleh Park</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A paved path in Jamshidieh Park</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gathering space with artificial lights in Sayee Park</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fountains and water feature in Sayee Park</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground in Niavaran Park</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top view of Sayee Park from the stairs</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An entrance in Niavaran Park</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A pathway with shady trees in Sayee Park 11 2 2
Gathering space in Qeytarieh Park 12 -1 1
Stairs with running water in Niavaran Park 13 0 0
A path crossed by the main axis in Niavaran Park 14 1 0
Pool in Niavaran Park 15 -2 1
Sport equipment in Niavaran Park 16 -2 -1
Flowers in Qeytarieh Park 17 1 -1
Flowerbeds and seats in Qeytarieh Park 18 1 0

6.4.1.1.1 Factor 1, Main Theme: Traditional Water Features and Pathways

This group of respondents selected their top-three photographs (see Table 6-5: Most Valued Landscape Settings) as fountains and the water feature in Sayee Park (photo No.7), a paved path in Jamshidieh Park (photo No.5), and pathways with shady trees in Sayee Park (photo No.11). The three top-ranked photographs show a traditional water feature with fountains and paths with trees on the side.
Data analysis of this group of Iranian participants (20 people, 11 females and 9 males) demonstrates that traditional water features and paths in natural, cultural, and spacious landscape settings are the main landscape visual characters in inspiring scenery and aesthetic value for them. Spaciousness in this thesis refers to both enclosure and depth as ‘spatial definition through distinct edges or landmarks’ (Kaplan & Kaplan 1989, p. 34). Participants expressed their reasons for choosing these photos as: ‘the existence of water; fountains; flowers; the willow tree; nice scene; endless space enclosed by trees; different levels; the paved pathway; tall trees; shadows; beautiful place to be; and nice path with greenery and old trees’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Valued Landscape Setting</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fountains and water feature in Sayee Park - No. 7</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A paved path in Jamshidieh Park- No. 5</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A pathway with shady trees in Sayee Park- No. 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participants’ interpretations of the particular landscape elements demonstrate the way they define aesthetic in park landscapes. Photo No.7 illustrates traditional Iranian water features with fountains, a willow tree and a pavilion in the back and colourful flowers in the front. Considering the scale of the photo, which does not include a broad view, the location of water in relation to the land form has created an enclosed space. The existence of flowers and trees also contribute to creating a space of enclosure and a ‘place to pause’. This photo also illustrates a setting that indicates centrality based on the placement of the water feature as a focal point.

The symbolic significance of water in Iranian cultural history dates back to the pre-Islamic period, where Anahita, the goddess of Zoroastrians, was considered the goddess of water. After Islam, since the image of paradise illustrated in the Quran was very similar to the Persian paradise gardens, icons of the Persian garden and the symbolic role of water became very significant and respectful. This respect for water in the Iranian culture is likewise because of the shortage of rainfalls and the harsh climate of Iran (apart from the northern provinces). Therefore, the presence of water, especially with fountains in order to produce a desirable sound and cool weather, was highly considered in garden design.

Another theme that has been considered by the cluster of participants in association with their preferences of aesthetic values of the Iran’s park landscapes is depth. Depth in both photos No.5 and No.11 is seen in paths enclosed by shady trees. The respondents’ expressions of depth include ‘endless space enclosed by trees’ and ‘nice path with greenery and old trees’. Trees in these photos define and emphasise the paths - an approach which is also evident in Persian garden design.

Analysis demonstrates that cultural values and respect of Iranians for the water and trees, in the form of architectural manifestations in Persian gardens are still significant factors in inspiring aesthetic values in Iran’s contemporary urban parks. It is also evident that centrality, spaces of enclosure, and paths in urban parks are contributing to create aesthetic settings in parks.

In contrast to their most valued landscapes, the group has chosen what they described as: ‘too crowded, erratic, not nice, dirty, messy, chaotic, and untidy’, as
their bottom-three photographs (see Table 6-6: Least Valued Landscape Settings). These characteristics refer to the visual impact of disturbing elements in which the area is visually affected by disturbance (Gulinck et al. 2001; Iverson 1985; Ode, Tveit & Fry 2008). Disturbance here indicates unpleasant visual elements such as chaos, crowd, and dark and dirty water. Water is considered not valuable in creating an aesthetic view in this particular photo as it is perceived dark and dirty which can be referred to the level of maintenance or stewardship. Status and conditions of human-made structures in the landscape and the frequency of their maintenance can influence the value of stewardship as a landscape visual character indicator (Laurie 1975; Nassauer 1995; Ode, Tveit & Fry 2008; Weinstoerffer & Girardin 2000), as well as the perception of aesthetic in the landscape. This issue brings up the distinction between design and maintenance; however, it seems obvious that a poorly maintained/dirty water feature will be seen negatively by almost any culture.

**Table 6-6: Least Valued Landscape Settings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Least Valued Landscape Setting</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13th day of Norouz, in Mellat Park - No. 1</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool in Niavaran Park - No. 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport equipment in Niavaran Park – No. 16</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.4.1.2  **Factor 2, Main Theme: Pathways and New Form of Water Features**

The second group of the responses chose their top-three photographs as those that defined landscape scenery and aesthetic values in the existence of plantations, a new (modern) form of water features, and depth in pathways (see Table 6-7: Most Valued Landscape Settings). Seven respondents (three females and four males) have loaded on this factor while, experience with Q-studies has suggested that there should be at least 10 respondents to be loaded on any theme to warrant further discussion. However, this landscape analysis shows that the different forms of water features and paths that reflect depth with a focal point, in different shapes and with various forms of vegetation are the significant values of landscape settings in association with the scenery and aesthetic values.

**Table 6-7: Most Valued Landscape Settings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Valued Landscape Setting</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cypress trees along a pathway in Laleh Park - No. 4</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge on the creek of Laleh Park – No. 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A pathway with shady trees in Sayee Park - No. 11</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The water feature here is not the same as historical and cultural water features in Persian gardens as it mostly represents English picturesque landscape design, which has also become accepted as part of contemporary Iranian park design. Historically, in the late 18th century, garden design in Iran was influenced by western culture focusing on picturesque qualities, function and water’s roles in vitalising, clearing and cooling (Irani Behbahani & Khosravi 2011). Participants expressed their reasons for choosing these photos as: ‘ordered trees; neat and tidy; nice path; beautiful pond; nature and greenery; and different levels’. The analyses of this group also demonstrate that settings with water features and paths with trees on side are highly preferred as aesthetic landscape scenes. However, orderliness, naturalness, topography, and spaciousness represent main landscape visual characters in inspiring scenery and aesthetic value in these photos.

Nonetheless, this group of the respondents are more interested in aspects of English picturesque landscape design, as it is evident in photo No.3. In photo No.11, which has been considered by both groups, topography and different levels have produced ‘a nice view’. According to Irani Behbahani and Khosravi (2011) developing gardens on Tehran’s Alborz hillsides in the Qajar era allowed the possibility of watching the distant landscape, which was an innovation of garden design at that time. This new consideration of the garden’s view later became a principal foundation of landscape design in Iran (see Chapter Eight).
Table 6-8: Least Valued Landscape Settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Least Valued Landscape Setting</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An entrance in Niavaran Park - No. 10</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A paved path in Jamshidieh Park – No.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top view of Sayee Park from the stairs – No. 9</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents in this group gave their lowest scores to photographs: An entrance in Niavaran Park, No.10, A paved path in Jamshidieh Park, No.5, and Top view of Sayee Park from the stairs, No.9. They believed that they portrayed images that look dry, unnatural, artificial, and without enough greenery. Although, photo No.9 illustrates a top view of the Sayee Park, the existence of stairs, as man-made elements in the photo, has made the scene unpleasant. Photo No.5 was considered dry and without sufficient greenery by the respondents in this group. Analysis shows that for this group less man-made elements, naturalness, and the percentage of natural vegetation (Arriaza et al. 2004; Ayad 2005; Ode, Tveit & Fry 2008; Palmer 2004a) in evaluating landscape setting aesthetic values have great importance. It is also
interesting that there is no contradiction between orderliness and naturalness here, since Iranian participants consider ordered vegetation as natural settings.

Figure 6-1 summarises landscape scenery and aesthetic values in Iran’s park landscape settings perceived by the both groups of the Iranian respondents.

6.4.2 Landscape personal and cultural values

6.4.2.1 Iran’s parks’ results

Table 6-9: Factor Q-Sort Values for Each Statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13th day of Norouz, in Mellat Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open space in Laleh Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge on the creek of Laleh Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cypress trees along a pathway in Laleh Park</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A paved path in Jamshidieh Park</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gathering space with artificial lights in Sayee Park</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fountains and water feature in Sayee Park</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground in Niavaran Park</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top view of Sayee Park from the stairs</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An entrance in Niavaran Park</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Setting</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Influence</td>
<td>Contribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A pathway with shady trees in Sayee Park</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gathering space in Qeytarieh Park</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stairs with running water in Niavaran Park</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A path crossed by the main axis in Niavaran Park</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool in Niavaran Park</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport equipment in Niavaran Park</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flowers in Qeytarieh Park</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flowerbeds and seats in Qeytarieh Park</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.4.2.1.1 **Factor 1, Main Theme: Social Traditions and Cultural Landscape Icons**

This group comprising 16 respondents (10 females and 6 males) who were associated with this theme selected as their top-three photographs (see Table 6-10: Most Valued Landscape Settings), No.1, 13th day of Norouz, in Mellat Park, No. 7, Fountains and water feature in Sayee Park, and No. 14, A path crossed by the main axis in Niavaran Park.
The group’s interpretations of their selections revealed that they most valued the landscape in terms of having personal and cultural values, because of social traditions, festivals, historical landscape icons, and a strong rooting of their past. They explained their reasons for selecting these photos as: ‘it reminds me my childhood memories of 13th day of Norouz; memories of having picnic with my family and friends; reminds me memories of Iran’s parks when we went camping; brings back my memories of Iranian New Year ceremonies; the fountains are like my hometown gardens; it is very pleasant; the space just looks very familiar the paths, vegetation, trees’.

Photo No.1 indicates a famous nature activity among Iranian people on the 13th day of the New Year. Personal memories are interwoven with the ‘cultural’ events held.

### Table 6-10: Most Valued Landscape Settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Valued Landscape Setting</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13th day of Norouz, in Mellat Park - No. 1</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fountains and water feature in Sayee Park - No. 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A path crossed by the main axis in Niavaran Park - No. 14</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
in park landscapes. Memory here is a realm that is shared among individuals to create collective identities and anchored in place by cultural events and practices. Photo No.7 shows a water feature with fountains as a significant landscape element in both Persian garden and contemporary urban park design in Iran. Photo No.14 illustrates a strong icon of Persian garden design with two axes and a flower pot in the middle of their intersection. This quadripartite pattern of the Persian garden (char-bagh or four-part garden) gives historical richness to the landscape. However, this iconic aspect of the landscape here has not been clearly expressed by the respondents but their sense of ‘insideness’ or familiarity with the place is evident through phrases such as: ‘it is very pleasant; the space just looks very familiar’.

The memories of such physical environments in Iran, as well as those social activates and cultural traditions that were undertaken in park landscapes, grant meaning to the place and make it culturally and personally valuable. Analysis of the data reveals how cultural practices of picnicking in 13th day of Norouz are symbolically loaded for an ongoing reconstruction of a nation. Photos No.7 and No.14 are regarded as cultural heritage landscape icons, while photo No.1 is considered a landscape where visions of Iranian identity are realised and articulated.

Conversely, the group has chosen what they described as ‘dark and gloomy; very artificial with no spirit; I cannot relate to it; and it does not have any meaning for me’, as their bottom-three photographs (see Table 6-1: Least Valued Landscape Settings). Photo No.3, as a representation of English picturesque design, which has been considered as an aesthetic scenery in the previous stage; here does not have any cultural and personal value for the respondents.
Table 6-11: Least Valued Landscape Settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Least Valued Landscape Setting</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gathering space in Qeytarieh Park - No. 12</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge on the creek of Laleh Park - No. 3</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An entrance in Niavaran Park - No. 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.4.2.1.2 **Factor 2, Main Theme: Paths as Meaningful Cultural Settings**

This group of the respondents includes 11 people (four females and seven males) who have selected photos: Gathering space with artificial lights in Sayee Park (No.6), A paved path in Jamshidieh Park (No.5), and Flowerbeds and seats in Qeytarieh Park (No.18), as their most valuable photos.
These three photographs illustrate paths in straight lines with benches, trees, flowers, and illuminations. Paths in Iranian park design are highly considered because they function both as movement and stillness, and static and dynamic spaces. They are places for sitting, gathering, having dinner or lunch with family and friends, or drinking tea and having a chat with each other. The word *koocheh bagh* (garden alley) in Iranian literature refers to a passage which is enclosed by trees or walls, a meeting place, and a symbol of the confluence of nature and culture. *Koocheh bagh* (garden alley) has been widely illustrated in Iranian literature, paintings and Persian wall
carpets. For example ‘The Alley’ by Fereydoon Moshiri, a prominent contemporary Iranian poet (1927-2000), is one of the significant and impressive poems in Persian literature. Part of ‘The Alley’ poem is presented below:

Without you
On a moonlit night,
My thoughts aflight,
I visited that alley again.
My body,
transformed into eyes,
Craved to actualise,
Another meeting with you, in vain.
Sweet anticipation,
Of love’s rejuvenation,
Overflowed
My mortal cup.
In that sacred locality
Outside all reality,
The crazed lover with me
Caught up.
Thorns of your being blossomed,
In every recess of my soul;
Recollections of your laughter,
Echoed from pole to pole.
The perfume of lost memories,
Permeated the whole;
As I recalled that night,
The alley,
The realm of silences,
The brook,

By Fereydoon Moshiri, translated by Iraj Bashiri (Project Gutemberg Self-Publishing Press).

This group explained their motives for selecting the photos as: ‘it is like our orchard garden in my hometown; it is like parks we visited when I was a university student; because of the nice path with old and green trees; it is colourful; reminds me my hometown parks in Isfahan; because of the paved pathway; reminds me Iranian nature; it is a good place for walking; brings back my memories of family gatherings and fun in Iran’s parks at childhood’. This group, however, did not respond favourably to photographs No.16, No.8, and No.15, (see Table 6-13: Least Valued Landscape
Settings), as shown by their selection of the bottom-three images. Their interpretations include: ‘it is very erratic; not nice and clean; does not have any meaning for me; it is not natural; very crowded; inconvenience; lack of safety; stagnant water; crowded; messy; and not familiar’.

Analysis shows to what extent local identity and the way in which it is mediated through cultural and landscape narratives can be effective in inspiring personal and cultural values in park landscapes. It has been found that a spatial manifestation of koocheh bagh in the form of paths in urban parks plays an important role in inspiring memory and nostalgia, creating a pleasant space, and expressing a powerful relationship between memory, culture, and identity. Nevertheless, chaos, crowd, lack of safety, stagnant dirty water, mess, and lack of naturalness in park environments provide inconvenient, unpleasant, and meaningless spaces.

Table 6-13: Least Valued Landscape Settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Least Valued Landscape Setting</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sport equipment in Niavaran Park - No.16</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground in Niavaran Park - No.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool in Niavaran Park - No. 15</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 6-2 sums up the cultural and personal values in Iran’s park landscapes expressed by the Iranian participants in both groups.

6.4.3 Landscape social and recreational values

6.4.3.1 Iran’s parks’ results

Table 6-14: Factor Q-Sort Values for Each Statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13th day of Norouz, in Mellat Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open space in Laleh Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge on the creek of Laleh Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cypress trees along a pathway in Laleh Park</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A paved path in Jamshidieh Park</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gathering space with artificial lights in Sayee Park</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fountains and water feature in Sayee Park</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground in Niavaran Park</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top view of Sayee Park from the stairs</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An entrance in Niavaran Park</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A pathway with shady trees in Sayee Park</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gathering space in Qeytarieh Park</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.4.3.1.1  Factor 1: Main Theme: Social and Passive Activities

This cluster of respondents (19 people, 9 females and 10 males) chose their top-three photographs as those that defined landscape values in social traditions and festivals and broader landscape settings (see Table 6-15: Most Valued Landscape Settings). They expressed their reasons as: ‘Iranian New Year ceremonies; 13th be dar in Iran; good picnic area for being with friends in nature and having food; open space for playing kids and having picnic; open space with shady trees to sit under; flat area with shady trees; good and safe open space for family gatherings; nice place for being together with family; water, open space for walking and sitting with creek and shady trees’.
Here, the respondents’ preferences for recreational activities in park landscapes can be strongly attributed to the social traditions in the landscape (photo No.1) and a desire for passive recreation. Photo No.1 was also chosen as a most valued photo in relation to the cultural and personal values and the least valued photo in association with aesthetic. It demonstrates that the respondents’ perception of aesthetic scenes in the landscape is concerned with landscapes without disturbing visual elements. These ‘disturbing visual elements’ include unnatural and man-made structures, dry, unclean, and unpleasant landscape elements, and crowded scenes. However, their patterns of use are depended on some of those elements.

Photos No.2 and No.3, illustrate English picturesque and flat spaces with a creek and shady trees. These spaces are considered appropriate places for picnicking, gathering, and being together as important passive recreational activities in urban parks undertaken by Iranian people. For these respondents, the primary social attraction of urban parks is that there is an appropriate space for them to sit in a
natural and safe environment. The parks in this respect are like outdoor function centres that facilitate social activities, and their provisions for these sorts of activities are considered significant. On the other view, according to the dry climate of Iran, broad natural settings with opportunities for picnicking are highly desirable. Furthermore, since parks provide various sorts of sport and social activities, the experience of park visiting is not restricted to picnicking.

In contrast, this group did not respond favourably to photographs No.15, No.10, and No.12, as shown in Table 6-16: Least Valued Landscape Settings, due to the following reasons: ‘it does not look nice and clean; stagnant water; not a good place to be with friends; the pool is not safe for kids; it is very artificial; dark and dry; it does not have flat and appropriate space for picnicking and sitting with family and friends’. Accordingly, the existence of unpleasant elements, topography, darkness, lack of naturalness and safety, and lack of appropriate space and facilities for sitting and gathering, are considered as factors that affect desired recreational activities in park environments.
### Table 6-16: Least Valued Landscape Settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Least Valued Landscape Setting</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pool in Niavaran Park - No. 15</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An entrance in Niavaran Park - No.10</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gathering space in Qeytarieh Park - No. 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.4.3.1.2 **Factor 2, Main Theme: Social Activities, Passive and Active Recreation**

This group which consists of seven respondents, five females and two males, selected cultural landscape portrayed in the photos 13th day of Norouz, in Mellat Park (No.1), and photos that illustrate recreational facilities such as play grounds and sport equipment, Playground in Niavaran Park (No.8), and Sport equipment in Niavaran Park (No.16), (see Table 6-17: Most Valued Landscape Settings). Their reasons include: ‘good playground kids can play and we can sit and have a chat or walk; it is a good outdoor place for doing some exercise; good space for gathering and being with friends in nature’. Social traditions, passive recreation, and the wish for being together in nature are again raised as important desired activities in park spaces,
while recreational facilities and equipment for active recreation are also considered significant. Additionally, variety in leisure activities influences their preferences for spaces with active recreational facilities and family fun activities beside natural spaces in park environments. Despite the fact that only seven respondents have loaded on this factor, the analysis shows that it is a distinct group and should be included to give insight into their perspectives in choosing different activities in park environments.

Table 6-17: Most Valued Landscape Settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Valued Landscape Setting</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Playground in Niavaran Park - No. 8</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport equipment in Niavaran Park - No. 16</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13th day of Norouz, in Mellat Park –No. 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This group, however, chose their three least valued photos as illustrated in Table 6-18: Least Valued Landscape Settings, due to the following reasons: ‘there is no space for kids or having picnic; there are so much rocks; not a good place for gathering and having picnic’. Yet, topography, and lack of an appropriate space for sitting, picnicking, and kids’ activities are considered parameters that make the spaces unfavourable. Surprisingly, paths here are reflected unfavourable for undertaking recreational activities as the participants believe recreational activities
in parks demand particular space arrangements for sitting and gathering as well as facilities for doing active recreation.

**Table 6-18: Least Valued Landscape Settings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Least Valued Landscape Setting</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A paved path in Jamshidieh Park - No. 5</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top view of Sayee Park from the stairs - No. 9</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A pathway with shady trees in Sayee Park - No. 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The summary of landscape social and recreational values in Iran’s parks expressed by the respondents in both groups has been illustrated in Figure 6-3.
6.4.4 Landscape scenery and aesthetic values

6.4.4.1 Ruffey Park’s results

Table 6-19: Factor Q-Sort Values for Each Statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lake view</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunny track</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter and picnic area</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stairs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iranian cultural festival</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play ground</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open space with a map sign</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curved path</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter and trees</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathway with cypress trees</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle riding and walking in pathways</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play area with tall trees</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top view of the lake</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake with deck</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curved path by the lake</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Valued Landscape Setting</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top view of the lake - No.13</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake with deck - No.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake view – No.1</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.4.4.1.1 **Factor 1, Main Theme: View, Lake, and Open Space**

This theme was defined by a cluster of individuals who characterised aesthetic landscapes by their strong liking or values of different views of the lake. All 20 respondents (9 females and 11 males) aligned to this theme chose the top-three photographs that showed different views of the lake as their most valued landscapes. This group stated their opinions as: ‘beautiful view of the lake; water; greenery; it is very peaceful and joyful; nice view; the view is perfect; very natural and pristine; beautiful composition of the lake, trees, meadow, and the sky; a beautiful view of the lake from the top; peaceful space; open space; looks like a beautiful painting’.

Table 6-20: Most Valued Landscape Settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Valued Landscape Setting</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top view of the lake - No.13</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake with deck - No.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake view – No.1</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Water is a significant aesthetic element in Iranian culture and history, and exists in all photos selected by the participants in this group. These photos illustrate beautiful composition of the lake, trees, meadow, and the sky according to the participants’ statements, which produces a perfect ‘view’ like a beautiful painting. Openness and wide views also were considered favourable while the lake plays a focal role in all photos, and inspires centrality and stillness.

This group of the respondents prefer open area, which can hardly be found in Iran’s urban parks, however, they have mentioned frequently that the view and the open space are very peaceful and relaxing. On the other hand, they selected photos No.3, No.5, and No.16 as their least valued landscape settings (see Table 6-21: Least Valued Landscape Settings), because they seemed: ‘dry with an incompatible shelter; untidy and unsightly; unpleasant; not beautiful; too crowded; messy; not organised; dark with no greenery; and dry without greenery and seats’. It is evident that chaos, crowd, and unnatural elements as visual impacts of disturbance considered as factors that result in unpleasant visual landscape scenes.
6.4.4.1.2 **Factor 2, Maine Theme: View, Lake, and Open space**

This group of the respondents (16 people, 10 females and 6 males), is likewise interested in photos of the lake (No.13 and No.14, see Table 6-22: Most Valued Landscape Settings). Photo No.17 shows a part of the lake with a distant view of the park from the top of a hill. They admitted that they look beautiful to them because of the: ‘beautiful view; open space; naturalness; water and greenery; sky and clouds; quietness and peacefulness’. In contrast, photos No.16, No.5, and No.4 (see Table 6-23: Least Valued Landscape Settings) that indicate group gatherings and picnicking, as well as man-made constructions (stairs) in the park are the least valued photos in relation to aesthetic values. The respondents expressed their feelings towards them as: ‘it is crowded and seems dry; I do not like crowded places; so messy; very crowded, it is too artificial and dry’.
The categories mentioned most frequently and giving high ratings on aesthetic likelihood represented naturalness and legibility such as: ‘greenery, lake, open space, and the sky, from a distant view’. While, the categories contributing to low ratings on aesthetic likelihood represented lack of vegetation, or disturbance such as: ‘man-made features, overcrowded and the disordered spaces’. The sentiments mentioned as being felt in the types of settings presented in the most valued photos were ‘peace’, ‘quiet’ and ‘relax’.

Table 6-22: Most Valued Landscape Settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Valued Landscape Setting</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top view of the lake - No.13</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake with deck - No.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A top view of the park - No.17</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Here, the respondents do not describe the landscape details and only mention that the overall view is pleasant and enjoyable. According to the different characteristics of Australian urban parks compared to Iranian ones this may be referring to the design of more open spaces in Ruffey Park and the lack of flowers. It may also be addressed as a result of alienation and lack of familiarity with the park spaces which makes the Iranian visitors only prefer the legible, open, and distant spaces. Analysis demonstrates that natural components such as grass, water and trees in wide and open settings provide favourable views and are highly valuable qualities in assessment of the likelihood of aesthetic in Ruffey Park and the sense of restoration.

Figure 6-4 summarises landscape scenery and aesthetic value in Ruffey Park from the viewpoint of the respondents in both groups.
6.4.5 Landscape personal and cultural values

6.4.5.1 Ruffey Park’s results

Table 6-24: Factor Q-Sort Values for Each Statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lake view</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunny track</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter and picnic area</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stairs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iranian cultural festival</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play ground</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open space with a map sign</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curved path</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter and trees</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathway with cypress trees</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle riding and walking in pathways</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play area with tall trees</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top view of the lake</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake with deck</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curved path by the lake</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13th day of Norouz festival        16    2     -2
A top view of the park            17    0     1
Old trees and a bench             18    1     2

6.4.5.1.1  **Factor 1, Main Theme: Restoration and Social Traditions**

This cluster includes 19 respondents, 9 females and 10 males, who selected the photo of the lake No.13, and photos of Persian festivals No.5 and No.16 (see Table 6-25: Most Valued Landscape Settings) as their most valued landscape settings in terms of having personal and cultural values. They asserted their reasons as: ‘I go there for walking with my daughter; I walked here with my friends; I watched sunrise with my husband in this place; it is a peaceful place; love these kinds of places to go with my friends; it is full of sense of vitality; it reminds me memories of 13th day of Norouz picnicking; reminds me my childhood memories of 13th be dar; Iranian New Year ceremonies; fresh air and Iranian festivals’.
A number of respondents stressed their personal meaning of Ruffey Park illustrated in Photo No.13 as a peaceful and relaxing place. This photo has been considered as a most valued photo in terms of aesthetics as well. Analysis reveals that the landscape aesthetic attributes in photo No.1 made it a desired place for the respondents to be with their beloveds, it is also perceived as a peaceful place full of a sense of vitality. On the other hand, photo No.16 and No.5 which indicate the social traditions and Iranian festivals in parks have been selected as meaningful settings, however, these photos had no aesthetic values for the respondents. Collective memory of these traditional social activities in parks here reconstructs the past which has been left behind. Therefore, it is evident that individual and collective patterns of use among Iranian participants are distinct factors that create personal and cultural meanings in park landscapes, and each of them requires appropriate settings.

These individuals act within their cultural background as Johnson defines in a ‘way in which abstract structures and norms of “culture” are translated into actions on the
ground’ (Johnson 2007, p. 142). These actions which are guided by social traditions, memory, and affection happen in the landscape where they are simultaneously created and responded to by these human activities. The interaction with the world and the landscape is mobile in both space and time and movement through places. Information and knowledge are not received in a passive manner through experiencing landscape. ‘People act in accordance with practical projects, values, needs, desires and interests. What information and knowledge is indeed received can only be understood in the context of these needs and desires’ (Tilley 2004, p. 30). Identities are put into these particular settings and are played out in these places, through emotions, feelings, memory, movement and practical activities (Ryan 2015; Tilley 2004).

View, water, open space, naturalness, legibility, and cultural and social activities in the landscape are considered as parameters that contribute to creating settings that evoke emotions, feelings, memory, and identity for Iranian participants. The focality of the lake, the existence of a bench close to the lake, and the view of the wide open space produce a sense of enclosure, restoration, relaxation, and vitality which provides a good place ‘to be together’, which has also aesthetic values. While, settings with less natural elements and more material culture and cultural practices, inspire meaning and recall memories for the respondents with regards to land use patterns and cultural practices, they have least values in terms of aesthetics.

In contrast, this group believes that photos No.4, No.7, and No.8 (see Table 6-26: Least Valued Landscape Settings) have no specific personal or cultural meaning for them and stated that: ‘it is too artificial and does not have any meaning for me; does not look safe and nice; does not seem good; looks dry; and they do not have any meaning for me’. Man-made structures and lack of naturalness again result in meaningless landscape settings. However, unlike Iran’s parks, the paths in Ruffey Park are perceived meaningless and alien. This may be due to the different landscape characteristics of Iran’s park paths which are not merely a passageway but also a ‘place to pause’ with benches, flowerbeds, and illuminations.
Unlike the least valued photos expressed by other participants, in this group, photos No.7 and No.8 do not illustrate chaos, artificial features, crowd, and visual disturbance. They show paths, lawns, trees and scenes that do not include wide and open views of the park, and there is no lake and no seats. These sorts of spaces with less aesthetic attractions are alien and meaningless for the respondents as their experiences of such spaces in park landscapes before are different. For them, urban parks are mainly ‘places to pause’ and spaces with fewer opportunities for staying are considered not welcoming and personally and culturally meaningless.

6.4.5.1.2 Factor 2, Main Theme: Restoration and Peacefulness

This group consists of 11 people (seven females and four males), who selected their most valued photos, as illustrated in Table 6-27: Most Valued Landscape Settings. Photos No.14, No.13, and No.18 indicate the lake with a deck, a distant view of the
lake, and an open space with an old tree and a bench. They stated their reasons as: ‘I walked here with my friends; it reminds me memories of fishing by the lake in my hometown when I was a teenager; it reminds me a similar place where we went with our family in Iran; water makes me contemplate; I went walking there with my friends; it is a peaceful place; wide space which is peaceful; and it is quiet and green’. Therefore, ‘view’, ‘open space’, and ‘naturalness’ are considered as factors that contribute to a sense of restoration and peacefulness, which also refer to the aesthetic aspects of the landscape.

Nonetheless, according to council’s information, Ruffey Park attractions include wetlands and boardwalks, hill top views, a re-vegetation area and remnant vegetation, a heritage trail, a perimeter jogging path, playgrounds, disc golf course, family walk, and Waldau Village historic walk (Manningham City Council 2015). Some of these attractions are highly acknowledged by Iranian immigrants and some are not. Naturalness and legibility in Iran’s urban park case studies are not as impressive as they are in Ruffey Park because of the particular type of design and management in Iran’s parks, cultural aspects, the dry climate, and the scale of the urban parks. These parameters in the landscape are desired by Iranian people who often travel thousands of kilometres to the north of Iran to enjoy the broad, natural, and different landscape. This is evident in the participants’ descriptions of their meaningful places in Ruffey Park here, which are peaceful and remind them their memories of such places in Iran. Furthermore, the historic characteristics of Ruffey Park, which are the main aims of its initial designers (Calder, Parkin & Seddon 1974) and are illustrated by various signs in the park, are not perceived significant by the Iranian participants.

Calder et al. (1974) argue that Ruffey Creek reserve provides the basis for an integrated landscape concept for recreational requirements of Doncaster with its diversity of landscape features. There is another parallel aim towards a design concept which is keeping natural features as well as conserving an indication of past land use. Moreover, Ruffey Lake Park Masterplan in 1993 developed an interpretive strategy for the park including the provision of major park entry signs, and four major Park Information Maps, and provision of Heritage Trail signs and development of a brochure. Besides these efforts, the historic characteristics of the park are not clearly
perceived by the Iranian users. Naturalness here as a design objective with cultural and historical roots, is perceived as a refuge and peaceful space for restoration or being together, which demonstrates the lack of connection with the physical place or ‘outsideness’.

Table 6-27: Most Valued Landscape Settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Valued Landscape Setting</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lake with deck - No.14</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top view of the lake - No.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old trees and a bench – No.18</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In contrast, this group believes that photos of Iranian cultural festivals, shelter areas, and social activities in park environments (see Table 6-28: Least Valued Landscape Settings) do not inspire any particular meaning for them because: ‘it looks dry; so crowded; there is no privacy for concentration; it cannot be peaceful because of the crowd; it is untidy; I have a sense of alienation towards the shelter; it is not familiar (shelter); and does not have any meaning for me as it is too crowded’. Accordingly, it is evident that for this group of participants restoration and peacefulness are
significant landscape meanings that cannot be found in crowded and disordered places.

Table 6-28: Least Valued Landscape Settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Least Valued Landscape Setting</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iranian cultural festival - No. 5</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter and picnic area – No. 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13th day of Norouz festival - No. 16</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Landscape cultural and personal values in Ruffey Park, as mentioned by the two groups of the respondents, are summarised in Figure 6-5 below.
### 6.4.6 Landscape social and recreational values

#### 6.4.6.1 Ruffey Park’s results

**Table 6-29: Factor Q-Sort Values for Each Statement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lake view</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunny track</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter and picnic area</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stairs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iranian cultural festival</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play ground</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open space with a map sign</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curved path</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter and trees</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathway with cypress trees</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle riding and walking in pathways</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play area with tall trees</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top view of the lake</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake with deck</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curved path by the lake</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13th day of Norouz festival</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A top view of the park</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old trees and a bench</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.4.6.1.1 **Factor 1, Main Theme: Social Traditions and Passive Activities**

Twenty two people have been loaded on this factor, which include 10 females and 12 males. This group has chosen their top-three photographs as those that defined landscape recreational values in passive activities illustrated in photos No.3, No.5, and No.16 (see Table 6-30: Most Valued Landscape Settings). They described their reasons as: ‘It is a good and safe place for family gatherings; BBQ & shelter good for gathering; Iranian picnicking which is interesting; good picnic area; it is a good place for having picnic and BBQ; Iranian festivals; traditional Iranian picnicking in 13th *be dar*’.

**Table 6-30: Most Valued Landscape Settings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Valued Landscape Setting</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shelter and picnic area - No.3</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iranian cultural festival - No.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13th day of Norouz festival - No. 16</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The participants reported that the activities they could perform in the park presented in the photos were social activities such as gathering, eating, and picnicking with family and friends. Social activities entailed going to the park with someone else, and
may also involve visiting the park to meet other people informally. Research shows that short informal contacts have a high impact on people’s well-being (Nordh & Østby 2013; Thompson 2002; Whyte 1980). Social activities in public spaces often demand particular configurations and provisions. Since, there was no equipment for physical activity or playing in Ruffey Park, apart from children’s playgrounds and disc golf course, these activities were less likely to be mentioned.

Group picnicking and being with family and friends are considered the most significant social activities in Ruffey Park. Furthermore, the respondents’ preferences for recreational activities in park landscapes can be strongly attributed to the image of cultural landscape and a desire for passive recreation. Culture and the collective memory are greatly influential in recreational preferences in park landscapes after migration and past interactions with these spaces continue to affect their preferences in the new landscape setting.

This group however did not respond favourably to photographs No.2, No.1, and No.4 as shown by their selection of the bottom-three images (see Table 6-31: Least Valued Landscape Settings). They stated that they are: ‘not a good path it seems dry; [the path] somehow good for walking but not for gathering; not safe for kids or having picnic, no place to sit and have picnic; no facilities for outdoor activities; not safe with no place for sitting; without spirit; not a good place for sitting with friends; dry, and not safe and nice’. These landscape photos were considered inappropriate for social activities since they portray settings which reflect a lack of safety and appropriate places to sit and have a picnic, and lack of facilities for outdoor activities.
6.4.6.1.2  **Factor 2, Main Theme: Being Together and Restoration**

This factor showed a strong preference for landscapes that illustrate top views and open spaces and provide appropriate places for walking, picnicking, gathering, and being together as important passive recreational activities in urban parks undertaken by Iranian people. Naturalness in these photos is evident through the existence of the lake, trees, and greenery, while legibility can also be described through continuity and focality (see Table 6-32: Most Valued Landscape Settings).

Thirteen respondents have been loaded on this factor (seven females and six males) who valued these landscape scenes due to: ‘the lake; green open space and tall shady trees; a good view of the lake; reclusion; a peaceful place; a nice top view of the lake; a quiet nice view, love these kinds of places to go with my friends; sitting under the...
shade of trees; a good space for kids to play and ride bicycle; this path is good to go walking with a friend; it is quiet and green; a pleasant pathway for walking by the lake, shady trees and a bench for sitting; a wide space; and a nice track for walking or kids bike riding’.

Respondents’ reasons demonstrate that desirable and valuable recreational activities in Ruffey Park include being together and undertaking passive activities in wide, natural, legible landscape settings with shady trees and benches. Enclosure and reclusion, quietness, and peacefulness are highly preferred by this group and these elements were found in landscape settings illustrated in photos No.13, No.18, and No.15. The path here is considered valuable and pleasant for walking or bike riding mostly because of the lake. Once again, ‘lake’, ‘view’, ‘open space’, and ‘naturalness’ are contributing to create a desired setting and a place which is perceived ‘quiet’ and ‘peaceful’ for ‘contemplation’ and ‘being together’.

Table 6-32: Most Valued Landscape Settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Valued Landscape Setting</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top view of the lake - No.13</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old trees and a bench - No.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curved path by the lake - No.15</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In contrast, photographs that this group strongly disliked were No.4, No.2, and No.12 (see Table 6-33: Least Valued Landscape Settings). They considered that these photographs display settings which are: ‘artificial with less greenery; not good for kids to play in; not a good path, seems dry; not a good place for sitting with friends; less facilitated for outdoor activities; good for walking but not for gathering; not safe; without sufficient greenery; and not a good place for having picnic and gathering’.

It is understood from their descriptions that gathering and picnicking are also considered significant as valuable recreational activities in park environments, which need particular settings and characteristics. Although photo No.12 illustrates a playground in Ruffey Park, it is still considered not valuable due to the lack of naturalness and gathering space. However, this might have also happened because of the scale of the photo which illustrates a distant view of the activities.

Table 6-33: Least Valued Landscape Settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Least Valued Landscape Setting</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stairs - No. 4</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunny track – No.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play area with tall trees - No. 12</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 6-6 below summarises landscape social and recreational values in Ruffey Park as stated by the two groups of respondents.

![Figure 6-6: Landscape social and recreational values in Ruffey Park](image)

6.5 Paradise Resemblance Image among Most Valued Photos

This project also aims to explore the possible influence of ‘paradise’, as a powerful landscape myth in Persian culture, on the physical environment and people’s understanding of park landscapes. Therefore, to discuss which of these photos represents the image of paradise for the participants and why, and if there are any particular reasons for choosing it in each case study, the participants were invited to the last stage. They were asked to refer to their first most valued photographs of all stages carefully and place them in two piles (for each case study) in such a way that each includes the first most valued photos of each stage. The respondents then chose the photo which represents paradise the most between them for each case study, (see Figure 6-7).
Table 6-7: The table for placing photos that represent paradise for the participants in each case study

| Photo analysis in relation to Iran’s parks surprisingly revealed that although few photos had been chosen more frequently each participant had seen the paradise in a distinct photo which illustrated a landscape setting of a particular park. This means that each individual had selected various photos which evoked specific meaning in each stage. This also makes it almost impossible to categorise photos that represent paradise the most among the cluster of Iran’s park landscapes. It likewise demonstrates that paradise perception varies for each individual and underpins the memory, temporality, and perception in considering the landscapes evoked. Memory and nostalgia evoked by immigrants increase the sense of elusiveness, not merely in terms of the physical environment, but the memories they experienced, the people they were with, and the activities undertaken there. This sense of elusiveness imbued with the joy and pleasure deduced in park landscapes creates a distinct paradise for each individual. |
In contrast, analysis of Ruffey Park photos indicates that photos of the lake from different perspectives (photos number 1, 13, and 14) have the most resemblance with the image of paradise among others, based on participants’ selections and were selected by 87% of them. Among them, photo No.13 was chosen by 57% of the participants (23 people, 13 females and 10 males). They believe that it portrays a beautiful view of the lake with nice greenery and open space, which is natural, peaceful, pleasant, and quiet. Participants’ descriptions of the lake in the Ruffey Park cluster comprise the sense of relaxation, restoration, aesthetic, and naturalness, which inspire the attributes of heaven or paradise to them.

The picture of number 13 in Ruffey Park tell me about the paradise, because always told us that paradise is a perfect place and in this picture, view is perfect, you can see nature with water and a place with family. Also paradise suppose to make you peaceful and for me 13 is a peaceful place.

It is recognisable that physical attributes and the visual aesthetic which result in creating a sense of restoration and a desired place in park landscapes here play a more influential role. The next chapter discusses the analysed data and the correlation between them in more detail.
Chapter Seven: Discussions of Correlations Between Gathered Data

This chapter discusses the analysed data presented in Chapter Six and elaborates the correlation between them. It draws attention to the impacts of cultural factors both on the physical landscape and people’s environmental behaviour in park spaces. In making sense of their landscape preferences, many Iranian respondents explained how these related to their past experiences of park spaces in Iran and memories of traditional activities. Considering the new physical characteristics of urban park landscapes after migration, on the one hand, and immigrants desire to continue familiar activities and leisure experiences in parks, this chapter examines the extent of fit and adaptation of their habits in the new landscape.

Diverse people use parks in various ways and this is often attributed to differences in socio-demographic factors such as class, age, gender, and especially race/ethnicity by leisure researchers (Byrne & Wolch 2009; Gobster 2002; Payne, Mowen & Orsega-Smith 2002; Shinew, Floyd & Parry 2004; Tinsley, Tinsley & Croskeys 2002). Ethno-racial differences in park use have been found in all types of parks (Byrne, Goodall & Cadzow 2013; Gobster 2002; Johnson 1998; Thomas 2001; Thomas 2002; Tierney, Dahl & Chavez 2001) (see Chapter Four). However, the way park design and settings affect ethno-racial perception and usage of these spaces has not received enough consideration.

This chapter analyses data in association with the Q methodology, observation, and the survey questionnaire, and the in-depth interview data will be brought in to support the arguments. Theories discussed in Chapter Two will be applied to interpret the analysed data. It is argued how aesthetic aspects of the physical environment, personal meaning, and social and recreational activities in urban park landscapes influence ‘sense of place’ before and after migration.
7.1 Research Question 1

How do experiences of favourite aesthetic places of Iranian users in urban park landscapes result in place identity?

a) What are the spatial aesthetic values of urban park landscapes in Persian culture?

b) Are these values being attributed to Australian urban park spaces after migration? How?

Results from the data analysis of two groups of respondents show that naturalness, spaciousness, orderliness, tidiness, and topography in the shapes of water features, paths, places of enclosure, different levels, flowers, and ordered and green plantations, are favourite ‘aesthetic’ places in Iran’s urban park landscapes. Naturalness is an important aspect of restorative environments which were considered favourable both as a pattern in the landscape and vegetation. Spaciousness as a visual scale is observable in the forms of depth in paths and enclosures in the settings with water features.

However, in Ruffey Park case, lake, view, and open space, which represent naturalness and legibility, were referred to as favourite aesthetic places. Existence of water indicates coherence in the landscape (Kuiper 2000; Ode, Tveit & Fry 2008; van Mansvelt & Kuiper 1999), which refers to a more immediate understanding and readability of our environment (Kaplan & Kaplan 1989). Water, likewise, in the landscape is often used as an indication of naturalness (Ode, Tveit & Fry 2008) and as an important aspect of restorative environments (Hartig et al. 2003; Kaplan & Kaplan 1989; Ode, Tveit & Fry 2008). Respondents’ emphases on the ‘open space’, ‘view’, ‘naturalness’, and ‘peacefulness’ support the legibility, coherence, and naturalness landscape characters in Ruffey Park. However, the general terms of ‘open space’, ‘natural’ and ‘peaceful’ might mean different things in Iranian culture due to various reasons, such as specific characteristics of green spaces, climate, and ecology in Iran, as well as the Iranian cultural landscape and socio-cultural aspects. Therefore, the
naturalness and open space which are seen in Ruffey Park and Iran’s parks, and the sense of restoration which is perceived in these two contexts may be different.

Table 7-1 below summarises most and least valued landscape photos in terms of aesthetic in both case studies.

Table 7-1: Most and least valued landscape photos in terms of aesthetic in both case studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landscape scenery and aesthetic values</th>
<th>Ruffey Park</th>
<th>Iran’s Parks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most valued</td>
<td>Picturesque sceneries, view, lake, and open space</td>
<td>Traditional water features and pathways, picturesque sceneries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least valued</td>
<td>Disordered, crowd, unnatural visual elements, dry scenes</td>
<td>Disordered, crowd, dark and dirty water, unnatural visual elements, dry scenes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7-1: Favourite aesthetic places in park landscapes, extracted from the analysis in Chapter Six and place theories in Chapter Two
Concepts such as ‘harmony’, ‘tidiness’ and ‘orderliness’ have been considered as associated with aesthetics in cultural landscape planning. Principles of landscape composition have also been noted as important in the planning of cultural landscapes, such as ‘unity’, ‘variety’, ‘intensity’ and ‘historical depth’ as key concepts (Jones & Daugstad 1997). Favourite places have been found to afford restorative experiences that lead to emotion and self-regulation processes which are basic to the development of place identity (Korpela & Hartig 1996).

Place identity refers to the special character of place which distinguishes it, while reflecting its cultural origins and heritage (Butina-Watson & Bentley 2007). Place identity in Iran’s urban park landscapes embodies design characteristics which mostly include the icons of Iranian cultural landscape and Persian paradise gardens such as water features, paths, places of enclosure, topography and different levels, flowers, and ordered and green plantations. Here, water feature is considered an iconic cultural and historical element that makes the scene distinguishable and memorable (Jessel 2006). This symbolic role of water is a common language between the community to express their beliefs, culture, traditions, and selves. It is also more significant in countries with a dry climate. In addition, water in the landscape is often used as an indication of naturalness that describes the perceived closeness to a preconceived natural state (Ode, Tveit & Fry 2008). Environmental psychologists believe that naturalness is an important aspect of restorative environments that enhance recovery of mental energies and effectiveness (Hartig et al. 2003; Kaplan & Kaplan 1989; Ode, Tveit & Fry 2008). Furthermore, the water feature illustrated in photo No.3, which mostly represents English picturesque design, demonstrates that some of the Iranian participants were interested in the new form of water features and settings compared to those traditional ones, and found them very scenic.

These characters of the landscape create favourite places in Iran’s urban park landscapes which inspire aesthetic values for the respondents. They also afford restorative experiences that lead to emotion and self-regulation processes and develop place identity (see Figure 7-1). However, crowded spaces and lack of ‘tidiness’, ‘orderliness’, and ‘natural elements’ are aspects that create least valued landscape scenes in terms of aesthetic and make them unfavourable.
Table 7-2: Favourite aesthetic places in Iran’s urban park landscapes, identified by two groups of the respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fountains and water feature in Sayee Park - No. 7</td>
<td>Cypress trees along a pathway in Laleh Park - No. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A paved path in Jamshidieh Park - No. 5</td>
<td>Bridge on the creek of Laleh Park – No.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A path ways with shady trees in Sayee Park - No. 11</td>
<td>A path ways with shady trees in Sayee Park - No. 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Place identity has also been conceptualised as ‘the cognitive connection between the self and the physical environment’ (Kyle, Graefe & Manning 2005, p. 155). It is evident that Iranian respondents have made connections between their selves and the place physical identity. According to Proshansky, place identity is defined as ‘those dimensions of self that define the individual’s personal identity in relation to the physical environment by means of a complex pattern of conscious and unconscious ideals, beliefs, preferences, feelings, values, goals, and behavioural tendencies and skills relevant to this environment’ (Proshansky 1978, p. 155). From this perspective, physical settings provide an opportunity for individuals to express and affirm their identity (Kyle, Graefe & Manning 2005, p. 155). This can be observable in electing icons of Iranian cultural landscape as favourite places in association with aesthetic values, which likewise demonstrates that aesthetic values are profoundly cultural.
Table 7-3: Favourite aesthetic places in Ruffey Park landscapes, identified by two groups of the respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top view of the lake - No.13</td>
<td>Top view of the lake - No.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Top view of the lake - No.13" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Top view of the lake - No.13" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake with deck - No.14</td>
<td>Lake with deck - No.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Lake with deck - No.14" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Lake with deck - No.14" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake view – No.1</td>
<td>A top view of the park - No.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Lake view – No.1" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="A top view of the park - No.17" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There has been an increased interest in the subject of the way in which immigrant communities can make sense of place and belonging to new locations as an aspect of place identity theory (Macfarlane, Fuller & Jeffries 2000; Rishbeth 2001; Roe 2012, p. 197). However, it is significant to know which parameters affect immigrants’ sense of place and how. In the case of Iranian immigrants and Ruffey Park, analysis shows that the configuration of ‘view’, ‘lake’, and ‘open space’ derived from cultural notions of ‘bush’ and ‘Arcadia’, and English picturesque design concepts, affect Iranian immigrants’ sense of aesthetic places. Although these concepts are not perceived consciously by the participants, the overall setting is considered pleasant and scenic. These characteristics here play an important role in developing person–environment interactions and subsequently place identity.
The respondents see the park landscapes as unmodified natural landscape, despite the existence of numerous built facilities such as roads, walking tracks, and shelters, as well as their long histories of human modification (explained in Chapter Five). These elements of the park have been under-perceived; and aesthetic aspects of the park are referred to the understanding of naturalness, pristine conditions, topography, and legibility (see Figure 7-1). Therefore, to answer the question ‘are those spatial aesthetic values being attributed to Australian urban park spaces after migration? And how?’ It has been found that peacefulness and restoration are greatly felt in the Arcadian context of the Ruffey Park. These sentiments are evoked from the spatial aesthetic values of the Ruffey Park. Spatial aesthetic values are strongly related to the existence of water and the perception of unmodified broad natural landscapes for most of the respondents, while the picturesque design purposes are rarely perceived. This can be due to the smaller scales, climatology, and a desire for wide natural spaces, or the design of urban parks in Iran which includes more man-made structures, buildings, and facilities which in some cases may reduce the sense of naturalness in parks. One of the respondents who migrated to Australia with his family in 2010 describes his feelings about Australian urban parks as:

I have a good feeling in parks, because they are very natural. It feels like you are not in the city; you are in a virgin nature far from the urban area ... they are very different from Iran’s parks, which are designed for special recreational purposes, but I think here parks have been just separated from other urban areas and left undisturbed ... we just go there for picnicking and having BBQ with our friends usually at weekends. Although, there are not enough places for such purposes but if you are lucky you can find some shelters or benches to get together.

The surroundings of humans consist of physical, social, and cultural components that affect the lives of people and their attitudes towards the built environment, as well as their expectations of the designers. What landscape architects create is a ‘potential environment’ for human behaviour, and what people perceive and use is their ‘effective environment’. Predicting what the effective environment of people will be is a crucial role for design professions when the built environment is
configured in a particular pattern (Lang 1987, p. 75). Yet how is it possible to predict the effective environment of a particular group of users in a multicultural society such as Australia if the environment is configured based on a culture and patterns that are inexplicable to them? One of the respondents, who is from Isfahan, Iran and has been in Australia for five years, explains:

Melbourne’s parks unlike Iran’s ones, look like forest to me with lots of ups and downs. I think parks in Iran require much more maintenance due to the harsh weather, but here the fauna and flora in parks are different. For example you can rarely see colourful flowers, flower beds, shrubs, or tracks with rows of cultivated trees on sides in Melbourne’s parks.

Lang (1987) argues, the physical environment consists of the ‘geographical setting, the social of the interpersonal and intergroup organisations that exist, the psychological of the images that people have in their heads, and the behavioural of those elements to which a person responds’ (Lang 1987, p. 77). The surrounding of individuals in this view consists of the real world, and the phenomenological world which is perceived and consciously or unconsciously affects people’s behavioural patterns and emotional responses. This person’s assumption in relation to Ruffey Park refers to her cultural image of an urban park and her understanding of ‘naturalness’. For this person a park landscape without flowerbeds and rows of cultivated trees seems unmanaged, and the intended effect of designers of picturesque landscapes cannot be perceived.

Research on physical attributes of the landscape demonstrated that preferences for wilderness and designed landscapes may differ significantly among various social groups (Kaplan & Kaplan 1989). In addition, research has shown that managed and designed landscapes are more often preferred by people who have anthropocentric values, while people with a more ecocentric value prefer wild landscapes (Buijs, Elands & Langers 2009; Dearden 1984; Kaltenborn & Bjerke 2002).

The present study demonstrates that although Iranian immigrants may prefer using managed landscapes and utilitarian provisions of urban parks, they greatly acknowledge apparent natural characteristics of the landscape which create
favourite aesthetic scenes full of a sense of peacefulness and restoration. They also highly valued water as an important aspect in inspiring sense of aesthetic, which refers to the significant role of water in Iranian cultural landscape.

7.2 Research Question 2

How do personal and cultural meanings of place in urban park environments contribute to place attachment for Iranian immigrants?

a) What are the spatial cultural values of urban park landscapes in Iran?

b) Are these cultural values attributed to Australian urban park spaces after migration? And how?

The respondents’ interpretations of their selections in Iran’s case study revealed that they most valued the landscape, in terms of personal and cultural values, because of historical landscape icons, pathways, social traditions, festivals, and strong rooting of their past. According to Ode et al. (2008), historical richness in the landscape focuses on the amount and diversity of cultural elements. This is evident in photo No.14, (see Table 7-5: Meaningful cultural places in Iran’s park landscapes, identified by two groups of the respondents), which illustrates two axes with a flower pot in the middle of their intersection as a strong icon of Persian garden design. This quadripartite pattern of Persian garden (char-bagh or four-part garden) which has its roots in Iranian history, culture, art, carpet, and landscape design gives historical richness to the landscape and makes it culturally and personally valuable. Moreover, paths as places for sitting, relaxing, and conversing represent the cultural passage (koocheh bagh), and are symbols of the confluence of nature and culture. Social traditions, and cultural events and picnicking are also considered significant. However, paths in Ruffey Park reflect less personal and cultural meanings, which indicate that they have fewer attractions compared to the other parts of the park. Urban parks for the respondents are mainly ‘places to pause’ or ‘places of gathering’ and spaces with fewer chances for staying are considered not welcoming and personally and culturally meaningless.
In the case of Ruffey Park, views, water, open space, naturalness, legibility, and social and cultural activities in the park landscape are parameters that contribute to creating settings that evoke emotions, feelings, memory, and identity for Iranian participants. The focality of the lake, the existence of a bench close to the lake, and the nice view produce a sense of enclosure, restoration, relaxation, and vitality which provides an appropriate place ‘to be together’. Whereas settings with less natural elements and more material culture and cultural practices, inspire meaning and recall memories for the respondents with regards to land use patterns and cultural practices, have the least aesthetic values. Analysis also reveals that landscape aesthetic attributes create a desired place for the respondents to be with their beloveds, they are also perceived as a peaceful place full of sense of vitality. On the other hand, photos No.16 and No.5, (see Table 7-6: Meaningful cultural places in Ruffey Park landscapes, identified by two groups of the respondents), which indicate the social traditions and Iranian festivals in parks have been selected as meaningful cultural landscape settings, however, these photos had less aesthetic values for the respondents.

Table 7-4 below summarises most and least valued landscape photos in terms of personal and cultural values in both case studies.

**Table 7-4: Most and least valued landscape photos in terms of personal and cultural values in both case studies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landscape personal and cultural values</th>
<th>Ruffey Park</th>
<th>Iran’s parks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most valued</td>
<td>Picturesque sceneries, restored and peaceful scenes, social traditions in park landscapes</td>
<td>Cultural landscape icons, pathways, memory of the past, social traditions in park landscapes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least valued</td>
<td>Man-made structures, lack of naturalness, paths and tracks, disorder, dry scenes</td>
<td>Unnatural features, dark and gloomy scenes, lack of safety, stagnant dirty water, disorder</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 7-2: Meaningful personal and cultural places in park landscapes, extracted from the analysis in Chapter Six and place theories in Chapter Two
Table 7-5: Meaningful cultural places in Iran’s park landscapes, identified by two groups of the respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13th day of Norouz, in Mellat Park - No. 1</td>
<td>Gathering space with artificial lights in Sayee Park - No. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1" alt="13th day of Norouz, in Mellat Park - No. 1" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Gathering space with artificial lights in Sayee Park - No. 6" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fountains and water feature in Sayee Park - No. 7</td>
<td>A paved path in Jamshidieh Park - No.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Fountains and water feature in Sayee Park - No. 7" /></td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="A paved path in Jamshidieh Park - No.5" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A path crossed by the main axis in Niavaran Park - No. 14</td>
<td>Flowerbeds and seats in Qeytarieh Park - No. 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image5" alt="A path crossed by the main axis in Niavaran Park - No. 14" /></td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Flowerbeds and seats in Qeytarieh Park - No. 18" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scholars have focused on the concept of place attachment as the phenomena of human-place bonding, and describe this phenomenon in a number of terms such as sense of place, place dependence, rootedness, and insideness. In photo No.1 the particular activity that is undertaken in the landscape, which is culturally known by the participants and personally experienced by them, has given spirit to the place that is beyond the landscape itself or its elements. Culture here in the form of social traditions has a significant role in the relationship between human and the landscape.
and making a sense of place. Low and Altman (1992) noted that these emotional qualities are supported by cognition (thought, knowledge, and belief) and practice (action and behaviour). Therefore, place attachment is an interplay of emotions and affect, beliefs and knowledge, and actions and behaviours (Kyle, Graefe & Manning 2005, p. 155). Several studies have emphasised this conception of human-place interactions and argued that attachment to a physical space is a process which occurs through our interactions with the settings. Place attachment mostly appears when individuals get familiar to the setting and give value to it (Kyle, Graefe & Manning 2005, p. 155; Milligan 1998; Relph 1976; Tuan 1980).

This process of giving values in Ruffey Park, where naturalness, restoration, being together, and socio-cultural activities are the main source of human-place bonding, leads to ‘place attachment’. While, historical icons and paths in Iran’s parks are viewed as having spectacular, unique or iconic built features (Coeterier 2002; Green 1999), and historic elements (Jessel 2006) that make the place meaningful. This view can also be referred to place dependence. The concept of place dependence has been described as a kind of attachment which is related to potentials of a particular place in terms of satisfying and supporting the needs and goals of an individual in comparison to other similar currently available settings (Stokols & Shumaker 1981; Williams et al. 1992, p. 31).

Paths in Iran’s parks are not merely used as a passage, they are places that provide stillness and passive activities, and have roots in Iranian recreation culture and garden design. The momentous physical environment, social interaction, and personal meaning contributing to satisfying felt behavioural, strong emotional attachment, and insideness in park landscapes. Analysis shows to what extent local identity and the way in which it is mediated through cultural narratives can be effective in inspiring personal and cultural values in park landscapes. It has been found that a spatial manifestation of koocheh bagh in the form of paths in urban parks plays an important role in inspiring memory and nostalgia, creating a pleasant space, and expressing a powerful relationship between memory, culture, and identity.
Memory is a realm that is shared among individuals to create collective identities. It is often anchored in place by specific events or commemorative practices, even the whole landscape can be attached to the texture of memory. Social practices are an important way in which narratives are discovered and recovered outside the story in different forms and practices. They enable people to see how narratives become a fundamental part of landscapes texture and experience (Potteiger & Purinton 1998, p. 58). In other words, Iranian respondents’ memory here is intertwined with their cultural identity and rootedness in place which has resulted in a strong emotional attachment to Persian garden icons, paths, and social traditions in park landscapes (see Figure 7-2). Analysis of the data reveals how cultural practices of picnicking are symbolically loaded for an ongoing reconstruction of identity. Photos No.7 and No.14 are regarded as cultural landscape icons, while photo No.1 is considered a landscape where visions of Iranian identity are realised and articulated (see Table 7-5: Meaningful cultural places in Iran’s park landscapes, identified by two groups of the respondents).

A place can be a resource for satisfying felt behavioural or experiential goals, and also an essential part of one’s self to result strong emotional attachment (Williams et al. 1992, p. 32). This strong emotional attachment can then result in ‘place attachment’. According to the analysis, physical settings that provide: 1- places of enclosure, stillness, relaxation and restoration in natural settings; and 2- places for being together and doing social and cultural activities, are significant landscape personal and cultural values in Ruffey Park, which contribute to ‘place attachment’. This is almost the same in Iran’s parks, however, icons of cultural landscape design and pathways in Iran’s park landscapes were highly considered as places which are culturally and personally meaningful.

In other words, the concept of ‘being together’ which generates cultural belonging, produces familiar imagery and fortifies collective memory in Ruffey Park, leads to reconstructing the past and reinforcing habitual behaviour in park landscapes in a new context after migration. In answering the question: ‘are these cultural values attributed to Australian urban park spaces after migration? And how?’ It is evident that naturalness and legibility in Iran’s urban park case studies are not as impressive
as they are in Ruffey Park because of the particular type of design and management in Iran’s parks, cultural design aspects, the dry climate, and the scale of urban parks. These parameters in the landscape are desired by Iranian people who often travel thousands of kilometres to the north of Iran to enjoy the wide, natural and unique landscape. The concept of legibility here refers to the geographical legibility as the ease to understand the layout of a place for a particular activity.

Naturalness and picturesque characteristics of Ruffey Park are highly admired by Iranian respondents, who also prefer cultural practices and social activities in Ruffey Park. However, unlike Iran’s parks historicity in Ruffey Park, which is the main aim of its initial designers (Calder, Parkin & Seddon 1974) and is illustrated by various signs in the park, is not perceived significant by the Iranian participants. Naturalness as a design objective with cultural and historical roots is perceived as a refuge and peaceful space for restoration or being together, which demonstrates the lack of connection with the physical place or ‘outsideness’.

Most of Iran’s parks are man-made but Melbourne’s parks are so natural. I feel like I am in north of Iran in Melbourne’s parks. They have lots of peace ...

I like the highest part of the park which got the best view.

Northern Iran includes the Southern Caspian regions which are covered with dense forests, mountains, and impressive sea shores which is mostly visited by domestic tourists. Due to the distinct climate, this area includes a wide range of natural scenes which attract lots of domestic tourists every year.

[Melbourne’s parks are] so beautiful but very quiet ... I experience them differently in [Iranian] festivals. They are not quiet in festivals, because in that time the focus is on the festival and less on park environments ... My favourite place in Ruffey Park is near the lake, it feels like you are in heaven.

There are many interesting things in parks in Iran like: conventional cafés, small museums, public sports device and so on, in addition to beautiful nature ... I really miss sitting on café seats and chatting with my friends under street lights specially at night after 10 pm.
I really like Melbourne’s park environments where you can find fantastic trees, beautiful lakes, and nice hills ... More visiting Ruffey Park you will explore more nice places ... [I like the area] close to the lake, because some early morning when I go there I see around covered by dense fog.

[in Ruffey Park] I like top views of the lake, seating on seats under the shadow of trees and look the entire park and the houses and roads nearby.

Table 7-6: Meaningful cultural places in Ruffey Park landscapes, identified by two groups of the respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top view of the lake - No.13</td>
<td>Lake with deck - No.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13th day of Norouz festival - No.16</td>
<td>Top view of the lake - No.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iranian cultural festival – No.5</td>
<td>Old trees and a bench – No.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These views illustrate that places can be perceived differently by their users, in terms of the kinds of ideals and values they bring to them, and their rootedness in the place. On the other hand, readers continuously make their own stories through memory,
experience, interpretation, and landscape. Thus, it is important for the designers to understand these complexities and recognise that a simple approach to symbolism might not be applicable. Creating an elaborate iconography without considering how such references might be read by individuals and communities is seen to be accomplished by many designers. Engaging the process of landscape narrative as connected to social practices helps designers to discover the existing social frameworks and observe the landscape through the lens of narratives rooted in a community culture (Potteiger & Purinton 1998).

Depending on the knowledge and bond of a person with the landscape, it is being read in many different ways and used for various activities. The recreational value of a landscape is revealed through its layers of meaning which are interpreted differently by various users. Cultural landscapes include references to their cultural history which contribute to their identity. But, should the landscape narrative be explained one-dimensional, or represents different narratives for a variety of people?

In the process of renewing their ties to the landscape to achieve cultural belonging, Iranian respondents reconnect with their experiences and memories of such spaces in Iran. Nonetheless, the physical attributes of park landscapes have been found extremely effective in inspiring personal and cultural meanings, a sense of restoration, and fostering a sense of place. Since place is a meaning-based concept and meanings deriving from experience with the physical landscape, the social construction view predominates in some place studies. For Tuan (1977), meaning of place is primarily socially constructed and humans ascribe it to space based on their experiences. He also believes that an unexperienced physical setting is a ‘blank space’, and has no important characteristics (Stedman 2003; Tuan 1977). Greider et al. (1994), assert landscape is a reflection of cultural identity and is more about us than the natural environment.

‘Landscapes’ are the symbolic environments created by human acts of conferring meaning to nature and the environment, of giving the environment definition and from a particular angle of vision and through a special filter of values and believes. Every landscape is a symbolic environment. These
lanscapes reflect our self-definitions that are grounded in culture (Greider & Garkovich 1994, p. 1).

The present thesis highlights that according to diverse ‘cultures of nature’, immigrants in Australian cities do not merely visit parks, but engage in processes of place-making. Immigrants carry their cultural narratives of nature, which provide them with a lens through which to perceive nature and landscape. However, the role of planning in the physical environment and its effects on this process must also be considered.

7.3 Research Question 3

Which characteristics of the physical environment in park landscapes in both contexts encourage social and recreational practices and foster a sense of belonging? And what sort of recreational activities are preferred by Iranian users? And why?

7.3.1 Survey Findings

According to the observation and survey data analysis, Iranian immigrants prefer ‘being with family and friends’, ‘walking and getting fresh air’, and ‘doing sport and exercise’ and ‘picnicking’ as their most favourite activities in Iranian parks. However, ‘festivals and celebrations’ are the most undertaken activities in Ruffey Park, followed by ‘picnicking, BBQ’, and ‘being with family and friends’.

It is evident that activities such as sport and exercise are less undertaken in Melbourne urban parks by the Iranian respondents. According to the responses this is due to the availability of the fresh air and green spaces in almost all parts of the suburban areas, which facilitate these activities. Nevertheless, the existence of favourite sporting facilities and fitness equipment in Iran’s parks is an important factor in making these spaces an appropriate place for doing sport and exercise, and the lack of them in another context may decrease active engagements with park spaces.

In Iran we visited parks for having picnic, walking, using sport facilities and equipment, which there are not any in Melbourne’s parks, but in Melbourne
everywhere is like a park so we do not need to go to the park for getting fresh air or walking or doing exercise.

In Iran we used parks for doing exercise, and skating, but in Melbourne’s parks we usually go for walking and BBQ.

Here [in Melbourne] we go to parks for being together, having lunch, and walking, or for meeting my friends, in Iran we went to parks for getting fresh air and socialising. In Tehran we did more jogging and sporting activities, but in Melbourne we do more BBQ and catching up with friends.

Nonetheless, picnicking, and being together are the favourite activities in urban parks which continue to be preferred after migration as well. Moreover, festivities and cultural celebrations in Australian parks can also be seen in association with the interest Iranians have in conducting community cultural gatherings and celebrations in natural settings. The interweaving of social and cultural dimensions of such events is highly significant as a source of collective affirmation and identity in conditions of migration, and can also foster sense of familiarity and belonging to the physical environment.

Moreover, as first Anglo-Celtic settlers in Australia could not see the Indigenous’ dreaming and spiritual sites, with pathways and edible plants, and ignored their landscapes full of memories from their own life and their ancestors (Byrne, Goodall & Cadzow 2013, p. 51); non-English immigrants likewise do not have the cultural key to the Australian landscape myths. Therefore, they will develop their own myths to relate to the Australian environment. This mythical landscape, as discussed in Chapter Three, has resulted in the creation of a natural and picturesque landscape, and wide open spaces in Australian parks. These characteristics are perceived as untouched nature with a highly restorative and peaceful atmosphere. Iranian participants in this study mostly spoke of how the Australian parks seemed natural compared to their park landscapes of their homelands, and how they have fewer facilities such as illuminations at night.
Melbourne’s parks are beautiful and natural. There are less man-made and designed structures in the park spaces; no gardens, flowers, water features or planned entertainments or recreational facilities ... it would be good if there was a chance of using parks at night. It would have been used more often and [for] longer hours ... I miss the social activities and being with friends and family in Iran’s parks as well as the flowers, trees, and some entertainments like 3D cinemas and markets.

They [Melbourne’s parks] are so natural and wide. They are like a beautiful heaven during the day, nice and quiet, but they are scary at nights ... Iran’s parks can be used at night. Lots of people bring their dinner to the park and have dinner there with their friends and family. There are lots of sport facilities as well.

According to the observations and data analysis, passive activities including ‘festivities’, ‘being together’, ‘picnicking’ and ‘socialising’ are the most preferred activities carried out by Iranian immigrants. Findings of this study demonstrate that Iranian immigrants highly admire the aesthetic aspects of Australian park landscapes and found them peaceful and restorative. However, they miss those recreational, social, and sporting activities they used to undertake when they were in Iran.

Survey data and observation also demonstrate that the growth of population and living in apartments have increased the need of open spaces in Iran. This is evident through the kind of activities that Iranians undertake in urban park spaces which is similar to those that they used to do in their back yards. Lack of natural/open spaces in their residential places has resulted in using urban parks as places for resting, getting fresh air and vitality, having dinner, or drinking tea, and having a chat with each other.

On the other hand, changing in lifestyle after migration and living in houses with large open spaces enables Iranian immigrants to undertake small group gatherings and family chats in their backyards. However, Iranian broader conception of what a park is has caused an understanding of parks as public places that require facilities that these immigrants expect of them, such as night use, illumination,
cultural/educational activities, active recreation facilities, the existence of exhibitions, cafés, restaurants, and settings for socialising. The next section will discuss the Q methodology data analysis in relation to landscape social and recreational values specified by the respondents.

7.3.2 Q Methodology Findings in Relation to Landscape Social and Recreational Values

Photo sorting results through Q methodology demonstrate preferences for activities in relation to festivities, socialising, and public gatherings. It has been also revealed that the existence of flat and appropriate spaces for sitting, gathering, and picnicking, are desirable in Iran’s parks. Socio-cultural activities, passive recreation, and the wish for being together in nature are again raised as important activities in park spaces. Nonetheless, recreational facilities, play grounds, and equipment for active recreation are also considered significant. Moreover, analysis demonstrates that ‘disturbing visual elements’ including unnatural and man-made structures reflect unpleasant landscape scenes for the respondents; however, their patterns of use are mostly depended on those elements. The respondents believe that social activities in parks demand particular space arrangements and provisions, and they usually miss some of those provisions in Melbourne parks such as 3D cinemas, amphitheatres, and markets.

In Ruffey Park, social traditions, passive activities, gathering, and being together are reflected as desirable activities. Culture and the collective memory are greatly influential in recreational preferences in park landscapes after migration, and past interactions with these spaces continue to affect immigrants’ preferences in the new landscape settings. Here again, safety, greenery, and the existence of an appropriate place for sitting and gathering in park landscapes are considered significant.
Table 7-7 summarises most and least valued landscape photos in terms of social and recreational values in both case studies.

Table 7-7: Most and least valued landscape photos in terms of social and recreational values in both case studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landscape social and recreational values</th>
<th><strong>Ruffey Park</strong></th>
<th><strong>Iran’s parks</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Most valued</strong></td>
<td>Social traditions, gathering, being together, passive activities</td>
<td>Social activates, gathering, passive &amp; active recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Least valued</strong></td>
<td>Lack of greenery, lack of safety and appropriate places to sit and have picnic, lack of facilities for outdoor &amp; social activities</td>
<td>Lack of naturalness and safety, lack of appropriate spaces and facilities for sitting and gathering, inappropriate spaces for kids or having picnic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7-3: Landscape social and recreational values in park landscapes, extracted from the analysis in Chapter Six and place theories in Chapter Two.
Table 7-8: Landscape social and recreational values in Iran’s park landscapes, identified by two groups of the respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13th day of Norouz, in Mellat Park – No. 1</td>
<td>Playground in Niavaran Park - No. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open space in Laleh Park - No. 2</td>
<td>Sport equipment in Niavaran Park - No. 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge on the creek of Laleh Park - No. 3</td>
<td>13th day of Norouz in Mellat Park – No. 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7-9: Landscape social and recreational values in Ruffey Park landscapes, identified by two groups of the respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shelter and picnic area - No.3</td>
<td>Top view of the lake - No.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iranian cultural festival - No.5</td>
<td>Old trees and a bench - No.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13th day of Norouz festival - No.16</td>
<td>Curved path by the lake – No.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Ruffey Park case study, strong preferences for landscapes illustrating top views and open spaces that provide appropriate places for restoration, nature watching, walking, picnicking, gathering, and being together have also been observed. Naturalness in these photos is evident through the existence of the lake, trees, and greenery, while legibility can also be described through continuity and focality (the lake). Accordingly, ‘being together’ and ‘restoration’ in wide, natural, legible landscape settings with shady trees and benches are desired and valuable recreational activities in Ruffey Park. Enclosure and reclusion, quietness, and peacefulness are greatly preferred. A path by the lake here is considered valuable and pleasant for walking or bike riding. Moreover, ‘view’, ‘open space’, and
‘naturalness’ are contributing to create a place which is perceived ‘quiet’ and ‘peaceful’ (see Figure 7-3).

I have lots of memories of parks in Iran from my childhood till now. A few of them are my favourites for different reasons. The greenery is quite old in most of them and with beautiful species and trees, the water features are so nice as well as birds or animal sanctuaries.

Melbourne’s parks are beautiful and natural. There are less man-made and designed structures in the park spaces, no gardens, flowers, water features, or planned entertainments or recreation facilities. Melbourne parks are natural and have been kept natural and have less entertainment facilities.

Iran’s parks got more flowers and need much more maintenance, due to the dry and harsh climate of Iran. And in my idea Melbourne’s parks do not have enough entertainment places such as restaurants, exhibitions, markets, and cafés than Iran.

Iran’s parks are smaller. They got sport equipment for people, which is so good, and one of the important differences in my view is that Iran’s parks got lots of flowers and good maintenance. Melbourne’s ones are usually natural which is very beautiful and I personally prefer Melbourne’s open and wide park spaces especially for having picnic with friends. It needs some flowers, colourful flowers.

[In Iran we usually visited] Mellat Park. It was beautiful, peaceful, and close to where we lived in Tehran. We visited it regularly because of my little daughter, and my husband and I could relax and enjoy the nature. They [Melbourne’ parks] are so natural and wide. They are like a beautiful heaven during the day, nice and quiet, but they are scary at night … We hold some of our ceremonies and festivals in the park which helps our kids get familiar with our culture … I think playgrounds in Australia are more challenging for kids and they are made of safer materials, and I think it is much safer to cover the ground with timber.
Using parks at night time, the existence of restaurants, cafés, buildings in which people gather for social or recreational activities, colourful flowers, and different forms of sporting facilities are some examples of recreational provisions desired by Iranian immigrants in park spaces that were mentioned by the respondents in the interviews.

Gathering is a fundamental principle in making landscapes, while the interconnection of natural and cultural processes significantly affects the configurations of landscapes. Gathering is a way of regaining, remembering, preserving, and recreating what is desired or lost. It is also a way of creating a more coherent world (Potteiger & Purinton 1998, p. 164). Each individual’s unique experience of the world gives different qualities to place, but this experience is filtered through collective narratives and public discourses. Therefore, the rules of inclusion and exclusion that give places and regions their character and identity should be highly considered. This would shift our attention away from the spatial scale towards more complex issues associated with the inter-relationships of place, self and community in modern civil societies (Entrikin 1997, p. 266).

7.4 Belonging as a Product of Performativity

In general, social and cultural meanings of a place are the ideas, values, and beliefs which provide a type of information that orders the world. Since landscapes are socially constructed settings imbued with meaning, this information allows people to define themselves and also the way they behave in the place (Bender 1993; Greider & Garkovich 1994; Riley 1992). Johnson (2007) and Tilley (2004) connect actions within a physical or cultural space or structure to identity through applying Bourdieu’s concept of habitus. Bourdieu argues that ‘the structures constitutive of a particular type of environment (i.e. the material conditions of existence characteristic of a class condition) produce habitus, systems of durable, transposable dispositions’ (Bourdieu 1977, p. 72).

Habitus is created among members of a group through:
The focus on action and what actors do – people and other actors – emphasises the importance of ritualised performances, habitual and non-habitual behaviours, play, and doings of which everyday life is made. The idea of performativity highlights the relevance of concerted actions – or ‘events’ – in our mundane existence and their fragility and inscrutability. An ethnographic attention to performance then is an attention to identity performances, border-crossings, and practices of all kinds. Non-representational ethnographies still attempt to be performative in style by privileging ‘particular, participatory, dynamic, intimate, precarious, embodied experience grounded in historical processes, contingency, and ideology’ and by ‘tak[ing] as both its subject matter and method the experiencing body situated in time, place, and history’ (Conquergood 1991, p. 187; Vannini 2015, p. 321).

The concept of belonging as a product of performativity enables us to go beyond the limitations of narrative, by giving meaning to the environment through collective and individual behaviour (Leach 2002). The term habitus has also been applied by Tilley (2004) to connect actions within a physical and cultural space to identity. Tilley relates landscape phenomenology to identity and asserts that ‘ideas and feelings about identity are inevitably located in the specificities of familiar places together creating landscapes and how it feels to be there’ (Tilley 2004, p. 25). Identities are brought into a particular setting and are played out in there, through emotions, feelings, dwelling, movement, and practical activities. Tilley claims that ‘to know a landscape is to know who you are, how to go on and where you belong’ (Ryan 2015, p. 18; Tilley 2004, p. 25). Analysis of the present thesis confirms Tilley’s study and suggests that perception and usage of urban park landscapes are dependent to both Iranian’s
understanding of park landscapes as mediated with their identity, and landscape characteristics and settings that support this understanding (see Figure 7-4).

Building on Bourdieu’s theory of habitus and theories of ‘sense of place’, the analysis illustrates how Iranian immigrants’ interpret Melbourne park landscapes is highly dependent on their cultural identity in relation to park use and landscape design. The landscape operates on unconscious levels and affects their perceptions and uses of place as mediated by their approach to nature, which contribute to the phenomenon of the sense of belonging.

7.5 Landscape Architecture and Human Interests

The aesthetics of architecture must transcend function and human interests. If architectural constructions are shaped to match human needs, interests, or desires, then whose interests are to dominate and how they may be constructed? Architecture is both an art and a profession. As an art it aims to imagine a future world; as a profession it attempts to practice in the public interest (Dovey 2002). In order to link architecture to cultural identity, we must extend our analysis beyond the discourse of form and engage with subjective processes of identification. Architecture offers a potential mechanism for inscribing the self into the environment. It facilitates a form of identification and contributes to a sense of belonging. Therefore, it is essential to consider our engagement with the
environment as well as the nature of the environment itself, in order to reassess the relationship between architecture and cultural identity (Leach 2002).

Considering the new physical characteristics of urban park landscapes and immigrants’ continuities with their past leisure experiences, respondents presented a fit between habitus and the new park environments to adapt their habitus to the new landscape. However, this ‘compulsive fit’ does not mean that they assimilate into the new dominant culture. In contrast, non-English immigrants have been found to highly prefer their cultural and social activities that they used to do in park spaces before migration, and facilitating their expectations in these spaces may increase the rate of park use among them.

7.6 Transferring Habitus

The lack of fit between landscape (as field) and habitus, may result in active interventions as attempts to shape the park environments in different images to make it fit into the habitus. Its success is dependent on various factors, such as the position of particular users within the social field of the neighbourhood (Benson 2014). According to Benson (2014), while a ‘fit’ between habitus and field may generate a sense of belonging, this ‘fit’ may be re-made, challenged, and even dismantled as a result of the dynamic relationship between place and identity (see Figure 7-5). Therefore, it is essential to recognise that belonging is an uncertain process, in which habitus and field both are adaptable so that belonging may be achieved.
Benson (2010) highlights the role of culturally-specific imaginings and subjective experiences in relation to the migrants struggle to emplace themselves in a new place. Such imaginings are often generated following migration, particularly in their emerging relationships with the landscape. The landscape is in continual process and the immigrants’ relationships with their new surroundings are also in process, as they gain increasing knowledge and experience of their surroundings. Understanding immigrants’ relationships with the landscape provide a lens through which it is possible to explore immigrants’ emplacement in their new environment (Benson 2010).

Drawing on Benson (2010) this study argue s that immigrants’ relationships with the landscape are shaped by the intersection of ‘imagining’ and ‘experience’. The role of imagining in shaping the way immigrants understand the landscape is very important in the development of a relationship with it. The complexity of this relationship, as Benson (2010) stresses, relates to the element of detachment which contains the landscape viewed from a distance and often shaped by imagination. Nonetheless, in order to increase immigrants’ usage and enjoyment of park spaces, it is important to pay more attention to the ‘experience’ and give them a wide range of desired experiences by facilitating their expectations of these spaces.

The data analysis presented in the previous chapter illustrates that, the aesthetic aspects of Ruffey Park landscapes provide a restorative and desired space for Iranian immigrants. While, on the other hand, it demonstrates the extent to which the immigrants value engagement with the landscape as mediated with their cultural
identity to develop social activities and passive recreation. In contrast, cultural connections together with the physical settings of Iran’s parks provide more practical engagements with the park landscapes for the respondents.

Iranian immigrants celebrate most of their cultural events in public Parks. Part of these cultural practices need to be undertaken at night like char-shanbeh-Soury (see Figure 7-5), and demand illumination. Char-shanbeh-Soury is a prelude to Norouz (the Iranian New Year) on the last Tuesday of the year, and is celebrated with firework displays and the jumping over of fires. These examples demonstrate the complexity in the ways that immigrants use park landscapes. They also supports Bourdieu’s logic of practice as a process of embodying knowledge to live within a new environment, and of incorporating this knowledge into the individual habitus (Benson 2010). Iranian immigrants’ usage and understanding of the new park landscape demonstrate the extent to which they continue to reflect upon this process which contributes to a ‘sense of belonging’.

7.7 Perception of ‘Paradise’ in Park Landscapes

This study also explores ways in which the image of ‘paradise’ - that correlates with a particular Persian archetype - can be perceived in urban park landscapes in Iran and in a new park landscape after migration. As the last stage the respondents were asked to refer to the first most valued photographs of all stages in the Q methodology photo sorting, and place them into two piles (for each case study) in the way that each includes their first most valued photos of each stage. The respondents then chose the photo which represents paradise the most between them for each case study. Since, Iranian respondents were not familiar with the concept of ‘Arcadia’ they were asked to specify which photos represents ‘paradise’ for them in both contexts. Photo analysis in relation to Iran’s parks surprisingly revealed that each participant had seen the paradise in a distinct photo which illustrated a landscape setting of a particular park in Iran that was mentioned earlier in the thesis. Memory and nostalgia that is evoked by immigrants, increases the sense of elusiveness not merely in terms of the physical environment but the memories they experienced, the people they were with, and the activities undertaken there. This sense of elusiveness imbued with the
joy and pleasure deduced in park landscapes creates a distinct paradise for each individual. However, this can also be related to the design of the Iran’s parks which, in most cases, is based on the paradise narrative in Persian culture and addresses enclosure, stillness, and being together through spatial settings.

In contrast, the Ruffey Park photo analysis indicates that photos of the lake from different perspectives (photos number 1, 13, and 14) have the most resemblance with the image of paradise among others based on participants’ selections, and were elected by 87% of them. Among them photo number 13 has been chosen by 57% of the participants (23 people, 13 females and 10 males). They believe that it portrays a beautiful view of the lake with nice greenery and open space which is natural, peaceful, pleasant, and quiet. Participants’ descriptions of the lake in the Ruffey Park cluster comprise a sense of relaxation, restoration, aesthetic, and naturalness, which evoke the attributes of heaven or paradise.

The most frequent chosen photos of Iran’s case studies were photos of Sayee, Jamshidieh, and Laleh Parks, while almost all photos had been chosen by various individuals. These photos contain a photo of a water feature with fountains surrounded by flower beds including a pavilion and shady trees in the background, a paving stone path enclosed by shady trees, and a creek with a bridge on it beside a lawn area. The participants expressed reasons of their choices due to the physical existence of elements such as: ‘fountains and water, nice path, flowers, the fresh air and the greenery, paved path, shady trees for sitting under, and a nice scene and nature’.

Figure 7-6: Photo No.13
According to Tuan (1974), ‘place incarnates the experiences and aspirations of people. Place is not only a fact to be explained in the broader frame of space, but it is also a reality to be clarified and understood from the perspectives of the people who give it meaning.’ (Tuan 1979, p. 387). Place connects the environment to people or groups and plays a role as a ‘repository of collective memory’ (Entrikin 1997, p. 264) and this active relationship can be expressed as a sense of place and belonging.

They [Melbourne’s parks] are wide and open, very green and peaceful. I feel these as soon as I enter the park with all my senses … [My favourite place in Ruffey Park is the] lake, because I love water it is relaxing.

As stated by Persian mathematician, astronomer, philosopher, and poet, Omar Khayyam (10th-11th century) Heaven is a moment’s peace and Hell is a fire enkindled of our grief.

Heaven but the vision of fulfilled desire,  
And Hell the shadow from a soul on fire,

The present study found that aesthetic, picturesque, and Arcadian attributes of Ruffey Park environments play a prominent role in creating a sense of place or in representing the image of paradise or heaven among Iranian participants. This phenomenon may relate to the configuration of space, type of vegetation, presence of the lake, and the view, which contribute to creating an aesthetic scene full of sense of restoration. These attributes are portrayed in photo No.13 to the extent that the setting evokes the image of paradise for the Iranian respondents.

In contrast, it was revealed that paradise in Iran’s parks can be found in almost every corner of a park’s environment, based on the particular individuals’ meaning of that spatial setting. The spatiality of human life is first seen in material manifestation as a mappable real geography and through social and historical forces that shape and structure the material appearances. The first perspective objectively emphasises
‘things in space’, and the second one is more subjective and illustrates ‘thoughts about space’. These two modes of spatial thinking have often been considered as a container of all the spatial dimensions of the totality of social life in a given situation (Soja 1999, p. 74). In the case of Iranian park landscapes ‘thoughts about space’ including individual and cultural memories of space were more influential in inspiring a pleasant place or a paradise, while ‘things in space’ in Ruffey Park play a significant role in this regards. In other words, insideness in every spaces of Iran’s parks make them intimate, memorable, and pleasurable, however, being an outsider in Ruffey Park leads to mostly considering attractive and aesthetic landscape scenes.

It is evident that more than the half of the participants believe that paradise is observable in Ruffey Park’s lake setting, which inspires a sense of enclosure, peacefulness and restoration. However, in Iran’s parks, where the respondents are familiar with their environments and had a long term interaction with them, or as Relph describes are ‘insiders’, past experience of space plays a significant role in inspiring a sense of paradise.

Attitudes also include history, myths, culture, and beliefs, which are embedded in the information obtained from the environment that gives it meaning. These ambient qualities as Lang (1987) explains evoke emotional responses, and motivational messages that stimulate needs, which lead individuals to assign value to the particular setting. It is evident that the concept of paradise as a historical, cultural, and ideological landscape is perceived in almost every space of Iran’s urban parks by the Iranian research participants. It demonstrates how rootedness, belonging, and past experience of space contribute to the perception of paradise as an ideal place by Iranian participants, and how the image and meaning of it can be different by various individuals.

The difference of experiences between these two contexts gives rise to the importance of the relationship between self and place and the concept of ‘insideness’ and ‘outsideness’. The perceived paradise in Iran’s parks is more commonly felt to be as a result of ‘insideness’ or the familiarity with the place. Nonetheless, the role of aesthetic scenes and picturesque sceneries that influences sense of restoration as a
contributor that evokes personal meanings, are crucial factors in inspiring and representing the image of paradise in the Ruffey Park landscape. These characteristics are highly impressive in Ruffey Park compared to Iran’s park case studies, to the extent that according to the respondents, they create a picturesque landscape like a beautiful painting and are also related to their own cultural concept of paradise.

Paradise myth as a powerful spatial narrative in which to experience aesthetic pleasure, and experimenting ideals, has a great influence on the way landscape is culturally framed. Data analysis in this chapter demonstrates that understanding the influence of cultural factors on Iranian people’s appreciation of park spaces and on the physical landscape itself needs more understanding of 1- Iranian cultural landscape and ideology; 2- Iranian park settings and design; and 3- Iranians’ contemporary use of and engagement with these spaces in Iran, in more detail. In doing so, it is essential to identify Iranian people’s understanding of and engagements with urban park landscapes and explore the social and cultural experiences and historical processes that shape those engagements and understanding. Therefore, the next chapter elaborates Iranians’ garden and park culture, and explores the evolution of cultural attitudes and their reflections on contemporary meaning, layout and use of park spaces in Iran.
Chapter Eight: Influential Factors on Iranians’ Preferences of Recreational Activities and Engagements with Urban Parks

For centuries, nature has played a significant role in the Persianate world. Across generations and beyond national borders, Persian gardens and parks have carried traces of narratives, beliefs and attitudes of the people who have designed, built and used them. This chapter elaborates Iranians’ cultural landscape and understanding and use of Iran’s contemporary urban parks. It investigates Persian garden history and philosophy, and the emergence of urban parks in Iran. It examines the evolution of cultural attitudes and their reflections in contemporary meanings, layout and use of park spaces.

Landscape narratives both influence and are shaped by shifting cultural values and needs. Sociocultural factors and habitus transformation, have contributed to the diminution of the role of traditional cultural narratives in contemporary urban park design in Iran. However, some design and behavioural legacies from traditional ‘baghs’ (Persian gardens) are still observable in contemporary urban parks and among Iranian people.

This chapter underlines that the consideration towards stillness spaces as places to pause in park landscapes inherited from the Persian garden ideology has influenced recreational behaviour and activities in contemporary urban parks in Iran. It concludes how landscape narratives and cultural ideologies can affect attitudes towards nature and the community understanding and usage of constructed natural environments.

8.1 Contemporary Urban Parks in Iran

Traditional Persian gardens were relatively small and carefully scaled to the local availability of water, because of the hot, arid climate prevalent in much of Iran. However, with urbanisation, the need grew for public green spaces in Iran’s cities, to
serve as shaded channels providing cooling breezes (Ardalan 1980). In recent decades, public parks have become essential as housing density has increased and apartment blocks have replaced traditional houses with their private courtyards and pools.

In traditional Islamic cultures, the generic term for ‘places of public gathering’ includes public gardens, pathways, streets, covered streets (for example, bazaars) and places connected with the institutions of urban society. In contemporary times, we would add airports, railway stations, sport stadiums and public parks to the cluster of public gathering places (Ardalan 1980). This shifting of ‘places of public gathering’ is observable in the contemporary use of urban parks in Iran by various social groups, such as elderly people, young men and students, who often frequent parks near their universities. An example of this is Laleh Park in central Tehran, which is near the main campus of the University of Tehran. Levels of accessibility and the location of public parks, as well as attitudes and tastes specific to particular social classes, affect park usage patterns (Daneshpour & Mahmoodpour 2009; Lotfi et al. 2011). Some parks in Iran are sites of anti-social behaviour, such as drug exchange or drug use (Ahmad et al. 2014; Ashrafi & Rashidi 2013), but some are also used by rehabilitation groups, such as Narcotics Anonymous.

Urban green spaces play an important role in enhancing the quality of life and improving the environment of contemporary cities. In central Tehran, Laleh Park is located on one of Tehran’s main streets, Kargar [Worker] Street, with easy access to public transportation. The central location, proximity to the carpet and contemporary art museums and the park’s own extensive markets have made Laleh Park one of the city’s most visited. In recent decades, there has been an increasing interest in recreation and leisure studies by Iranian scholars, examining the role of parks in improving the quality of urban life. In a study on negative and positive factors of visiting Tehran’s Sayee, Laleh, Shafaq and Qezel qale Parks, visitors were asked why they go to parks and how they experience park spaces. This research found that citizens of Tehran use urban parks for family fun, avoiding pollution, walking, refreshment and escaping the monotony of life (Dinarvandi et al. 2014).
As Figure 8-1 shows, spending time with family and friends is reported as the most important motivation for visiting parks in Tehran. Observing natural scenery, providing a place for children to play and doing exercises are other reasons for visiting parks among residents of Tehran, are all responses to the new demands of life in the metropolis. However, these motivations intersect with the traditional ideology of the Persian garden as a place to pause and as an environment, in which visitors escape the routines of everyday life, enjoy meeting with others to socialise, relax and unwind.

A similar study on the psychological and social effects of urban parks on Tehran citizens’ quality of life (Khosravaninezhad et al. 2011), also demonstrates that Tehran’s residents go to urban parks to ‘walk’, ‘gain vitality’ and ‘find access to healthy air’. Data for this research project was collected from visitors to Jamshidieh, Laleh, Besat and Mellat Parks. In response to the question ‘What motivates you to come to the park?’, 85% of participants stated ‘spending time with family and friends’, highlighting the importance of social life in the city, while 43% replied ‘watching natural scenery’, reflecting the need to experience nature in urban environments. To address emotional dimensions, participants were asked ‘How do you feel about being in the park?’ Answers included ‘joy and happiness and enjoying life’, ‘resting and recovering’ and ‘relieving pent up emotions’. This project also sought reasons for people leaving their areas of residence for recreational activities. The most important reasons were poor air quality and lack of recreational facilities (Khosravaninezhad et al. 2011).
These studies suggest there may be more demand for passive recreation than active recreation in Tehran’s parks. Passive recreation involves stillness and fewer exertions rather than active recreation which includes a lot of movements, however, both requires structured arrangements and provisions. It is also evident that urban parks play a significant role in the psychological health and feelings of happiness in the lives of Tehran’s citizens, functioning as a refuge from the busy urban lifestyle. These spaces also work as the city’s lungs, producing fresh air in the midst of heavy pollution. Socialising and being together is a major activity with great cultural significance for people in Iran. In the city of Yazd, visiting parks and urban green spaces has been found to have a positive impact on mood, with the capacity to promote an individual’s mental state (Abkar et al. 2010). People in Yazd visit urban parks to relax and escape from a stressful city environment. Findings also demonstrate how the incorporation of water and green spaces in urban parks can influence visitors’ health (Abkar et al. 2010; Frumkin 2001).

The desire to ‘stay and ponder’ (Kamali Dehghan, 2015) in a tranquil place, inherited from the narratives and ideologies around the Persian garden, is embedded in the design of urban Iranian parks in different ways, such as the creation of more gathering spaces, seating areas, distant views, flower beds, fountains and cafés. Furthermore, over the last decade, parks with particular themes or functions, reflecting shifting narratives and ideologies, have been established in Iran. These new parks may include a cultural centre, playground, sports field, library, museum, amphitheatre, restaurants or cafés, to provide a wide range of leisure activities. For example, Bagh-e Irani [Iranian garden] suggests the character and layout of an ancient Persian garden; Bagh-e Miniature exhibits Iran’s architectural heritage. Goftogu [Dialogue] Park includes various styles of garden design from different countries, reflecting the narratives and ideologies of the ‘Dialogue among Civilisations’ (see Khatami 2012), promoted especially by Seyed Mohammad Khatami, President of Iran from 1997 to 2005.

The Holy Defence Museum Park displays documents of the war between Iran and Iraq and Āb o Ātash [Water and Fire] Park (see Figure 8-3) represents the Qur’anic narrative of Abraham, which demonstrate Iranians' broader conception of what a
park can be. Finally, some parks for women and children only, such as Beheshte Mâdarân [Mothers’ Heaven] Park in Tehran have been established to enable women to enjoy outdoor environments without hijab and without the potential disturbance of men sharing their public space. Gender-segregated parks in Tehran and other cities, such as Mashhad and Qom, aim to address women’s rights in relation to the use of urban green spaces. More research is needed to explore to what extent these parks can be effective in promoting women’s share of urban green spaces and social equality.

Figure 8-2: Examples of Char-bagh (Four-part garden) pattern of Persian Garden (photo of Fin Garden 16th Century in Kashan) in Shamshiri and Basij contemporary Parks in Tehran,
Shifting narratives and ideologies, and moving from ‘bagh’ (historical Persian garden) to ‘park’ have caused urban dwellers to experience ‘nature’ in new environments. Although Persian garden icons and characteristics have been included in contemporary urban park design, sociocultural factors and habitus transformation, have contributed to the diminution of the role of traditional cultural narratives in contemporary urban park design in Iran. In most cases the geometrical structure of the Persian garden has been included in the design agenda. However, the design philosophy and architectural orders such as plants order, water order, sound and shadow order of the Persian historical garden which inspire ‘paradise’ characteristics have rarely been transported to the contemporary parks.

Figure 8-3: Playing shuttlecock in Āb o Ātash Park, 2014, photo by G. J. Breyley, used with permission

New interactions with contemporary urban parks include a range of different activities. However, some behavioural legacies from traditional ‘baghs’ are still observable among Iranian people in contemporary urban parks such as tendencies towards stillness spaces and passive activities. The consideration towards stillness
spaces in the design of park landscapes inherited from the Persian garden ideology has also influenced recreational behaviour and activities in contemporary urban parks in Iran.

A tendency towards creating spaces of stillness, which mainly encourage passive activities, can also be seen in the design of Tabiat [Nature] Bridge in Tehran, which has interwoven traditional and modern design (see Figure 8-4). The bridge was unveiled in late 2014 to connect Âb o Âtash and Tâleqâni Parks, which were separated by a highway in north Tehran. Tabiat Bridge is now a popular place for social gatherings, as well as traditional events, festivals and picnics. Its curved structure has broad entrances, multiple pathways and three floors of restaurants, cafés and sitting areas. Tabiat Bridge brings to mind Isfahan’s Si-oseh and Xâju bridges (built in the Safavid era, during the 16th century, and registered on the UNESCO World Cultural Heritage List), which were places for public meetings, poetry reading and traditional tea houses. Tabiat Bridge’s young architect, Leila Araghian, explains her design inspiration: ‘I didn’t want it to be just a bridge which people would use to get from one park to another, I wanted it to be a place for people to stay and ponder, not simply pass’ (Kamali Dehghan, 2015).

Figure 8-4: Tabiat Bridge, photo by Mohammad Hassan Ettefagh, used with permission
8.2 Comparison of Iran’s Contemporary Urban Parks and Persian Gardens

To investigate the meanings and concepts of urban parks, in comparison with historic Persian gardens, I draw on Mahdavinejad and Abedi’s model (2012), which explains landscape perception as a function of two variables: understanding and involvement. They address three primarily emotional responses - pleasure, excitation and dominance - in the perception of place meaning. Pleasure deals with liking and disliking, the concept of excitement includes an environment’s interesting features, and dominance is related to the sense of personal freedom (Lang 1987; Mahdavinejad & Abedi 2012). Mahdavinejad and Abedi used photographic prints to represent two historic Persian gardens and two urban parks. Participants were asked to rate a total of 20 photographs of each site. The variables between historic gardens and urban parks were tested and further analysis addressed the effect of the characteristics of the landscape on the emotional responses of participants.

There were no significant differences between historic Persian gardens and urban parks in the perception of emotional meaning and concepts of pleasure. However, differences were observed in excitation variables, which include ‘fictional – realistic’, ‘glorious – trivial’ and ‘hectic – peaceful’, while no difference was found in the area of picturesque and beauty concepts. In the dominance variable, major differences were seen in the sense of security, which was less perceived in urban parks, but no differences were seen in concepts of comfort. It was concluded that the Persian garden has many values, but some of them are missing in contemporary landscape design in Iran. Most of these values relate to fictional qualities and excitement, which are linked to the features of the Persian garden (Mahdavinejad & Abedi 2012).

Drawing on these studies, it appears that contemporary parks in Iran may be losing qualities connected with traditional fictional worlds. The parks’ functions have also changed, due to new urban lifestyle needs, habitus transformation and novel ideas in park concept and design. The kinds of retreat, thought, love, art, poetry and philosophy enjoyed in Iran’s urban parks are not those which were associated with Persian gardens; these parks lack the fictional and excitement values of the Persian...
garden. However, contemporary parks are mostly places for recreational activities, such as family fun, picnicking, enjoying fresh air, walking, visiting exhibitions, doing sport and exercise, relaxation and refreshment. The decrease in the sense of security in new urban parks, compared with Persian gardens, may be a result of the design of parks or of socio-cultural issues, such as the public nature of parks, in contrast to the restricted access granted to private gardens.

Iranians’ engagements with parks are mostly adapted forms of the traditional activities of the Persian garden, which have been modified to match new urban lifestyle and habitus transformation. Retreat, thought, spirituality, poetry, philosophy, music, and meeting in the Persian garden have now been transformed into reading, resting, chatting, painting, photography, gathering, and various other cultural and educational activities in the park (Amir 2010). There are also some new engagements with park environments according to the demands of new generations and the existence of modern equipment, for example playing shuttlecock, skating, paddle boats, games and exercise (Amir 2010), which vary among different parks and diverse social classes. Changes in urban lifestyle are another reason that led to undertaking passive activities and using parks as places for resting, getting fresh air and vitality, as a result of living in small apartments and lack of open spaces in residential complexes. Accordingly, both Persian garden ideology and changing in lifestyle have contributed to an understanding of urban parks as places to pause, to get fresh air, to restore, to get together, to have fun, and to exercise. Therefore, urban parks in Iran have become important places for meeting and socialising and this issue is also highly considered in the design and settings of urban parks.

Research on Tabriz’s urban parks reveals that some parks are not used regularly and they face problems of inappropriate or ‘useless’ facilities (Ahmad et al. 2011). For example, El Goli (Shah Goli) Park in southwest Tabriz was built as a royal garden in 1785 and developed as a public park in 1930, with an area of 60.7 hectares. The park was further extended in 1989 and 1996 with new features. To determine the ranking of park activities towards the quality of life indicators, Ahmad et al. (2011) examined the park’s usability factors with a survey. The options of park usability were ‘relaxation’, ‘socialisation’, ‘nature involvement’, ‘physical activity’ and ‘passive
entertainment’. Results show ‘walking in the park’ has the highest preference, followed by ‘to picnic’, ‘to sit in the shade of the trees’, ‘to enjoy the landscape view’ and ‘to socialise with friends’. Physical activities such as volleyball, tennis and football have the lowest score, validating Gobster’s (2002) argument that some visitors prefer passive activities and socialisation. Ahmad et al. (2011) assert that this situation in Iran may have also derived in part from past cultural and religious restrictions on women conducting physical activities in outdoor environments.

Walking and picnics emerged as the most popular park activities. Three activity groups were also specified from the factor analysis of the activities: ‘appreciation and exploration of nature’, which includes ‘to picnic, to enjoy the landscape view, to walk in the park, to explore and study about nature, and to sit under the trees shade’. ‘Social interaction’ is described as the desire ‘to socialise with other people, to socialise with friends, and to observe people’s actions in the park’ and ‘group physical activity’, suggesting that parks help citizens escape from solitude and loneliness. ‘Appreciation and exploration of nature’ was found as the most desirable reason for park use. It is concluded that urban parks should be designed in a way that reduces tensions and stress, and improves the social and environmental aspects of the city (Ahmad et al. 2011).

Studies of park use in people’s daily life, especially in the Middle East, show that park use is affected by social, economic and cultural factors, as well as environmental characteristics of urban green spaces. Ghandehari et al. (2012) conducted a demographic study on parks in Mashhad focusing on age, sex, marital status, education and the income of people who live near parks. This study reveals that most park users in Mashhad are young people between 18 and 30, and the particular needs of this age group affect other variables, such as the types of activities (Ghandehari et al. 2012). It was found that men and married people are more likely to use parks and the majority of park users are high-school graduates. Most research participants preferred active pleasures and reported performing physical activities at moderate level. Findings show lack of a sense of security for women; they usually prefer to go to the park with family and children at weekends (Ghandehari et al. 2012). However, the allocation of gender-segregated parks and the emergence of women’s sports
groups in various urban parks may increase social acceptance of women’s presence in Iran’s parks.

Analysis of contemporary urban parks studies in Iran also demonstrates that there are two different sorts of engagements with these spaces in forms of new and adaptable activities. The former is the result of modern equipment and new engagements with park spaces, while the latter has been influenced by Persian ‘paradise’ gardens as embedded places of paradise narrative and changes in urban lifestyle. To elaborate the ways narratives, beliefs and ideologies may influence the establishment and creation of ‘natural’ landscapes, and the way these landscapes may affect or be affected by habitus transformation, the next section investigates Persian ‘paradise’ gardens in more detail. It explores the ways historical shifts, the new demands of urban life and aspects of ‘western’ culture have influenced Iranian attitudes towards constructed natural environments and altered the layout of the Persian garden.

8.3 From ‘Bagh’ to ‘Park’

For centuries, the Persianate world has been subject to transnational influences. Over the last century, in particular, Iran has seen dramatic shifts in political and cultural affiliation – with both ‘the west’ and ‘the east’, with diverse effects on popular tastes and attitudes. In the 20th century, the significance of public space in new urban environments has led to the emergence of more public green spaces in the form of the park rather than the bagh (garden), which had mainly been used as a place for private gatherings, for particular, often socially privileged, groups of people. This shift, both in terms of the design of new parks and the ways people engage with them, is influenced by the new demands of urban life, as well as sociocultural aspects of ‘modernity’.

The English term ‘paradise’ comes, via the Greek parádeisos (παράδεισος), from the Old Persian word pairidaeza, which literally means ‘walled enclosure’ (Coates 1998, p. 58). A desire for such enclosures developed among certain classes in Western Europe by the 12th century. Demand for this new kind of landscape, set apart from
the city and the countryside, is reflected in the literature of the time. As Coates observes ‘Privacy and intimacy were key features of these pleasure gardens’ (Coates 1998, p. 59). The word *bagh* (garden) in Farsi language means a ‘piece of land’ (Shahcheraghi 2010, p. 93), and in Islamic culture indicates a man-made, geometrical enclosed area cultivated with flowers, trees and other plants, with water and pavilions based on particular ideologies to inspire meaning and imagination (Shahcheraghi 2010, p. 41).

The notion of creating a suitable space for spirituality, solitude and contemplation, to connect to eternal peace and divine unity, a tenet of Islamic Sufism⁷, is reflected in Iranian – and, more broadly, Persianate art, literature and architecture (Ardalan, Bakhtiar & Haider 1973; Nasr 1990). Iranian architecture, in particular, has intelligently applied different design concepts such as rhythm, hierarchy, enclosure, movement and stillness to address this ideology (Ardalan, Bakhtiar & Haider 1973; Ghanaati et al. 2015; Noghrehkar 2008).

The present thesis argues that this ideology and the desire for solitude and contemplation, which is also evident in the design of Persian gardens (Shahcheraghi 2010), has then been imbued in landscape planning and park design in Iran. This cultural viewpoint along with the demands of the new urban lifestyle have developed a preference for stillness and ‘passive’ activities in park spaces. However, the private nature of Persian gardens which were mostly used by Persian nobles and socially privileged groups, also contributes to this perception and preference.

While much of the current literature on Persian gardens focuses on classification (Pinder-Wilson 1976), tracing ancient or poetic elements (Carroll 2003; Gharipour 2013; Hobhouse 2006; Javaherian 2004; Khansari, Moghtader & Yavari 1998; Naima 2011) or the notion of ‘the Islamic garden’ (Clark 2011; Ruggles 2008; Zangheri 2006), this chapter contributes a transgenerational approach, as it examines a range of shifts in everyday attitudes and uses of gardens and parks in Iran.

---

⁷ The Sufi tradition is one of experiential and mystical piety that has historically played an important role in shaping Muslim values, worship, theology, conversion, and social order, see (Graham 1993).
8.4 Persian Gardens

Persian gardens date back to the sixth century B.C. and were places to connect individuals with divinity and heavenly glories (Rogers 2001). They were designed in a square or rectangular form, and the char-bagh (four-part garden) pattern is the most popular form of these gardens. Some of the earliest gardens in the world valued for their restorative qualities can be traced back to Persian gardens (Anderson 2011; Brookes 1987). The garden offered ‘the outward and visible sign of an inward, invisible grace, the promise of divine order and meaning amid chaos, of ever-renewing life in the face of mortality, and of ease after travail’ (Anderson 2011, p. 8; Khansari, Moghtader & Yavari 1998, p. 12).

Figure 8-5 and 8-6 illustrate a photo and the map of Fin Garden in Kashan, Iran. However, the map of Fin Garden has been also illustrated slightly different in some Farsi books on Persian garden.

Figure 8-5: Fin Garden, Kashan, Iran, Source: (Khansari, Moghtader & Yavari 1998)
The Persian garden is a place of contemplation and poetry that has also been used for gatherings on occasions such as parties, and cultural festivals (Brookshaw 2003). The Persian garden is walled, designed as a geometric framework, with two channels of water. Spaces between the water channels were filled with fruit and plane trees and flowers. Studies on Persian gardens have highlighted the cultural beliefs (Ansari, Taghvaee & Mahmoudi Nejad 2008; Ardalan, Bakhtiar & Haider 1973; Khansari, Moghtader & Yavari 1998; Shirvani 1985), the history and representation of the Persian garden in art and literature (Faghih & Sadeghy 2012; Hunt 2011; Irani Behbahani & Khosravi 2011; Shahcheraghi 2010), and the *char-bagh* pattern in landscape architecture and garden design in Iran (Khansari, Moghtader & Yavari 1998; Pinder-Wilson 1976; Shirvani 1985). However, more research is required on the influence of Persian garden design on other cultures and on the quality and possible differences in the perception and usage of Persian paradise gardens by them.

Although, the ‘Persianate tradition’ transcends current national borders and is evident in countries such as Afghanistan, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, Azerbaijan, Turkey,
Pakistan, India and even Spain, this study focuses mainly on Iran and ancient Persia. According to Irani Bebahabi and Khosravi (2011), the Zoroastrian religion in Persia during the Sassanid era highly valued nature, particularly water, which was guarded by Anahita, the goddess of water, whose mythical role had a great impact on palace gardens in that era. Therefore, most of the gardens were located in the vicinity of springs and ponds, such as Takht-e Soleyman, Firouzabad Palace and Bisotun. During the Islamic period in Iran, a number of Persian gardens were created there and also in other countries, from India to Spain. The Safavid era (16th century) was the most magnificent period in gardening and garden making in Iran after the advent of Islam. Gardens in this period were considered patterns that formed the physical structure and shape of the city, for example Naqsh-e Jahan Square and Char-Bagh Street in Isfahan. The style of the Persian garden and the quadripartite form, along with the organisation of water, plants and architecture, were also employed in the gardens of this era and subsequent eras (Irani Behbahani & Khosravi 2011).

In ancient Iran ‘bagh’ was also referred to an area used for agricultural purposes and keeping animals. Hunting gardens are some examples of these sorts of ‘baghs’. ‘Hunting baghs’ were built in the vicinity of animal habitats which were mainly recreational places for kings and privileged people. Some hunting gardens were also part of large gardens in which different sorts of animals were kept for hunting (Shahcheraghi 2010). According to Jellicoes (1975) in The landscape of man, the large hunting gardens in Mesopotamia and Sumer are also considered as ancient forerunner of the picturesque.

In the late 18th century, during the Zand era (1750-1794), gardens in smaller scales were designed in Shiraz city accordingly to Safavid garden style with mono-axial or biaxial geometric order. Many gardens built during the reign of Karim Khan, including Delgosha Garden, Eram Garden and Jahan-Nama Garden, have all been renovated and revitalised and are open to the public today. The influence of the Islamic forms, motifs, and imaginations can be seen in lots of these new gardens. The square or rectangle remains as a simple geometry, and the building forms, pleasure pavilions, reflections, sounds of water, and axial symmetry are some examples of the translation of these ideas. In these gardens, practical purposes go along with spiritual
significance, and geometric layout enabled the practical needs of irrigation (Cole 2011).

The Persian garden is an environment to experience being away from daily routines, to appreciate aesthetic pleasures and abilities and to experiment with ideals. The experience of a garden, with its shapes, colours and scents, can restore people to a more positive view of themselves and give them a chance to be with and communicate with other people. Experiences and memories of these meaningful places give people a conception of their identity and correspond with an individual’s preferences (Stigsdotter & Grahn 2002). The garden is a place with a magnificent perspective, an intelligent use of natural elements, including water and plants, to affect all human senses and feelings, as well as the place where many public activities occur, such as games, music and even philosophical debates. Such activities can be seen in Persian miniature paintings (Ramyar 2012), as well as carpets, and are referred to in Persian poetry.

Cultural attitudes to gardens as places to pause, ponder, and get together - derived in part from Sufism and also the private nature of Persian gardens - are vital principles in Iranian recreational culture, imbued in park settings and other aspects of urban planning, such as squares (meydan) and bridges. During different historical periods in Persia, both the concept and the form of the Persian garden changed, due to the influence of ‘western’ and ‘modern’ cultures, shifts in lifestyle demands and, subsequently, habitus transformation. This historical transformation is briefly discussed in the next section.

8.5 The Influence of Western Culture on Persian Gardens in the Qajar (1794–1925) and Pahlavi8 (1925–1978) Eras

In the late 18th century, Tehran was chosen as Iran’s capital city and underwent changes in layout, with the construction of new palaces, gardens and streets. During

---

8 In 1921 Reza Pahlavi, an officer in Iran’s only military force established himself as the most powerful person in the country by suppressing rebellions and establishing order. In 1925 a specially convened assembly deposed the last ruler of the Qajar dynasty, and named Reza Khan, who earlier had adopted
this period, Tehran’s significance increased and almost all aspects of life in the royal court were influenced by western culture. This included gardening and the creation of palace gardens. Qajar princes and nobles competed with each other in garden and flower design, and planting new vegetation (Irani Behbahani & Khosravi 2011). Gardens in this era maintained their identity and form, in terms of geometric organisation and order, with a pool or building placed at the intersection of two axes. Such continuity of layout can be seen in the Nezamiyeh, Masudiyeh and Lalezar gardens.

Irani Behbahani and Khosravi (2011) also note that developing gardens on Tehran’s Alborz hillsides in the Qajar era allowed the possibility of watching the distant landscape, which was an innovation of garden design at that time. This new consideration of the garden’s view later became a principal foundation of landscape design in Iran. The view to a distant landscape influenced the organisation of the garden, the position of axes and the location of buildings in new garden design. A pool or a large pond acted as a central point of the garden, in addition to its picturesque and functional role as a water reservoir in most gardens of this period.

This new approach to water in garden design, focusing on picturesque qualities, function and water’s roles in vitalising, clearing and cooling, was due to the influence of western culture. Hence, some traditional principles of garden design, such as the relationship between the gateway and building with the main axis, came to be disregarded. Examples of these compositional forms of garden are the Farmaniyyeh, Masudiyeh and Niyavaran Gardens (Irani Behbahani & Khosravi 2011).

Inspiration from Europe, especially in art and architecture, eventually led Persian culture to lose some of its traditional elements. Records show that the term ‘park’ was first used during the Qajar dynasty, replacing bagh in reference to urban green spaces. One of the main differences between new Persian parks and old baghs (gardens) is its organic geometric planning rather than the symmetric geometry. The first Persian parks were also designed with walls that functioned as a boundary. Parks

---

in Tehran have developed over time in terms of character, identity, usage and form (Majlessi et al. 2013). Gradually, at the end of the Qajar era, it became common in Iran to import elements from European design, such as ornamental plants, often planted in open spaces, and the use of lawns in front of buildings.

Architectural forms and landscape patterns are transformed by transnational cultural interactions, which also affect the development of new ideas in relation to the use of natural spaces and even attitudes towards ethnic identity. In other words, the move towards ‘modernity’ in a new urban milieu, which influences sociocultural structures, may lead to different environmental behaviour, shifts in social traditions and subsequently a new or re-imagined ethnic identity.

A socially engaged architecture entails the deconstructive and reconstructive tasks of exposing and giving voice to real public interests; unpacking and restructuring the habitus. Such a programmatic deconstruction would entail a systematic engagement with the ways in which the lifeworld has been sliced, its functions categorised, coded, juxtaposed and omitted. The key role of architects is to join design imagination to the public interest; it is to catch the public imagination with visions of a better world (Dovey 2002, p. 278).

In the 20th century, during the Pahlavi period, both the concept and the spatial arrangement of gardens in Iran changed as a result of the influence of western culture, people’s recreational needs and population growth and Iran’s old, private gardens were replaced with public urban parks. The introduction of public urban parks was part of city development programs (Irani Behbahani & Khosravi 2011). Although the influence of western culture has profoundly changed the settings and form of the Persian garden in its new form of the urban park, some elements of the Persian garden can still be traced in Iranian park design and layout. Watercourses, quadripartite form, axes, plants and flowerbeds are employed in a number of Iran’s recent park settings.

Although some contemporary urban parks in Iran maintain elements of the Persian garden icons and layout, the use and functions of these spaces have changed dramatically. Landscape has a specific potential to engage narratives in a
continuously cultural and natural process. This process will create unstable meaning that can then be grounded in specific social contexts. Stories and common interpretations of them are often shared by different social groups and communities from a nation-state to a subculture form (Potteiger & Purinton 1998).

8.6 Iranian Respondents’ Interpretations of Park Landscapes

Both survey and Q methodology data analysis show that respondents’ patterns of use mostly differ in association with individual and collective usage. They mainly prefer quiet aesthetic scenes for sitting, nature watching, walking, and having a chat. These spaces also have more cultural/personal meaning for them. However, flat and safe spaces are considered appropriate for picnicking and group gatherings, while sport equipment and facilities are essential for active recreation. Nonetheless, large group picnicking in parks by Iranian immigrants help them to build social networks in a new country, which results in both place attachment and sense of belonging.

![People Activities in Laleh Park](8-7: People Activities in Laleh Park, photos by author)

As Figure 8-7 illustrates Iranian people mostly use urban parks as places to pause, to stay, to rest, and to restore. This is partly related to their cultural background, however, the new urban lifestyle, the growth of population, and living in apartments have also increased the need for restoration in park spaces. The kind of activities that
they undertake in urban park spaces is similar to those that they used to do in their back yards. Lack of natural/open spaces in their residential places has resulted in using urban parks as a meeting place and places for resting, getting fresh air and vitality, having dinner, or drinking tea, and having a chat with each other. This is also evident in interviews, when the respondents mostly said that in Iran they went to parks for chatting, having food, and getting fresh air.

On the other hand, changing in lifestyle after migration has caused different usage of outdoor spaces, for example living in houses with open spaces may enable Iranian immigrants to undertake small group gatherings and family chats in their home backyards. Furthermore, as one of the respondents expressed in the interviews, suburban areas in Melbourne look like a park to them and there is fresh air everywhere, therefore they do not have to go to the park to exercise.

However, Iranians’ perception of park landscapes inspired by their individual psychology, cultural background, and social ideas continues to affect their usage and expectations of park spaces after migration. Iranian broader conception of what a park is, has caused an understanding of parks as public places that require facilities that these immigrants expect of them, such as night use, illumination, cultural/educational activities, sport equipment, and the existence of exhibitions, cafés, restaurants, and settings for socialising. This ‘broader conception’ was also highlighted by studies on non-English immigrants’ expectations of public parks in Australia that were discussed in Chapter Four.

People often perceive and inhabit landscape infused by their individual psychology and social ideas. According to Bourdieu and other practice theorists and structurationists, individuals construct the world for themselves through their daily practices. Individual actions (agency) and perceptions of surroundings become part of their individual identity; however, they are neither atomistic nor entirely individual. Human life is a group life, and while human beings construct the world as individuals they do so within a great deal of unconscious mental baggage from their social milieux (Bourdieu 1977, pp. 78-89; Groth 2014; Wenger 1998).
Human global mobility is linked to a sense of home and belonging, and analyses how people maintain a sense of home while being on the move (Marcu 2014, p. 334). Bourdieu defines habitus as ‘a system of durable, transposable dispositions, structured structures predisposed to function as structuring structures, that is, as principles which generate and organise practices and representations’ (Bourdieu 1990, p. 53). Habitus as Bourdieu explains is ‘a genetic theory of groups’ (Bourdieu 1987), pursuing strategies to produce and reproduce the conditions of collective existence (Hiller & Rooksby 2002a, p. 380). Habitus and related notions allow us to ‘make space for the satisfaction of individuals’ desires and interests through the harmonious coordination of larger, national and international social groups’ (Hiller & Rooksby 2002a, p. 385).

... the habitus, as the Latin indicates, is something non-natural, a set of acquired characteristics which are the product of social conditions and which, for that reason, may be totally or partially common to people who have been the product of similar social conditions ... There is a dialectical confrontation between habitus as structured structure, and objective structures. In this confrontation, habitus operates as a structuring structure able to selectively perceive and to transform the objective structure according to its own structure while, at the same, being re-structured, transformed in its makeup by the pressure of the objective structure (Bourdieu 2002, p. 29 & 31).

8.7 Landscape Narratives as an Important Factor in Community Preferences of Recreational Activities

Immigrants carry their cultural narratives of nature, which provide them with a lens through which to perceive nature and landscape. The word ‘narrative’ comes from the Indo-European root ‘gna’, and it means both ‘to tell’ and ‘to know’ (Hinchman & Hinchman 1997, p. xiii; White 1984, p. 1). In traditional cultures, whose social bonds were created and supported by custom, narrative defines ‘what [had] the right to be said and done’ (Hinchman & Hinchman 1997, p. xiii ; Lyotard 1984, p. 37). Since stories do not simply reflect the reality, narratives involve selectivity, rearranging,
and simplification. Therefore it is necessary to find equivalent terms to express the way narratives convey the reality about the world. Some of these terms include: ‘paradigms’, ‘capsule views of reality’, ‘interpretive devices’, and ‘world views’. In all of them, the concept of narrative mediates between the self and the world (Hinchman & Hinchman 1997, p. xvi).

Rappaport, defines ‘community narrative’ as a story that is common among a group of people and that may be shared through social interactions and rituals. He argues that settings have a story that is preserved and transmitted: ‘For example, neighbourhoods or organisations may have narratives about residents or members that are communicated in complex but very concrete ways. These narratives tell the members something about themselves, their heroes, their history, and their future’ (Rappaport 1995, p. 803).

On the other hand, ‘spatial narrative’, in place-related studies and research, is defined as a conceptual framework that links environmental patterns and science with the cultural knowledge of place (Silbernagel 2005). Environmental patterns of landscape elements naturally form a language that plays a fundamental role in forming spatial narratives (Thayer 2003). According to Anne Whiston Spirn ‘… landscape has all the features of language. It contains the equivalent of words and parts of speech – patterns of shape, structure, material, formation, and function … Like the meanings of words, the meanings of landscape elements (water, for example) are only potential until context shapes them’ (Spirn 1998, p. 15).

Once we learn this language, we will see the landscape as a collective work of art, and a set of design compositions, rather than a combination of different individual elements. It is like ‘a mosaic of patterns of ordered elements’ (Lewis 1996, p. 88; Silbernagel 2005, p. 112). Thus, in order to examine the landscape as a ‘way of seeing’ in a particular community and study environmental patterns of landscape elements, it is crucial to investigate the interwoven culture parallel.

Discussions in this chapter revealed that the cultural narrative of paradise embodied in the Persian garden is an important factor that influences Iranians’ preferences of recreational activities in contemporary public parks. It has been unfolded that Persian
garden ideology and pattern also have been imbued in landscape planning and park design in Iran. This cultural viewpoint along with the demands of the new urban lifestyle, have developed a preference for stillness spaces and ‘passive’ activities in park spaces among Iranians. Studies also confirm that ‘passive’ activities such as socialising, spending time with family and friends, enjoying natural scenery and relaxation are most popular among Iranian people, who also consider parks as places for children to play, exercise and escape from urban life. Research likewise provides evidence of decreasing interest in sports and physical activities in urban parks in Iran.

The present thesis highlights that active recreation such as dog walking and sport activities, has been observed to be greatly considered by Anglo-Australians. However, Iranian and more broadly non-Anglo immigrants have been seen to prefer passive activities and group gatherings, and engage in a process of place making in Australian parks. This process takes place through enjoying park landscapes, restoration, bonding with the past, and undertaking social activities.

Landscape has a specific potential to engage narratives in a continuously cultural and natural process. This process will create unstable meaning that can then be grounded in specific social contexts. Stories and common interpretations of them are often shared by different social groups and communities from a nation-state to a subculture form (Potteiger & Purinton 1998). This chapter explored how cultural ideologies, landscape narratives, changing in lifestyle, and habitus transference and transformation among Iranian people frame perceptions, usage, and layout of contemporary urban parks in Iran. It was also investigated how these factors contribute to understanding, usage, and expectations of Melbourne urban parks by Iranian immigrants.

The next chapter aims to examine these cultural ideologies in more detail and explore how landscape icons may influence other cultures subsequently. It discusses the ways in which landscape architecture reflects the prevailing attitudes towards nature in a society by studying the ancient world’s philosophies and ideologies as a starting-point for this investigation. It particularly investigates Persian garden representations in
Iranian art and literature and projects the transformation of Persian paradise gardens’ icons and patterns in landscape architecture of other countries.
Chapter Nine: Landscape Narratives and their Impacts on Cultural Ideologies and Landscape Architecture

Genesis and evolution of cultural landscapes are key issues in understanding the present-day landscapes, and help to define past, present and future relationships between humans and the environment (Dearing 2006; Diamond 2002; Goudie 2013; Mercuri 2014, p. 1801; Redman 1999).

This chapter explores certain landscape narratives and cultural landscapes in both western and eastern cultures, and their reflections on people’s perception and use of nature. It aims to examine how cultural ideologies and systems of beliefs, particularly in relation to Eden, have affected people’s understanding of natural landscapes and landscape design and how landscape icons influenced other cultures subsequently. It describes how narratives of Eden evolved and influenced landscape design by explaining the narratives of ‘Paradise’ and ‘Arcadia’ in eastern and western cultures as two distinct landscape narratives, with a brief history of their emergence and evolution. It discusses the ways in which landscape architecture reflects the prevailing attitudes towards nature in a society by studying the ancient world’s philosophies and ideologies as a starting-point for this investigation.

It then focuses on the Persian paradise garden and explains the notion of iconography, as a visual explanation of an idea in landscape design. It investigates Persian garden representations in Iranian art and literature and projects the transformation of Persian paradise gardens’ icons and patterns in landscape architecture through historical and spatial explorations.

9.1 Cultural Narratives

Since narrative is vital in cultural experience, it is important to investigate not only the designed narratives, but the routine practices, rituals, journeys, and memories embodied in a place. ‘Narrative refers to the story, what is told, and the means of telling, implying both product and process, form and formation, structure and
structuration.’ (Chatman 1980, p. 26; Potteiger & Purinton 1998, p. 3). While every story is a narrative, every narrative is not necessarily just a story.

How may narratives create a shared public realm in a diverse contemporary culture? And how does the generation of stories and fictions challenge and transform concepts of function, determinism, and representation? Potteiger et al. (1998), define nine types for landscape narratives:

1- ‘Narrative Experiences’, which includes routines, rituals or events that represent narrative structures, such as festivals, processions, and daily journeys; 2- ‘Associations and References’, elements in the landscape that are linked to an experience, event, or history; 3- ‘Memory Landscape’, tangible places of personal or public memory such as museums, monuments, and regions; 4- ‘Narrative Setting and Topos’, which refer to a setting linked with particular events in a culture’s narratives i.e. pastoral topos as a nostalgic return to origins; 5- ‘Genres of Landscape Narratives’, places which are shaped by narratives, legends, or myths as a place of utopian harmony and fertility; 6- ‘Processes’, actions or events that are caused by some agencies such as wind or water that inscribe time into landscape by recording the changes; 7- ‘Interpretive Landscape’, elements in a place that tell what happened in it; 8- ‘Narrative as Form Generation’, develops images in the design process by using stories; 9- ‘Storytelling Landscape’, places which are designed to tell specific stories, either existing literary or cultural narratives or produced by the designer such as gardens (Potteiger & Purinton 1998, p. 11).

This chapter concentrates on ‘genres of landscape narratives’ and subsequently ‘storytelling landscapes’ in relation to Eden mythology, and argues how these landscapes and landscape narratives are shaped according to Eden ideologies. Furthermore, it investigates how these ideological landscapes have affected garden design in both the east and the west, and examines the ways people engage with these spaces.
9.2 Garden Genesis

Eden has a strong narrative role in human history and has been referenced, as inspiration, source, and metaphor, in cultivated gardens in both the east and west. While the desire for a perfect and eternal garden was common in different cultures, there are various and particular perceptions and imaginations that arise from the ancient narratives.

The possibility that genesis might be a rationalisation of processes and practices that were already underway, plays an important role in the idealistic realm in human beliefs. It is also completed by the idea that this orientation planned the foundations for the emergence of the modern western scientific-technological world-view. The Christian view of nature based on the Bible can be difficult to define. In early Christian theology it was argued that the classical heritage ascribed too much power to nature as autonomous; they also believed that nature served God and had no independent moral force. By the standards of old English poetry, the memorable scenes of bewildering haunts became the popular image of the physical environment, and this symbolic approach to nature and landscape influenced medieval fiction and visual art. While interest in nature for its own reasons is not entirely neglected, the concern of the artist or poet to recreate a particular scene is rarely felt, and the heavenly or hellish qualities of natural scenes are usually invoked (Coates 1998).

Jean Froissart, a medieval French author (late 14th/early 15th), admired four characteristics for ‘pleasure gardens’ in *Le Joli Mois de May*: refinement, organisation, order, and regularity. As described by Froissart, a garden, ‘was exactly marked out, and bounded by a thick, firm hedge, evenly cut; the shrubs looked as if they had been trimmed to a precise pattern’ (Coates 1998, p. 59; Pearsall & Salter 1973, p. 173). Eventually, the interest in nature for its own reasons developed by the growth of ancient cities and the distinction between urban and rural in the west, which resulted in creating more natural open spaces rather than enclosed gardens. Because the existence of natural open spaces in the urban environment that evoked rural landscape for urban dwellers, was highly desired.
In the other corner of the world, the east, the Sumerians (between 5500 and 4000 B.C.) believed that the kingdom ‘came down from heaven’ and love of the cities for the kings, together with the perception of the city as a symbolic world, resulted in the combination of both worldly and holy powers. Gardens in these cities were actually derived from paradise myths and symbolised as places of absolute eternity and peace. In ancient India, Buddhism and Brahmanism influenced the development of gardens. Gardens with trees were bestowed on the Buddhist priests by the kings or the rich. Some trees of the gardens were considered to be sacred and girls were named after flowers. In the late Middle Ages, paradise depictions illustrated the rituals experienced in the Palace, as well as the concept of a happy and comfortable life (Uludas & AdıLoĞlu 2011, p. 47).

9.3 Narratives of Eden

Since gardens are signs and carriers of meaning, research on the importance of gardens provides an opportunity to examine environmental and other cultural values (Seddon 1998). Therefore, to illustrate how cultural ideologies are established through the narratives of nature and how they affect natural landscapes, this chapter explores the concept of ‘Eden’ in landscape making through historical studies and examines the terms ‘Paradise’ and ‘Arcadia’ as two prominent concepts and attitudes towards nature in eastern and western cultures. It also investigates their influence on shaping landscape and people’s perception and use of nature.

Does landscape design and architecture reflect the prevailing attitude of a society towards its natural environments? Coates (1998) claims that since ancient Greek thought provides the bedrock for the western intellectual experience, it is essential to study the ancient world as a starting-point for investigating western attitudes to nature. Ancient Greek thinking about nature was inseparable from scientific, philosophical, and religious ideology. This ideology includes the relationship between matter and spirit/soul, in which nature is considered an internal property rather than a physical territory, a principle and process rather than a material entity. The belief that the natural world was ordered and sanctified led places with particular natural attributes to be selected for constructing shrines and temples. Wildlife was protected
in sacred groves. These were places where hunting and fishing were banned, and in some cases, protection was even formalised by legal rules (Coates 1998, p. 31).

To establish a distance between ancient and modern approaches to nature, Matt Cartmill emphasises that ‘when Ancient Romans spoke of natura, they were talking not about wild landscape or the unspoiled countryside, but about something more like what we call natural law’ (Cartmill 1996, p. 45). The evidence of ceramic art, floor tiles, wall paintings, sculpture and architectural motifs demonstrates that the ancient Romans and Greeks enjoyed and appreciated ‘aspects of the natural world’. These sensibilities are displayed in the perception of countryside as a healing place for urban dwellers, and since the origins of the myth of the countryside, as the most powerful symbolic landscape in Britain, can be traced back to the growth of ancient cities, the distinction between urban and rural became related to the poles of nature and culture. Romans flocked to the countryside on public holidays, and the western tradition of the weekend cottage or lakeside cabin reflects this Roman search to escape from the stresses of the city life and personal troubles (Coates 1998, pp. 34-5).

Roman gardens in Europe provide a dominant origin for western gardens, and the notion of Arcadia as a rural idyll was symbolically defined by the Romans. However, the Sumerian gardens (between 5500 and 4000 B.C.), established in cities, located in present-day southern Iraq, resulted from paradise myths and were symbolised as places of absolute serenity, eternity and peace. Stronach (1990) notes that from sixth century B.C. onwards, when irrigation agriculture was adopted, the garden came to epitomise the fertility of the land and emerged as a unique source of pleasure and delight. One of the tangible models of paradise gardens are Persian gardens (600 B.C.) in the Middle East. These gardens represented imperial power and magnificence, as

---

8 Greeks and Romans thought that humans were made in God’s image and all creation existed for man’s (sic) benefit. Greek thinking about nature was inseparable from scientific, philosophical, and religious speculation. According to Aristotle (384–322 B.C.), nature is everything outside culture. This idea characterised nature as the origin of living things and the principle of life, and the source, constituent material, or essence of something, see (Coates 1998).
well as providing a place for retreat, thought, love, art, poetry, and philosophy (Cooper 2006).

Classical Chinese gardens as another example of eastern gardens are classified from different perspectives. Royal gardens are the most distinguished among classical Chinese gardens which were an artistic form of the imperial political structure. One example is the geographical concept and the unified political model that the royal family owns the vast world. In Ancient China (403 -211 B.C.), the definition of the ‘world’ for the Chinese was very narrow and the concept of ‘unity under heaven’ was non-existent. The development of concepts such as time and space later leads to a ‘Chinese traditional universe pattern’ and the establishment of the spatial layout of royal gardens (Wang 2015).

In Africa, Ancient Egyptians drew attention to the splendour of the universe, human’s place in creation, and the significant role of pharaohs. Egyptian gardens can be divided into five types: fruit and vegetable gardens, small domestic gardens, palace gardens, temple gardens, and plant and animal gardens (Turner 2005). The primarily prototypical image of Japanese gardens derived from the physical structure of Japan - mountains rising abruptly from the sea. However, the constructive nature was a principle force in shaping the development of Japanese cultural landscape. Therefore, the balance of natural and man-made beauty became a guiding principle that forms the aesthetic bases of all Japanese gardens. The Japanese garden delights the senses and challenges the soul. Poetic epics and Japanese gardens reveal qualities of the human spirit (Marc 2012).

The first botanical gardens, established in the 16th and 17th centuries, represented the Garden of Eden with their surrounding walls. In early botanical gardens, such as those in Padua, Italy, paths symbolised the four rivers of the world (the Euphrates, Tigris, Pison, and Gihon) and the sections created by the paths represented the four continents (Europe, Asia, Africa, and America). The idea of the garden as a microcosm of the world dates back to Persian paradise gardens, which were usually divided into four sections. The plants were all placed in the garden based on their genus and their
geographic origins to create a microcosm of the natural world (Potteiger & Purinton 1998, pp. 163-4).

Each plant embodied the virtues and, as noted by John Prest in his book *The Garden of Eden*:

> Everything in this garden was then, in its turn, enveloped in allegory. Each individual flower illustrated some aspect of the Christian faith, reminding the observer either of some simple virtue, or some more sophisticated theological truth. Thus the rose, whose bud opened and whose blossom fell in a single day, put one in mind of the modesty of the Virgin (Prest 1981, p. 23).

Since the desire for Eden never disappeared, humanity’s attempts to define perfection throughout history have resulted in attempts to create Edenic gardens on Earth. The east and west had various experiences, in relation to creating and enjoying these earthly Edens, which resulted in establishing two significant concepts of garden: ‘Paradise’ and ‘Arcadia’.

### 9.4 Paradise and Arcadia

Arcadia is in the mountain-hemmed middle region of the Peloponnese, a substantive near-island that makes up much of Greece’s land mass. The economy of Arcadia was largely pastoral, and was known for its streams and springs, its forests, and its fine sheep. Arcadia was the site of the oldest cult of Artemis, whose haunt was the wilds of nature and who may have been a Minoan or pre-Greek deity. In Greece *paradeisos* describes the pleasure parks of the Persian nobility from the Old Persian word *pairidaeza*, which means enclosed by a wall (Eisenberg 1998). Furthermore, in Greek translations of the Bible, *paradeisos* also defines Eden and Edenic gardens (Khansari, Moghtader & Yavari 2005). Every garden wall is two-sided, nature can be outside and culture inside, or the garden encloses and protects nature in a world overrun by humans. Most poets and painters have felt the need to put a wall around Eden because it was a garden and gardens had walls, or perhaps because a wall would keep evil out and forestall the fall (Eisenberg 1998).
The wall, along with water, the systems of design and plantation, and the sensory stimulations, provide centralisation and ‘environmental detachment’, which directs individuals to a ‘spiritual attachment’ and creates a restorative place for contemplation (Shahcheraghi 2010) as a manifestation of heaven. Eisenberg (1998) argues that the two definitional elements of Persian paradise gardens are wall and water: wall separates and water connects. The wall helps to mark the boundaries of the self, while the water helps to observe links with things, human and non-human. The wall of the paradise garden was a cultural frame which was placed in the idealised world of their ancestors, a geometrical wilderness in which nomadic nostalgia could be freely and safely indulged (Eisenberg 1998).

Royal gardens in ancient Persia first emerged in the city of Pasargadae, which was established by Cyrus the Great, the founder of the Achaemenid Empire, in the sixth century B.C. This city was located near contemporary Shiraz and was established as the capital of the empire. The city was based on an area between hunting gardens, palaces, gardens, tombs and temples. The watercourses were made out of stone blocks and square shaped pools, which, besides their scenic role according to Stronach (1978), also shaped the organised quadripartite geometry of the garden that represents the order of the universe and the four basic elements (water, earth, wind and fire) that shaped the world. The intersection of the two main axes of the garden that divided the garden into four parts was later referred to as the four Eden Rivers, since the dominance of Islam (Irani Behbahani & Khosravi 2011). Stronach (1994) also explains the quadripartite geometry of Pasargadae Royal Garden:

... while the quadripartite plan of Cyrus’ Royal Garden could be viewed as no more than an expression of the new, geometrical articulation that is manifest in much of the plan of Pasargadae ... Cyrus, who is called 'king of the four quarters' in his Babylonian cylinder, could have sought a metaphor for this vaunted title in a garden with a fourfold design. More than this even, the almost unguarded, well-nurtured character of the site of Pasargadae might

---

10 Pasargadae is located approximately 90 km north-east of the City of Shiraz in Iran, which is the location of the first royal residence, planned and built by Cyrus the Great after he found the Achaemenid Empire. See (Mozaffari 2014).
have been meant in some way to represent the Achaemenid empire in microcosm ... (Stronach 1994, p. 9).

However, the reason behind the quadripartite geometry of the Persian garden is not quite clear as the theory of basic elements that shaped the world is based on a Greek mythology and cannot be referred to as the genesis of the Persian garden. Scholars state that the quadripartite geometry design of the Persian garden might have been for construction reasons as a demonstration of the royal propaganda, while others claim that Paradise and Medieval garden design was influenced by the mandala\textsuperscript{11} pattern (Sherrod 2006; Shirvani 1985).

The Sassanids, who followed the Achaemenids, in the first and second centuries borrowed many separate concepts of the Persian garden from the Achaemenids and placed greater emphasis on long channels and pools (Stronach 1994). The Zoroastrian\textsuperscript{12} religion in Persia during the Sassanid era set a high value on nature, and particularly water, which was guarded by Anahita, the goddess of water, whose mythical role had a great impact on palace-gardens in that era. Thus, most of the gardens were located in the vicinity of springs and ponds. During the Islamic period in Iran, a number of Persian gardens were created in this country and also in other countries such as India and Spain (Irani Behbahani & Khosravi 2011).

After Alexander’s conquest, the Greeks borrowed both the word and the idea of the Persian Paradise gardens as \textit{paradeisos}, which has been used by Xenophon\textsuperscript{13} as the ‘Pleasure Park’. In Canopus city, one of the world’s first cosmopolitan cities, fountains

\textsuperscript{11} The mandala pattern has been used as a base in creating gardens from ancient times, and its pattern belongs to the earliest days of human history. According to Aniela Jaffe (1964), the mandala is a symbol of wholeness with the square as a symbol of earthbound matter and the circle as a symbol of the psyche or spirit. The psyche controls our experiences with the surrounding environment which are the basis of the psychological ‘culture’ in which we exist. Earthbound matter is ‘nature’ which refers to both our physical body and surrounding environment, including plants and other animals, see also (Sherrod 2006).

\textsuperscript{12} Zoroastrian is an ancient monotheistic Persian religion and a religious philosophy.

\textsuperscript{13} Xenophon was a student of Socrates and contemporary of Plato who was born into a moderately wealthy Athenian family c. 430 B.C. Xenophon was a philosopher, writer and historian and also a military man. After the second expedition into Persia, Xenophon continued to fight for the Spartans in the battle of Coronea.
along the great street distributed water for many gardens in Hellenistic Alexandria in the Ptolemaic period, from the first until the fourth century B.C. (Hunt 2011). Early Muslims in the sixth century found the earthly counterpart of the promised Qur’anic paradise in the Persian garden. They soon noticed that within the privacy of the protective walls of a garden, sensual pleasure could be enjoyed. Islamic gardens are often described as earthly gardens of the Qur’anic paradise with vegetation, fountains and streams, and pavilions interwoven with Islamic arts (Moynihan 1979).

On the other side, the narrative of the Garden of Eden has shaped western culture since the earliest times. Since the 17th century, Europeans and Americans have attempted to recover Eden by turning wilderness into gardens. A number of thoughts and emotions, such as hopes and fears, are interpreted by such cultural narratives. For example, in American culture, those who work hard and are lucky enough can find treasure as a reward, but for those who fail the result is dire consequences (Merchant 2003, pp. 2-4). Therefore, the recovery of Eden, in the shape of a garden, could be the reward for those who had worked hard.

Roman gardens in Europe, as Eisenberg asserts, are the first recognisably western gardens. In the Roman Empire a large number of people had plenty of money and the desire to spend it on gardens.

The Romans were on very cosy terms with mother earth. Their earth goddess, Tellus, was a cosy figure, a patroness of grain and cattle, of marriage, and of all the bodily functions the Romans performed with such relish. The Romans saw no contradiction between their love of this earth goddess and such other expression of their materialism as sewers, highways, lead smelters, and strenuously artificial gardens (Eisenberg 1998, p. 186).

The notion of Arcadia as a rural idyll is attributed to the Roman poet Virgil. Virgil transposed the simple life of shepherds in Arcadia from Greece’s mountainous region to the groves and meadows of Sicily. Since Panofsky, the German art historian, represented Virgil as the creator of a new visionary realm, the idealised paradox of the Roman’s pastoral poetry offered a philosophical contemplation appropriate to the modern garden (Eyres 2009). Roman gardens can be observed from the tiny
garden of a fish-sauce shop at Pompeii, to the vast manufactured landscapes of Hadrian’s villa at Tivoli. They deserve our attention since they are the first pleasure gardens that are recognisably western, and the fundamental basis of western gardens is set within them (Eisenberg 1998).

Eyres argues that some places, such as English landscape gardens, are already influenced by an Arcadian-ness, whether by intention or by reception. In recent years, London’s Serpentine Gallery was established to enhance the enjoyment of the ease and leisure in Kensington Gardens, an urban Arcadia, which was created nearly 300 years ago. The re-designed garden was opened in 1998 and eight benches offer the opportunity to rest and to reflect upon a pastoral meditation on the pleasures of ‘evening’ (Eyres 2009, p. 115). According to the description and the philosophical roots of Arcadia, it can be said that redefining Arcadia as a garden concept in contemporary landscape needs more research, in terms of recreating idyllic landscapes, which caters to their users’ needs and preferences.

9.5 Garden Iconography

As a visual explanation of an idea, iconography is a method for theoretical and historical study of symbolic imagery that is associated with ethnography, it can also illustrate the meaning of garden images (Benes 1999; Wages 1999). Garden iconography includes garden images, according to the scenic manifestation of certain icons, figures and symbolic objects, and can be described as an instrument that is related to art, history and philosophy, which plans the garden’s identity. By studying garden iconography, it is possible to identify the icons of new gardens, and an iconographic framework for their identities, which will suggest icons, layout and design principles for the development of a new garden style based on the local culture and history. This will also result in the development of a national landscape identity for developing nations, and community cohesion. Garden identity includes a garden’s character, symbols, and images. These specific cultural features that make a place recognisable will make up the iconography of a garden. Some traditional gardens in history, such as Chinese and Persian gardens, are examples of gardens that
have special icons and have already passed on their iconography (Kaboudarahangi, Tahir & Kamal 2011).

Gardens have been shaped throughout past events, beliefs, needs and the culture of people who have created them. Gardens’ iconography or image reading, as a practice, is a creative method of historical analysis of the garden (Helmreich 2002; Kaboudarahangi, Tahir & Kamal 2011). History and culture have had a great influence on the structure and evolution of garden identity. Iconography is a way to express a range of ideas in terms of gardens in historical paintings or images (Wages 1999), and a method to analyse the historical landscapes in terms of their relationships to people and to the interactions between people and nature in specific cultures and societies.

Persian gardens as one of the most famous forms of paradise gardens were usually places for contemplation, philosophising and relaxation and, as Cooper (2006) argues, they were as early as painting or sculpture. The next section explores some prominent elements and characteristics of the Persian garden.

9.6 Water in Iranian Culture

Respect of water was a holy tradition in the pre-Islamic period in Iran. Water as the basis of life, is a sign of beauty in nature. Gardens in hot and dry places symbolise freshness, delicacy, and paradise on earth (Ansari 1989). For Persians water had a high degree of respect as a holy entity. Anahita was one of the Zoroastrians’ goddesses who was also called the goddess of water. She has been described as a tall beautiful girl in Zoroastrians’ holy book Avesta. The existence of water in living places was a principle element of design in Iran before Islam and each residential place used to have a reservoir of water (Ansari, Taghvaee & Mahmoudi Nejad 2008, p. 109).

According to Ansari et al. (2008), after the advent of Islam, water was recognised as a symbol of cleanness, neatness and brightness based on the Holy Qur’an in Iran, and Muslim architects began to build gardens with attention to the description of paradise in the Holy Qur’an. Paradise according to the Qur’an is a garden with fruit trees, rivers, and four streams of water, honey, milk, and wine. This perspective of paradise has been also reflected in Iranian arts, miniatures, carpets, and literature.
Persian carpet patterns illustrate images of festivities held in the Safavids Gardens of the 16th century. The gardens of that era had waterways, divisions in the garden path, and a building in the centre. In front of the building was a rectangular pool which coincided with the longer axis of the garden. Some of the Persian gardens were usually built in sloping lands and built on several levels. In these cases, garden designers established features and waterfalls over the topography to create an enhanced experience with the sounds of flowing water and magnificent reflections of sunshine (Shahidi et al. 2010).

9.7 Trees in Iranian Culture

There is not adequate research on attitudes towards plants and planting in the Middle East. However, there was a great love of flowers, their colours and scents, and the shades provided by fruit trees with little concern for natural vegetation, indigenous species and botanical gardens. The main reason for respecting trees in Iran might have been the hot and dry climate which increases protected desire for the shade and protection that trees provide. Trees in Iran are also respected for some cultural and religious reasons. According to several myths and tales of saints, certain ancient trees have been sent from heaven (Ansari, Taghvaee & Mahmoudi Nejad 2008).

In the main axis of the Persian garden there is a corridor made by cypress trees, plane trees, and pine trees with a careful consideration of planting system. The square or rectangular form of the garden is usually divided into smaller squares and in the peak of each corner an evergreen tree or a tree with longer life was cultivated. This arrangement was designed in the way that from any view, the rows of trees could be seen, and there was no sudden bare space in the whole garden area while the light is provided for all trees (Shahidi et al. 2010).

Gertrude Bell (1937), an English writer, traveller, and political officer, in her book *Persian Pictures*, describes her experience of Persian garden:

The indescribable charm of a Persian garden is keenly present to the Persians themselves. . . Their poets sing the praise of gardens in exquisite verses, and
call their books by their names. . . . We found ourselves in its gate one evening, after an aimless canter across the desert, and determined to enter. The loiterers in the gateway let us pass through unchallenged. We crossed the little entrance-court and came into a long dark avenue, fountains down the middle of it, and flower beds, in which the plants were pale and meagre for want of light; roses, the pink flowers which scent the rose-water, and briars, a fourth of white and yellow bloom, growing along its edges in spite of the deep shade of the plane-trees. Every tiny rill of water was fringed with violet leaves - you can imagine how in the spring the scent of the violets greets you out in the desert when you are still far away. . . . We wondered along intersecting avenues, until we came to one broader than the rest. . . (Bell 2005, p. 15).

It is evident that how the garden and particularly trees and their shadows are desired in the harsh climate of Iran, and how they are considered pleasant. The flowers’ scent, the shade of trees, fountains, paths and the hierarchy of access all invite visitors to stay in the space, to restore, and to contemplate.

9.8 Persian Garden as a ‘Place to Pause’

The nature of the Persian garden was mainly for inviting individuals to contemplate, to think, and to restore the spirit and senses. Although a range of social and cultural events and activities were held in the Persian garden, the main function of the garden was encouraging passive activities, and the garden was considered as a ‘place to pause’. This characteristic can be a reflection of Islamic Sufism ideology in Iran which emphasises that God and Sufis have a specific relationship and to maintain this friendship and relationship the Sufis need to remember God frequently through contemplation and saying *dhikr*. Furthermore, it can be associated with the private nature of Persian gardens which were primarily used by Persian nobles and socially privileged groups for holding ceremonies, gatherings, or providing pleasant places for recreation, contemplation, poetry, etc.
Gardens in particular retain an important image in Iranian culture that not only represents Iranian identity but sometimes creates it. Throughout history, Iranian culture and garden image in Iranian minds influenced each other intensely, yet it is not precisely known which had the biggest impact on the other (Shahcheraghi 2010, p. 175). In order to study these profound connections and drawing on Persian garden iconography in landscape architecture, next section investigates how Persian garden’s icons and characters affected painting, literature, carpet design, and landscape design in Iran. It is also argued how Persian garden’s elements and patterns have been exported to other countries in the world.

9.9 Garden in Persian Carpets

The Persian carpet is one of the significant physical manifestations of the Persian garden. The Persian garden and the Persian carpet are often representative of each other. The Persian carpet not only represents the general structure of the garden and its elements, but many of its details in two-dimensional form. Hunt (2011) argues that the Persian garden is beautifully illustrated in the Persian carpet with the primary source of textile inspiration in the char-bagh, and some of these Paradise garden carpets and rugs have clear char-bagh designs and show the Persian garden as inspiration.

The oldest known carpet pattern to illustrate the Persian garden is observable in the Pazarik carpet, found preserved by ice in the Altai Mountains in Siberia and believed to be around 2,500 years old. Square segmentations and various frames in the pattern of the Pazarik carpet bring to mind the form and icons of the Persian garden (Shahcheraghi 2010). The Persian garden is an example of spring, and since it could not truly make spring eternal, the Persian carpet was born to bring the spring in winter too. It is also suggested that the paradise garden could be the whole world: the central font is a world-pole, the four channels are the four rivers, and the four corners are the four corners of the earth (Eisenberg 1998).
9.10 Garden in Persian Miniatures

Along with gardening, painting, poetry and calligraphy are arts which are all concerned with capturing the essence of nature (Davies & Prain 1989). In contemporary times in the west, gardening and painting share common concerns. Some compositional elements applied in painting such as light, shade, texture, balance, and colour are using in gardening as well. Paintings of gardens need not be just decorative; they can also involve complex aspects of a society’s identity (Field 2006). Ross (1998) describes a sister relationship between painting, poetry, and gardening, and nominates three qualities which link gardening and painting: ‘imitation’, ‘allusion’, and ‘representation’ (Ross 1998, p. 91).

In Persia the origins of Persian miniature painting reached its peak mainly during the Mongol and Timurid periods (13th until 16th centuries). Miniature painting has various styles from depicting battle scenes to illustrating and giving visual images to accompany a literary text and making it enjoyable and easy to understand. Miniature painting has a profound connection with poetry and during the last ten centuries a broad range of magnificent miniature paintings have been inspired by many literary works (Kianush 1998).

In Iranian cultural history, some scholars argue that the primary purpose of the Persian miniature, which features physical and semantic elements of the Persian garden, is to display paradise and sublime nature, and it is often called the ‘garden of desire’ (Kevorkian & Sicre 1983). In another view, the Persian miniature has strong connections with Iranian literature and poetry and this has made it an illustration of Iranian literature.

In miniature painting, like other Iranian arts, the garden is illustrated with details such as birdsong, running water, flowers’ scents, and the feeling of the breeze, while all the reader’s senses are influenced. Significantly, Iranian miniature is an abstract art, which links the material world (garden) with the imaginative world (literature). It makes a middle world between the two, and applies the Persian garden layout to connect with the imaginative world. In Iranian miniature, none of the objects, humans, or natural elements, has shadow and there is no three-dimensional space.
either. Spaces are synchronised and connected, in two-dimensional shape, which creates a timeless space and another world (Ardalan 1974). Moreover, looking at miniature paintings and people activities illustrated in them, tells us about the ways Persian gardens were used in Persia. Persian garden miniature paintings mostly illustrate Iranian literature in images of particular ceremonies, musicians and gatherings, cultivating plants, lovers and love stories, or a figure of a person sitting and contemplating.

9.11 Garden in Persian Literature

Gardens are so important within the Persian culture to the extent that they have become a major subject for poetry. Garden literature and garden landscape both create space, in virtual and real ways. Poems about gardens in Iranian literature are classified in three categories: 1- imitative poems, in which poets applied the word garden as the previous poets did; 2- descriptive poems, in which poets such as Roodaki and Ferdosi (10th century), tried to describe the garden characteristics and its scenes; 3- interpretive poems, which explain and interpret the garden (Sadat Oshkoori 2001). In interpretive poems, the poet thoroughly knows the garden’s components and its functions. They are also aware of the iconic and folkloric concept of each component and phenomenon in the garden, and utilise this knowledge in their poetic expressions intelligently, for example, Hafiz in the 14th century, and Molavi (Rumi) in the 13th century (Rahpeyma 2007).

Jalal al-Din Mohammad Rumi and Shams al-Din Mohammad Hafiz Shirazi are two of the great mystic, Sufi poets who composed magnificent poetry in the Persian language in the 13th and 14th centuries. Persian poetry is an essential part of the Persian cultural setting and after more than seven centuries the poetry of Rumi and Hafiz, a precious heritage, still has a great influence on Persian cultural construction. Iranian often refer to Rumi’s and Hafiz’ poems when they want to give each other hope and comfort (Aneer 2014), or advice in different situations. Table 9-1 below investigates the garden in Hafiz poems.
**Table 9-1: Investigating ‘The Garden’ in Hafiz poems, adapted from (Shahcheraghi 2010) and (Clarke 1891 English translation)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significance of the Garden in Hafiz Poems</th>
<th>Combination of words</th>
<th>Example of Rhymes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allegory of universe</td>
<td>Universe’s garden</td>
<td>What is the purpose of watching the universe’s garden.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Picking your face flowers by my eyes’ hand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>مراد دل ز تماشایی باغ عالم جهست.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>به دست مردم چشم آز رخ تو گل چینی.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegory of Eden</td>
<td>Garden of Eden</td>
<td>Fortune is that which, without the heart’s blood cometh to the bosom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Otherwise with effort and toil the garden of Eden, all this is naught.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>دولت آن است که بخون ناب در کنار</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ورنه به پا دوی و عمل باغ جان این همه نیست.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mystical interpretations</td>
<td>Garden of beloved’s face</td>
<td>When the sun rises from the east of the cup.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A thousand tulips from the garden of beloved’s face open up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>چو افتاب می از مشرق پیله بر آید.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>زاغ عارض ساقی هزار لاله بر آید.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A place for spirituality</td>
<td>Garden of vision</td>
<td>My soul be the ransom of Thy mouth! since in the garden of vision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The pottery array of the world established no rosebud sweeter than this rosebud.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>جان فدا دهشان به که در باغ نظر.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>جمن آرای جهان خوشتر این عجه نیست.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A place for recreation and relaxation</td>
<td>Pleasure, chatting, spring, garden</td>
<td>Is anything more pleasant than the pleasure of chatting and enjoyment of the garden and spring?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Where is the butler? Ask what is the cause of our waiting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples of applying the garden concept in Rumi’s poems from ‘Translations of Divan-e-Shams’, by Shahriari (1998) are presented below

When the moon was shining its light
Both worlds were garden of delight
All souls for home then took flight
And so we say, may it be so
آن ماه چو تابان شد کوئین گلستان شد
بر روح بر افزودی تا بود چنین بودی

O Gardener, the musician’s thunder brought forth the cloud of the wine-bearer
Garden drunk, meadow drunk, rose drunk and thorn drunk
O revolving skies how many times upon this path are wayfarer
Dust drunk, water drunk, wind drunk, fire drunk
The visible is in such state, questioning the invisible yourself spare
Soul drunk, and mind drunk, imagination and thoughts drunk
باغبانا رعد مطبوب ابر ساقی گشت و شد
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If you’ve been to the garden, where is your bunch?
And where your soulful pearl if at sea you lunch.
With all this pain where is your gain?
The only veil, yourself, remain.

Hafiz’ and Rumi’s poems are the most popular interpretive poems in the Farsi language and are part of the Iranian collective memory. Hafiz considers the garden as a place for reflection and meditation with colourful flowers, green trees, and beautiful scenery, while the garden in Rumi’s poems is a symbol of God’s blessing, peace, and joy and includes both material and immaterial elements. In some pieces of Rumi’s poetry the garden means an allegory of universe, Eden, and mysticism. He also used gardens as an allegory of his soul in a broad range of meanings.

Aneer (2014) argues that in most of Rumi’s and Hafiz’ poems the garden is intended to indicate the unity between man and God and the hardships while travelling the path to unity. The other important function of the many of their poems is to create an identity which is both a Sufi identify and a Persian identity as opposed to an Arab-oriented Muslim identity. The Sufi tradition played a crucial role in molding the imaginary, symbolism, and the worldview in Persian poetry. In this tradition, love alone can bring together all contradictory and varied qualities and reinstate them in God’s unity, and is understood as the unifying divine power (Chittick 2003).

9.12 The Spread of the Persian Garden Icons around the World

The Persian word pairidaeza was first brought to Greece and then to Rome as paradeisos after Alexander’s conquest. Later in the seventh to ninth centuries C.E., Islam and the spread of Arab culture brought the Persian garden again to the Mediterranean world through North Africa, Sicily and Spain. As the first pleasure
This desire was feeding and healing both body and soul, just as the Persian gardens are known to do. Thus, the inspiration of the Persian garden has not happened only once but in multiple waves of influence (Hunt 2011).

According to the archaeologist, writer, and historian Patrick Hunt (2011), the remnant garden of Villa Farnesina in Rome near the Tiber - its location might be the Garden of Agrippa in imperial Rome - the Borghese Gardens above the Pincian Hill in Rome, as well as gardens of Renaissance and Baroque, are all indirect descendants of the Persian garden style.

Stronach argues that Court of the Lions in the Alhambra palace built in the 14th century goes back to Pasargadae: ‘The apparent borrowings – such as were presumably directly derived from the traditions of the Near Eastern gardens of the late Sassanid early Arab world – include the symmetrical manipulation of water, the frequent presence of stone water channels (sometimes with basins occurring at intervals) and, not least, the fourfold division of the available garden space’ (Stronach 1994, p. 10). The Generalife Garden built in the 20th century, located in Granada, Andalusia, Spain, also has the Persian garden pattern of the four-part harmony of gardens and courtyards with a long pool framed by flowerbeds, fountains, and pavilions. The Persian garden and its Islamic successors continue to inspire future gardens with their design and characteristics, even if future gardens may not have any religious or civic functions (Faghih & Sadeghy 2012; Hunt 2011). Garden design, like most of the world’s oldest civilisations, began in the arid Middle East, and today new garden designs still reflect their seminal form.
Persian rectangular walled orchard gardens can be seen in Greek, Roman and modern American gardens. Topias (farms) or contemporary urban backyards in Greece have been transformed by the idea, since gardens also play a key role in the stories of the oldest religions. The prototypal four-square gardens from 4,000 years ago have evolved into free-form, public, private, decorative, or practical gardens. The American West Coast garden today, with its icons such as walls, fountains, pavilions, channels, pools, terraces and groves, undoubtedly reflects the paradise gardens’ style, while seemingly there is no connection to the formalities of the paradise Persian, Indian, or Greco-Roman and Mediterranean antecedents (Sardar 2009).

One of the significant instances of the earthly paradise gardens is the Taj Mahal in India, built in 1632 to 1653, by Emperor Shah Jahan in memory of his third wife, Mumtaz Mahal, which has achieved that ethereal quality of transcendence. The light design of the columns, scalloped arches, and endless filigree reduce the hard geometries of structures. The garden has also been depicted in the tiles, mosaics, carved screens, and the calligraphy and painting (Cole 2011).

In California, some of the earliest planning signs were of a landscaping nature rather than architectural. In 1902, well-known New York architect, Bertram Grosvenor Goodhue, who was a member of a group of extraordinary talented architects and was
inclined towards historical disciplines in buildings planning in America, was asked to
design a Mediterranean Villa with Persian gardens in Montecito, near Santa Barbara.
To make certain of what exactly was wanted he travelled to Iran to see real Persian
gardens. After visiting a number of gardens he came back with many images and ideas
and finally he designed a house perched at the top of its site, with Persian terraces
and gardens spilling down the slope. When the Villa - which was for J. Waldron
Gillespie - was completed in 1903, it was the first of its kind in California (Oliver 1986).

Furthermore, a walk through the glorious gardens of the Getty Villa in Malibu,
California, evokes a time of splendor and opulence from ancient Rome (see Figure 9-2).
The Villa was established in 1972, as a museum in California, based on ancient
Roman garden styles and characteristics. Water features and the architecture of the
gardens show the influence of many cultures, including Persian culture. The gardens
of the Getty Villa are characterised by a combination of architecture, planting,
fountains, and statuary, which are arranged in strict symmetry around a central axis.
Although each garden at the Villa has a different character, water provides the central
focus in various forms such as shallow marble pools, fountains, and a formal dipping
pool. The presence of full-length sculptures of gods, human figures, and animals,
heroes, and sages of ancient Greece and Rome in the Villa gardens today, evokes the
art, religion, and history of ancient Rome (Bowe & DeHart 2011).
9.13 Conclusion

Attitudes towards nature and landscape have been addressed by a broad range of disciplines. Trying to understand people’s attitudes towards nature is an important principle in landscape studies. One of the essential ways that people shape and make sense of experience and landscape is ‘narrative’. Narratives and stories connect the tangible aspects of a place to the intangible aspects, including sense of time, event, experience, and memory. Narratives offer ways of shaping landscapes and contribute to the formal concerns of design (Potteiger & Purinton 1998). The effect of beliefs and ideology on establishing and creating natural landscapes and also the impression of these established sites on people’s perception and use, as two significant principles in cultural landscape studies, need more consideration in terms of physical design and human perception.

Eden is a strong narrative of human history in almost all ancient religions and beliefs in the world, which has also been the source of many of the myths and constructed gardens in both the east and the west. One of these constructed gardens is the Persian paradise garden. Persian styles in garden making were infused with the
Zoroastrian religious beliefs in Persia during the Sassanid era (first–second century). These beliefs placed a high value upon nature and particularly water, which was guarded by Anahita the goddess of water, whose mythical role along with the dry weather conditions in Persia had a great impact on palace-gardens in that era. The Persian paradise garden was a walled garden, which was enclosed to provide a place for relaxation, restoration, spirituality, and love. The systems of design and plantation, and the sensory stimulations, provide centralisation, which direct individuals to spirituality, and creates a restorative place for contemplation. These spiritual and mystical attributes of the garden had a great impact on Persian art and literature, which placed the Persian garden as a restorative place and representation of heaven in Persian culture. Although a range of social and cultural events and activities were held in the Persian garden, the main function of the garden was encouraging passive activities, and the garden was considered as a ‘place to pause’. This characteristic is also seen in Islamic Sufism ideology in Iran, which emphasises that God and Sufis have a specific relationship and the main principle in this friendship is contemplation and remembrance.

After Alexander’s conquest, the Greeks borrowed both the word and the idea of Persian paradise gardens. However, the concept of Arcadia in the west as a pastoral paradise first evolved in Rome, and Roman gardens in Europe were the first recognisably western gardens. The notion of Arcadia as a rural idyll based on the Greek mythology is attributed to the Roman poet Virgil. Virgil transposed the simple life of shepherds in Arcadia from Greece’s mountainous region to the groves and meadows of Sicily. The Virgilian myth was then transmitted through western culture by oral pastoral songs and by the printing and translation of his work into the major European languages, and influenced a number of poets in the English language (Short 1991). Accordingly, the concept of Arcadia as a lost Eden in western culture refers to the nostalgia for rural roots and has more emphasis on naturalism and virgin wilderness.

Later in the seventh to ninth centuries C.E., Islam and the spread of Arab culture brought the Persian garden to the Mediterranean world through North Africa, Sicily and Spain. The Persian garden has been considered by many cultures over time.
Today, Persian garden icons can be traced in many historical or contemporary landscape architecture designs in different corners of the world.

However, Persian garden characteristics have had several variations during the process of this translation and transferral into other cultures and ideologies. More research is required into the influences of Persian garden architecture on other cultures and on the quality and possible differences in the perception of Persian paradise gardens. It is also worth considering the appearance and function of garden elements in other cultures and landscape architectures. Further exploration is needed on the ways the power of narratives in different cultures can transform architectural forms and patterns in landscape design, and how it can be effective in establishing new ideas in relation to design or use of natural landscapes, and even cultural identity.

The previous chapter revealed that the cultural narrative of paradise embodied in the Persian garden is one of the important factors that influenced Iranians’ preferences of recreational activities and contemporary urban park characteristics in Iran. This chapter elaborated cultural narratives of Eden - particularly ‘paradise’ and ‘Arcadia’ - and their historical roots. It has been unfolded that paradise myth and Persian garden concept not only have profoundly influenced various aspects of the Persian culture, but also landscape design in diverse cultures. These explorations demonstrate how the power of landscape narratives can be influential on 1- the design and settings of urban park landscapes and people’s understanding and expectations of them; 2- constructing a viewpoint in relation to the natural environment in different aspects of a culture; and 3-transferring landscape design icons to other cultures. The next chapter summarises and concludes the main findings of the research and further elaborates on strategies in park design in multicultural Australian cities.
10  Chapter Ten: Conclusion

This chapter summarises and concludes the main findings of the research and further elaborates the question: how might Australian urban park management strategies support non-English-speaking immigrants’ activities in urban park spaces? It proposes recommendations for landscape planners and designers in association with facilitating better social interactions in urban parks. This chapter similarly explains limitations of the study and provides suggestions for future research.

10.1  Summary of Research

This study was an examination of behaviours, attitudes and preferences of people of non-English background with regard to the characteristics of urban parks in multi-ethnic settings. It took the research on urban parks as public spaces and highlighted cultural background and nature myths as important issues in park design. It also examined how different characteristics of park landscapes embodied various landscape narratives and how these landscape narratives and cultural landscapes are seen through the eyes of newcomers.

Whereas earlier studies identified different immigrants’ engagements with parklands that led to place attachment and sense of belonging, this research acknowledged cultural characteristics of park landscapes, and elaborated immigrants’ understanding and usage of particular cultural settings. The two important landscape narratives, ‘bush’ and ‘Arcadia’, as significant characteristics of Australian parks, and the Iranian immigrants’ conceptualisations of ‘paradise’ cultural landscape, provided the setting for this research. The research identified the needs and desires of Iranian immigrants in urban parks and their cultural roots, while understanding how the specific needs of non-English immigrants could be accommodated.

The research explored the reflections of cultural landscapes and landscape narratives on both users’ appreciations and preferences, and the urban park characters. The former were complemented by structured field observations, survey questionnaires, and structured interviews with Iranian users of the Melbourne case study park,
together with investigations on urban parks usage in Iran. This part of the research provided data on the way park environments are used by the Iranian community through case studies in Iran and in Australia. The latter was undertaken by exploring landscape myths in Australia and in Iran, and their reflections on the design and characters of urban parks. This part identified the ‘bush’ and ‘Arcadia’, as two significant landscape myths in Australian culture, and the influence of the English idea of the picturesque in art and landscape architecture, as having contributed to considering natural open spaces in Australian urban park design. This trend in the design of landscape led to creating landscapes that illustrate the aesthetic of nature. On the other hand, Persian gardens as an example of the ‘paradise’ myth in Persian culture have infused ‘stillness’ and ‘spaces of enclosure’ in the characteristics of contemporary urban parks in Iran, which along with the needs of the new urban lifestyle have resulted in preferences for ‘passive activities’. Further explorations in Chapter Eight - and partly in Chapter Three - also revealed that the power of narratives can be influential on constructing a viewpoint in relation to the natural environment in different aspects of a culture, and transferring landscape design icons to other cultures – Chapter Nine (see Figure 10-1).

Figure 10-1: The reflection of landscape narratives on culture, urban park characteristics, and users’ preferences of these spaces

Through these investigations and the complementary Q methodology, a rich set of data was generated in order to address the research questions. This thesis
approached the issue of immigration and park experience and perception through seeking the links between cultural landscapes, landscape myths, past experiences, park spatial configurations and physical settings, and the way immigrants engage with them. In doing so, this thesis applied theories of place and habitus as a sense of place, and analysed how landscape myths influence both the people environmental behaviour and expectations, and the physical landscape in urban park spaces.

10.2 Summary of Findings

The findings of this research confirm earlier research that the ‘park idea’ has been shaped by very specific beliefs about nature. However, in this mobile world the attempt to maintain identity and re-establish home has caused immigrants not merely visit parks, but engage in processes of place-making. Immigrants carry their cultural narratives and habitus of nature, which provide them with a lens through which to perceive park landscapes. However, the role of planning and its effects on this process is also considerable. The findings advocate the discrimination theory explained in Chapter Four that asserts: ethnic minorities experiencing discrimination in parks may avoid using them or change the way they use these spaces, and changing the composition of park management and adding more ‘minority’ representation may increase park use rates among ethnic groups (Byrne & Wolch 2009).

Nonetheless, it has been revealed that in accordance with transculturalism and habitus transference, non-English immigrants adopt multiple park cultures derived from both the origin and host countries. However, this does not mean that they assimilate into the dominant park culture; in contrast they highly prefer their cultural and social activities that they used to undertake in park spaces. Findings also highlight the importance of investigating ethno-racial understanding and usage of park spaces through elaborating on the concept of place.
10.2.1 ‘Sense of Place’ Perceived in Park Landscapes

Analysis has demonstrated that Iranians’ cultural values and sense of respect for water and greenery, in the form of architectural manifestations in Persian gardens, are still significant factors in inspiring aesthetic values in Iran’s contemporary urban parks. It is also evident that centrality, spaces of enclosure, and paths in urban parks contribute to creating aesthetic settings. Physical settings provide an opportunity for individuals to express and affirm their identity (Kyle, Graefe & Manning 2005, p. 155). This has been observed in electing icons of Iranian cultural landscape as favourite places in association with aesthetic values, which likewise demonstrates that aesthetic values are profoundly cultural.

On the other hand, crowded scenes and untidy/dirty landscape settings were considered not favourable. This issue brings up the distinction between design and maintenance; however, it seems obvious that a poorly maintained/dirty landscape feature will be seen negatively by almost any culture. Moreover, there was often differing responses to photos of cultural activities depending on whether the question was about cultural activities or aesthetics. Both survey and Q methodology data analysis show that respondents’ patterns of use mostly differ in association with individual and collective usage. They mainly prefer quiet aesthetic scenes for sitting, nature watching, walking, and having a chat. These spaces also have cultural/personal meanings for them. However, flat open spaces are considered appropriate for picnicking and group gatherings, even if they are crowded particularly in Norouz.

In the case of Iranian immigrants and Ruffey Park, analysis showed that the configuration of ‘view’, ‘lake’, and ‘open natural space’ derived from cultural notions of ‘bush’ and ‘Arcadia’, and English picturesque design concepts, affect Iranian immigrants’ sense of aesthetic. It has been found that stillness and spaces of enclosure, as significant characteristics of Persian historical gardens, are greatly desired in the Arcadian context of the Ruffey Park. Moreover, spatial aesthetic values in Ruffey Park are strongly related to the perception of unmodified wide natural landscapes for most of the respondents. This can be due to the different climatology
and a desire for and memories of broad natural landscapes, or the design of urban parks in Iran which includes more man-made structures, buildings, and facilities which in some cases may reduce the sense of naturalness in parks.

Icons of Iranian cultural landscape and Persian paradise gardens such as water features, paths, places of enclosure, topography and different levels, have been found as characteristics that evoke place identity in Iran’s urban parks. These characteristics of the landscape create favourite places in Iran’s urban park landscapes which inspire aesthetic values for the respondents and afford restorative experiences that lead to emotion and self-regulation processes and develop place identity. However, some of the respondents also showed interest in aspects of English picturesque landscape design and the new form of water features in Iran’s park settings. This desire demonstrates that Iranians have views already influenced by external/English ideas of landscape design, and they found them scenic and favourable.

The present study demonstrates that although Iranian immigrants may prefer using managed landscapes and utilitarian provisions of urban parks, they greatly acknowledge natural characteristics of the landscape which create favourite aesthetic scenes full of a sense of peacefulness and restoration, particularly in the case of Ruffey Park.

Apart from aesthetic aspects, culture in Iranian parks in the form of social traditions plays a significant role in the relationship between human and the landscape and making sense of place. Additionally, cultural landscape icons and paths in Iran’s park landscapes have been found to be significant factors in giving value to the place and human-place bonding. This process of giving values is different in Ruffey Park where restoration and being together with family and friends are the main sources of human-place bonding that result in place attachment. The greater percentage of paths overall in Iranian parks also demonstrates this cultural difference in the design of parks in these two contexts. Less paths in Ruffey Park has resulted in more wide open spaces, while greater paths with flowerbeds and seats in Iranian parks leads to creating a vibrant enclosed space which mostly invites individuals to stay.
The findings also suggest that place attachment derived from human-place bonding and emotional attachments in park landscapes is inspired through social activities, cultural events, and historical landscape icons in Iran’s parks. In other words, respondents’ most valued landscapes in terms of having personal and cultural values, are those associated with social activities, cultural events, and historical landscape icons in Iran’s parks, which demonstrates strong rootedness to their past. Culture here in the form of social traditions has a significant role in the relationship between human and the landscape and making sense of place. Spaciousness and depth illustrated in the paths also contribute to making landscape distinguishable and memorable and reinforcing the historicity of the landscape. Paths in Iranian parks are not merely used as a passage; they are ‘places of public gathering’ that provide stillness and passive activities. Hence, the momentous physical environment, social interaction, and personal meaning contributing to satisfying felt behavioural, strong emotional attachment, and insideness in Iran’s park landscapes.

In Ruffey Park, views, lake setting, open spaces, naturalness, legibility, and sociocultural activities in the landscape have been considered to be parameters that contribute to creating settings that evoke feelings, memory, identity, and emotional and place attachments for Iranian participants. According to the analysis, physical settings that provide: 1- places of enclosure, stillness, and restoration in natural settings; and 2- places for being together and doing social activities, are significant landscape personal and cultural values in Ruffey Park, which result in ‘place attachment’.

Results also illustrate that naturalness and legibility in Iran’s urban park case studies are not as impressive as they are in Ruffey Park because of the particular type of design and management in Iran’s parks, cultural landscapes, the dry climate, and the scale of the urban parks. Furthermore, unlike in Iranian parks, the historical characteristics of Ruffey Park, which were the main aims of its initial designers (Calder, Parkin & Seddon 1974), and have been illustrated by various signs in the park, are not perceived significant by the Iranian participants. The historical and cultural roots of naturalness here as a design objective, are not fully appreciated by Iranian
respondents, which demonstrates the lack of connection with the physical space or ‘outsideness’.

The findings of this study also show to what extent local identity and the way in which it is mediated through cultural narratives can be effective in inspiring personal and cultural values in park landscapes. The study found that spatial manifestations of koocheh bagh, in the form of paths in urban parks, evoke memory and nostalgia, create a pleasant space, and express a powerful relationship between memory, culture, and identity. However, paths in Ruffey Park reflect less personal and cultural meanings, which indicates that they have less attractions compared to the other parts of the park landscape. Urban parks for the respondents are mainly ‘places to pause’ or ‘places of gathering’ and spaces with fewer chances for staying are considered not welcoming and personally and culturally meaningless. This also may have happened due to the greater aesthetic attractions of the lake setting in Ruffey Park which draws users’ attention.

Settings with less natural elements and more material culture and cultural practices, inspire meaning and recall memories for the respondents with regard to land use patterns and cultural practices, while they have least values in terms of aesthetic. Socialising, festivals, cultural activities, and picnicking are regarded as significant in urban park landscapes. However, chaos, crowds, lack of safety, stagnant, dirty water, mess, and lack of naturalness in park environments are factors that create inconvenient, unpleasant and meaningless spaces.

This thesis provides further insight on the nature of human–place bonding by examining sense of place perceived by the respondents in two different landscape contexts. Place identity in terms of the cognitive connection between the self and the aesthetic physical landscape, was evident in cultural aspects of park landscapes embodied in their design. For example icons and elements of Persian garden design in Iran’s parks, and ‘Arcadia’ character of Ruffey Park manifested through ‘view’, ‘lake’, and ‘open space’.

The concept of place identity is a process of ‘environmental self-regulation’ in which the environment plays an important role in regulating social interaction as well as
creating and maintaining one’s self. The physical environment in this sense is
momentous in itself for the individual (Korpela 1989, p. 244). Thus, a place can be a
resource for satisfying felt behavioural or experiential goals, and also an essential part
of one’s self to result strong emotional attachment (Williams et al. 1992, p. 32). In
this approach, place identity refers to both social and personal aspects of place and
place attachment is the result of satisfying needs and goals in a place together with
specific personal relationships. Since, the focus of this thesis was mainly on aesthetic
aspects of park landscapes; ‘place identity’ only included personal aspects in relation
to physical attributes of place.

It has been found that place attachment derived from human-place bonding and
emotional attachments in park landscapes is inspired through social and cultural
activities, and historical and cultural landscape icons in Iran’s parks. However, in
Ruffey Park restoration in pleasant and scenic landscape settings and being together
with family and friends are the main sources of human-place bonding that result in
place attachment. These findings indicate that immigrants show a stronger
preference for aesthetic aspects of the landscape and socialising, when they cannot
regulate their individual identity within the new environment. It is also observable
that repeated community activities in urban parks can result in place attachment
developing among immigrants.

10.2.2 Ideals of Narrative Characteristics in Park Landscapes

Water, paths, Persian garden icons, and social activities, have been found to be the
prominent ideals of nature in Iran’s parks as they have aesthetic attributes and
cultural and personal values. Some scholars argue that these nature concepts have
been idealised by Islam in the Middle East region as means through which
practitioners can become closer to their God (Foltz, Denny & Baharuddin 2003).
However, Chapter Eight and Nine broadly investigated the roots and philosophy of
paradise gardens and the transformation of Persian paradise gardens’ icons and
patterns in landscape architecture through historical and spatial explorations. It was
argued how in the seventh to ninth centuries C.E., Islam and the spread of Arab
culture brought the Persian garden to the Mediterranean world through North Africa,
Sicily and Spain. Today, the Persian garden pattern can be traced in many historical or contemporary landscape architecture designs in different countries in the world.

Water has a more symbolic than practical role in Iran urban parks, inherited from the Persian garden design. Persian garden layouts with significant and symbolic use of water, demonstrates both rationality and human intervention in nature, and the potential productivity of nature in producing plants, fruits, and flowers, especially in dry climates. Accordingly, Persian gardens tend to be highly ‘formal’ in a geometric design sense called char-bagh – gardens divided into four quadrants separated by two channels of water, and with a pool or a pavilion in the centre. This geometric design, which has influenced landscape design in Iran, contrasts strikingly with the naturalistic ideal of Australian park landscapes.

The western ecological movement to preserve untouched nature or to restore nature back to a golden age, when people had a more natural relationship with the earth (Petruccioli 2003), is almost impossible to detect in the design of Persian gardens. This is not actually because Iranians are not attracted by the proposals of the western ecological movement, but it is due to the dry climatology in Iran, apart from the northern provinces. The act of garden and park making in Iran is indeed recreating nature which, in most cases, is not untouched, but geometric and planned.

Analysis has demonstrated that the characteristics of Iran’s parks inherited from the Persian garden design in the forms of water features, paths, and places of enclosure, are perceived as ordered modified landscapes, which result in a sense of restoration and pleasure. Furthermore, these characteristics along with the Iranian social traditions undertaken in park landscapes contribute to create a memorable place and sense of ‘insideness’. In another view, as discussed in Chapter Three, myths ‘bush’ and ‘Arcadia’, and the picturesque characteristics of Australian landscape have impacted upon landscape design which resulted in considering greater natural landscape than man-made structures, and more open space in Australian parks. Analysis has showed that this characteristic of park landscapes manifested in the forms of lake, view, and open space in Ruffey Park, perceived as unmodified natural landscape, highly peaceful and restored, and inspire aesthetic scenes. However, lack
of past experience, relationship and connection with the space has resulted in sense of ‘outsideness’, which is also due to unfamiliarity with design references. Although aspects of the picturesque seem present in some contemporary Iranian park design, but the bush, the scale, and type of landscape elements are greatly different in Australian parks. The present study found that Iranian respondents highly admire the aesthetic and restorative aspects of Ruffey Park landscapes; however, fostering ‘place attachment’ relies mostly on their actions and practices in these spaces as a process of getting familiar to the settings.

### 10.2.3 Preferences of Practices in Urban Park Landscapes

The findings of this research indicate that Iranian immigrants prefer ‘being with family and friends’, ‘walking, and getting fresh weather’, and ‘doing sport and exercise’ and ‘picnicking’ as their favourite activities in Iran’s parks. However, ‘festivals and celebrations’ are the most undertaken activities in Ruffey Park, followed by ‘picnicking, BBQ’, and ‘being with family and friends’. The interweaving of social and cultural dimensions of cultural events is highly significant as a source of cultural and ethnic affirmation and identity in conditions of migration, and can also foster a sense of familiarity and belonging to the physical environment.

However, as has been found by previous research on non-English-speaking immigrants and park environments in Australia (Byrne, Goodall & Cadzow 2013), this study also suggests as the first Anglo-Celtic settlers in Australia could not see the Indigenes’ dreaming and spiritual sites and ignored their landscapes full of memories, non-English-speaking immigrants similarly cannot thoroughly communicate with the mythical, historical, and cultural Australian landscape today. This mythical landscape, as discussed in Chapter Three, has resulted in creating naturalistic landscapes and open space in Australian parks. Iranian participants in this study mostly spoke of how Melbourne parks seemed natural compared to the park landscapes of their homelands, and how they have fewer facilities such as illuminations at night.

Safety, greenery, brightness, and the existence of an appropriate place for sitting and gathering, in park landscapes reflect important factors in relation to having social and
recreational values. Socio-cultural activities, passive recreation, and the wish for being together in nature were raised as important desired activities in park spaces. Nonetheless, recreational facilities and equipment for doing active recreation were also considered significant. Analysis demonstrates that ‘disturbing visual elements’ including unnatural and man-made structures evoke unpleasant landscape scenes for the respondents; however, their patterns of use mostly depend on some of those elements such as shelters and playgrounds. The respondents believe that social activities in parks demand particular places and space arrangements, and facilities for sport or doing active recreation are also essential.

In Ruffey Park likewise, social traditions, picnicking, and gathering were mentioned as desirable activities in park spaces. Culture and the collective memory are greatly influential in recreational preferences in park landscapes after migration and past interactions with these spaces continue to affect immigrants’ preferences in the new landscape setting. This can be clearly seen in respondents’ strong preferences for celebrating traditional events and festivals in park landscapes and in considering urban parks as ‘places of public gathering’. However, the broader conception of what an urban park is has resulted in expectations of recreational provisions such as illumination at night time, the existence of restaurants, cafés, buildings in which people gather for social or recreational activities, colourful flowers, and sport facilities. This desire has also been highlighted by numerous studies on non-English immigrants’ engagements with Australian park landscapes (see Chapter Four).

This thesis highlights how landscape can be perceived differently by immigrants in terms of the ideals and values they bring to it. The physical attributes of park landscapes have been found extremely effective in inspiring personal and cultural meanings, a sense of aesthetic, and fostering a sense of place. Thus, the present thesis acknowledges that according to the uniqueness of human or group cultures and different experiences that people have with the landscape, it is possible for a single natural space to encompass multiple ‘places’ (Stedman 2003). Nevertheless, the design of the landscape plays an important role in creating meaning and undertaking activities by the users.
Drawing on Benson (2010) this thesis argued that immigrants’ relationships with the landscape are shaped by the intersection of imagining and experience. The role of imagining in shaping the way migrants understand the landscape is very important in the development of a relationship with it. The complexity of this relationship, as Benson (2010) stresses, is in relation to the element of detachment which contains the landscape viewed from a distance and often shaped by imagination. Iranian immigrants’ relationships with Ruffey Park environments demonstrate that for some of the respondents the cultural and the natural realms are intertwined. This is evident in their patterns of use in forms of social traditions and festivities. However, some of the respondents see themselves as being distinct from their surroundings in park environments, as they prefer observing the landscape and draw a distinction between the natural and the social realms.

The data analysis has illustrated that on the one hand, longing for an aesthetic, natural, and restorative landscape in Ruffey Park provides a lens through which Iranian immigrants continue to gaze on the landscape. While, on the other hand, it demonstrates the extent to which the migrants privilege engagement with these aesthetic park landscapes as a way of developing social activities and passive recreation. Contrary, cultural connections together with the physical settings of Iranian parks provide more practical engagements with the park landscapes for the respondents.

Gathering socially with other people was found to be a fundamental principle in making stillness spaces in park landscapes in Iranian culture, while the interconnection of natural and cultural processes significantly affects the configurations of landscapes. Moreover, strong preferences for landscapes illustrating top views and open spaces that provide appropriate places for restoration, nature watching, walking, and being together were also observed. In both contexts, performativity in the park landscapes was found to be an important factor in granting meaning to the place, sense of belonging, and identification with space which is influenced by different arrangements of space and demands specific facilities.
This thesis suggests that perception and usage of urban park landscapes are the result of Iranian immigrants’ understanding of park landscapes as mediated with their past experiences and cultural background, and landscape settings that support this understanding. The thesis also highlights that place meaning in urban park landscapes is structured by users’ habitus while also offering the possibility of transforming it. Building on Bourdieu’s theory of habitus and theories of ‘sense of place’, the analysis illustrates how Iranian immigrants’ interpret Australian park landscapes is highly dependent on their cultural identity in relation to park use and landscape design. The landscape operates on unconscious levels and affects their perceptions and uses of place as mediated by their approach to nature, which contribute to the phenomenon of the sense of belonging.

Iranian people often use urban parks as places to pause, to stay, to rest, to gain vitality, to meet, and to socialise. This is partly related to their cultural landscape (see Chapter Eight), however, the new demands of urban life, the growth of population, and living in apartments have also influenced this consideration. The kind of activities that they undertake in urban park spaces is similar to those that they used to do in their back yards. Lack of natural/open spaces in their residential places has resulted in using urban parks as places for resting, getting fresh air and vitality, having dinner, or drinking tea, and having a chat with each other. This is also evident in interviews, when the respondents mostly said that in Iran they went to parks for chatting, having food, and getting fresh air. On the other hand, changing in lifestyle after migration and living in houses with open spaces enables Iranian immigrants to undertake small group gatherings and family chats in their backyards.

Discussions revealed that cultural narrative of paradise embodied in the Persian garden is one of the important factors in Iranians’ preferences of recreational activities. It has been unfolded that Persian garden ideology and pattern have been imbued in landscape planning and park design in Iran. Moreover, this cultural view point along with the demands of the new urban lifestyle, have developed a preference for stillness and ‘passive activities’ in park spaces among Iranians.
‘Stillness’, as duration of stay in the landscape for social/passive purposes, needs specific provisions and settings, particularly to encourage visitors to engage in social activities and stay for longer in urban parks, which not only makes urban parks more sustainable, but also reinforces social cohesion. Designing excessively large or open spaces with fewer provisions for social/passive purposes may discourage passive recreational users from remaining in parks for long periods of time.

Furthermore, this thesis found that aesthetic and picturesque attributes of Ruffey Park environment play a prominent role in representing the image of paradise among Iranian participants. This phenomenon may relate to the scale, configuration of space, type of vegetation, presence of the lake, and the view, which contribute to creating an aesthetic scene full of sense of restoration. These attributes are portrayed in photo No.13 to the extent that the setting evokes the image of paradise for the Iranian respondents. In contrast, it was revealed that paradise in Iran’s parks can be found in almost every corner of a park’s environment, based on the particular individuals’ meanings of that spatial setting, which indicates that paradise has considered more a matter of cultural memory than aesthetics.

It has been found that more than the half of the participants believe that paradise is observable in Ruffey Park’s lake setting, which inspires a sense of enclosure, peacefulness and restoration. However, in Iran’s parks, where the respondents are familiar with their environments and had a long term interaction with them, or as Relph describes are ‘insiders’, past experience of space plays a significant role in inspiring a sense of paradise.

The difference of experiences between these two contexts gives rise to the importance of the relationship between self and place and the concept of ‘insideness’ and ‘outsideness’. The perceived paradise in Iran’s parks is more commonly felt to be as a result of ‘insideness’ or the familiarity with the place. Nonetheless, the role of aesthetic scenes that influences sense of restoration as a contributor that evokes personal meanings, are crucial factors in inspiring and representing the image of paradise in the Ruffey Park landscape.
10.3 Facilitating Better Social Interactions for Non-English Immigrants in Urban Parks

Australian cities are facing rapid increases in cultural and ethnic diversity due to migration and various lifestyle patterns. Park environments in Australia are areas where people from different cultural backgrounds experience each other’s distinctiveness and are habitats for cultural diversity. Parks are also places in which family and community gatherings can occur to foster deep bonds between people, and with the places themselves (Byrne, Goodall & Cadzow 2013).

Active recreations such as dog walking and sport activities have been observed to be less undertaken by non-English park visitors than Anglo-Australians. This may be due to the prioritisation of sporting facilities in parks that has been influenced by the dominant English culture, while sports desired by other cultures may be different. Iranians and more broadly non-Anglo immigrants have been found to prefer passive activities and group gatherings, and engage in a process of place making in Australian parks. This process takes place through enjoying park landscapes, restoration, bonding with the past, and undertaking family fun activities and socialising. These engagements have been also observed among other non-English immigrants in Ruffey Park i.e. Chinese, Greeks, Italians, Malaysians, and South Koreans, which can result in a greater social attachment to parklands. Nonetheless, the present thesis like numerous studies on non-English immigrants’ park visitation - discussed in Chapter Four - has highlighted that non-English immigrant families expect higher provisions for socialising and recreational activities in Australian urban parks.

If cultural and ethnic groups are restricted in their use of parks, then the opportunity to make relationships between places and the communities who use them is missed. Parklands must be socially, as well as biologically, sustainable to survive, thus the social relations in parklands are considerable issues in park design and management (Goodall et al. 2004). Park planners have a significant role in defining ways in which park spaces can be better used by all members of society. Therefore, it seems necessary to further consider sustainable development principles into the planning, design, development and management of urban parks to achieve a balance between
the conservation of cultural landscape and biodiversity, and the public recreation and facilities that are provided. But, how would the structure and function of a sustainable urban park be conceptualised in order to achieve this goal, and how can we define this concept and its characters precisely?

Considering the rapid increasing of ethnic diversity and social mixture of cities, it is essential to pay attention to the ways different residents and social groups experience the city, and foster their sense of belonging (Devadason 2010; Savage, Bagnall & Longhurst 2005). Making sense of place in relation to landscape is different in various cultures, and it depends on use, association, meaning, and the functions that the landscape provides. It is essential for policymakers and professionals or other individuals in communities to recognise these values and meanings (Roe 2012). Parkland which has no social value will not survive, and the most effective way to enhance community level support for sustainable use is to ensure that parklands are valued and enjoyed by diverse groups of people (Goodall et al. 2004).

It is obvious that in order to indicate a more cultural/rural landscape, creating spaces which excluded the axes, circles, squares, and other geometric patterns which visibly represent the city, has been preferred by Australian park designers. Excluding artificial lights in the majority of urban parks may be due to the same reason, however, it may also have been considered because of political or security issues. It is worth considering the setting of parks, for example the existence of colourful flowers, benches, or ‘public gathering’ facilities in urban park environments such as illuminations, amphitheatres, exhibitions, kiosks and cafés to make them more enjoyable for ethnic minority users. Drawing on the issue of new use of parks and urban green spaces, and avoiding alienation in these spaces, it is significant to ask which activities should be allowed in parks, and there is no need to limit the activities to those ‘traditional’ ones, nor allow any activity to dominate the park (Nankervis 1998).

This study suggests that passive recreation mainly demands stillness, spaces of enclosure, recreational provisions, and entertaining facilities. As previous studies (Byrne, Goodall & Cadzow 2013) have observed, an intense desire for garden-parks
has also been found. According to their cultural background, respondents expressed a demand for having flowerbeds, ponds, and illumination in park environments. However, it is important to note that various forms of recreation are also undertaken by several groups of non-English immigrants, i.e. Iranian bushwalkers and nature explorers, in different kinds of Australian parks.

Urban parks can provide a vital locality and their design in combination with the cultural characteristics of various ethnic groups inform the opportunities for intercultural interactions. Research has found social interactions in urban parks can stimulate social cohesion in multicultural societies (Peters, Elands & Buijs 2010). Designers have a great impact on the way spaces can be used. Their emphasis in the design of parks should not be mainly placed on aesthetics and less on function and recreation. The way facilities are distributed will influence different types of usage. Considering broad open spaces in the design of urban parks may prevent staying in parks for long periods of time or in certain times such as night.

Ruffey Park as an important urban park in Doncaster area can provide a range of important recreation and social opportunities for people in the City of Manningham and from other municipalities. This includes various ethnicities such as Chinese, Greeks, Italians, Malaysians, South Koreans, and Iranians. The interaction of people especially with different cultural backgrounds in Ruffey Park often takes place around BBQ and picnic areas, as there are limited settings designed for social activities – apart from festival times and specific events. Results show that the park has been widely considered as a place for restoration, socialising, gathering, festivals, social and emotional bonding, and as a place to stay, by non-English immigrants. Therefore, due to this broader conception of what a park might be, the existence of cafés, restaurants, amphitheatres, museums, or any other cultural and educational centres in parks are desired. Moreover, various sport facilities, illumination for night use and creating more and different paths for various functions and settings that enable better social interactions are in high demand. Nonetheless, since urban public parks have potentials to stimulate social cohesion through informal interactions and encounters between different ethnic groups and even intergroup; it is important to consider the notion of socio-petal spaces in park settings. Yet, how this consideration
of the socio-petal concept in urban park design and creating more spaces for social activities may affect the Australian cultural landscape needs to be investigated.

Although solitude, relaxation, and restoration are favourite leisure activities among different groups of users in parks, the existence of spaces that get people together in public parks are also important. Studies indicate that space configuration and furniture affect the number of interactions within a space (Main & Hannah 2010). Furniture arrangements could encourage or discourage face-to-face communication and social activities in park environments. The term ‘socio-petal’ was introduced by Humphrey Ostmond in 1957, to describe settings that are expected to bring people together and encourage face-to-face communication (Ostmond 1957). Nevertheless, culture also influences the way people prefer to orient towards each other in the process of engaging social activities (Hall 1966; Lang 1987), which needs more investigations particularly in association with park usage.

Therefore, architects, urban planners and park managers, should consider that in order to provide opportunities for intergroup/intragroup interactions, especially in a multicultural context, placing a number of socio-petal arrangements in urban parks would be effective. The socio-petal arrangements together with providing demanded recreational facilities in urban parks may also contribute to developing a ‘sustainable urban park’ used and enjoyed by all members of society. The results of this thesis support ideas of urban park design and management which are towards maintaining a broad range of experiences; from naturalness to developed settings and social activities’ provisions.

10.4 Limitations of the Study

There are a number of limitations embedded in the design of this research. The case study park in Melbourne was limited to one particular park which was familiar for the research participants, and excluded other possible park visitations. Studying other case studies would have provided a broader range of park use patterns and engagements. Data was collected during warm seasons and during the day time, which does not provide information about how parks may be used during cold seasons or at night. Considering the issue that night usage is favourable by Iranians
and also several non-English immigrant groups, it is important to study their activities at night particularly in relation to the park settings and provisions.

The photos selected to be applied in the Q methodology photo sorting were limited and did not comprise all park spaces and every sort of leisure activities undertaken in urban parks and by various users, due to the specific use of this method in three stages which could not include too many photographs. Furthermore, focusing on the Iranian community as a representation of non-English immigrants provides insights that can be applied to other non-English ethnic communities who use Ruffey Park. However, it led not to elaborate on other cultural landscapes and leisure activities carried out by diverse ethnicities. Furthermore, considering the fact that landscape is a multi-sensory field applying the Q technique and the use of photographs as a method in this research reduced understanding landscape to the visual and pictorial.

The analysis of this study considers ethnicity as a non-homogeneous concept and investigated possible differences between the members of Iranian cultural group individually. For this reason the number of participants was limited. It should be noted that individuals within an (ethnic) culture do not necessarily behave in the same manner, and the opportunities that an environment affords are not perceived in the same way by them (Lang 1987). Therefore, it is required to study various factors such as age, gender, socio-economic, marital status, education, and the length of stay in a new context as well, since levels of acculturation differ from one individual to another. The research, however, sought to understand how cultural ideologies and landscape narratives affect people’s understanding of urban park spaces, therefore, factors such as age, gender, socio-economic, and education levels were less relevant.

10.5 Future Research

Understanding visceral and experiential dimensions of landscape has been an ongoing project for anthropologists, landscape architects, and human and cultural geographers. Their studies examine personal behaviours to identify how a wide range of landscape qualities can be uncovered by behaviour investigations. However, the discipline of the experimental potential of landscape is beginning to open up. Wylie (2006), in his study concludes with a call for a ‘geopoetics’ – a term generally defined
as a landscopic creativity – that ‘would be about working explicitly with expressive vocabularies and grammars in order to creatively and critically knit biographies, events, visions, and topographies into landscape’ (Wylie 2006, p. 533).

Key challenges for the discipline of landscape architecture in this regard involve answering two key questions. Firstly, what is the broadened scope of activities that individuals, groups, and society should undertake in urban park landscapes? And, secondly, what are the ways different cultural/ethnic groups may inhabit and sustain themselves within public parks?

This research raises questions for future studies to determine how various spaces and components of an urban park are perceived and used by visitors and to what extent their perception and usage may change in shifting ideological contexts. Further research, however, could investigate how park planners, managers, and policy makers can support and encourage non-English ethnic groups, to use urban parks, and how the design of urban parks can satisfy their needs in order to enhance equity in the use of parks, and increase social activities. More research is needed to evaluate and examine different ethnic groups’ culture of park visiting and to find solutions for better participation of immigrants in Australian public park spaces. It is also essential to investigate how different landscape settings in national parks are perceived and used by various user groups, and their preferences in these spaces.

It is similarly worth considering how the power of narratives in different cultures can transform architectural forms and patterns in landscape design, and how they can be effective in establishing new ideas in relation to design or use of natural landscapes, and even cultural and ethnic identity. Redefining Arcadia as a garden concept in contemporary landscape also needs more research, in terms of recreating idyllic landscapes, which cover their users’ needs and preferences. It is also worth investigating how concepts of ‘bush’ and ‘Arcadia’ have influenced Anglo-Australian culture of park use and how various non-English users interpret this Australian landscape identity. Further investigation is also required into the influences of Persian garden architecture on other cultures and on the quality and possible
differences in the perception of paradise gardens, as well as in the appearance and function of garden elements in other cultures and landscape architecture.

In order to increase the ‘publicness’ of urban park spaces for multiple users in cross-cultural societies, it is crucial to study diverse characteristics of urban park environments, together with cultural landscape of various groups of users. Further research is required to understand how different activities and provisions in urban parks considering their cultural context, can contribute to performativity in space and the sense of belonging among immigrants, or foster inclusion among various ethnic groups in multi-cultural societies.
11 Appendices

11.1 Appendix A: Consent Form for the Respondents

Deakin University
School of Architecture and Built Environment
Geelong Waterfront Campus
Victoria Australia

CONSENT FORM

Project title: Migration, Landscape, and Culture: Urban Parks and Iranian Immigrants in Melbourne

Researcher’s name: Nasim Yazdani

Supervisor’s name: Dr Mirjana Lozanovska, Dr David Beynon

• I have read the Plain Language Statement Sheet and the nature and purpose of the research project has been explained to me. I understand and agree to take part.
• I understand the purpose of the research project and my involvement in it.
• I understand that I may withdraw from the research project participation at any stage and this will not affect my status now or in the future. The refusal to participate will not jeopardise my relationships with Deakin University, the Iranian Community in Melbourne, or the researchers involved with the study.
• I understand that while information gained during the study may be published or presented in any public form, my identity and personal details will not be revealed.
• I declare that I am over 18 years of age.
• I do/do not agree to photographs being taken and used.
I have provided information about the research to the research participant and believe that he/she understands what is involved.

انچنان کلیه اطلاعات لازم در مورد این تحقیق را در اختیار شرکت کننده قرار داده‌ام و مطمئن هستم این‌ها کاملاً در جریان قرار گرفته است.

Researcher's signature and date

اتماس و امضای محقق

11.2 Appendix B: Survey Form

Deakin University, School of Architecture and Built Environment

Geelong Waterfront Campus, Victoria Australia

Survey Form

RESEARCH TOPIC: Migration, Landscape, and Culture: Urban Parks and Iranian Immigrants in Melbourne

1- How long ago did you migrate to Australia?

2- How long have you been in Melbourne?

3- What is your age?

4- What is your gender?

5- How many people are in your family?

6- How many children do you have?

7- Occupation?

8- Highest level of formal education?

9- How often do you travel to Iran?
10- Is Ruffey Lake Park close to where you live?

---

11- How often do you visit Ruffey Park? And why?

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

12- Which park did you usually visit in Iran before migration and how often? a) Did you go there with your family, friends, or individually? b) Did you visit there at the weekends or weekdays? c) What time in a day did you go there morning, afternoon, or evening?

در ایران قبل از مهاجرت، معمولاً به یک پارک شهری می‌رفتید و چه وقت یکبار؟ (الف) آیا تاکنون به آن پارک می‌رفتید؟ (ب) آیا آخر هفته‌های یا پارک می‌رفتید یا در روزهای هفته؟ (ج) چه وقت روز معمولاً به پارک میرفته‌اید؟

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

13- What did you do in the park? Are there any differences in the way you use and interact with parks in Melbourne in comparison to Iran?

در پارک آیا تفاوت‌هایی در نحوه استفاده و تعامل شما با پارک‌های ملبورن در مقایسه با ایران وجود دارد؟

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

14- Does the weather play a barrier or incentive role for you in using urban parks in Melbourne? And why?

آیا آب و هوای ملبورن مانع استفاده شما از پارک‌های ملبورن باعث حبوب پارک‌های می‌شود یا باعث حبوب پارک‌های می‌شود؟

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

INSTRUCTION TO RESPONDENT

This study seeks to understand how Iranian immigrants in Melbourne attach values to urban park spaces in comparison to their previous experience in Iran.
You are invited to sort thirty six (36) photographs from Melbourne and Iran’s park spaces (18 photographs for each), in three stages: 1- Landscape scenery and aesthetic values, 2- Landscape personal and cultural values (e.g. memories) 3- Landscape social and recreational values (e.g. exercising, family gatherings, ceremonies, or festivities), and state your perception based on “Most Valued Landscape and Least Valued Landscape”. We are interested to know your perception of these spaces.

Please refer to the first 18 photographs carefully and place them into three (3) piles, based on the most and least valued landscape in relation to the given subject. Separate the photographs based on your perception according to the categories below:

I) Photographs that you most valued (MOST VALUED)
II) Photographs that you least valued (LEAST VALUED)
III) Photographs that are neutral/ not relevant (NEUTRAL)

There is no right or wrong answer in this survey. After you have completed separating the photographs, count the total numbers of photographs for each category in the piles and write them down on the bottom left-hand corner of the answer sheet.

Please look again at the MOST VALUED pile and choose one (1) photograph that you most valued and place it in the column under “+3” on the right hand side of the answer sheet. Then, of the remaining photographs in this category, choose the next two (2) and place them in the column under “+2” (It does not matter where you place the two photographs under the column). Follow through the process until you have finished placing all the photographs of the most valued landscapes.

Next, take out the photographs from the LEAST VALUED piles and choose one (1) that you least valued and place it in the column under “- 3” on the left-hand side of the sheet. Continue placing them under this category until you are done.

Finally, take out the photographs from the NEUTRAL pile and place them in the middle of the sheet. When you have completed your sorting, feel free to rearrange the photographs again as necessary. Then, write down the number of each photograph on the answer sheet.

After this do the process again for the next 18 photographs.
لطفاً لردنده دسته هر دسته طبقه، ویژه آنها را برداری نمود. از این آنها، رتبه اولیه نمودی که با ارزش و خنثی دسته بندی نمایید. ممکن است در هر دسته تعداد نامزدهای قرار گیرند. سپس تعداد عکسهایی را که در هر دسته بعد از اول درخواست های مشخص شده در سمت چپ بازیکن پاسخگو درج نمایید.

لطفاً به دسته عکسهایی که با ارزش از نظر شما طبقه بندی شده اند برگردید و بهترین را برگزیده در خانه زیر "+" درسمت راست جدول متراکم در صفحه پاسخگوی شاره در دیده. سپس برای عکسهای اسنادشان در هر دسته بندی دو تای بهمراه انتخاب نمایید و در خانه های زیر "+" قرار دهید (نتیجه مهم نیست). همینطور ادامه دهید تا عکسهای این قسمت تمام شوند.

سپس به دسته عکسهایی که ارزش رجوع کرده و همین روند را در مورد آنها اعمال نمایید. در آخر عکسهایی مربوط به دسته خالی را برداشته و در قسمت وسط جدول قرار دهید. وقتی چندین عکسی تا اسنادی در صورتی که در اینجا نواحی محدودیت کننده قرار گرفته، عکسی به‌طور کلی شماره هر عکس را در جدول پاسخگوی وارد نمایید.

بعد از این مرحله پروش یک بار دیگر در مورد عکسهایی پارک بعدی تکرار می‌شود.

Below are questions about your opinions.

سوالات زیر در مورد نظرات شما مبناید.

(A) **Most Valued.** Please state the reasons why you most valued the followings aspects:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ruffey Park</th>
<th>Iran’s Parks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(B) **Least Valued.** Please state the reasons why you least valued the followings aspects:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ruffey Park</th>
<th>Iran’s Parks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Is there anything else that you would like to tell us about the urban park landscapes? We would appreciate any comments.

Now, please refer to the first Most Valued photographs of all stages carefully and place them into two (2) piles in the way that each includes the first Most Valued photos of each park. We want to discuss which of these photos represents paradise for you and why, and if there are any particular reasons for choosing it in each case study.

Ruffey Park Most Valued Photos

Iran’s Parks Most Valued Photos

Photos

با ارزشترین عکس‌های پارک رافی پارک

با ارزشترین عکس‌های پارک‌های ایران
Which of these two photographs represents paradise better to you?

کدام یک از این دو عکس به نظر شما بیشتر شان دهند بهشت می‌باشد؟

Discussion:

Thank you for your attendance

امشاركت شما در اين تحقيق سياسگزاريم
## Appendix C: Photo Sorting Answer Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:**
- A: Animal
- B: Botanical
- C: Cultural
- D: Outdoor
- E: Historical
- F: Natural
- G: Political
- H: Religious
- I: Scientific
- J: Technological

**Instructions:**
- Circles indicate the presence of a photo in a category.
- The number of circles corresponds to the number of photos in that category.

---

**Diagram:**
- Visualizations for each category are depicted with various symbols indicating the presence and quantity of photos.
- The layout is organized to reflect the categories and their corresponding photos.

---
Appendix D: Interview Consent Form & Questions

Individual Interview Consent Form

Thank you for your time and effort which you put on the previous stages. To start the interview, I will ask some questions that refer to your background and how you’ve come to settle in the place you now live and this interview will take about one hour. I am really interested how you use these parks, and it would be appreciated if you share with us some of your photos after the interview that show the way different spaces of park are used and various materials that are brought to park (both in Australia and in Iran). These photographs will support the information related to culture and activities done in urban park spaces and will only be used in this research and publications after obtaining the consent of you as participants, and if you prefer your photos to become non-identifiable all the faces in them will be blurred before using.

• I understand the purpose of this interview and agree to take part.

• I do/do not agree to be recorded in video and voice record.

• I do/do not agree to photographs being taken.

• I do/do not agree that the photographs which I have supplied with identifiable/non identifiable faces being used in this research, academic presentations and publications.
Deakin University, School of Architecture and Built Environment
Geelong Waterfront Campus, Victoria Australia

Interview Questions:

1- Where were you born?

2- When did you first migrate to Melbourne and why did you decide to settle here?

3- Describe your reasons for migrating?

4- What influenced you to choose this location to live?

5- Do you have any memories of park visiting in Iran? Which park and what did you enjoy about it?
The following questions will refer to your thoughts on the parks and specifically Ruffey Park in Melbourne and how this evolved or changed over the time or after migration.

6- Describe the way you feel about Melbourne’s park environments. Has this changed or evolved over time?

7- How do parks in Melbourne compare or contrast to the urban parks in Iran? Describe the main differences in terms of spaces and lay out and which (aspects of the original and present parks) are more favourable.

8- What changes would you like to be made to the present Ruffey Lake Park in Doncaster from its current state?

9- Describe your favourite space in the Ruffey Lake Park and your reasons as to why this particular space is most appealing?

10- Is there anything you miss about Iran’s parks e.g. Laleh Park?

Thank You

سپاسگذاریم
### Appendix E: Data Analysis by PQ Method Programme

#### 11.5.1 Landscape scenery and aesthetic values, Iran’s parks’ results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GSORT</th>
<th>Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6462x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6318x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6333x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.7258x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.7145x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.3891x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.4025x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.5976x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.5886x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-0.3971x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.0441x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.4527x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.2022x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.3116x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.3957x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.5757x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.7496x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.4111x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.8007x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.7667x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.3826x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.2442x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.3373x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.6000x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>-0.1161x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.3179x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.3259x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.8665x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.7946x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.4529x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.3501x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.5892x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.5792x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.3117x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.8713x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.8612x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.8649x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.9180x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.8851x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.8164x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11.5.2 Landscape personal and cultural values, Iran’s parks’ results
### 11.5.3 Landscape social and recreational values, Iran’s parks’ results

**Table 1: Activity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Matrix with an X indicating a defining sort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loadings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QSORT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 145  0.5576X  0.0883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 142  0.2926X  0.2309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 137  0.8369X  0.0904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 136  0.4573X  0.0335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 129  0.1974X  0.4407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 128  0.8627X  0.1333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 128  0.0136X  0.0043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 127  0.3817X  0.0625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 121  0.7638X  0.2433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 120  0.2178X  0.6740X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 120  0.5441X  0.5750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 115  0.3905X  0.4600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 113  0.6086X  0.0581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 112  0.2766X  0.6316X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 131  0.3961X  0.1684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 119  0.6474X  0.2220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 111  0.1272X  0.4357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 146  0.8380X  0.3663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 141  0.3869X  0.3922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 132  0.6739X  0.2359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 126  0.6433X  0.0769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 131  0.4066X  0.5994X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 147  0.1688X  0.7988X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 148  0.3932X  0.3411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 149  0.2680X  0.5024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 122  0.5089X  0.0876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 120  0.7709X  0.4352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 150  0.5816X  0.0605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 150  0.3437X  0.8696X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 152  0.4332X  0.2645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 134  0.0333X  0.7344X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 134  0.5542X  0.3058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 148  0.0380X  0.2641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 149  0.8982X  0.3479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 139  0.9187X  0.0761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 138  0.9013X  0.1579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 138  0.8493X  0.1140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 123  0.8706X  0.2797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 123  0.9171X  0.1305</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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11.5.4 Landscape scenery and aesthetic values, Ruffey Park’s results

| Path and project name: C:\Method\projects\Aesthet | PAGE 1 |
| Factor Matrix with an x indicating a defining sort |

Loadings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QSORT</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>-0.0958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.002</td>
<td>0.5682X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.003</td>
<td>0.4492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.004</td>
<td>0.7000x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.005</td>
<td>0.8400X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.006</td>
<td>0.9491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.007</td>
<td>0.2418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.008</td>
<td>0.4718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.009</td>
<td>0.0250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.100</td>
<td>0.4078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.101</td>
<td>0.2489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.102</td>
<td>0.2661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.103</td>
<td>0.2708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.104</td>
<td>0.4421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.105</td>
<td>0.8462X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.106</td>
<td>0.6233X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.107</td>
<td>0.1435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.108</td>
<td>0.3073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.109</td>
<td>0.7653X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.110</td>
<td>0.7013X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.111</td>
<td>0.4517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.112</td>
<td>0.5734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.113</td>
<td>0.4393X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.114</td>
<td>0.7827X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.115</td>
<td>0.6381X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.116</td>
<td>0.2902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.117</td>
<td>0.7770X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.118</td>
<td>0.7174X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.119</td>
<td>0.8174X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.120</td>
<td>0.2367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.121</td>
<td>0.6676X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.122</td>
<td>0.8255X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.123</td>
<td>0.4763X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.124</td>
<td>0.2234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.125</td>
<td>0.5237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1.126</td>
<td>0.6888X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.127</td>
<td>0.8080X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.128</td>
<td>0.6654X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1.129</td>
<td>0.6410X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.130</td>
<td>0.0938X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SORTS</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>-0.1496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 37</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>-0.0686X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 35</td>
<td>0.415</td>
<td>-0.3041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 133</td>
<td>0.753</td>
<td>-0.2759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 120</td>
<td>0.727X</td>
<td>-0.2455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 129</td>
<td>0.675X</td>
<td>-0.1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 128</td>
<td>0.59X</td>
<td>-0.1318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 127</td>
<td>0.847X</td>
<td>-0.0402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 121</td>
<td>0.4402</td>
<td>-0.2935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 120</td>
<td>0.5705X</td>
<td>-0.0653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 116</td>
<td>0.2506X</td>
<td>0.6386X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 115</td>
<td>-0.2378</td>
<td>-0.4632X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 113</td>
<td>-0.7990</td>
<td>-0.4491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 114</td>
<td>0.4281</td>
<td>-0.2160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 113</td>
<td>0.3245X</td>
<td>-0.5273X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 112</td>
<td>0.1117</td>
<td>-0.5907X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 111</td>
<td>0.0588</td>
<td>0.9886X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 110</td>
<td>0.1549X</td>
<td>-0.3521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 109</td>
<td>0.7218X</td>
<td>0.1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 108</td>
<td>-0.0518</td>
<td>-0.0862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 107</td>
<td>0.6376X</td>
<td>-0.0074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 106</td>
<td>0.4069</td>
<td>0.6416X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 105</td>
<td>0.4318</td>
<td>-0.1393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 104</td>
<td>0.553X</td>
<td>0.0383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 103</td>
<td>0.462X</td>
<td>-0.2485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 102</td>
<td>0.1027</td>
<td>0.4426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 101</td>
<td>0.7047X</td>
<td>0.1314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 100</td>
<td>0.0482</td>
<td>-0.4959X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 99</td>
<td>0.4354</td>
<td>-0.5295X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 98</td>
<td>0.8080X</td>
<td>-0.0382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 97</td>
<td>-0.2237</td>
<td>0.6532X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 96</td>
<td>0.1530</td>
<td>0.6793X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 95</td>
<td>-0.062X</td>
<td>-0.3776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 94</td>
<td>0.2847</td>
<td>0.3205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 93</td>
<td>0.9176X</td>
<td>-0.0582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 92</td>
<td>0.8098X</td>
<td>-0.3596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 91</td>
<td>0.8565X</td>
<td>-0.0320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 90</td>
<td>0.9174X</td>
<td>-0.0817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 89</td>
<td>0.7839X</td>
<td>-0.1386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 88</td>
<td>0.9637X</td>
<td>-0.5274</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11.5.6 Landscape social and recreational values, Ruffey Park’s results

### Loadings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QSORT</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 145</td>
<td>0.4445</td>
<td>0.0521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 142</td>
<td>0.3803</td>
<td>0.5180X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 137</td>
<td>0.7522X</td>
<td>0.3713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 138</td>
<td>-0.7219X</td>
<td>0.1309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 130</td>
<td>0.1188</td>
<td>0.7560X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 129</td>
<td>0.3087</td>
<td>0.8659X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 128</td>
<td>0.5641</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 127</td>
<td>-0.1494</td>
<td>0.8117X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 121</td>
<td>0.4322</td>
<td>-0.2200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 120</td>
<td>0.6283X</td>
<td>0.2083X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 110</td>
<td>0.7071X</td>
<td>-0.1177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 111</td>
<td>-0.3734</td>
<td>0.0728X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 113</td>
<td>-0.4488</td>
<td>0.0632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 2038</td>
<td>0.2038</td>
<td>0.3908X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 131</td>
<td>-0.3652</td>
<td>0.4987X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 827</td>
<td>0.7427X</td>
<td>-0.2876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 111</td>
<td>0.8042X</td>
<td>0.2533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 125</td>
<td>-0.2647</td>
<td>0.7425X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 2941</td>
<td>0.1624</td>
<td>0.5433X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 141</td>
<td>-0.2286</td>
<td>0.5313X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 112</td>
<td>0.3660X</td>
<td>0.0088X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 126</td>
<td>0.6431X</td>
<td>0.3933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 127</td>
<td>0.7730X</td>
<td>0.0936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 147</td>
<td>0.4698X</td>
<td>0.4105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 148</td>
<td>0.7766X</td>
<td>0.4022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 110</td>
<td>0.1310</td>
<td>0.2937X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 222</td>
<td>0.6057X</td>
<td>0.5463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 140</td>
<td>0.5410X</td>
<td>0.1759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 129</td>
<td>0.5146X</td>
<td>0.5136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 153</td>
<td>-0.0591</td>
<td>0.8598X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 193</td>
<td>0.1893X</td>
<td>0.5232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 134</td>
<td>-0.1620X</td>
<td>0.2438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 142</td>
<td>0.5428X</td>
<td>0.1008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 124</td>
<td>0.0411</td>
<td>0.1469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 145</td>
<td>0.6741X</td>
<td>0.1286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 134</td>
<td>0.8567X</td>
<td>0.1894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 138</td>
<td>0.7849X</td>
<td>0.4212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 136</td>
<td>0.3615X</td>
<td>0.2125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 123</td>
<td>0.9561X</td>
<td>0.1053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 117</td>
<td>0.9432X</td>
<td>0.3333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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