Perception of Tourists Towards Challenges Heritage Building Conservation

Nurhanisah Hazarudin*
School of Housing Building and Planning, Construction Management, UniversitiSains Malaysia, 11800 USM, Pulau Pinang, Malaysia

Radzi Ismail
School of Housing Building and Planning, Construction Management, UniversitiSains Malaysia, 11800 USM, Pulau Pinang, Malaysia

Wan Nadzri Osman
School of Technology Management and Logistics, Universiti Utara Malaysia, 06010, Kedah, Malaysia

Fazdliel Aswad Ibrahim
Faculty of Engineering Technology, Universiti Malaysia Perlis, 02100UNIMAP, Perlis, Malaysia

Abstract

Building conservation is the key challenges to the heritage building. The main attractive element for tourist to visit heritage building is condition of building. This paper attempt to identifying the challenges in heritage building conservation. Quantitative method was used in this study which involved tourist as respondents. This study was conducted in Georgetown, Penang, Malaysia. Total numbers of returned questionnaires are 127. Descriptive analysis was used in this study to know the level of challenges in heritage building conservation. The results found that there are four challenges aspects; consist of building aspect, technicality aspect, social aspect and environment aspect. The first ranked of challenges in heritage building conservation scope is social aspect. Based on tourist perception, they believed social aspect become the main challenge in building conservation. Followed by building aspect, environment aspect and technical aspect. In social aspect, the results show that low involvement of young people with the heritage and conservation activity, public participation are still low with the heritage, program and lack of public awareness on heritage building conservation. These challenges resolve by increase the awareness and involvement the public people. Further research need to emphasis on how to increase public awareness in heritage building conservation.
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1. Introduction

Nowadays the Heritage Building is the ones of attractive asset for tourism development agenda. This attractiveness land mark contributed to increase nation’s revenue and it’s very important to government to conserve all heritage buildings. Heritage building is a symbolic of the immutable history for the country and need to be preserved and protected from dilapidation for the future generation also for the attraction of the country (Aksam Hasnizan et al., 2016a). Therefore, the conservation works are essential in order to maintain the significance of the heritage building.

Besides that, heritage building consist of the aesthetic significance which indicate the history, time, people, culture, legislation and situation during that time (Said ShahrulYani et al., 2013). Hence, historic building will benefit especially for the modern generation to reminisce and appreciate the heritage of their country whether building, culture, traditional costume or traditional dance. It is importance for the young generation to contribute in the heritage conservation to ensure their awareness of the heritage (Mastura et al., 2015).

Furthermore, Forsyth (2013), stress that conservation are essential for the heritage building to ensure the continuation and sustainability of the historical value. It is because the existence of the heritage building represent the history, culture and significant value of the building. The conservation in heritage building also important to educate people about the conservation in heritage building and appreciate the heritage value besides to increase awareness of people in aspect of heritage building conservation.

Conservation of historic building especially in Malaysia is not easy because of the laws and guidelines for the conservation work. Based on the Azizi et al. (2016), the existing laws and guidelines for the conservation heritage building are confusing due to the different authority control. The confusing existing laws and guidelines for the conservation heritage building will lead to the discrepancies of the standard procedure to preserve heritage building. Thus, it will affected the decision making to choose the suitable method to conserve the building because of the unclear laws and guidelines. This happened due to the jurisdiction of various agencies at different level for the heritage conservation (Said ShahrulYani et al., 2013). Jurisdiction of the various agencies such as government or private whether in federal, state and local will lead problem to maintain the national heritage. Therefore, it has to be solved by having standard guidelines of heritage conservation for every level to follow. This paper is endeavoured to investigate the challenges in heritage building conservation scope.
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2. Literature Review

2.1. Definition of Heritage Building

According to Forsyth (2013), defined heritage building as the monument which convey everlasting history and become the national treasure based on the features of the building. Besides that, Earl and Andrew (2015), mentioned heritage building portray sense of architectural applied at the building and it represent the artistic and cultural value adapted at the building. It is because heritage building was built during the past to meet the purpose of the building at that time. Dicks (2000), state that each of the heritage building has some certain reason behind the existence of the building based on the administration during that era. If the building was building during the colonial era it will carry the colonial sense at the building as the symbol of imperialism and colonization. Heritage building during the imperialism and colonial era will be used for the purpose of administration such as governor building, court, post office, prison and others.

2.2. Heritage Building Conservation in Malaysia

According the Eshak (2011), Malaysia is a country rich with historical value because our country has been colonized by the Portuguese (1511-1641), Netherlands (1641-1824), British (1824-1957) and Japan (1941-1945) for about 434 year of colonization. During the colonization at Malaysia, these colonialists left certain significance history value such as in aspect of culture, law, education, administration and building. Thus, it shows that buildings are one of aspect from the history. The building during the colonization era are gazetted as the heritage building and it is protected by the government in Malaysia. Heritage building in Malaysia are managed by Department of National Heritage under Ministry of Tourism and Cultural. Table 1 below show the statistic of national heritage in Malaysia.

| Category  | Type        | Total |
|-----------|-------------|-------|
| Site      | Building/monument | 50    |
|           | Archaeology  | 12    |
|           | Natural     | 7     |
| Total     |             | 69    |

Source: (Department of National Heritage, 2015)

According to the table 2.0 Statistic of National Heritage for Site by the Department of National Heritage (2015), national heritage for site consist of three type which are building or monument, archaeology and natural. Building or monument recorded as the highest national heritage at 50 number, archaeology heritage at 7 numbers and natural heritage at 7 numbers. The statistic shows that building or monument heritage are the highest in Malaysia. However, there is no data on the separation of the monument and building from this data. But, there are some lists of the buildings were gazetted under the national heritage site according to the department of National Heritage for each category of building type.

2.3. Challenges Aspect in Heritage Building Conservation

Aygen (2013), stated that the challenges aspect in heritage building conservation also not only focused on the building itself. But, there are another challenges aspect which influences the quality of the conservation work toward the heritage building conservation such as the environment and social influence.

2.3.1. Challenges in Building Aspect

Hisham and Hasnawyati (2015), stated that the main challenges in heritage building conservation are the aesthetic values of the building. It is because heritage buildings convey the sense of architectural, history, culture and people of the building. Each of heritage building will have different uniqueness of based on the history happened at the building. Pemića et al. (2015), also explained that the challenges to preserve the historic value of the building need to manage properly. It is because the heritage building means it carry the historic value with the building from the past. The historic value of the heritage building will indicate the value of the building from the heritage aspect. It is because some crucial historic incidents occur at the building during the past. Therefore, it is important to ensure that the conservation process at the heritage building should not effected the historic value of the building.

2.3.2. Challenges in Technicality Aspect

Based on Heritage and Steven (2011), it discussed about the conservator are lack of technical skill especially in heritage building conservation. Lack of skill by the conservator will effected the quality outcome from the conservation work. This also affected to the quality of the heritage building after the conservation work. Lack of technical skill by the conservator also will destroyed the detail architecture value of heritage building and reduce the quality of the building. Sodangi et al. (2011), also stressed about the architect which do not have enough experience to handle heritage building project will cause damages toward the building. It is because heritage building characteristic are totally different from the modern building which more sophisticated. Thus, architect should acquire skill to handle heritage building project to ensure the architectural sense and heritage value of the building are protected.
2.3.3. Challenges in Social Aspect

In addition, (Dian and Nuraisyah, 2013), stated that lack of awareness among the public in heritage building conservation also influence the quality of the building. It is because public awareness will contribute in the activity to conserve in heritage building conservation through the involvement with heritage activity. Yung and Edwin (2011), also stated that public participations are still low with the heritage program which leads to the lack of awareness of heritage in heritage conservation. Therefore, the participation of public are important in heritage building conservation to make sure heritage building are protected from destroyed.

2.3.4. Challenges in Environment Aspect

Furthermore, Omar et al. (2013), discussed that current project development around the heritage site effect the condition of the heritage building. The development will influence heritage building conservation from the threat of high rise building in aspect of view, quality and condition of the building. The development will cause pollution at the surrounding area of heritage building site. Harun and Izzamir (2011), also stated that pollution from the surrounding area will affect the aesthetic value of heritage building. Pollution will affect the quality of heritage building such as colour, texture and durability. Munarim and EnedirGhisi (2016), also stated there are abandoned heritage site without any proper conservation inspection from the authority. When heritage buildings are become abandoned heritage site the quality of the building will deteriorate and destroyed slowly. Besides that, abandoned heritage building also exposed to the vandalism activity which make the quality of heritage building worst. Adiwibowo et al. (2015), discussed that renovation and reuse the heritage building by the owner will treat the heritage building. Therefore, renovation and reuse should be observe and get approval from the authority. This to make sure the renovation and reuse will not destroyed the architectural value of heritage building.

3. Methodology

The research design for this study is based on the framework model to identify the challenges aspect in heritage building conservation among the users of the heritage building through the survey in the form of questionnaires. The aim of this study is to identify the challenges aspect in heritage building conservation. This study consist of four challenges aspect in heritage building conservation which are challenges in building aspect, technicality aspect, social aspect and environment aspect.

The process of data collection conducted for this research among the users and the unit of analysis is individual users. The individual users represent the participation of the user in order to achieve the objective of this research. Data collection process of this research was collected from Mac 2017 until April 2017. (Kumar and Promma, 2005), mentioned that the sampling method refer to the step starting from choosing the relevant data from the population of the research to ensure the detail evaluation and investigation of the sample chosen.

Questionnaire was distributed to the respondent for the data collection in order to determine the challenges aspect in heritage building conservation. The analysis method used for this study are descriptive analysis. The target population for this research are the group of users for the heritage site Georgetown, Penang. The users of the heritage building consist of the tourist which are local people and foreigner. Total population is 6,347,618 and sample size as recommended by Krejcie and Daryle (1970), is 384. All 127 questionnaires were returned in these study.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1. Demographic

Total respondents involved in this research are 127 respondents. The respondents involved in this research represent the users of heritage building at Georgetown, Penang area. The users of the heritage building consist of the local people and foreigner. The following data below shows the value of the respondent between the local people and foreigner. Table 2 shows the respondent nationality involved in this research.

| Nationality  | Frequency | Percentage (%) |
|--------------|-----------|----------------|
| Malaysian    | 106       | 83.5           |
| Non-Malay    | 21        | 16.5           |
| Total        | 127       | 100            |

Malaysian users have shown the higher number of users at 105 respondents (82.7%) because of the high number of local users at the heritage building site at Georgetown, Penang. While non-Malay shows 21 respondents (16.5%) from out of 127. The non-Malay consist of the foreigner from the Denmark, Greek, England, Nigeria, Jordan, Africa, Canada, Pakistan and Australia. These indicate that there is variety in nationality of the user at the heritage site.
### Table 3. Age of Respondents

| Age       | Frequency | Percentage (%) |
|-----------|-----------|----------------|
| 20 – 24   | 29        | 22.8           |
| 25 – 29   | 37        | 29.1           |
| 30 – 34   | 19        | 15.0           |
| 35 – 39   | 18        | 14.2           |
| 40 – 44   | 8         | 6.3            |
| 45 – 49   | 8         | 6.3            |
| 50 and above | 8      | 6.3            |
| Total     | 127       | 100            |

Besides that, this survey also found that the respondent age between 25-29 shows the highest number of respondent compared to the other age group with 37 respondent(29.1%) while respondent at age between 20-24 show the second highest with 29 respondent (22.8%). The age of respondent between 30-34 years ranked at third with 19 respondents (15.0%) and the fourth ranked are the age between 35-39 years with 18 respondents (14.2%). While the respondent from the age group of 40-44 years, 45-49 years and 50 years and above share the fifth ranked with 8 respondents (6.3%).

### 4.2. Challenges Aspect in Heritage Building Conservation

The results indicated that all the aspects discuss in the literature were influence the heritage building conservation. There are building aspect, technical aspect, social aspect, and environment aspect. In Table 4 shown the result based on survey that was conducted among the tourist in the research areas.

### Table 4. Challenges Aspect in Heritage Building Conservation

| Challenges in Building Aspect | Mean   |
|-------------------------------|--------|
| Building Aspect               | 4.2087 |
| Technical Aspect              | 3.6907 |
| Social Aspect                 | 4.3071 |
| Environment Aspect            | 3.9449 |

According to the result of the descriptive analysis, challenges related to the social indicate the highest value of mean at 4.3071. The highest value of mean for the challenges related to the social show that respondent identify the challenges related to the social aspect as the most influence challenges toward the effect of awareness in the heritage building conservation.

While challenges related to the technical aspect shows the lowest value of mean compared to the challenges on the social aspect. The value of mean for the challenges on technical aspect result at 3.6907. The value of mean for the challenges on technical aspect indicate that respondent identified the challenges related to the technical aspect as least influence toward the effect of awareness in heritage building conservation.

The challenges related to the building aspect show the mean value at 4.2087 following with the challenges related to the environment aspect at 3.9449 of mean value. Therefore, this result of the descriptive analysis show that the challenges related to the social aspect indicate as the highest level of response compare to the other challenges in heritage building conservation. Thus, the result indicate that the challenges related to the social aspect which are government and society as the most crucial criteria influence the awareness in the heritage building conservation.

### Table 5. Challenges Aspect in Social Aspect

| Challenges in Social Aspect                                      | Mean   | Ranked |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|--------|--------|
| Low involvement of young people with the heritage and conservation activity | 4.7402 | 1      |
| Public participation are still low with the heritage program    | 4.7087 | 2      |
| Lack of public awareness on heritage building conservation      | 4.6929 | 3      |
| Lack of collaboration project between public sector and private sector | 4.5748 | 4      |
| Education program related to the importance of heritage conservation are not comprehensive | 4.4724 | 5      |
| Lack of media support to spread the information of heritage conservation | 4.2362 | 6      |
| Lack of incentives for the heritage building project            | 3.9685 | 7      |
| Low enforcement for the heritage building conservation          | 3.9606 | 8      |
| Standard guideline are not comprehensive to conserve heritage building effectively | 3.7559 | 9      |
| There is no specific standard guidelines especially in maintenance work for heritage project | 3.6457 | 10     |
Based on the result, the challenges related to low involvement of young people with the heritage and conservation activity for social aspect recorded as the highest value of mean score at 4.7402. The highest value of mean score for the challenges related to low involvement of young people with the heritage and conservation activity show that respondent identify this challenges as the crucial challenges for social aspect in heritage building conservation. While challenges related to there is no specific standard guidelines especially in maintenance work for heritage project recorded as the lowest value of mean score at 3.6457 for social aspect. Challenges related to there is no specific standard guidelines especially in maintenance work for heritage project recorded as lowest value of mean score show that respondent identify this challenges as least challenges for social aspect in heritage building conservation.

Challenges related to the public participation are still low with the heritage program show the mean score at 4.7087 ranked as second followed by lack of public awareness on heritage building conservation the third ranked by the respondent with the mean score at 4.6929 for the challenges in social aspect. While, the fourth ranked of challenges of social aspect is challenges related to the lack of collaboration project between public sector and private sector with the value of the mean score at 4.5748 and followed by the challenges of the education program related to the importance of heritage conservation are not comprehensive ranked at the fifth by the respondent with the value of mean score at 4.4724. The analysis result for the challenges related to lack of media support to spread the information of heritage conservation show the mean score at 4.2362 at sixth ranked by the respondent in the social aspect while lack of incentive for the heritage building project ranked at seventh with the value of mean score at 3.9685. Challenges related to the low enforcement for the heritage building show the value of mean score at 3.9606 at eight ranked by the respondent. While, challenges of the standard guideline are not comprehensive to conserve heritage building effectively ranked at ninth by the respondent in the social aspect with the value of the mean score at 3.7559.

5. Conclusions

The conservation of heritage buildings faced challenges in many aspects, there are social aspect, building aspect, environment aspect, technical aspect. In perception of tourist that visit in heritage zone, they believed social aspect become the main challenge to conserve the heritage building because lack of public awareness. It clearly shows that the government need to emphasis on how to increase the awareness and involvement of public people in their programme on heritage building conservation.
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