



**Finding ‘My Happy Place’: Promoting Cooperative Behavior through Place Attachment and Place Memory**

**Erlis Manita\*, Dicky Chresthover Pelupessy**

Universitas Indonesia

Email: erlis.manita@ui.ac.id

---

**INFO ARTICLE**

---

**ABSTRACT**

---

**Keywords:**

place attachment; place memory; cooperative behavior; community psychology

This narrative literature review explores the relationship between place attachment, place memory, and cooperative behavior within communities. Cooperative behavior, essential for social harmony and resilience, is influenced by socio-psychological factors and, notably, by emotional and cognitive connections to physical spaces. Place attachment, defined as the bond between individuals and their environments, and place memory, encompassing personal and collective experiences tied to locations, are examined as catalysts for fostering cooperation. The study synthesizes research from 2014 to 2025, focusing on Indonesian contexts such as Jakarta, Bandung, and Pekalongan, to understand how these place-based factors enhance communal collaboration. The research employs a narrative literature review methodology, analyzing journal articles, books, and reports from databases like Google Scholar and Scopus. Thematic synthesis reveals that positive place memories and strong place attachments significantly promote cooperative behavior by strengthening emotional bonds, social cohesion, and community engagement. Key findings highlight the roles of social interactions, physical space design, and emotional experiences in building place attachment, which in turn encourages civic participation and collective action. The study underscores the importance of designing public spaces that foster emotional and social engagement to enhance cooperative behavior. It also identifies gaps in understanding the independent role of place memory, suggesting avenues for future research. These insights offer practical implications for urban planners and policymakers aiming to strengthen community resilience through place-based strategies.

---

**Introduction**

Cooperative behavior is key to forming harmonious communities. Håkonsson et al. (2016) define cooperative behavior as an act or situation in which individuals work or act together to achieve common goals or mutual benefits. Cooperative behavior involves interactions between two or more people working together toward a shared objective, with outcomes that are mutually beneficial for all parties involved (Nava et al., 2023). Engaging in such behavior contributes to community resilience (Billiet et al., 2021; Feinberg et al., 2023; Mmbughu et al., 2025). Therefore, maintaining cooperative behavior within society is crucial, not only for social harmony but also for the

sustainability of the community itself. The benefits of cooperative behavior are not only experienced by the community as a whole but also by the individuals who actively engage in such behavior. According to (Capraro, 2023), individuals within a cooperative society tend to fare better than those who choose not to cooperate, as both individual and collective cooperation enhance social welfare and directly improve individual well-being.

Although cooperative behavior is essential for community, it is influenced by a range of factors that can either strengthen or weaken it. Among these, social norms play a causal role in promoting cooperation and tend to grow stronger and more resilient in high-risk contexts, helping maintain cooperative actions even amid external change (Szekely et al., 2021). Additionally, the structure of social networks within a community also influences cooperation; communities characterized by dense social ties and cohesive structures are generally associated with higher levels of cooperative behavior (Gallo & Yan, 2015).

People can feel good about themselves when they work together (Krill & Platek, 2012), but the amount of emotional benefit or happiness they get from working together may be different for each person. This is why people have different levels of interest in working together (Prentice & Sheldon, 2015). Knowing the social setting and the reasons why people work together can help people work together better. When people are willing to share resources, energy, or even ideas, they not only strengthen their connections with one another, but they also foster a strong sense of trust.

This behavior motivates people to become more active in community activities. According to Procentese et al. (2019), this can support collective action and strengthen a sense of togetherness. Furthermore, Davenport et al. (2007) argue that trust can be formed through individual cooperation that bridges the relationship between external organizations and community members. Thus, effective collaboration in joint decision-making can be created. Thus, cooperative behavior benefits individuals and is important in forming cohesive and social communities. There has been much research on place attachment.

Most studies on cooperative behavior still focus on socio-psychological factors at the interpersonal level. Interestingly, beyond these factors, place also plays a role in shaping cooperative behavior within communities. Place does not merely serve as a physical context but also acts as a catalyst for the formation of social relationships and cooperative networks. The focused organization theory of social ties suggests that physical locations such as homes, workplaces, or cafes can serve as foci that organize and strengthen social networks. Empirical evidence from location-based social data confirms that the category of shared place significantly influences the formation of friendships (Brown et al., 2013). Furthermore, recent findings show that place identity, which refers to a person's emotional and cognitive connection to a location, has a significant positive effect on willingness to cooperate at the local level (Zhang et al., 2021). However, few have explored how place, as a meaningful entity in human life, can influence social engagement.

For many, such places are more than locations; they are emotionally charged spaces that shape how we feel, act, and relate to others. These 'happy places' do more

than comfort us, they anchor us. This phenomenon known as place attachment. Giuliani (2003) defined place attachment as bonds that people develop with places. Various places can serve as a 'happy place' for someone. For instance, a playground where one played with friends during childhood, a specific room at home (like a bedroom or living room), a favorite dining spot shared with family, or even a place of worship. These happy places can vary widely from person to person. However, a key element often underlying these positive experiences is the memory of that place. Personal memories associated with experiences at a particular location are referred to as place memory (Ratcliffe & Korpela, 2016). Gifford and Scannell (2010) explain that the meaning and emotional connection between people and a particular place can be shaped by memories of that place. This relationship is demonstrated by psychological processes involving actions, thoughts, and feelings.

The emotional ties people feel to their local environment are crucial in a fragmented and increasingly mobile world. Research over the past decade has shown that place attachment is associated with comfort, happiness, and important behaviors, including resident participation (Chang et al., 2022), pro-social behavior (Irani et al., 2023; Chen et al., 2024), and civic involvement (Shaykh-Baygloo, 2020). In addition to strengthening trust, place attachment also strengthens social engagement within communities. Paydar and Kamani Fard (2024) say both are important for community strength and growth.

One clear example of Indonesian society working together for many years is gotong royong. They can help people work together better, and these cultural practices can strengthen social bonds and increase active involvement in community activities. Working together is not only a social norm in the tradition of gotong royong. Instead, it empowers communities and brings them closer together. However, this tradition is currently facing cultural entropy. As explained by Marhayati (2021), although these cultural principles remain strong, the social mechanisms that support them are slowly becoming less effective in inspiring and controlling human behavior.

To understand the relationship between place attachment and cooperative behavior, this study employs a narrative literature review approach. A narrative literature review is a method that synthesizes and interprets a broad and often scattered body of research to offer theoretical insights that individual empirical studies cannot typically provide (Baumeister & Leary, 1997). This review focuses on articles published between 2014 – 2025 that examine place attachment, place memory and cooperative behavior, including works that investigate these phenomena within Indonesia communities. By focusing on these studies, the objective is to develop a theoretical understanding of how place memory and place attachment are connected to cooperative behavior. It will also discuss other psychological aspects that can strengthen these bonds. Specifically, the review endeavors to determine the impact of place attachment and place memory on cooperative behavior in community settings and to provide actionable insights for application in the Indonesian context.

## **Research Methods**

This study will employ a narrative literature review approach to collect, analyze, and synthesize various relevant studies on place attachment, place memory, and cooperative behavior. The primary data sources will consist of journal articles, books, and research reports published between 2014 and 2025. Inclusion criteria will encompass research that discusses place attachment and place memory, studies conducted within community contexts, particularly in Indonesia, and articles that explore the relationship between place attachment and cooperative behavior. The data collection procedure will involve searching for literature through academic databases such as Google Scholar, JSTOR, and Scopus, where the researcher will gather and document information from selected articles, including methodologies, findings, and implications.

Subsequently, data analysis will involve thematic synthesis, where the collected information will be organized based on key themes that emerge from the literature, such as definitions and concepts of place attachment, the role of place memory in shaping attachment, and the influence of place attachment on cooperative behavior. This research will also involve critical analysis to assess the strengths and limitations of existing studies and to identify research gaps that need to be addressed. In the discussion and implications section, the researcher will outline how the findings can be applied in the context of public space design and community development in Indonesia, as well as provide recommendations for further research and policy practices that can enhance place attachment and cooperative behavior. Finally, the study will conclude with the main findings from the literature review and their implications for cooperative behavior in social contexts.

## **Results and Discussion**

### **Place Memory, Place Attachment and Cooperative Behavior**

According to Korpela and Ratcliffe (2016), place memory is a personal experience in a particular place, or a past event related to a specific place. Erkan (2024) argues that place memory involves personal and collective memories associated with a specific location. These memories may include cultural practices, life events, and historical significance. From the explanation, place memory includes individual and collective memories related to a particular place. These memories are past events, cultural practices, personal experiences, and historical significance related to the place. Through meaningful relationships with specific places, place memory connects a person to their past and social environment.

Two types of memory, semantic and autobiographical, can explain the relationship between personal experiences and memories and our attachment to a place (Korpela and Ratcliffe, 2016). Autobiographical memory involves specific personal events and experiences in an individual's life. This memory is closely related to the self and personal identity, including memories of the past, present, and anticipated future with personal meaning. This memory plays an important role in forming place attachments. It allows a person to view an environment as "my place" by associating specific places with personal

experiences. Unlike autobiographical memory, semantic memory is general knowledge about the world that is unrelated to personal experience. Semantic memory includes facts, concepts, and information that are not related to specific events that occurred in a person's life. Semantic memory can help recognize a location but does not provide the emotional connection and personal attachment that autobiographical memory does.

According to Aoki and Li (2024), through the concept of goal setting, positive place memory can influence human behavior. Papies (2016) explains that external stimuli can activate a goal and influence how a person processes information and behaves in ways that are consistent with achieving that goal. Places associated with positive memories may serve as external cues that activate goals for contributing to the local community. Aoki and Li (2024) stated that this could encourage cooperative behavior in the community environment.

Another key concept, place attachment, is needed to understand the relationship between people and place (Kyle et al., 2004). Place attachment is a bond between a person and a particular location. Lyu et al. (2024) stated that these bonds can be formed from micro-level environments to broader environments on various scales. Examples of micro-level environments are homes and surrounding areas. Meanwhile, examples of broader environments are cities, regions, and countries. Through memories, experiences, and personally given meanings, this phenomenon describes the relationship between a person and a particular environment.

Scannell and Gifford (2010) explain that the proposed tripartite model of place attachment is complemented by three dimensions: person, place, and psychological process. The attachment of individuals and groups to places that have symbolic or personal meaning is included in the human dimension. The psychological process dimension includes behavioral, cognitive, and affective processes. Behavioral processes are actions of maintaining or engaging with the location, cognitive processes are meanings and beliefs about the location, and affective processes are emotional attachment or topophilia. Meanwhile, the place dimension includes social and physical characteristics, such as architecture, landscape, and social interactions.

There are two important components to the concept of place attachment (Williams et al., 1992). The two components are place dependence and location identity. Place dependence refers to the extent to which a person is functionally dependent on a location. Meanwhile, location identity refers to how a person associates a location with their self-concept. Various studies have shown that place attachment influences civic participation, community involvement, and loyalty to the community, and is correlated with variables such as length of residence, education, and occupation (Chang et al., 2022; Erkan, 2024; Shaykh-Baygloo, 2020).

These findings indicate that place attachment plays a role in encouraging cooperative behavior in local communities. Place identity strengthens an individual's emotional connection to their environment. Place dependence reflects their functional dependence on a particular place. Place attachment has been shown to contribute to various aspects of community behavior, such as place loyalty, civic engagement, and

resident participation. From the significant relationship between place attachment and factors such as occupation, educational background, and length of residence, it can be seen that local context is important in building social cohesion. Stronger attachment to smaller areas such as neighbourhoods, especially in conservation zones, suggests that strong local ties facilitate more effective collaboration in sustaining communities. Thus, place attachment is crucial in forming a sustainable and cooperative society.

### **Cooperative Behavior in Local Community**

Lyu et al. (2024) stated that in local communities, cooperative behavior involves individual participation in providing public goods to expand social networks and improve environmental welfare. To achieve shared goals and foster collaboration, it is essential to understand the various factors that influence cooperative behavior in a community setting.

Several elements, such as the structure of the community network, can enhance cooperative behavior in society. Sugimoto et al. (2022) state that individuals with strong social ties actively participate in communal cooperation. Strong social ties can create mutual expectations and trust, which are the main drivers of cooperative behavior. In a social network, the strength of the community structure critically influences the level of cooperation. According to Chung et al. (2014), communities with strong frameworks generally can encourage higher cooperation. Meanwhile, weaker structures allow uncooperative individuals to emerge. As explained in a study in Shiraho Village, Okinawa, Japan, conducted by Sugimoto et al. (2022), cooperative behavior is influenced by various factors, such as place of origin, community expectations, and social ties.

Often, cooperative behavior is intertwined with social norms and societal expectations. Individuals tend to engage in behaviors deemed appropriate and beneficial by their community. Furthermore, these behaviors are moderated by social role, origin, and age (Sugimoto et al., 2022; Syaifurridzal and Prayitno, 2017).

Challenges to cooperative behavior in local communities are shaped by social contexts, individual preferences, and community expectation (Sugimoto et al., 2022). Community structure plays a pivotal role in advancing cooperation, since the effectiveness of social sanctions in promoting collaborative behavior depends fundamentally on community formation within populations (Chung et al., 2014). The emergence and sustainability of cooperative behavior constitute fundamental elements of societal progress, influenced by interaction radius and cost-benefit ratios (Jun & Sethi, 2008).

### **Enhancing Cooperative Behavior in Local Communities Through Place Memory and Place Attachment**

Enhancing cooperative behavior within local communities can be achieved through the utilization of place memory and place attachment. Positive memories associated with a location can significantly increase an individual's desire to engage in cooperative behavior. Aoki and Li (2024) conducted a study involving residents in Japan. The study found that people who remember positive memories of a location tend to be more

cooperative in their community. The study further explained that the relationship between place memory and cooperative behavior is mediated by several factors. Place attachment serves as a mediator in the relationship between place memory and cooperative behavior by strengthening emotional bonds and social cohesion. Individuals with a strong attachment to a place tend to demonstrate cooperative behavior and participate in community activities. Their emotional connection to the place can encourage active engagement and collaboration for the common good. Self-interest is another factor that plays a role. Individuals usually engage in cooperative behavior if they believe it will benefit them. A significant influence is also had by the emotional value of memories associated with a location. Positive emotional experiences related to a particular location can strengthen attachment and cognitive-emotional bonds to the location. It will encourage individuals to engage in cooperative behavior to preserve the location.

Positive memories of a location can encourage cooperation and enhance a sense of community. Place attachment to the surrounding environment can positively affect mental and physical health, increase community connectedness, and strengthen social relationships (Zahnow, 2024). These findings suggest that place attachment is an effective strategy for encouraging cooperative behavior in local community life.

Through various mechanisms, place attachment facilitates cooperative behavior in society. Emotional response is important in forming place attachment (Shaykh-Baygloo, 2020; Aoki & Li, 2024). Affection as emotional valence means the positive or negative value given to a location (Aoki and Li, 2024). Affect is positioned in affective attachment, one dimension of place attachment that reflects the attachment and emotional liking for a place (Shaykh-Baygloo, 2020).

Place attachment also includes social attachment, identity, and dependence (Shaykh-Baygloo, 2020). Social attachment is a bond rooted in place-based social relationships. Place identity is the integration of a place into one's identity. Place dependence is the functional value of a place through unique opportunities or resources. Shaykh-Baygloo (2020) conducted a study explaining that place attachment is a complex and multidimensional phenomenon that can significantly shape people's attitudes and behavior, especially place loyalty and civic engagement. According to Chang et al. (2022), through reciprocity norms, community participation can be enhanced by place attachment. The expectation that one engages in mutually beneficial actions provides support with the anticipation of future reciprocity.

The type of place attachment can influence the strength of community bonds and likelihood of participation in communal activities. (Zahnow, 2024) categorizes places into four types based on common exposure and social experiences: public spaces (e.g., parks, beaches, transit stations, playgrounds, pedestrian paths, and bike trails), large-scale consumption venues (such as shopping malls, supermarkets, and department stores), local consumption establishments (including cafés, pubs, and restaurants), and socialization spaces (like gyms, community clubs, and places of worship). This study shows that large-scale consumption places and public spaces are the most frequently visited. All members of society can access these spaces and provide an arena for social interaction across

diverse groups. In people's lives, they play an important role in offering spaces for socialization and recreation, thereby strengthening attachment to a location.

Similar research conducted in Indonesia has identified public space as a place of individual attachment. For example, Luluah conducted research in 2021 on attachment to space in Taman Lapangan Banteng. This study explains that attachment to this space is formed from five key variables: security, comfort, unique memories, unforgettable memories, and pride. Memory emerged as the most significant factor. Many respondents reported that unforgettable memories stemmed from meaningful experiences and emotional attachments in the park. Respondents have a deep emotional attachment to Lapangan Banteng Park. It is driven by unique personal meanings, positive experiences, and the park's safe and comfortable atmosphere.

Furthermore, Anggia et al. (2022) identified place attachment toward Teras Cihampelas, a public space in Bandung. Their study concluded that attachment to this site is driven by three primary factors: social interaction, physical characteristics, and personal experiences—with social interaction being the most dominant. These various factors collectively build a place attachment and are reinforced by Teras Cihampelas's uniqueness as the first public flyover in Indonesia. In 2021, Taufan et al. studied place attachment at Jetayu Field, an open public space in Pekalongan. This study found a high level of visitor attachment. Sense of belonging emerged as the most significant dimension. Satisfaction with physical quality proved important for attachment formation.

Various interrelated physical, emotional, and social factors shape place attachment in Indonesian public spaces. Core formative elements include social interactions and emotional experiences such as pride and memories within the space. Unique physical characteristics and accessibility also play an important role. Through physical qualities, social engagement, and meaningful experiences, place attachment collectively develops through an emotional bond with public space.

Place attachment and place memory are important in enhancing local community cooperative behavior. Attachment involves physical elements such as accessibility and design of public spaces, social dimensions such as community interactions, and emotional factors such as meaningful memories through a complex mechanism.

In Indonesia, research on Lapangan Jetayu, Teras Cihampelas, and Taman Lapangan Banteng explains that physical qualities, social engagement, and social experiences can foster attachment to a location. Urban planners and policymakers can strategically leverage place attachment and place memory to develop public spaces. These serve as recreational venues and active catalysts that strengthen local communities' cooperative behavior and social cohesion.

## **Conclusion**

This review explores how place attachment and place memory influence cooperative behavior in a community setting. Empirically, the role of place attachment and place memory has been proven to support increased cooperative behavior in the community. Psychological attachment and positive memories of a place can motivate

someone to engage in cooperative behavior. However, the specific role of place memory in promoting cooperative behavior remains underexplored. Recent research suggests that memory is often treated as a component of place attachment, making it difficult to independently determine the actual effect of place memory on cooperative behavior. Therefore, further research is needed to better understand how place memory contributes to cooperative behavior, both as a stand-alone concept and as an integral part of place attachment.

## References

- Anggia, T., Guswandi, G., & Anggrahita, H. (2022). Place Attachment Teras Cihampelas sebagai Ruang Publik bagi Masyarakat Kota Bandung. *Media Komunikasi Geografi*, 23(1), 111–128. <https://doi.org/10.23887/mkg.v23i1.45950>
- Billiet, A., Dufays, F., Friedel, S., & Staessens, M. (2021). The resilience of the cooperative model: How do cooperatives deal with the COVID-19 crisis? *Strategic Change*, 30(2), 99–108. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jsc.2393>
- Brown, C., Noulas, A., Mascolo, C., & Blondel, V. (2013). A place-focused model for social networks in cities. <https://doi.org/10.1109/SocialCom.2013.18>
- Capraro, V. (2023). How to promote cooperation for the well-being of individuals and societies. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/gtuj4>
- Chang, K.-C., Chen, H.-S., & Hsieh, C.-M. (2022). Effects of relational capital on relationship between place attachment and resident participation. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 32(1), 19–41. <https://doi.org/10.1002/casp.2531>
- Chung, N. N., Chew, L. Y., & Lai, C. H. (2014). Influence of Community Structure on Cooperative Dynamics in Coupled Socio-ecological Systems. *Acta Physica Polonica B Proceedings Supplement*, 7(2), 257. <https://doi.org/10.5506/APhysPolBSupp.7.257>
- Erkan, E. (2024). Places of memory and place attachment: A study at the neighborhood scale in Istanbul. *MEGARON / Yıldız Technical University, Faculty of Architecture E-Journal*, 123–137. <https://doi.org/10.14744/megaron.2024.63239>
- Feinberg, A., Ghorbani, A., & Herder, P. M. (2023). Commoning toward urban resilience: The role of trust, social cohesion, and involvement in a simulated urban commons setting. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 45(2), 142–167. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07352166.2020.1851139>
- Gallo, E., & Yan, C. (2015). The effects of reputational and social knowledge on cooperation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 112(12), 3647–3652. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1415883112>
- Håkansson, D. D., Obel, B., Eskildsen, J. K., & Burton, R. M. (2016). On Cooperative Behavior in Distributed Teams: The Influence of Organizational Design, Media Richness, Social Interaction, and Interaction Adaptation. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00692>

- Kamani Fard, A., & Paydar, M. (2024). Place Attachment and Related Aspects in the Urban Setting. *Urban Science*, 8(3). <https://doi.org/10.3390/urbansci8030135>
- Krill, A. L., & Platek, S. M. (2012). Working Together May Be Better: Activation of Reward Centers during a Cooperative Maze Task. *PLoS ONE*, 7(2), e30613. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0030613>
- Li, Z., & Aoki, T. (2024). Effects of recalling place memory on promoting cooperative behaviors in local communities. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 53(1), e23149. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.23149>
- Lyu, D., Liu, H., Deng, C., & Wang, X. (2024). Promotion of cooperation in a structured population with environmental feedbacks. *Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science*, 34(12), 123136. <https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0236333>
- Marhayati, N. (2021). Internalisasi Budaya Gotong Royong Sebagai Identitas Nasional. *Jurnal Pemikiran Sosiologi*, 8(1), 21. <https://doi.org/10.22146/jps.v8i1.68407>
- Mmbughu, A. E., Katundu, M. A., & Mrimi, M. T. (2025). Leveraging co-operatives for community development: insights from cashew farmers in Tanzania amid the negative impact of climate change. *Discover Sustainability*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43621-025-00962-y>
- Nava, F., Margoni, F., Herath, N., & Nava, E. (2023). Age-dependent changes in intuitive and deliberative cooperation. *Scientific Reports*, 13(1), 4457. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-023-31691-9>
- Papies, E. K. (2016). Goal priming as a situated intervention tool. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 12, 12–16. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2016.04.008>
- Prayitno, G., & Syaifurridzal, M. (2017). Social Capital and Public Participation on Planning in Coastal Area Development. *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*, 79, 012019. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/79/1/012019>
- Prentice, M., & Sheldon, K. M. (2015). Priming effects on cooperative behavior in social dilemmas: Considering the prime and the person. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 155(2), 163–181. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.2014.977763>
- Procentese, F., De Carlo, F., & Gatti, F. (2019). Civic engagement within the local community and sense of responsible togetherness. *TPM - Testing, Psychometrics, Methodology in Applied Psychology*, 26, 513–525. <https://doi.org/10.4473/TPM26.4.2>
- Ratcliffe, E., & Korpela, K. M. (2016). Memory and place attachment as predictors of imagined restorative perceptions of favourite places. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 48, 120–130. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2016.09.005>
- Scannell, L., & Gifford, R. (2010). Defining place attachment: A tripartite organizing framework. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 30(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2009.09.006>
- Shaykh-Baygloo, R. (2020). A multifaceted study of place attachment and its influences on civic involvement and place loyalty in Baharestan new town, Iran. *Cities*, 96, 102473. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2019.102473>

- Sugimoto, A., Sugino, H., van Putten, I., & Yagi, N. (2022). A study on community expectation for cooperative behaviour among locals and migrants: a case study of an Okinawan village, Japan. *Maritime Studies*, 21(1), 65–76. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40152-021-00254-x>
- Szekely, A., Lipari, F., Antonioni, A., Paolucci, M., Sánchez, A., Tummolini, L., & Andrighetto, G. (2021). Evidence from a long-term experiment that collective risks change social norms and promote cooperation. *Nature Communications*, 12(1). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-25734-w>
- Taufan, A. A., Wijaya, I. N. S., & Sasongko, W. (2021). Keterkaitan Place Attachment dengan Kepuasan Pengunjung Lapangan Jetayu Sebagai Ruang Terbuka Publik. *Planning for Urban Region and Environment*, 10(3), 71–80.
- Zahnow, R. (2024). Place type or place function: What matters for place attachment? *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 73(3–4), 446–460. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajcp.12722>
- Zhang, Q., Jia, Q., & Zhou, J. (2021). Place Identity and Local Cooperative Behaviors: The Moderating Role of Organizational Identity. *Proceedings - 2021 10th International Conference on Industrial Technology and Management, ICITM 2021*, 31–35. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICITM52822.2021.00013>