

Semiotic knowledge toward heritage product in tourism industry:

A case of Terengganu

Muhamad Abi Sofian Bin Abdul Halim¹, Wan Asri Bin Wan Ab Aziz¹, Azman Bin Che Mat²

(1. Faculty of Business Management, MARA University of Technology, Terengganu 23000, Malaysia;

2. Academy of Language Studies, MARA University of Technology, Terengganu 23000, Malaysia)

Abstract: In order to provide an appropriate context for the current state of the heritage product in tourism industry, semiotic knowledge become an important role to know deeply the identity, philosophy, and also the meaning of behind the actual product. Scott (2000) stresses the requirement of aesthetic and semiotic content in a creative product, instead of creativity. But, how many of retailers and salespersons in heritage product believe the semiotic as knowledge to present the product and opportunities in their selling? According to Kotler (2000) a good personal selling will provide a detailed explanation or demonstration of the product. The message can be varied by the salesperson to fit the motivations and interests or each prospective customer. So, the purpose of this paper is to closely examine the level of awareness among retailers and salesperson toward the important of semiotic knowledge as part of strategic persuasion in a selling process. This survey study will develop a sample among retailers and salesperson in Kuala Terengganu as a respondent who give the feedback to fulfill the research questions.

Key words: semiotic; heritage product; personal selling; persuasion; tourism

1. Introduction

Terengganu is an area rich of traditional and heritage product like traditional food, batek, silk, songket, wood curving, music, dance, and others traditional product. The growth of tourism industry in Terengganu has contributed to the demand of local heritage product, and directly it will bring advantage to practitioners especially for those who are involved in producing, retailing, distributing and supplying in a heritage product. Actually, most of the tourist eager to visit Terengganu is caused by attraction of heritage resource. The demand of tourism product in certain country on global scale caused of environment, social-culture and also heritage. In fact, heritage become as the backbone of the UK tourism industry (DCMS and DTLR, 2001).

A good retailer or salesperson will have a selling strategy to communicate with potential buyers of a product with the intention of making a sale. Basically, personal selling focuses initially on developing a relationship with the potential buyer. Then, the primary role of salesperson is to persuade and encourage buyer make a decision to buy the product in retail. Information become a main tool to persuade and encourage the consumer makes decision

Muhamad Abi Sofian Bin Abdul Halim, MBA, senior lecturer of Faculty of Business Management, MARA University of Technology; research field: entrepreneurship.

Wan Asri Bin Wan Ab Aziz, Master, senior lecturer of Faculty of Business Management, MARA University of Technology; research field: operations management.

Azman Bin Che Mat, Master, senior lecturer of Academy of Language Studies, MARA University of Technology; research fields: linguistic and translation.

to buy the product. Normally, salespersons that have a semiotic knowledge will highly success to attract consumer to their product, especially for those who are involved with the heritage product in tourism market. Retailers and salespersons have to know the benefits of semiotic knowledge in heritage product in order to communicate with the tourist everyday. In fact, the knowledge of semiotic among salesperson and retailers also becomes easy to them to describe their product properly and make consumer become interested to buy the product. The success of any retailers in heritage product does not only depend on the core product itself, but it also will depend on how are they strategies persuasion and deliver the clear product information.

1.1 Heritage product in tourism industry

Malay culture has a symbolic and clearly describes social identity in term of attitude, thinking, and value. Basically, the term of culture include beliefs, values, attitudes, customs and institutions, which influence the way of life of a particular society. Taib Osman and Wan Abdul Kadir (1987) have highlighted that performance of culture, politic, economy and socio-organizing as a result of knowledge and the impact of belief, value, custom and attitude. Nowadays, the variables of beliefs, values, attitudes, and customs are highly contributed to the development of heritage product in tourism industry in Malaysia (Rais Yatim, 2006).

So, the implication of tourism is to revitalise the heritage and enhance it to promote heritage product, to nurture cultural knowledge, reinforce civic pride and national identity, and to facilitate economic development. The government of Terengganu since 2004 has adopted and implemented measures aimed at making the state an important tourist destination. Under *Rancangan Pembangunan Negeri Terengganu 2004 – 2008 (RPNT)*, tourism was tagged as one of the “growth poles” to propel national economic growth to high levels. Instead of hotel and restaurant services, telecommunication and efficient transportation system, the implication of tourism must be supported by good heritage products that meet international consumer standards.

The heritage tourism phenomenon has often been criticised for converting local cultures and lifestyles into commodities for sale to foreign audiences (Arthur, Mensah, 2006). However, it is possible for heritage entrepreneur to serve multiple products to tourist without altering the principle historical status and value. In fact, M. Taib Osman and Wan Kadir (1987) also highlighted that culture is not static and single direction, but it's dynamic to meet the societies' needs and want. Hence, the adaptive re-use of heritage product in modern culture are inspired by reasons to develop the product/service in tourism market, and the local retailer will benefit from the activity. But, how many of retailers and salespersons in Terengganu are able to describe the heritage product in a context to persuade and encourage modern consumers?

1.2 Definition of semiotic

The term of semantic is widely used in language study. The semantic study is engaged with meaning of words, phrases and so on, while the semiotic study is more general. The name itself comes from the Greek word for “mark” or “sign”, semeion, and was originally used by John Locke in his 1690 essay *Concerning Human Understanding* (although with a different spelling) (Paul Cobley and Litza Jansz, 1997). Philosophy of language pays more attention to natural languages or to languages in general, while semiotics focuses on non-linguistic signification. There were philosophers who are also linguists were interested in semiotic study like Ferdinand de Saussure (1857-1913) and Charles Sanders Peirce (1839-1914).

According to Dewan Bahasa's (2000) definition, semiotic is a study on signs and symbols and their relationships with things or idea intended as mentioned in Encarta (2008) an on line dictionary which cited as follow “the study of signs and symbols of all kinds, what they mean, and how they relate to the things or ideas they refer to”.

This discipline is frequently seen as having important anthropological dimensions. However, some semioticians focus on the logical dimensions of the science. They examine areas belonging also to the natural sciences — such as how organisms make predictions about, and adapt to, their semiotic niche in the world. In general, semiotic theories take signs or sign systems as their object of study: the communication of information in living organisms is covered in biosemiotics or zoosemiosis.

In this paper, semiotic is perceived on traditional based craft's product. These products such as batik, songket and mengkuang were believed for having semiotic background. The study will interpret semiotic term during the symbols, history, usefulness and the products. Any new information of these products which was not expected earlier will contribute to this study.

1.3 Problem statement

Lacking of semiotic knowledge among salesperson and retailers in selling their heritage product becomes a major problem. Actually, some buyers make a decision to buy a product because they have enough information about the product. Normally, clear information is a main factor for consumers to make a decision. But, how many retailers or salespersons in heritage product are able to explain the advantage of product to persuade or encourage consumer to buy the product in a context of semiotic knowledge. Hence, the purpose of this paper is to closely examine the level of awareness among retailers and salesperson toward the important of semiotic knowledge as part of strategic persuasion in a selling process.

Research on the knowledge, attitudes, and practices of the retailer regarding semiotics knowledge toward product heritage may help to inform policy-makers in Terengganu or Malaysia. Unfortunately, little or no research has been conducted in this area in the country. Therefore, the aim of our study is to evaluate the extent of the knowledge, attitudes and practice of semiotic knowledge in Terengganu with the view to identifying a plausible strategy for increasing the volume of sale to our product heritage. Our study focuses on knowledge, attitudes and practice of retailers or producers because the success of sale or demand is starting from them for industry in heritage and tourism in Malaysia.

1.4 Objectives

General Objective:

a. To study the knowledge, attitude and practice (KAP) are important of semiotic knowledge among retailers at Pasar Kedai Kepayang Kuala Terengganu from January to February 2008.

Specific Objectives:

b. To identify the level of knowledge on semiotic in general with reference to: symbol, explanation of story and functions of the product heritages.

c. To determine the attitude of retailers with regards to semiotic knowledge in the way of sale.

d. To determine the practice of retailers with regards to: lifestyle -regular exercise.

e. To find out the correlation between knowledge, attitude and practice regarding semiotics knowledge of the product among retailers.

2. Literature review

The field of semiotics emerged in the 19th century as a systematic way to study signs, both individually and as they appear grouped into symbol systems. Included in this concept is the study of how meaning is created, understood, and conveyed to others. As such, semiotics is a broad, cross-disciplinary endeavour that spans fields

such as philosophy, linguistics, sociology, and anthropology, to name a few. The name itself comes from the Greek word for “mark” or “sign”, *semeion*, and was originally used by John Locke in his 1690 essay *Concerning Human Understanding* (although with a different spelling) (Paul Cobley and Litza Jansz, 1997). It is perhaps useful to denote the unique characteristics that distinguish semiotics from other similar, related field; perhaps in this respect semiotics is easier to define by what it is not, rather than what it is.

Semiotics is not communication studies: while communication studies are interested in information theory, and how to most effectively transmit data from one point to another, utilizing the most efficient delivery method possible. Thus, communication theorists construct algorithms and models to explain the biology, psychology, and mechanics involved in this process. Obviously, once the data is received by the recipient, it must be decoded, and here is the tangential connection to semiotics; however, although there are shared concepts between the two fields, the emphasis between the two approaches is different (Daniel Chandler, 2006). Linguistics is a bit harder to distinguish, especially because of semiotics’ origins as a sub-discipline of linguistics.

Although both start from the same point, semiotics links linguistic and non-linguistic information to offer plausible conclusions that place the interpretation of language in a social context (sometimes termed the *semiosphere*). Pure linguistics takes on a more systematic approach, and deals with the lower-level components of languages, syntax and grammar. Possibly most challenging is the distinction between semiotics and the philosophy of language. It has been argued that the difference is one of traditions more than subjects, as different authors have called themselves “philosopher of language” or “semiotician” almost interchangeably. Philosophy of language pays more attention to natural languages or to languages in general, while semiotics focuses on non-linguistic signification.

3. Methodology

This cross-sectional survey was carried out in February 2008 at the *Pasar Kedai Kepayang* in Terengganu, which is one of the popular places for buying the heritage product in Terengganu. The *Pasar* too many heritage products of Terengganu which could be found in some where in Terengganu’s village. The products to be related in this study are categorized into four items as below:

(1) *Batik*: a fabric printed by an Indonesian method of hand-printing textiles by coating with wax the parts not to be dyed; also: the method itself (Mariam Webster Dictionary, 2008). There are differences between Malaysian method and Indonesian method on *batik*’s product.

(2) *Songket*: a fabric embroidered with gold or silver string (Kamus Dewan, 2000). The price of *songket* is normally expensive and been used during occasion such marriage, *Raya* and so on. *Songket* also has a name regarding to the price, place and history.

(3) *Mengkuang*: a plant known as *pandanus aurantiacus* is popular in craft product industry. Traditionally, Malay used this plant to make *mengkuang*’s mat, basket and cap. But nowadays they use *mengkuang* to create a craft product in difference and various shapes.

(4) Copper, Rattan & bamboo’s craft.

3.1 Population and sampling

The populations of the retailer at *Pasar Kedai Payang* in Kuala Terengganu are 100 retailers to sale product heritages like *Batik*, Copper, Rattan & bamboo’s craft, *Songket* and *Mengkuang* and Wood’s craft. A convenient sample of 31 retailer of the *Pasar Kedai Kepayang* retailer in Heritage product was selected for the study. Data

was collected by a self-administered questionnaire. A convenience sampling method was used. All retailers are eligible for the survey. However, only retailers who were present in the Pasar Kedai Kepayang at the time the study is conducted actually participated in the survey.

On the day of administration of the questionnaire, retailers who are found in the Pasar Kedai Kepayang are requested to answer the questionnaire. They are then informed of the survey, its objectives and procedures, and assured that the information collected would be treated as confidential and used only for research purposes. Retailers who gave their verbal informed consent were provided with the 2-page of self-administered questionnaire. They are also asked to request for clarification if any item in the questionnaire was not clear. The exercises take about a half hour.

3.2 Study instrument

We used a 2-page self-administered questionnaire for data collection. The questionnaire had both closed and open-ended questions. It was composed of two parts. The first part contained information on the demographic characteristics of the study participants. The second part has three sections A, B and C. Section A assessed the knowledge of retailers about semiotic knowledge; section B evaluated their attitudes while section C was concerned with their practices as regards semiotic knowledge.

We determined the knowledge about semiotic using five items rated on a five-point Likert scale as (1) very don't know (2) don't know (3) little bit know (4) know and (5) very know. The four questions to evaluate the level of knowledge about semiotics were: (1) "Do you know how to identify this product?" (2) "Do you know how to classify this product?" (3) "Do you understand how to explain the origin function of this product?" (4) "Do you know how to describe the symbolic/motif for this product?" (5) "Do you know what the story behind of symbol for this product is?"

The retailers' attitudes were measured using four items rated on a five-point Likert scale as (1) strongly disagree (2) disagree (3) Neither agree/Nor Disagree (4) agree and (5) strongly agree. The four items were: (a) "I would initiative to study or gain effort the information about the symbol of the product", (b) "The symbol must be added in the design of the product", (c) "I would recommend semiotic of the product to a customer" and (d) "Providing semiotic for the product would encourage our industry". We decided that a high score was indicative of positive attitude while a low score would be indicative of a negative attitude.

The questionnaire for part two in section C required the retailers to state their prior practice with semiotic knowledge practices. It consisted of three items rated on a five-point Likert scale as (1) very seldom, (2) seldom, (3) normal (4) often and (5) very often. The three items were: (a) "Base on you product knowledge, how often do you apply it in the promotion of product?" (b) "How often do you introduce more detail of the product?" and (c) "Do you use the product base on semiotic in your life?" We decided that a high score was indicative of positive practice while a low score would be indicative of a negative practice.

The test-retest reliability method was carried out on the items of the questionnaire to ascertain the reliability of the items and also the instrument as a whole. The first run of test, which was administered on 31 respondents, yielded the cronbach alpha reading of 0.863 for the component on knowledge, 0.795 for the component on attitude and 0.899 for the component on practice. The overall cronbach alpha reliability level of the all the components were 0.885, thus proving a strong reliability level.

Generally, the instrument possesses very strong reliability, mainly 0.8 and above. This will prove that the items and its sub-items in the instrument are very reliable and can be used confidently to measure the intended feedback from the respondents.

4. Statistical analyses and finding

The data was entered and analyzed with the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software programme (version 13.0). For descriptive statistics results were expressed in terms of proportions or percentages and for analytical statistics odds ratios were used to examine the relation between variables. The Pearson correlation analysis was used to examine the relationship between knowledge, attitude and practice.

Table 1 Demography by frequency and percentage

Variable	Frequency	Percentage	Mean	Standard deviation
Business status				
Producer	1	3.2	2.84	0.454
Distributor	3	9.7		
Retailer	27	87.1		
Main product				
Batik/Songket	18	58.1	1.90	1.274
Cooper	5	16.1		
Craft	2	6.5		
Gold	5	16.1		
Scarf	1	3.2		
Job position				
Owner	12	38.7	1.61	0.495
Worker/Salesman	19	61.3		
Race				
Malay	31	100.0	1.000	0.000
Gender				
Male	12	38.7	0.61	4.95
Female	19	61.3		
Marital status				
Single	11	35.5	1.45	0.675
Married	19	61.3		
Others	1	3.2		
Age				
Under 20 years	1	3.2	2.29	0.529
20 – 35 years	20	64.5		
36 – 65 years	10	32.3		
Number year of working				
Less than 1 year	6	19.4	3.32	1.536
1 – 2 years	4	12.9		
3 – 5 years	5	16.1		
6 – 10 years	6	19.4		
More than 10 years	10	32.3		
Education				
Primary school/UPSR	4	12.9	1.90	0.396
Secondary school/SRP/SPM	26	83.9		
STPM/Diploma	1	3.2		

The Table 1 has a listing for demography of respondents in this study. Researchers have identified nine factors to be concluded in this part. The first factor, business status has showed that most of the respondents are retailers which are 87.1% in percentage. The second one is main product which 58.1% of the respondents involving in Batik and Songket. The third factor, job position has proven most of the respondents are workers or salesmen. They are 61.3% compared to the owners who are 38.7%. The fourth factor informs that all the respondents are Malays. The gender, which is the fifth factor proves that female ratio is bigger with 61.3%. Looking at marital status as sixth factors, married respondents are the highest with 61.3%. Respondents in age between 20-35 years dominate this profession during this research was conducted as noted in seventh factors with

64.5%. This table also indicates 32.3% of the respondents have been involving for more than 10 years are the highest. Their education is really moderate with the highest percentage, 83.9% between Primary School with 12.9% and STPM/Diploma with 3.2%.

In summary, respondent's demography in this study is well collected. It will help researchers to find out the detail which will meet the objectives in this study. Table 2 will relate these factors to the domain analysis of the study.

Table 2 The respondents knowledge toward semiotic

	Item	Very don't know	Don't know	Little bit know	Know	Very know
1	Do you know how to identify this product?	2 (6.5%)	1 (3.2%)	9 (29.0%)	12 (38.7%)	7 (22.6%)
2	Do you know how to classify this product?	1 (3.2%)	2 (6.5%)	11 (35.5%)	9 (29.0%)	8 (25.8%)
3	Do you understand how to explain the origin function of this product?	1 (3.2%)	1 (3.2%)	10 (32.3%)	14 (45.2%)	5 (16.1%)
4	Do you know to describe the symbolic/motif for this product?	1 (3.2%)	2 (6.5%)	16 (51.6%)	6 (19.4%)	6 (19.4%)
5	Do you know what the story behind of symbol for this product is?	1 (3.2%)	6 (19.4%)	13 (41.9%)	6 (19.4%)	5 (16.1%)

Based on the Table 2, 19 respondents or 61.3% know and very know how to identify the products. 17 respondents or 54.8% know to classify the products. 19 (61.3%) respondents know and very know that they understand to explain the origin function. To describe the symbolic/motif for the product only 12 (3.8%) respondents know and very know and 16 (51.6%) just little bit know. Only 11 (35.5%) respondents know and very know and 13 (41.9%) respondents just little bit know the story behind of symbol for the product. So based on the result we can conclude the whole items in moderate level for knowledge among respondents toward semiotic.

Table 3 The respondents attitude toward semiotic

	Item	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree/Nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
1	I would initiative to study or gain effort the information about the symbol of the product	1 (3.2%)	3 (9.7%)	1 (3.2%)	18 (38.7%)	8 (25.8%)
2	The symbol must be added in the design of the product	1 (3.2%)	2 (6.5%)	6 (19.4%)	15 (48.4%)	7 (22.6%)
3	I would recommend semiotic of the product to a customer	0 (0.0%)	2 (6.5%)	4 (12.9%)	19 (61.3%)	6 (19.4%)
4	Providing semiotic for the product would encourage to our industry	1 (3.2%)	3 (9.7%)	6 (19.4%)	16 (51.6%)	5 (16.1%)

From the Table 3, 26 respondents or 64.5% agree and strongly agree that they would initiative to study or gain effort the information about the symbol of the product. 22 respondents or 71.0% agree and strongly agree that the symbol must be added in the design of the product. 25 (80.7%) respondents agree and strongly agree that they would recommend semiotic of the product to a customer. Only 21 (67.7%) respondents agree and strongly agree that providing semiotic for the product would encourage to our industry. So we can conclude the whole items in high good level for attitude among respondents toward semiotic knowledge in heritage product.

Table 4 The respondents practise toward semiotic

	Item	Very seldom	Seldom	Normal	Often	Very often
1	Base on you product knowledge, how often do you apply it in the promotion of product?	1 (3.2%)	7 (22.6%)	5 (16.1%)	11 (35.5%)	7 (22.6%)
2	How often do you introduce more detail of the product?	0 (0.0%)	4 (12.9%)	12 (38.7%)	8 (25.8%)	7 (22.6%)
3	Do you use the product based on semiotic in you life?	0 (0.0%)	4 (12.9%)	10 (32.3%)	11 (35.5%)	6 (19.4%)

Table 4 show 18 respondents or 58.1% often and very often that they apply semiotic knowledge in the promotion of product. Only 15 respondents or 48.4% often and very often those they introduce more detail of the product. 17 (54.9%) respondents often and very often those they using the product base on semiotic in their life. So we can conclude the whole items in moderate level for practice among respondents toward semiotic knowledge in heritage product.

Table 5 Respondents knowledge, attitude and practice with mean and standard deviation for demography

Variable	Knowledge		Attitude		Practise	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Business status						
Producer	3.0000	0.50332	3.5000	0.00000	2.3333	0.19245
Distributor	3.0667	0.84368	3.5000	0.25000	3.8889	0.98966
Retailer	3.6222	0.81970	3.8889	0.77625	3.5802	0.95527
Main product						
Batik/Songket	3.6556	0.73502	3.8889	0.51608	3.6481	0.90368
Cooper	3.1600	1.07145	3.1500	1.05475	3.2667	1.14018
Craft	4.1000	1.27279	4.5000	0.70711	4.3333	0.94281
Gold	3.2800	0.83187	3.9500	0.87321	3.4000	1.14018
Scarf	3.8000	0.0000	4.5000	0.00000	3.0000	0.00000
Job position						
Owner	3.5500	0.69348	3.8750	0.71111	3.4722	0.88144
Worker/Salesman	3.5474	0.90883	3.8158	0.77209	3.6316	1.01771
Race						
Malay	3.5484	0.81970	3.8387	0.73753	3.5699	0.95527
Gender						
Male	3.7667	0.93355	3.6250	0.98569	3.5278	1.03921
Female	3.4105	0.73174	3.9737	0.51299	3.5965	0.92682
Marital status						
Single	3.3818	0.68966	3.7727	0.64667	3.3636	0.87502
Married	3.6947	0.87526	3.8947	0.81358	3.6845	1.02724
Others	2.6000	0.00000	3.5000	0.00000	3.6667	0.00000
Age						
Under 20 years	2.6000	0.71163	3.5000	0.00000	3.6667	0.00000
20 – 35 years	3.3700	0.87939	3.9125	0.53971	3.3833	0.81846
36 – 65 years	4.0000	0.81970	3.7250	1.07658	3.9333	1.18426
Numbery year of working						
Less than 1 year	2.9667	0.34448	3.7917	0.43060	3.5556	0.62063
1 – 2 years	3.3000	0.47610	4.0000	0.20412	3.2500	0.73912
3 – 5 years	3.8400	1.06207	3.9500	0.67082	3.7333	1.25610
6 – 10 years	3.9333	1.04051	3.7917	1.05376	3.7222	1.18165
More than 10 years	3.6200	0.76855	3.7750	0.92384	3.5333	1.04468
Education						
Primary School/UPSR	3.3500	1.18181	3.0000	1.30703	3.7500	1.50000
Secondary School/SRP/SPM	3.5615	0.78998	3.9423	0.55366	3.5000	0.87560
STPM/Diploma	4.0000	0.00000	4.5000	0.00000	4.6667	0.00000

Table 5 shows the average or mean score and standard deviation (SD) for the demography of the respondents' knowledge, attitude and practise based on score scales of 1 to 5, with 5 as the highest and 1 as the lowest score of knowledge, attitude and practise among respondents toward semiotics knowledge in heritage product.

(a) Knowledge in semiotic

As for business status, the mean score for retailer is higher 3.6222 as compared to the distributor and producer towards the knowledge of semiotic. As for main product, those under the craft and others category show a higher mean at 4.1000 as compared to those scarf, batik and others. In term of job position it shows that those under the owner group has a higher mean score of 3.5500 as compared to the worker/salesman group with the mean score of 3.5474. As for gender, the mean score for male respondents is higher as compared to the females towards the knowledge of semiotic. As for marital status, those under the married show a higher mean as compared to those unmarried or singles others category. As for the age factor, it shows that the older the respondents the higher are the mean (4.0000). Based on the working year factor, those with 6–10 years category has a higher mean score of 3.9333 and followed by 3–5 years and more than 10 years more category. In education level, that is those with the higher level of education STPM/Diploma, shows a higher knowledge of 4.000 as compared to those with the low level of education.

(b) Attitude in semiotic knowledge

Respondent's attitude toward semiotic value in the heritage product has the highest mean score among retailers with 3.8889 as they are the big party in business status. While in product category, craft with two respondent and scarf with only one respondents show the highest mean score with 4.5000. Job position in this demography has no different in term of their attitude whether the owners or the workers both have 3.8750 and 3.8158. The gender and the marital status have a small gap as well. According to the gender, the female respondents have higher mean score compared to the male with 3.9737. Marital status shows the married respondents have the highest mean score with 3.8947 compared to single and others groups. The age and the year of working have an important impact on respondent's attitude. The age 20-35 with 20 respondents shows the highest mean score with 3.9125. As the year of working mentions that 1-2 duration has 4.000 mean score. The fact shows that the respondent with higher education level has more positive attitude with 4.5000.

(c) Practicing their knowledge of semiotic

Respondent's willingness to practise any semiotic value in the heritage product has the highest mean score among distributor with 3.8889 and there are only three of them. While in product category, craft group with two respondents has the highest mean score with 4.333. Job position in this demography has no different whether the owners or the workers both have 3.4722 and 3.6316. The gender and the marital status have a small gap as well. According to the gender, the female respondents have higher mean score compared to the male with 3.5965. Marital status shows the married respondents have the highest mean score with 3.6845 compared to single and others groups. The age and the year of working have an important impact on respondents practice. The age 36-65 with 10 respondents shows the highest mean score with 3.9333. As the year of working mentions that 3-5 duration has 3.7333 mean score. The fact shows that the respondent with higher education level has more positive practise with 4.6667.

Table 6 The correlations between knowledge, attitude and practise toward semiotic

	Knowledge	Attitude	Practise
Knowledge	1		
Attitude	0.264	1	
Practise	0.720**	0.379*	1

Notes: ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed); * Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

The relationship between knowledge and attitudes of respondents was investigated using the Pearson correlation analysis. From the results, there was statistically significant association between knowledge and attitudes towards semiotic with $r=0.720$ and $p=0.000$ at probability level of 0.01. Those with adequate knowledge generally showed favourable attitudes with regards to semiotic. And the attitude and practise show have relationship with $r=0.379$, $p=0.035$ at probability level of 0.05 toward semiotic knowledge.

5. Conclusion

Most retailers lacked adequate knowledge about the general semiotic knowledge of product heritage. Knowledge about how to describe the symbolic/motif for the product was low (3.8%) and only (35.5%) retailer had knowledge the story behind the symbol for the product. So this study has positively identified that the use of a certain strategy in the level of the semiotic knowledge, particularly in knowledge, attitude and practise does contribute towards an improved sale performance among the retailers. We hope that our study will provide baseline data to assist policy makers in developing appropriate evidence-based strategies to promote the use of semiotics knowledge in Malaysia heritage industries. We strongly recommend that strategies to promote semiotic knowledge among retailer be focused on spreading accurate information through information, education and communication by producer or designer of heritage product through develop better training to retailer, which have been found to be reliable and associated with good knowledge on semiotics.

References:

- Arthur, S. & Mensah, J. (2006). Urban management and heritage tourism for sustainable development: The case of Elmina cultural heritage and management programme in Ghana. *Management of Environmental Quality: An International Journal*, 17(3), 299-312.
- Daniel, C. (2006). *Semiotics: The basics*. Routledge, London.
- DCMS & DTLR. (2001). *The historic environment: A force for our future*. Department of Culture, Media and Sport, London.
- E. K. M. Masinambow & Rahayu S. Hidayat. (2001). *Semiotik: Mengkaji Tanda dalam Artifak*. Jakarta: Balai Pustaka.
- Johansen, J. D. & Larsen, S. E. (2002). *Signs in use: An introduction to semiotics*. London: Routledge.
- Kotler, Philip. (2000). *Marketing management*. The millennium edition, upper saddle river, Prentice Hall.
- M. Taib Osman & Wan Kadir. (1987). *Kajian Budaya dan masyarakat di Malaysia*. DBP: Kuala Lumpur.
- Paul, C., & Litza, J. (1997). *Introducing semiotics*. Totem Books, Cambrige.
- Scott. A. (2000). *The cultural economy of cities*. London: Sage.
- Teuku Iskandar & Baharuddin Iskandar. (2000). *Kamus Dewan (3rd ed.)*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa Dan Pustaka.
- Theo Van Leeuwen. (2005). *Introducing social semiotics*. London: Routledge.
- Umberto Eco. (1976). *A theory of semiotics*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Yayasan Pembangunan Usahawan Terengganu. (2003). Laporan Tahunan, Kuala Terengganu.
- Retrieved from <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Semiotics>.
- Retrieved from http://encarta.msn.com/dictionary_/semiotic.html.
- Retrieved from <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/semiotic>.

(Edited by Emily and Joy)