

**Factors of Awareness, Problems and Recommendations
Towards Conservation of Cultural Heritage Handicraft :
a Case Study of Aranyik Knives Conservation,
Pha Nakhon Sri Ayutthaya Province**

เกศรินทร์ ธารีเทียน¹

Kessarin Tharethian¹

วิลาศินี อโนมะศิริ²

Wilasinee Anomasiri²

Abstract

The objectives of this research are to study level of awareness, factors of awareness, problems and recommendations towards conservation of cultural heritage handicraft : a case study of Aranyik knives conservation, Pha Nakhon Sri Ayutthaya Province. Quantitative research was employed. A questionnaire survey was conducted with 355 respondents who were above 18 years old and lived in Tha Chang sub-district, Nakhon Luang District, Pha Nakhon Sri Ayutthaya Province for at least 5 years. The quantitative analysis included descriptive statistics, t-test, and one way ANOVA.

The study result found that the awareness of the respondents towards Aranyik knives conservation was low. The factors significantly related to people awareness towards

¹Student of Master of Arts Programme in Environmental Social Sciences, Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities, Mahidol University.

²Advisor and Chairman of the thesis Committee, Master of Arts Programme in Environmental Social Sciences, Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities, Mahidol University.

conservation of cultural heritage (Aranyik knives) included duration of stay ($p\text{-value} = 0.05$) as well as knowledge and valuation of cultural heritage ($p\text{-value} = 0.01$). The problems of Aranyik knives conservation included lack of inheritance to the next generation, lack of production technology, and lack of communication.

This research recommends the collaboration between government agencies and local people to indicate supporting measures to conserve local cultures. The handicraft center (Aranyik knives) should be established to present origin, culture, tradition, local way of life, and local wisdom. Marketing strategies should be applied to promote the identity of local products. In additions, the activities should be set up with young generation in the community to increase awareness towards cultural heritage conservation.

Keywords : Conservation, cultural heritage, handicraft

Introduction

The way of life of people in society has been rapidly changed due to accelerated development in the country. The globalization has brought about external cultures without appropriate integration to the traditional culture. As a result, the cultural identity has been declined and misplaced. It is normally accepted that culture is one of social capital and it is as important as economic capital. The value of cultural capital will be increased when people use it appropriately. The cultural capital will be developed when the users understand, aware, and admire values of the culture (Office of the National Economic and Social Development Council, 2008 : 19-30).

Phra Nakhon Si Ayutthaya is a world heritage and was the capital of Thailand for 417 years. Ayutthaya is important for historical identity in terms of physical, history, and civilization. Many archeological sites were situated in the area reflecting prosperity in the past. The city-state of Ayutthaya was founded in 1350. Art and culture in Ayutthaya era was influenced by the royalty, Buddhism, and Sukhothai cultures. Later, Ayutthaya art and culture has influenced the present architecture, sculpture, painting, minor art, performing art, literature, tradition, and Buddhism. Ayutthaya culture in early and late period was related to the royalty and Buddhism. The cultural heritages in Phra Nakhon Si Ayutthaya Province include local handicrafts such as Aranyik knives, Khon mask, leaf weaving, local doll making, Thai house, and cotton candy.

“Aranyik knife” is a traditional Thai handicraft reflecting way of life in local level and national level. Aranyik knife handicraft is under the provincial development plan 2018-2022, issue 3 re agricultural, industrial, merchant, and service development by using creative innovation and indigenous knowledge, objective 3.3 to promote community products and SME (source : Phra Nakhon Si Ayutthaya Development Plan 2018-2022, Strategic Unit, Phra Nakhon Si Ayutthaya Provincial Office, 2018). In additions, knife was a first tool that human created to use in many activities. Thus, Aranyik knife is a heritage culture and living culture that reflect root of the community. The future generation should conserve this valuable cultural heritage.

From the above reasons, the researcher would like to study the awareness of people towards the conservation of cultural heritage handicraft : a case study of Aranyik knives conservation, Pha Nakhon Sri Ayutthaya Province. The study in this research included factors of awareness, problems and recommendations towards conservation of cultural heritage (Aranyik knives). The research result could be used as database to set up sustainable development and tourism plan for Ayutthaya heritage city.

Objectives

1. To study level of people awareness towards conservation of cultural heritage handicraft : a case study of Aranyik knives conservation, Pha Nakhon Sri Ayutthaya Province
2. To study factors of awareness towards conservation of cultural heritage handicraft : a case study of Aranyik knives conservation, Pha Nakhon Sri Ayutthaya Province
3. To investigate problems and to propose recommendations towards conservation of cultural heritage handicraft : a case study of Aranyik knives conservation, Pha Nakhon Sri Ayutthaya Province

Material and methods

The target group of this study included 355 respondents who were above 18 years old and lived in Tha Chang sub-district, Nakhon Luang District, Pha Nakhon Sri Ayutthaya Province for at least 5 years. The questionnaire included 6 parts as follows;

Part 1 personal factors i.e. sex, age, education level, origin and socio-economic factors i.e. occupation, income, number of family member, and duration of stay in Pha Nakhon Sri Ayutthaya Province

Part 2 knowledge of cultural heritage conservation (Aranyik knives)

Part 3 information perception of cultural heritage conservation (Aranyik knives) i.e. source of information, and frequencies of information

Part 4 valuation of cultural heritage (Aranyik knives)

Part 5 awareness towards conservation of cultural heritage (Aranyik knives)

Part 6 problems, obstacles, and suggestions to increase awareness of cultural heritage conservation (Aranyik knives)

Results

Personal factor

Most of the respondents were female (55.2%) in age 34-50 years old (43.7%). Most of the respondents graduated primary school and lower (27.9%) and 89 percent of the respondents had origin in Pha Nakhon Sri Ayutthaya Province.

Socio-economic factor

Most of the respondents were company staffs/general employees (54.6%). The average income of household was 10,001-15,000 Baht per month (40.6%). The number of household family was 4-6 persons (70.4%). The duration of stay in Pha Nakhon Sri Ayutthaya Province was 36-53 years (35.5%).

Supporting factor

Most of the respondents had knowledge about cultural heritage conservation (Aranyik knives) in medium level (60.3%). The information perception towards cultural heritage conservation (Aranyik knives) was low (49.3%). The valuation of cultural heritage (Aranyik knives) was low (45.6%) and the awareness towards cultural heritage conservation (Aranyik knives) was low (71.3%).

Level of awareness towards cultural heritage conservation (Aranyik knives)

The result found that the level of awareness of most respondents was low (28 scores and less, 71.3%), followed by high (33 scores and above, 16.3%) and medium (29-32 scores, 12.4%). The average score was 26.43. S.D. was 5.05. The maximum score was 39, while the minimum score was 16.

The analysis of the differences between personal factors and awareness towards cultural heritage conservation (Aranyik knives) through One-Way Analysis of Variance: One-Way ANOVA and t-test

According to the analysis of the differences between personal factors, socio-economics factors, supporting factors and awareness towards cultural heritage conservation; the factors significantly related to people awareness towards conservation of cultural heritage (Aranyik knives) included duration of stay ($p\text{-value} = 0.05$) as well as knowledge and valuation of cultural heritage ($p\text{-value}=0.01$). The problems of Aranyik knives conservation

included lack of inheritance to the next generation, lack of production technology, and lack of communication.

Table 1 The analysis of the differences between personal factors and awareness towards cultural heritage conservation (Aranyik knives) (One-way Analysis of Variance and t-test)

Variables	Mean ($\bar{x}$)	S.D.	N	P-Value
Sex				0.63
Male	26.52	5.197	159	
Female	26.36	4.942	196	
Age				0.52
33 years old and younger	27.03	5.636	107	
34–50 years old	26.11	4.838	155	
51–67 years old	26.34	4.443	67	
68 years old and older	26.11	5.286	29	
Education level				0.71
Primary school and lower	26.43	4.817	99	
Upper secondary school	27.10	4.905	76	
High school/Vocational School	25.98	5.397	85	
Diploma	26.18	5.136	53	
Bachelor degree and above	26.45	5.133	42	
Origin				0.11
In Pha Nakhon Sri Ayutthaya	26.70	4.878	316	
Province Outside Pha Nakhon Sri	24.25	5.910	39	
Ayutthaya Province (Yasothon,				
Khon Kaen,				
Patum Thani, Saraburi, Nan,				
Nakohnsawan, etc.)				

Table 2 The analysis of the differences between socio-economics factors and awareness towards cultural heritage conservation (Aranyik knives) (One - way Analysis of Variance and t - test)

Variables	Mean ($\bar{x}$)	S.D.	N	P-Value
Major occupation				0.63
Merchant	26.21	5.253		
Government office/ state enterprise	25.80	3.794		
Student	26.55	5.296		
Company staffs/ general employees (Cocks feeding, construction, van driver, etc.)	26.32	4.893		
	27.61	5.551		
Average income per month				0.78
5,000 Baht and less	26.66	5.634		
5,001 – 10,000 Baht	26.35	4.952		
10,001 – 15,000 Baht	26.65	5.085		
15,001 Baht and more	25.79	4.944		
Number of family member				0.47
3 persons and less	26.01	5.554		
4 – 6 persons	26.64	4.811		
7 persons and more	25.45	6.006		
Duration of stay in Pha Nakhon Sri Ayutthaya Province				0.05*
17 years and shorter	24.50	6.306		
18 – 35 years	27.11	5.240		
36 – 53 years	26.21	4.601		
54 – 71 years	26.96	4.468		
72 years and longer	25.00	5.247		

*Statistically significant difference found at $p \leq 0.05$

Table 3 The analysis of the differences between supporting factors and awareness towards cultural heritage conservation (Aranyik knives) (One - way Analysis of Variance and t-test)

Variables	Mean ($\bar{x}$)	S.D.	N	P-Value
Knowledge of cultural heritage conservation (Aranyik knives)				0.00*
6 scores and less	28.40	5.899	5	
7 – 8 scores	25.00	3.625	214	
9 scores and more	28.62	6.074	136	
Information of cultural heritage conservation (Aranyik knives)				0.86
33 scores and less	26.54	4.935	175	
34 – 37 scores	26.11	4.901	51	
38 scores and more	26.41	5.292	129	
Valuation of cultural heritage conservation (Aranyik knives)				0.00*
11 scores and less	28.30	5.839	162	
12 – 14 scores	24.91	3.952	147	
15 scores and more	24.71	2.227	46	

*statistically significant difference found at $p \leq 0.01$

Discussion and Conclusion

The result found that the awareness of people towards cultural heritage conservation (Aranyik knives) was low (71.3%) which rejected the null hypothesis. The awareness towards cultural heritage conservation (Aranyik knives) was low were because of low perception of information and low valuation of

cultural heritage conservation (Aranyik knives). It is interesting to notice that most of the respondents gave value of cultural heritage in low level (45.6%). In additions, 45.1 percent of the respondents needed to know more information about the method of cultural heritage conservation (Aranyik knives). This can be implied that local people do not know the method of cultural heritage conservation (Aranyik knives) so that they do not have experience in cultural heritage conservation (Aranyik knives). Consequently, the awareness of cultural heritage conservation (Aranyik knives) was low. Thus, more information on cultural heritage conservation (Aranyik knives) may increase the awareness of local people.

The analysis of the differences between personal factors, socio-economics factors, supporting factors and people awareness towards conservation of cultural heritage handicraft: A case study of Aranyik knives conservation, Pha Nakhon Sri Ayutthaya Province

Hypothesis 1 : The difference of people awareness towards conservation of cultural heritage handicraft was affected by sex.

The study found that there was no significant differences between sex and people awareness towards conservation of cultural heritage. *The hypothesis was rejected.* This could be explained that information perception was a result of personal interest. The result of this study was consistent with the study of Ariya Aubuathong (2007 : 148) who found that there was no significant differences between sex and cultural conservation in Phra Pathom Chedi, Nakhon Pathom Province.

Hypothesis 2 : The difference of people awareness towards conservation of cultural heritage handicraft was affected by age.

Since most of the respondents included elders and young generations who had to go to school. Thus, they could not participate in the tradition and consequently they did not give value to cultural conservation. *The hypothesis was rejected.* The result of this study was consistent with the study of Ariya Aubuathong (2007 : 148) who found that there was no significant differences between age and cultural conservation in Phra Pathom Chedi, Nakhon Pathom Province.

Hypothesis 3 : The difference of people awareness towards conservation of cultural heritage handicraft was affected by education level.

The study found that the difference of people awareness towards conservation of cultural heritage handicraft was not significantly affected by education level. *The hypothesis was rejected.* The hypothesis was rejected. Most of the respondents graduated primary school and lower (27.9%); followed by high school/ vocational school (23.9%), upper-secondary school (21.4%), diploma (14.9%), and bachelor degree and higher (11.8%). Therefore, their experience related to awareness were indifferent. In additions, the cultural conservation was not contained in the course syllabus. The respondents only obtained experience of cultural conservation when participating in the community's tradition. The result of this study was consistent with Amornsiri

Duangdee (2012 : 101) who studied tourists in Amphawa Floating Market in Samut Songkhram Province and found that the difference of people awareness towards conservation of fireflies was insignificantly affected by education level.

Hypothesis 4 : The difference of people awareness towards conservation of cultural heritage handicraft was affected by domicile.

The study found that the difference of people awareness towards conservation of cultural heritage handicraft was not significantly affected by domicile. *The hypothesis was rejected.* The domicile of most of the respondents was in Pha Nakhon Sri Ayutthaya Province (89.0%) while 11.0 percent of the respondents were from outside the province (Yasothon, Khon Kaen, Pathumthani, Sarabuthi, Nan, Nakhonsawan, etc.). The reason of moving to Pha Nakhon Sri Ayutthaya Province was mostly due to marriage. Only few respondents moved and stayed alone. The result of this study was consistent to Kamjorn Wongprasert (2010: 124) who found that the difference in domicile did not significantly affect cultural conservation awareness.

Hypothesis 5 : The difference of people awareness towards conservation of cultural heritage handicraft was affected by occupation.

The study found that the difference of people awareness towards conservation of cultural heritage handicraft was not significantly affected by occupation. *The hypothesis was rejected.*

Most of the respondents were businessman/ merchant (25.9%), followed by others (fighting cock feeding, construction, van driver, etc 11%), students (5.6%), and government/ state enterprise (2.8%). Occupation might affect the perception of the respondents. The perception depended on experiences, attention, valuation, as well as interest of the respondents. Personal awareness was a result of perception. Thus, the difference of people awareness towards conservation of cultural heritage handicraft was not significantly affected by occupation. The result of this study was consistent to Kamjorn Wongprasert (2010: 124) who found that the different occupation did not significantly led to difference in cultural conservation awareness.

Hypothesis 6 : The difference of people awareness towards conservation of cultural heritage handicraft was affected by income.

The study found that the difference of people awareness towards conservation of cultural heritage handicraft was not significantly affected by income. *The hypothesis was rejected.* There was no expense in accessing to cultural heritage conservation. Both rich and poor people could engage in cultural heritage in the community. Thus, the difference of people awareness towards conservation of cultural heritage handicraft was not significantly affected by income. The result of this study was consistent with Amornsiri Duangdee (2012 : 101) who studied tourists in Amphawa Floating Market in Samutsongkram Province and found that the difference of people awareness towards conservation of fireflies was insignificantly affected by average income per month.

Hypothesis 7 : The difference of people awareness towards conservation of cultural heritage handicraft was affected by number of household members.

The study found a significant difference between duration of stay and people awareness towards conservation of cultural heritage. The respondents who have lived in Pha Nakhon Sri Ayutthaya Province for 18-35 years had high level of awareness towards cultural conservation. *The hypothesis was accepted.* Most of the respondents had lived in the community since they were born, thus; the different duration of stay led to difference of people awareness towards conservation of cultural heritage. The result of this study was consistent to Kamjorn Wongprasert (2010: 150) who found that the different duration of living led to difference in cultural conservation awareness at significant level 0.05

Hypothesis 8 : The difference of people awareness towards conservation of cultural heritage handicraft was affected by number of household members.

The study found that the difference of people awareness towards conservation of cultural heritage handicraft was not significantly affected by number of household members. *The hypothesis was rejected.* Most of the respondents had approximately 4 members in the family including students and workers. Thus, they did not exchange information about cultural heritage conservation. Consequently, the different number of

household members did not lead to the difference of awareness towards conservation of cultural heritage. The result of this study was contradict to Veeraya Boonsin (2010 : 102) who studied people awareness towards water resources in Koh Samui District, Suratthani Province and found that the difference of people awareness towards water resources problem was affected by number of household members at significant level 0.001.

Hypothesis 9 : The difference of people awareness towards conservation of cultural heritage handicraft was affected by level of knowledge.

The study found that the difference of people awareness towards conservation of cultural heritage handicraft was affected by level of knowledge at significant level 0.001. *The hypothesis was accepted.* The respondents who had high level of knowledge towards cultural heritage conservation (Aranyik knives) would have higher awareness than others. The result of this study was consistent with Darapak Yenjai (2008) who studied academic personnel in schools in Nakhonchaisri District, Nakhonpathom Province and found that the different score of knowledge led to difference in awareness towards air pollution from cremation at significant level 0.01.

Hypothesis 10 : The difference of people awareness towards conservation of cultural heritage handicraft was affected by information perception.

The study found that the difference of people awareness towards conservation of cultural heritage handicraft was not significantly affected by information perception. *The hypothesis was rejected.* Most of the respondents perceived information related to cultural heritage conservation (Aranyik knives) in low level (49.3%). Consequently, the awareness towards cultural heritage conservation was low. The awareness of people who differently perceived the information towards conservation of cultural heritage handicraft was similar. The result of this study was consistent with Darapak Yenjai (2008 : 143) who studied academic personnel in schools in Nakhonchaisri District, Nakhonpathom Province and found that the different score of information perception led to difference in awareness towards air pollution from cremation at significant level 0.05.

Hypothesis 11 : The difference of people awareness towards conservation of cultural heritage handicraft was affected by valuation of cultural heritage.

The study found that the difference of people awareness towards conservation of cultural heritage handicraft was affected by valuation of cultural heritage at significant level 0.001. *The hypothesis was accepted.* The respondents who gave low valuation to cultural heritage had low awareness towards cultural heritage conservation. Since the level of knowledge of the respondents was in moderate and high level; thus the respondents differently gave valuation to the cultural heritage conservation.

The result of this study was consistent to Kamjorn Wongprasert (2010 : 152-153) who found that the different duration of living led to difference in cultural conservation awareness at significant level 0.05

Problems, obstacles, and recommendations to raise awareness towards cultural heritage conservation

According to the study, problems and obstacles in raising awareness towards cultural heritage conservation included;

1) Youths and new generation did not pay attention to inherit conducting Aranyik knives due to difficulty in the production process. In additions, the knowledge of Aranyik knives' making was not transferred to new generation. Thus, the number of knife makers was decreased.

2) Most of the respondents has been informed about cultural heritage conservation in low level. Although the frequency of receiving information was often (more than 4 times per month), the level of perception to the information was low. This might be because the information was not in the respondents' interest. The result of this study indicated that the respondents need to know these following information; 1) method of cultural heritage conservation (Aranyik knives), 2) importance of cultural heritage conservation (Aranyik knives), and 3) participation in cultural heritage conservation (Aranyik knives). Source of information that the respondents would like to receive was from television.

3) Local people were lack of knowledge and understanding towards cultural heritage conservation. The result of this study indicated that the respondents need to know these following information; 1) method of cultural heritage conservation (Aranyik knives), 2) importance of cultural heritage conservation (Aranyik knives), 3) participation in cultural heritage conservation (Aranyik knives). This is also a good opportunity for local people to participate in cultural heritage conservation (Aranyik knives).

4) The valuation of cultural heritage conservation (Aranyik knives) was low. Most of the respondents paid attention to occupation rather than to the cultural heritage conservation. They thought that it was a government's responsibility to conserve Aranyik knives. Once people were ignored to conserve cultural heritage, it was difficult to raise awareness to them.

Recommendations

Awareness towards cultural heritage conservation (Aranyik knives)

1) Regarding knowledge and understanding, local people should be informed about cultural heritage coservation (Aranyik knives). The result of this study indicated that the respondents need to know these following information; 1) method of cultural heritage conservation (Aranyik knives), 2) importance of cultural heritage conservation (Aranyik knives), 3) participation in cultural heritage conservation (Aranyik knives). These activities should be

done by government or local government agencies in order to strengthen relationship between each other. This is also a good opportunity for local people to participate in cultural heritage conservation (Aranyik knives).

2) Regarding receive of information, most of the respondents has been informed about cultural heritage conservation in low level. Although the frequency of receiving information was often (more than 4 times per month), the level of perception to the information was low. This might be because the information was not in the respondents' interest. The result of this study indicated that the respondents need to know these following information; 1) method of cultural heritage conservation (Aranyik knives), 2) importance of cultural heritage conservation (Aranyik knives), and 3) participation in cultural heritage conservation (Aranyik knives). Source of information that the respondents would like to receive was from television.

3) Regarding the valuation of cultural heritage conservation (Aranyik knives), most of the respondents did not pay attention to the problems of cultural heritage conservation. The respondents have received benefit from cultural heritage (Aranyik knives) such as income and pride in community culture. As a result, local people were ignored to conserve cultural heritage (Aranyik knives). The community should set up community activities to teach community traditions by coordinating with temple and school. These activities would also increase public participation in cultural heritage conservation.

4) The respondents was lack of awareness in 1) method of cultural heritage conservation (Aranyik knives), 2) importance of cultural heritage conservation (Aranyik knives), 3) participation in cultural heritage conservation (Aranyik knives). Thus, the activities should be set up to promote knowledge with all age groups via community learning network.

Awareness raising

1) The related government agencies should support cultural heritage conservation (Aranyik knives) activities. Once people has attended the activities, they will value the cultural heritage and will consequently increase their awareness towards cultural heritage conservation (Aranyik knives).

2) The study found that knowledge towards cultural heritage conservation (Aranyik knives) was medium. Therefore, youth and young generation as well as elders in the community should be informed about tradition, culture, and the way of sustain cultural heritage.

3) The local administrative organization and concerned government agencies should develop cultural tourism by focusing on the identity of Aranyik knives. The cultural tourism will increase income to the community.

4) The Aranyik handicraft training should be set up to increase number of new artists as well as to support creating new identity of products and marketable products.

Recommendations for Further Study

1. The way to increase knowledge towards cultural heritage conservation (Aranyik knives)
2. The way to increase people's awareness towards cultural heritage conservation (Aranyik knives)
3. Cultural tourism management (Aranyik knives) by local community

References

- Aekarat Phayattikool. (2012). **The study of cultural heritage of Chiang Khan district to design a Cultural Learning Center Chiang Khan district, Loei province.** Thesis. Master (Interior Design). Graduate School. Silpakorn University.
- Ariya Oubuatong. (2007). **A comparative study of awareness on cultural heritage conservation between Thai and foreign tourists: a case study of Phra Pathom Chedi, Nakhon Pathom province.** Thesis. Master of Arts (Environment). Faculty of Graduate Studies, Mahidol University.
- Bureau of Education. Phra Nakohn Si Ayutthaya Municipality. (2016). **Annual traditions.**
- Chanidapa Krachaechan. (2014). **The participation of community members from the Kwai Rover, A riverside community in Kanchanaburi.** Thesis. Master of Arts Program in Environmental Social Sciences. Faculty of Graduate Studies, Mahidol University.

- Kamjohn Wongprasert. (2010). **The Awareness of Local People Towards Cultural and Environment Conservation**. Thesis. Master of Arts (Environment). Faculty of Graduate Studies, Mahidol University.
- Matichon Daily. (2014). **Ayutthaya city landscape**. Friday 25 April 2014.
- Ministry of Culture. (2005). **Definition, Concept, and Issue related to “Cultures”**. Office of the National Culture Commission: Bangkok.
- Ministry of Culture. (2007). **Cultural Master Plan 2007-2016 : Executive Summary**. Bangkok: Strategy and Planning Division. Office of the Permanent Secretary.
- Noppawan Threerapuncharoen. (2006). **Participatory action research of the community leader for environmental development on Muslim cultural tourism zone : case study on Phatuchai and Phathong, Phranakhon Si Ayuthhya District, Phranakhon Si Ayuthhya Province**. Research. Phranakhon Si Ayutthaya Rajabhat University.
- Office of the National Culture Commission. (1985). **Sciences and values establishment**. Bangkok: Kurusapa Printing Ladphrao.
- Office of the Royal Society. (2012). **Culture**. Accessed on 18 February 2019.

Paisan Sansornvisuth et al. (2014). **Knowledge management of local cultural heritage in Uthai Thani Province. Proceedings.** 15th Graduate studies in Northern Rajabhat Universities Conference. Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Nakorn Sawan Rajabhat University.

Phra Nakhon Si Ayutthaya Provincial Office. (2017). **Phra Nakhon Si Ayutthaya strategic movement following Ministry of Interior policy and provincial strategic plan 2016 - 2017.** Information and Communication Bureau: Phra Nakhon Si Ayutthaya Province.

Ploypattra Takulthongjaroen. (2014). **The awareness of cultural heritage conservation through the participatory process a case study of Saladaeng Nua village, Chiang Rai.** Thesis. M.Arch. (Interior Architecture) Graduate School. Bangkok University.

Rataya Saraporn. (2009). **Local people's participation in cultural heritage conservation: a case study of the old sector of Pattani town.** Thesis. Master of Arts (Environment). Faculty of Graduate Studies, Mahidol University.

Royal Institute Dictionary 1999. (2003). Bangkok: Nanmeebooks Publication Limited.

Suwat Sirirat. (2008). **Knowledge of conservation and rehabilitation of mangrove forest area: a case study of people in Kwang Thakarm, Bang Khun Thein district, Bangkok, Thailand.** Thesis. Master of Arts (Environment). Faculty of Graduate Studies, Mahidol University.

- Tanomlap Ratchawat. (2007). **Awareness of Thai tourists on cultural heritage conservation: a case study Wat Chaiwatthanaram, Phra Nakohn Si Ayutthaya Province.** Thesis. Master of Arts (Environment). Faculty of Graduate Studies, Mahidol University.
- Thanakorn Trakarnta. (2007). **Guidelines for designing educational center of history on the cultural heritage site of Lop Buri.** Master Thesis. Thammasart University.
- Tipaporn Triban. (2014). **Guidelines for potential development of historical tourism: Case study of Aranyik Knives Village, Phra Nakhon Si Ayutthaya Province.** Thesis. Master of Arts (Hospitality and Tourism Industry Management). Bangkok University.
- Touchaporn Rock-chai. (2016). **The Analysis of Values and Existence of Knifesmithing Local Wisdom: A Case of Aranyik Knife Village at Nakhon Luang in Pha Nakhon Sri Ayutthaya Province.** Silpakorn Educational Research Journal. 8(2). 230-240.
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (n.d.). (2005). **Convention concerning the protection of the world cultural and natural heritage.**