CHAPTER SIX
FIELDWORK RESULTS

6.0 Introduction
This chapter by using Melaka Heritage Trail as an experimental case study presents results of the data sample collected in April and May 2011 to investigate the respondents’ (residents, government and visitors) attitudinal characteristics as factors for the local community involvement in heritage management in the Melaka World Heritage Site. Two types of measurement techniques were implemented in the process of data collection to ensure each group of respondents provided sufficient data according to the research questions and objectives (Figure 6.1).

The first data collection technique was using a questionnaire approach. The respondents who were involved in this technique are residents and visitors. In general, the survey for both groups was conducted within Melaka World Heritage Site (WHS) zones, which consists of a Civic Zone and an Old Quarter Zone (Figure 6.2). The Civic Zone is mainly a tourist area. This area houses various historic structures, from colonial buildings, churches, graveyards, to a replica of Melaka Sultanate Palace and fortress (Appendix 3.1). To reclaim a Malaya heritage, most of these colonial buildings are carefully adapted to house a museum (Appendix 3.2). Meanwhile, the authenticity of Old Quarter Zone literally presents the identity of Melaka through its
historically complex architectural design (Appendix 3.4), which is intrinsically loaded with intangible cultural heritage (see Chapter Three: Background to Malaysia).

The questionnaire survey for residents was conducted in the Melaka city centre on the boundary of the Melaka WHS, whereas the survey for the visitors was conducted along the route of the Melaka Heritage Trail. The dependent variables of questionnaires for both groups were different. However, there was a relationship in terms of questionnaire context, where both respondents were asked to scale their perceptions towards heritage trail development such as, conservation, awareness of historic structures, (see Section 6.2.4) and experience received first hand from their visit, such as multi cultural awareness (see Section 6.3.4). Simultaneously, comparisons were drawn between the responses to the two questionnaires, for resident involvement and for visitor experience in order to explore, explain and understand anomalies in the differing attitudinal relationships between residents and visitors, which affect heritage trail development and heritage management as discussed and analysed in the following sections.

Moreover, both questionnaire surveys were administrated simultaneously and research assistants were required to facilitate the survey, in order to deal with visitor respondents (see Chapter Two: Methodology).

The second technique involved semi-structured interviews, where two groups of respondents consisting of residents and local government personnel were engaged. The residents who participated in the questionnaire survey were subsequently asked to attend a follow-up interview to ascertain whether there were local issues not addressed in the initial study. The rationale of this individual approach was to provide an opportunity for individual residents to share their thoughts in private in relation to their past involvement and experience of heritage management within the city (see Chapter Two: Research Methodology). Meanwhile, the
individual interviews with the local government personnel were conducted in different locations, such as in the personnel office and on site of Melaka WHS. However, the interview timeframe varied because it was challenging to find a suitable time due to officers’ tight schedules. Besides, only a small data sample was required from these respondents. Therefore, the limitation mentioned above has less effect on the research timeframe, and the interviews were completed within April to May 2011. In order to organise the data samples and analyses, this chapter is divided into three main sections, which represent the three respondent groups (residents, local government personnel and tourists). In each section, there are several sub-sections according to survey categories, or concepts, and theme, or topics of the semi-structured interviews (see Figure 6.1).

The first section shows the local government personnel’s views of community involvement and heritage management issues. The core issue that was discussed was mainly about the governmental implications in relation to their approach to community involvement in terms of legislation, administration framework, planning and development. The second section deals with the results obtained from residents, therefore, a distribution of demographic characteristics of the residents was presented. In the following sub-section, place attachment values of the residents were investigated to determine individual and community identity. Furthermore, analyses of the residents’ awareness and perceptions towards heritage trail development that highlighted responses to both place attachment value and perceptions of heritage assets were then compared to results derived from semi-structure interviews to evaluate the current involvement of the local community toward heritage management in Melaka’s historic city. The results for both place attachment value and perceptions were collated with the results from the semi-structured interviews. This is to strengthen the findings with supported information based on in-depth understanding of the pertinent issues. For example, there is a strong relationship
between length of residency and resident attachment in determining the resident’s value towards heritage assets in Melaka (see section 6.2.2).

---

**Figure 6.1: The Presentation of Fieldwork Results**

- **Local Government Personnel**
  - Interview
  - Current practices of local community involvement:
    - a) Perceiving the benefits of heritage — social and economy benefits.
    - b) Opportunities and limitations of participation process — the ability (skills, knowledge) of community towards management process — relationship with conservation work.

- **Local Community**
  - Questionnaire Survey
  - a) Local Community Socio-Demographic Characteristics.
  - b) Attitudes towards Place Attachment — Place Identity — Place Dependency
  - c) Heritage Trail Awareness.
    - The history and development of Melaka Heritage Trail
    - Relationship of trail development and community properties.
  - d) Perceptions towards Heritage Trail Development.
    - Economy and Social impacts

- **Domestic and Foreign Visitors**
  - a) Visitors Socio-Demographic Characteristics.
  - b) Awareness towards Melaka Heritage Trail.
  - c) Perceptions towards Heritage Trail Experience.
    - Physical characteristic of the trail
    - Engagement with local community

---
Chapter Six: Fieldwork Results

The last section presents the questionnaire results from visitors. In this section, the chief motivation was to determine whether the heritage trail design has expanded the visitors’ knowledge and quality of experience. Similarly, the connection between the heritage trail design and local community was explored to identify whether visitors had made contact (social or business) with the local community while walking along the trail. Hence, the results from these respondents investigated whether the design of the heritage trail engaged with the local community either directly or indirectly. These results will illustrate how one can develop tourism through effective engagement in the future community involvement in heritage management.

Figure 6.2: Map of Melaka World Heritage Site Zones
Source: Melaka City Council, 2010

In addition, the results were presented according to statistical analyses, such as frequencies descriptive, t-tests, cross-tabulation and one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). Furthermore, the results were analysed based on mean score distributions and the mean value; this will be used as a comparison between independent variables (i.e demographics) and dependent variables (i.e perceptions and attitudes). Besides questionnaires, tables, graphs, maps and photos were used to represent and analyse the results to make them more comprehensible to the local community and local authority. These findings reveal the intrinsic value of engaging
with the local community in making explicit its cultural identity. Meanwhile, the local authority could use these findings to reflect on their own current processes of engagement. For instance, it indicates that the government could increase engagement with the local community in managing its own heritage, which will be discussed in the concluding sections of this thesis.
6.1 Local Government Personnel’s Views of Community Involvement

This section presents the results of interviews held with local government personnel (Figure 6.3). The aim of this method is to understand the authorities’ approach regarding the involvement of the local community in heritage management and tourism. Twelve employees from four local government departments were involved in these interviews (Appendix 6.1). Each respondent is varied in terms of their professional positions, but most of them are connected to the managerial aspects of heritage in Melaka. The government personnel were chosen from diverse departments because it diversifies the richness of the data. In addition, in certain circumstances; respondents appeared to show a variance of opinion towards some topics and issues of heritage. For instance, the result showed that respondents’ understanding varied towards heritage definitions. Their understanding affected and was associated with the respondents' professional position. Given that the Melaka authorities make extensive use of this term in their task responsibilities (i.e conservation and tourism), some consideration is given to how the term is generally understood. Therefore, the following sections carefully distinguish and integrate the connection between respondents’ opinions and the role of respondents’ expertise.
6.1.1 Perceiving the Benefits of Heritage

The majority of respondents defined heritage as a value or quality of objects (tangible) or culture (intangible) that creates a transition between the past and present. As a consequence, respondents’ emphasis reflects the importance of strategic management or planning to ensure this heritage is inherited by future generations. The implicit and explicit value of heritage, it has particular social and economic benefits. However, the role of heritage for economic regeneration is often tied into political uses, and a growing concern with the social benefits associated with heritage management.
The interviews from the perspective of the tourist industry, personnel from tourism and municipal departments revealed the importance of maintaining and building on the city’s existing heritage in terms of the city’s own cultural identity and the potential market for cultural and world heritage tourism. Since the late 1980s, when Melaka was acknowledged as a venue of culture and heritage, the Melaka State Government has worked towards putting the city forward as a suitable candidate for nomination as a UNESCO World Heritage Site (WHS). This goal was finally achieved in July 2008. Despite the government’s interest in establishing the city’s historic identity for economic reasons, these values are intimately tied up with communities’ feeling of belonging and ownership. Hence, with regard to the government’s enthusiasm to increase the economic income (at the state level), government personnel were directed to develop the role of tourism planning and city development to be in full compliance with heritage conservation and preservation principles. For example, the government promotional literature highlights properties that have received grants towards renovation as they believe this approach to conservation will attract tourism to the city. Since the heritage conservation received serious attention from Federal Government, the 8th Malaysia Plan (2001-2006) has started to allocate a monetary support (RM85 million) for heritage conservation and preservation efforts in Malaysia. Moreover, since the 9th Malaysia Plan (2006-2011), the Federal Government has increased this to RM100 millions to make the outcomes more sustainable, to increase the number of heritage attractions. Thus, this could contribute to increase the tourism industry as a money earning sector in the Malaysia. However, the State Government needs to develop a structural budget plan to request sufficient funds for conservation work (Paiman, 2003).

‘The planning and development of this city must comply with heritage conservation and preservation principles. When we initially introduce new tourism event in this city, we will make sure it […] comes with certain input and output on heritage conservation awareness’.

(Interviewee no. 3, tourism agency officer)
There is a contradiction between the differing government perspectives held by the conservationist and tourist department personnel. There is a need to balance both conservationist remits with governmental planning to develop tourism and revenues. Respondents reveal that there is some lack of cooperation between conservation and tourism agencies in balancing the demand and supply of heritage. Conservation imperatives and the opinions of the conservation officers appear to be overshadowed by the development of events and public facilities that have immediate appeal to tourists and generate instant revenue. Hence in the decision making process, there has been very little priority given to conservationist's advice. However, some of the conservation work has to be done ‘in reverse’ or in parallel with tourism.

‘Since the city has been nominated as World Heritage Site. We are very concerned about development (tourism) in this city. In order to do that we are now working backwards to ensure we are following the city’s planning and management plan’.
(Interviewee no. 4, MBMB conservation unit officer)

Furthermore, since the local community appears to engage in the tourism industry, conservation personnel highlighted some implications that could influence the community behaviour towards the use of heritage assets. For example, due to ownership rights, the changes on heritage fabrics and improper modification on heritage façades could potentially change the authentic identity of the city's heritage as a whole. Certainly, the majority of personnel agreed that this is caused by the lack of enforcement by local authority to prevent any breaches in planning. In consequence, in order to 'control' the community from destroying their own heritage, respondents urged for a comprehensive mechanism to be put in place, for example, by enforcing the legislation act and establishing ground staff to do the routine checks on heritage assets. The result also reveals that the majority of personnel realised the
importance of engagement with the community to maintain the sustainability of heritage conservation and tourism.

6.1.2 Opportunities for and Limitations to Encouraging Local Community Involvement

Undoubtedly, benefits would be gained from employment and economic income via local community involvement in heritage conservation and tourism. In addition, personnel from the tourism department have illustrated that the influx of tourists to the Melaka WHS provides an easy source of money to aid the community. In order to maximise income derived from tourism, one officer emphasised the need to be ‘creative’ in utilising the resources in the city. Therefore, local authorities have conducted some training programmes in order to expand community knowledge and skills towards tourism opportunities. However, tourism personnel indicate that these opportunities seldom receive attention from the local community.

‘we did try to encourage the local community to participate in our training guide courses. But, the problem that we faced was there were very few young people in this city. Most of them were in the 50s and 60s.”
(Interviewee no. 10, tourism agency officer)

To encourage community participation in heritage conservation, there are similar programmes and training sessions (i.e. workshop, seminar) planned to both educate and create awareness among the local community. Again, a low community attendance creates a great challenge to local authorities. One officer suggested that the people’s attitudes could be a factor to ‘this challenge’. For instance, the officer indicates ‘when we decide to nominate this city as WHS, some local residents think that we are trying to take their property ownership’. (Interviewee no. 6, PERZIM officer). Furthermore, the issue of conflict within the community could be an additional cause to this lack of participation. For example, the officer indicates that some people are involved in heritage conservation because of personal interest or a hidden agenda.
However, he refused to be drawn on the issue of ‘conflict’ or to give further details as to its origin.

A lack of funding could be another issue in terms of community commitment. The officer indicated that there was a typical belief among the local community that the conservation work would cost them a lot of money. Although, the officer emphasised, the cost for heritage assets’ conservation and restoration were fully funded by State government, this misunderstanding is still present. Besides government monetary support and other incentives, property owners have been introduced to tax discount and land tax exemption in order to encourage community involvement in conservation. However, there are clashes between incentive programmes and legislative policy because these incentives are only valid in relation to the ‘genuine’ owner of the property. The officer highlighted this dilemma since property ownership was mainly in the hands of foreigner investors from Singapore and Taiwan. Hence, these incentives are not fully utilised because of the restrictions in place, such as the requirement for property owners’ to be national citizen in order to receive these privilege. Respondents were also asked whether the community was approached in the decision-making process. Interestingly, the results from both tourist and conservation personnel revealed that local community had little engagement from local authorities. Therefore, respondents’ opinions towards community involvement in Melaka Heritage Trail project acknowledged the positive role played by the heritage trail as an effective mechanism to solve certain managerial problems; however, there were few indicators from interview results to show direct engagement with the local community.

‘this approach might be interesting because it can be a double edged sword. It can provide two benefits in the same time. It can be used to educate tourists about heritage elements, and local community can use the heritage elements to present the cultural identity to lure tourists walked along the trail’.

(Interviewee no. 8, PERZIM officer)
This is because most of the government personnel have little knowledge about the heritage trail project. One of the conservation personnel explained that in the late 1990s the trail project was initiated and funded by a private company, the American Express Foundation. It was a collaboration project with a Non-Government Organisation (NGO) called the Malaysia Heritage Trust. Although most of the agencies from local government were not actively involved in this project, some local agencies such as Melaka’s Museum Cooperation and Melaka’s Historical City Council played a pivotal role in provisional work such as the collecting historical documents, architectural sketches and the city’s action plan. Certainly, they took an active role in selecting attractions along the trail which involved community’s property in both Civic and Old Quarter zones, and supposedly community participation. However, based on respondent results the involvement of the local community on this project was minimal because the chosen attractions were based on physical structure (tangible heritage) rather than the community’s culture (intangible heritage).

There are several reasons forwarded for less involvement of the community in decision making. The respondents highlighted the main reason being the capability of local people to be ‘decision makers’, another being potential bias, for example people’s decisions may be influenced via their personal interest or hidden agenda towards conservation and tourism. However, if the decision was authorised by a third party (i.e local authorities), the conflict of interest between community groups can be eliminated. Moreover, the responsible personnel in making the decision should be more knowledgeable and have expertise in this field. Another reason that is frequently repeated by government personnel is the complexity of the administrative framework. For example, the respondents are sceptical on the community’s ability to understand the management process. Importantly, the involvement from the local
community in decision making has been seen to slow down the whole process of administration and management.
6.2 Description and Discussion of Results from the Local Community

The results were divided into four sections (Figure 6.4). In total, 143 residents were involved in the questionnaire surveys. In the early stages, the target sample was 305 residents, which covers all zones of the Melaka World Heritage Site (WHS), including the Melaka heritage trail. However, after a month of work (April 2011 - May 2011), only 143 data samples were successfully obtained. This was because the residents were reluctant to participate in both the questionnaire survey and the semi-structured interview. Although a variety of standard survey persuasion techniques (Groves and Couper, 1998; Stoop, 2004) were applied to explain the purpose of the survey and emphasis the confidentiality of response, these techniques were unable to increase the residents’ response rate (see Chapter Two: Research Methodology). Some previous studies offered an honorarium gift (i.e. money) to increase participation, but this research could not afford any funding because it is an independent research. Moreover, this could lead to a bias in terms of residents’ truthfulness in terms of responses. However, the collected data sample is still eligible for further analysis because the survey was backed-up with interview results. This mixed approach means the response rate is not the only measure, and there are other approaches utilised to validate the reliability of the data sample such as by linking the results from local government personnel interviews and questionnaire survey from visitors.
The resistance in term of participation maybe because the residents believed that this research would not effect any changes economically or socially. There have been a diverse range of surveys conducted in Melaka WHS. For instance, tourism development (Triana, 2005; Worden, 2003; Worden, 2001), communities (Ravichandran, 2009; Peter, 2003) sociology (Johari, 2010; Nurulhalim, 2006; Lee, 2002), and anthropology (Ho et al., 2005, Paiman, 2003, Yazid, 2003) which all involved the local community. However, residents seemed unhappy about the outcome of their contribution to previous studies. For example, one of the residents indicated that; “I had participated in hundreds of surveys and interviews with a diverse range of people as
such students, reporters, or even from local government officers in a variety of aspects. In most cases, the aim was to understand about our cultural around here. But until now, I did not see or received any changes happen to me or my family after all those participation attempts [...]” (local resident no. 14).

The low rate of the residents’ participation in the survey maybe also partly due to the survey being conducted during the peak hours (11am – 7pm everyday) of their business day, when most residents would be unable to participate in the survey. Thus, the researcher had to come back after the peak hours. However, residents still refused to participate in the surveys for several reasons, such as fatigue and exhaustion. Furthermore, residents tried to avoid making any appointment for the survey. Some of the residents claimed that the city’s environment is well managed by local authorities. “I think everything is going very well, and I am happy for what is happening here (community’s integrity, businesses, and lifestyle). So I think a research about what is going on in the city may not be appropriate anymore” (local resident no. 20).

However, beside this initial set back in gathering the data sample in both Melaka WHS zones and along the Melaka Heritage Trail, enough raw data was finally gathered by the end of the survey period via multiple surveys (see Figure 6.1). The results are presented below.

6.2.1 Distribution of Local Community Socio Demographic Profiles

In this section, the characteristics of residents are presented with reference to their demographic background. The distribution of the data sample and length of residency among residents is illustrated in the map below (Figure 6.5). Overall, the data was gathered mainly in the Old Quarter Zone (84.6%) rather than Civic Zone (15.4%). The unequal distribution was not surprising because the majority of the residential population is located within Old Quarter Zone.
Meanwhile, there is no residential area in the Civic Zone except several business premises such as souvenir shops, restaurants, and assets of mobile vendors, trishaw drivers and tour guides.

Furthermore, the results indicate that 81.8% of the residents were local-born and permanently lived and worked in the Melaka WHS zones (particularly in the Old Quarter Zone). Meanwhile, 18.2% indicated that they were not local-born but became a permanent resident after several years of living and working in this area. The average time that non-local-born residents lived in the city was more than 15 years. It was understood that this was because of matrimonial reasons. However, this only constitutes a small minority as only some of the nonlocals were identified. The main reason for migration was business opportunities related to tourism. This finding initially enlightens the main issue on how the city’s heritage resources influence the participation of foreign entrepreneurs or investors in business-related tourism. Moreover, it is intriguing to explore and understand which residential groups were more influenced in terms of motivation to get involved in heritage management related to heritage trail development in this city.

The age distribution of the residents was categorised into four categories. Forty-one percent of the respondents were over 55 years old, followed by 22.4% ranged between 45-54 years old and 16.1% range between 20-34 years old. The percentage distribution from young residents is the lowest among the age categories. As discussed previously (see Chapter Three: Background to Malaysia), the growth of modern cities in Malaysia (i.e Kuala Lumpur and Johor Bharu) has been associated with population shrinkage especially from the younger generations in Melaka. The trends are further intensified with the impact of globalisation and internalisation on the internal structure and performance of these modern cities (Badaruddin and Rahmat,
The younger populations are no longer interested in residing in old shophouses but prefer to stay in modern condominiums outside of Melaka’s inner-city.

With regard to employment distribution, an illustration from cross-tabulation analysis (Figure 6.6) highlights the relationship between the age groups and employment distribution. Most of the residents were involved in the retail business (74.8%) rather than services (15.4%) and manufacturing (4.2%) (See Table 6.1). On average; most of the residents involved in the survey had worked for more than 10 years in these businesses. In detail, residents over 55 years old were dominant in the retailing business followed by the age range between 45-54 years. In the Old Quarter Zone, the existing retail sector consists of businesses such as souvenir shops, grocery’s shops, antique shops, fashion designer boutiques and religious merchandises. Meanwhile, the service sector encompassed tourist accommodation, restaurant outlets, tour guides (i.e. trishaws driver) and cleaning staff. In contrast, the manufacturing
businesses were more including ironsmiths, handicraft makers, stone makers, art artists and clog-makers.

Table 6.1: Breakdown of employment groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Businesses sectors</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retailing:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Antique shop</td>
<td>74.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Art gallery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fashion outlet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Small grocery store</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Souvenir shop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Street vendor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service:</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Restaurant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Landscape maintenance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tour guide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Trishaw driver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Security staff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing:</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ironsmith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Stone maker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Handmade signage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clog maker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB: the rest of 5.6% is unemployed residents (i.e housewife and retired)

Figure 6.6: Breakdown of residents age groups vs employment groups
Although the cross-tabulation analysis shows that there is a scatter pattern between age representation and service sector employment; however, the fieldwork observation confirmed that young residents were dominant in the service sector (See Figure 6.6). Young generations are more energetic and creative; they understand the need to diversify to make heritage resources more attractive and unique. For example, the city's heritage and identity could accommodate tourist’s accommodation by introduce a thematic concept (i.e B&B and guesthouse). These types of accommodation have become a new concept in the niche tourism market. There is increased demand from tourists, especially from foreign tourists, to experience the local cultural environment which has been aided by the use of multimedia technology, such as websites, which has enabled effective promotion and affordable marketing. Moreover, the young residents are also more urban-oriented in a modern society. They are highly influenced by tourism when an economic or social link is established (Martin, 2000 p. 127). However, regarding to accommodation services operated by young residents, not many of them are willing to take this business risk because it involves numerous monetary aspects. For example, the fixed cost for property maintenance and high requirement for heritage property modification as well as ethical and legislation guidelines.

Certainly, there is a strict requirement in changing buildings of a historic nature. The guidelines for heritage building maintenance and conservation is emphasised in almost all Malaysia legislation and some of these laws and regulations are strongly linked with each other. For example, if the property owner wanted to change the building façade, the National Heritage Act (2005) will be used to assess whether the transformation could affect the significant value of the building as a whole. Then, the Melaka Structural Plan (2001) will be used to evaluate whether the change is appropriate to the conservation policy and planning in this city. Finally, the Melaka Municipal City Council has to make the decision according to those assessments.
As a result, only a few property owners have currently consulted with local authorities to gain permissions and conversion for their property (MBMB officer, 2011). “Any proposal would take a lot of time to get full permission due to the nature of the Malaysian bureaucratic process” (local resident no. 2). Therefore, some of the property owners have made the changes without permission from the relevance authorities (MBMB and PERZIM officers, 2011). Consequently, a national sensation was created in early 2002 with the demolition of three listed commercial residences in the Melaka conservation zone without local authorities’ approval (see Appendix 5.1). There are two possible explanations for this event: Firstly, the property owner gets frustrated with the permission process; or, secondly, the lack of enforcement from local authorities for building inspection routines enables those owners to disregard the legislation.

Meanwhile manufacturing businesses are still in existence but the numbers involved in this industry are slowly shrinking. There are only a few residents’ over the age of 55 years in this business. In contrast, several residents aged between 35 – 44 years old are determined to remain in the manufacturing sector. This is probably because they have inherited the skills and own property inherited from previous generations. However, there are no young residents involved in this business. This is because of the influence of technological inventions. From the researcher’s observation, most of traditional trades such as ironworks, traditional coffins maker, wood craft and antique shoe are still being made by hand with limited technological tools. Hence, a lot of patience and commitment are needed to produce these quality products. From a business perspective, this operation seems too slow for mass production, and the economic income generated does not appeal to younger residents. Thus, only some of the elderly residents are still producing these products as part of their leisure-time activity and sometimes in order to honour loyal customers. Paradoxically, these activities became a tourist attraction.
As can be seen from the results above, it can be explained that most of the local tradesmen have now established a reputation that attracts existing and new tourists. Pearce et al. (1996; in Andriotis 2000 p. 83) suggested the communities with little contact with others [tourists] have enormous difficulty in dealing with tourism. Therefore, a further analysis would be appropriate to determine residents’ attitudes and perception with employment status. A small percentage of residents were identified as full-time retired (4.20%) and housewife (1.4%).

Meanwhile Figure 6.7 illustrates the distribution of the residents' gender. The results show that male residents (65%) are more than female residents (35%). The lowest percentage from female respondents was correlated with the influence of residents' reluctance to participate in the both questionnaire surveys and interview. It was due to most of female residents were refused to participate in this activity. This is maybe because of security and personal information concerns. This is a common human behaviour where women tend to be suspicious towards strangers. They would require consent from the head of the family (husband, father or brother) before revealing information which is in direct comparison to male participants (Stoop, 2004). In addition, the finding revealed that, Chinese women were the most likely group to resist participation as detailed in the following section. A classic study conducted by Cohen, Machlin and Branscome (1996) determined that ‘[…] education level was also determined to be associated with females' reluctance to participation in the survey […]’. However, the authors’ argument in relation to education level of participant knowledge or decision-making may bringing a different result due to the growth of e-knowledge. This is because people can assess any information they want from the internet, as illustrated in the growth of Malaysian ICT (Information and Communication Technology) as increased usage of the local internet.
In contrast, many previous researchers argue that there is evidence on gender imbalance in the use of the internet (Munusamy and Ismail, 2009; Enochsson, 2005; Weiser et al., 2000). These studies also suggest that women are often limited in their use of the internet due to family commitment (Munusamy and Ismail, 2009), and technological abilities such as skills to use the computer effectively and efficiently (Hargittai and Shafer, 2006). However, in terms of purpose of using the internet, Weiser et al., (2000) and Liu and Huang (2008) found that males are the main users of the internet, mainly for entertainment and leisure, whereas, females use it primarily for interpersonal communication and education. This is to say that, although women have limited space, money and time to access the internet, in regard to perceived web based knowledge, women are more likely to utilise the internet for educational purposes.

The data sample further elaborated the distribution of residents’ ethnic groups (Figure 6.8). The results show that the main ethnic group in this area is Chinese (54.5%), followed by the Malay ethnic group (31%). Meanwhile, the ethnic group labelled as ‘other’ (8%) has a higher percentage compared to the ‘Indian’ ethnic group (6%).
Figure 6.8: Residents’ Ethnic groups

The ethnic group ‘other’ was categorised as Peranakan; which also means ‘descendent’ (see Chapter Three: Background to Malaysia). According to the annals’ record, the growth of this ethnic group came from the result of marriage (especially with local women) and the establishment of the family institution between traders or immigrants who settled in Melaka centuries ago. In this city, there are three groups of Peranakans, which are Baba and Nyonya (Chinese’s descendent), Eurasian Peranakans (Dutch descendent), and Chitty Peranakans (Indian descendent). The majority of Peranakan in this city is Baba and Nyonya (Peranakan Chinese). This explains the dominant presence of the Chinese community in this city. However, the population of this ethnic group is shrinking because the younger generation tends to marry into different ethnic groups.

Meanwhile, the questionnaire survey also gives attention to the educational background among residents. The results illustrated in Figure 6.9 depict the residents’ educational breakdown. The education system in Malaysia is divided into four categories. There are primary education (7-12 years); secondary education (12-17 years old); post-secondary education/pre-university (18-19 years old); and tertiary education/collage/university (over 18 years).
In general, the majority of residents are quite well educated where 4.2% of residents did not have any formal education. The largest percentage with 44.8% has completed high school. This is followed by an even distribution between secondary school (23.1%) and primary school (19.6%). Meanwhile, 8.4% received tertiary education. This is not surprising due to residents’ age and employment background. In addition, a gender breakdown towards the education background determines that females received less education qualification in comparison to male participants. This is in agreement with Cohen’s findings in relation to less education background and less interested participation in the survey amongst female due to worth of thought.

![Figure 6.9: Residents' education levels](image)

Although there was concern regarding the residents’ length of residential status influencing the educational background in this city, a cross-tabulation analysis has confirmed that the majority of higher educational backgrounds from this sample population are genuinely from local-born residents rather than non-local residents. Therefore, it can be argued that the educated population is not strongly influenced from non-local born residents.
In fact, the importance of education is associated with the residents’ attitudes and perceptions towards heritage and tourism management as suggested by numerous scholars such as Kwan, (2010), Martins (2000), Jones et al. (2000), or Andriotis (2000). For example, the growth of local residents’ interest towards heritage conservation in the United Kingdom and Australia was derived from educational background in the society as a whole (Kwan, 2010 p. 21). In addition, a contradicting study conducted by Halpenny (2006), which is slightly similar to present investigation, found that there was a strong relationship between residents’ education and individuals’ place attachment value in perceiving their neighbourhood environment. This suggests that education could play a role in fostering residents’ attitudes and perceptions towards heritage trail development in Melaka WHS. However, a study by Martins (2000) stated that education is not a significant indicator in residents’ attitudes. Besides, these various studies have found mixed results regarding the impact of education on residents’ attitudinal characteristics. This has been confirmed from the results presented below (See Section 6.2.2) as no significant differences were found between residents’ education background and attitudes and perceptions towards community involvement in heritage management as a whole.

In order to understand how residents perceive the socio-economic impact from tourism development, most Southeast Asian scholars experience that it is difficult to explore the impact of tourism development by assessing between residents’ income and their socio-economic status (Ong Puay and Sharina, 2008). According to a recent conventional approach to explore respondents’ economic income, most of the scholars, particularly in Malaysia, allow respondents to determine their yearly or monthly income. However, this approach seems to create a potential bias if respondents indicate the wrong information. Furthermore, it would affect the rest of the data sample and conclusions. Moreover, Al-Hagla (2010) indicates that the value of income did not represent much information about respondent socio-demographic
characteristics. However, in this research context, respondents’ economic income is essential to comprehend the relationship between tourism development and resident participation approach. This is in relation to previous argument from local authorities (see Section 6.1.2) in regard to community participation due to personal interest or hidden agenda and one of the factors was about economic income.

Hence, as a strategy to avoid the limitation stated above, a series of predetermined statements was designed to investigate resident economic income. Table 6.2 highlights that the current income of 80.4% of residents is from daily work within the city. Meanwhile, 19.6% have stated that their income is not related to daily work within the city. It was determined that there are few retired residents (over 55 years old) involved in volunteer work, especially doing daily chores at their local place of worship. Therefore, there is no relationship between employment and income due to these individuals being unpaid employees. In addition, although the majority of residents are involved in the retailing business, it was determined that some of the residents (mostly Chinese) are not operating their business on a full-time basis. This is because their business is based on ‘seasonal’ demand. For example, during the celebration of Hungry Ghost Festival (also known as ‘Poh Toh’ in Hokkien and ‘Yu Lan’ in Mandarin) in Melaka; the shop will be opened to sell the prayer items (i.e. joss paper, candles, and aromatic joss stick) to the Taoist and Buddhist devotees (See Appendix 6.2). As a result, their current income is not generated from daily trading activity but based on religious ceremonies held in this area. Geographically, most of these residents are located along or nearby worship buildings, particularly in Harmony Street (Figure 6.10).
### Table 6.2: Indicators for respondents current income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Frequency (n=143)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current income from daily work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>80.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current income derived from WHS status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>60.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>39.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with current income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>57.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 6.10: Scenery along Harmony Street in the evening**

*Source: author’s fieldwork 2011*

Furthermore, details about residents’ current economic incomes were investigated by asking whether their current income was derived from Melaka WHS status (i.e. business related tourism). The result shows that more than half of the residents agreed that the WHS status has improved their economic income (60.1%). Meanwhile, 39.9% indicated that the WHS status did not influence their current income albeit relying on the tourism industry. It can be assumed that, since the WHS nomination, there was no direct improvement in economic income for certain groups of residents. Therefore, regardless of the influence of WHS status, the following result
shows that 57.3% of residents stated they were satisfied with their current income and 42.7% indicated that they were not satisfied with their current income.

The result shows that residents who were unsatisfied with their current income were mainly from the retail sector (i.e. groceries, souvenir). Most of these entrepreneurs are struggling to survive with their businesses because of two factors. Firstly, there is competition between local retail businesses and the development of new mega-store retail outlets nearby Melaka WHS zones (Figure 6.11). Apparently, the retail prices offered at the mega-store shopping mall are much cheaper in comparison to local retail businesses, which is a result of the product supplier network. Moreover, the mega-store is considered as a ‘one-stop shopping centre’; thus, most people would prefer to buy their groceries here, where, the fishmonger is even placed under the same roof. Secondly, it was understood that some business property is in rental-term agreement. Therefore, due to high demand and market value of property in this area, some residents are unable to pay a higher rental price because of differentials due to market competition around the city.

Figure 6.11: Map location of Melaka Megamall nearby Melaka WHS
Source: DataranPahlawan, (2012)
It was determined that this is because of the strong influence of recent tourism attractions mainly in the Old Quarter Zone, namely Jonker Street (Figure 6.11 and 6.12 and see Chapter Three: Background to Malaysia). It was suspected that this new tourist attraction has diverted the tourist from walking along the heritage trail route. This is because Jonker Street is not part of the heritage trail, though it offers plenty of heritage and cultural attractions that associate to business oriented. Moreover, there was a substantial improvement in terms of infrastructures (i.e. widen roadways, pedestrian pavement, colourful lighting and many more) compared to the infrastructure along the Melaka heritage trail (Figure 6.14).
Figure 6.14: New pedestrian pavement along Jonker Walk’s Street
Source: Author’s fieldwork 2011
6.2.2 Local Community Attitudes towards Place Attachment

*Attitude is a fundamental concept that is often used to understand and predict people’s reaction to an object or change and how behaviour can be influenced.*

(Fishbein and Ajzen, 1975)

Overall, the respondents’ distribution (percentage) of place attachment showed a high level of attachment in associate to the heritage (Table 6.3). The results from questionnaire variables that relate to place identity and place dependency attachment illustrated that more than 60% of residents were in agreement that they felt a sense of belonging to their community and heritage compared to those noted as ‘neutral’ or ‘disagree’.

The internal consistency of indicators measuring both attachment dimensions was evaluated using Cronbach’s alpha coefficients. The results showed that the Cronbach’s alpha values for both dimensions were between 0.59 and 0.62 (Appendix 6.3). However, not all statements (attachment attributes) were adequate to be included in this analysis due to inconsistency of respondents in answering the questionnaire survey. Although an attempt to develop the Cronbach’s alpha value by reducing the number of items (e.g., 6 or fewer) for ‘critical’ value of alpha (less than 0.59) has been made, the results still not showing an adequate finding as a whole. In fact, Williams (2000) emphasis that the technique to discriminate the scale attributes (attachment statements) throughout the respondents should be put in attention rather than statistical value of Cronbach’s alpha test (see Table 6.3).
Table 6.3: Local Community Attitudes towards Place Attachment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place Attachment Attributes</th>
<th>Percentage of respondent agreements(^1) (n=143)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place Identity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) I am still practising my ancestry tradition and culture in daily life.</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>5.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) My family is still serving our traditional foods for special celebrations or occasions.</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) I am still encouraging my children to speak my ancestry language.</td>
<td>83.2</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) I am proud that I can speak my ancestry language fluently.</td>
<td>91.6</td>
<td>8.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) I will give a word of warning to tourists for their inappropriate behaviour at my places.</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) The city environment makes me feel comfortable and peaceful.</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>6.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) I really feel like I am from this place(^2).</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) I always feel like I belong here.</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) I have invested my heart and soul in this place.</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place Dependency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) I can easily identify which landmarks (buildings, mausoleums, and holy places) represent to specific ethnic groups in this city.</td>
<td>91.6</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) I am knowledgeable about my ancestry background.</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>7.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12) This is the best place for what I like to do.</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13) No other place can compare to this area for what I like to do here.</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14) This place makes me feel like no other place can.</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15) I have particularly feeling (i.e. love) for this place(^2).</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16) I feel committed to this place(^2).</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>8.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17) My family is still practising our cultural and traditional custom for special celebrations and occasions.</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18) I wouldn’t substitute any other area for doing the types of things I do here.</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(19) I would make personal sacrifices to protect this place.</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Percentage was calculated based on responses that were re-coded as: Agree= combination of ‘strongly agree’ and ‘agree’; Neutral=neutral; Disagree=combination of ‘strongly disagree’ and ‘disagree’.

\(^2\) The value scale was re-coded to reverse negatively worded item.

Furthermore, t-test and one-way ANOVA analyses showed that residents’ attachment was found closely associated to socio-demographic characteristics such as residential status, age groups, and employment (Appendix 6.4). For instance, local born residents showed significant differences for both attachment dimensions via respondents’ behaviour reaction to protect the intangible (i.e. I am still encouraging my children to speak my ancestry language) and tangible...
heritages (i.e. I wouldn't substitute any other area for doing the types of things I do here). Moreover, the emotional attachments were often expressed by older residents (45 to over 55 years) towards the identity and dependency of attachment towards the place. By the fact, there were diverse ranges of demographic factors (i.e. ethnic groups, education background, and economic income indicators) that showed the correlation to the attachment of the place. For example, there was a strong correlation between Chinese residents who had primary educational backgrounds and acknowledgement that their economic income was not influenced by WHS status.

The results indicate that residents’ attachment to the heritages (intangible and tangible) within this place (Melaka city) was strongly constructed in the context of ‘collective memory’ (Olick 1999; Johnson 1998; Confino 1997; Assmann 1995). The term of collective memory is a perfect indicator to show the relationship between people and the environment (Johnson 1998). The collective memory can shape or even dictate the meanings associated by an individual with common memories object or events. In addition, Assmann (1995) has extended the context of collective memory to cultural memory as its ‘capacity to reconstruct’. The author argues that no memory can preserve the past. Therefore, cultural memory works by reconstructing the past and relating knowledge to an actual and/or contemporary situation. For example, the influence of age in the over 55 age group was strongly correlated to place identity in terms of family or seasonal occasions (i.e. ‘my family is still serving our traditional foods for special celebrations or occasions’). This suggests that this culture is not only being remembered but practiced actively. Moreover, the Peranakan ethnic group showed a significant finding in term of emotional attachment values to place identity (I really feel like I am from this place) and place dependency (I have particularly feeling (i.e. love) for this place). This finding, obviously, is unusual when viewed in contrast to previous studies regarding multiple ethnic
group attachment. The previous studies were intended to investigate the attachment of a single ethnic group in western culture (see in Williams, et al., 1992). This is because many Asian countries (e.g Malaysia, Indonesia) contain a multi-cultural ethnic group as opposed to Western countries (Williams et al. (1992) in Johnson 1998). Hence, this finding shows a unique indicator of place attachment value that influenced by the diverse range of ethnic groups.

Besides the influence of collective memory as an indicator to determine residents’ attachment; some scholars have suggested the residents’ education background could potentially determine the attachment value as well (Confino 1997; Assmann 1995). As mentioned earlier, a majority of residents are quite well educated (Figure 6.9); however, the results analysed show that residents with less education (informal and primary) were strongly attached to the place in comparison to those highly educated. A cross-tabulation analysis confirmed that residents who received informal or primary educations were among the elderly residents. This means that, the attachment value is also constructed by the element of ‘experience’. This is supported by Johnson (1998) who suggested that “attachment derives more from what was experienced in a particular environment rather than the shape, size, or location of the environment” p.5.

In relation to economic circumstances the results showed a weak relationship between residents’ attachment and economic factors. Since the city has been re-branded as a new image of tourist destination (WHS status) the local born residents that mainly work in the retailing sector argued that the influence of WHS status in terms of economic implication did not affect their attachment value as a whole. By contrast, newcomers (foreign residents) living in this city showed a strong relationship between attachment value and the influence of economic opportunity. However, their attachment value was based on dependency of place rather than identity to place. This result is similar to McCool and Martin (1994) suggestion that
“highly attached newcomers living in tourism settings may, in fact, represent a resident-tourist who, having made a conscious decision [to], becomes quickly attached […]” p.2.

The result show a significant relationship between residents’ age groups and their attachment value. However, since the results indicate the higher attachment value was associate to elderly residents, there is a concern about the attachment value from young residents where the results showed a lack of relationship between attachment value and young residents’ attitudes. This is suggesting the main issue is a lack of cultural engagement with the young and a lack of engagement among the residents of all age groups in protecting their heritage.

The following sections reveal the residents’ perceptions towards heritage trail development. The analyses were carried out to identify the benefits that could be gained by residents especially by the involvement in the heritage trail design and development. The lack of recent engagement between the residents and heritage trail user has an economic impact. Hence, the relationship between residents and the trail’s users becomes a primary concern firstly to comprehend the development of future involvement in Melaka WHS. Secondly, to understand and develop a strong relationship between local community involvement and heritage management practice.
6.2.3 Local Community Awareness towards Melaka Heritage Trail Development

In order to assess the perception of the residents towards heritage trail development, awareness about the Melaka Heritage Trail existence was examined. This is to determine the actual number of people who are aware of this development. In this section, a polar question was designed to indicate the respondent awareness. Polar questions are ones to which the expected answer is the equivalent of ‘Yes’ or ‘No’ (and, which are thus sometimes called yes-no questions). The questions use interrogative words, such as ‘who’ or ‘where’ (See Appendix 2.6). There were 143 residents involved in this questionnaire survey. However, only 121 residents were selected for further investigation. This is resulting from the predetermined question which indicates the awareness of the respondents regarding the existence of the heritage trail in this area (Figure 6.15).

Therefore, the following results were analyzed according to the response of the 121 residents' instead of the 143 sample. According to the illustrative figure above, the results show that 84.5% of residents were aware about the trail existence. It was ensured that residents were referring to the genuine Melaka Heritage Trail according to the trail characteristics such as location, main attraction along the trail route and interpretive signage. Meanwhile, 15.4% were
unaware of trail development. It was also understood that most of the unaware residents referred to the trail development as Jonker Street instead of the actual Melaka Heritage Trail. As it has been noted in the previous section 6.2.1, Jonker Street became a popular destination among visitors due to the initiative by local government to upgrade the infrastructure along the street and the introduction of the ‘Cultural Market’ every Saturday night (see Chapter Three: Background to Malaysia). Nonetheless, a small distribution of residents indicates that they were totally unaware about the trail development in this city. Moreover, it was also understood that most of the unaware residents were non-local born residents.

The following questions were asked in-detail to determine the pattern of residents awareness towards the heritage trail development. Figure 6.16 reveals that, 71.1% of residents were aware that their property was part of the heritage trail attractions. Meanwhile, 28.9% were unsure whether their property was part of the heritage trail attractions. It was identified that, they were presumed to be part of the heritage trail attractions, hence a physical indication such as interpretive signage should be placed in front of heritage trail properties and free printed brochures about their property should be available in the Melaka tourist information centre. Surprisingly, some residents who were unaware of their property as part of the heritage trail attractions actually lived along the heritage trail. Conversely, some residents from alternative tourist routes (not along the official Melaka heritage trail) believed their property to be part of Melaka’s heritage trail. This suggests that, these residents believe their properties have a unique cultural identity compared to other attractions along the heritage trail.
Results from Figure 6.17 show an even percentage distribution (Yes=54.5% and No=45.5%) for the question ‘if any other heritage trail exists in this area?’ It can be assumed that there is a wide range of awareness among the residents about heritage trails within the city’s area. Among the residents’ responses towards the answer ‘Yes’, most of them were local-born.

As explained before (see Section 6.1.2), this Melaka heritage trail was designed and developed by local NGOs and funded by American Express Foundation in 1998 (PERZIM 2011; Kamarul 2009). Apart from this trail, there are three other thematic heritage trails that be found around the Melaka WHS (PERZIM, 2011; Fieldwork Observation 2011). Some parts of the trails were designed for the purpose of individual event requirements. For example, a Dutch Heritage Trail
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was designed by Melaka Museums Cooperation (PERZIM) as a ‘gift’ during Holland’s Prime Minister’s Visit at Melaka in year 2002. The trail was located in the heart of Civic Zone area, which was the main attraction within Melaka WHS (Appendix 2.1). Several brochures about this trail have been printed and were available in the Melaka tourist information centre. However, several years after the Dutch Prime Minister’s visit to Melaka, the brochures were withdrawn from the tourist information centre due to lack of commitment of local agency as well as funds to update (PERZIM, 2011). However, the trail is still being used but only for educational purpose such as school trips (PERZIM, 2011).

The other heritage trail, which is preferred by local-born residents, is known as Religious Heritage Trail. The trail is located in the Old Quarter Zone, particularly along Harmony Street (Figure 6.18). The trail was introduced by trishaw drivers for tourists who took a ride with them. Therefore, it can be said that the trail is a guided but naturally born trail. However, formal documents are not presented in the information centre or Melaka Trishaw Association Society. Thus, it can be assumed that the Religious Heritage Trail was established as an informal heritage trail; and it has only been recognised and used by the trishaw driver.

Residents who answered ‘No’ (see Figure 6.16) were mainly derived from non-local born residents. Most of them believed that there were no other heritage trails in this city except Melaka Heritage Trail and Jonker Walk’s Street. Literally, the Jonker Walk’s Street cannot be accepted as a heritage trail because the real function of this trail is business-related. Moreover, it is a touristic cultural street than a heritage trail (Ong Puay and Ong Puay, 2003).

From the results above, it can be suggested that, most of the local born residents were more knowledgeable in determining the heritage trails around the city. It can be suggested that there
is an established collective memory among local born residents in regard to recalling previous activities in this city. Meanwhile, non local-born residents seem to have limited knowledge about the heritage trail. Further investigations into the lack of knowledge associate with non-local born residents is explored in the following section.

Figure 6.18: Melaka Heritage Trails in the World Heritage Site Zones
As analysed in Figure 6.19, three questions were structured to investigate residents’ knowledge about the background of Melaka Heritage Trail. This is because it is believed that if a resident is more aware of their surroundings, the better he/she will perceive the trail development either as a benefit or threat professionally or personally (Johari, 2010; Halpenny, 2006; Triana, 2005).

The results show that there were equal percentages in regard to the residents’ knowledge regarding the question ‘Why’ (71.1%= Yes and 28.9%= No) and by ‘Who’ (71.9%= Yes and 28.1%= No) the Melaka Heritage Trail has been developed in the city. Furthermore, there was an even distribution (55.4 %=Yes and 44.6%=No) among the residents towards ‘when’ the trail was first opened to the public. A possible explanation for the diverse results as ‘why’ could be due to large distribution from local born residents. It was also determined that most of these local born residents were located particularly along the Melaka Heritage Trail. Among the variety of answers from the residents, there was a comment that repeatedly occurred among the residents: Residents indicated that the Melaka Heritage trail was designed and developed mainly to educate tourists about Melaka’s local cultural heritage. The trail started to become popular since the 4th Malaysian Prime Minister Mahathir launched Melaka’s heritage and tourism promotion in 1989 (Worden, 2001). Since that event, tourism activity in Melaka has
become the most vibrant sector of Melaka’s economy, with a wide range of tourist attractions due to specially restored and preserved heritage sites in the city centre. Melaka’s tourism department has frequently introduced a new tourism ‘package’ to tourists. For instance, introducing Malaysian and Melaka cultural heritage into the museums makes it more convenient and rewarding to attract visitors on day trips. However, since the visitors’ enthusiasm about Melaka’s cultural heritage has become more sophisticated the collaboration between Melaka’s NGOs and Melaka’s tourism department has released the Melaka Heritage Trail as a new touristic package, emphasising its importance the diverse types of heritage assets on offer along the trail (i.e natural element, religious building, museum and historical sites).

Furthermore, due to ‘corporate responsibility’ towards three major themes - cultural heritage, leadership and community services - the American Express Foundation sought the potential of Melaka Heritage Trail design to meet their concerns on heritage conservation activity. Therefore, this corporate company has funded the whole Melaka Heritage Trail project (Figure 6.20). In consequence, some of the residents preferred to call this trail an American Express Heritage Trail, rather than refer to it as the Melaka Heritage Trail, which shows that the identity of the cooperating American Express has become embedded in residents’ memory and preference. Most residents remembered that there was a ceremony to launch the Melaka Heritage Trail to the public, but could not clearly remember the date or year the event happened.
Undoubtedly the involvement of a private corporation (such as the American Express Company) has to do with long term business investment in Melaka city. The American Express’s involvement in historic preservation reflects the company’s effort to develop sustainable tourism in Melaka city. Certainly, by successfully establishing sustainable tourism in this city, it could encourage more travellers to the city. In addition, the company has an established relationship with the local community through an extensive programme of sponsorship, such as sponsoring information panels along the Melaka heritage trail (see Figure 6.20). This has established the company’s identity within the community. However, the fieldwork observation found that there are few local shops in the heritage zones that accept American Express credit cards for transactions. However, they are widely accepted in most hotels and in the modern shopping mall near the heritage zones.

Besides the participation of the private company to encourage conservation awareness among the local community, it can be suggested that this ‘invitation’ could be one of the Melaka State Government's efforts, or strategy, to set up an International network for financial assistance in
heritage conservation. Hence, this effort could be viewed as an initial indicator with regard to decision making by the local authority in Melaka.

Meanwhile, among the residents who have indicated ‘No’ towards these questions, it was understood that most of the residents have forgotten about the existence of Melaka Heritage Trail in this city. This is because the trail has been hidden within the new tourist developments and infrastructure (See Figure 6.18). Moreover, other tourist attractions seemed to bring more benefits to Melaka’s local economy and its local community.

In order to clarify residents’ consistency towards their awareness and knowledge of the Melaka Heritage Trail and its development the following questions (Figure 6.21) were asked in order to verify previous resident responses and statistical results. In general, there were immense distributions among residents who have indicated ‘Yes’ to all questions. In particular, the residents were asked whether they knew the exact length of the Melaka Heritage Trail and the appropriate time that it took to walk this route which encompassed both Civic and Old Quarter Zones.

![Figure 6.21: Residents' knowledge of Melaka heritage trail characteristics](image)

Figure 6.21: Residents’ knowledge of Melaka heritage trail characteristics
The results from the figure below show that 65.3% of residents indicated they knew the length of time needed for trail users to walk and enjoy all the attractions along the trail. The time frame suggested by residents was relatively similar to the researcher’s experiment results (see Chapter Three: Methodology). Hence, it can be suggested that the residents have tried and experienced the walk along the Melaka heritage trail on average two times in their life. However, the majority of the 34.7% of residents who indicated ‘No’ determined that they had never walked along the trail. Therefore, most of these residents were unable to answer the question. In addition, the following question was asked in regard to the number of attractions along the trail. The results show that there was a percentage increment for those who answered ‘Yes’ (76.9%) to this question. Again, most of residents who indicated ‘Yes’ were locally born residents. Moreover, the positive answer also affected the knowledgeable residents who had walked along the trail before. By far, most residents frequently referred to the religious buildings as one of the main attractions along the trail. Besides, those residents acknowledged their own property as part of the trail attractions.

Similarly, 86% of residents agreed (Yes) that there is an area along the trail that genuinely represents their cultural and tradition identity. In general, it was clarified that a majority of the residents claimed that the Old Quarter Zone is the most preferred area that represents their identity. In detail, it was determined that within the Old Quarter Zone Harmony Street is the most preferable location that represents and embodies the most significant values associated with their identity. It can be suggested that most of the residents preferred the religious area as representative of their unique identity.

In general, 87.6% of residents believed that the heritage trail design had a role to play in representing their cultural and traditional identity. However, 12.4% of residents did not perceive
the heritage trail design as a tool to represent their identity as a whole. The results show that the residents’ distribution towards this question was the same as individuals who had a wider knowledge of the heritage trail background and who determined the characteristics of the trail correctly. Again, the local born residents showed a positive response towards the role of the heritage trail in representing their identity.

According to the percentage distribution, local born residents have a better knowledge of their cultural heritage and surrounding development. Conversely, those who had limited knowledge of the cultural heritage of the city were mainly from non-local born residents. However, this initial conclusion has to be confirmed with other analyses in the following sections.

6.2.4 Local Community Perceptions towards Heritage Trail Development

Measuring the residents’ perception towards the heritage trail is essential to provide an initial overview of the level of local community participation, especially to the aspects of conservation and tourism (Table 6.4). The results are presented according to two factors. Firstly, local community perception was measured within the context of economic impact of the heritage trail development on business opportunity to the local community. Four statements were constructed to measure these economic impacts. More than 60% of respondents agreed that the heritage trail made a positive impact to their socio-economic status. However, the Cronbach’s alpha shows that three out of four statements have strong internal consistency which suggest a new value of variable ($\alpha = 0.92$) which illustrate that the community perceptions of the economic impact is correlated to verify a potential of heritage trail development in creating business opportunities to community.
Table 6.4: Local Community Perceptions of Melaka Heritage Trail Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceptions: Since the Melaka Heritage Trail has been developed...</th>
<th>Percentage of respondent agreement(^1) (n=121)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Impacts (EI):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) It has increased my economic income.</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) It has created employments opportunities.</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) It has changed the patterns or trends of businesses in this city.</td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td>9.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13) Business opportunities have been divided equally to each community in this city.</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Impacts (SI):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) It has changed my social life.</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) I have met a lot of tourists with different cultural and social background.</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) I am proud with this development because it has represented my town identity.</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) I have involved in many activities related with tourism.</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) It has represented diverse ethnic groups in this city.</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12) It has represented a significant buildings and religious places to represent each ethic group in this city.</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(19) It has widened our cultural understanding.</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20) We have a good toleration to share facilities equally.</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(21) It has united our communities together.</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conflicts (CF):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) It has created several conflicts among this community.</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14) Business opportunities only for specific community in this city.</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15) I feel less privacy.</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16) I feel respect from tourists.</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18) Most of tourists did not respect my culture and tradition.</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Percentage was calculated based on responses that were re-coded as: Agree= combination of 'strongly agree' and 'agree'; Neutral=neutral; Disagree=combination of 'strongly disagree' and 'disagree'.

214
Comprehensive statistical analyses (t-test and one-way ANOVA) were conducted to investigate the details of which factors (socio-demographics) influenced the perception variables. Unfortunately, none of these analyses led to statistical significance. Two possible explanations were considered. First, the results showed that the development of the heritage trail has provided an equal distribution of economic benefits to the diverse groups of residents. Second, there is a possibility that the heritage trail is not being used comprehensively by the residents and not perceived by them as their asset, although this argument seems to contradict the previous results; for example, many residents are strongly attached to the place and heritage assets (see Section 6.2.2) and have a wide knowledge about the background of Melaka Heritage Trail (see Section 6.2.3). These results can be argued against the grain in terms of their understanding towards the important role played by the heritage trail. Therefore, this may highlight that there was a lack of engagement from trail providers to ‘create’ economic opportunities to the residents during the early stage of the heritage trail planning and development. As a result, resident may not be able to utilise benefits from the Melaka heritage trail development.

Meanwhile, the following years after the Melaka Heritage Trail was launched to the public, the Melaka State Government introduced the Jonker Walk’s Street as new attraction for tourists. This apparently creates a confused situation among the residents as they presume this project (Jonker Walk’s Street) was an upgraded design of the Melaka Heritage Trail. In consequence, it has created internal conflicts among the residents. It was evident that some residents have found this ‘upgrade’ was utterly unfair to them because it focuses on a specific area and specific community. For example, a result from cross-tabulation analysis confirmed that residents living along Jonker Street often received the economic benefits from tourism, compared to the other official tourist routes. It appears that the ‘channel of communication’
between trail providers (i.e. Municipal authority, tourism authority) and local community is not effectively well established.

The second factor of measuring the residents’ perception was based on the social impact. Eleven statements were designed, and Cronbach’s alpha analysis shows that all these statements have a strong internal consistency to be constructed as a concept item ($\alpha= 0.82$). Likewise, statistical results showed that no significant differences were found between socio-demographics and perception variables. However, significant differences were found between the perception items against the heritage trail awareness. The result shows that residents who have acknowledged their awareness about the ‘background’ of the heritage trail are significantly correlated with their social-life (Appendix 6.5). Although some of the residents realise their property is not part of the trail attraction, a statistical result shows that residents still feel proud of the development of the trail in highlighting the product (tangible heritage) and cultural activity (intangible heritage) within this city. Moreover, these residents emphasised that the trail has played a significant role to enhance their knowledge of the surrounding culture and traditions. In addition, the results illustrate that the local community positively accepts the intercultural interactions since the heritage trail enhances the experience of local residents, for instance, to experience a different cultural and social background from tourists and develop multilingual skills. However, residents emphasise this situation has not adversely affected their social and moral values. Moreover, the results confirm that the influx of tourists in their properties did not raise any issues with regard to residents’ privacy.

However, surprisingly, a significant difference was found when the perception variables were tested against the residents’ awareness towards their knowledge about the existent alternative heritage trail in this city (see Appendix 6.5). This result reveals that residents who indicated
there were alternative trails in this city had a positive impact on their social-life compared to those who emphasised there was no other trail than the Melaka Heritage Trail. This is to say that none of these trails contribute to the influx of economic benefits to the local community. However, this result confirms that the development of the heritage trail significantly impacts in a social context. Perhaps the influences of these social impacts strengthen the residents' sense of belonging to place and heritage assets. Thus, this has proved that residents are positively accepting the tourism development (heritage trail) in their society, but the influence of economic benefits should be emphasised more in the future planning.

The next sections show the results from the visitors' perception towards heritage trail experience. The above results and following analyses are expected to show a triangulation relationship between community engagement, visitor experience and heritage trail design. In addition, a participation model was tested to determine the interrelationship among the triangulation components.
6.3 Descriptive Results from Visitors

In this section, the data samples obtained from the visitor are to investigate the relationship between heritage trail development and engagement of local community in order to influence visitor experience during their visitation in Melaka WHS.

As has been discussed earlier in the methodology chapter, the close-ended questionnaire survey was conducted in Melaka World Heritage site, which consists of two core zones (Civic Zone and Old Quarter Zone) and the Melaka Heritage Trail. The surveys were simultaneously undertaken as the researcher had limited time and cost constraints. Therefore, a research assistant team was set up to assist the researcher to administer the visitor survey.

The results from this survey were divided into four main sections (Figure 6.22). In the first section, the data sample was presented according to the visitors’ socio-demographics characteristics such as gender, age groups, ethnic groups, education levels and employment status. Demographic characteristics were often used in studies related to social science, to explain the diversity within the sample population and to show the connection between demographic profile and perception variables.

In the second section, visitors’ travel patterns were tabulated, such as travel arrangement, purpose of visit, source of information, duration of stay, and types of accommodation. This information is essential because, as it has been suggested in the literature review, there are
strong anomalies between visitors’ travel patterns and perceptions towards the heritage tourism experience (Poria, 2001).
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**Figure 6.22: The presentation of fieldwork research (domestic and foreign visitors)**

In the third section, visitors’ awareness about the Melaka Heritage Trail was investigated. It was determined by using yes/no answers (polar questions). The visitors also were asked if they walked along the trail, or not, by using the same answering method. In addition, this section was outlined to determine which attraction areas (along the trail) developed a strong relationship between community and visitors.
Finally, the perception variables were designed according to three themes (Dilworth, 2003). The perceptions were assessed by determining the visitors’ knowledge, emotional and behaviour towards heritage trail experience. Therefore, visitors were required to indicate their agreement based on the Likert Scale method from (1) ‘Strongly agree’ to (5) ‘Strongly disagree’. This was expected to reveal the interrelationship between visitors’ perceptions and local community participation in the heritage trail development.

6.3.1 Distribution of Socio-Demographic Characteristics among Visitors

305 questionnaires were administered but only 155 data samples were found suitable for the data analysis. The rest of the data samples did not comply with the survey requirement. For example, 83 of respondents did not answer the questionnaire, and 67 respondents indicated that they were unaware and did not know that there was a heritage trail in the town. In the end, only 155 questionnaires were analysed.

Due to the low response rate, there were several limitations that have been identified. The biggest challenge was the conflict that three other surveys have been conducted in the same time and place with this research survey. Although the topics of questionnaire surveys were different, the tendency of the same respondents to participate in the second survey after they had participated in the first survey presented fewer possibilities. Although there was an attempt to resolve this conflict, it was not effective, and eventually none of the researchers committed to resolve the conflict together. For example, all researchers agreed to use a ‘survey time-frame’ method. This method was introduced by allowing only one survey to be conducted in the selected area within a fixed time. In this case, all researchers agree to swap each survey within 3 hours that cross each other’s path and this process continuously swaps over from the
morning until evening every day. However, this method was disrupted by unpredictable weather conditions that affected the time-frame schedule.

The other limiting factor was caused by unpredictable weather conditions. It was noted that during and after the rain showers, most of the visitors remained indoors (mostly in the museums). Therefore, the questionnaire survey could not be done on those days because this survey is only validated by visitors who have experienced the trail route. This survey could not be continued beyond the planned survey period due to time pressure and budget limitation. Nevertheless, the data sample is still valid for future analysis into this research topic. It can be used as supporting evidence in representing the participation of local community in heritage trail development.

The data sample presented starts with socio-demographic distribution for both foreign and domestic visitors. As Figure 6.23 suggests there was equal distribution between males (49%) and females (51%) in terms of visitors’ responses. Meanwhile, in terms of the age groups, there was only a little gap between foreign and domestic visitors (Figure 6.24). Overall, 62% of the respondents are 20-34, followed by the age group of 35-44 (20.4%) and the lowest number of the visitors is in the age group of over 55 (5.8%).

Apparently, the results shown above contradict results gathered by Kerstetter et al. (1998) thirteen years ago. The authors of the previous study indicate that ‘tourists who travel to heritage areas tend to be older, wealthier, and interested in extended family and education-oriented experiences’. This study has shown that the interest of people to visit the heritage and historic sites differ and depends on several factors such as motivations and expectations (Poria, Reichel and Biran, 2006), and place settings such as tourist-oriented facilities (Plog,
2001). For example, the growth of young adults, or family tourists who are interested in visiting heritage sites is mainly due to of the development of the historic city to cater for such a diverse range of age levels, especially children. In this study area, it was determined that the re-branding of Melaka River, as ‘the night river cruise’ and ‘the colourful lights by the riverside’ (Figure 6.25) during the night time, received positive feedback among family members who love to enjoy the night scenery (Tourism Department Officer, 2011).

**Figure 6.23: Visitors’ gender distribution**

**Figure 6.24: Visitors’ age groups distribution**
As far as the ethnic affiliations were concerned (Figure 6.26), the majority of data samples were collected from domestic visitors (78%) followed by foreign visitors (22%). There were three ethnic groups identified within domestic visitors. The largest ethnic group was Malay (64%) followed by Chinese (8%), and the lowest was Indian (6%). There are two explanations for this ethnic group breakdown for domestic visitors. Firstly, as Malay is the largest ethnic group in Malaysia, so it is not surprising to see this as the largest participant in this survey. Secondly, this could be considered as part of the research limitation. This is because as members of the research team are mainly from the Malay ethnic group, there is a possibility of the tendency of the research team to select the same ethnic group for the survey. Certainly, this is much easier in terms of communication. Therefore, it can be suggested that the selection of the research team from multi-ethnic groups could diversify the data samples. Meanwhile, the breakdown of nationalities of foreign visitors (Figure 6.27) showed that the majority of foreign participation was from Australia (28%). It was followed by a slightly less percentage from Holland (17%), United State of America (14%) and Indonesia (14%). The lowest respondent’s participation was from Italy (8%) and the United Kingdom (8%).
Figure 6.28 depicts the breakdown of visitors’ education levels. The result shows that there was no huge gap between the background of education levels between foreign and domestic visitors. The largest proportion of visitors held a Diploma qualification (38.1%) followed by a Bachelors and Masters degree (37.4%). There were also two groups of education levels (lower and upper secondary education) that represent a similar percentage (12.3%). This suggested that the majority of visitors who visit the heritage site are well educated. This can lead to greater expectations from this group of visitors in terms of the heritage setting and attractions. These suggest that the value and quality of existing cultural events and museum artefacts is lacking in terms of diverse engagement. Hence, this survey has identified a need to develop
events or facilities of a more diverse nature to attract all sections of the public and demographic profiles.

Figure 6.28: Distribution of visitors’ education levels

Figure 6.29 presents the breakdown of employment distribution between foreign and domestic visitors. The result shows that a majority of both foreign and domestic visitors work in the service sector (41.8%). The service sector can be divided into several sub-sectors such as transportation, telecommunication, financial and insurance, real estate, education and business. In Malaysia, this sector is the second most prominent sector in national economic income after the industrial sector. This sector has been growing and will be the primary sector in Malaysian economy in the future. Thus, it can be suggested that the majority household income of this employment group was known as middle class workers, which is approximately, around RM 3,000 – RM 5,000 per month. (£7,000 to £12,000 per annum - with the currency average on £1 = RM5). The average household income for middle-class people also has been confirmed from the secondary data obtained from Malaysian Economic Planning Unit (EPU 2009; EPU 2010).

The second highest proportion of respondents to participate in this survey were categorised as students and they were mainly from domestic visitors (38%). Moreover, there were three
employment positions that showed a huge gap of percentage distribution between foreign and domestic visitors. These are retailing sector (11.7%), retirees and housewife (5.2%). With respect to the retirees group, it is quite a common finding to see relatively old people from Western countries spend their leisure time visiting heritage sites and travelling to foreign countries (Mechinda Serirat and Gulid 2009; Kerstetter et al. 1998).

Figure 6.29: Distribution of visitors’ employment groups

6.3.2 Visitors’ Travel Characteristics

The importance of visitors’ travel patterns is essential in understanding the visitors’ perception towards heritage trail experience. This section begins by presenting an overview of the visitors travel characteristics in Melaka World Heritage Site. In terms of number of prior trips to Melaka WHS, both foreign and domestic visitors showed different levels of agreements (Figure 6.30). The result shows that a majority of foreign visitors claimed that it was their first time visiting the Melaka WHS (91.2%). Meanwhile, 68.6% of domestic visitors saw themselves as repeat visitors, on average having visited the site already three times.

In addition, visitors were also asked about the purpose of their visit (Figure 6.31). A majority of
both foreign and domestic visitors indicated that it was a holiday trip to Melaka WHS (79.4%). Meanwhile, the second highest percentage was marked as ‘other’. This category was intentionally left as a blank space at the bottom of ‘pre-determined list’ in this questionnaire question (see Appendix 2.6, Section B) in order to allow both foreign and domestic visitors to specify their purpose of visit to the Melaka WHS explicitly. As a result, 9.9% of domestic visitors indicated ‘other’ purpose of their visit was an educational trip.

Figure 6.30: Number of prior trips to Melaka WHS

Figure 6.31: Visitors purpose of visit to Melaka WHS
A follow-up question was asked in order to determine the visitors’ reason for planning a trip to Melaka. Results from Figure 6.32 reveal that both foreign and domestic visitors choose to visit the Melaka WHS mainly because of the identity of this city as a famous destination (40.6%) and short travel time (32.3%). However, the reason to enjoy the city’s scenery and historical landscape was placed in the lower percentage rate (6.5%). It can be concluded that there was a strong correlation between identity of the place and travel distance. Research data reveals that the domestic visitor is ranking higher in statistical unit than foreign tourists. This is because local residents are more likely to use the Melaka WHS trail as access, travel and knowledge of site is readily available via verbal communication, whereas foreign tourists are not so aware about the specific attractions and heritage within the city in details. This is due to lack of publicity and a need for more extensive marketing abroad. In addition, there was one reason (It was in the itinerary) showed no feedback from foreign visitors. This would suggest that most of the foreign visitors arranged their own travel plan to Melaka (without arrangement from travel agency), unlike the domestic market that was attracted through local advertising and word of mouth.

Figure 6.32: Distribution of visitors’ reasons to visit Melaka WHS
In consequence, a comprehensive analysis was conducted to explore the correlation between visitors’ purpose of visit and visitors’ reasons for choosing the Melaka WHS destination (Figure 6.33). The graph below shows that the ‘reasons to plan the visit’ was well distributed within ‘Holiday’ and ‘Others’ purposes of visits. With respect to holiday category, the reasons to plan the visit because of ‘Famous destination’ and ‘Short time travel’ have shown the highest frequency received from respondents.

In addition, there was an interesting finding within the ‘Holiday’ category. As the third highest of visitors’ reason to plan a trip to Melaka was determined as ‘Fixed itinerary’. It was revealed that those who indicated ‘other’ purpose (education trip) as a reason for visiting Melaka involved school trips or tour groups (see Figure 6.31) that cited a ‘Fixed itinerary’ as a determining factor. This group within the ‘Holiday’ category ranked ‘Fixed itinerary’ as the third highest reason to plan a trip to Melaka.

Figure 6.33: A Breakdown between Purpose of visit and reason of choosing the Melaka WHS destination

Figure 6.34 reveals the source of information received by both foreign and domestic visitors before travelling to the Melaka WHS. Fifty five percent of domestic visitors revealed that most of information about this city was received from ‘Friends or relatives’ and this was found to be
the second highest percentage distribution for foreign visitors (93.4%). Notably, this finding reinforces Lee’s exploratory study in Melaka (2009). This method of dissemination by word of mouth or friends and family is not only limited to in person conversation, but due to the evolution enhancement of technology. This is because the modes of communications for interaction and sharing information have become more dynamic (Bruni, Francalanci and Giacomazzi, 2012). For example, the increased usage of social–networking via the web (e.g email, facebook, twitter) and text-messaging means public opinion spreads much faster than via conventional ways. Therefore, it can be suggested that the influence of ‘word of mouth’ is a powerful and effective advertisement in order to promote heritage tourism. However, it should be emphasised that there is a risk from this phenomenon because if the visitors have unpleasant experiences, it could affect their knowledge sharing with other friends or relatives about specific heritage destinations (Sweeney et al., 2008; Hogan et al., 2004; Dichter, 1966). Furthermore, with regards to the enhancement of current technology, the result shows that 24.8% of domestic visitors claimed that the source of information was associated with multimedia such as internet (emails, websites) television, and radio.

Meanwhile, the highest percentage of foreign visitors received initial information about Melaka WHS from ‘Published sources’ (41.2%). The ‘Published sources’ were identified from any printed materials such as newspapers, billboard advertisements, posters and brochures. By contrast, the result found that 17.6% of foreign visitors claimed that the information was received from travel agencies. By contrast, the results from ‘reasons to visit the Melaka WHS’ (See Figure 6.32) showed that foreign visitors did not participate in a guided tours which is reinforced by the fact that foreign respondents did not require fixed itineraries. Therefore, the assumption can be made from this finding (Figure 6.34) that information from travel agencies
could be their (foreign visitors) initial or primary source to find out about the attractions in Melaka.

According to the results above, it can be argued that both domestic and foreign visitors had limited sources of information about Malaysia and Melaka. For example, the source of information received by domestic visitors showed unbalanced weight in terms of formal and informal channels of communications due to the influence of ‘recommenders’ by word of mouth. Meanwhile, published materials and multimedia were too low by comparison in terms of the percentage distribution. Hence, it can be suggested that Melaka’s authorities should take progressive action by domestic promotion strategies to highlight Melaka city as a tourist destination. This is crucial as the Melaka’s authorities (i.e tourism and conservation departments) might want to emphasise the attractions based on the current planning and development in order to develop a sustainable future in term of resources and products.

![Source of information about Melaka WHS](image)

**Figure 6.34: Distribution of visitors’ source of information about Melaka WHS**

Meanwhile, with respect to ‘source of information about Melaka WHS’ received by foreign visitors, it was found that the multimedia promotion rated the lowest amongst the foreign visitors’ responses. This is crucial to understand as this medium of multimedia has been used
as an effective advertisement strategy in the tourism industry and for other destinations (Messmer and Johnson 1993; Woodside 1990; Silberman and Klock 1986). Moreover, a study from Dae, Yeong and Fesenmaier (2005) showed that an effective multimedia campaign for specific tourist sites showed strong linkages to “top-of-mind awareness, [repeated requests for travel] information, and the [increased] likelihood of visiting a destination” (p.45) among potential tourists. Therefore, it is essential for Melaka’s authorities to step forward in promoting Melaka as a WHS at international level, for example, by investing in television commercial advertising, sponsorship for seasonal sport events, and introducing low fares airlines to Malaysia. Certainly, this should be done via effective partnerships among government departments, private agencies and support from Central Government.

Meanwhile, a further investigation regarding visitors’ travel characteristic was determined by identifying the number of group members while travelling to the Melaka WHS (Figure 6.35). The results show that foreign visitors who were travelling as a ‘Couple’ (55.9%) represented the highest percentages. Meanwhile, there were roughly equal percentages among domestic visitors who travelled as ‘Couples’ (30.6%), and respectively as ‘Group’ (32.2%) or ‘Family’ (35.5%). However, the result highlighted that there was a huge percentage gap between foreign (14.7%) and domestic (1.7%) visitors regarding the ‘Alone’ traveller. This may suggest that the foreign visitors who travel ‘Alone’ have a strong desire to explore the city’s characteristics. This result is in agreement with Bryan’s (1977) suggestion that the ‘specialist’ or alone traveller seeks out experiences to match their level of knowledge and skills.

Overall, the results show that the Melaka WHS has become a major-tourist destination especially for domestic visitors. As illustrated in Figure 6.25, it was revealed that the re-branding of the tourism package has attracted especially visitors’ family members, to spend
their holiday in this city. Therefore, it can be suggested that the motivation of visitors to travel to this city would be because of the safe environment combined with elements of fun (Hawley 1990). This relates to new city attractions designed and developed to attract more domestic and international tourists (Nurulhalim, 2006; Triana, 2005).

In addition, Figure 6.36 reveals the duration of stay among visitors. Overall, the results showed that 55.5% of both foreign and domestic visitors planned to stay overnight in the Melaka WHS. The average stay was two nights. However, the breakdown of the percentage distribution between both visitors on an overnight stay showed that foreign visitors were the highest group planning to stay overnight (82.4%). Meanwhile, there was a balanced percentage distribution for a day trip (52.10%) and an overnight stay (47.9%) among domestic visitors.
The average length of stay for a day trip was four hours. According the average hours spent within this city, it can be deduced that visitors were not scattered throughout the city but mainly concentrated in the Civic Zone (see Figure 6.2). Indeed, this might be because of safety, such as less traffic congestion and plenty of open spaces. For example, ‘Family’ visitors preferred to spend time at the Civic Zone rather than Old-Quarter Zone because of more family oriented attractions for both resident and tourist alike.

The higher the percentage of overnight stays among foreign visitors, the greater the expenditure with greater economic benefits to the community and State Government. Besides, for those who decided to stay overnight, their experience would be more rewarding than a day tripper’s visit because although the Melaka WHS is a compact city, a one-day trip is not enough time to explore the city’s attractions. Therefore, to deal with the time restriction and needs of a day tripper, a heritage trail becomes an essential tool to guide the visitor along heritage attractions. Indeed, the heritage trail is useful for those who wanted to stay in the city for a short though culturally comprehensive visit that may encourage them to return. Besides, the Melaka’s authorities could view the development of thematic heritage trails as a strategy for sustainable management. For example, developing a series of thematic heritage trails may

Figure 6.36: Duration of stay in Melaka WHS
encourage visitors to stay on specific routes and, at the same time, it would help conservationist to minimise impacts on the heritage resources and assets. However, the trail design should be associated with effective interpretation elements such as translated literature, and related ‘materials’ such as signages, to enhance the visitor’s knowledge and experience.

With respect to the overnight visitors’ distribution, Figure 6.37 presents popular types of accommodation chosen by visitors (foreign and domestic). By far the largest group, 44.1% of foreign visitors decided to stay in a hotel, followed by hostel accommodation at 23.5%. The results reveal that most of the visitors stayed in hotels and hostels within a 3 miles radius from the Melaka WHS’s city centre. By contrast, 5.2% both foreign and domestic visitors who chose to stay in ‘Homestay’ accommodation.

![Figure 6.37: Types of accommodation in Melaka WHS](image)

There are few possible reasons for the lack of demand, from both foreign and domestic visitors, for homestay accommodation. Firstly, the major hurdle for this property could be because of its location and setting. The homestay accommodation in Malaysia is not new to the tourism industry (Yahaya and Abdul Rasid, 2010). In the beginning, the homestay emerged from an overspill of tourism in terms of overflow of tourists that could not be handled by the big
entrepreneurs (i.e hotels, hostels). Normally, the location of the homestay is nearby the popular tourist destinations and the product offered is merely accommodation. However, since the rapid growth of hotels and hostels around Melaka city, homestay properties has now been overshadowed by newer facilities. Despite the contribution to the tourism industry, a report from KPMG Peat Marwick in 1991 claimed that homestay accommodation did not significantly contribute to foreign exchange earnings.

Secondly, it could be associated to the lack of service quality and price rate. Apparently, some of these properties provide very basic amenities. For example, only a few properties are equipped with air conditioning. Therefore, the guests might be feeling uncomfortable especially for Western visitors to get used to the tropical weather in Malaysia. Meanwhile, with respect to price rate, these properties are sometimes too expensive for certain groups of visitors. For example, the price is still unaffordable for the younger visitor to stay in homestay accommodation. As a result, it was showed that most of them prefer to stay in hostels.

However, the homestay accommodation could have a future potential in cultural heritage tourism. This is because the concept of homestay in Malaysia is different from homestay elsewhere, where guests will be staying together with host families. Therefore, the guests have opportunities to interact, gain knowledge, and experience of life style and culture of the local community. Indeed, due to this potential, it could provide additional income and employment to the community. However, the role of local authorities to promote homestay accommodation is essential to highlight a culture-community-based-tourism product, for example, by providing initiative supports (funding, legislation, upgrade and improve infrastructure) and motivation (knowledge based skills). Moreover, this could be viewed as a way for local government to increase the involvement of the local community. Furthermore, if a partnership initiative,
between local authorities and local community, successfully promotes homestay accommodation and the demand of homestay is established and sustained, not only will it attract foreign visitors, but perhaps the domestic tourist market.

6.3.3 Visitors’ Awareness of Melaka Heritage Trail

Visitors were asked whether they were aware of the Melaka Heritage Trail. 155 respondents completed this survey; these respondents were sorted according to their awareness of the trail and prior knowledge. Those respondents that did not indicated awareness of the trail were excluded from the data sample. This decision was based on the primary aim of this survey which analyses information from visitors who have knowledge of the heritage trail as a tourist attraction.

The results indicated that the majority of visitors obtained information about Melaka WHS via friends and relatives (domestic visitors) and published materials (foreign visitors). However, with respect to visitors’ awareness and knowledge towards the existence of the Melaka heritage trail, it was found that the majority of both visitor groups claimed that they knew about this trail through friends and relatives. Apparently, this is a reasonable finding as there is little information about the trail on websites or via tourist brochures. Moreover, this trail has received less attention from local authorities or tourism agencies due to the role and function of the trail being considered ‘outdated’ (see Section 5.8).

In regard to trail awareness, visitors were asked to indicate their favourite attractions along the trail by scoring (in ascending sequence numbers) a list of names provided. Figure 6.38 presents the visitors’ favourite attraction along the trail. Overall, the results showed that the majority of visitors have chosen the attractions in the Civic Zone compared to Old Quarter
Zone. The previous section has explained several possible reasons as to why most visitors select this area (see Section 6.3.3). The Melaka River and A Famosa sites indicate the highest percentages distribution among visitors' preferences. The Melaka Sultanate Place was chosen by domestic visitors (10.7%) as the third most popular attraction, but it received no response from foreign visitors. Other attractions had a low rating of less than 12%, and there was no response from both foreign and domestic for one site namely Sri Poyyatha Vinayagar Temple.

The Melaka River attraction was the highest percentage rated attraction among visitors. This percentage breakdown illustrated the fact that the new development was highly received by both groups of visitors. However, the highest rated attraction in terms of distribution from domestic visitors showed that the A Famosa attraction was the first choice due to its heritage (28.1%). The Melaka River has started to boost the tourism market since 2004. This is partly due to the Melaka state government's decision to grant and engage in major conservation and maintenance work along the Melaka River in order to develop a new tourism package. The aim of this project was to create an alternative tourism 'honey pot' preferably within the Civic Zone area (Nurulhalim 2006 p. 78). Nowadays, the Melaka River is not only offering a river cruise.
experience but also has created a new thematic heritage trail route either by boat or pedestrian walkway along the river. Moreover, a study by Yee (2009; p. 115) proposed to use the Melaka River as the starting point for every heritage trail in the city. It can be suggested that the Melaka River has been utilised as an iconic image for natural heritage in the city.

Meanwhile, the A Famosa was still a popular attraction. This is not surprising because since Melaka launched the first tourism campaign in the 1980s, the image of A Famosa has been used widely in promotion and marketing (Tourism Department Officers, 2011). Therefore, the A Famosa is more likely to be a ‘must visit’ icon for visitors to Melaka. Surprisingly, the Melaka Sultanate Place, located just behind the A Famosa attraction, was somewhat unknown to visitors and results confirmed that 10.7% of domestic visitors who choose this attraction were repeat visitors.

The third highest percentage distribution for favoured attraction from foreign visitors’ was the Christ Church building (11.8%) and this responds directly in the survey to the distribution of foreign visitors in terms of nationality. Apparently, Dutch visitors were the second highest visitor group involved in this survey. Therefore, attractions such as Christ Church, St Paul’s Church (5.9%) and the Stadhuys building (8.8%) would attract Dutch visitors as they create a sense of belonging and collective memory (as these sites refer back to colonial rule).

Beside popular attractions, the Sri Poyyatha Vinayagar Temple in the Old Quarter Zone is, however, highlighting a conflict as a tourist attraction. In addition, this result was found similar to a study by Johari (2010). The author has explored the visitor satisfaction along the Melaka Heritage Trail. The author suggests that there was a high response of visitor satisfaction while visiting the A Famosa attraction and a low response (unpopular site) at Sri Poyyatha Vinayagar Temple. A possible explanation is ethnic in nature and management issues. To put this into
historical context, this temple is the ancient building that was built 200 hundred years ago (PERZIM, 2011; Nurulhalim, 2006) and has been listed as important Malaysian Heritage (Figure 6.39). Therefore, due to its significance in terms of history and heritage, this temple was chosen as one of the Melaka heritage trail’s main attractions. At the early stages of the development of the Melaka heritage trail, however, because of clashes between devotees and city’s conservationists over the building’s characteristics and lack of interpretation about religion elements, the temple management has decided to remove the heritage trail signpost (Interviewee No. 2, Temple’s Caretaker). Moreover, since there was too much incorrect information issued by tourist guides, a decision was taken to close the building to tourists. Apparently, this is because most of the devotees felt insulted about the promotion of false information about their religious beliefs (Local resident No. 2).

Another reason for the building to be closed is less contentions and is on the ground of safety. As this building was made by wood, some parts of the building were decayed (PERZIM Officer, 2011; Kamarul, 2010). Therefore, the temple management has decided to close the building for visitors and open some sections for devotees only.
This situation highlights interesting issues. Firstly, there was a lack of coordination between the property owner (temple management) and tourist operators in explaining the cultural reason for the property to be presented in a particular manner to public. Secondly, there was a lack of engagement between local authorities and the property’s owners in order to create awareness to the public towards conservation. Thirdly, there was a lack of involvement between trail provider and property owner during the stage of trail development and specifically in relation to the design of signpost information. Therefore, it can be suggested that all these stakeholders should work together if each party wants to highlight the significance of this property in terms of tourism and conservation. Moreover, with regard to the capacity of the heritage trail, this partnership could strengthen the role of the trail in order to promote tourism and conservation awareness.

6.3.4 Visitors’ Perception of Heritage Trail Experience

This section presents the results from the survey of visitor perception towards the heritage trail experience (Table 6.5). The results reveal two importance factors in influencing the visitor experience. The first factor relates to the physical characteristics of the trail such as trail design, attractions, and infrastructural facilities. In general, the results show that 70% of visitors agreed that the trail route is compatible with their age groups and physical endurance. However, in terms of capacity usage, the visitors suggested that the trail will not be able to cater for a large group in one occasion. In terms of the trail’s attractions, 72% of visitors agreed that all the attractions enriched their experience and knowledge.

Meanwhile, the result shows that the poor maintenance of infrastructural facilities along the trail, such as information panels, benches, pathways, and toilets distracted from their experience (Figure 6.40). For instance, visitors were confused with some directions on the trail
signage which is not updated very well. The signage is getting 'old' (i.e rusted, faded, and vandalised); the delivery technique of information (interpretation panel) seems outdated and needs to be adapted in the present days. A classic example from Beaumont’s study (1999) reveals that the interpretation signs have significant influence over the visitors on their tour to Australia’s cultural and historic sites. The author suggests a key opportunity to influence visitors is through what they see and experience from the correct delivery of information in terms of interpretation signages, clear directions, labelling the objects, strategic location, and appropriate height and angle for comfortable viewing. Hence, it is essential for heritage managers to understand the features, concepts, themes and stories of the natural and cultural heritage, and using a combination of well written text and professional graphics to deliver a ‘clear’ message. A field work observation confirmed that the existing signage in this city (as well as the Melaka heritage trail) was not of ‘identical shape’. Signage design (i.e layout, font, colour), and materials can be seen to vary. This is presumably because the signs were installed separately, according to different conservation projects (Figure 6.41). This highlights the lack of comprehensive planning by local authority in terms of future development as well as in designing the signage. A good example can be adopted by Melaka’s authority by referring to the Heritage Walk of Ahmedabad in Gujarat, India. The signposting was designed by Ahmedabad Municipal Council, and each signpost was designed to distinguish the neighbourhood area. This is essential to make the urban ‘fabric’ easier to be comprehended by the end user. Simultaneously, it creates a sense of belonging and pride to the neighbourhoods. This consideration in placement and design would reduce the probability that the signs would be ‘neglected’ (i.e vandalised). This is because the identity of the signpost would enhance the local community and encourage local people to maintain and protect their "belongings". Moreover, there are volunteers among the local population who conduct guided heritage walks
for both domestic and foreign visitors, and the fees collected could be used for maintenance work on buildings or infrastructural facilities (Gujarat Tourism 2010).
### Table 6.5: Visitor Perceptions of Heritage Trail Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heritage trail experience</th>
<th>Percentage of respondent agreement^1 (n=155)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) It has increased my knowledge about this city.</td>
<td>Agree 86.5</td>
<td>Neutral 11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) I have enjoyed my journey.</td>
<td>Agree 98.1</td>
<td>Neutral 1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Most of communities living in this area are friendly^2.</td>
<td>Agree 63.2</td>
<td>Neutral 16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) I can now easily define how many communities live in this area after walking along this trail^2.</td>
<td>Agree 27.7</td>
<td>Neutral 32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) The trail development fit with my age capability^2.</td>
<td>Agree 69.7</td>
<td>Neutral 12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) It has increased my knowledge about local communities in this city.</td>
<td>Agree 80.6</td>
<td>Neutral 14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) I am happy with this heritage trail because it has represented its city’s cultural identity as a World Heritage Site.</td>
<td>Agree 87.7</td>
<td>Neutral 11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) This is my favourite place to go during my free time.</td>
<td>Agree 52.9</td>
<td>Neutral 41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) There is something special about communities living in this area^2.</td>
<td>Agree 67.7</td>
<td>Neutral 12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) I would prefer to spend more time here if I could.</td>
<td>Agree 58.1</td>
<td>Neutral 39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) I have tried a lot of local foods.</td>
<td>Agree 65.2</td>
<td>Neutral 9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12) I feel secure^2.</td>
<td>Agree 83.2</td>
<td>Neutral 7.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13) I would rather to visit somewhere else (another historic city).</td>
<td>Agree 45.8</td>
<td>Neutral 29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14) I feel tired.</td>
<td>Agree 44.5</td>
<td>Neutral 14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15) I am particularly like all the attractions along this trail^2.</td>
<td>Agree 72.3</td>
<td>Neutral 18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16) I can walk along this trail at night.</td>
<td>Agree 61.3</td>
<td>Neutral 25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17) I have explored more about local and cultural characteristics.</td>
<td>Agree 52.9</td>
<td>Neutral 24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18) I realised that coming here is one of the most satisfying things I do.</td>
<td>Agree 63.2</td>
<td>Neutral 34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(19) I feel like I belong here.</td>
<td>Agree 38.1</td>
<td>Neutral 41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20) What happens in this place is important to me.</td>
<td>Agree 56.8</td>
<td>Neutral 38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(21) I identify the lifestyle and values of the people who live here.</td>
<td>Agree 56.1</td>
<td>Neutral 27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(22) I get greater satisfaction out of visiting this place than I do out of work.</td>
<td>Agree 71.0</td>
<td>Neutral 25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(23) I have strong feeling (i.e love, attach) about this area^2.</td>
<td>Agree 85.2</td>
<td>Neutral 7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(24) I realised that coming here is one of the most enjoyable places I do.</td>
<td>Agree 74.2</td>
<td>Neutral 22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(25) Most of the infrastructures (e.g information panel, pathway, bench, toilet, etc) are well managed.</td>
<td>Agree 34.2</td>
<td>Neutral 13.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\^1 Percentage was calculated based on responses that were re-coded as: Agree= combination of ‘strongly agree’ and ‘agree’; Neutral=neutral; Disagree=combination of ‘strongly disagree’ and ‘disagree’.

\^2 The value will be re-coded to reverse negatively worded item.
This precedent from Ahmedabad’s heritage trail shows how the local authority could grasp the opportunity to engage with the residents and businesses. Melaka’s authority could adopt a similar strategy in order to improve the engagement with local community. For example, since traditional craftsmanship is available in the historic city, a redesign of the signposts may be carried out by local trades, thus creating a rich resources. The involvement of Melaka’s community may be varied through appointment, competition, or residents' vote. Moreover, by empowering the property owner to design the interpretation material such as a story or background about their property, it would strengthen the sense of the community’s identity to place.

Moreover, the elderly visitors’ group were seen more dominant in the statistical analysis in highlighting their perception towards the trail characteristics compared to other age groups. For instance, 60% of elderly visitors agreed and tended to gain more experience about the city and its heritages by using the trail at night. Although this action may be unexpected from this age group, results highlight the elements that are possibly associated with this action. There was a
unique relationship between the role of the heritage trail and respondents' attitudes in creating a symbolic meaning to the visitors. This may be associated to visitor past or collective memory. Certainly, the collective memory has to be associated with the influence of the surrounding environment (Johnson, 1998). Therefore, the authenticity of products or attractions along the trail could be the element to relate with visitors’ collective memory. This is confirmed by the significant finding between elderly visitor and the statement ‘I have a strong feeling (i.e love, attach) about this area’. Moreover, a cross reference analysis determined that these visitors are mainly from Chinese and Indian ethnic background. As the previous chapters and sections (See Chapter One: Background to Malaysia) highlighted that most heritage elements in this city were influenced by Chinese and Indian descendents, this is a possible reason for these visitors to engage with the role of the heritage trail. In general, there was no correlation between visitor’s ethnic groups and favourite attractions along the trail that responded to ethnicity except for the Dutch section of the Melaka Heritage Trail. A possible explanation from this finding may be that visitors have perceived their trail’s enjoyment and experience towards the heritage attractions as a whole rather than any single entity.
Chapter Six: Fieldwork Results

Figure 6.41: Various forms of information panels

The second factor of visitors’ experience was determined by the influence of local community engagement. In addition, the visitors' travel patterns contribute to the significant findings of the results. For example, visitors with a fixed itinerary (i.e. arranged by travel or tour agency) were identified to have a direct engagement with the local community compared to independent visitors (i.e. self arrangement). The engagement of local community occurred presumably because it was pre-arranged by third parties’ (i.e. travel agency). Moreover, the results from field work observation and interviews gathered from local residents confirmed that the
engagement with community which encompassed cultural activities and performances such as
dancing, making a traditional craftwork and experience local cuisine adds to the visitor's
cultural experience (Figure 6.42). The results highlighted the involvement of community in
enhancing visitors' experience and knowledge across diverse ethnic groups of visitors as a
whole. This illustrates an established interaction between the community and foreign visitors
towards sharing the local culture. However, this interaction is focussed mainly on small pre-
arranged groups or costumers and it does not translate to large group or continuous streams of
(individual) tourists. This is to say that, the local community still ‘create’ a barrier between
themselves and visitors and this may be because they do not want to deal with ‘crowdedness’
(Figure 6.43). Instead, they are happy to do these activities by pre-arranged packages.
Certainly, the local community sees the economic impact of large organised visitors groups
compared to on-site visits by day trippers.

Figure 6.42: A group of visitors gather around local resident during
‘story-telling’ activity
(Source: Fieldwork observation, 2011)
6.4 Conclusion

This chapter showed the interpretation of research data, in order to achieve the research objectives. Three groups of respondents were anticipated to give different opinions towards local community involvement in cultural heritage management. This is because, the position of each respondent may reflect the research data in terms of their connection with the local community. For example, the data from local government personnel were analysed to understand the potential benefits that can be perceived by local community via their involvement in tourism and heritage management. Furthermore, the data from local community was used to determine the connection between local community attitudes towards place attachment and perceptions towards the development of Melaka heritage trail. This is to show whether both variables can influence their future involvement. Meanwhile, the data from tourists were synthesised to determine whether the tourism product (heritage trail) and local community involvement are well integrated to influence their experience and satisfaction. The following chapter relates the evidence from the findings with the relevant literature.