Annals of Library and Information Studies
Vol. 68, September 2021, pp. 294-299

A study on the relationship between awareness, dissemination and sharing of cultural heritage knowledge among the youth

Somipam R. Shimray[a] and Chennupati K. Ramaiah[b]

[a]Research Scholar, Department of Library & Information Science, Pondicherry University, Pondicherry, Email-srshimray@yahoo.com
[b]Professor, Department of Library & Information Science, Pondicherry University, Pondicherry, Email-ckramaiah.lis@pondiuni.edu.in

Received: 26 February 2021; revised: 19 July 2021; accepted: 05 August 2021

Through a questionnaire survey, the study has examined the relationship between awareness, dissemination and sharing of cultural heritage knowledge among the youth of Tangkhul tribe, Manipur, state. Factor analysis for the cultural heritage information (CHI) requirements produced two factors i.e. awareness and dissemination, and factor analysis for sharing cultural heritage knowledge resulted in six factors, namely: rewards, intention to share, expected relationship, enjoy helping, self-efficacy and reciprocity. Multiple regression analysis was carried out and it was found that "intention to share" is the most vital variable affecting awareness on cultural heritage knowledge with β-value=0.152, p-value=0.031 and R-value=0.118. Similarly, the Beta coefficients of rewards (β=0.141; p-value=0.015) and self-efficacy (β=0.244; p-value=0.000) are the most significant variables affecting dissemination on cultural heritage knowledge with R-value=0.131. This study enables us to understand the most sought cultural heritage information needs i.e. awareness. Youth seek cultural heritage information to make themselves aware about their rich culture and determine factors for sharing cultural heritage knowledge.

Keywords: Cultural heritage; Information needs; Information dissemination, Tangkhul tribe

Introduction

Cultural heritage is a collection of cultural practices carried forward in human lives and passed on to the younger generations[1]. It symbolizes the human state in the face of life, explaining the evidence for a way of life[2], revealing the features of a historical article with the exemplification of morals, perceived over several eras, which have endured from past to present[1]. Percolating cultural heritage is possible through creating awareness. The most essential quality of creating awareness is to transmit cultural values of a society to the younger generations[3] enabling to preserve the traditional values of a community. Cultural heritage research aims at creating awareness, maintaining, preserving and educating the younger generations about their rich cultural heritage. Creating cultural heritage awareness, disseminating and sharing cultural heritage among the youth is vital to carry on society's cultural practices[4]. Research on sharing and creating awareness of cultural heritage contributes to the people, communities and society at large[5].

Knowledge is considered as the key reason of competitive advantage in knowledge society[6]. Knowledge is required for development, long term sustainability and achievement of the society[7]; consequently, knowledge is dominant resources for a society[8]. Knowledge sharing is a process over which knowledge is shared among communities, friends, families, etc. There has been no quantitative research conducted in the Tangkhul community in determining the relationship between awareness, dissemination and sharing of cultural heritage knowledge among the youth. This paper attempts to determine the above mentioned relationship.

Review of literature

The Tangkhul tribe is one of the chief Naga tribes of Manipur occupying the north-eastern part of the state[9]. The Tangkhul are settled in Ukhrul and Kamjong districts. Marginal Tangkgul population are found in Senapati, Chandel, Thoubal, Tamenglong and Imphal East districts in Manipur state and Somra Tangkhul hills in Myanmar (Burma). The Tangkhuls and other Naga tribes such as Angamis, Chakhesangs, Maos, Poumais, Marams and Thangals have diaspora references from Makhel, a Mao village in Senapati district, Manipur. They had also elevated megaliths at Makhel in commemoration of their having spread from there to diverse directions. There are numerous

theories on the history of the Tangkhul tribe, yet it remains argumentative because of the nonexistence of documentary proofs'. Horam[10] perceived that the Tangkhuls tribe considered Makhel presently located in the north district of Manipur as their place of origin and this theory is predominant among the Northern Tangkhuls, also called Raphei.

Describing culture is challenging, intricate and demanding[11]. Culture is an integral theory within sociology. It plays an essential part in social life, vital for determining social relations, keeping and challenging social direction, and determining the daily activities and involvements in society. It is the characteristic and understanding of a specific group of individuals comprising religion, language, food, social practices, music and arts[12]. Cultural heritage is considered as an accumulation of data in which human beings practice, gather, develop, improve and maintain endurance by passing it on to the younger generations[1].

Cultural heritage awareness can be created through education. Inculcating cultural heritage awareness at younger ages effectively conserves cultural heritage[1]. Diverse methods are used to create cultural heritage awareness, extending from a wide range of courses committed to cultural themes[13], virtual classrooms[14], heritage festivals, freedom walks, heritage trails & walks, heritage awards, street plays, heritage sites and heritage newspapers[3,15]. The good strategy is to educate individuals so that they acquire a sense of belonging and thus achieve to own their cultural heritage[16]. Hence cultural heritage awareness programs are vital for safeguarding and imparting traditions to the younger generations who will be accountable for future resources[17]. Cultural heritage education is essential in understanding the significance of cultural heritage[18]. Tapan[14] stated that creating cultural heritage awareness is a vital component for the conservation of cultural heritage. Society has the primary accountability for the maintenance and continued existence of cultural heritage[16].

Knowledge sharing is a charitable activity, it is enhanced by sharing. Sharing expertise, sharing know-how and sharing skills have been issues among the youth[19,20]. There are several influences on sharing cultural heritage knowledge[21,22]. Okyere-Kwakye & Nor[23] deliberated on individual factors and knowledge sharing and also quantified that the elements that affect knowledge sharing are "altruism", "self-efficacy", "mutual reciprocity" and "trust". Bock, Zmud, Kim, & Lee[24] examined behavioural intention in knowledge sharing and stated two elements i.e., first and second-order factors. First-order factor variables comprise "anticipated extrinsic rewards", "anticipated reciprocal relationships", "sense of self-worth", "fairness", "affiliation" and "innovativeness". Second-order factors contain "attitude toward knowledge sharing", "subjective norm", "organization climate" and "intention to share knowledge" as behavioral intention in knowledge sharing. The authors explained that individuals share their knowledge when they anticipate rewards.

Bartol and Srivastava[25] discovered that rewards are the most significant incentive to share knowledge. An individual who shares knowledge anticipates others to also share knowledge with them[26], reciprocity ensures continuous exchanges of knowledge[27], and people who have confidence in reciprocity incline to share their knowledge[28]. Enjoyment in helping is a strong motivator in sharing knowledge[29]. Individuals willingly disseminate knowledge to develop a relationship with others[30]. Individual awareness determines the intention to share knowledge[31,32]. Bock, Zmud, Kim, & Lee[24] indicated that knowledge disseminators are encouraged by rewards to share their knowledge. Moreover, Ajzen[33] specified that self-efficacy is measured as the self-motivator for disseminating knowledge; individuals with the self-assurance of sharing knowledge are more enthusiastic in sharing knowledge with others[34].

In light of the literature review, it is imperative to examine the relationship between awareness, dissemination and sharing of cultural heritage knowledge among the youth.

Objective of the study

- To examine the association between awareness, dissemination and sharing of cultural heritage knowledge.

Research hypotheses

H1: There is a positive relationship between cultural heritage knowledge sharing and awareness.

H2: There is a positive relationship between cultural heritage knowledge sharing and dissemination.

Methodology

The study's target population is Tangkhul youth staying in and outside the state of Manipur, India. The research instrument was developed after a thorough review of published literature on cultural heritage awareness, dissemination and sharing of cultural

heritage knowledge. The survey method and questionnaire tool were chosen for conducting this study. The selected questionnaire consists of 8 variables related to cultural heritage information (CHI) needs and 34 variables related to knowledge sharing on cultural heritage. A five-point Likert scale was used for all the variables. Based on Connelly[35], a sample size of 10% was collected to test the validity. Thus, a pilot study was conducted by collecting data from 50 respondents.

For this study, 500 questionnaires were distributed, of which 418 questionnaires were returned, however; 18 questionnaires were rejected since they were incomplete. The respondents for this study were selected by employing a stratified random sampling method. Table 1 represent descriptive statistics of the respondents, of which 51% of the respondents were female, 28.5% of the respondents were between the ages of 24-26 years, 50.5% of the respondents were postgraduates, 34.5% of the respondents belong to arts subject backgrounds, 32% of the respondents belong to the northern part of the Tangkhul region, 52.3% of the respondents stay in Manipur, and 24.5% of their family annual income is in between INR 1,00,001 – 3,00,000.

Table 1 — Descriptive statistics of the respondents

Variable	Classification	No.	%
Gender	Male	196	49.0
	Female	204	51.0
Age (in years)	18-20	70	17.5
	21-23	105	26.3
	24-26	114	28.5
	27-29	71	17.8
	30 & above	40	10.0
Educational Qualification	Graduate	198	49.5
	Postgraduate	202	50.5
Subject background	Arts	138	34.5
	Science	108	27.0
	Technical	90	22.5
	Management/Commerce	64	16.0
Region	North	129	32.3
	East	92	23.0
	South	89	22.3
	West	90	22.5
Current place of residence	In the state of Manipur	209	52.3
	Outside the state of Manipur	191	47.8
Family annual income (INR)	Less than 1,00,000	74	18.5
	1,00,001 – 3,00,000	98	24.5
	3,00,001 – 5,00,000	89	22.3
	5,00,001 – 7,00,000	96	24.0
	7,00,001 – 9,00,000	20	5.0
	9,00,001 and above	23	5.8

Analysis and findings

Reliability test

A reliability test was carried out to determine the internal consistency of the instrument. Cronbach[36] stated that an alpha value greater than 0.7 designates that the instruments have internal consistency. The alpha value for this study is higher than 0.7 (Table 2); thus, the construct is suitable to progress for further analysis.

Cultural heritage information needs

A principal component factor analysis with a Varimax rotation was engaged to present the motives in seeking cultural heritage information. Table 3 presents that the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy is 0.876. According to Kaiser[35], if the KMO test value is at 0.5 or greater, then the data is suitable to progress for further analysis. In this study, the p=0.000 value is less than 0.05, indicating a relationship between the variables.

All the variables went through factor analyses and factors with an Eigenvalue greater than 1 were favored in this study. Table 4 presents the outcome of the eight variables that encouraged the Tangkhul youth to seek cultural heritage information. Factor analysis yielded two factors that motivate the youth to seek cultural heritage information, “awareness” and “dissemination”. From the two factors, “awareness” is

Table 2 — Reliability statistics

Construct	No. of items	Cronbach’s Alpha
Cultural Heritage Information Needs		
Awareness	4	0.830
Dissemination	4	0.805

Table 3 — KMO and Bartlett's Test

Test Name		Value
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		0.876
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	1402.689
	df	28
	Sig.	.000

Table 4 — Factor analysis of CHI needs

Factors	Loading	Eigenvalue	Variance	Reliability
Awareness		4.271	53.389	0.830
A1	0.834			
A2	0.829			
A3	0.800			
A4	0.546			
Dissemination		1.051	13.134	0.805
D1	0.868			
D2	0.851			
D3	0.570			
D4	0.557			

the most important reason for seeking cultural heritage information with an Eigenvalue of 4.271 and a variance value of 53.389, followed by "dissemination" with an Eigenvalue of 1.051 and a variance value of 13.134.

Knowledge sharing

Factor analysis was carried out to reduce an excessive number of variables into fewer factors. It excerpts maximum common variance from all variables and places them into a standard score. Principal component factor analysis with a Varimax rotation was carried out to explain the relation with variables used for sharing cultural heritage knowledge. Table 5 outlines the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) quantity of sampling adequacy as 0.919. Conferring to Kaiser[37], if the KMO test is at 0.5 or more, then the data is appropriate to continue for further study. Therefore, in this study, the p=0.000 value is less than 0.05, indicating an association between the variables.

The factor analyses generated six factors, defined as rewards, intention to share, expect a relationship, enjoy helping, self-efficacy and reciprocity (Table 6), explaining 60.11% of the total variance. Cronbach's alpha value was measured for the entire variable to examine internal connectivity and was found to have acceptable internal consistency reliabilities, which is greater than 0.70 ($\alpha > 0.70$)[38]. Out of the motives to share cultural heritage knowledge, "*rewards*" with eight variables is the most important reason to share cultural heritage knowledge, having an Eigenvalue of 10.950 and 31.287% of the variance.

Table 5 — KMO and Bartlett's Test

Test Name		Value
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.919
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	6674.193
	df	561
	Sig.	.000

Table 6 — Factor analysis of knowledge sharing

Factors	Loading	Eigen values	Variance	Reliability
Rewards		10.950	31.287	0.869
REW1	0.808			
REW2	0.769			
REW3	0.716			
REW4	0.712			
REW5	0.711			
REW6	0.687			
REW7	0.528			
REW8	0.475			
Intention to share		3.608	10.309	0.867
IS1	0.775			
IS2	0.763			
IS3	0.709			
IS4	0.668			
IS5	0.643			
IS6	0.519			
IS7	0.468			
IS8	0.402			
Expect relationship		1.594	7.462	0.842
ER1	0.679			
ER2	0.672			
ER3	0.633			
ER4	0.579			
ER5	0.509			
ER6	0.491			
ER7	0.433			
Enjoy helping		10401	4.004	0.819
EH1	0.770			
EH2	0.665			
EH3	0.644			
EH4	0.625			
Self-efficacy		1.244	3.555	0.763
SE1	0.689			
SE2	0.687			
SE3	0.683			
SE4	0.557			
Reciprocity		1.224	3.497	0.750
RCPT1	0.754			
RCPT2	0.712			
RCPT3	0.646			

Results and discussion

Multiple regression analysis was engaged to verify the stated hypotheses. Tables 7 and 8 present the multiple regression analysis with respect to effect of rewards, intention to share, expected relationship, enjoy helping, self-efficacy, reciprocity on cultural heritage awareness and cultural heritage dissemination. The knowledge sharing factors are measured as an independent variable and cultural heritage awareness and cultural heritage dissemination are considered as the dependent variables.

Table 7 presents the F-value and p-values, which determine that knowledge sharing factors (rewards, intention to share, expected relationship, enjoyment in helping, self-efficacy and reciprocity) can be used as a liable forecaster of awareness on cultural heritage knowledge. The Beta coefficients designate that the knowledge sharing factor of 'intention to share' is the most vital variable affecting understanding on cultural heritage knowledge with β=0.152 and p-value=0.031. The R-square value determines that the knowledge sharing attributes have R=0.118% significant prediction on awareness of cultural heritage knowledge (i.e. 11% variance of the dependent variable is

Table 7 — Relationship between cultural heritage knowledge sharing and awareness

	Awareness		
Variables	Beta	t-value	p-value
Rewards	-0.059	-1.014	0.311
Intention to share	0.152	2.170	0.031
Expect relationship	0.077	1.035	0.301
Enjoy helping	0.064	0.984	0.326
Self-efficacy	0.086	1.368	0.172
Reciprocity	0.082	1.336	0.182
F value		8.795	
R		0.344	
R Square		0.118	

Table 8 — Relationship between cultural heritage knowledge sharing and dissemination

	Dissemination		
Variables	Beta	t-value	p-value
Rewards	0.141	2.449	0.015
Intention to share	0.107	1.540	0.124
Expected relationship	-0.067	-0.912	0.362
Enjoyment in helping	-0.009	-0.142	0.888
Self-efficacy	0.244	3.916	0.000
Reciprocity	0.019	0.317	0.751
F-value		9.904	
R		0.362	
R-Square		0.131	

described by the independent variables) at 1% significance level. The R-square value (0.118) is low in this study as this study was not focused on testing model, therefore, the explanatory variables in this study do not explain change in most of the dependent variable except showing a change with intention to share. This study is in line with Ajzen & Fishbein[31] and Bhattacherjee[32], which explained that an individual's awareness explains their primary intentions in sharing knowledge.

Knowledge sharing can be measured as an activity of social exchange. Bock, Zmud, Kim, & Lee[24] stated that knowledge disseminators are motivated by rewards to share their knowledge. Further, Bock, Zmud, Kim, & Lee[24] said that individuals share their expertise with others while expecting some kind of reward. Similarly, Bartol & Srivastava[25] also confirmed that rewards are the most vital motivator for knowledge sharing. Furthermore, Ajzen[32] detailed that self-efficacy is considered as the self-motivator for disseminating knowledge; people with self-reliance are more willing to share knowledge with others[34].

Table 8 presents the F-value and p-values determine that knowledge sharing factors (rewards, intention to share, expected relationship, enjoyment in helping, self-efficacy and reciprocity) can be used a viable forecaster disseminating cultural heritage knowledge. The Beta coefficients designated that knowledge sharing because of "rewards" (β=0.141; p-value=0.015) and "self-efficacy" (β=0.244; p-value=0.000) are the most vital variables affecting dissemination of cultural heritage knowledge.

R-square value R=0.131% determines that the knowledge sharing attributes have a significant prediction on the dissemination of cultural heritage knowledge (i.e. 13% variance of the dependent variable is described by the independent variables) at 1% significance level. The R-square value (0.131) is low in this study as this study was not focused on testing model, therefore, the explanatory variables in this study do not explain change in most of the dependent variable except showing a change with rewards and self-efficacy. This study is in line with findings of Bock, Zmud, Kim, & Lee[24]; Bartol & Srivastava[25]; Ajzen[33] and Bock & Kim[34].

Conclusion

This study enables an understanding of the most sought cultural heritage information needs and knowledge sharing in cultural heritage. Further, this study suggests that intention to share, rewards and self-efficacy are significant influencers in sharing cultural heritage knowledge. Similar research can be conducted with teachers, parents and the elderly in the society, who are often considered to be powerful cultural heritage knowledge holders.

References

1 Islamoglu Ö, The importance of cultural heritage education in early ages, *The International Journal of Educational Sciences*, 22 (1-3) (2018) 19-25.

2 Alivizatou M, Contextualising intangible cultural heritage in heritage studies and museology, *International Journal of Intangible Heritage*, 3 (2008) 43-54.

3 Srivastava S, A study of awareness of cultural heritage among the teachers at university level, *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 3 (5) (2015) 336-344.

4 Öcal T and Altuner H, The importance of historical and cultural heritage of niğde in terms of cultural geography, *Current Urban Studies*, 2 (2014) 74-82.

5 Boyd W E, The significance of significance in cultural heritage studies: a role for cultural analogues in applied geography teaching, *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 20 (3) (1996) 295-304.

6 Stewart T and Ruckdeschel C, Intellectual capital: The new wealth of organizations, *Performance Improvement*, 37 (7) (1998) 56–59.

7 Nonaka I and Takeuchi H, The knowledge-creating company: How Japanese companies create the dynamics of innovation, (Oxford University Press; Oxford), 1995.

8 Choe J M, The consideration of cultural differences in the design of information systems, *Information & Management,* 41 (5) (2004) 669-684.

9 Ruivah K. Social Change Among the Nagas (Tangkhul), (Cosmo Publications; New Delhi), 1993.

10 Horam M, Social and cultural life of nagas. (B.R. Publishing Corporation; New Delhi), 1977.

11 Cobley P, Culture: definitions and concepts. In W. Donsbach, the international encyclopedia of communication, (Wiley-Blackwell; Hoboken), 2008, p. 6038

12 Zimmermann K A, What is culture (2017). Available at: https://www.livescience.com/21478-what-is-culture-definition-of-culture.html (accessed on 25 October 2020)

13 Lockhart J S and Resick L K, Teaching cultural competence: The value of experiential learning and community resources, *Nurse Educator,* 22 (3) (1997) 27-31.

14 Jackson C, Yorker B and Mitchem P, Teaching Cultural diversity in a virtual classroom, *Journal of Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Nursing,* 9 (4) (1996) 40-42.

15 Shankar B and Swamy C, Creating awareness for heritage conservation in the city of Mysore: Issues and Policies, *International Journal of Modern Engineering Research,* 3 (2) (2013) 698-703.

16 Tapan M, Our problems of conservation architecture and urbanization, (Republic Books; Istanbul), 2014.

17 Lambert C A, Heritage education in the postmodern curriculum, (University of Pennsylvania; Pennsylvania), 1996.

18 Copeland T, Heritage and education: a European perspective. Keynote speech at the nostra forum (2004). Available at <http://www.europanostra.org/documents/> (accessed on 1 Oct 2020).

19 Taylor H, Tacit Knowledge: conceptualizations and operationalizations, *International Journal of Knowledge Management,* 3 (3) (2007) 60-73.

20 Chen C C, Factors affecting high school teachers' knowledge-sharing behaviors, *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal,* 39 (7) (2011) 993-1008.

21 Joia L A and Lemos B, Relevant factors for tacit knowledge transfer within organisations, *Journal of Knowledge Management,* 14 (3) (2010) 410-427.

22 Li Z, Zhu T and Wang H, Study on the influencing factors of the intention to share tacit knowledge in the university research team, *Journal of Software,* 5 (5) (2010) 538-545.

23 Okyere-Kwakye E, and Nor K M, Individual factors and knowledge sharing, *American Journal of Economics and Business Administration,* 3 (1) (2011) 66-72.

24 Bock G W, Zmud R W, Kim Y G and Lee J N, Behavioural intention formation in knowledge sharing: examining the roles of extrinsic motivators, socio-psychological forces and organizational climate, *Management Information Systems Quarterly,* 29 (1) (2005) 87-111.

25 Bartol K M and Srivastava A, Encouraging knowledge sharing: the role of organizational reward systems, *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies,* 9 (1) (2002) 64–76.

26 Blau P M, Exchange and power in sociai life, (Wiley; New York), 1964

27 Lin H F, Effects of extrinsic and intrinsic motivation on employee knowledge sharing, *Journal of Information Science,* 33 (2) (2007) 135–149.

28 Chiu C M, Hsu M H and Wang E T, Understanding knowledge sharing in virtual communities: An integration of social capital and social cognitive theories, *Decision Support Systems,* 42 (3) (2006) 1872-1888.

29 Wasko M M and Faraj S, Why should i share? Examining social capital and knowledge contribution in electronic networks of practice, *Management Information Systems Quarterly,* 29 (1) (2005) 35-57.

30 Huang Q, Davison R M and Gu J, Impact of personal and cultural factors on knowledge sharing in China, *Asia Pacific J Manage,* 25 (3) (2008) 451–471.

31 Ajzen I and Fishbein M, Understanding attitudes and predicting social behavior, (Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs), 1980

32 Bhattacherjee A, Understanding information systems continuance: An expectation-confirmation model, *MIS Quarterly,* 25 (3) (2001) 351-370.

33 Ajzen I, Perceived behavioral control, self-efficacy, locus of control, and the theory of planned behavior, *Journal of Applied Social Psychology,* 32 (4) (2002) 665 - 683.

34 Bock G W and Kim Y G, Breaking the myths of rewards: An exploratory study of attitudes about knowledge sharing, *Information Resources Management Journal,* 15 (2) (2002) 14-21.

35 Connelly L M, Pilot studies, *Medsurg Nursing,* 17 (6) (2008) 411-412.

36 Cronbach L J, Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests, *Psychometrika,* 16 (3) (1951) 297-334.

37 Kaiser H F, An index of factorial simplicity, *Psychometrika,* 39 (1) (1974) 31-36.

38 Gaur A S and Gaur S S, Statistical methods for practice and research: A guide to data analysis using SPSS, (Sage Publications; New Delhi), 2009.